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Abstract
The Berlin Zeughaus (Armoury) has served for over three centuries as a principal site for the self-representation of the Prussian state and German nation. Though the museal history of the site only began with the opening of two small Schinkel-designed display rooms in 1831, it has always held a primary display function as a place for the presentation of war trophies—a function that is inscribed in the very fabric of the building. This thesis examines the way in which national historical narratives have been enacted at the site via an investigation of the changing perception and presentation of its collections across time.

Taking a primarily museological approach, this thesis considers museum practices at the Zeughaus in the context of German historiographical developments and their connection to political and ideological imperatives, the evolution of the museum landscape in Berlin, and the broader relationship between these developments, the emergence of the modern public museum, and the changing conception of the role and function of museums over the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Treating the Zeughaus itself as an “object,” it examines the shifts and continuities in the interpretation and mediation of the site and the collections that have been housed there, revealing an intimate relationship between the two.

The current inhabitant of the Zeughaus, the German Historical Museum, bears the legacy of these layered histories. As the national historical museum of the Federal Republic of Germany it is both a separate entity, created under specific political circumstance and designed to address a set of historical-political needs, and the successor institution of its East German counterpart, the Museum for German History. The tensions inherent in this dynamic necessitate critical reflection on the history of the institution as a vital pre-requisite for an understanding of how nation is reified in the museum and the role of the national museum today.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMGUS</td>
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<td>Sowjetische Militäradministration in Deutschland (Soviet Military Administration in Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMB-SPK</td>
<td>Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin – Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz (State Museum of Berlin – Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>VEB</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
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Introduction

Making histories: the legacy of collecting traditions

[T]he version of the past that appears in this year’s museum display has been created, very largely, out of objects collected in the past, often in accordance with purposes and principles different from, and even foreign to, our own. Presenting history in the museum thus becomes a critical encounter with the history of the museum itself.

- Graeme Davison, National Museums: Negotiating Histories

MacNamara: They’re staying at the Grand Hotel Potemkin. You know where it is?
Fritz: Yes sir. It used to be the Grand Hotel Goring, and before that, it was the Grand Hotel Bismarck.

- Billy Wilder’s One, Two, Three, United Artists, 1961

In 2013 Germany celebrated the two-hundredth anniversary of the “Battle of Nations,” the victory of the coalition Prussian, Austrian, Russian, Swedish, Saxon, and Württemberg armies over the occupying Napoleonic forces at Leipzig on 16-19 October 1813. As the turning point in the liberation of the German-speaking territories and a significant expression of, and further impulse for, growing German national movements, the Battle of Leipzig holds a place in German commemorative culture analogous to that in Britain of the later defining victory over Napoleon at Waterloo. The German Historical Museum’s (Deutsches Historisches Museum; DHM) modest bicentennial contribution, 1813 – At the Battlefield near Leipzig (22 August 2013 – 23 March 2014), which centred on an Austrian oil painting, “Declaration of the Allied Victory” by Johann Peter Kraft

2Billy Wilder, One, Two, Three, USA: United Artists, 1961
3Susan M. Pearce describes the status of Waterloo in Britain as that of a ‘sublime event, one which was so intense in its capacity to stimulate emotion and experience that it achieved immediate and lasting significance in the construction of what it meant to be British throughout the nineteenth century’. Susan M. Pearce, ’The matériel of war: Waterloo and its culture,’ in Conflicting visions: war and visual culture in Britain and France, c. 1700-1830, ed. John Bonehill and Geoff Quilley (Aldershot, Hants., England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005), p. 208. An understanding of the importance of the Battle of Leipzig in the German commemorative culture can be gleaned from the treatment of the subject for the centennial celebrations in 1913, for which the monumental Völkerschlacht memorial was built outside Leipzig, along with a purpose-built pavilion at Breslau (Wrocław) to house one of two major exhibitions; Historische Ausstellung Jahrhundertfeier der Freiheitskriege, Katalog der Historischen Ausstellung: Jahrhundertfeier der Freiheitskriege Breslau 1913 (Breslau: Verlag Jahrhundert-Ausstellung, 1913); Josef Fohnesics, ’Die Breslauer Ausstellung zur Jahrhundertfeier der Freiheitskriege,’ Kunst und Kunstwerk. Monatsheft herausgegeben vom k.k. Österreich, XVI, no. 10, 1913, pp. 505-525; Jeffrey R. Smith, ’The Monarchy versus the Nation: The “Festive Year” 1913 in Wilhelmine Germany,’ German Studies Review, 23, no. 2, 2000, pp. 257-274.
(1839) acquired in the mid 1990s, presented a series of tableaux from the work to illustrate selected themes related to the battle and its subsequent memorialisation. It also included pieces from the museum’s historical collections grown over a period of two centuries; collections that had themselves developed out of the contemporary commemoration of the victories of 1813-15.

Perceived as an uninspired reflection of a lack of direction at the museum, the exhibition became the springboard for a series of highly critical press reports. Coinciding with the DHM’s corporate “re-positioning” and the launch of a new logo, the reports were primarily concerned with a failure of leadership, but also broached broader questions regarding the role of the museum as Germany's premier national historical museum, the focus of its special exhibition programme, and the vision for its permanent presentation of German history today. Though the museum's major permanent exhibition, which had been opened in the Berlin Zeughaus (armoury) on Unter den Linden in June 2006 has received criticism among academic circles, the museum had nonetheless enjoyed broad popular appeal as well as the general support of the German press, with the conservative Axel Springer publishing house dedicating a twenty-four-page Die Welt supplement to

---


the museum in the summer of 2006 along with a full-colour collector's volume, both under the title "Memory of the Nation." Seven years on, the museum was being accused of 'historical amnesia.'

As a new national museum founded in West Germany in 1987, the German Historical Museum began life with neither a collection nor an exhibition building. The expert commission appointed to develop the museum concept acknowledged that the museum itself would stand or fall on its ability to acquire suitable material. By its own account, a “stroke of luck” saw the embryonic museum inherit the vast collections of the former national historical museum of the German Democratic Republic, the Museum for German History (Museum für Deutsche Geschichte; MfDG), just two years later, following the fall of the Berlin Wall. At the same time the DHM abandoned its plans for a new Aldo Rossi designed building opposite the Reichstag and took residence in the seventeenth-century Berlin Zeughaus, former Prussian armoury, arms and armour and military historical museum, and, from 1952, seat of the MfDG. While the transfer of the building and its collections was by no means uncontroversial, the political decision reflects both a common problem of a national unification dominated by West German interests and perspectives and an ongoing process of political re-orientation at the Zeughaus, which has served for over three centuries as a central site for official state self-representation. In this sense, the current crisis at the museum is also reflective of broader tensions, as challenges to the established West German historical narrative enshrined in the permanent exhibitions are met with uncertainty.

Also in 2013, another of the DHM’s special exhibitions highlighted a different problem of historical re-interpretation—the legacy of collecting traditions. Around the World. Tourism posters from the collection of the German Historical Museum (18 April – 1 September 2013) featured five posters dating from the 1910s and 1920s, recently re-purchased at auction following the loss of just

---


7 Kilb, ‘Ein Fall von Geschichtsvergessenheit,’ p. 25.


10 The DHM initially took up temporary residence in the Zeughaus, still planning to realise the Rossi building, but the decision to transfer the capital from Bonn to Berlin and the establishment of a new government quarter along the section of the Spree leading westward from the Reichstag (now Bundestag) solidified the museum’s residence in the Zeughaus.
over 4,200 of the museum’s exceptional 80,000-strong poster collection.11 The lost posters, representing approximately one third of the world-renowned Hans Sachs collection seized by the Nazi Propaganda Ministry in 1938 as the Jewish collector fled Germany with his family, were awarded by the German Federal Court to Sachs’ heir in March 2012 following a protracted legal battle.12 The comprehensive collection, which included works by Alfons Mucha, Wassily Kandinsky, Käthe Kollwitz, Max Pechstein, Otto Dix, Jules Chéret, Lucian Bernhard and A.M. Cassandre, was believed lost until a portion surfaced in the collections of the Museum for German History in the mid-1960s. Though Sachs had received some compensation from the West German government for the (then) lost collection in 1961, the Federal Court found that his legal rights had never been relinquished. The German Historical Museum’s vigorous attempts to retain the collection again earned criticism, this time as a historical museum ‘without historical instinct.’13

Though the German Historical Museum argued it was acting in the original collector’s interests, citing the desire to keep the collection together, and while the collection has subsequently been broken up and sold, a loss not just for the museum but for the art and cultural community as a whole, the DHM’s handling of the claim nevertheless represents a failure of institutional responsibility in the light of National Socialist injustices. But the case is also indicative of the

---

broader issues surrounding inherited collections. In a sense, the DHM inherited not only the collections of the Museum for German History and the Zeughaus museum before it, but also the legacy of the questionable collecting practices of the past, a problem compounded by missing records and the uncertain origin of many of its objects, the Sachs collection among them. Though the case has received the most public attention, it is just one of many complications surrounding the museum’s collections. Acquired across a period of almost two centuries, the collections reflect both the very different ideological and historiographical needs of the political regimes that have ruled Prussia and Germany during that time, and the problematic nature of collections assembled under the state privilege of two German dictatorships. The DHM’s subsequent attempts to re-acquire items from the Sachs collection as they appear on the open market provides a curious insight into the relationship between collections and institutional identities.

This thesis is concerned with the presentation of official histories at the Berlin Zeughaus and how they have been enacted via collecting and exhibition practice and museum technologies. The extreme breaks in the museum’s governance provide the opportunity to examine both shifts and continuities in the political, ideological, and historiographical image presented at the site as well as the way in which the museum has served as both a reflection of, and active participant in, the construction of official historical narratives and the promotion of national identities. Focussing on the idea of reorientation, the study traces the museum’s core historical collections as they have progressed through time, revealing how they have been perceived, integrated, expanded, re-interpreted, and re-presented under different historical-political circumstances. Though the museal history of the site only began with the opening of two small display rooms designed by Friedrich Schinkel in 1831, later being transformed into a grand Ruhmeshalle (Hall of Fame) and public museum of arms and armour and army history for the glorification of the Prusso-German historical image after the unification of 1871, it always held a display function as a central site for the presentation of war trophies—a function that is inscribed in the very fabric of the building. Attempts to re-conceptualise the displays according to art and cultural-historical principles in the aftermath of the First World War proved difficult and the museum was quickly co-opted into the National Socialist military propaganda and popular education programme after 1933. Extensive damage during the Second World War and the dispersal and destruction of much of the museum’s inventory did not deter the re-establishment of the collections and their incorporation into the broader national historical image of the German Democratic Republic, which realised the potential of the building it “reclaimed” from the militarist and imperialist past for the creation of its own national institution. Each of these stages in the history of the Berlin Zeughaus has engaged with the
legacy of inherited collections to re-create the past in its own image. Today’s German Historical Museum, in the heart of the “Berlin Republic,” is no exception.

While the Zeughaus represents a specific case through which the shifts in the German national image are manifest, the questions raised by its example are of significance for museums beyond Berlin and Germany. Viewed in the context of local and international museum developments, the evolution of the museum and its collections provides a concrete point of reference for a specific German narrative as well as the international crosscurrents that have informed the development of the modern museum and museological discourse. Few museums today do not have to contend with historically grown collections and the legacy of past collecting and exhibiting practices. As the case of the German Historical Museum shows, even those new institutions founded without collections often subsequently incorporate one or perhaps many existing collections (public and private), which they must evaluate and adapt to suit their institutional concept. This process is central to the consideration of the site, which incorporates the multiple tensions of its layered histories in objects, practices, architecture, and place.

These tensions also prompt engagement with museological questions, not merely related to the responsibilities of museums, but to the very nature of objects as historical evidence and their use for the promotion and maintenance of historical narratives and institutional authorities. Though theorists have long since problematised the idea of objects as evidence, this idea remains central to many history museums today. Indeed, the principle concept for the DHM’s permanent exhibition rests on the primacy of original historical objects—over 8,000 in total—that are intended to ‘testify

---

14 Another example of a new national museum established without a collection that soon found itself responsible for a large historical collection is the National Museum of Australia (NMA), which incorporated the collections of the former National Museum of Australian Zoology, dating from the first quarter of the twentieth century. See; Guy Hansen, “A sum of many parts: the history of the National Historical Collection” (paper presented at the Collecting for the Nation Symposium, National Museum of Australia, Canberra, 21 March 2006); Libby Robin, “Weird and wonderful: the first objects of the National Historical Collection” (paper presented at the Collecting for the Nation Symposium, National Museum of Australia, Canberra, 21 March 2006).

to the reality of the past.\textsuperscript{16} Even the exhibition title, \textit{German History in Pictures and Objects (Deutsche Geschichte in Bildern und Zeugnissen)}, reveals the dominance of the idea; the word "Zeugnis" means physical evidence, a certificate or report, or the testimony of a witness.\textsuperscript{17} At the time of the exhibition opening, reporter Wolfgang Ruppert called it a 'remarkable footnote' in the history of divided Germany that approximately half the objects on display originated in the collections of East Germany's national museum.\textsuperscript{18} But this is more than just a footnote. It is fundamental to the way in which history has continually been made and re-made at the site. Upon scrutiny, this process of reinterpretation disrupts the very notion of objects as evidence—and of objectivity in museum narratives—and reveals the use of such exhibition strategies as fraught, at best. This is what Gaynor Kavanagh has referred to as the 'shifts of meaning and reading', as the 'much broader social and cultural contexts of the museum overlay, even reframe, the object and its meaning.'\textsuperscript{19}

These shifts can be used to explore historiographical or museological concerns, or, indeed, the nexus between the two. They help elucidate the processes of both remembering and forgetting. 'Historical truth', writes David Lowenthal, 'is a merit much proclaimed and little adhered to. We normally choose to remember what we feel is necessary, and to forget what we prefer to omit.'\textsuperscript{20} In the museum this is played out in both the presentation of objects, via the exhibition, and the choices regarding their selection, preservation, and care, reflecting the museum's dual role as interpretive institution and archive.\textsuperscript{21} As Timothy W. Luke has demonstrated with the example of the long-neglected Enola Gay, which became the centre of the so-called "museum wars" in the United States

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{17} It is interesting to note the difference between the exhibition titles for the first, semi-permanent exhibition opened under the museum's first director, Christoph Stölzl, in 1994, and the latter opened under the direction of Hans Ottomeyer. The 1994-98 exhibition was titled \textit{Pictures and Objects from German History (Bilder und Zeugnisse der deutschen Geschichte)}, a less categorical claim than the latter \textit{German History in Pictures and Objects}. Though subtle, the difference is significant. The latter implies a presentation of German history (something objective and concrete) as given evidence by pictures and objects. The earlier title implies a presentation of pictures and objects taken from and/or towards an understanding of Germany history.
\item \textsuperscript{18} ['Daher ist es eine bemerkenswerte Fußnote der deutschen Teilungsgeschichte, dass die Hälfte der Objekte der ständigen Ausstellung aus diesen ehemaligen DDR-Sammlungen stammt, die andere Hälfte aus den Neuerwerbungen des DHM. '] Wolfgang Ruppert, 'Das Schweigen der Objekte. Kann man die deutsche Geschichte ausstellen?,' \textit{der Freitag}, 9 June 2006, p. 16.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Kavanagh, 'Objects as Evidence, or Not?,' p. 131.
\end{itemize}
when it was finally displayed (albeit in truncated form) at the Smithsonian: ‘Any astute reading of the museum recognizes its modes of remembering are also necessarily always manners of forgetting.’ These modes often reveal powerful truths, because they are determined by inherent social, political, and ideological beliefs. Ludmilla Jordanova points to this process when she states: ‘What is present, like what is omitted, is not accidental, even if the selection process is largely unconscious. It is precisely in this way that historical myths are constructed—myths that express powerful, if silent needs.’

Examining these processes is all the more important because, despite the many challenges that museums now face from a variety of competing interests (contested cultural property ownership, demands for representation, the fracturing of dominant narratives), they continue to command a great deal of public trust. This trust is often associated with carefully constructed institutional authorities, and has been linked to the public perception of objects as tangible proof of past events. While a great deal of academic interest has focussed on the construction of these authorities via architecture, place, language, the physicality and arrangement of objects, and the movement of visitors through space, museum practitioners are often concerned with the practicalities of museum work far more so than with institutional critique. But, as Carol Duncan avers: ‘To control a museum means precisely to control the representation of a community and some of its highest most authoritative truths.’ Engaging with institutional histories, not merely those success stories built around the canonisation of great (male) collectors and directors, but the uneasy realities of the museum’s complicity in upholding particular narratives and the complications inherent in many collections, can help uncover the contingency of these narratives, not only historically but also in current practice.

---

A new past?

In 1990 historian Paul Sheehan astutely observed that the momentous historical change underway would not only profoundly affect the future, but must also necessitate changes to the past. Assuming control of the Museum for German History in the weeks preceding reunification, the German Historical Museum quite consciously set about re-writing the meaning of its new collections. Long-term head of the DHM collections, Dieter Vorsteher, has described the process by which the objects of the former East German museum were transformed:

The ideological glue binding the objects and their message cracked along with the fall of the society of the GDR. The objects have been removed from the showcases of the permanent exhibition, from the "arsenal" of class struggle, to the depots, where, in isolation, they are first of all neutralized and separated from their ideology.

This passage speaks directly to the museum's perception of its burdened inheritance and its own role in relation to the re-assertion of an objective (neutral, ideology-free) use of objects. The museum itself was, however, far from free of its own ideological imperatives. Conceived as a response to a perceived "loss of identity" in the Federal Republic, it was simultaneously part of a worldwide "museum boom," a product of the re-nationalisation of West German politics and culture during the 1980s, and the culmination of the particular West German historiographical development over the course of the post-war era.

The specific circumstances of the foundation of the DHM have been covered extensively elsewhere, as have the broader historical debates with which the museum idea was associated. It

---

is not necessary to reproduce either in detail here, though it is important to understand the broad context within which the museum was conceived and the implications for its institutional mission. This also serves as a backdrop for a more detailed analysis of historiographical developments in the East, presented in the latter part of this thesis (chapters 5 to 7). The following therefore traces the main contours of the West German developments in very broad strokes. The term "historical consciousness" is used here to indicate a public awareness of history (as opposed to professional historical writing). With regard to dominant and changing historical narratives, this constitutes a broad assimilation of those narratives among the population for the construction and maintenance of a sense of common belonging, but may be, as Mary Fulbrook contends, far more influenced by other forms of historical production than by historians themselves. Though it is beyond the scope of this study to assess specific responses to historical narratives among individuals and groups, broad shifts in the development of a post-war historical consciousness in West Germany have been evidenced by participation in the production and consumption of historically oriented cultural products. It should be added, however, that accounts of the development of West German historical consciousness themselves reflect the construction of a type of national narrative; a narrative about how (West) Germany has successfully addressed its troubled past.

The standard accounts of West German post-war historical consciousness posit a number of distinct phases of development beginning with an initial rejection of the past in the immediate aftermath of defeat as people turned their attention to survival and physical reconstruction. Contemporaries who came of age in the post-war era speak of a withdrawal into forgetfulness, resistance and repression of the past, and a society that had 'turned its back on history.' While historians such as Friedrich Meinecke struggled to reconcile the pre-war triumphalist national historiography with the "German catastrophe," coming to understand Nazism as a perversion of the

---


32 Mary Fulbrook, 'Representing the nation: history and identity in East and West Germany,' in Representing the German nation: history and identity in twentieth-century Germany, ed. Mary Fulbrook and Martin Swales (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), p. 185.

33 Jörn Rüsen, for example, has examined historical consciousness and its relationship to moral values and reasoning; how historical narrative and memory of temporal experience orient individuals according to specific principles and influence practical life decisions. Jörn Rüsen, History: Narration - Interpretation - Orientation (New York and Oxford: Bergahn Books, 2005), Ch. 1.

German national character, conservative historians such as Gerhard Ritter were ‘quick to reclaim positive national values’, and widespread political apathy left established historical perspectives largely unchallenged.36

With the establishment of the Federal Republic in 1949, the era of political cleansing and re-education in the Western occupation zones came to an end and a largely resentful West German public expected not just a line to be drawn under retribution measures, but also under the past.37 Amnesty and integration following amendments to the Basic Law in 1951 resulted in the reintegration of former Nazis into business, the civil service, politics, and the judiciary, something that Anson Rabinbach has linked to a practical and political need to de-emphasise Nazism’s ‘broad popular basis and deep social roots in German history and tradition’.38 At the same time Cold-War politics precipitated a blurring of fascism and communism under the rubric of totalitarianism, which further displaced the twelve years of National Socialism from a national history in all other respects commendable.39 While officials spoke of Vergangenheitsbewältigung, or “coming to terms with the past,” such efforts represented not a genuine confrontation with the past, but rather, in author and jurist Bernhard Schlink’s words, ‘a longing for the impossible: to bring the past into such a state of order that its remembrance no longer burdens the present.’40

But a number of high-profile scandals involving former Nazis in positions of power, the Eichmann trial in Israel (1961), the Auschwitz trials in Frankfurt am Main (1963-65), and debate over the statute of limitations in the lead-up to the twentieth anniversary of WWII brought the Nazi past back into the public spotlight and this issue merged with concerns over democratic freedoms in West Germany during the 1960s to shape the contours of the larger student movement there. Thus, the German past was a critical element of the generational conflict that erupted in 1968. To quote Schlink once more: ‘We regarded it as self-evident that the past had to be talked about, researched,

---

38 Anson Rabinbach, 'The Jewish Question in the German Question,' in Baldwin, Reworking the Past, p. 47.
39 Berger, ‘Historians and Nation-Building in Germany after Reunification,’ pp. 189-190. Mary Fulbrook points out that the concept of totalitarianism also effectively diluted the distinctively German character of Nazism by rendering all totalitarian regimes, both right and left, as ‘a function of modern mass societies in general [rather] than of German history in particular.’ Mary Fulbrook, ‘Dividing the past, defining the present: Historians and national identity in two Germanies,’ in Writing national histories. Western Europe since 1800, ed. Stefan Berger, Mark Donovan, and Kevin Passmore (London; New York: Routledge, 1999), p. 225.
40 Schlink, Guilt about the Past, p. 44.
taught, learned. Our image of German history acquired its contours from its shadow. In the historical sciences, Fritz Fisher’s 1961 study, published in English as Germany’s Aims in the First World War, which placed responsibility for the outbreak of WWI with Germany, had far-reaching implications for the possible continuities of German history, not least between the Kaiserreich and the Third Reich. Other critical histories followed, as structuralist historians began to re-assess the Weimar and Imperial eras tracing structural continuities. This new scholarship signalled a methodological shift, incorporating techniques from the social sciences, which began to compete with the dominant political and economic histories that had prevailed in the conservative historical profession of the 1950s, with a concomitant shift away from national and towards local foci. Nevertheless, conservative national historians also remained active throughout the period.

The synthesis of the new approaches developed during the 1960s came with the publication in 1973 of Hans-Ulrich Wehler’s The German Empire, 1871-1918, which articulated the mature Sonderweg thesis, in which the celebratory nature of a previously held belief in a German “special path” was inverted. Drawing on Marxism and modernization theory, this formulation rested on Germany’s failure to carry through a bourgeois revolution, resulting in the continuance of pre-industrial (feudal and agrarian) elites in Imperial Germany’s advanced industrial society, whose interests lay in resistance to political modernism, the maintenance of an authoritarian and illiberal system, and an aggressive foreign policy for the maintenance of domestic assent. German history by this estimation had taken a wrong turn, leading away from western norms, with implications for the locus of Nazism in a negative German exceptionalism. Challenges to the Sonderweg thesis came in two very different forms. Conservative historians, keen to salvage German virtue, continued to resist the approach, while social historians on the British left initiated a much more considered

41 Ibid. p. 25.
42 Fisher himself stated that he only once mentioned the possible ramifications of his work with regard to continuities between Imperial Germany and National Socialism in the 1961 publication. He dealt explicitly with the topic in a subsequent publication, released in Germany in 1979 and titled in English, From Kaiserreich to Third Reich: elements of continuity in German history, 1871-1945, in 1986. Fritz Fischer, “Twenty-Five Years Later: Looking Back at the ‘Fischer Controversy’ and Its Consequences,” Central European History, 21, no. 3, 1988, p. 218.
44 Berger, The search for normality, p. 4.
46 Ibid.
47 Chickering, 'The Quest for a Usable German Empire,' p. 8.
critique of its core assumptions; most particularly its backward projection of 1933 as a determining factor for events in preceding periods and the presupposition of a “normal” path to modernisation.48

This critique opened up a new space for constructive debate about the place of National Socialism in German history, coupled with an increased awareness at the popular level (often linked to the screening of the US mini-series Holocaust in West Germany in 1979), and by the late 1980s pluralist approaches including feminist, cultural, labour, “every day,” and postmodernist histories were (belatedly) emerging in the West German historical sciences.49 During the 1980s there was an enormous upsurge in interest in history more generally (see further chapter 7), with several high-profile exhibitions proving hugely popular. The period also saw an attempted return to celebratory and exculatory national narratives. In the light of the CDU/CSU victory in 1982, Chancellor Helmut Kohl’s infamous “grace of late birth” remark with regard to his own generation’s relationship to the NS past, president Richard von Weizsäcker’s reference to 8 May 1945 as the “liberation” of Germany in a speech marking the fortieth anniversary of the allied victory in Europe, and Ronald Regan’s attendance at a military cemetery containing SS graves at Bitburg for the same, an act that turned Germans into the victims of an ‘awful evil started by one man’ and re-cast the past in the image of Cold War alliances, the most offensive of these revisionist histories prompted a sharp reaction from the Left.50 In particular, it was the relativisation of Nazi crimes via reference to other genocides (the question of “singularity”), and the desire to “normalise” the past and establish positive national bonds epitomised by recent publications from Cologne historian Andreas Hillgruber and a FAZ article titled “The Past that will not Pass” by Ernst Nolte in 1986 that set off what became a protracted, emotionally-charged, and acrimonious debate.51

Though certainly not the first high-profile controversy to break through into the public sphere, the Historikerstreit (historians’ dispute) was a significant reflection of the unresolved tensions in the German historical sciences, not only between the conservative and liberal camps, but also concerning core methodological questions, about which opinion among the diversified “Left”

50 Quote from Ronald Regan’s speech at Bergen-Belsen on 5 May 1985, an official engagement added to the schedule following protest over the Bitburg invitation, in Geoffrey H. Hartman, Bitburg in moral and political perspective (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), p. 263.
51 See note no. 31 above.
remained unreconciled. Though some have argued that the debate was ultimately unproductive, it does reveal important aspects of West Germany’s difficult relationship to the past and its inextricability from questions of national identity. Although not its immediate provocation, the proposals for the German Historical Museum in West Berlin and its companion, the House of History (Haus der Geschichte; HdG) in Bonn, were intimately bound up in the debate. Both conceived as national projects contrary to the strictly federalised cultural system in the FRG, the DHM was to present German history in a European context from the ‘first mention of the Germans in the ninth century’ to the present-day (with a small introduction in Celtic, Roman, Germanic and Frankish early history and an “open end” for the continuance of exhibitions to be written by the next generations), though its core focus was 900-1945.\textsuperscript{52} The HdG took the history of the Federal Republic and divided Germany from 1945 as its subject.\textsuperscript{53} The political imperatives for the creation of a positive national identification were never far from the surface. By the DHM’s own summation:

\begin{quote}
The conceptual development of the German Historical Museum in the mid 1980s [...] was a response by West German politics to the Germans’ resurgent need to tackle the history of their own nation. Above all, however, the politicians intended to set up an institution whose exhibits disseminated self-assurance among the general public.\textsuperscript{54}
\end{quote}

‘The cultural goal, politically,’ stated Hans-Martin Hinz in 2008, ‘was to offer people a place where they could experience who they are as Germans, where they come from and where their path could take them in the future.’\textsuperscript{55} Meanwhile, the aims set out for the HdG centred on the promotion and consolidation of a historical consciousness built around a clear narrative of democratic success.\textsuperscript{56}

The instrumentalisation of history via the proposed museums was not lost on those concerned about the West German national turn. Historian Hans Mommsen recognised in both plans a ‘goal of refuge in past normality.’\textsuperscript{57} Though the projects shared a common origin, they were qualitatively different: ‘one can hardly get upset about Bonn,’ wrote Andreas Ludwig in 1986, ‘so clear is the indoctrination intent of this “museum”’.\textsuperscript{58} The case for Berlin was much more

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{53} Bundesministerium des Innern et al., ’Überlegungen und Vorschläge zur Einrichtung eines ”Hauses der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland” in Bonn. Gutachten,’ edited by Bundesministerium des Innern, Bonn, 1984.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{54} Hinz, ‘Negotiating Histories,’ p. 56.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{56} Bundesministerium des Innern et al., ‘Überlegungen und Vorschläge,’ p. 1.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{58} [...über Bonn kann man sich kaum noch aufregen, so klar ist die indoktrinatorische Absicht dieses ”Museums”...]}\end{footnotes}
multifaceted. It was also, arguably, more important. Here was a proposed national museum that would present German history in its entirety—a presentation spanning two thousand years and the only museum to include National Socialism within a broader narrative of national development. Early debate about the museum had centred primarily on the issue of location, with the Berlin museum community committed to retaining the proposed Martin Gropius Building, former applied arts museum and home of the Museum of Prehistory and Early History and the East Asian Art Collection until 1945, for presentations of art and culture.\footnote{Geschichtswerkstatt Berlin, \textit{Die Nation als Ausstellungsstück: Planungen, Kritik und Utopien zu den Museumsgründungen in Bonn und Berlin} Geschichtswerkstatt Nr. 11 (Hamburg VSA-Verlag1987), p. 124.}

This issue was tentatively resolved with the idea to construct a new building opposite the Reichstag in early 1985, but in April the Greens "re-opened" the question in parliament, challenging the undemocratic nature of the decisions surrounding the DHM, the political implications of its placement (not the physical centre of West Berlin, but rather the symbolic heart of the former, possible future, capital), its undefined concept, and the lack of an existing collection which should provide an imperative for the establishment of a new institution. This, argued Christiane Zieseke of Berlin’s Alternative List, was about 'establishing [a museum] purely from above. A monument of a new national identification is in preparation.'\footnote{The debate surrounding the location of the proposed DHM and the implications of the proposed site for the making of meaning are discussed at length in Till, "Place and the politics of memory." See also Helmut Trontow, 'Die Berliner Diskussion (1978 bis 1985),’ in Stölzl and Beier-de Haan, \textit{Deutsches Historisches Museum: Ideen, Kontroversen, Perspektiven}, pp. 55-59.}\footnote{["Die zum Vorzeigen geeignete republikanische Tradition des Ortes verschleiert in der Öffentlichkeit, daß es sich um eine reine Gründung von oben handelt. Vorbereitet wird ein Monument neuer nationaler Identifikation."] Christiane Zieseke, 'Protokoll einer öffentlichen Diskussion, veranstaltet durch "Die Grünen" im Deutschen Bundestag und die Faktion der Alternativen Liste Berlin im Reichstagsgebäude in Berlin am 21. April 1985,' in Stölzl and Beier-de Haan, \textit{Deutsches Historisches Museum: Ideen, Kontroversen, Perspektiven}, p. 251.}\footnote{Geschichtswerkstatt Berlin, 'Zur Einleitung;' and Jürgen Habermas, 'Zum neokonservativen Geschichtsverständnis und zur Rolle der revisionistischen Geschichtsbeschreibung in der politischen Öffentlichkeit,' Geschichtswerkstatt Berlin, \textit{Die Nation als Ausstellungsstück}, pp. 7-9; pp. 43-49.} Philosopher and sociologist Jürgen Habermas warned against the neo-conservative historical understanding and the role of revisionist histories in the political public sphere, while the Berlin History Workshop highlighted the role of the museums in the Right's attempt to wrest the control of German history from the influence of the Left that had emerged during the 1960s, rejecting the plans outright.\footnote{This issue was tentatively resolved with the idea to construct a new building opposite the Reichstag in early 1985, but in April the Greens "re-opened" the question in parliament, challenging the undemocratic nature of the decisions surrounding the DHM, the political implications of its placement (not the physical centre of West Berlin, but rather the symbolic heart of the former, possible future, capital), its undefined concept, and the lack of an existing collection which should provide an imperative for the establishment of a new institution. This, argued Christiane Zieseke of Berlin’s Alternative List, was about ‘establishing [a museum] purely from above. A monument of a new national identification is in preparation.’} But despite continuing debate, the museum’s expert advisory council delivered its revised concept in June 1987 and the DHM was officially presented to the city of Berlin as a “gift” from Chancellor Kohl for its 750th anniversary in October. When the Wall fell the DHM had built a collection of around 20,000 objects. It officially inherited a further 450,000 objects, though the figure is likely far greater. Although the momentous historical changes precipitated modifications to its concept, most significantly the incorporation of the GDR into its post-war presentations and the accommodation of the displays within a building a
third the size of that envisaged, the 1987 concept remained (and remains) the core defining principle of the DHM, a principle to which the extant collections must be re-oriented.

Reorienting place: a methodological model

In the aftermath of German reunification the process of reorganising the physical landscape of the former East prompted a series of site studies focussed on the reorientation of meaning at places of significance. These dealt predominately with urban topographies, particularly the fast-changing centre of Berlin with its representative structures and “burdened landscapes,” as well as key memorial sites, many of which possessed layered histories as sites of National Socialist terror, Soviet prison camps, and memorials dedicated to some of the GDR’s core foundational myths, which were now in the process of being made anew. These kinds of studies were influenced by a number of key texts linking memory, place, and ceremonial practice with the construction of historical narratives and nation-building projects, most notably Benedict Anderson’s Imagined Communities (1983), Erich Hobsbawm and Terrence Ranger’s The Invention of Tradition (1983), Hobsbawm’s Nations and Nationalism since 1780 (1992), Pierre Nora’s Lieux de Mémoire (published in French between 1984-92 and in English between 1996-98), and the English-language publication of Maurice Halbwachs’ posthumous 1950 publication On Collective Memory (1992).

---


The site studies also coincided with an increasing adoption of cultural studies methods within German Studies in English-speaking countries, further building on social history models to embrace, in Irene Kacandes' words, 'articulation, conjecture, habitus, hegemony, identity, ideology, power, race, representation and sexuality.' The level of interest in Berlin as a “conduit,” per E.J. Gittus, for the shaping of a new German national identity, was matched only by the enormity of information that was now becoming available as the archives of the former GDR were finally opened to scholarship. Though many of the sites dealt with were, and continue to be, of critical importance for the outward projection of the new political orientation—Potsdamer Platz, the Reichstag, the Holocaust memorial, the Palace Square and former Palast der Republik / future palace reconstruction—Schinkel’s New Guard House (Neue Wache) on Berlin’s central boulevard Unter den Linden stands out as an exemplar for this model, with no less than seven scholars presenting studies of the site and its changing representative value (Fig. 0.1 to 0.3). As a site created to commemorate the victories in the Wars of Liberation, that was then re-conceived as a war memorial after World War I, re-appropriated for military ritual under National Socialism, dedicated to the victims of fascism and militarism during the years of division, and re-configured as the “Central Memorial of the Federal Republic of Germany for the Victims of War and Tyranny,” it is both the product of an emerging sense of German nationhood in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, and a reflection of how the nation has been conceived over time, particularly in relation to others. That the most recent changes were made under the auspices of its neighbouring institution, the German Historical Museum, is reflective of the shared history between the Zeughaus and the Neue Wache and their status within the state representative apparatus.

---


67 [Zentrale Gedenkstätte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland für die Opfer von Krieg und Gewaltherrschaft].
Figure 0.1: Interior of the Neue Wache under National Socialism (Postcard image unattributed, 1930s, author’s own collection)

Figure 0.2: Interior of the Neue Wache as the "Memorial to the Victims of Fascism and Militarism," 1970 (Bundesarchiv, Bild 183-J0930-0035-001 / Koard, Peter / CC-BY-SA)
Reorientation in the museum context

The same period saw a rising interest in the question of East German material culture, most particularly consumer culture and its ability to stand in for a lost GDR identity. With the massive re-organisation of the museum landscape, which in Berlin had developed as a mirror image on either side of the Wall thanks to the common origin of many of its museums in the Prussian royal collections as well as the enormous importance of staking out a cultural presence in the divided city, questions were also being raised early on about the process of “musealising” the recent past.

---


(dominated, it should be added, by West German perspectives).\footnote{Wolfgang Ernst, Katharina Flügel, and Hochschule für Technik Wirtschaft und Kultur Leipziger Gespräche zur Museologie, Musealisierung der DDR: 40 Jahre als kulturhistorische Herausforderung (Aflte: VDG Verlag und Datenbank für Geisteswissenschaften, 1992); Bernd Faulenbach and Franz-Josef Jelich (Eds.), Probleme der Musealisierung der doppelten deutschen Nachkriegsgeschichte: Dokumentation einer Tagung des Forschungsinstituts für Arbeiterbildung und der Hans-Böckler-Stiftung (Essen: Klartext-Verlag, 1993). The German term Musealisierung equates to “musealisation,” which ICOFOM describes as ‘the operation of trying to extract, physically or conceptually, something from its natural or cultural environment and giving it a museal status, transforming it into a musealium or ‘museum object’, that is to say, bringing it into the museal field.” It does not contain the negative overtones of the term “museumification,” which projects, again per ICOFOM, the ‘pejorative idea of the ‘petrification’ (or mummification) of a living area, which may result from such a process…” International Council of Museums et al., ‘Key Concepts of Museology.’ 2009, Available at http://icom.museum/what-we-do/professional-standards/key-concepts-of-museology.html [accessed 3 May 2012].} Despite these object and practice focussed discussions, the method adopted in the post-unification site studies has not been applied at the level of the museum collection to investigate how objects, together with museums as architectural monuments, have been re-fashioned according to representative requirements. This has perhaps resulted from a perception held outside museum studies circles of museums as somehow static, at the very least extremely slow-moving institutions. Death and dust have long been tropes of the museum, pervading academic literature and popular accounts alike. This is most famously encapsulated in Theodore W. Adorno’s oft quoted equation of the term museum with mausoleum; its counterpart being the museum’s continual recourse to the descriptor “lively.”

Studies in material culture have also distracted the gaze from the museum. Though museum theorists have always been concerned with the way in which objects operate in the museum context, other fields engaging in material culture research such as archaeology, anthropology, natural history, art history, and the histories of science and technology, have primarily been concerned with the “use” life of objects in society (or the actual life of plant and animal specimens in nature). The object in the museum, on the other hand, is perceived to have entered a liminal space: a terminus of sorts. It has fallen out of its systemic context.\footnote{Mike Smith, “Viewpoints on material culture: An archaeologist’s view” (paper presented at the Collections Symposium National Museum of Australia, Canberra, 30 May 2008).} This is not only reflective of Adorno’s death analogy, it is also supported by the museum’s own language of preservation and care, in which the physical properties of objects are perceived to be fixed in time, no longer subject to the normal processes of deterioration and decay. But neither materiality nor meaning is static in the museum context. Instead, the technologies of the museum itself—selection, preservation, categorisation, interpretation, and display—create multiple layers of meaning, as objects are re-envisioned across time.

Models developed specifically for the study of artefacts, their iconographic and stylistic qualities, materiality, manufacture, function, and their conscious or unconscious representation of society, have likewise sought to uncover meanings either at the point of origin or in the social
An exception is Susan Pearce’s introduction of the broader methods of material cultural studies to the exploration of collections and her adaptation of semiotic approaches as her own methodological contribution to this field.73 ‘It is [...] incumbent upon the investigator’, she writes,

to try to find ways in which, first, the social meanings of individual objects can be unravelled; second, the significance of the museum as a cultural institution can be understood; and third, the process through which objects become component parts of collections, and collections themselves acquire collective significance, can be appreciated.74

This was a significant break with the long-standing conception of the museum as “end station,” and built upon the ideas that emerged during the late 1980s, including Gaynor Kavanagh’s fictional example of the life-cycle of a tiger in and out of the museum (itself published in an anthology edited by Pearce) and Charles Saumarez-Smith’s consideration of object trajectories in the Victoria and Albert Museum (V&A), London, in Peter Vergo’s The New Museology (1989).75 In many ways these approaches for the study of single objects resembled economic anthropologist Igor Kopytoff’s model of the “object biography” set out in Arjun Appadurai’s The Social Life of Things (1986), which proposed a culturally informed biography of “things” for the investigation of cultures via the shifts and differences in the status of objects over time. Appadurai described the usefulness of this approach; ‘from a theoretical point of view human actors encode things with significance,’ he wrote, ‘from a methodological point of view it is the things-in-motion that illuminate their human and social context.’76 Though developed for use outside the museum, it is precisely this idea of “things-in-motion” that is so useful for uncovering museum meanings. As Kopytoff explained: ‘Biographies of things can make salient what might otherwise remain obscure.’77

This study takes the biographical model as its inspiration, while incorporating the questions and approaches typically present in the post-unification site studies in order to address the changing status of the collections of the Berlin Zeughaus. In this way, it engages with issues that are relevant to both German Studies, particularly the question of German national identity and the


74 Ibid. p. 1.

75 Kavanagh, ‘Objects as Evidence, or Not?’, pp. 125-137; Saumarez Smith, ‘Museums, Artefacts and Meanings,’ pp. 6-21.


assertion of specific historical narratives to support authorised versions thereof, and Museum Studies, by exploring the specific museum technologies, practices, and discourses that determine how such visions are reified. As an institution primarily devoted to official state and national self-representation, analysis of the Zeughaus necessarily focuses on the idea of the nation, a concept that is intimately linked with the birth of the modern public museum and whose interrelationship can be traced in the history of the site. This thesis therefore perceives the site and its collections within the cultural, political and social contexts of Prussia and Germany over the period, as well as placing the museum within the frame of broader museological developments. Though the reception of the museum's messages by its publics, something that has proven to be far more complex and multidimensional encounter than once thought, is an important aspect of our understanding of museum meanings, the status of the site as the “showcase” of official national historiographies justifies the focus here on intentions instead. Where reception is considered, it is primarily in relation to the perceived success or failure of these intentions, as reflected in internal reports, official recommendations, and published accounts, rather than the multiple layers of interpretation that may be present during a personal encounter.

Structure of the thesis

This thesis consists of seven chapters, which take a broadly chronological approach to the history of the Berlin Zeughaus and its collections between the initial construction of the armoury (1695-1706) and the transition of East Germany's Museum for German History to the current German Historical Museum in September/October 1990. Within each chapter, key aspects of the development of the collections and their presentation are foregrounded, with particular emphasis on the construction of a national historical image via museological practices, museum technologies, and above all, the perception and interpretation of the objects and collections as a whole. Though the collections themselves have grown and changed across time, encompassing today a broad range of object types from everyday objects to fine arts, numismatics, documents, posters, costume and textiles, photographs, and films, it is primarily the core historical collections that emerged and grew from the 1820s onwards that form the main thread throughout the thesis.

---

The first chapter begins with analysis of the architecture and location of the Berlin Zeughaus, both of which have been significant factors in the construction of meaning at the site. It then traces the creation of a small semi-public museum within the Zeughaus, which opened in 1831 and served a number of practical and symbolic functions in the context of the Prussian reform movement, an awakened national consciousness in the German-speaking territories, and attempts by the Prussian crown to mould commemorative culture in its own image. These direct domestic stimuli for the creation of the museum rooms are also considered in relation to broader museum developments, both at the city and state level, and as part of European-wide shifts, as former royal collections became increasingly specialised, forming new museum types in parallel with the professionalization and specialisation of academic disciplines. Finally, chapter 1 takes two key events in the early history of the Zeughaus, the *Universal German Industrial Exhibition (Allgemeine Deutsche Gewerbeausstellung)* held there in 1844 and the storming of the Zeughaus during the revolution of 1848, to show how economic and social changes linked to a growing national drive affected the perception of the Zeughaus.

Chapters 2 and 3 take the full conversion of the Zeughaus to a public museum and Hall of Fame (*Ruhmeshalle*) after German unification as their subject. Chapter 2 begins with a brief discussion of an 1872 exhibition of applied arts held there as another example of the use of the building for large public exhibitions and the further specialisation of the Berlin museums, before turning to the concrete inspiration for the Zeughaus conversion. The political tensions inherent in the project are revealed through examination of the plans put to the House of Representatives, drawing on Monika Arndt’s 1985 study in which the original documents are reproduced in facsimile. Analysis of the architectural alterations and the painting and sculpture programme from the perspective of their contribution to the construction of a Prusso-German national narrative set the frame for the following chapter, in which the developed collections and their museal presentation are shown to uphold and validate the historical image initiated in the *Ruhmeshalle*. Though the museum itself opened prior to the completion of the elaborate painting and sculpture gallery in 1891, the analysis of these two elements across chapters 2 and 3 is structured according to the visitor’s path through the museum in order to reveal how the narrative was also constructed by the movement of people in space. It therefore takes the completed project as its starting point, examining the *Ruhmeshalle* prior to the museum spaces. Returning to the chronological narrative, the second part of chapter 3 examines the ceremonial functions of the Zeughaus and the growth the collections in the heightened militaristic atmosphere of Wilhelmine Germany. Finally the role of the
Zeughaus as a central stage for the War Ministry’s mediation of the First World War is set within the frame of wide-scale wartime collecting and exhibition practice both in Germany and beyond.

The period between the establishment of the Weimar Republic and the collapse of National Socialist Germany forms the fourth chapter, which focuses on the continuities and changes across the period. Attempts to shift the nationalist and militarist focus of the Zeughaus displays based on cultural and art historical principles during the Weimar era reveal the limitations imposed by financial and conceptual constraints and by the collections themselves. Despite some successful changes, aspects of the museum presentation remained heavily influenced by conservative nationalist thought, a fact that is demonstrated by the adoption of an “anti-display” technique in which the loss of French war trophies under the conditions of the Treaty of Versailles was demonstratively placed on show, as well as the creation of a small World War exhibition in 1932. Both exhibits reveal the seeds of National Socialist historiography already present in the museum prior to 1933, but, as the second part of the chapter reveals, these ideas were radicalised and instrumentalised in new ways following the Nazi seizure of power. The changes made in the museum after 1933 are discussed in relation to broader Nazi cultural policy, as well as the specific museological literature that precipitated the creation of a changing special exhibition programme, the re-conceptualisation and expansion of the World War exhibition, and the rationalisation of the extant displays. Linking to the broader museum programme in Berlin during the era, chapter 4 also focuses on the extra-museum activities developed by the Prussian State Museums as a means of expanding museum audiences, both in terms of overall numbers and an expanded concept of visitorship. As one of the key museal sites of National Socialist military propaganda, the Zeughaus remained open well after the majority of institutions closed during World War Two. The final section of the chapter looks at the preparation of the museum for war, its new exhibition priorities after 1939, and the ultimate toll of the National Socialist war of aggression in the disbursal and destruction of its holdings.

Chapters 5 through 7 deal with the post-war history of the Zeughaus, concluding in 1989/90. Chapter 5 addresses the immediate post-war era and the decisions surrounding the heavily damaged Zeughaus and its collections. It begins with analysis of the diverse exhibitions held there between 1946 and 1948 in the context of political re-education and cultural policy in the occupied and divided city. These exhibitions also reflect the growing political tensions between the Soviet and western allies in the lead-up to the establishment of the two separate German states. The concrete decisions regarding the use of the building and the development of the idea for a national historical museum of the GDR, which would eventually find its home in the Zeughaus, are then
examined with regard to the emergence of the GDR historical sciences and the early national image they helped foster. This is reflected in the work of a small museum team established in 1950, which culminated in the official founding of the museum in 1952, an event that is viewed not just as a significant expression of East German political-ideological imperatives, but also in relation to the West German developments with which they were so intimately bound.

Chapter 6 begins with analysis of the first permanent exhibitions opened in two stages in 1952 and 1953, tracing key aspects of the Marxist-Leninist national historical image as it was presented in crude museological form. It then takes the 1957 special exhibition *Weapons and Uniforms in History* (*Waffen und Uniformen in der Geschichte*) as a medium for examining the museum’s integration of the historical Zeughaus collections into the broader GDR historical narrative, revealing how a re-consideration of the once-maligned militaria collections met specific military-political requirements in the context of escalating Cold War tensions. The response of West German commentators complicates a straightforward reading of the exhibition based on political intentions and highlights the complex legacy of memory in the case of the Zeughaus museum. The exhibition also represented the adoption of new museological techniques for the interpretation and display of the Zeughaus objects, leading to chapter 7, which is principally concerned with the emergence and development of a socialist museology. It traces the foundation of a new museum practice in the GDR from 1953-71, focussing on museum theory. Shifts in the national historical image with the development of the “heritage and tradition” (*Erbe und Tradition*) concept are then used to contextualise a heightened interest in museological questions in the GDR and the new priorities for the presentation of national history after the “normalisation” of German-German relations in the 1970s. International relationships are also an important consideration here, prompting questions about the broader implications of the museum developments in the East and the cross-cultural impact of socialist museological thought via representative organs at the international level. Finally, the last of the MiDG’s major permanent exhibitions opened in 1981 and 1984 serve as a means of examining how the developed socialist museology translated into exhibition practice.

**Site-specific literature and key sources**

This study engages with several existing works pertaining to the site and its various museum incarnations. The key material related to the German Historical Museum has been included above. The most significant of the works dealing with the longer history of the site are the companion publications by long-term head of the militaria collections at the Museum for German History,
Heinrich Müller, and his former colleague Regina Müller, both of which were published by the
German Historical Museum in conjunction with an exhibition held for the three-hundredth
anniversary of the Zeughaus between 25 March 1994 and 10 January 1995.\footnote{Heinrich Müller, Das Berliner Zeughaus: vom Arsenal zum Museum (Berlin: Deutsches Historisches Museum, 1994); Regina Müller, Das Berliner Zeughaus: Die Baugeschichte (Berlin: Deutsches Historisches Museum, 1994).} Heinrich Müller’s concern has been the historical development of the Zeughaus militaria collections, drawing on his extensive knowledge of historical arms and armour and collecting traditions for the same, as well as
his practical experience as one of the chief custodians of the collections from the early 1950s to 1990. Regina Müller tracks the history of the building itself, offering detailed analysis of the planning and construction at each stage of its development. Both make links to prevailing political, cultural, and ideological influences and imperatives. Though the approach adopted here is qualitatively different—the central focus on museology, the reorientation of the collections, and national narratives, the very different starting-point (reflecting new imperatives a quarter of a century after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the “outside” perspective of a non-German researcher), and the much more detailed focus on museum practice during the GDR era—these works are of central importance and inform the early chapters of this work in particular.

Other contributions to the history of the site include Monika Arndt’s 1985 analysis of the Ruhmeshalle as the self-representation of the Prussian state after the foundation of the German Empire, including a study of the completed painting and sculpture programme.\footnote{Monika Arndt, Die Ruhmeshalle im Berliner Zeughaus. Eine Selbstdarstellung Preußens nach der Reichsgrundung, ed. Landeskonservator Berlin (West) Senator für Stadtentwicklung u. Umweltschutz, Bauwerke und Kunstdenkmäler von Berlin (Berlin (West): Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1985).} This work is quite remarkable given the limited access to material for the West German scholar, and in conjunction with contemporary sources is of particular significance for the second chapter here. Cristina Beil and Eva Zwach cover aspects of the presentation of the First World War in the museum, Beil in relation to a broader analysis of the subject in German museums from 1914 to 1939, which takes the Zeughaus as a key example, and Zwach as part of a comparative analysis of German and British war museums.\footnote{Eva Zwach, Deutsche und englische Militärmuseen im 20. Jahrhundert: eine kulturgeschichtliche Analyse des gesellschaftlichen Umgangs mit Krieg (Münster: Lit, 1999); Christine Beil, Der ausgestellte Krieg: Präsentationen des Ersten Weltkrieges 1914-1939 (Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 2004).} For the National Socialist era, some preliminary information has been compiled by Lars H. Thümmler that is available via the German Historical Museum’s website, though some information has proven incorrect and analysis itself is limited.\footnote{Thümmler cites Die Front and Deutsches Volk – Deutsche Arbeit as Zeughaus exhibitions. The former was a private exhibition held at Unter den Linden 70 between at least 1919 and 1934, after which time it was purchased by the Zeughaus as part of the expansion of its World War collections in preparation for a major re-design in 1935/36 (see chapter 4). The latter was a large-scale exhibition held at the Messegelände at the Funkturm in Charlottenburg. The files relating to the exhibiton in the DHM Hausarchiv pertain to the Zeughaus acquisition of the material and provision of loan.
For the GDR era the most thorough existing works both relate to the period of its foundation in the early 1950s, being Karen Pfundt’s unpublished diploma thesis for the Political Science department at the Freie Universität, and Stefan Ebenfeld’s *Geschichte nach Plan?,* which focuses on the period between 1950 and 1955, examining the museum from the perspective of its role in the developing historical sciences in the early years of the GDR.\(^8\) Concerned primarily with the museum as a reflection of the structural development of the historical sciences, Ebenfeld does not analyse collecting practice or exhibitions. Existing accounts of the history of the Museum for German History have also been written by the museum itself, which are treated here as contemporary sources indicative of the self-projection of the institution, though they may also be used to support factual information. Two conference papers have also dealt with the dissolution and transfer of the museum in 1989/90, the first by Thomas Weißbrich, which provides an overview of both institutions and traces the process of their merger, and the second by this author, which focuses on the special exhibition created for the fortieth anniversary of the GDR and the museum’s attempts to negotiate a new role after November 1989.\(^9\)

An extended article written by Glenn H. Penny III in the mid-1990s represents a significant English-language introduction to the MfDG.\(^5\) It is also concerned with the enactment of national narratives in the museum and traces the broad history of the museum from its establishment in 1952 to its dissolution in 1989/90. Using selected special exhibitions Penny seeks to uncover the shifts in the GDR historical image as part of a broader process of national myth-building. Unfortunately, from a museological point-of-view, Penny has misinterpreted a number of the exhibitions he discusses as special exhibitions, when they were in fact sections of the permanent


This is an important distinction, not only because he argues that it is through the more flexible medium of the special exhibition that the changes in the historical image can be traced, but because the permanent and special exhibitions fulfilled very different functions and held a different status in the work of the museum. Nonetheless, it would be difficult to argue against Penny’s historiographical conclusions, and this work seeks to extend his reading by providing the museological frame, in terms of the concrete work of the museum, the broader museum culture in East Germany, and the development of a theoretical frame in the form of a Marxist-Leninist museology.

Finally, mention must be made of an existing unpublished PhD thesis dealing with the Museum for German History. Taking its inspiration from the Penny piece, the 2002 work by David E. Marshall, seeks to uncover the content of the museum’s displays and their relevance. Though Marshall does approach museological concerns, one of his principal aims being to determine how innovative the MfDG was, whether it was, as it claimed, a “museum of a new type,” he fails to engage with the particular means by which meaning is made in the museum context. Marshall’s central question is also flawed. On the basis of museum discourse and developments both within and beyond the Soviet Bloc, it would be possible to determine whether the MfDG represented a unique institutional concept. To some extent this thesis engages with this idea by situating the museum within the broader museological theory and practice both at the site across time and in comparison with parallel developments in the GDR and beyond. But Marshall fails to address these concerns. His investigation of the term “museum of a new type” is also problematic. He makes no reference to the specificity of the term, which is an adaption of a Stalinist phrase used to describe the Party and its “vanguard” role, that was adopted by the SED at a particular point in its consolidation of power via the strengthening of Marxism-Leninism as the core of its ideological programme (see chapter 5). His investigation therefore misses the central significance of the use of the term and its ramifications for an understanding of the role of the institution in this process. Without this frame, the relevance of Marshall’s subsequent analysis is questionable.

86 See further chapter 6, note no. 8.
87 David Edward Marshall, "Das Museum für Deutsche Geschichte: A study of the presentation of history in the former German Democratic Republic" (Ph.D. Thesis, University of California, Riverside, 2002). Despite allusions to a published version of the thesis as part of Peter Lang Publishing’s Studies in Modern European History series (Vol. 56) in online databases, the work has never been printed and is only available as the original PhD manuscript. This has been confirmed by the named publisher; Frank Liska, Customer Service Manager, Peter Lang Publishing New York, personal correspondence, 6 February 2013.
88 Other concerns regarding Marshall’s research methodology include his selection criteria for the examination of special exhibitions, which is not given, his lack of comparative analysis and his overly descriptive style that fails to link the presentations to contemporary political developments, though in many instances direct correlations can be drawn between SED resolutions and the specific work of the museum. Indeed, there appears to be little understanding of the
With the exception of Marshalls’ work, this thesis draws upon the existing, predominately German-language, secondary material to present the first detailed history of the Zeughaus and its collections in English, making this important case available to museum theorists beyond the immediate German-language context. This analysis is extended by extensive archival research conducted in the House Archive of the German Historical Museum and the Bundesarchiv. Primary sources consulted include visual and documentary material including exhibition photographs and design schemes, exhibition concepts and “scripts” detailing the material incorporated, the layout of the displays, and the museum texts, internal plans, reports, and correspondence, SED directives and resolutions, exhibition opening speeches and museological conference proceedings, and newspaper clippings. Due to the limited availability of the material held in the DHM archive for the period prior to 1945 due to conservation issues at the time the primary research was undertaken, the majority of material of this nature relates to the post-war era (chapters 5 to 7). Contemporary exhibition catalogues, museum guides, and city guidebooks have also been instrumental in uncovering the presentation and mediation of the site and its collections across time; they form a key source in conjunction with contemporary newspaper articles and museum literature. Interviews were also conducted with collection staff at the German Historical Museum and former staff members of the Museum for German History between August 2010 and July 2011 (Appendix I).

This thesis offers a unique perspective on the history of the Zeughaus. By incorporating the longer history of the building together with its collections within the context of nation-building and museological developments and the relationship between them, it uncovers shifts and continuities in the presentation of German history that are of vital importance for an understanding of contemporary practice. At the same time, it presents a case whose significance reaches beyond Germany, offering insight into the role and function of national historical museums and the ways in which they make meaning. Substantially new material is presented here with regard to the incorporation of the changing museum practice during the National Socialist era and the Zeughaus Museum’s relationship to the popular education activities of the Prussian State Museums (chapter

89 An overview of the history of the site can be found in English in the German Historical Museum’s dual-language publication. Ulrike Kretzschmar and Winfried Brenne, Das Berliner Zeughaus: vom Waffenarsenal zum Deutschen Historischen Museum (München: Prestel, 2006).
Though aspects of this have been considered by others, the Zeughaus has traditionally been treated as part of a network of army museums and as conceptually separate from the Berlin art collections. This thesis complicates this delineation, providing insight into the complex relationship between the museum and the other Berlin collections, with whose fate it has constantly intersected.

Also of significance is the detailed analysis provided here of the exhibitions held in the Zeughaus during the immediate post-war era (chapter 5). These are examined in relation to cultural policy in the occupation zones, changing political and ideological requirements, the construction of new political structures in the Soviet Zone, competing interests with regard to the use of the building, and, ultimately, the growing rift between the eastern and western Allies. Chapter 5 also extends Ebenfeld’s thorough analysis of the foundation of the museum to include key museological concerns including the political significance of the development of the collections under the auspices of a “national people’s collection.”

Both chapters 6 and 7 represent a substantial original contribution to the history of the site as well as the under-researched question of socialist museum practice. These chapters utilise predominately archival material and contemporary publications to re-construct the progress of museological discourse in the context of a concrete examination of the work of the MfDG. This constitutes not only new research, but also an important shift in perspective. While acknowledging the primary propaganda function of the museum, this approach supports a more nuanced understanding of the contributions and cross-cultural influence of the socialist museums, which have been largely neglected in the post-unification era by a museum profession dominated by the former West and keen to sweep away the vestiges of the GDR past. As the primary national historical museum in the Federal Republic today, the German Historical Museum bears the legacy of its layered histories. It is both a separate entity, created under specific political circumstance and designed to address a set of historical-political needs, and the successor institution of its East German counterpart. The tensions inherent in this dynamic necessitate critical reflection on the history of the museum as a vital pre-requisite for an understanding of the role of the national museum today.
Chapter 1. The museum and site in context, 1695-1871

“Exhibit No. 1”: the Berlin Zeughaus, 1695-1831

In his description of the 1981 West German blockbuster exhibition Prussia—an attempt to take stock (Preußen—Versuch einer Bilanz), curator and museum theorist Gottfried Korff described the exhibition building, the part-reconstructed Martin Gropius Building in the shadow of Berlin Wall, as ‘Exhibit No. 1.’ In this case, the exhibition makers had made a conscious decision to utilise the raw state of the building and to draw it, its location on the cusp between East and West, and the surrounding landscape dominated by the ruins of the Prussian and National Socialist administrative apparatus, into the exhibition concept itself, using it to frame the broader question of the role and legacy of Prussian history within (West) German historical consciousness. Though architecture and site are fundamental to the construction of meaning in any museum, the intimate relationship between the Berlin Zeughaus and its collections, informed by the building’s original function and its location at the centre of the Prussian and later German capital are of central importance for an understanding of the role of the museums housed there and the way in which they have enacted authority within the representative landscape of the city and the nation.

This chapter outlines the early history of the Zeughaus, taking into account the practical use of the building as an armoury, as well as its intrinsic museal function as a place for the display of war trophies. It then considers the creation of a small semi-public museum within the Zeughaus as both an extension of its traditional role, and as the articulation of new strains of thought, new imperatives for the use of objects, and new requirements for the building at the heart of the Prussian capital. Using the example of the Berlin Museum, opened just one year prior to the Zeughaus as Berlin’s first purpose-built public museum, this chapter places the establishment of the museum in the Zeughaus and the consolidation of its first collections within the context of Berlin’s emerging museum culture and the broader developments that coincided with the birth of the modern public museum. Analysis of the first exhibits opened in 1831 extends this reading to reveal modes of display and collecting principles that would come to dominate museum practice over the course of the century and provides an understanding of the way in which the ideas that led to the creation of the museum were articulated in the type and arrangement of objects it displayed.

---

2 Ibid.
Finally, this chapter examines the changing perception of the Zeughaus and its role and function over the course of the latter half of the nineteenth century via two key events—the *Universal German Industrial Exhibition* held there in 1844 and the plunder of the armoury during the revolution of 1848. These are seminal events not only because they reflect shifting attitudes towards the building and its function, but also because they directly link the Zeughaus and its collections to a growing national agenda, as expressed through economic and industrial achievements and sanctioned by the Prussian crown, as well as via external demands in the context of societal change. Only after the realisation of German unification in 1871 did the museum undergo its next major transformation, which is the starting point for chapter 2. As these early developments show, the turning points in the creation of the museum have always been precipitated by political and social shifts, emerging as an expression of the dominant state idea. This is also true of the circumstances in which the building itself was initially conceived.

The Zeughaus as armoury: architecture and sculptural works

From its earliest inception the Berlin Zeughaus served not just a practical but also a representative function; as an armoury, it was never merely a place for the storage of weapons and military equipment (collectively called *Zug*, hence the term *Zeughaus*). Built between 1695 and 1706 (with interiors completed in 1730), the Zeughaus was envisaged from the outset as an expression of the power of the Brandenburg-Prussian state. Friedrich Wilhelm, Elector of Brandenburg and Duke of Prussia, first advanced the idea for a grand central armoury for the fame and honour of the Hohenzollern House in his political testament of 1667. Subsequent military victories over the powerful Swedish army in the Battle of Fehrbellin (1675) and the Great Sleigh Drive (1678-79) earned Friedrich Wilhelm the title “The Great Elector” and placed Brandenburg-Prussia and its army on the European stage, though the construction of the Zeughaus itself first began under his successor, Elector Friedrich III. From 1701, with his self-coronation as Friedrich I, King in Prussia, the Zeughaus became a powerful symbol of the newly proclaimed kingdom and its claim to political sovereignty. Still in the formative stages of construction, Prussia’s new status was inscribed in the very fabric of the building, both through its extensive sculptural programme and in its architectural form.

---

3 Müller, *Vom Arsenal zum Museum*, p. 9.  
The Zeughaus was built as a two-story, quadratic structure, with four evenly proportioned wings surrounding a central courtyard (Fig. 1.1). Over the course of its construction, four architects contributed to the Zeughaus design. Johann Arnold Nering commenced the project only shortly before his death, giving the building its main form. He was replaced in 1696 by Martin Grünberg, followed by sculptor and architect Andreas Schlüter in 1698 and Jean de Bôdt in 1700. Though de Bôdt completed structural works following the collapse of an internal pillar in 1899, Schlüter is most notably associated with the building because of his influence on its sculptural works. The building is an imposing example of North German baroque, and has been continually described as one of the most significant surviving examples of its type. Hailed for its beauty and splendour, it is as much the discourse surrounding the building as its physical form that underpins its place as one of prestige and symbolic importance at the level of city, region and nation, as well as on the wider European stage.

Figure 1.1: The Berlin Zeughaus 1706, engraving by Johann David Schleuen, c. 1760 (Königliche Zeughaus Verwaltung, Führer durch das Königliche Zeughaus in Berlin, 5. Auflage, W Moeser, Berlin, 1892, p. 9)

---

7 Edith Fründt, Der Bildhauer Andreas Schlüter (Leipzig: Insel-Verlag, 1969), pp. 55-56.
‘[F]rom the small-minded decorative atmosphere of his time,’ wrote art historian and museum director Julius Lessing in his description of the Nering’s Zeughaus designs in 1884, ‘he had his gaze fixed on the grand patterns of the Italian high renaissance, whose powerful, monumental style he enhanced, without lapsing into mimicry.’\(^9\) In scale and proportion the Zeughaus certainly projected a powerful and monumental image. Each of its uniform sides measures 280ft (85.3m), with a total height to the upper balustrade of 23m.\(^10\) Its interiors consist of two main floors, each forming four large open spaces around the stately courtyard, which are divided by 64 pillars, arranged two rows deep.

The building has four main portals, one in the centre of each wing, with two additional entrances to the right and left of each main portal. The portals themselves feature carved wooden doors on the lower floor and four Doric columns above, with those facing south, east and west also topped with tympana and relief carvings. The central tympanum facing Unter den Linden shows Minerva, goddess of war, instructing students in the art of war, while extending above the balustrade a series of sculptural groups show war trophies in the form of captured armour, cannons, colours and standards, instruments and chained slaves (Fig. 1.2). Those facing Unter den Linden feature Mars to the east and Bellona to the west, in addition to the weapons stockpiles and shackled slaves (Fig. 1.3). On the western façade two eagles bear an electoral hat (Kurhut) and Prussian crown, pointing to the transitional period of the construction of the building.\(^11\) Extending upwards from the pilasters bordering the upper floor balustrade, a series of plinths feature torso and helmet armour in Greco-Roman style, while the keystones above the windows and doors on the lower floor are decorated with elaborate antique helmets in addition to figures of Medusa and a pair of harpies (Fig. 1.4).

---

\(^9\) ['…aus der kleilichen Verzierungsflut seiner Zeit hatte er [Nehring] seinen Blick auf die großen Muster der italienischen Hochrenaissance gerichtet, deren mächtige monumentale Art er weiterbildete, ohne in Nachahmung zu verfallen.’] Lessing, ‘Sonderdruck,’ p. 802.

\(^10\) The height of the building is actually irregular due to road works on the “Platz vor dem Zeughaus” during the building of the Schloßbrücke (1821-24). In this process the southern (Linden) side of the building lost approximately 28cm in height as the road was built up, so that the overall impression of the building from its main façade is now slightly less than originally designed. Königl. Zeughaus-Verwaltung, *Wegweiser durch die Sammlungen des Königlichen Zeughauses in Berlin* (Berlin: W. Moeser Hofbuchhandlung, 1883), p. 6.

\(^11\) Lessing, ‘Sonderdruck,’ p. 804.
Figure 1.2: One of eight sculptural groups featuring trophies of war above the balustrade of the Zeughaus (Photo Simon Böttler, 2012)

Figure 1.3: Bellona figure group, southern façade of the Zeughaus (Photo Simon Böttler, 2012)
Figure 1.4: Decorated keystones, northern façade of the Zeughaus (Photos Simon Böttler 2012)

The most celebrated of the building’s ornamentation are undoubtedly the twenty-two keystones by Andreas Schlüter in the central courtyard depicting the faces of dying warriors, which are invariably described as the building’s most artistically important features and among the most exquisite sculptural works in Berlin (Fig. 1.5). Typical in this regard is H. Rockstroh’s 1823 description for a Berlin guide book in which he states: ‘Because they are so excellently worked, these masks, so perfect in their own way, they are among the most exquisite curiosities of this building, if not the city.’

More interesting than the question of their aesthetic reception, however, is the symbolic meaning ascribed them. Time and again, the Schlüter masks are portrayed as a counterpoint to the triumphal image of war presented on the outer façade of the building. ‘They bring to mind,’ according to the first Zeughaus catalogue produced in 1883, ‘precisely in their close connection with the victory trophies etc. on the outside of the building that are characteristic of the glorious side of war, in contrast to this, the horrors of war—death and destruction.’

But as Regina Müller has shown, the idea that the figures form a counterpart to the building’s expression of

---

12 [‘Denn so vortrefflich sind sie gearbeitet diese Larven, so in ihrer Art vollkommen, daß sie zu den vorzüglichsten Merkwürdigkeiten des Gebäudes, ja der Stadt selbst gehören.’] H Rockstroh, Berlin - nach seinen vorzüglichsten Merkwürdigkeiten; ein Wegweiser für Einheimische und Fremde nebst einer Preussisch - Brandenburgischen Regentengeschichte (Berlin: Magazin für Kunst, Geographie und Musik, 1823), p. 222.

triumph is not borne out by iconographical analysis. She demonstrates that the figures, as severed heads and trophies of war rather than the masks of dying warriors, represented a common architectural motif in keeping with the building's overall symbolism, concluding that the 'architectural sculpture of the Zeughaus is, in both its detail as well as its entirety, an allegory of victory.'

In 1844 Adolph Glassbrenner referred to the Zeughaus as ‘a stone epic, a silent hymn to victory.’ This triumph was enacted not only through sculptural works, but also found direct expression in the building’s form. Drawing comparison with Versailles and the Louvre, Hans-Joachim Kucke has demonstrated the significance of French Rococo and early classicism for the architectural and ornamental style of the Zeughaus, revealing a number of references the building makes to its French predecessors. Among these he notes the strong hierarchy of proportion drawing influence from the bienséance as practiced by the Paris Académie, the upper balustrade and flat roof as a symbol of royal status following their use under Louis XIV, the use of sculptural elements to “explain” the building, and the profusion of sculptures above the balustrade referencing the sculptural programme at Versailles. Similarly, the four-winged construction of the Zeughaus, the placement of allegorical statuary at the front portal, and the decoration of the portal itself are

Figure 1.5: Three examples of Schlüter’s “Dying Warrior” keystones in the central courtyard of the Zeughaus (Photos Simon Böttler, 2012)

14 Müller, Die Baugeschichte, pp. 105-109.
18 Ibid. pp. 22-25.
shown to draw inspiration from the eastern façade of the Louvre.\textsuperscript{19} In this way, the visual language of the French examples served to legitimise the claims of a fledgling state; not simply attesting to its military glory, but expressing Prussia’s status as equal to that of the great monarchies of Europe.

Turning to the language with which the building has traditionally been described, it becomes clear how this visual symbolism was narrated to a broader public beyond the borders of Berlin. Marianne von Reinhard described the Zeughaus in Berlin: Ein Buch für junge und alte Preußen in 1852 as ‘so modest, so sublime, so worthy of its grand purpose,’ linking the grandeur, solidity and permanence of the building directly to the military power of the Prussian state: ‘Firm and proud it stands there like the Prussian army, firm and proud like the tenor of Prussian warriors, as tested thousand upon thousand times on the battlefield, firm and proud like Prussia’s position is and will remain for all time.’\textsuperscript{20} Written shortly after the upheaval of 1848, this account is steeped in patriotic fervour, but it is not an uncommon example. Similar language was employed again thirty years later upon the occasion of the full conversion of the building to a museum, at which time Julius Lessing wrote;

\begin{quote}
In grandeur, nobility and true greatness the old Zeughaus on the Spree remains unsurpassed, and even the eye of the layman, which is wont to give no regard to the laws of architectural art, which so easily confuses the bulky with the grand, remains captivated by the powerful serenity and unity of the dignified building from the time of the first king.

[An Würde, Vornehmheit und wahre Größe bleibt das alte Zeughaus an der Spree unübertroffen, und selbst das Auge des Laien, welches sich keine Rechenschaft geben mag über die Gesetze architektonischer Kunst, welches so leicht das Massige mit dem Großen verwechselt, bleibt gefesselt von der machtvollen Ruhe und Geschlossenheit des ehrwürdigen Baues aus der Zeit des ersten Königs.]\textsuperscript{21}
\end{quote}

Time and again, the evocation of stateliness, solidity and grandeur are utilised to reinforce the image of a building representative of the authority of the Prussian state and, after 1871, the German nation; an assertion that was supported also by its physical location within the representative landscape of the capital.

\textit{The Zeughaus Unter den Linden: the significance of location}

A number of museum theorists have argued for the significance of architecture as a key aspect of our understanding of the ways in which museums uphold power and authority.\textsuperscript{22} Carol Duncan and

\begin{notes}
\item[Ibid.]
\item[20] ‘...so einfach, so erhaben, so ganz würdig seiner großen Bestimmung [...] Fest und stolz steht es da wie die preußische Heeresmacht, fest und stolz wie der Sinn preußischer Krieger, so tausend und aber tausend mal auf den Schlachtfeldern erprobt, fest und stolz wie Preußens Stellung ist und bleiben wird zu allen Zeiten.] Reinhard, Berlin, p. 73.
\item[21] Lessing, ‘Sonderdruck,’ p. 801.
\item[22] See, for example, Michaela Giebelhausen, The architecture of the museum; symbolic structures, urban contexts, ed. Michaela Giebelhausen (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), pp. 1-14; Michaela Giebelhausen, 'The Architecture is the Museum,' in New Museum Theory and Practice, ed. Janet Marstine (Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2008), pp.
\end{notes}
Alan Wallach, for example, demonstrate how the museum’s ‘physical prominence and monumental appearance signal its importance’, while Michaela Giebelhausen argues directly that ‘the architecture is the museum; it is precisely the architectural configuration that gives the museum meaning.’ An additional, and vital, component of this discussion is the role of place in the configuration of museum meanings. This relates both to how the museum’s location informs its own role and status as well as how museums themselves contribute to the urban environment as anchors of modern cities, as important spaces for the conceptualisation of public culture and, more recently, as part of a proliferation of de-centralised urban redevelopment schemes epitomised by Frank Gehry’s Guggenheim Bilbao, but repeated in multiple other examples.

The museum and its environment enjoy a dialogic relationship. Museums are not only instrumental in ‘configuring geographies of power and space’, as historian Sophie Forgan points out, but the city itself also informs our reading of the museum. Though the Zeughaus did not begin life as a museum, its original place in the administrative and representative landscape of the royal Residenzstadt has continued to inform its reading across time. The most significant structure with which the Zeughaus shared a relationship was the Berlin city palace (1443-1950/51). The palace formed the centre of the state apparatus, around which Berlin’s most important institutions were oriented (Fig. 1.6). Other contemporary institutions included the Kronprinzenpalais (1663) directly opposite the Zeughaus, the Lustgarten (1658), and the Linden Ally itself (renamed Unter den Linden in 1737), which had developed as a tree-lined promenade from 1647, linking the palace with the Tiergarten and the newly established city of Charlottenburg (1705) beyond. Perhaps more significant is the way the area developed from the mid eighteenth century onward, particularly during the nineteenth century. The other stately addresses in the near vicinity of the Zeughaus came to include; the Prinzessinnenpalais (1730); the opera (1742); the Prinz-Heinrich-Palais (1748), later the Berlin University (1810), today’s Humboldt University; the Berlin cathedral (1750) on the same site as the present cathedral (1905); the Royal Library in the “Kommode” building (1780) and later

as the State Library at Unter den Linden 8 (1903); Schinkel’s Neue Wache (1818); the Altes Palais (1837), palace of Prince Wilhelm (later Kaiser Wilhelm I); the Altes Museum (1830) and Neues Museum (1855) and the further development of the Museum Island complex with the National Gallery (1876), the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum, today’s Bode Museum (1904), and the Pergamon Museum (completed 1930) (Fig. 1.7). In addition, monuments and memorials including those to Prussian Generals Scharnhorst (1819), Blücher (1819), von Bülow (1819-1822), Gneisenau and Yorck (both 1840), and Daniel Rauch’s monument to Friedrich the Great (1851), accompanied the concentration of monumental architecture and statuary surrounding the Zeughaus by the late nineteenth century.

Thus, over the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries Unter den Linden grew to become Berlin’s most important boulevard, beginning at the Zeughaus Square and extending west to the Brandenburg Gate (completed 1791).27 In the words of Monika Arndt, it became the Prussian

---

27 The name Unter den Linden applied to longer and longer stretches of the boulevard over the course of time. At the time the Zeughaus was constructed the street was known as Lindenallee (1690-1723), later Linden Straße (1723-1734). This street was expanded from the current university building to Pariser Platz (itself only named such in 1814) in 1737. The expansion of the street naming eastward from the university to the Palace bridge, encompassing the stretch on which the Zeughaus stands, only dates to 1936. The contemporary name for the section of the boulevard on which the Zeughaus stood prior to 1936 was Am Zeughaus. Lais and Mende, Lexikon Berliner Straßenamen, p. 339; 452.
via triumphalis, at the centre of the royal seat and the representative centre of the state.\(^{28}\) With the construction of Schinkel’s Palace Bridge in 1824 the palace square was linked to the boulevard. ‘The beautiful bridge, designed and carried out by Schinkel himself,’ stated one mid-century compendium, ‘links the boulevard coming from the Brandenburg victory gate, ever richer in monuments to the fatherland, to the square between the palace, cathedral and museum, which will shortly be decorated with works of art of more general interest.’\(^{29}\) The concentration of buildings around the palace square provided an important evocation of state power; an assertion demonstrated well by Louis Weyl’s description in his 1839 guidebook, Der Fremde in Berlin, Potsdam und auf der Eisenbahn. Upon conclusion of a walking tour, which begins and ends at the palace square, the “focal point” of the city, he remarks:

We are once again at the palace, from where we set out, and overlook here the magnificent square enclosed on all four sides with the most important grand buildings, the palace, the cathedral, the stock exchange, the museum and the armoury, the spirit of the state manifested in a beautiful picture: justice, leniency and power in the royal castle, to its right the temple of true godly worship, to its side trade and industry thrive, opposite resplendent the temple of science and art, safeguarded by powerful defence against hostile disturbances.


It has often been noted that with the placement of the Berlin Museum on the Lustgarten Schinkel made a powerful statement about the importance of art—an assertion of its centrality, a ‘claim to equal status with dynasty, church, and army: those three fundamental pillars of the Prussian state.’\(^{31}\) In relation to the emergence of a museum within the Zeughaus and, by 1883, its full conversion to a public museum, it is important to recognise that the inverse of this is also true. The Zeughaus had always been a powerful symbol of state; it belonged to the centralised performance of power to which Schinkel referred, and it continued, and indeed continues, to play an important symbolic role.

---

\(^{28}\) Arndt, Die Ruhmeshalle im Berliner Zeughaus, p. 24.


The Zeughaus should thus be seen as both building and monument within the context of the developing Brandenburg-Prussian and later national performative landscape. Its relationship to the surrounding structures has continually informed its representative function both as an armoury and as a museum.

Figure 1.7: View of Unter den Linden looking west from the Platz am Zeughaus, around the end of the eighteenth century (Königliche Zeughaus Verwaltung, Führer durch das Königliche Zeughaus in Berlin, 5. Auflage, W Moeser, Berlin, 1892, p. 7)

The transformation of the Zeughaus to a museum, 1815-1831

The demonstrative task of the Zeughaus was complemented from the outset by the display of trophies of war. Those amassed as sculptural motifs throughout the building were matched by physical trophies within, which acted as evidence of military supremacy and comprised an integral component of the conceptual understanding of the building. As is often noted, the gilt inscription over the main portal dedicated in 1706 testifies to the dual purpose of the building, linking its basic function as a weapons depot with its symbolic purpose and its intrinsic display function (Fig. 1.8):

For justice to the warrior's deeds and for terror to the enemies, for the security of his people and his federates, Friedrich I, august and unvanquished King of Prussia had this arsenal for storing all sorts of instruments of war as well as military armour and trophies built from scratch in the year 1706.

[Den Waffentaten zur Anerkennung, den Feinden zum Schrecken, seinen Völkern und Bundesgenossen zum Schutz, hat Friedrich I. der erhabene und unbesiegte König der Preußen]
It is significant that from its inauguration both the building and its objects served as an embodiment of the power of the state, well prior to the establishment of a museal component at the site.

There were two pivotal stages in the transformation of the Zeughaus from a place primarily dedicated to the storage of weapons to a museum, each linked to military and political developments as well as the memorial requirements of the Prussian state. The formation of the first museum rooms should also be seen in the context of broader cultural developments, the emergence of academic disciplines and a new awareness of history and preservation, all of which were manifest in the development of the Berlin museums, which emerged as specialised institutions from the collections of the Hohenzollern house during what James J. Sheehan has called the ‘great age of German museum building’.33 As such, the Zeughaus developments were reflective of the political, cultural and epistemological changes that characterised the reorganisation of the Royal Kunstkammer (Art Chamber) and Rüstkammer (Armoury Chamber) into disciplinary collections,

---

32 German translation of the Latin inscription quoted in Königl. Zeughaus-Verwaltung, Wegweiser durch die Sammlungen des Königlichen Zeughauses in Berlin (Berlin: W. Moser Hofbuchhandlung, 1885), p. 10; the same text is quoted in Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 10.
33 Sheehan, Museums in the German art world p. 43. On historical consciousness, preservation, and collecting see also; Susan A. Crane, Collecting and Historical Consciousness in Early Nineteenth-Century Germany (London and Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), Ch. 1 and 2.
while the "opening up" of these collections also links to the historical emergence of the modern public museum more generally.

Completed in 1831, the designation of dedicated spaces within the Zeughaus for a semi-public museum represents a qualitatively different collecting and display philosophy to the prior presentation of trophies and the 'embellishment' of the interiors with rare and outstanding pieces.\textsuperscript{34} Werner Hahlweg's examination of the building's earliest known interior plans (dated 1732 and discovered in 1937), attests to the systematic ordering and inventorisation of holdings according to type, calibre and origin even at this early date, with cannons, howitzers and mortars arranged on the ground floor, and infantry, cavalry and artillery weapons on the upper floor.\textsuperscript{35} Though the plans provide evidence, as Hahlweg points out, of the Zeughaus' 'specific appointment' as an arsenal for weapons of war as well as a 'treasure house' for war booty,\textsuperscript{36} the utilisation of the depot for a specific \textit{museal} purpose nonetheless represented an important caesura in the use-history of the Zeughaus.\textsuperscript{37} One of the most significant contributing factors to this break was the increased requirement for public commemoration and the formation and strengthening of the image of Prussia in the light of an emerging proto-nationalism and the re-configuration of the European political order following the Napoleonic wars. Prussian victories in the Wars of Liberation provided a specific motivation and simultaneously contributed the objects for display, via a massive influx of war booty.

\textbf{War trophies and the memorialising impulse}

Shortly after their victory at Jena and Auerstedt on 14 October 1806, French troops entered Berlin. There, Napoleon's programme of removal of cultural property is perhaps best encapsulated in the image of the Quadriga, Johann Gottfried Schadow's copper monument featuring four life-sized horses and an oversized winged goddess of peace, which had stood atop the Brandenburg Gate since 1793.\textsuperscript{38} The removal of the Quadriga was ordered by Napoleon only weeks after his victory, arriving in Paris in May 1807 to be displayed alongside the treasures of a subjugated Europe in the Musée

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{34} The term "embellishment" per Elector Friedrich II quoted in; Kretzschmar and Brenne, \textit{Das Berliner Zeughaus}, p. 81.
  \item \textsuperscript{35} Werner Hahlweg, 'Zur Geschichte des Zeughauses. Neuaufgefunde Zeughauspläne mit Inventarverzeichnis vom Jahre 1732,' \textit{Berliner Museen}, 59, no. 1, 1938, pp. 4-5. Hahlweg was a principle figure at the Zeughaus during the National Socialist era, contributing also to the Nazi museum literature. His theories about museum practice and army museums are discussed further in chapter 4. Heinrich Müller notes that these plans were held at the Zeughaus until 1945, after which time they disappeared. See Müller, \textit{Vom Arsenal zum Museum}, p. 34; 41-45; Müller, \textit{Die Baugeschichte}, p. 138.
  \item \textsuperscript{36} '[Sie [die Pläne] sind ein weiteres Zeugnis für die dem Haus eigentümliche Bestimmung: Arsenal für Kriegswaffen der Armee und zugleich Schatzhaus kriegerischer Beutestücke zu sein.]' Hahlweg, 'Neuaufgefunde Zeughauspläne,' p. 4.
  \item \textsuperscript{37} This point is also made by Jan-Hendrik Kurze, "Das Deutsche Historische Museum im alten Berliner Zeughaus: Wieviel Symbolik eines preußischen Militärdenkmal's verträgt ein Ort der Selbstbesinnung durch historische Erinnerung?" (Masters Dissertation, Freie Universität Berlin, Institut für Politikwissenschaft, 1997), p. 26.
  \item \textsuperscript{38} Pohlsander, \textit{National monuments and nationalism}, p. 176.
\end{itemize}
Napoléon. Opened to the public in 1793 as a dramatic assertion of the new French Republic, the Louvre under Napoleon made the conquests of war—both captured weapons and artworks—highly visible emblems of state power. Though, as the case of the Zeughaus aptly demonstrates, the display of war booty had a much longer tradition, what was innovative in the case of the Louvre was the recognition of this new institution as a means of communicating such assertions to a newly conceived public. In Berlin, the wholesale removal of important artworks under the direct instruction of Louvre director Dominique Vivant Denon is well articulated by a contemporary account from Hedwig von Olfers, daughter of Prussian statesman August Stägemann. ‘With Herr Schickler I was in the company of French officials,’ she wrote, ‘among others Herr Denon, who is selecting the relevant art treasures here in Berlin. What you have not yet seen of the artworks of Berlin, Potsdam, Sanssouci, you will see in future in Paris.’

The Zeughaus, too, was subject to plunder—not for the first time in its history. Many of its objects were destined not for the Louvre, but for the Hôtel des Invalides, an institution with which the Zeughaus shared an intimate relationship over the years in the tussle for war trophies. The Hohenzollern Kunstkammer and several royal palaces, which were integral to the later formation of the Zeughaus collections, were also looted. With French occupation the Zeughaus itself came under the control of the French command and was utilised over the period as a magazine, stable, and forge, resulting in substantial damage. The subsequent victory in the “Battle of Nations” at Leipzig (1813), the occupation of Paris (1814) and the final defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo (1815), brought about not only considerable national euphoria, but also the weapons and trophies that would once again fill the Zeughaus. Back in Prussian hands, plans were drawn up for the repair of
the building, along with an additional memorial component in celebration of the military triumph and as a reflection of a national sentiment that should find its expression in Prussian patriotism.

The earliest plans for a memorial date to the beginning of 1815, prior to Waterloo, with the arrival in Berlin of an elaborately decorated 48-pound cannon captured at the Hôtel des Invalides. The cannon became the centrepiece for a proposed monument to be erected either on the Lustgarten, directly before the main portal of the Zeughaus on Unter den Linden, or within the building itself. Architect, planner, painter, set designer and recently named Geheimer Oberbaurat (chief government building surveyor), Karl Friedrich Schinkel (1781-1841), was engaged to prepare plans for the memorial, drafts of which also included a proposal to convert the entire ground floor of the southern wing into a trophy hall, complete with glazed windows and iron grating so that 'the people could look into these sanctified halls dedicated to the glory of war from outside.' When the war ministry declined Schinkel's plan on the basis of its own military-technical requirements for the Zeughaus (made even more urgent by the influx of captured weapons), Schinkel re-worked his design for the monument. Undeterred by practical space considerations, he presented two new designs, one of which was even more ambitious than the earlier proposal and involved the conversion of the whole ground floor of the Zeughaus for the purpose of display.

In January 1816 Friedrich Wilhelm III sanctioned a much more modest proposal and ordered the cannon monument be placed on the Kastanienwäldchen, the small chestnut grove to the west of the Zeughaus. This memorial was, as Monika Arndt points out, one of the earliest of a larger program of 'monuments to cultivate the memory of the victorious elevation of Prussia', that included the re-installation of the Quadriga at the Brandenburg Gate and the renaming of the rather unimaginative "Viereck" and "Achteck" as “Pariser-" and “Leipziger Platz" respectively. It was Schinkel who produced the designs for modifications made to the re-won Quadriga so that the goddess of peace, now holding aloft a crowned eagle sitting atop an iron cross encircled by an oak

---

46 The suggestion for a monument at the Zeughaus was made during the transport of the cannons to Berlin by Prince August of Prussia in a letter to the war ministry dated 17 September 1814. Müller points out that the captured cannon was not, in fact, French, but a Dutch cannon brought to Paris by Napoleon. Its transport to Berlin by land rather than by sea with the two smaller cannons proposed for the monument was measure to avoid Dutch claims on the piece. Ibid. pp. 54-55.
49 The proposal of a larger and more elaborate design than the commission entailed was not out of character for the prolific Schinkel, who also independently developed designs for the Berlin Museum as a separate structure on the Lustgarten whilst engaged to design the museum as a conversion of the existing stables attached to the Academy of Arts building. See Moyano, 'Quality vs. History,' pp. 585-608; Seehan, Museums in the German art world pp. 70-81.
50 [...]Denkmäler zur Erinnerung an die siegerreiche Erhebung Preußens zu bilden] Arndt, Die Ruhmeshalle im Berliner Zeughaus, p. 18; Street names per Lais and Mende, Lexikon Berliner Straßennamen, p. 272; 339.
wreath, could be reoriented as Victory. Much of the statuary in the immediate vicinity of the Zeughaus mentioned above also commemorates this decisive period via the memorialisation of Prussia's military generals, as did the Neue Wache, completed to Schinkel's designs adjacent the Zeughaus in 1818. Although his larger plan for the Zeughaus was not yet realised, this broader memorialising tendency did have an impact on the perceived character of the building. ‘In this era of high patriotic spirits,’ writes Arndt, ‘a plan was now articulated for the first time, with which the traditional character of the magazine as a monument would be strengthened, its meaning as a functional building, on the other hand, would be noticeably diminished.’

During the years of French occupation Prussia also underwent far reaching political, economic and administrative reform. Made all the more imperative by its humiliating defeat, reforms were implemented that, although hampered by existing structures of power and interest, aimed to establish more economic and civil freedom as well as a more responsible and structured bureaucracy. These included the establishment of a central administration comprising five ministries, the separation of administration from the judiciary, reforms in education and taxes, and the abolition of restrictions on the buying and selling of land. While some hoped for greater popular participation, based on the idea that French military strength lay in a political and psychological advantage, attempts to promote patriotic ties through representative organs remained largely unfulfilled. Military reform was, on the other hand, one of the more successful endeavours. Under General Gerhard von Scharnhorst the army was professionalised; the old order was purged, an official hierarchy established, a new ministry formed, careers were opened to talent, and new training schools were established.

Within this context, the spoils of the eventual victory over the French became the impetus for the establishment of a dedicated museum collection under the auspices of the Artillery and Engineering School for the purposes of practical military instruction. Particularly significant were a series of objects seized in France, that arrived in Berlin in October 1815 and February 1816. These consisted of 175 crates of models, including rare replicas of fortifications dating from the reign of Louis XIV (1643-1715), and a further 95 crates of Kunstsachen, which roughly translates as artworks, but which comprised documents, instruments, colours and standards, models of cannons

54 Müller, *Vom Arsenal zum Museum*, pp. 57-58.
and artillery vehicles, tools, firearms, templates for the fabrication of rifles, pistols, sabres, bayonets, gun locks, pieces of armour, and lances. In 1820, at the urging of Prince August of Prussia, Commander General of the Prussian Artillery, these objects became the cornerstone of a museum collection established under the provisional title “Artillery Museum” and a commission was appointed to oversee its implementation. This new museum was not simply an extension of the role of the newly established military academies, however. It was part of a much larger cultural shift that manifested in the establishment of new institutions such as the Berlin University (founded by Wilhelm von Humboldt in 1810) and proposals for a public art museum that had begun as early as 1797, reflecting changed attitudes to the value and potential of art and its deployment for civic cultivation. This broader process is important for an understanding of the development of the Zeugahus museum because it also had a profound impact on the re-conceptualisation of existing collections, which would eventually form a core of the museum’s holdings.

Museological currents

In 1840 satirist Adolph Glassbrenner wrote a small piece entitled Das Antiken- und Raritäten-Cabinet for his series, Buntes Berlin (1837–1858). Written ten years after the opening of Berlin’s first public museum, the satire depicts a morning spent in a local antiquities and rarities cabinet when caretaker, Pholeke, is left to show two visitors through the collection. Having paid their entrance fee (eight Groschen we later discover), nail smith Stulle and his sister Narcisse are guided through the cabinet, beginning with ‘the oldest piece in this curious collection’, the two apples from which Adam and Eve ate in paradise. After explaining that of the two objects in the collection only that from which Adam ate was visible because ‘Eve couldn’t get enough, and nibbled on the second, which is why the one is not to be seen’, Stulle remarks with surprise that it is just a rather ordinary apple. When Pohleke explains that a similarity to other apples is natural because ‘an apple is an apple’, Stulle remains unconvinced and wonders why it has not yet rotted. ‘Now listen here, Herr Stulle,’ replies Polecke, ‘if you didn’t once wish to be astonished in an Antiquities and Rarities Cabinet, for what did you pay your entrance fee then?’

56 Ibid.
57 Ibid. p. 64.
60 ['Eva konnte nicht genug kriegen, un knabberte noch den zweeten an, weshalb der eener jar nich zu sehen is'] ibid. pp. 10-11.
61 ['Appel is Appel'] ['Na hörn Se mal, Herr Stulle, wenn Sie sich in ein Antiken- und Raritäten-Cabinet nicht mal verwundern wollten, wovor hätten Sie'n denn Ihr Entrée bezahlt?'] ibid.
This small passage remarkably captures not only the essence of the curiosity, or wonder cabinet (*Wunderkammer*) that categorised early collecting practice from the Renaissance to the emergence of the modern museum, but also the changing attitudes to the value of this kind of collecting and the expectations of the public in a new era of public culture. After all, as Stulle later remarks, if the automaton of the Chinese Emperor had not danced, what would they have had for their eight Groschen?\(^{62}\)

The Hohenzollern *Kunstkammer* was opened to the public in 1805. Eva Giloi’s remarkable study of royal relics and souvenirs as they passed through the collections of the *Kunstkammer*, the Neues Museum, the Hohenzollern Museum, and the Prince Wilhelm Palace, shows that at the time of its opening the *Kunstkammer* collections were still very much perceived and organised according to the criteria of a traditional baroque curiosity cabinet.\(^{63}\) A typical collection of this type contained, in Sheehan’s words, ‘a variety of objects deemed to be valuable: ancient coins, unusual feathers, beautiful seashells, stuffed animals, old armour, and whatever else seemed rare, curious, or beautiful.’\(^{64}\) Such collections reflected the intellectual legacy of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, being ‘organized as a sort of living encyclopaedia, containing every and anything that was noteworthy and unusual.’\(^{65}\) Susan Pearce explains early modern collecting practice ‘set within a framework of natural theology,’ in which man sought to approach the mind of God through reason and material investigation. \(^{66}\) ‘The universe becomes its component material parts and the relationships between them.’ she writes, ‘The rational mind achieves a true understanding of objective natural knowledge by the physical process of observing and arranging material evidence.’\(^{67}\) This included both man-made and natural wonders; objects valued for their rarity, age, beauty, and, like the apple, their perceived religious or mystical properties or their connection to historical events and people. Thus, the curiosity cabinet often contained both religious *and* secular relics, making little distinction between the two. In Berlin, as both Giloi and Sheehan have pointed out, the collections were organised not by typological or even thematic or historical considerations, but by material.\(^{68}\) Here, a piece of the true cross may sit happily alongside a wooden sculpture or an elaborately carved cherry stone.

\(^{62}\) Ibid. p. 17.
\(^{64}\) Sheehan, *Museums in the German art world* p. 19.
\(^{65}\) Giloi Bremner, "Ich Kaufe mir den Kaiser!," p. 5.
\(^{67}\) Ibid. p. 111.
\(^{68}\) In fact, as Giloi shows, the collections were divided into two separate categories, Natural History and Arts. The natural history collections were not scientific in their purpose. Rather they were designed to amaze the visitor. Likewise, the collection of arts were not categorised into high art, crafts or ethnographic collections, but were displayed according to the
As was the case throughout Europe, it was from these collections that the Berlin museums emerged. But as Stephen Bann aptly reminds us, this process was not a simple expansion of the traditional role of the curiosity cabinet. It was, rather, a symptom of profound shifts in relation to the production of knowledge:

Museums did not “grow” from cabinets of curiosity. On the contrary, paradigms of knowledge themselves shifted, over the period between the Renaissance and the late nineteenth century, in such a way as to ensure that collections of objects acquired a new epistemological status, while being simultaneously adapted to new forms of institutional display.69

The museum in the Zeughaus therefore resulted not only from specific memorial requirements following Prussia’s military victory, nor the political reforms that had been prompted by the earlier defeat. It was also part of European-wide changes as collections were re-conceived in the light of novel currents of thought that included the re-conceptualisation of the role of history and historical objects based on Romantic ideals and the emergence of specialised disciplinary fields. These developments are perhaps best exemplified by Schinkel’s Berlin Museum, and, indeed, many scholars have sited this museum, along with Munich’s Glyptothek, to demonstrate the emergence of the modern public museum as a new museum type.70 ‘Schinkel’s museum,’ writes Theodore Ziolkowski, ‘magnificent as it is, represents more than the triumph of individual genius. If any structure can be said to exemplify the cultural thought of its time—not only in design and setting but in its very conception—it is the Alte Museum.’71 As its immediate neighbour across the Spree, the Berlin Museum and the new ideas it embodied are also important for the history of the Zeughaus because both shared a connection in the person of Karl Friedrich Schinkel, who realised his plans for the Berlin Museum (opened 1830) at precisely the time he was engaged to design displays for the Zeughaus.

The Berlin Museum and the new museum culture

Just as Schinkel had proposed an extensive museum conversion for the Zeughaus when commissioned to design a relatively modest monument in 1815, so too his initial engagement to convert the stables of the Academy of Sciences for a museum led to a much grander and historically more significant scheme. ‘The project involved much more than a new museum,’ writes Douglas

71 Ziolkowski, ‘Schinkel’s Museum,’ p. 370.
Crimp, ‘Schinkel proposed a complete renewal of the very heart of Berlin’.\textsuperscript{72} Not only was this a physical renewal, with the reclamation of land to the north of the \textit{Lustgarten} (itself remodelled by Schinkel in 1826), it was also an intellectual and cultural renewal, as the great romantic \textit{Geist} of the era was made manifest in every detail of the museum's physical and spatial design. Such ideas would have been impossible without the aforementioned political reforms, and the concept that art could be utilised for the betterment of society was both the legacy of Enlightenment, and reflected the political hopes of the post-revolutionary generation.\textsuperscript{73}

The administrative planning and realisation of the museum, under the auspices of the newly created Ministry for Culture also reflects the connection between political and social reform and what Sheehan has called the 'brief but intense flowering of cultural activity in Berlin.'\textsuperscript{74} The involvement of the Prussian administration, along with the fact that for the first time a purpose-built museum would possess no ancillary royal functions, signals the significance of the Berlin Museum in the evolution of the public museum form. Even Leo von Klenze's \textit{Glyptothek}, built concurrently and co-credited with the establishment of the modern museum's most dominant architectural forms, retained royal ceremonial spaces; it was both public \textit{and} private.\textsuperscript{75} Duncan and Wallach point to a confusion of function in many of these early museums; 'lurking behind the façade of the public art museum are often memories and sometimes even the reality of royal ceremony. Some museums, especially those established very early by monarchs, seem poised between the two identities.'\textsuperscript{76} The Berlin Museum's decisive break is illustrated well by a passage from \textit{Asher's Picture of Berlin}, a guidebook published in 1837: 'It is most literally thrown open to the public every day but

\textsuperscript{72} Crimp, 'The End of Art and the Origin of the Museum,' p. 263. On Schinkel's urban planning in Berlin and particularly the way in which he conceived of the total environment, designing on a scale beyond the single architectural form by relating his buildings to existing structures as well as his own clusters of buildings in central Berlin, see also Hermann G. Pundt, 'K. F. Schinkel's Environmental Planning of Central Berlin,' \textit{Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians}, 26, no. 2, 1967, pp. 114-130. It should be noted that Schinkel designed no less than six major structures within the immediate vicinity of the Palace, Zeughaus and university between 1816 and 1832. They were: the Hauptwache (Neue Wache) built between 1816-18; the Schlossbrücke (1824); the Berlin Museum (1830), the Bauakademie (1831-35); the new Packhof (1832) no longer standing, it was on the site of today's Neues Museum; and the Werderkirsche, today's Friedrichswerder Church containing exhibitions from the National Gallery collections representing Schinkel's work and the work of his contemporaries (1825-28). In addition, Schinkel designed the fountain for the Lustgarten (1826) and remodelled the nearby Gendarmenmarkt with the addition of his new Schauspielhaus (1818-1821). For a full list of Schinkel's architectural works see Franz Vallentin, 'Schinkel, Friedrich,' in \textit{Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie}, ed. Historische Commission bei der Kgl. bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Leipzig: Duncker und Humboldt, 1908), pp. 17-28.

\textsuperscript{73} Sheehan, \textit{German history}, 1770-1866, p. 329. This is perhaps best summed up in the person of Wilhelm von Humboldt who, as a statesman in the reform governments of Stein and Hardenberg, was directly involved with the museum. Georg G. Iggers writes: 'Throughout Humboldt's life there is a thread of continuity with the cosmopolitan, humanistic orientation of his younger years, as well as a clear shift of emphasis toward the new national values.' Georg G. Iggers, \textit{The German Conception of History} (Middletown, Connecticut: Weskeyan University Press, 1983), p. 44.

\textsuperscript{74} Sheehan, \textit{Museums in the German art world} p. 57.

\textsuperscript{75} Ibid. p. 69; 72.

\textsuperscript{76} Duncan and Wallach, 'The Universal Survey Museum,' p. 452.
Sunday; in Summer, from 10 to 4; in Winter from 10 to 3, without any other formality than that of writing in a book at the entrance.\footnote{Adolf Asher, \textit{Asher's Picture of Berlin and its Environs - a copious account of every Object worthy of inspection in the Metropolis of Prussia, in Charlottenburg and Potsdam; to which is added: a list of German Classic Authors and of their Preeminent Works} (Berlin: Asher, 1837). p. 35.}

The exclusion of private spaces, free admission, as well as the total spatial design of the museum embodied the new belief in art's social role. Oft lorded as a "true temple of art," the museum was both a place for personal, inward reflection, and a civic space. It's central rotunda, modelled after the Pantheon, simultaneously separated the internal displays from the outside world and evoked the reverence of a hallowed space, preparing the visitor for his encounter with art. But it also spoke once more to the civilising potential of art in public culture.\footnote{On the civilising function of art with specific reference to the Berlin example see Sheehan, \textit{Museums in the German art world} pp. 49-52; Giebelhausen, \textit{The architecture of the museum}, pp. 3-4; On civilising rituals and art museums more generally see Duncan and Wallach, \textit{The Universal Survey Museum,'} pp. 448-469; Duncan, \textit{'Art museums and the ritual of citizenship,'} pp. 279-286; Tony Bennett, \textit{The birth of the museum: history, theory, politics}, Culture: policy and politics. (London; New York: Routledge, 1995).} While one may be encouraged to contemplate the artworks in solitude, on the upper floor a grand double staircase and an open façade linked the visitor back to the social world at the culmination of the tour.\footnote{For the best elucidation of this idea, linking the spatial design to the philosophical, cultural and political ideas that had emerged during the revolutionary period, see Sheehan, \textit{Museums in the German art world} pp. 43-81. Particularly interesting is his discussion of two of Schinkel's drawings for the museum, where he points to the very different use of people in each space. Here, the figures are not simply placed to show the scale of the building, they are also deeply demonstrative of Schinkel's different intentions for the use of the spaces. On the building's design, of which there is much to add, see also Ziolkowski, \textit{'Schinkel's Museum,'} pp. 367-377; Crimp, \textit{'The End of Art and the Origin of the Museum,'} pp. 261-266; Giebelhausen, \textit{The architecture of the museum}, pp. 1-14; Giebelhausen, \textit{'Museum Architecture,'} pp. 223-244; Pundt, \textit{'K. F. Schinkel's Environmental Planning of Central Berlin,'} pp. 114-130; Moyano, \textit{'Quality vs. History,'} pp. 585-608.}

Much has been written about the way Schinkel's Berlin Museum embodied the ideals of the Romantic era. Its location, mentioned above, placed art at the very centre of civic life, and the proportions of the building, speaking directly to the surrounding structures, also supports this assertion. In its sense of unity it was both the embodiment of the romantic longing for synthesis and harmony and the classical idealism of Goethe's age.\footnote{Pundt, \textit{'K. F. Schinkel's Environmental Planning of Central Berlin,'} p. 123. Sheehan notes that although the older generation may have responded to the young romantics (born 1770s-1780s) with a mixture of scorn or dismissal, romanticism itself owed a great deal to the ideas of Goethe, Schiller and Kant, particularly with regard to the centrality of art, the commitment to moral and spiritual reform, and the civic role of beauty. Sheehan, \textit{German history, 1770-1866}, pp. 326-330.} While Schinkel's great detractor on the project, Alois Hirt, may have accused him of subordinating the artworks to architecture, as Douglas Crimp maintains, ‘[t]he question for Schinkel was not what he labelled the “pure” purpose of the museum—the housing of works of art—not whether art or architecture was to be privileged, but how the antithesis could be transcended in a higher unity.’\footnote{Crimp, \textit{'The End of Art and the Origin of the Museum,'} p. 264.}
Classicism also informed the building's temple-like form by looking to Greek civilisation as the source of beauty and cultural inspiration, but equally significant was a new reading of the past. In the shadow of revolutionary upheaval, Georg G. Iggers explains, ‘[t]he philosophy and methodology of historicism permeated all the German humanistic and cultural sciences, so that linguistics, philology, economics, art, law, philosophy, and theology became historically oriented studies.’

Historicism, along with the professionalisation and institutionalisation of historical writing, also underscored the invention of national traditions. Stefan Berger identifies this as an ‘increasingly symbiotic relationship between historical writing and the construction of national identities.’ The modern museum, as one of the key institutions emerging from and upholding national historical ideas and values, can never truly be disengaged from this process. While the Berlin Museum, as Else van Wezel argues, was conceived in opposition to the universalist and national triumphalism of the Musée Napoléon, it was also a product of French politics.

Not only did Paris serve as a model for the developing museum culture (Schinkel and museum director Gustav Waagen both travelled to Paris to study the organisation and display of collections), but in Napoleon’s mass looting policies the very conception of art as national property rather than royal possession was forged.

The arrangement of artworks too was influenced by the new historical thinking. Asher's Picture of Berlin again provides a useful description: ‘For those who are desirous of studying the history and progress of the art, from its Byzantine origin, through the schools of Florence and Sienna to its period of excellence, and thence to trace its gradual decay, there can be no better opportunity than is here afforded them.’ Crimp maintains that it was Hegel, above all, whose vision was realised in the museum; art had been ripped from the present and re-cast for the purposes of
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82 Iggers, The German Conception of History, p. 5.
84 Berger, The Invention of European National Traditions, p. 22.
85 Elsa van Wezel, "Denon's Louvre and Schinkel's Alte Museum: War Trophy Museum versus Monument to Peace", in Debora Meijers et al., Napoleon's legacy: the rise of national museums in Europe 1794-1830, Berliner Schriftenreihe zur Museumsforschung, Band 27. (Berlin: Institut für Museumsforschung, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin · Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz and G+H Verlag, 2009), p. 157. Stefan Berger’s elucidation of the national particularism that emerged within Romantic thought as both a reaction to the universalising values of the enlightenment, which was particularly associated in the occupied territories with Napoleonic hegemony, and as a product of those very values, provides the broader intellectual framework for the changes in the conception of art and cultural property; Berger, The Invention of European National Traditions, p. 22.
86 On Paris as a model see Sheehan, Museums in the German art world p. 52. On the Napoleonic policies and concepts of national property see Crimp, 'The End of Art and the Origin of the Museum,' p. 262. Sheehan also makes this point, stating: 'For German patriots, the forcible removal of the best pieces from their own collections was a particularly humiliating indication of their impotence; they wanted to reconquer these lost trophies and to display them as symbols of their recovered authority. Among the many lessons to be learned from the French, therefore, was the power of art to express state power.' Sheehan, Museums in the German art world p. 52.
87 Asher, Asher's Picture of Berlin, p. 39.
thought and reflection, so that the museum 'represented not the possibility of art's rejuvenation but the irrevocability of art's end.' Crimp, *The End of Art and the Origin of the Museum,* p. 265. The museum also made visible the central tenets of the emerging Art Historical discipline, organising artworks by category (sculpture, china, and painted glass on the lower floor and a picture gallery above, with vases and bronzes in the basement), by national "schools," and chronologically according to the model of progress and decay.

The new displays represented a very different conception of art and its role in society than that which had governed the *Kunstkammer's* classification of objects according to material. Not surprisingly, the *Kunstkammer* itself underwent major re-organisation during the period following the establishment of the Berlin Museum. Under new director, Leopold von Ledebur re-classification began in 1830, the same year that the *Kunstkammer* joined the Royal Museums. Though Ledebur was a notable advocate of the new preservationist tendencies, the re-organisation was necessitated as much by practical concerns as intellectual ones. Not only had Schinkel and the museum commission cherry-picked the best paintings, sculptures and classical antiquities from the royal collections for their own museum, many other emerging fields had made significant claims on the collections. Eva Giloi notes the dilapidated state of the *Kunstkammer* when Ledebur took over, following two decades in which 'its natural history specimens, art, antiquities, Egyptian and Germanic artefacts, and historical weapons had been moved to other museum spaces', and the need to ensure that the collections were not 'permanently demoted to the level of meaningless bric-a-brac.'

Ledebrur's re-organisation of the "remains" of the *Kunstkammer,* as well as the very separation of so much of its inventory reflects the emergence of the new public museum culture, which would gain momentum over the course of the nineteenth century with the establishment of the *Kupferstichkabinett* (1831); the assignment of land to the north of the Berlin Museum for the development of the later Museum Island precinct (1841); the establishment of the Berlin Zoo (1844) and the opening up of royal parks and gardens, the construction of the Neues Museum (1844-55) and the successive opening of its collections with the transfer of the Egyptian Collection
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89 Reference to the *Kunstkammer's* transfer to the Royal Museums; Julius Lessing, *Führer durch die Sammlung des Kunstgewerbe-Museums zu Berlin* (Berlin: Spemann, 1887), p. 2. For a description of the *Kunstkammer* shortly after Ledebur's re-organisation, including a brief section regarding the previous organisational principles, see Franz Kugler, *Beschreibung der in der Königl. Kunstkammer zu Berlin vorhandenen Kunst-Sammlung* (Berlin: Heymann, 1838).
90 Among these the Egyptian Artefacts had been moved to Monbiju Palace in 1822, German Antiquities to the same in 1826, historical weapons were transferred to the Zeughaus in 1827 and 1830 (below) and the Natural History Collections had been transferred to the new university established in 1810. Eva Giloi, *Monarchy, myth, and material culture in Germany 1750-1950* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 61-65; Sheehan, *Museums in the German art world* p. 54.
91 Giloi, *Monarchy, myth, and material culture,* p. 108.
92 Giloi Bremner, "Ich Kaufe mir den Kaiser!," p. 125.
from Monbiju Palace (1850) and the installation of the Ethnographic collections (1859). Linking broader museological currents to the developments at the Zeughaus, it is significant that several other arms and armour collections were either founded or re-organised during the first half of the nineteenth century. New establishments included the collections of the Count of Erbach (1820) and the Musée Cluny Paris (1833), while the Musée d’Armures Brussels (1835), the Royal Historical Museum and Gun Gallery Dresden (1833), the Rüstkammer of the city of Emden (1837), and the Armerie Reale in Turin (1837) were all made anew. After German unification museum development continued and intensified in Berlin, now the imperial capital. As such, the two-stage establishment of the Zeughaus museum in 1831 and 1883 mirrors the two significant waves of museum development, whose roots can be traced in the cultural shifts of the early nineteenth-century and the re-organisation of existing collections to suit the new political, intellectual, and educational imperatives.

**Consolidation and transfer of existing collections**

During the years between the foundation of the Artillery Museum and the opening of the first Zeughaus displays, a collection was established that drew upon variety of sources. The transfer of objects to the Zeughaus from other Prussian fortresses had a long tradition; from its earliest days the Zeughaus had been designated as a place for the consolidation of the best objects from throughout the realm, housing not only trophies, but also historical weapons and armour. So too, objects had been transferred at various times from the collections of the Hohenzollern family, including consignments of valuable weapons from the royal Rüstkammer. The build up of weapons and equipment for military use, particularly under the rule of the King Friedrich Wilhelm I, had also been significant, with the number of cannons more than doubling between the 1713 and 1732. But this kind of assembly of weapons at the Zeughaus differed both conceptually and methodologically from the nineteenth-century consolidation of objects for the new museum, with the earlier transfers subject to the will of the reigning monarch, a fact dramatically demonstrated by the depletion of Zeughaus stockpiles, the sale of historical pieces from the Rüstkammer, and the smelting of old, often richly decorated cannons to facilitate the military campaigns of Friedrich II.
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94 Müller, *Die Baugeschichte*, p. 138. Both Heinrich Müller and Regina Müller note the context within which the Zeughaus holding were so substantially increased. It is important to see this as part of a much larger expansion of the army and its resources under Friedrich Wilhelm I, the “Soldier King,” whose reign was one of peace, but whose legacy, an 81,000 man strong army and vastly increased stockpiles of weapons, would be the foundation of his successor, Friedrich II’s military success.

95 Ibid. pp. 138-139.
After the foundation of the museum the acquisition of objects and the transfer of existing collections was linked to the systematic development of a collection that was perceived both in perpetuity and as a whole. Its scope and structure were defined by a set of purposes that both overlapped with the older functions of display at the Zeughaus, most notably the demonstration of victory, and reflected new priorities for the preservation of historical objects and the pedagogic concerns of a newly invigorated Prussian military. The structure and organisation of the collection is best demonstrated by an analysis of the displays, as they would have appeared in 1831, which reflected the internal logic of the collections themselves. For the moment, however, it is worth remaining with the process of collection development and the consolidation of existing holdings for the creation of the new museum.

Like the new Berlin Museum, the Zeughaus collections were drawn primarily from existing holdings. An inventory giving provenance information for some 1,974 objects (dated 1831-32) has been summarised by Heinrich Müller and provides valuable insight into the method by which objects were obtained. The largest category comprised objects transferred to the museum from the holdings of the Zeughaus itself. From the artillery depot 628 objects were allocated to the museum in addition to a sample collection (Mustersammlung) of 184 European firearms. The war booty brought to Berlin from Paris comprised the next largest category, with 637 objects listed. Objects were also obtained by direct acquisition and through the exchange of doubles with the Rüstkammer in Dresden (210 objects in total by these methods). Of the royal collections, 205 objects were assigned to the museum from the Charlottenburg Palace Gun Chamber (Gewehrkammer) and 219 originated in the Kunstkammer, over half of which had only been acquired in 1822 when Privy War Councillor and renowned private collector Friedrich Krüger bequeathed his collection to the crown.

That the transfer of objects to the Zeughaus represented more than the consolidation of historical weapons under one roof, but rather a new conceptualisation of historical objects and their potential to represent state-sponsored narratives, is aptly demonstrated by the transfer of objects from the Kunstkammer. As we’ve seen, during the course of the 1820s the Kunstkammer had been eroded, piece-by-piece, as various specialist museums were established from its Universalist collections. Eva Giloi paints a vivid picture of then director Jean Henry’s struggle against the

96 Müller, *Vom Arsenal zum Museum*, p. 75.
97 Müller points out elsewhere that many of Krüger’s own objects could conceivably have originated in the Royal Rüstkammer and even in the Zeughaus itself, as he was an active collector during the period in which Friedrich II was divesting objects (1746-51) as well as being in Berlin at the time of the Russian occupation, when many the loot of Zeughaus objects became available on the open market. Ibid. p. 46; pp. 69-72.
depletion of his collections. In the case of arms and armour, he argued for their retention ‘on the grounds that they were not merely weapons, but also antiquities, works of art, ethnographic artefacts and relics of the fatherland,’ and thus belonged within the scope of the Kunstkammer. The idea that the weapons could be put to use in service of the fatherland brought Henry a reprieve and it was agreed in 1827 that only those weapons ‘that illustrated the origins and development of “the art of modern warfare, through the invention and perfection of fire arms”’ would be moved to the Zeughaus, while historical weapons and royal souvenirs would remain. But Henry’s victory was short-lived. In November 1830 a further 108 objects were transferred to the Zeughaus, representing medieval and early modern arms and armour including cross-bows, firearms, close combat weapons such as swords, rapiers, pole arms and daggers, suits and pieces of armour, chainmail, and barding. Those weapons that did remain in the Kunstkammer, most notably the relics of Prussian rulers and generals, were subject to new director Ledebur’s re-conceptualisation and cast in a patriotic cultural-historical context. Many of these, most notably the so-called Blücherbeute, or Blücher Booty, comprising Napoleon’s decorations and hat left behind as he fled the advancing Prussian army under the command of Field Marshall von Blücher at Waterloo, would enter the Zeughaus collections later and point to a continual process of rationalisation and re-organisation among the Berlin collections (see further chapter 3).

With the acquisition of the Kunstkammer objects the Zeughaus possessed a comprehensive collection showing the development of Brandenburg-Prussian weaponry, as well as an impressive array of medieval and early modern objects, including many elaborately decorated pieces associated with important manufacturers, artisans, and historical figures. The systematic acquisition of contemporary weapons from other European powers as well as some non-European weapons enhanced the scope of the collection alongside military models of both historical and contemporary cannons and machinery. In its component parts the Zeughaus collections drew together the three strains of thought explored above in relation to the broader political and cultural shifts that emerged during the post-revolutionary era; the patriotic sentiment and the memorialisation of the Wars of Liberation (colours, standards, trophies and war booty), the military-pedagogic requirements of the Prussian reform era (contemporary firearms samples and military models), and historicism and preservation impulses (historical arms and armour).
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98 Giloi Bremner, “Ich Kaufe mir den Kaiser!,” pp. 118-125; See also Giloi, Monarchy, myth, and material culture, pp. 55-63.
99 Giloi Bremner, “Ich Kaufe mir den Kaiser!,” p. 120.
100 Minister Karl von Alemenst quoted in ibid. p. 121.
101 Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 69; p. 72.
102 On the reorganisation of the Kunstkammer after 1830 see Giloi Bremner, “Ich Kaufe mir den Kaiser!,” Ch. 4; Giloi, Monarchy, myth, and material culture, Ch. 5.
In November 1831 the Zeughaus displays were finally completed according to Schinkel’s designs. The process had been drawn out by a number of factors, including cost and space considerations. Importantly, as Heinrich Müller has shown, the officers involved, for whom the museum project was merely a side-venture, lacked both the time and the expertise required to process the old weapons, many of which needed cleaning and restoration as well as identification, the latter made all the more difficult by a lack of reference material. Just as the new discipline of Art History was only now producing its first key works, so too *Waffenkunde*, the historical study of arms and armour, had not yet emerged as a distinct field of study. Bureaucratic processes caused further delays, with the War Department, the War Minister, and often the king himself maintaining approval over the museum’s conception and execution. Nevertheless, just one year after the opening of the Berlin Museum, the Zeughaus displays were completed. Reflecting the overarching categorisation of the collections according to two main groups, the Art and Armour Chamber (*Kunst-Rüstkammer*) and the Model and Sample Collection (*Modell- und Mustersammlung*) were installed in two separate spaces on the upper floor of the Zeughaus in the north and south wings respectively.

**The museum displays, 1831**

The majority of the Zeughaus remained dedicated to the storage of military weapons and equipment after 1831. On the ground floor stood heavy ordnance, both modern and historical, in addition to eighteen French fortress models. According to one contemporary account, the vaulted halls housed ‘powder carts driven end to end in rows, next to a large number of disposable gun barrels, gun carriages and other war machines, as well as an important collection of old cannons of every calibre distinguished by age, beautiful work and ornamentation’ (Fig. 1.9). Upstairs the magazine was bounded by tall gun racks, forming ‘iron walls’ around the centremost bays and leaving the outside perimeter free for visitors to access the two new museum spaces. These racks were both functional and ornamental. In Asher’s description, the ‘70,000 to 80,000 stand of arms’ encircling the
museum apartments formed ‘a most imposing effect.’ Decorative elements around the perimeter included early modern and Renaissance armour, ornate assemblages of small arms and instruments, and colours and standards, while the apartments themselves were formed by large display cabinets designed by Schinkel, which bordered the display areas encompassing six bays each in the centre of the north and south wings (Fig. 1.10).

Figure 1.9: View of the lower floor of the Berlin Zeughaus (Leipziger Illustrierte Zeitung, J.J. Weber Verlag, Leipzig, Band 3, No. 71, 1844, p. 300)

Figure 1.10: Floor plan of the upper floor of the Zeughaus, 1831, showing the two museum apartments and storage facilities (author’s own depiction based on examination of contemporary images and descriptions. Not to scale)

108 Asher, Asher’s Picture of Berlin, pp. 55-56.
In the Art and Armour Chamber to the north, four central columns were decorated with gun barrels encircled by gilt laurel leaves (Fig. 1.11). Against the northern wall stood a bronzed plaster figure of General Blücher, taken from Daniel Rauch’s design for his Breslau monument (1827), which was surrounded by the trophies of 1815, most notably a mass of colours captured in France. Like the fortress models, these trophies were not only those won on the battlefield, but included colours taken from display in fortresses, armouries, and in the Musée d’Artillerie in Paris, including many dating from the French Revolution.109 Mounted above the windows opposite the Blücher statue on the far side of the display room was a cast of Schinkel’s tympanum designed for the recently erected Neue Wache, featuring the goddess of victory in the centre of a mighty battle.110 The room itself housed a significant collection of weapons and instruments including rifles, muskets, pistols, crossbows, swords, assorted cutting and thrusting weapons, and drums organised in the glass display cabinets as well as arranged in decorative assemblages atop the cabinets. Paired with the contemporary trophies of the Wars of Liberation, these principally historical collections served to historicise and romanticise the recent Prussian victory by drawing upon a growing interest in medieval imagery as German national movements began looking to the past for specifically German symbols and myths.111

Medievalism pervaded much of the nineteenth-century German imagination. This was most visible in architecture, where pan-Germanic national aspirations were expressed in the adoption of Gothic as the one truly “German” style.112 It also became a prominent motif in the construction of Heimat imagery as well as a central concern of historical writing.113 ‘Medievalism’, Stefan Berger contends, ‘was one of the most enduring characteristics of Romantic national history-writing.’114 The display of medieval, Gothic and Renaissance armour within the context of the Prussian memorialisation of the Wars of Liberation therefore appealed to an awakened national imagination. By adopting the iconographic language of Medievalism and linking it to the recent victories for which Prussia could claim glory the museum spoke the language of the national movements while placing Prussia at the heart of an authentic and above all historical cultural community.

110 On the construction of the neue Wache Pickford, ‘Conflict and Commemoration;,’ p. 140.
111 Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 58.
113 Alon confino on Heimat iconography; ‘The Nation as a Local Metaphor: Heimat, National Memory and the German Empire, 1871-1918,’ History and Memory, 5, no. 1, 1993; Reference to historical writing and the importance of the Middle Ages; Berger, ‘The Invention of European National Traditions,’ pp. 31-32.
114 Berger, ‘The Invention of European National Traditions,’ p. 32.
Many of the Gothic and Early Modern works presented formed the decorative backdrop for a more scientifically conceived organisation within the display cabinets, whose arrangement represented an engagement with new taxonomic principles. Ordered chronologically, the weapons were presented in type-sequences to show the technological development of each class of weaponry. This technical-evolutionary model was employed to assist in the study of historical weapons and was very much in accordance with the military education model put forward by Scharnhorst and his contemporaries. These displays were intended to demonstrate the evolution of weapons technology and thereby serve as a resource for the further development of arms, a particular imperative for Prussia, which lagged behind France in this regard. The early displays therefore made no differentiation between weapons based on country of origin, instead placing each piece within its particular sequences so that minute technical changes might be traced as part of a broader process of evolution. The significance of the collections thus arranged lay not in the worth
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115 Sheehan, *German history, 1770-1866*, pp. 308-310; Müller, *Vom Arsenal zum Museum*, p. 58.
of individual objects (Müller notes the countless arms placed in vitrines without identifying labels), but in their value as a whole.

This represented a significant shift in the perception, organisation and utilisation of collections. Susan Pearce has traced gradual changes in collecting practice over the course of the early modern period from an emphasis on the particular ‘among which esoteric resemblances might be sought’, to the typical ‘through which recurrent and reliable patterns might be perceived’. By the late-seventeenth century this led to the idea of “completeness” in collections, and by 1700, she contends, ‘the gaze was no longer trained upon resemblances between the rare and the strange as a way of explaining the nature of the universe; rather it was concentrated upon measurement and distinction, and upon notions of classification as the explanatory paradigm’. But, as the Hohenzollern Kunstкаммер demonstrates, older modes persisted well into the nineteenth century. While taxonomy had emerged much earlier, having its roots in Linnean concepts articulated in Systemа Natura (first published 1735), the application of principles common to natural history collections did not become a prominent mode of organisation for products of human ingenuity until much later. It was not until the 1850s and 1860s that typology emerged as a guiding principle for cultural objects, and not until the latter half of that century that it truly came to the fore. Notable were collections of technology and applied arts following the advent of the international industrial exhibition, when technological progress came to symbolise national achievement and the permanent collections that emerged were established for the promotion of national economic growth and industrial innovation. Archaeological, anthropological and historical material also underwent re-organisation, more intensely after the advent of Darwinian evolutionary principles and their application to a progressivist cultural model as articulated by Pitt-Rivers during the 1860s and 1870s.

Arthur MacGregor has shown that progressivist social and cultural anthropologies had much more in common with pre-Darwinian concepts of evolution than with Darwin’s own work. Pitt-Rivers’ own investigations began in 1851, almost a decade before the publication of The Origin of the
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Species.\textsuperscript{122} But, as one reviewer of Pitt-Rivers' posthumous publication \textit{The Evolution of Culture and other Essays} (1906) stated: 'The application of the evolutionary idea to human inventions was a new and bold step in the sixties of the last century, but it inevitably followed the changed outlook upon nature resulting from the scientific movement of the time.'\textsuperscript{123} MacGregor concludes that 'Darwin's thesis galvanized [...] the refinement and extension of the typical series that were to dominate artefactual research for generations to come and which were to condition the appearance of museum displays for the next century or more.'\textsuperscript{124} These principles also held implications for collecting \textit{practice}, with collections now perceived within scientifically defined boundaries. 'The idea of collections as potentially complete series became widespread alongside evolutionism in the nineteenth-century,' writes Sharon Macdonald.\textsuperscript{125} Museums could now 'fill in the gaps' within a determined selection rationale.\textsuperscript{126} In the case of the Zeughaus, the scientific principles that underpinned the arrangement of objects also determined the collecting parameters and therefore set the foundation for a comprehensive international collection of arms and armour.\textsuperscript{127}

The arrangement of the Zeughaus collections represents an early articulation of these dominant modes of display and collecting practice. Although art historical ideas had already begun to impact the arrangement of fine art collections, including the incorporation of periodisation within the agreed upon national schools, typological arrangement owed more to natural than art history. It is telling that an imperative to demonstrate and promote progress via such displays was identified so early with regard to weaponry, though not surprising in the wake of the Napoleonic Wars. It is significant that Pitt-Rivers' own ruminations regarding the classification of cultural material according to morphological affinities from the most simple to the most complex came about in relation to his own engagement with weapons as a Colonel in the British Army. 'During his investigations,' wrote Pitt-Rivers' successor Henry Balfour,

cast at a time when the old Tower musket was being finally discarded, he was forcefully struck by the extremely gradual changes whereby improvements were effected. He observed that every noteworthy advancement in the efficiency, not only of the whole weapon, but also of every individual detail in the structure, was arrived at as a cumulative result of a succession of very slight modifications, each of which was but a trifling improvement upon the one immediately preceding it. Through noticing the unfailing regularity of this process of gradual \textit{evolution} in the case of firearms, he was led to believe that the same principles must probably govern the development of other arts, appliances, and ideas of mankind.\textsuperscript{128}

\textsuperscript{122} Alfred C. Haddon, 'Review: The Method of Pitt-Rivers,' \textit{Folklore}, 18, no. 2, 1907, p. 217.
\textsuperscript{123} O.M.D, 'Review: 66,' \textit{Man}, 7, 1907, p. 108.
\textsuperscript{124} MacGregor, 'Exhibiting evolutionism,' p. 86.
\textsuperscript{126} ibid.
\textsuperscript{127} Müller, \textit{Vom Arsenal zum Museum}, p. 58.
\textsuperscript{128} Henry Balfour in Pitt-Rivers, Balfour, and Myres, \textit{The evolution of culture and other essays}, p. v. Original emphasis.
These ideas were remarkably close to those of Scharnhorst, who promoted an understanding of the historical development of weaponry as a fundamental precondition for innovation.\textsuperscript{129} In this way the military reform agenda so instrumental to the foundational concept of the museum was manifest in its collecting and exhibition philosophy.

Military education was the overriding consideration for the Model and Sample Collection displayed in the south wing (Fig. 1.12). It too was set within six bays enclosing four central columns, though these remained unadorned. A fence along the southern edge of the display area constructed from swords and halberds enclosed the space, which included tables draped with crimson cloth for the display of models. Like the Art and Armour Chamber, this space incorporated a memorial component, with a statue of King Friedrich Wilhelm I, similarly decorated with military trophies, against the southern wall.\textsuperscript{130} Reflecting the imperatives of a teaching collection, primarily for the use of officers and officers in training, the collections comprised models of both old and new cannons, machinery and military engineering equipment, and the Sample Collection of European firearms, which could be studied by military personnel to familiarise themselves with the weapons in use by the leading European powers.\textsuperscript{131}

Given the place of the Zeughaus within the military training apparatus and the segregation of practical and exhibition spaces within the armoury, the displays opened in 1831 should be considered as semi-public museum spaces. While the exhibits were accessible between 3-4pm on Wednesdays and Saturdays,\textsuperscript{132} visitors were required to register with the Zeughaus Captain behind the armoury. Foreign visitors, moreover, must gain permission from the War Minister before visiting the museum.\textsuperscript{133} In this respect, the Zeughaus was not on par with the liberal admissions policy of the Berlin Museum. It represented instead a hybrid of old and new forms; it was ‘a type of military museum’ in Asher’s account, a chamber of art and armour, a functional armoury, an extension of Berlin’s military education facilities, a memorial to the Wars of Liberation, and as it had always been, a symbol of Prussian military might.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[129] Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 58.
\item[130] Zedlitz-Neukirch, Neuestes Conversations-Handbuch für Berlin und Potsdam, p. 828. On the symbolic placement of the Friedrich Wilhelm I statue here see Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 84.
\item[131] Zedlitz-Neukirch, Neuestes Conversations-Handbuch für Berlin und Potsdam, p. 828.
\item[132] Asher, Asher’s Picture of Berlin, p. 56.
\item[133] Alexander Cosmar, Alexander Cosmar’s neuester und vollständigster Wegweiser durch Berlin für Fremde und Einheimische - ein alphabetisch geordnetes Verzeichnis [...] Im Anhange: Der neueste, alphabetisch geordnete Wegweiser durch Potsdam und seine Umgebungen (Morin, 1843), p. 124.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Changing perceptions of the Zeughaus, 1831-1871

Between the completion of the museum within the Zeughaus and the full conversion of the building to a public museum and Ruhmeshalle beginning in 1877 there were a number of events that impacted both the perception of the Zeughaus and its physical holdings. As with the first phase of the museal use of the building, each was linked to the broader development of German national consciousness—firstly during the heightened phase of national movements with the use of the building for the first industrial exhibition representing the area of the German customs union (1844) and a few years later the storming of the building during the revolution of 1848. Both events contributed to the strengthening of the building’s museal role, and with the influx of weapons following the succession of wars leading up to German unification, they paved the way for the next phase of the Zeughaus as museum.
“The arts of peace in the temple of war”\textsuperscript{134} 

The German Customs Union (\textit{Zollverein}) was established in 1834 as a means of economically integrating member states of the German Confederation, created at the Congress of Vienna in 1814-15. The 38 member states of the Confederation remained administratively and politically separate, but the \textit{Zollverein} facilitated an expansion of internal trade via the elimination of complicated tariffs and customs barriers that had characterised the protectionist tendencies of the individual states.\textsuperscript{135} In reality, this had been a gradual process, beginning in 1818 with the creation of the Prussian Customs Union.\textsuperscript{136} By the mid-1840s the Prussian Union had been joined by the southern and middle-German territories, its members including Hesse-Darmstadt, Hesse-Cassel, Thuringen, Saxony and Bavaria Palatine, Bavaria and Württemburg, Nassau and Baden, Frankfurt, Brunswick, and Luxemburg.

During the eighteenth century, writes James Sheehan, economic activity 'tended to be locked in separate islands, which were then linked by intermediaries to a regional system of markets.'\textsuperscript{137} Any larger scale commerce, he argues, should be seen as part of an international, rather than specifically \textit{German} trade network.\textsuperscript{138} This lack of economic cohesion reflected the broader political, cultural, geographic and linguistic fragmentation of the dominant states (Prussia and Austria) and the numerous smaller states, territories, free cities and other, more ambiguous, political entities that made up the over three hundred territories of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation (962-1806). The \textit{Zollverein}, as the first attempt at a supra-regional economic union, has been seen as the first manifestation of a specifically German economy. Sheehan warns against the “national consensus” inherent in this assertion, which assumes the primacy of the national unit, but fails to take into account the actual economic activity of the era, focussing on policy to demonstrate the economic impact of the union in the process of the broader national unification.\textsuperscript{139} It is nonetheless clear, as Sheehan himself contends, that by the 1830s German nationhood had become a 'burning political issue'.\textsuperscript{140}

Whether or not the union had played a significant role in bringing together otherwise fragmented groups, it did represent a certain patriotic agenda—one that clearly linked economic and industrial progress with political unity and the idea of a historical German \textit{Volk}. Such claims

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{136} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{137} James J. Sheehan, 'What is German History? Reflections on the Role of the Nation in German History and Historiography,' \textit{The Journal of Modern History}, 53, no. 1, 1981, p. 7.
\item \textsuperscript{138} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{139} Ibid. pp. 11-13.
\item \textsuperscript{140} Ibid. p. 2.
\end{itemize}
were communicated to the public via the ‘brilliant industrial spectacle’ of the first large-scale *Universal German Industrial Exhibition* held in the Zeughaus for eight weeks from 15 August 1844.\[141\] ‘Certainly it was a great, uplifting sight’, stated the first of three official reports, ‘to see the many territories and states in which our common great fatherland has divided itself during the progress of the centuries, represented in totality’.\[142\] The exhibition organisers believed the event reflected a deep yearning in the German people for unity; ‘the German patriotic feeling stirs for such mutual enterprises: so many a true German heart longs for a point of unity’.\[143\] The exhibition did indeed represent the broadest array of German-speaking territories yet to participate in a mutual programme. Though industrial exhibitions had been held from the 1820s onward, including one in Mainz in 1842 that had been the first attempt to present exhibits from all the provinces of the German union, most were much narrower in scope.\[144\] The Berlin exhibition, by contrast, was a vast endeavour, for which Friedrich Wilhelm IV granted almost the entire floor space of the Zeughaus, the use of which was described by one reporter as an ‘interesting meeting of the arts of peace in the temple of war’ (Fig. 1.13).\[145\]

Taking place on both levels of the armoury, a total of 68,661 square feet of floor space was cleared for the exhibition, with an additional 20,000 square feet of wall space (created by the erection of a 20ft backing wall in the galleries, weapons hall and stairwells for the hanging of fabrics and goods).\[146\] The 3,040 exhibitors represented the *Zollverein* states of Prussia, Southern Germany, middle Germany, and Luxemburg, as well as several North German states and the Austrian Empire. As was the case for the British displays at the Great Exhibition held at the Crystal Palace in 1851, the hosts were provided the largest exhibition area, with 1,932 exhibitors from the Prussian states compared with 392 from the southern German states, 467 from the middle German states, 75 from Austria, and 174 from the north German (non-*Zollverein*) states.\[147\]

\[141\] [‘...das glänzende industrielle Schauspiel’ ‘Die Gewerbeausstellung,’ p. 298.
\[143\] [‘Auch das deutsche Vaterlandsgefühl wurde für solche gemeinsame Unternehmungen rege: so manches treue deutsche herz sehnt sich nach einem Vereinigungspunkt’] ibid. p. 11.
\[144\] For a summary of industrial exhibitions held during the 1820s-1840s (up to and including 1844) in German speaking territories see ibid. pp. 3-9.
\[146\] Allgemeine Deutsche Gewerbe-Ausstellung, *Amtlicher Bericht (Erstes Heft)*, p. 54.
The exhibition was divided into eight categories covering an extensive array of wares from silk, cotton and wool fabrics, finished garments, carpets, and works from human hair, through to heavy metalwork (machinery, ironware, brass, lamps, wire), light metalwork (surgical instruments, watches, optical, mathematical and physics instruments, weapons, jewellery), woodwork (furniture, flooring, leather goods, brushes), earthenware (porcelain, pottery, glass, mirrors, mortar, asphalt), chemical products (paint colours and pigments, perfume, soap, tobacco and chocolate), and paper (books, writing implements, bookbinders, musical instruments and wax figures). The large, heavy objects and machinery were exhibited on the ground floor, with the smaller, lighter objects on the upper floor (Fig. 1.14). Making use of Schinkel’s decorated columns, the space normally housing the Art and Armour Collection was designated for the display of expensive furniture, fine porcelain and crystal.

Boasting visitor numbers in excess of 5,000 per day (with an admission price of 5 Sgr.), the Universal German Industrial Exhibition was the first opportunity for the Zeughaus to prove its

---


149 Average number of visitors per day and entrance fee per ‘Die Gewerbeausstellung,’ pp. 298-299; The entrance fee is also given in Allgemeine Deutsche Gewerbe-Ausstellung, Amtlicher Bericht (Erstes Heft), p. 64. In Prussia in 1840 30 Sgr. (Silver Groschen) was equivalent to one Taler. See Charles Kindleberger, ‘Germany’s overtaking of England, 1806–1914,’ Review of World Economics, 111, no. 3, 1975, p. 255.
suitability for large-scale exhibition purposes.\textsuperscript{150} As the 
\textit{Leipziger Illustrierte Zeitung} proclaimed: 'A
more magnificent space for an industrial exhibition would not easily be found in another
\textit{city},'\textsuperscript{151} That the exhibition was also a significant vehicle for the expression of a growing national movement
is demonstrated by the commemorative coin created for the event, showing a seated figure of
\textit{Germania} holding a laurel wreath, a sword resting at her side and the words, 'seid einig' (be united)
on the rock on which she sits. On the reverse five shields depict the industrial sectors of shipping,
mining, engineering, agriculture, and weaving, placed within a wreath of wheat and vines encircling
the prize-winning Borsig "Beuth" locomotive crossing a viaduct.\textsuperscript{152} Around the edge the motto;
'Onward with German diligence and German strength' echoed the words of Finance Minister
Flottwell in his opening speech of the exhibition.\textsuperscript{153}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure114.jpg}
\caption{Figure 1.14: View of the industrial exhibition 1844, showing King Friedrich Wilhelm IV inspecting the heavy machinery on the lower floor (\textit{Leipziger Illustrierte Zeitung}, J. Weber Verlag, Leipzig, Band 4, 1845, p. 313)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{150} Müller, \textit{Die Baugeschichte}, p. 151.
\textsuperscript{151} ['Ein herrlicher Raum zu einer Gewerbeausstellung wird nicht leicht in einen anderen Stadt gefunden werden.'] 'Die Gewerbeausstellung,' p. 298.
\textsuperscript{152} The Borsig "Beuth" locomotive No. 44 was a first-prize winner at the exhibition. Borsig had commenced production of locomotives in 1841, producing the first German built machine (incorporating design elements from both British and American examples) for the Berlin-Anhalt railway. The "Beuth" (built in 1843) was named after Peter Beuth, a member of the Prussian reform commission and, from 1818, head of the Department of Trade under the Finance Ministry. Beuth was also the founder of the Berlin Industrial Institute (founded 1820), which he led until 1845 and where Borsig studied from 1823-25. See J. B. Hollingsworth and Arthur Cook, \textit{The illustrated directory of trains of the world} (London: Salamander, 2000), pp. 42-43; Kindleberger, 'Germany's overtaking of England, 1806–1914,' p. 273; Karl Karmarsch, 'Borsig, Johann Karl Friedrich August,' in \textit{Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie}, ed. Historische Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Leipzig: Duncker und Humboldt, 1876). For Beuth see W. O. Henderson, 'Peter Beuth and the Rise of Prussian Industry, 1810-1845,' \textit{The Economic History Review}, 8, no. 2, 1955; Karl Karmarsch, 'Beuth, Peter Caspar Wilhelm,' in \textit{Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie}, ed. Historische Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Leipzig: Duncker und Humboldt, 1875).
\textsuperscript{153} ['Vorwärts mit deutschem Fleisse und deutscher Kraft'] The bronze medal was stamped by Heinrich Lorenz and carried the word \textit{Loos}, referring to the lottery organised in conjunction with the exhibition.
Kid gloves and the revolution

‘In the year 1844 we looked upon these halls proud and joyful,’ wrote Marianne von Reinhard in her 1852 guide to Berlin, ‘in 1848 bowed and mournful.’ She was referring to the events of June 1848 when protesters stormed the Zeughaus, demanding weapons they had been promised by the king. Situated directly between Berlin’s two key sites of unrest, the city palace, where protesters addressed their concerns to the king, and the Sing Academy, home of the Prussian constituent assembly, the Zeughaus was at the very centre of the revolutionary upheaval.

There are many and complex explanations for the European-wide unrest of 1848, some of which can be seen as common threads running throughout the various centres of revolution, such as poor economic conditions, agricultural crises, food shortages, changing patterns of labour, industrial crises, and political aspirations. At each site of revolution there were also always specifically local factors contributing to social and political discontent, compounded by the diverse, often conflicting goals of the different sectors of society involved in the unrest; peasants demanding the removal of feudal obligations, workers calling for improved pay and conditions, artisans concerned about the removal of protections under the traditional guild system, and students and the bourgeoisie largely arguing for constitutional reform.

The events in Berlin were both part of the wider European unrest caused by ‘new forces gnawing away at the stability of existing political structures’, and specifically “German,” Prussian and local concerns. These pressures, fuelled by the dismissal of 400 workers from the Borsig Locomotive Company, led to a bloody uprising on 18 March, when Friedrich Wilhelm IV’s soldiers fired upon a crowd gathered on the palace square. The barricading of the city streets and widespread fighting that ensued left over three hundred civilians and twenty-four soldiers dead. Whereas the King’s steadfast refusal to heed demands for political reform had precipitated the unrest, he now ordered the withdrawal of troops and quickly announced a progressive set of concessions, including the establishment of a Prussian constituent assembly, the arming of a civic guard, and support for German unification. These reforms only led to the short-term cessation of unrest though. According to Donald Mattheisen, Friedrich Wilhelm’s allowances ‘did restore public

154 ['Im Jahr 1844 blickten wir stolz und freudig auf diese Hallen, 1848 gebeugt und trauernd.'] Reinhard, Berlin, p. 75.
156 Ibid., p. 41.
confidence, but they gave the misleading impression that the king had adopted the program of the liberal opposition. In fact, he had only made a tactical retreat.\textsuperscript{159}

The proximity of the Zeughaus to the palace was compounded by the establishment in May of the Prussian assembly in the Sing Academy to the rear of the Kastanienwäldchen. By the following month, public dissatisfaction with the assembly led to a series of protests around the Academy. These intensified in the period leading up to 14 June, despite Police Chief Julius Freiherr von Minutoli’s ban on public assembly. Karl August Varnhagen’s diary entry for that day paints a vivid picture of those gathered. ‘In the Kastanienwäldchen and around the main guardhouse the largest crowd yet!’ he wrote, ‘Natural consequence of the Minutoli ban! [...] The groups are very mixed, fine gentlemen and coarse workers, students, apprentices, ladies with parasoles, craftsmen.’\textsuperscript{160}

The King’s pledge to arm the people had thus far only been granted to Berlin’s more prosperous citizens, who formed the militia (Bürgerwehr) that now stood in opposition to the protestors.\textsuperscript{161} When the Bürgerwehr fired on the crowd two people were killed and several injured. The situation grew out of control and in the evening the crowd breached the Zeughaus (Fig. 1.15):

In the moonlit night it still came about however that the armoury was overrun by the people and the soldiers were ordered away. Thousands of guns and a good deal of bullets and lead were taken out, [Bürgerwehr Commander] Blesson with his stupid efforts achieved nothing! Only the Artisans’ Association and student body convinced the people to leave the armoury towards morning, whereupon once again soldiers were sent in. – The city was very restless, and much was possible!

[In der mondhellen Nacht kam es aber noch dazu, daß das Zeughaus vom Volk erdrungen und die Soldaten daraus fortgeschickt wurden, Tausende von Gewehren und viele Kugeln und Blei wurden herausgenommen, Blesson mit seinem dummen Anstalten richtete nichts aus! Erst der Handwerkerverein und die Studentenschaft brachten die Leute gegen Morgen dahin, das Zeughaus zu verlassen, worauf sogleich wieder Soldaten hingesandt wurden. – Die Stadt war sehr unruhig, und es war vieles möglich!]\textsuperscript{162}

The decision of Captain von Natzmer, who was in charge of the military company in the Zeughaus, to retreat rather than battle the crowd most likely saved the events from escalating into the bloodbath of March 18.\textsuperscript{163}

\textsuperscript{159} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{161} Helmut Bleiber, ”Berlin, Storming of the Armory,” Available at ohio.edu/chastain/ac/berlin.htm [accessed 21 March 2012].
\textsuperscript{162} Varnhagen von Ense and Assing, Tagebücher, 5, p. 69.
\textsuperscript{163} Natzmer’s actions were the cause of some debate. He was officially tried for dereliction of his post and the remarks of von Griesheim quoted by Engels in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung on 20 June 1848 reflect the polarisation of opinion about his actions. While some saw the withdrawal of his troops as heroic, Engels stating that Natzmer most likely saved the monarchy while others called for his public acknowledgment, Griesheim equated his actions with the desertion of the
Figure 1.15: The storming of the Zeughaus, Neuruppiner Bildbogen Nr. 1348 (DHM Graphik Sammlung, Inv. Nr.: Gr 54/1363)

The following day First Lieutenant and Department Director of the War Ministry Karl Gustav von Griesheim called on the patriotism of every resident of Berlin for the urgent return of weapons. The ministry hoped, according to Griesheim's public notice, 'that the sympathy for the patriotic armed forces among the Berliners is so great, that each will make every endeavour among his own circle, to make the loss as minimal as possible.'\textsuperscript{164} Losses were, however, substantial. Heinrich Müller states that in total 1,100 new needle-fired guns were removed from the armoury, a figure that accords with Griesheim's parliamentary report of 17 June 1848.\textsuperscript{165} As the looting progressed to the upper floor, the historical collections were also plundered. According to Marianne von Reinhard, 'even many valuable and irreplaceable weapons, flags and trophies, won with the blood of brave Prussians, your fathers and forefathers, dear children, were robbed and destroyed.'\textsuperscript{166} Although many weapons were later recovered, records show significant losses.\textsuperscript{167}

Quite the opposite view was expressed by Friedrich Engels in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung. While he labelled the action 'an event without consequences, a revolution that stopped halfway,' he credited the action with the rejection of the conservative Camphausen draft constitution and the resignation of several members of the ministry.\textsuperscript{168} More pertinent to the Zeughaus was his analysis of the parliamentary response to the desecration of 'the sacred shrine [sic.] of old Prussia',\textsuperscript{169} Quoting directly from Griesheim's parliamentary address, he wrote:

*Theft, robbery and destruction* took place. New weapons were flung down and broken. *Antiques of irreplaceable value, rifles inlaid with silver and ivory and artistic, hard-to-replace artillery models were destroyed. Trophies and flags won by the blood of the people, symbols of the nation's honour, were torn and besmirched!*\textsuperscript{170}

The emphases were Engels' own, intended to ridicule Griesheim's misplaced concern. He went on:

The people have destroyed the artillery models! Herr Griesheim is demanding that the people are supposed to put on kid gloves before starting a revolution? But the most horrible event is yet to come—the trophies of old Prussia have been besmirched and torn! [...] The people of Berlin disavowed the wars of liberation by trampling upon the flags captured at Leipzig and


\textsuperscript{165} Müller, *Vom Arsenal zum Museum*, p. 96; Griesheim quoted in Marx and Engels, *Collected works Vol. 7 Marx and Engels*, p. 98.

\textsuperscript{166}['...gar viel kostbares und unersetzliches an Waffen, Fähnen, und Siegeszeichen, erkämpft mit dem Blute tapferer Preußen, eurer Väter und UrVäter, liebe Kinder, geraubt und vernichtet wurde.'] Reinhard, *Berlin*, p. 76.

\textsuperscript{167} Müller provides an inventory of Zeughaus holdings (Gewehren und Blankwaffen) following the return of weapons from 4 August 1849 as well as the details of other equipment (Ausrüstungsstücke) from 16 December 1848 in *Vom Arsenal zum Museum*, pp. 89-99.


\textsuperscript{169} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{170} Karl Gustav von Griesheim quoted by Engels in ibid. Original emphasis.
Waterloo. The first thing the Germans have to do in their revolution is break with their entire disgraceful past.\textsuperscript{171}

Whether the people had indeed disavowed the Wars of Liberation, which would continue to hold enormous sway in the enactment of Prussian and later German national identity, or whether they were simply rallying against the Prussian crown and its army, the events demonstrated how easily the carefully constructed historical image could be shattered in a moment of upheaval. The condemnation of the destruction epitomised by Griesheim and Reinhard reflects the symbolic resonance of the Zeughaus and its displays much more than the scientific, artistic, or even monetary value of the objects themselves. On this point Engels' remarks once again prove insightful: 'The people for the first time confront in a revolutionary way not only their oppressors but also the glittering illusions of their own past.'\textsuperscript{172} It was the vulnerability of these “glittering illusions” in the face of a new, internal enemy that caused such alarm.

In the events of June 1848 it is clear just how problematic the parallel function of the Zeughaus as armoury \textit{and} museum had become. The practical necessities brought about by social and political change, advances in weapons technology, and parallel changes within museum culture necessitated a reconsideration of the building and its function. This was not confined to Berlin. Following attacks on arsenals in Munich, Berlin and Vienna, the separation of the military and museal functions of these buildings gained ground.\textsuperscript{173} Regina Müller writes;

\begin{quotation}
Already, the emerging museum development of some weapon collections at the beginning of the century, as well as the development of the military equipment itself, pointed to a shift in the use of arsenals that was carried out conclusively—across nearly all of Europe—during the course of the nineteenth century. This transformation “from the weapon depot to the Museum” gained a further—political—impulse through the '48 Revolution.

\end{quotation}

In the case of the Berlin Zeughaus it would be another thirty-five years before this political impulse would come to fruition. Not until after the “unification from above” and the establishment of the German Empire around Bismarck’s “small German” (\textit{Kleindeutsch}) solution, did the imperative for the full transformation of the Zeughaus become evident. Following the Wars of Unification and in a culture of mass national memorialisation, the Zeughaus would become the central museum embodiment of the Prussian vision of the German Empire established in 1871.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{171} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{172} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{173} Müller, \textit{Die Baugeschichte}, p. 157.
\textsuperscript{174} Ibid. p. 159.
\end{flushleft}
Chapter 2. “The memory of the rise of the nation”: the *Ruhmeshalle*¹

“Half eaten by moths”: the Zeughaus at unification

Everywhere there was completely covered up to the roof with scaffolding upon which old firearms slumbered, piled up in the thousands, here and there stood a stuffed grenadier from the time of Frederick the Great, half eaten by moths, the floor boards splintered, the walls blackened from dust and crumbled from occasional knocks, the windows dull and barely able to be opened, nowhere a curtain, everything rotten, bleak and lonely.

[D]ort war bis zur Decke heran alles vollgebaut mit Gerüsten, auf denen alte Gewehre schlummerten, zu Tausenden aufgeschichtet, hier und dort stand ein ausgestopfter Grenadier aus der Zeit Friedrichs des Großen, halb von Motten gefressen, die Dielen zersplittert, die Wände von Staub geschwärzt und von gelegentlichen Stößen zerbrockelt, die Fenster blind und kaum zu öffnen, nirgends ein Vorhang, alles morsch, öde und einsam.

- Julius Lessing, 1884²

Prussian victory over Denmark (1864), Austria (1866), and France (1870/71) set the scene for German unification based on Bismarck’s “small German” vision. The influx of captured weapons and trophies over the period pushed the Zeughaus to capacity and while a number of attempts were made to re-organise the displays, the sheer volume of objects, coupled with the lack of expertise of those involved, highlighted the continuing difficulties of the dual purpose of the building, something which Lessing’s description of chaos and neglect makes clear. This chapter provides analysis of the conversion of the Zeughaus to a public museum, incorporating major architectural renovations and the creation of a “Hall of Fame” (*Ruhmeshalle*), a painting and sculpture gallery dedicated to the glory of Prussian rulers and generals, in the wake of German unification.

The first section deals with the use of the building for a major applied arts exhibition in 1872. This is a useful starting point because it demonstrates a further shift towards the perception of the Zeughaus as a potentially significant museum site. It also provides an example of the continuation of the process of museum specialisation in Berlin, linking the local developments with broader international museum trends, and revealing an additional frame through which the Zeughaus conversion should be considered. The political-historical requirements of the new German Reich, particularly with regard to the consolidation of a unified German identity are the

---

² Lessing, 'Sonderdruck,' p. 805.
subject of the following section, which analyses the project proposals developed between 1874 and 1877. It reveals how ideas of objectivity and preservation inherent in the idea of the “museum” became an important justification for the broader memorial project in the light of political opposition. Finally, this chapter describes and analyses key aspects of the architectural, painting, and sculpture programme of the Ruhmeshalle in order to show how these aspects supported a specific image of German history that placed Prussia at the centre of a triumphalist national narrative. This becomes the basis for understanding the associated museum development, which is the focus of chapter 3.

**Applied Arts Exhibition, 1872**

Despite an influx of material following the 1870/71 victories over France, plans for the further development of the Zeughaus remained tentative in the immediate period following unification. In 1872, however, an external initiative provided an opportunity to utilise the building for a major temporary exhibition, showcasing not only the objects directly associated with the exhibition concept, but also a selection of Zeughaus weapons. This exhibition further shaped the perception of the building as a museum site and provided a platform for another significant addition to the ever-growing specialist museums under the banner of the Royal Art Collections, the organisation that would later become the State Museums of Berlin.

The advent of the international exhibition, for which London’s 1851 *Great Exhibition of the Industry of All Nations* served as the starting point, prompted a wave of new museums dedicated to the promotion of economic growth through artistic, technical, and industrial education and innovation. The first and most influential of these was the South Kensington Museum, today’s Victoria and Albert Museum. While it is not possible within the scope of this study to fully consider the development of this institution, it is important to note the museum’s primarily pedagogic agenda; it was first and foremost concerned with the elevation of public taste linked to the idea that demand for improved goods would prompt manufacturers to adopt better design principles, thereby raising Britain’s industrial competitiveness. Economic and political motives were therefore

---

3 Established as a direct consequence of the Great Exhibition the museum incorporated the Central School of Art (1852), the former Government School of Design (1836), as well as a collection drawn from the existing school collections and a selection of contemporary objects considered the best examples of excellence in design and workmanship from the Great Exhibition itself. The art school underwent a number of name changes. After the incorporation of the Government School of art it was initially named the Department of Practical Art, then Science and Art, and finally the Central School of Art. See Anthony Burton, 'The uses of the South Kensington art collections,' *Journal of the History of Collections*, 14, no. 1, May 1 2002, pp. 81-82; John R. Davis, 'The Great Exhibition and Modernization,' in *Victorian prism: refractions of the Crystal Palace*, ed. James Buzard, Joseph W. Childers, and Eileen Gillooly (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007), pp. 233-249.
central to the artistic and social reforms it promoted from the outset, whether through the display of contemporary or historical decorative arts.

Prussia’s contribution to the 1851 Exhibition reflected lingering problems of trade and industrial development and also made clear the political fragmentation that plagued attempts to construct a unified German industry.\(^4\) Exhibiting under the title “States of the German Zollverein,” Prussia showcased goods alongside Bavaria, Saxony, Württemburg, Frankfurt am Main, Hesse-Darmstadt (Grand Duchy of Hesse), Luxemburg, Nassau, Baden, and the vaguely described, ‘some other States of Northern Germany.’\(^5\) Austria and the non-Zollverein North German states made their own arrangements, but were located within the proximity of the Zollverein exhibits, while some of the states within the customs union also insisted on separating their displays.\(^6\) This arrangement created a degree of confusion for visitors confronted with displays labelled “Zollverein,” within an otherwise nationally oriented enterprise. As the weekly illustrated chronicle _The Crystal Palace and its Contents_ proclaimed, this was ‘a policy, not a country.’\(^7\) But whatever the ambiguity for the public about just what constituted “Germany,” the Zollverein exhibits presented a Prussian-dominated image, and their failure was a direct reflection on the union and its most dominant state.\(^8\)

The Great Exhibition and the subsequent endeavours in Paris (1855 and 1867) and London (1862) presented a significant imperative for improved industrial production, which was the impetus for the establishment of a number of museums based on the South Kensington model,

---


\(^5\) The unnamed North German Zollverein states were Baden, Electoral Hesse, Lippe, Lithuania, Saxon Grand Duchy and Duchies, Brunswick, Anhalt and Thuringian Principalities. Royal Commission for the Exhibition of 1851, _Official descriptive and illustrated catalogue of the Great Exhibition of the works of industry of all nations, 1851_, vol. III, Foreign States (London: Spicer Bros., 1851), p. 1047.

\(^6\) The North German states that exhibited separately were Hanover, Mecklenberg-Strelitz, Mecklenburg-Swerin, Nuremburg, Oldenburg, and the Hansa towns Hamburg and Lübeck. Within the Zollverein section, the states of Württemburg, Saxony and Bavaria set up distinctive displays, thus differentiating themselves from the common presentation. See _The Crystal Palace and its contents: being an illustrated cyclopaedia of the Great Exhibition of the Industry of all Nations, 1851_, (London: W.M. Clark, 1852), pp. 1133-1141; Royal Commission for the Exhibition of 1851, _Official descriptive and illustrated catalogue, III, Foreign States_, p. 85.

\(^7\) _The Crystal Palace and its contents_, p. 84.

\(^8\) Regarding the use of Prussian symbols in the main displays, including the use of the Prussian flag and eagle, as well as the tussles between the Zollverein states over representation, see Green, ‘Representing Germany?’, pp. 846-850. The reception of the Zollverein exhibits was mediocre at best. While several German reports praised the exhibits and a number of the official publications were more moderate in their assessment, the weekly publication _The Crystal Palace and its contents_ (1851-52) went to great pains to show the inferiority of the Zollverein’s showing. While some industries outperformed others, most notably chemicals, dyes, cast iron, bronzes, woolens, and some raw materials, the German products were generally considered imitative and of poor quality. To the editors’ surprise the products displayed seemed to have been chosen for their inexpensive production rather than their excellence, rarity or beauty: ‘With some exceptions, which it will be our business hereafter especially to notice, the products of German industry, taken as a whole, therefore, may be characterised as displaying little variety; and many parts of it were trivial, neither adding to national wealth nor helping forward national greatness.’ _The Crystal Palace and its contents_, quote p. 86; see especially pp. 84-86;205-206. For a more sober summary of the Zollverein exhibits see Louis Haghe et al., _Dickinson’s Comprehensive pictures of the Great Exhibition of 1851: from the originals painted for H.R.H. Prince Albert by Messrs. Nash, Haghe, and Roberts_ (London: Dickinson, 1854).
including the Austrian Museum for Art and Industry (Museum für Kunst und Industrie, 1863) and the German Industrial Museum (Deutsches-Gewerbemuseum, 1867) in Berlin. In the latter case, there was a very tangible link to the international exhibitions via two key personalities, Julius Lessing, who had spent his school holidays in London in 1862 and was profoundly affected by his visit to the exhibition there,\(^9\) later reporting for the *National-Zeitung* from Paris in 1867,\(^10\) and Princess Royal Victoria, daughter of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert, who married Crown Prince Friedrich III of Prussia in 1858. Not only was Princess Victoria influenced by the ideas of her father, who, along with Henry Cole, had been instrumental to both the Great Exhibition and the South Kensington Museum, she had also attended the exhibition, and it was there, at the age of ten, that she met the Prussian Prince.\(^11\) Both remained life-long advocates of the movement to improve the quality of applied arts production, and Victoria supported the Berlin museum from the outset, opening its first displays in the former Gropius-Diorama in 1868.\(^12\)

Although relatively late on the scene,\(^13\) the Deutsches-Gewerbemuseum represents a fairly typical example of the way this new museum type emerged and how it was organised and conceived.\(^14\) In the German territories there had been a number of prior institutions with cross-over functions, including the first nationally oriented museum, the Germanisches Nationalmuseum in Nürnberg (1852), and the Wittelsbach Museum (1855), today’s Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, both of which had been dedicated to patriotic education and the promotion of German arts and hand crafts.\(^15\) But these museums were primarily oriented to a cultural-historical presentation, placing historical material within an artistic and aesthetic interpretive frame. Berlin's German Industrial Museum, on the other hand, was an industrial and applied arts museum, established by a union of artists, manufacturers, and tradesmen with a generous endowment from the state for the purchase

---

\(^9\) Peter Jessen, 'Zur Erinnerung an Julius Lessing,' *Jahrbuch der Königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, 29, 1908, p. II.

\(^10\) Ibid.


\(^13\) The eventual establishment of the museum was linked to a second poor performance at the second London Exhibition (1862). Beuth and Schinkel had attempted to promote the idea of the creation of an industrial collection in Prussia but their ideas, as well as those of Gottfried Semper, had gone unheard. Valentin Scherer, *Deutsche Museen: Entstehung und kulturgeschichtliche Bedeutung unserer öffentlichen Kunstsammlungen* (Jena: Diederichs, 1913), p. 209.

\(^14\) Ibid.

\(^15\) Klemens Mörmann and Hilmar Hoffmann, *Der deutsche Museumsführer in Farbe* (Frankfurt am Main: Krüger, 1986), p. 671.
of examples from the Paris Exposition of 1867. It was also affiliated with an educational facility—and was therefore the first of its type in Germany. As the museum’s initial name suggests, the term “Applied Arts” (Kunstgewerbe), was not widely used at the time. At its foundation, there had been a struggle over the museum’s concept—whether it would primarily focus on industrial (technical) production or the applied arts (including historical collections), representing a distinction between science and industry versus arts and crafts and industry. The 1872 Zeughaus exhibition provided the template for a museum concept based on the latter, embodying the refined goals of the museum.

Until unification the Industrial Museum had remained a relatively modest institution. The acquisition of important collections had enriched the museum’s holdings, but as Leonore Koschnick’s comparison of visitor numbers between South Kensington (800,000), Vienna (108,000), and Berlin (11,757) for 1869 reveals, the museum lagged significantly behind its competitors. From 1870 the museum showed its collections in a number of rooms provided at the Ministry for Trade. Following unification, increased resources provided the impetus for the further expansion of the museum and in 1872 Lessing was appointed to oversee ‘the most important and magnificently visited exhibition of old applied arts objects, that first directed the attention of Berlin’s wider public to the new museum discipline.’ Not only did this exhibition draw large crowds, attracting 60,000 visitors in just over two months, it also set a new course for the museum. As Sven Kuhrau has argued, the exhibition furthered precise cultural-political goals by providing a model for an expanded applied arts museum.

Under the patronage of the Crown Prince Frederick and Princess Victoria, the Exhibition of antique applied arts objects (Ausstellung älterer kunstgewerblicher Gegenstände) was the first significant temporary exhibition to bring together objects from the Kunstkammer and royal palaces, public collections (those of the Royal Museums, the Beuth-Schinkel Museum, and the Industrial

---

21 ‘[der bedeutenden und glänzend besuchten Ausstellung älterer Kunstgewerblicher Gegenstände, die erstmals Berlin das Augenmerk eines tiefere Publikums auf die neue Museumsdisziplins lenkte:] Arno Schönberger, ‘Julius Lessing zum Gedächtnis,’ Berliner Museen, 17, no. 2, 1967, p. 27.
23 Kuhrau, Der Kunstsammler im Kaiserreich, p. 124.
Museum’s own collections), and authorities and institutes, with additional contributions from private patrons in public office, academia, and the aristocracy, as well as a number of artists, politicians, manufacturers and industrialists. Along the southern wall of the Zeughaus’ upper floor it presented a “technical” collection in thirty freestanding and wall-cabinets. These objects were organised in material and type-series (faience, porcelain, silk, glass, woodwork, ivory, metalwork, fabric etc.), with distinctions made for the various national and local production centres, as well as time-periods (Fig. 2.1). In the western wing, on the other hand, a series of historically furnished spaces unfolded as “epoch-rooms,” continuing on the eastern side and progressing from the medieval period through to the nineteenth century. They showed predominantly German, but also Italian, French, Dutch and other European design. Non-European objects were separated from this chronological sequence in two dedicated rooms in the western (Persia and India) and eastern (Japan and China) corners of the front wing.

![Floor plan of the Ausstellung älterer kunstgewerblicher Gegenstände](image)

**Figure 2.1:** Floor plan of the *Ausstellung älterer kunstgewerblicher Gegenstände* (Exhibition catalogue of the same name by Julius Lessing, C.F. Weis, Berlin, 1872)

Additionally, a weapons hall was arranged at the central entrance of the exhibition, showcasing a number of significant objects from the private collection of Prince Carl of Prussia. The two central cabinets housing these collections were divided, once again, into European and Oriental weapons, the former predominantly sixteenth-century embossed shields and helmets from the

---

famous centres in Augsburg and Italy, chests, musical instruments, goblets, tankards and embossed bowls.\textsuperscript{25} The latter included weapons from Persia and India, many from jade with inlaid diamonds, as well as Japanese bronzes.\textsuperscript{26} Prince Carl, third son of Friedrich Wilhelm III, began collecting during childhood and was supported at a scholarly level by contemporary luminaries from the art and museum scene including Daniel Rauch, Karl Friedrich Schinkel, and Gustav Waagen.\textsuperscript{27} From his privileged position within the royal house, Prince Carl had been able to build one of the most diverse and important private collections of arms and armour in Europe, with many pieces originating in the Zeughaus itself as well as the \textit{Kunstkammer} and \textit{Rüstkammer} prior to their transfer to the Zeughaus museum in the 1820s (chapter 1).\textsuperscript{28} The objects here were representative of the diversity of the applied arts conceived for an expanded future museum, and were valued for their richness of design as examples of the work of German and European masters as well as oriental ornamentation. Accompanying the Prince Carl displays were a number of cabinets featuring selected pieces from the Zeughaus collections. Unlike the guiding rationale for the display of objects in the original Zeughaus museum spaces, these pieces were chosen for their art and cultural-historical value, rather than being presented within a technical sequence.\textsuperscript{29}

The applied arts exhibition was both a prototype for the expansion and re-definition of the Industrial Museum and a demonstrative claim for the transfer of objects from the royal collections. In the exhibition catalogue Lessing wrote: ‘The [exhibition] comprises all of the material of value and significance, which finds itself scattered in the palaces and public collections, as well as very substantial contributions from private ownership.’\textsuperscript{30} The idea that the objects should find their

\textsuperscript{25} Lessing, \textit{Führer durch die Ausstellung älterer kunstgewerblicher Gegenstände}, p. 11.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid. Interest in historical weapons had grown among public and private collectors during the period following the Napoleonic wars, which Heinrich Müller attributes to a combination of national conviction, historical consciousness and a Romantic enthusiasm that was supported by the frequent movement of objects after such a prolonged period of systematic art theft. Such items adorned the halls of castles and palaces, but were also admired decorative pieces for bourgeois homes. Müller, \textit{Vom Arsenal zum Museum}, pp. 142-143.
\textsuperscript{27} Rauch was the sculptor responsible for the statue of Friedrich the Great on Unter den Linden (1851) as well as the statues of the Generals Blücher for Bresslaw (1818-27) and Blücher, Bülow, Scharnhorts, Gneisenau and York on the Berlin Opernplatz and before the Neue Wache (1826-59), and the sarcophagi of Queen Louise and Friederich Wilhelm III in the crypt at Schloss Charlottenburg (1827 and 1846 respectively). Schinkel needs no introduction; in addition to the numerous projects cited in chapter one, he was also responsible for the new Berlin Schauspielhaus on Gendarmenmarkt (1818-21), the Friedrichswerderisch Kirche (1825-28), and the Bauakademie (1831-35). He was an accomplished landscape painter and theatre scenic painter and designer. Von Waagen was director of the Royal Painting Gallery and had been instrumental in the development of the Berlin Museum. As princely tutor Heinrich Menu von Minutoli, whose collections were later acquired by the Deutsches Gewerbemuseum and were displayed in the 1872 exhibition was also a strong influence on the young Prince Carl’s collecting practice. Müller, \textit{Vom Arsenal zum Museum}, pp. 143-144.
\textsuperscript{29} Lessing, \textit{Führer durch die Ausstellung älterer kunstgewerblicher Gegenstände}, p. 11.
\textsuperscript{30} [‘Dieselbe umfasst alles Material von Werth und Bedeutung, welches sich in den Schlössern und öffentlichen Sammlungen zerstreut vorfindet, außerdem sehr erhebliche Beiträge aus Privatbesitz.’] ibid. p. 7. Author’s emphasis.
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“correct place” together in the specialised museum is inherent in this assertion, something Sven Kuhrau sees as the calculated plan of the exhibition.³¹ Both ideas won favour through the success of the exhibition and in 1873 the museum moved to new premises in the old Royal Porcelain Factory, ahead of the construction of a dedicated building designed by Martin Gropius, opened in 1881. Most significantly, a cabinet order of 29 November 1875 authorized the transfer of 9,000 objects from the Kunstkammer, which Lessing credited directly to the exhibition, and on 1 April 1885, the re-named the Museum of Applied Arts (Kunstgewerbemuseum) was officially placed under the administration of the Royal Museums, raising its profile as one of the growing number of state-level museums in Berlin under the centralised authority.³²

But the 1872 exhibition was not only significant for its role in the expansion of Berlin’s increasingly specialised museum landscape, nor as an example of the presentation of the Zeughaus objects within an alternative framework. It was also decisive for the further development of the Zeughaus itself. Just as it had in 1844, the Zeughaus proved an excellent venue for a large-scale public exhibition, attracting significant visitor numbers and showing ‘what wonderful space for the worthy exhibition of historical and artistic treasures was used, here in the most distinguished place in Berlin’.³³ Leonore Koschnick concludes that on balance ‘it was expressly emphasised, how much the location—the centrally located Zeughaus—had contributed to the success of the project.’³⁴ The practical considerations, highlighted by Regina Müller in relation to the perception of the Zeughaus after 1848 (chapter 1), were just as valid, if not more so after unification, as advances in military technology and changing state requirements further challenged the building’s utilitarian function. The exhibition had demonstrated just how well the building could suit other imperatives and looking back following the conversion of the Zeughaus to a museum, Lessing simply wrote: ‘The days of the Zeughaus as a weapons magazine were numbered.’³⁵

³² Lessing, Führer durch die Sammlung des Kunstgewerbemuseums, pp. 1-4. The museum was renamed in 1879. It also adopted a new statute at this time, significantly favouring the applied arts approach advocated by Lessing in the 1872 Zeughaus exhibition. For a detailed history of the museum see Barbara Mundt, ‘125 Jahre Kunstgewerbemuseum. Konzepte, Bauten und Menschen für eine Sammlung (1867-1939),’ Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen, 34, 1992, pp. 173-184.
³³ [‘…welcher herrlicher Raum für würdige Ausstellung historischer und künstlerischer Schätze hier an der vonnehmsten Stelle Berlins vernetzt wurde…’] Lessing, Sonderdruck, p. 105. See also Müller, Die Baugesichte, p. 164.
³⁵ [‘Die Tage des Zeughauses als Waffenmagazin waren gezählt.’] Lessing, Sonderdruck, p. 806.
The Zeughaus and Ruhmeshalle

The Zeughaus conversion also had specific political roots. The driving force behind the project was Kaiser Wilhelm I, who both initiated the scheme and maintained a remarkable degree of control throughout.36 A number of scholars have pointed to two key examples that provided impetus for the project.37 The first was the Musée Historique, the French national history museum in the Palace of Versailles, with its epic historical painting programme including the “Gallery of Battles” which had been opened by Louis-Philippe in 1837,38 and which Wilhelm had quite likely had an opportunity to visit in 1871. The second, and from the perspective of the completed Zeughaus renovations, more significant example was the k.u.k. Waffenmuseum in Vienna.39 Begun in 1849 under architect Theophil Hansen, it was not completed until 1872. It included an extensive painting and sculpture programme dedicated to the Habsburg dynasty and the “great men” of the Austrian army.40 Its vaulted entrance hall served as a “Generals’ Hall” (Feldherrenhalle) featuring life-sized marble statues of Austrian rulers and military generals from the Babenberg Margrave Leopold I († 994) to Habsburg Archduke Charles, Duke of Teschen (1771–1847). 41 A domed “Hall of Fame” (Ruhmeshalle), inspired by Schinkel’s Berlin example, incorporated both neo-gothic and Islamic elements—at once encapsulating a cathedral-like solemnity and making visible the power of the Habsburg throne, particularly in relation to the Ottoman Empire.42 This assertion was historically grounded by a series of large dome frescoes by Carl von Blaas depicting victorious battle scenes, which were complemented by four tondi showing allegorical depictions of “courage,” “moderation,”

36 Examples of Wilhelm I’s involvement in the smallest of details, particularly with regard to the painting programme are found in Regina Müller, ‘Der Umbau des Berliner Zeughauses zur Ruhmeshalle der preußischen Armee,’ Beiträge und Mitteilungen des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte, 13, 1987, p. 60; Arndt, Die Ruhmeshalle im Berliner Zeughaus, p. 28.
37 Arndt, Die Ruhmeshalle im Berliner Zeughaus, p. 26; Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 128; Müller, Die Baugeschichte, pp. 165-167; Müller, ‘Der Umbau des Berliner Zeughauses zur Ruhmeshalle’ p. 57.
39 “k.u.k.” stands for “Kaiserlich und Königlich”, “Imperial and Royal”. The museum is also referred to as the k.k. Waffenmuseum. The designation “k.k.” relates to the Austrian Empire and was used until 1867. After the Austro-Hungarian Compromise (Ausgleich) and the establishment of a dual monarchy (1867-1918), “k.u.k.” was used.
40 The Waffenmuseum was part of a much larger military complex, the k.k. Artillerie-Arsenal, whose construction also began in 1848. Situated at the rear of the Belvedere, the complex incorporated a weapons depot, a weapons factory, a caserne, and a number of other military buildings. Several architects took part in the programme, which was overseen by Hansen. See Ernst Förster, Denkmale deutscher Baukunst, Bildnerei und Malerei 11 (Leipzig: Weigel, 1867), pp. 1-4 and Plates 1-2. Note, further changes were made after the official opening in 1872, notably in 1877 when a number of interior changes were made. The museum itself was not dedicated until 1891. See Stefan Riesenfeller, Steinernes Bewusstsein. I, die Öffentliche Repräsentation staatlicher und nationaler Identität Österreichs in seinen Denkmälern (Wien: Böhlau, 1990), p. 64.
42 The royal arms and armour collections, although moved to the new Kunsthistorisches Museum on the Ringstraße not long after, were first displayed in glass cabinets and on tables in the middle of the halls, as well as in tableau-like arrangements on the walls. Rauchensteiner, 'Das Heeresgeschichtliche Museum als Gedächtnisort'. pp. 31; 36.
“power” and “art”. Completed one year after German unification, it incorporated a multi-national state identity and was a powerful expression of the “large German” concept based on the older, larger German Reich in opposition to the Prussian-led “small German” Reich. It is thought that Kaiser Wilhelm visited the museum when in Vienna for the 1873 World Exposition. The following year a commission was set up to investigate ‘in what fashion and with which means a Hall of Fame for the Prussian army could be created from the Zeughaus in Berlin.

“Regarding the transformation of the Berlin Zeughaus into a Hall of Fame…”

The concept drawn up by the commission, headed by General von Dresky and including the Director of the Artillery Depot and future Commander of the Zeughaus Major Ising, its future architect and designer Friedrich Hitzig, as well as Prince Carl of Prussia and the director of his collections Georg Hiltl, showed all the basic characteristics of the finished project. As in the Viennese example, it envisaged the construction of a large domed Ruhmeshalle in the upper north wing of the Zeughaus, in addition to the conversion of the southern “Linden” entrance to a grand hall, the glazing of the inner courtyard, the erection of a staircase leading directly from the courtyard to the Ruhmeshalle, and the full transformation of the lower floor to an artillery and engineering museum, with the remainder of the upper floor to house the arms and armour collections.

The plan, which according to contemporary sources won immediate favour with the Kaiser, had at its core the glorification of the Prussian army, its generals and royal leaders. Major building works would be complemented by an ambitious artistic and sculptural programme, ‘to adorn the shrine of Prussian military honour.’ It was also conceived as a national monument that would enact the specific political-historical requirements of the new Reich. At a time when unification had been won abroad (and from above), but not yet completed “within,” the new Zeughaus would draw together a number of anchors of a common German identity—those elements

43 The Ruhmeshalle and Feldherrenhalle of the k.(u.)k. Waffenmuseum are today part of the Heeresgeschichtliches Museum Wien.
44 Riesenfellner, Steinernes Bewusstsein, p. 65. A shift in focus over the course of construction—it was initially conceived in the wake of 1848 and thus emphasised Austrian military honour, the unity of Austria and her army, and the power of the Imperial throne—was necessitated by both territorial losses and the loss of the Austrian claim to political hegemony in the system of German dualism. Ibid. p. 66.
45 Arndt, Die Ruhmeshalle im Berliner Zeughaus, p. 108.
47 [’betreffend die Umwandlung des Zeughauses zu Berlin in eine Ruhmeshalle für die preussische Armee und somit für die ganze Nation’] ibid.
48 Arndt, Die Ruhmeshalle im Berliner Zeughaus, pp. 27-28; A full list of commission members is provided in Sarrazin and Eggert (Eds.), Der Umbau des Zeughauses,’ p. 93.
49 Ludwig Pietsch, ’Die neue preußische Herrscher- und Feldherrenhalle,’ Die Gartenlaube, no. 2, 1881, pp. 244-245.
50 [‘…um das Heiligtum preußische Waffenehre zu schmücken.’] Lessing, ‘Sonderdruck,’ p. 810.
that could fuse the politically constructed Staatsnation with the concept of an eternal Kulturnation.\footnote{For a concise discussion of these terms in relation to their use during the Imperial period, with particular reference to Meinecke, see Mark Hewitson, \textit{Nation and Nationalismus: representation and national identity in Imperial Germany}, in \textit{Representing the German nation: history and identity in twentieth-century Germany}, ed. Mary Fulbrook and Martin Swales (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), pp. 20-24.}

Most significantly, it would do so in a way that left no doubt as to the place of Prussia—and with it the Hohenzollern dynasty—as the rightful heirs of that tradition. If the Austrian example had represented the \textit{großdeutsch} vision, the plan for the Zeughaus was very much an assertion of Bismarck’s \textit{kleineutsch} federation and the need to consolidate and extend Prussian power within that system.\footnote{On the German constitution of 1871 and Bismarck’s agenda regarding the extension of Prussian power see Christopher M. Clark, \textit{Kaiser Wilhelm II} (Harlow, England; New York: Longman, 2000), pp. 27-31.} The detailed proposal presented to the House of Representatives in May 1876 made this clear in its very title; ‘regarding the transformation of the Berlin Zeughaus into a Hall of Fame for the Prussian army and thus for the whole nation.’\footnote{\[\ldots\] einer lebhaften Empfehlung Seitens des Kriegsministers von Kameke\] Friedrich Dörr, ‘Das Abgeordnetenhaus,’ \textit{Provinzial-Correspondenz}, 14, no. 20, 17 May 1876, p. 2.} Despite a ‘spirited recommendation’ from Minister of War, General von Kameke,\footnote{\[\ldots\] in einer Zeit der Not und Elends'] Windhorst is quoted in Müller, ‘Der Umbau des Berliner Zeughauses zur Ruhmeshalle ’ p. 58. On the source of finance through French Kriegsentschädigung see Arndt, \textit{Die Ruhmeshalle im Berliner Zeughaus}, p. 29; Sarrazin and Eggert (Eds.), ‘Der Umbau des Zeughauses,’ p. 93; Müller, \textit{Die Baugeschichte}, p. 168.} at a cost of six million Marks the proposal was less than enthusiastically received.

One reason for the hesitation of the parliament was the financial difficulty facing the new Reich. The stock market crash of 1873 had resulted in economic crisis and the leader for the Centre Party Ludwig Windhorst argues that ‘in a time of hardship and misery’ the costs were simply too high, even if French war reparations were slated towards the project.\footnote{\[\ldots\] in einer Zeit der Not und Elends\] Windhorst is quoted in Müller, ‘Der Umbau des Berliner Zeughauses zur Ruhmeshalle ’ p. 58. On the source of finance through French Kriegsentschädigung see Arndt, \textit{Die Ruhmeshalle im Berliner Zeughaus}, p. 29; Sarrazin and Eggert (Eds.), ‘Der Umbau des Zeughauses,’ p. 93; Müller, \textit{Die Baugeschichte}, p. 168.} He, and others, also made a number of arguments against the proposal on the grounds of its particularism—its emphasis on Prussia and her army and its articulation of the idea of a “Prussian nation.”\footnote{Müller, ‘Der Umbau des Berliner Zeughauses zur Ruhmeshalle’, pp. 57-61; Müller, \textit{Die Baugeschichte}, pp. 168-174.} It is important to understand this opposition in the context of the recent Reich formation and the efforts on behalf of the Prussian dominated nation-state to suppress alternative views and implement a singular national vision. The Prussian-led “small Germany” had never been the inevitable outcome of a national unification, just as the form that German national memory would take was not inscribed before 1871.\footnote{Confino, ‘The Nation as a Local Metaphor,’ p. 48.} As Robert Berdahl pointed out in his essay on German nationalism and historical writing in 1972: ‘The Bismarckian state was not “pre-determined”; it was “self-determined,” not by
popular sovereignty or by the *Volk*, but by its leading statesmen.\textsuperscript{58} Importantly, the German Empire also included a number of states against which Prussia had fought in the Wars of Unification. The *Ruhmeshalle* proposal, as a glorification of the army that had fought against those states that had supported Austria in 1866,\textsuperscript{59} Windhorst's own state of Hanover among them, reportedly evoked ‘very painful feelings’ among a number of members of the house.\textsuperscript{60}

In the new Reich a sense of belonging was therefore not automatically associated with the *Kaiserreich* itself, but was often rooted in local, regional, religious, ethnic, and class distinctions.\textsuperscript{61} A particularly strong regional identity was founded on individual historical traditions and cultural heritages within the ‘patchwork of regions and states’ that made up the new nation.\textsuperscript{62} Not only did the new Reich contain a multiplicity of conflicting affinities and structures, it also excluded ‘millions of people who had long standing ties to German cultural, social, economic, and political life, people who did not suddenly stop being part of German history just because the Prussian army won a few battles.’\textsuperscript{63} It is within this context that the new state sought to construct a singular, unified, and uninterrupted, official version of “Germany” and “Germaness” via appeals to myths, symbols and above all, history.

At the same time the Prussian state sought to consolidate power via a specific internal political campaign in the form of the *Kulturkampf*, a series of legislative measures designed to curtail the influence of the Catholic Church in matters of state and education.\textsuperscript{64} The perceived threat of Catholicism, which was largely represented in the south—in Prussia’s largest internal counterpart, Bavaria, as well as its ousted former rival, Austria—was linked to alleged conflicting allegiances arising from claims of papal infallibility, whereby the Church was held to threaten the very survival

\textsuperscript{58} Robert M. Berdahl, ‘New Thoughts on German Nationalism,’ *The American Historical Review*, 77, no. 1, 1972, p. 70; Also quoted in Sheehan, ‘What is German History?’, pp. 16-17. Sheehan, however, incorrectly references Berdahl as referring to Prussia’s leading “statesman” rather than “statesmen”, inadvertently attributing sole responsibility for the Reich formation to Bismarck.


\textsuperscript{60} [‘...sehr schmerzliche Gefühle’] Ernst Ludwif v. Gerlach (Centre Party), quoted in Arndt, *Die Ruhmeshalle im Berliner Zeughaus*, p. 31.


\textsuperscript{62} Confino, ‘The Nation as a Local Metaphor,’ p. 48. While upholding the prevailing consensus that Napoleonic occupation had been key to the formation of a German nationalism, Berdahl has also argued that the period following unification saw a significant rise in patriotism at the level of the individual states. Berdahl, ‘New Thoughts on German Nationalism,’ p. 69.

\textsuperscript{63} Sheehan, ‘What is German History?’, p. 18.

\textsuperscript{64} Between 1871-72 alone the Catholic section of the Prussian Ministry for Ecclesiastical and Educational Affairs was abolished, the “Pulpit Paragraph” was enacted that banned the clergy form speaking in public about state matters, and churches were no longer able to exercise supervision of schools. The term “crusade,” while often used, is an appropriate designation, because as Michael B. Gross shows, the *Kulturkämpfer* attached themselves in many ways to the idea of a knightly struggle and the associated Teutonic imagery. Michael B. Gross, ‘Kulturkampf and Unification: German Liberalism and the War against the Jesuits,’ *Central European History*, 30, no. 4, 1997, p. 549; pp. 561-566.
of the new Reich.\textsuperscript{65} By also equating Catholicism with France, the internal struggle was set as a continuation of the war of 1870/71, drawing upon a long tradition of French rivalry to cast Catholics as an internal enemy (\textit{Reichsfeind}).\textsuperscript{66} The \textit{Kulturkampf} went beyond Catholic persecution, though. As Mark Hewitson points out, labels such as "\textit{Reichsfeind}" were easily interchangeable, and like Catholics, socialists too were designated "anti-national."\textsuperscript{67} An atmosphere of mistrust extended also to Polish minorities and Jews—any groups whose existence seemed to threaten the liberal-nationalist, Protestant, Prusso-German vision. Indeed, in the case of the anti-Catholic campaign, it was often Jews who refused to back discriminatory legislation, rightfully recognising a dangerous precedent that could easily be used against other minorities.\textsuperscript{68} At its heart, then, the \textit{Kulturkampf} was much more than a religious struggle. As the name suggests, it was fundamentally about defining the culture of the nation.

With these considerations in mind, it is not surprising that the Zeughaus proposal promoted heated debate, effectively halting its progress for the parliamentary session of 1876. As Friedrich Dörr of the \textit{Provinzial-Correspondenz} noted, 'the government would hardly have introduced the [proposal] at such an advanced time of the session, if they could have supposed that it would give occasion to extensive discussions.'\textsuperscript{69} The Kaiser, however, personally presented a revised bill when parliament resumed the following year, stating in his opening address that the proposal had been re-worked in negotiation with the Reich administration (an allusion to a less Prusso-centric approach), adding the personal note:

\begin{quote}
I’m counting on your participation, in order to bequeath a worthy memorial to the coming generations of the deeds of their forefathers, in the form of a collection of the trophies of our military glory and all of the representative souvenirs of the development of patriotic warfare.
\end{quote}

[\textit{Ich rechne auf Ihre Mitwirkung, um in der Sammlung der Trophäen unseres Kriegsruhms und aller die Entwicklung des vaterländischen Kriegswesens bezeichnenden Erinnerungen den kommenden Geschlechtern ein würdiges Denkmal der Thaten ihrer Vorfahren zu hinterlassen.}]\textsuperscript{70}

\textsuperscript{66} Gross, 'Kulturkampf and Unification,' p. 548; p. 564.
\textsuperscript{67} Hewitson, 'Nation and Nationalismus,' p. 47.
\textsuperscript{68} Gross, 'Kulturkampf and Unification,' p. 554.
\textsuperscript{69} ['die Staatsregierung würde denselben zu einer so vorgerückten Zeit der Session kaum noch eingebracht haben, wenn sie annehmen könnte, daß er zu umfassenden Erörterungen Anlaß geben würde.'] Dörr, 'Eine Ruhmeshalle für die preußische Arme,' p. 1.
The new proposal appeared to have addressed many of the concerns previously raised, but as both Monika Arndt and Regina Müller have shown, the plan remained essentially unchanged; it had simply been re-written to elide its true purpose.\footnote{Müller, 'Der Umbau des Berliner Zeughauses zur Ruhmeshalle ’ pp. 57-62; Arndt, Die Ruhmeshalle im Berliner Zeughaus, pp. 32-35.}

Unlike that of the previous year, the new proposal presented a thorough argument for the project. Where the earlier version had focussed on the details of its implementation, as though the motive were self-evident, the revised draft obscured the detail and sought to justify the need for such an institution in terms of its broader national significance, emphasising a “common” history for the German army and the achievement of the German Volk, having won a long desired unification.\footnote{"Entwurf eines Gesetzes betreffend die Umwandlung des Zeughauses zu Berlin in eine Ruhmehalle für die Preußische Armee" (Anlagen zu den Stenographischen Berichten über die Verhandlungen des Hauses der Abgeordneten Nr. 186; 12. Legislatur-Periode, 3. Session 1876, 2. Bd., Berlin 1877, S. 1251ff) reprinted in Arndt, Arndt, Die Ruhmeshalle im Berliner Zeughaus, pp. 147-150; "Entwurf eines Gesetzes, betreffend eine andersweite Einrichtung des Zeughauses zu Berlin" (Anlagen zu den Stenographischen Berichten über die Verhandlungen des Hauses der Abgeordneten Nr. 13; 13. Legislatur-Periode, 1. Session 1877, Berlin 1877, S. 45ff) reprinted in Arndt, ibid. pp. 150-152.}

Where Prussia was specifically mentioned, it was in terms of its "historical mission": ‘With justified pride the Prussian army—and with her the Prussian people, from whom she arose—can look back on her past, whose history in a certain sense now has found a conclusion.’\footnote{[Mit berechtigtem Stolze kann die Preußische Armee—und mit ihr das Preußische Volk, aus dem sie hervorgegangen—zurückblicken auf ihrer Vergangenheit, deren Geschichte in gewissen Sinne nun einen Abschluß gefunden hat.] "Entwurf eines Gesetzes, betreffend eine andersweite Einrichtung des Zeughauses zu Berlin" (Anlagen zu den Stenographischen Berichten über die Verhandlungen des Hauses der Abgeordneten Nr. 13; 13. Legislatur-Periode, 1. Session 1877, Berlin 1877, S. 45ff) reprinted in ibid. p. 151.} This aspect had certainly been present in the original proposal, which Dörr characterised as a celebration of ‘the memory of the rise of the nation, which has developed step by step until its completion in the German Reich.’\footnote{[...das Gedächtnis des nationalen Aufschwungs, welcher von Stufe zu Stufe bis zur Vollendung des Deutschen Reiches geführt hat.] Dörr, 'Eine Ruhmeshalle für die preußische Armee,’ p. 2.} But here the German nation and the German Volk were foregrounded.

The other significant shift in the second draft proposal was its focus on the museum and its collections rather than the Ruhmeshalle itself. As Regina Müller points out, the term disappeared altogether from the second draft, now called ‘Draft act regarding an alternative installation of the Zeughaus in Berlin’.\footnote{"Entwurf eines Gesetzes betreffend eine andersweite Einrichtung des Zeughauses zu Berlin" Mülller, 'Der Umbau des Berliner Zeughauses zur Ruhmeshalle ’ p. 59; Müller, Die Baugeschichte, p. 172. The draft itself is reprinted in the appendices to Arndt, Die Ruhmeshalle im Berliner Zeughaus, pp. 150-152.} Whereas the first proposal had described the Ruhmeshalle complete with individually costed statues and frescoes, characterising the collections as a complimentary adjunct and specifically ruling out the placement of weapons collections in the Ruhmeshalle itself, the latter highlighted the collections above all, referring obliquely to the north wing as ‘a larger room planned.
for the entrance'.

Leaving its function open, it was simply stated that in its present form the space was neither suited to the display of weapons, nor artistic decoration. Within this scheme, the proposed architectural and sculptural works were presented as necessary changes in the interest of the artistic arrangement of the public collections. Where the inclusion of paintings and sculptures was mentioned, they were linked to the historical and artistic significance of the Zeughaus and the need to compliment the external sculptural works and provide the rooms their due sacred purpose.

A number of arguments were raised to strengthen the proposal. Firstly, the existence of like institutions was cited as justification for the expanded collections. 'Most of the nations of Europe' stated the proposal, 'have already realised similar ideas.' By referencing institutions such as the Tower of London, Paris' Musée d'Artillerie, and the arsenals in Vienna, St Petersburg and Madrid, a case was made for the national significance of the project in the context of Germany's representation within Europe. Examples were also provided from within Germany, so that the Prussian focus was tempered by the existence of parallel regional collections. The argument that existing European institutions necessitated a German response had been utilised successfully before. In 1853 this had been a core rationale for the foundation of the Germanisches Nationalmuseum as Germany's first "national" museum. 'Every nation has its historical museums'.

Echoing Lessing's argument for Berlin's Applied Arts Museum, the Zeughaus proposal also cited the need to consolidate historical objects currently disbursed throughout churches, private,
and princely collections. It was the scholarly value of these objects, expressed in terms of preservation, care, and custody (Regina Müller notes the pointed use of the term “institute” in the new proposal), which came to the fore, reflecting the perception of museums that had developed over the course of the century. In James Sheehan’s words: “The museum, always seen as the guardian of artistic treasures, now became also the guarantor of historical authenticity, the institution responsible for the careful preservation and proper restoration of artworks.”

The importance of the proposed museum was strengthened by the idea that the collections, once historically classified, would not only be of national significance, but would be made available to the nation. Thus, the museum idea was central to the framing of the revised proposal, an apparent shift that proved quite convincing:

If, furthermore, the name intended earlier “Ruhmeshalle of the Prussian army” caused offence in individual places and the appearance of a particular Prussian patriotism had provoked, so in the current version, by contrast, the simple and justified concept has come to the foreground, to prepare the Zeughaus, a masterwork of our architecture, in accordance with its old intention, to a worthy and justified purpose of a weapons museum of the Prussian army.

[Wenn ferner der früher beabsichtigte Name “Ruhmeshalle der preußischen Armee” an einzelnen Stellen Anstoß erregt und den Anschein eines preußischen Sonderpatriotismus hervorgerufen hatte, so ist dagegen in der jetzigen Vorlage der einfache und berechtigte Gedanke in den Vordergrund getreten, das Zeughaus, ein Meisterwerk unserer Baukunst, seiner alten Bestimmung gemäß für den würdigen und berechtigten Zweck eines Waffenmuseums der preußischen Armee herzurichten.]

With a reduced budget of 4,330,000 Marks, the bill was presented to the upper house on 22 February 1877, where it received ‘ready agreement on all sides.’ It was passed unanimously by all but one vote and came into effect on 17 March 1877.

The architectural conversion of the Zeughaus

Work on the Zeughaus renovations commenced under the leadership of Friedrich Hitzig in August 1877. The changes that transpired, including the creation of the ornate Ruhmeshalle, were clearly

---

83 Müller, Die Baugeschichte, p. 173.
84 Sheehan, Museums in the German art world p. 91.
85 Friedrich Dörr, ‘Das Zeughaus zu Berlin,’ Provinzial-Correspondenz, 15, no. 6, 7 February 1877, p. 1.
86 “[…alleseitig bereitwillige Zustimmung]” Friedrich Dörr, ‘Das Herrenhaus,’ Provinzial-Correspondenz, 15, no. 9, 28 February 1877, p. 4. The total budget included 400,000 Marks for the free disposition rights over the Zeughaus. This sum was payable to the German Empire for the use of the Zeughaus by the Prussian state because the building had officially become the property of the Reich according to paragraph § 1 of the statute passed on 25 May 1873. See Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 127.
87 Dörr, ‘Das Herrenhaus,’ p. 4. Müller, Die Baugeschichte, p. 174. It is interesting to note that although the collecting activity formed a core of the new argument for the conversion of the Zeughaus, the allowance for the installation of the displays remained relatively low. The acquisitions budget itself was not part of the overall project costing, but was considered an ongoing administrative cost, with 60,000 Marks allocated as an initial sum for the “completion” (Vervollständigung) of the collections, of a proposed annual budget not to exceed 180,000 Marks. Despite the shift in emphasis, these figures remained the same across both proposals.
indebted to the first, rejected proposal much more so than to its successor. The museum itself opened to the public on 8 November 1883, while the ambitious painting and sculptural programme of the Ruhmeshalle took significantly longer. Though not fully completed until 1891, it is important to first consider the Ruhmeshalle because it is this manifestation that best reflects the political-ideological mission enacted in the Zeughaus in the first decades of the Reich, a mission then made concrete via the museum displays themselves. This approach also takes the visitor’s circuit into consideration, analysing the architectural, artistic and museal elements, as they would have been encountered according to the intended progression through the building (Fig. 2.2).

![Figure 2.2: Floor plans of the Zeughaus including arrows showing the visitors’ circuit through the exhibition rooms (Wegweiser durch die Sammlungen des Königlichen Zughauses in Berlin, W. Moeser Hofbuchdruckerei, 1883, pp. 20; 162)]

The southern, “Linden” face of the Zeughaus presented as the main façade of the building but the actual entrance had traditionally been from the north, between the Zeughaus and the Gießhaus (Royal Foundry), along Hinter dem Zeughaus. This arrangement reflected the primarily practical use-history of the armoury, with many of the cannons produced in the foundry finding their home in the neighbouring Zeughaus. With the re-conceptualisation of the building the southern façade was made the primary entrance, where a grand foyer was created encompassing the nine-centremost bays of the ground floor. In the entrance hall, four Grisaille paintings by Ludwig

---

88 This was a legacy of the relationship between the two buildings, with the Gießhaus as the site for the manufacture of cannons and the Zeughaus the site of their storage. An exception to this arrangement was the 1844 Gewerbeausstellung discussed in chapter one, which made use of the front entrance to the south by virtue of the use of the southern half of the lower floor for the exhibition. An entrance was set up there with a ticket office to the west and office to the right. The Gießhaus ceased operations and was demolished in 1870. See Architekten-Verein zu Berlin and Vereinigung Berliner Architekten, Berlin und seine Bauten. Bd. 2-3. Der Hochbau (Berlin: W. Ernst, 1896), p. 28.
Burger (1825-84) depicting siege tactics were linked thematically to the collections displayed in the lower floor.\textsuperscript{89} The vaulted ceilings were decorated with stucco-work, including Brandenburg crests, eagles, and the monograms of the Brandenburg Electors Friedrich III, Friedrich Wilhelm, and King Friedrich I.\textsuperscript{90} The raw sandstone floors were replaced with fine granite slabs and vestibules were installed at the front entrance and the exit to the central courtyard featuring woodcarvings of the Prussian eagle and a portrait of Andreas Schlüter respectively.\textsuperscript{91}

The entrance hall was demarcated from the exhibition spaces by a set of elaborate iron gates (Fig. 2.3). Designed around a central “WR” (Wilhelm Rex) motif surrounded by a wreath of laurel and oak, they incorporated a specifically German national symbol (the oak) within a predominantly Prussian symbolic scheme; the Prussian Order of the Black Eagle, which had been created by King Friedrich I on the eve of his self-coronation, the motto of the order “suum cuique,” the Pour le Mérite, and the Prussian royal crown.\textsuperscript{92} It also incorporated the Iron Cross, an order with origins in the Middle Ages that had been resurrected by Friedrich Wilhelm III during the Napoleonic Wars.\textsuperscript{93} This was typical of the overall strategy for the converted Zeughaus, which drew together a range of historical, symbolic and allegorical representations in order to link Prussian and German history, to position Prussia as the heir of the First German Empire, and to glorify the Prussian state, its army and its rulers for fulfilling a perceived historical mission. This is also part of what Eric Hobsbawm has identified as the ‘mass-production of tradition’ during the early years of the Kaiserreich, in which a ‘multiplicity of references’ was employed in an attempt to construct a common national experience and a sense of belonging to a common German Volk.\textsuperscript{94} In the Zeughaus this was very much anchored within the Prussian historical framework.

\textsuperscript{89} The four wall paintings, on either side of the entrance and directly across, depicted the defence of a besieged city in the middle ages (fourteenth century), the bombardment of another in the period following the discovery of gunpowder (fifteenth century), the construction of communication trenches around Straßburg, and contemporary coastal defence. Each image was also accompanied by a depiction of the associated weapons and instruments for the given period. See Pietsch, ‘Die neue preußische Herrscher- und Feldherrenhalle,’ p. 247; Konigl. Zeughaus-Verwaltung, Wegweiser [1883], pp. 10-11; Konigl. Zeughaus-Verwaltung, Führer durch das Königliche Zeughaus in Berlin, Fünfte vermehrte Auflage ed. (Berlin: W. Moeser Hofbuchhandlung, 1892; repr., 4. Auflage), p. 19. See also Müller, Die Baugeschichte, p. 180.

\textsuperscript{90} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{91} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{92} On the Order of the Black Eagle; Jacob Andreas Fridrich, Abbildungen und Beschreibung aller hoher geistlichen, weltlichen und Frauenzimmer Ritter-Orden in Europa (Augsburg: Conrad Heinrich Stage, 1792), pp. 80-83; Das Buch der Ritterorden und Ehrenzeichen: Geschichte, Beschreibung und Abbildungen der Insignien aller Ritterorden, Militair- und Civil-Ehrenzeichen, Medaillen etc., nebst einer Auswahl der vorzüglichsten Costüme, (Brüssel, Leipzig, Muquardt: Muquardt, 1848), pp. 221-233; Preußen Tafel I, Nr. 221-223.

\textsuperscript{93} Heinz Kirchner, Birgit Laitenberger, and Hans Karl Geeb, Deutsche Orden und Ehrenzeichen: Kommentar zum Gesetz über Titel, Orden und Ehrenzeichen und eine Darstellung deutscher Orden und Ehrenzeichen von der Kaiserzeit bis zur Gegenwart mit Abbildungen (Köln; Berlin; München: Heymann, 2005), pp. 181-182.

\textsuperscript{94} Hobsbawm and Ranger, The invention of tradition, p. 278.
From the entrance hall the visitor proceeded to the courtyard, where Hitzig’s modern glass and wrought iron roof created a new interior that served as additional exhibition space and as the grand entranceway to the Ruhmeshalle and the exhibitions beyond (Fig. 2.4). Dominating the space were two features; a “colossal” statue of Borussia, Prussia’s answer to the national goddess Germania, and Hitzig’s monumental staircase leading to the upper floor. The external walls were cleaned of multiple layers of oil paint, which had been employed to protect the Schlüter keystones against almost two centuries of dust, rain and snow. Now enclosed in a grand vitrine, the sculptures were displayed to the public for the first time and it was to Schlüter’s classical aesthetic,
albeit with a hefty dose of nineteenth-century monumentalism, that the new works were oriented.\textsuperscript{97} The Borussia, carved by Reinhold Begas (1831-1911) in Carrara marble, reached 4.5m and was clothed in Roman battle-garb (Fig. 2.5). She stood central to the courtyard as though, per Monika Arndt’s interpretation, surveying a victorious battle scene. 'Through her upright, victorious posture,' she writes, 'through her costume: the breastplate, the greaves [shin plates] and the laurel-crowned antique-style helmet, as well as through her attributes: two laurel wreaths and a sword, she was characterised less as a national goddess, than as Bellona-Victoria.'\textsuperscript{98} The curved double staircase rose behind the figure. Each arm spanning 3.5 meters with a total height of 7.2 meters, it featured polished Bavarian syenite steps, a rusticated sandstone substructure carved with reclining nudes surrounded by the accoutrements of sea and land warfare, and a fine-grained limestone balustrade.\textsuperscript{99} At the base of each arm, two seated figures, also by Begas, anchored the staircase. They are invariably described as watchmen or as Roman warriors. In Lessing’s words, they were the ‘earnest guards of the solemn place’.\textsuperscript{100}

\textbf{Figure 2.4:} Cross-section of the Zeughaus courtyard and \textit{Ruhmeshalle} by Friedrich Hitzig (\textit{Berlin und seine Bauten}, Band 2-3, Verlag Wilhelm Ernst & Sohn, Berlin, 1896, p. 235)


\textsuperscript{98}’…ernsthafte Wächter der weihervollen Stätte’] Lessing, 'Sonderdruck,' p. 808.

\textsuperscript{99}Measurements per Sarrazin and Eggert (Eds.), 'Der Umbau des Zeughauses (Fortsetzung),' p. 102. See also Pietsch, 'Die neue preußische Herrscher- und Feldherrenhalle,' p. 246.

\textsuperscript{100}’…ernsthafte Wächter der weihervollen Stätte’] Lessing, 'Sonderdruck,' p. 808.
Figure 2.5: View of the Zeughaus courtyard showing Reinhold Begas’ Borussia statue and the western arm of Hitzig’s staircase (Postcard image Stange & Wagner, Berlin, 1908, author’s own collection)

Leading from the staircase, the grand Ruhmeshalle encompassed the entire north wing, consisting of two separate but connected spaces: the Herrscherhalle (Ruler’s Hall), in the nine-centremost bays, and the Feldherrenhalle (General’s Hall) comprising two rectangular galleries flanking the central hall. To create the Herrscherhalle, the ‘temple of the Prussian ruler’s fame’, the four central pillars were removed, opening up a space of just over 475 square metres, which included a new pendentive dome with an 8.5 meter skylight in the crown. Given the restricted

102 Sarrazin and Eggert (Eds.), ‘Der Umbau des Zeughauses (Fortsetzung),’ pp. 101-102. It is not within the scope of this study to provide complete details of the structural specifications or construction process of the Zeughaus renovations. The aim of the description is to give the reader a better understanding of the design and effect of the completed project. On the engineering and building works see Müller, Die Baugeschichte, pp. 174-184; Sarrazin and Eggert (Eds.), ‘Der Umbau des
light on the north side of the building, and the need to preserve wall space for the ambitious painting programme envisaged for the halls, the windows along the northern façade were closed over and square skylights were installed in each of the now-vaulted bays of the Feldherrenhalle. A rich colour palate and gilt stucco-work created an opulent impression, with the eight pillars surrounding the Herrscherhalle in deep red, and the walls, dado panelling and niches throughout worked with a marbled effect. This elaborate decorative scheme prompted a later observer to refer to the Ruhmeshalle as an ‘orgie of marble, bronze, paint, stucco, and nonsense.’ Beneath the dome a terrazzo floor inlaid with Roman marble and sandstone mosaics after drawings by Friedrich Gesellschaft (1835-98) showed man’s struggle against evil in allegorical form, while the stately entranceway and a series of dado reliefs depicted the life and death of a warrior, cast in bronze by Otto Lessing (1846-1912). Finally, two sets of wrought iron gates adorned with the “WR” motif and Prussian crown demarcated the memorial halls from the museum rooms at either end.

The architectural works were completed by the end of 1880, including several new external features on the north wing by Emile Hundrieser. In January, the Kaiser inspected the building, expressing, according to the Teltower Kreisblatt, 'his fullest satisfaction about the realisation of the building and the placement of the weapons, trophies etc., that had been made by way of trial at individual places.' The paper also remarked that the plan had always been the ‘hearts desire’ of the aged Kaiser. By the time the elaborate artistic works for the Ruhmeshalle were completed, however, Wilhelm had been succeeded by both his son and his grandson.

Zeughauses,’ pp. 93-95; Sarrazin and Eggert (Eds.), ‘Der Umbau des Zeughauses (Fortsetzung),’ pp. 101-104; Sarrazin and Eggert (Eds.), ‘Der Umbau des Zeughauses (Schluss),’ pp. 116-117.

103 Sarrazin and Eggert (Eds.), ‘Der Umbau des Zeughauses (Fortsetzung),’ p. 101. Note; the windows of the north hall were not bricked in, rather an additional wall was erected directly in front of the external wall, thus creating the additional wall space without destroying the fabric of the historical building. See Pietsch, ‘Die neue preußische Herrscher- und Feldherrenhalle,’ pp. 246-247. On the skylight construction see ibid.


106 Gesellschaft’s mosaic floor featured four scenes surrounding a circular pattern on the floor beneath the dome. They showed man fighting a bear, a deer, a wild horse and a steer. See Arndt, Die Ruhmeshalle im Berliner Zeughaus, p. 75. In addition, the centre of the floor featured Order of the Black Eagle.


109 Ibid.

110 In 1888 Kaiser Wilhelm I was succeeded by his son, Friedrich III. Already seriously ill, Friedrich III reigned for only three months until his death on 15 June 1888. He was succeeded by his son, Wilhem II. A list of Hohenzollern rulers beginning with the Great Elector is provided in Appendix A.
The Ruhmeshalle painting and sculpture programme

Upon entering the domed Herrscherhalle, the visitor was greeted by a large marble Victoria by Fritz Schaper (1841-1919), which rose to 3.9 meters against the central niche opposite the main entrance. To her right, a sequence of eight full-length bronze statues of the Hohenzollern rulers unfolded, beginning with Friedrich Wilhelm, the “Great Elector,” and proceeding in an anti-clockwise chronological circuit, with Kaiser Wilhelm I ending the sequence to Victoria’s left (Fig. 2.6). The most significant political events in the foundation and development of the Prussian kingdom and German Reich were depicted here in four large frescoes against the northern and southern walls, corresponding with the historical sequence of the statues. They depicted the self-coronation of Friedrich I in 1701 by Anton von Werner (1843-1915), Friedrich the Great accepting the homage of the Silesian estates at Breslau in 1741 by Wilhelm Camphausen (1818-85), King Friedrich Wilhelm III’s “Appeal to my people” of March 1813 by Georg Bleibtreu (1828-92), and the proclamation of the German Empire in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles in 1871, also by von Werner.

Figure 2.6: The Ruhmeshalle showing Schaper’s statue of Victoria and the full-length statues of the Hohenzollern rulers, before 1945 (Foto Marburg Aufnahme-Nr.: 825.213)

The two galleries of the Feldherrenhalle to the east and west of the domed hall continued the programme of portrait sculptures with thirty-six bronze busts of Prussian generals accompanied by
twelve paintings of historical battle scenes arranged in a chronological circuit (Fig. 2.7). Beginning with a bust of Christoph Freiherr von Sparr (1606-68) and a wall painting showing the Battle of Fehrbellin (18 June 1675), the sequence began on the north-west wall adjacent the Herrscherhalle and concluded in the same position to the east with Otto von Bismarck (1815-98) and a scene showing the delivery of Napoleon III’s capitulation to King Wilhelm after the Battle of Sedan (1 September 1870) (Fig. 2.8). An anti-clockwise procession could thus be made around the central domed hall or the complete Ruhmeshalle, while maintaining the progressive chronological arrangement of both the paintings and the sculptures (a floor plan of the Ruhmeshalle showing the placement of artworks is provided in Appendix C, with a full list of paintings and sculptures in Appendices D and E).

Figure 2.7: View of the eastern wall of the Herrscherhalle showing the allegorical fresco “War” with the eastern flanking Feldherrenhalle in the background (Postcard image Zeughaus-Verwaltung, Julius Bard, Berlin c. 1900, author’s own collection)

An exception to the otherwise consistent chronological arrangement was the placement of four portrait busts adjacent the domed hall, depicting Prussian War Minister, Albrecht von Roon (1803-79), Prussian minister and reformer, Heinrich von Stein (1757-1831), military reformer Gerhard von Scharnhorst (1755-1813), and Bismarck.111 Including the only non-military personnel

111 Only two of the four figures truly broke with the chronological arrangement as both Scharnhorst and Bismarck were placed in relation to the historical events of 1813 and 1870/71 respectively. Roon, however was situated on the opposite
represented in the sculpture programme (statesmen Stein and Bismarck), the four central figures were singled out for their involvement in the two great stages in the elevation the Prussia state—the Wars of Liberation (Scharnhorst and Stein) and the foundation of the Empire (Bismarck and Roon).\textsuperscript{112} This arrangement also created a symbolic coupling between the events of 1813/15 and 1870/71, which was a repeated motif throughout the \textit{Ruhmeshalle}, reinforced by the arrangement of the galleries themselves, which positioned the events of the Wars of Unification as the culmination of those begun in the Wars of Liberation. With the western hall encompassing the period from 1675 to 1760, and the eastern hall proceeding from 1813 to 1871, the \textit{Feldherrenhalle} presented a victorious historical lineage from the emergence of Prussia as a military power just prior to the establishment of the kingdom through to the latest victory over France.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{battle_of_sedan.png}
\caption{"The Battle of Sedan, 1 September 1870" by Carl Steffeck with the busts of Bismarck and Friedrich III (Postcard image Stange \& Wagner, Berlin 1906, author’s own collection)}
\end{figure}

The historical programme was complemented by a strong allegorical component, which underscored the political-ideological representation in the \textit{Ruhmeshalle} and drew together symbolic, mythological, and historical elements, merging realism and myth into a singular vision of

\textsuperscript{112} Arndt, \textit{Die Ruhmeshalle im Berliner Zeughaus}, p. 117. It is not insignificant that the more accomplished of the many sculptors used on the project, namely Calandrelli, Schaper, and Begas, were assigned these main figures.
Germany as Prussian destiny. This was enacted in four large lunette frescoes by Geselschap beneath the central dome, which were crowned by his four metre high, seventy metre long triumphal procession and four tondi depicting the cardinal virtues of the Hohenzollern rulers: "Justice," "Strength," "Moderation" and "Wisdom." These were matched in the Feldherrenhalle by four seated allegorical figures in marble showing the attributes of the Prussian generals: "Strategy," "Power," "Loyalty" and "Dedication." The tondi and attribute figures quite clearly expressed a set of idealised characteristics through which the visitor should regard the Hohenzollern rulers and their armies. Both utilised Renaissance iconography, classical dress, and symbolic attributes to clearly sign the meaning of the figures, at once lending an ancient and a sacred element to the scene. This imagery carried over in the main frescoes, the layout of which around the pendentive dome was reminiscent of Renaissance chapel ornamentation, particularly the work of Raphael, which had been a strong influence on Geselschap. This Christian—indeed Catholic—iconography was placed in the service of the imperial (Protestant) state idea, with figures taken not from the Christian canon but from Prussian and German history and Germanic mythology.

Geselschap’s epic triumphal frieze featured a procession of victorious warriors returning home from battles on sea and land (Fig. 2.9). It presented purely symbolic figures within the topos of classical antiquity: Calliope proclaiming the fame of the heroes, Victory crowning the conqueror, Bellona holding a crown aloft as a victory prize, warriors bearing trophies, genii singing and scattering flowers at their feet, and Clio pondering time’s turning wheel as she turns toward the vanquished enemy. The frieze made no direct reference to specific historical events or personalities. ‘At first sight it appears,’ writes Arndt, ‘as though the painter has avoided all allusion to current events.’ A reading of the work as an allegory of the most recent Prussian victory would not have been improbable for a contemporary visitor, however. This was underscored by the use of the Prussian eagle as a decorative motif around the frieze, the presentation of the crown as the prize

---

113 The figures of "Strategy" (Kriegswissenschaft) and "Power" (Kraft) by Begas were positioned in the Western hall of the Feldherrenhalle, with "Loyalty" (Treu) and "Dedication" (Begeisterung) by Schaper in the eastern hall. Königl. Zeughaus-Verwaltung, Führer durch das Königliche Zeughaus [1892], pp. 34; 45. These were originally intended for the four pillars central to the Herrscherhalle and were therefore part of the programme there rather than the purely historical Feldherrenhalle. They were re-ordered at the request of Wilhelm I, so that the figures of Scharnhort, Stein, Bismarck, and Roon could be placed more centrally. For an early description with reference to the intended placement of the allegorical statues see Sarrazin and Eggert (Eds.), 'Der Umbau des Zeughauses (Schluss),' p. 117. On the decision to re-organise the statues see Müller, Die Baugeschichte, pp. 204-205.

114 Arndt, Die Ruhmeshalle im Berliner Zeughaus, pp. 57-71.

115 Unless specifically attributed to a secondary source, the analysis of the allegorical paintings in the Ruhmeshalle that follows is based on the examination of surviving photographs of the works and the descriptions provided in contemporary guidebooks, primarily: Königl. Zeughaus-Verwaltung, Führer durch das Königliche Zeughaus [1892], pp. 24-27; Königliche Zeughaus Verwaltung, Das Königliche Zeughaus [1910], pp. 10-21; Zeughaus Direktion, Das Zeughaus: Die Ruhmeshalle [1941], pp. 8-10.

of war, and the image of fate’s hand in the defeat of the enemy. In her interpretation of the frieze, Arndt points to other contemporary examples that utilised similar iconography to represent the victory over France and the unification of Germany, particularly the pairing of the Prussian eagle with a raven, a metonymic reference to the medieval Kyffhäuser saga, in which the great twelfth century emperor Friedrich Barbarossa was said to sleep far beneath the Kyffhäuser Mountains awaiting the time that he would restore German glory.117

Beneath the frieze were the four large allegorical frescoes. "War," against the eastern wall, depicted a battle scene with Bellona as its central figure atop a golden chariot drawn by furies (Fig. 2.7, above). She held a flaming sword aloft with “Strength” and “Justice” at her side, surrounded by four ghostly riders described as hunger, death, battle and plague.118 Once again, reference was made to the most recent wars here, the attributes of strength and justice contrasted with the depravity of the enemy in the form of a seven-headed dragon, a reference to Babylon and the contemporary characterisation of France as “New Babylon.”119 “Peace,” against the southern wall, showed a Christ-

117 Ibid.
118 Königl. Zeughaus-Verwaltung, Führer durch das Königliche Zeughaus [1892], p. 25.
119 Arndt, Die Ruhmehalle im Berliner Zeughaus, p. 63.
like figure described as a ‘radiant Genius’ surrounded by angels announcing; ‘the salvation of the world: peace on earth. The bloody battle of honour and justice is victoriously contended, the treacherous enemy prostrated, the disrupter of peace!’ (Fig. 2.10). In the foreground the victorious warriors returned home, laying down their arms to be met by a jubilant crowd. In the distance below the clouds, a landscape of the Rhine Valley—the long disputed and recently re-captured territory near the border of France—could also be seen. Both of these images therefore utilised traditional Christian and classical motifs paired with contemporary symbols of Franco-German rivalry, thus equating the binaries represented—good and evil, justice and treachery, honour and dishonour, blessed and profane, victor and vanquished—with the idea of Germany as morally superior to her hereditary enemy. If the visitor was in any doubt, the emotive catalogue descriptions provided the frame within which the images should be read.


122 Arndt, Die Ruhmeshalle im Berliner Zeughaus, p. 67.

Figure 2.10: Herrscherhalle southern wall featuring the wall fresco “Peace,” the statues of Friedrich the Great and Friedrich Wilhelm II, and Otto Lessing’s cast entrance doors (Postcard image Zeughaus-Verwaltung, Julius Bard, Berlin c. 1900, author’s own collection)
The two remaining frescoes utilised similar techniques but also combined more concrete representations of specific historical personalities and made reference to the popular legends that helped underscore a sense of historical legitimacy and continuity for the newly established Reich. Against the western wall the “Reception of the fallen heroes” (Fig. 2.11), called upon the Teutonic mythology of Valhalla and the ascension of the heroic dead on the winged flight of the Valkyrie to tie the figures from both the recent and distant German past to the Germanic heroes of antiquity. The “Re-establishment of the Reich” (Fig. 2.12), which took the central position against the north wall, also employed historical and allegorical figures, and, more thoroughly than in the frieze above, drew upon the Barbarossa legend to link Wilhelm I to his ancient archetype. Indicative of the “multiplicity of references” employed for the creation of a national image in the early years of the Reich, both frescoes combined a number of well-established motifs with references to the Hohenzollern dynasty and Prussian history in a manner that also reflected the broader memorial culture of the era.

![Figure 2.11: “Reception of the fallen heroes,” western wall of the Herrscherhalle (Postcard image Zeughaus-Verwaltung, Julius Bard, Berlin c. 1900, author’s own collection)](image-url)
The search for an ancient lineage was most clearly enacted in the group of figures surrounding the central goddess of immortality in the "Reception of the fallen heroes." Since the first half of the nineteenth century, interest in the ancient Germanic tribes had found powerful resonance alongside national movements as a means of unifying otherwise distinct groups, though it had begun much earlier with the re-discovery of Tacitus' *Germania* (98 CE) during the fifteenth century.\(^\text{123}\) As a significant expression of a culturally, ethnically, and linguistically unified German people, the idea that the Germanic tribes (*Germanen*) were somehow equivalent to modern-day Germans (*Deutschen*) remained an important feature of German self-conceptualisation well after century's end.\(^\text{124}\) Tacitus’ depiction of the *Germanen* was celebrated, as Christopher B. Krebs has

\(^{123}\) Benerio cites the first German printing of *Germanía* as 1473 in Nürnberg. It had previously been known as early as 1420 and had been brought to Rome in 1455, where it came into the possession of the future Pope Pius II. It was, Benerio contends, the publication of an essay by Piccolomini in 1496 (written 1458) that compared (then) present-day Germany with the Germania of Tacitus that spurred enthusiasm for the study of the ancient work. Herbert W. Benario, ‘Arminius into Hermann: History into Legend,’ *Greece & Rome*, 51, no. 1, 2004, pp. 83-84.

\(^{124}\) Ingo Wiwjorra, *Der Germanenmythos: Konstruktion einer Weltanschauung in der Altertumsforschung des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2006), pp. 61-64. Krebs notes that while *Germania* was generally considered as a report of the German past, it was ‘not a report, nor was it about the German past.’ Christopher B.
recently shown, 'as an accurate reflection of authentic German people' until the beginning of the twentieth century, despite the fact that it was 'written by a Roman in Rome for Romans.' The significance of the text lay far less in its accuracy as a historical account, than as a means by which the present-day German nation could be projected backwards into the ancient past. After unification, the twin ideas that the "new Reich" could find legitimacy in the "old Reich" of the Holy Roman Empire as well as in antiquity via the Germanen was both culturally and politically compelling.

In the Valhalla fresco, the canon of heroes receiving the dead comprised the Germanic leader Arminius the Cherusci (BCE 17/18-CE 19), Charlemagne (742-814), Arnulf of Carinthia (850-899), Henry the Fowler (876-936), Otto I the Great (912-973), Friedrich I Barbarossa (1122-1190), Henry VI (1165-1197), and Friedrich II (1194-1250). In addition to the Cherusci, this pantheon spanned the Carolingian, Ottonian and Hohenstaufen dynasties and traversed a number of political and territorial configurations—not merely the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation but also its antecedents, the Eastern Frankish Kingdom and Carolingian Empire. All but Henry the Fowler also held imperial titles, though he was already an established figure in the German national imagination; as the founder of the Ottonian dynasty he was perceived as the first king of a "truly German" realm.

Among these great kings and emperors, Arminius (popularly known as Hermann) stood in for the "backward projection" into the Germania of Tacitus and the idealised set of characteristics for which the Germanen stood. 'Their kings they choose for their noble birth,' wrote Tacitus of the Germanen, 'their army commanders for their valour.' Given the central function of the Ruhmessenhall for the glorification of the Hohenzollern rulers and the Prussian army, association with such qualities was certainly advantageous. Hermann was also an enormously popular figure

125 Krebs, A most dangerous book, p. 44; pp. 48-49.
126 Wiwiorra, Der Germanenmythos, p. 61.
127 Ibid. p. 59.
128 The names of those depicted are provided in Königl. Zeughaus-Verwaltung, Führer durch das Königliche Zeughaus [1892], p. 26; Königliche Zeughaus Verwaltung, Das Königliche Zeughaus [1910], p. 20.
129 David A. Warner contends that the election of Henry I represents a departure towards a particular German path (Sonderweg). He also states that many modern scholars of Germany believed that the advent of the Ottonian dynasty 'represents the point of demarcation between what should properly be called an East Frankish or late Carolingian realm and a true kingdom or realm of the Germans.' Thietmar of Merseburg and David Warner, Ottonian Germany: the chronicon of Thietmar of Merseburg (Manchester; New York; New York: Manchester University Press; Palgrave, 2000), pp. 5-6.
with a broad ranging appeal. In Tacitus’ *Annals* he is characterised as ‘unquestionably the liberator of Germany’, having defeated Varus and beaten back Rome, ‘not in her early rise, as other kings and generals, but in the height of her empire’s glory’ at the Battle of the Teutoburg forest in 9 CE. This battle was effectively the last between the Romans and the Germans, the latter remaining unconquered. Hermann therefore served as an important national unifying figure, specifically in relation to perceived external threats; something that could be neatly reoriented to suit the needs of the present. As Herbert Benario writes:

> At last the Germans of modern times had an historical hero, who had maintained the freedom of the Germans (as naively interpreted) against the rapacious Italians of the South. The ancient struggle between Roman and German, between South and North, served as a paradigm of the present day.

The present day context to which Benario refers, and for which Arminius’ defeat of Rome provided historical inspiration, was the 1515 publication of the *editio principis* of the *Annals* 1-6 on the eve of the Reformation. Given the attempts after 1871 to create a unitary national identity based on the northern, Protestant model and with it to consolidate Prussian power over the southern states, the Hermann legend was equally as powerful in the mid 1880s as it had been in 1515. More significantly, Hermann’s status as liberator of Germany had been enacted in relation to the Wars of Liberation against Napoleon, for which he served as a rallying figure. In the *Kaiserreich* he was moulded into a key symbol of the German victories over France in 1813/15 and 1870/71, something that was most clearly demonstrated in the massive Hermann Memorial on the Grotenburg hill near Detmold (dedicated 1875), which presented the Battle of the Teutoburg forest

---

131 Benario states that Arminius was widely known by the mid-sixteenth century, the ‘final step’ of his general popularisation coming with the publication in 1543 of Burkhard Waldis’ *Illustrierten Reimchronik*. He also credits no less than 75 operas on the theme, performed between 1676 and 1910. Benario, ‘Arminius into Hermann,’ p. 87; p. 89. Hermann had also been celebrated in numerous literary and musical manifestations between the sixteenth and twentieth centuries, including Daniel Casper von Lohenstein’s *Großmütiger Feldherr Arminius oder Hermann* (published 1689), Handel’s opera *Arminius* (1737), Schlengel’s drama *Hermann* (1743), Justus Möser’s *Arminius* (1749), Christoph Martin Weiland’s poetic *Hermann* (1751), Friedrich Gottlieb Knopstock’s poem “Hermann und Thusnelda” (1752) and his cycle *Hermanns Schlacht, Hermann und die Fürsten, und Hermanns Tod* (1769, 84, 87), Kleists’ *Hermannsschlacht* (1809), Christian Dietrich Grabbe’s *Hermannschlacht* (1838), and Heinrich Heine’s verse in *Deutschland: Ein Wintermärchen* (1843). This list is compiled from Pohlsander, *National monuments and nationalism*, pp. 148-152, who states that ‘All in all, Arminius was celebrated in literature ca. 130 times between Hutten [1519] and World War II.’ Ibid., 153.

132 Anthony R. Birley, notes Tacitus and Birley, *Agricola and Germany*, p. 121; Reference to Tacitus’ description to Arminius as the ‘liberator of Germany’ also in Benario, ‘Arminius into Hermann,’ p. 85. This passage has also been interpreted as: ‘Assuredly he was the deliverer of Germany...’ See Cornelius Tacitus et al., *Annals, Histories, Agricola, Germania* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf: Distributed by Random House, 2009), p. 93.

133 Tacitus et al., *Annals, Histories, Agricola, Germania*, p. 93.


135 Ibid.
as the pre-configuration of the later Franco-Prussian rivalry under the motto ‘German unity my strength / My strength Germany’s power’ (Fig. 2.13).136

But it was not only the ancient rulers who were found in the “Reception of the Heroes.” A second tier of figures, seated around a semi-circular bank surrounding the central dais included the Great Elector, Friedrich the Great, Friedrich Wilhelm III, Defflinger, Zeiten, Seydlitz, Blücher, Scharnhorst, Gneisenau, and Theodor Körner.137 Thus the already established pattern of memorialisation of the Prussian rulers and military leaders, specifically those who had contributed to the territorial expansion of Prussia, was incorporated into the Valhalla scene; ancient heroes paired with modern generals (along with the popular figure Kröner). In the foreground, being carried aloft by the Valkyries, were the most recent heroes of German glory, those men whose blood had been shed, according to the catalogue of 1892, ‘on the field of honour’ for the sake of sacred German unity.138 Here was a celebration of victory that directly linked heroic sacrifice to the foundation of the Reich. The fresco itself was not completed until October 1890, following the death of Wilhelm I and Friedrich III (both 1888). Both Kaisers were incorporated into the scene; Wilhelm surrounded by the symbols of victory and peace and Friedrich, clad in ancient armour, holding the

---

136 ['Deutsche Einigkeit meine Stärke / Meine Stärke Deutschlands Macht'] Wolfrum, Geschichte als Waffe, p. 11.
138 ['...Streiter, die auf dem Felde der Ehre gefallen um blutigen Kampf um das verloren gewesene, durch sie nun wieder errungene heilige Gut deutscher Einheit.' ] ibid.
imperial crown aloft; a mirror of the figure of Charlemagne on the central dais, who held the medieval Imperial crown in his outstretched arm.

The direct linkage between historical and contemporary figures to build an ancestry for the new Reich was never more thoroughly played out than in the pairing of Friedrich I Barbarossa with Wilhelm I, who was cast as Barbablanca; white beard to Friedrich's red. In the “Re-establishment of the Empire” this trope was enacted via the central figure, described as a “Kaiser figure” (Kaisergestalt), and bearing the symbols of imperial rule with a full white beard. Standing God-like upon a cloud, he was flanked by angels holding the symbols of rule, justice, order, strength, wisdom, and belief, circled by the radiant light of the rising sun. Below the clouds a group of figures, allegorical representations of the states of the German Reich, looked up adoringly towards the Kaiser, as if toward an apparition. Also present were Friedrich III as crown prince, and Bismarck, described as the ‘bearer of the concept of the Reich’, and the ‘pillars of Prussian military power’, Moltke and Roon. Though Barbarossa was also present in the Valhalla scene, the presentation here directly referenced the Kyffhäuser legend, casting Wilhelm I as the reincarnation of the ancient ruler and the promised restoration of German glory. Once again, the catalogue made this clear: ‘Awakened after many centuries sleep a Kaiser figure appears, standing on a cloud, illuminated by the splendour of the rising sun, as the embodied idea of an innate German Reich.’

Like Hermann, Barbarossa represented a well-established figure with a broad-reaching national appeal. ‘He has become, as it were,’ wrote contemporary Edward Freeman, ‘the patriarch of a nation, and his memory still lives in the German heart as the impersonation of German unity.’ Again, the Barbarossa/Barbablanca pairing was not unique to the Ruhmeshalle, but was demonstratively played out in the flood of memorialisation following the establishment of the Reich. The grandest of these was the massive Kyffhäuser Monument (complete 1896), which showed a sleeping Barbarossa as if hewn out of rock, below a towering 81 meter obelisk topped with the imperial crown, out of which sprang Wilhelm I in an equestrian statue, itself measuring almost ten

---

139 This list of attributes of the angels from Königliche Zeughaus Verwaltung, Das Königliche Zeughaus [1910].
140 Ibid. p. 20.
142 ["Erweckt nach vielhundertjährigen Schlaf erscheint, stehend auf einer Wolke, umstrahlt vom Glanz der aufgehenden Sonne, eine Kaiser gestalt als der verkörperte Gedanke eines eigenen deutschen Reichts."] Ibid. p. 25. For an example of the established mythologisation of Barbarossa in literary works see Joseph Gersbach’s 1824 poem provided in Pohlsander, National monuments and nationalism, pp. 205-207.
meters in height (Fig. 2.14). This example points to the sheer enormity of memorial construction during the Kaiserreich, and the way in which a broad range of symbols, events, and figures were co-opted into the legitimising historical narrative of the new Prusso-German Empire in attempts to create common cultural, historical, and political bonds. Similar examples appeared across the German landscape, from the national Niederwald Memorial on the banks of the Rhine, complete with armour-clad Germania and triumphal war scenes cast in bronze relief from the smelted cannons won during the latest Franco-Prussian war, to Berlin's Victory Column on the Königsplatz before the Reichstag, which used the same technique to celebrate all the Wars of Unification and featured mosaics by von Werner (Fig. 2.15).

Figure 2.14: Kyffhäuser Monument; postcard featuring Friedrich I Barbarossa and Kaiser Wilhelm I (Postcard image Verlag v. Carl Garte, Kunstanstalt, Leipzig c. 1900, author’s own collection)

144 Measurements per Pohlsander, National monuments and nationalism, p. 208.
What many of these monuments enacted individually, the new Zeughaus and *Ruhmeshalle* carried out in a comprehensive programme of architecture, painting, sculpture, light, colour, and space. The arrangement of the halls and the circuit of the visitor through the building was integral to the way in which meaning was made at the site; the sequence of the history paintings and portrait sculptures underscored the spatial enactment of the progressive developmental vision of Prussian history, the ‘memory of the rise of the nation’, which culminated in the formation of the *Kaiserreich*. This teleological approach was reinforced by the creation of visual and spatial parallels by which analogies could be drawn between historical events and personages. By combining historical realist paintings of battle scenes and political events with portrait statues and a comprehensive allegorical component, the idea of a divine destiny for Prussia was grounded both historically and mythologically and a line of continuity was established between Hermann, liberator of the Germans, the first German Reich, and the Hohenzollern leaders. The tableaux that met the visitor upon arrival in the domed *Herrscherhalle*—with the central figure of Victoria between the Great Elector and Kaiser Wilhelm I, the paintings of the self-coronation of Friedrich I and the proclamation of the *Kaiserreich*, above which Geselschap’s “Re-establishment of the Reich” drew the circle of Hohenzollern and Prussian history into the broader German mythos—most succinctly captures the historical-political image of the *Ruhmeshalle*. The adjacent Zeughaus museum, whose exhibitions began as the visitor exited the *Ruhmeshalle* in the north-east corner of the

---

*Feldherrenhalle*, not only continued this programme, it also reified it through the philosophical treatment and conceptual arrangement of its original objects, which served as concrete evidence for the historical narrative so thoroughly demonstrated in the preceding galleries.
Chapter 3. The Muse of History, 1883-1918

“History without equal”\(^1\): the Zeughaus Museum, 1883

A collection of victory trophies of this army, as has now been suggested by our King, will hence be a lively picture of the “history without equal,” which has resulted from the constantly ascending line of the Electorate of Brandenburg to the German Empire, and which at the same time in the fullest sense is the history of our nation itself, because there is no state in which the nature and success of the army are so closely linked with the whole development and the life of the people.

[Eine Sammlung der Siegeszeichen dieser Armee, wie sie jetzt von unserem König angeregt worden, wird daher ein lebendiges Bild der “Geschichte ohne Gleichen” sein, welche von dem Kurfürstenthum Brandenburg in unablängig aufsteigender Linie zum deutschen Kaiserthum geführt hat, und welche zugleich im vollsten Sinne die Geschichte unseres Volkes selber ist; denn es gibt keinen Staat, in welchem das Wesen und die Erfolge der Armee so unmittelbar mit der gesammten Entwicklung und dem Leben des Volkes verknüpft sind.]

- Friedrich Dörr, 1876\(^2\)

The opening of the armoury in the thus far completed sections has been welcomed by all circles of the population with the liveliest joy. Probably never has a museum been popular from the very beginning in the same way.


- Julius Lessing, 1884\(^3\)

With the opening of the Zeughaus museum in 1883 the full conversion of the building to a modern, public museum was finally completed, just over fifty years after its first museal exhibits. No longer incorporating military storage, the majority of the building was made available for the display of the much expanded military-historical and weapons collections. The new museum was open, according to The English and American register’s guide of Berlin and Potsdam (1891) ‘on weekdays in the summer months from 10 to 3 o’clock in the winter from 10 to 2 o’clock and on Sundays from 12 to 3 o’clock.’\(^4\) The inclusion of Sunday hours indicates the changed focus of the museum, whose collections were now open to a broader public and available to the working classes on their ‘day of

---

\(^1\) Dörr, ‘Eine Ruhmeshalle für die preußische Armee,’ p. 2.
\(^2\) Ibid.
\(^3\) Lessing, ‘Sonderdruck,’ p. 815.
\(^4\) The English and American register’s guide of Berlin and Potsdam, (Berlin: H. Steinitz, 1891), p. 52. The same opening hours are given in the inside cover of the Zeughaus catalogues; Königl. Zeughaus-Verwaltung, Das Königliche Zeughaus: Führer durch die Ruhmeshalle und die Sammlungen, 4. Auflage ed. (Berlin: Mittler und Sohn, 1907); Königliche Zeughaus Verwaltung, Das Königliche Zeughaus [1910].
repose.\textsuperscript{5} The Zeughaus was not alone in this regard. The emergence of local \textit{Heimat} museums during the era saw a number of new strategies employed for the inclusion of a more broadly conceived museum audience, including free admission, geographical decentralisation, and local and domesticized historical themes, in addition to Sunday opening.\textsuperscript{6}

Berlin’s Royal Museums also extended their hours during the 1880s,\textsuperscript{7} a trend that should be seen within the context of the changing needs of cities under growing pressure from industrialisation and parallel shifts in the perception of museums and their role in the education of the masses. James Sheehan has demonstrated changes over the course of the century in the use of the term \textit{Bildung}, most directly translated as \textit{education}, but also bearing connotations of cultivation and character formation.\textsuperscript{8} By the latter nineteenth century, he contends, the spiritual and moral overtones of the term had been replaced by a pedagogic and scholarly emphasis.\textsuperscript{9} For museums, this shift occurred in parallel with an increase in disciplinary influence, an emphasis on scholarship, professionalisation (with scholars and bureaucrats replacing artists and amateurs in key posts), and the construction of larger, more complex, and increasingly specialised institutions—all of which reflected similar developments in the German sciences more generally.\textsuperscript{10} Sunday opening was not unique to Germany. In Britain, for example, debate had begun as early as the 1850s following the success of the Great Exhibition, but there “the Sunday question” was bound to a broader process of secularisation and the need for secular institutions to fulfil the requirements of moral edification.\textsuperscript{11}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{5} Alon Confino, \textit{Germany as a culture of remembrance: promises and limits of writing history} (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), p. 44. On the broader debates within museums at the time and the relation between Sunday opening and the changing perception of the public sphere see Barrett, \textit{Museums and the public sphere}. On the role of museums in Germany and their relation to changing concepts of \textit{Bildung} and their availability to the “general public”, see Sheehan, \textit{Museums in the German art world} pp. 113-120.
\item \textsuperscript{6} Confino, 'The Nation as a Local Metaphor,' pp. 42-86. Confino's study of the development of the \textit{Heimat} concept during the period includes a survey of some 197 \textit{Heimat} Museums that emerged between 1871-1918. He points to the significance of Sunday opening hours for the dissemination of the \textit{Heimat} idea to a broad public. These museums also catered to the needs and tastes of a broader German public through the localised nature of the institutions, understood both physically (their geographical location outside of large metropoles) and conceptually (the non-scholarly, personal and domestic representation of history as everyday life). The upshot of this was ‘an alternative to an elitist, educated and centralist image of the nation that excluded the social and the geographical (hometown \textit{Bürgertum}) periphery of the nation.’ While the Zeughaus and Ruhmeshalle, were certainly part of the centralist idea of nation, the inclusion of Sunday opening hours does indicate that the audience for this historical performance was conceived as broader than merely the educated public.
\item \textsuperscript{7} Sheehan, \textit{Museums in the German art world} p. 118.
\item \textsuperscript{8} Ibid. p. 115.
\item \textsuperscript{9} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{10} Giloi Bremner, "Ich Kaufe mir den Kaiser!,” pp. 224-225; Sheehan, \textit{Museums in the German art world} pp. 83-137; In the broader sciences the latter half of the nineteenth century saw an increase in specialist journals aimed at specific disciplines, a proliferation of handbooks in which the parameters of disciplinary knowledge were set, the foundation of new institutions, the “hardening” of disciplinary lines, the professionalisation of universities and research institutions, and a general shift towards empiricism. See Sheehan, \textit{German history, 1770-1866}, pp. 802-808.
\item \textsuperscript{11} The national Sunday League was formed in 1854 to advocate for the opening of libraries and museums on Sundays. As its mandate changed to include broader issues, a second organisation, the Sunday Society, was created to specifically
\end{itemize}
It was thus qualitatively different to the process to that occurred in Germany and, with continued resistance from the Church, Britain was relatively late to adopt a Sunday schedule.\textsuperscript{12}

The opening of the Zeughaus should thus be seen as part of larger, international museological shifts, but also in relation to specific epistemological and institutional changes within Germany. The construction and expansion of museums was also influenced by changing patterns of cultural consumption, which operated in conjunction with the disciplinary changes and perceived pedagogical imperatives for a growing urban population.\textsuperscript{13} An expanding popularisation of culture was evident in the growth of journals (popular and academic), the emergence of a commercial tourism industry, the construction of large, permanent panoramas such as the National-Panorama (1880) and the Sedan-Panorama (1883), an expansive building programme at the Berlin Zoo (first opened in the Tiergarten in 1844), the spread of photographic images and postcards, and the growth and development of urban public transport systems.\textsuperscript{14} Whether for scholarly interest or pure entertainment, the Zeughaus museum appears to have enjoyed particularly high patronage during the period. 'Whereas the other exemplary Berlin art collections are only poorly attended,' wrote Paul Lindenberg in \textit{Berlin in Wort und Bild} (1895), 'here young and old push and shove one another along, especially on Sundays, because here, as a Danish writer justly observed, “beats the Prussian heart in the great body of the German Empire.”'\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Berlin und die Berliner} (1905), simply referred to the museum as the 'most visited and most Prussian collection.'\textsuperscript{16}

\footnotesize{address the museums and libraries issue once more. See Amy Woodson-Boulton, \textit{Transformative beauty: art museums in industrial Britain} (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2012), pp. 60-61.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{12}Ibid. pp. 54-59. While some regional galleries opened during the 1870s, the major national institutions in London did not following suit until 1896. The relative lateness of the national museums to conform with a Sunday schedule is reflected in the Earl of Dunraven petition to the House of Lords in 1883, where he stated in relation to the success of the existing regional examples (Birmingham and Manchester): 'Nor was this a new experiment. It was an experiment that had been tried in all Protestant countries on the Continent. It had been tried in America, and in our Colonies, and the result was pronounced to be good.' House of Lords British Parliamentary Debates, 'Sunday Opening of National Museums and Galleries. Resolution,' \textit{The parliamentary debates (Hansard)}, 279, 8 May 1883.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{13}Berlin had expanded significantly in 1861 with the annexation of a number of suburbs including Wedding, Moabit, Tempelhofer Vorstadt and Spandauer Vorstadt. Robert Schwandl, \textit{U-Bahn, S-Bahn & Tram in Berlin: städtischer Schienennahverkehr in der deutschen Hauptstadt} (Berlin: Schwandl, 2012), p. 4.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{14}On museums and commercial tourism see Sheehan, \textit{Museums in the German art world} p. 119. Regarding the Berlin Panoramas see Giloi Bremner, "Ich Kaufe mir den Kaiser!,” pp. 263-268; Wolfrum, \textit{Geschichte als Waffe}, pp. 115-116; Architekten-Verein zu Berlin and Vereinigung Berliner Architekten, \textit{Berlin und seine Bauten. Bd. 2-3. Der Hochbau}, pp. 534-537. In Berlin the overground railway system developed steadily between 1838 and 1898. The first horse-drawn tram commenced in 1865, being supplemented by a second line in 1873 and growing exponentially during the 1880s-90s. The U-Bahn system opened its first line in 1902, becoming the fifth underground system in the world after London, Paris, Boston, New York, and Chicago. See Schwandl, \textit{U-Bahn, S-Bahn & Tram in Berlin}, pp. 8; 56-57; 88.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{15}[Während die übrigen musterhaften Berliner Kunstsammlungen nur schwach besucht sind, drängt und schiebt sich hier, zumal des Sonntags, alt und jung entlang, den hier, wie ein dänischer Schriftsteller mit vollem Recht bemerkte, "klopft das preußische Herz in dem großen deutschen Reichskörper.”] Paul Lindenberg, \textit{Berlin in Wort und Bild} (Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat d. DDR, 1987), p. 258.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{16}["Die besuchtesten und preußischste Sammlung"] \textit{Berlin und die Berliner. Leute. Dinge. Sitten. Winke}, (Karlsruhe (Baden): J. Bielefeld Verlag, 1905), p. 200.}
This chapter begins with an examination of the museum's collecting practice in order to determine the criteria and methodology by which the collections were developed in the lead up to the opening of the museum. It reveals a significant tension between the museum's scholarly agenda as an arms and armour collection and its historical mission as an expression of the glorious deeds of the Prussian army. The museum's internal architecture and display philosophy is then considered, with reference to existing models, to show how the presentation contributed to the museum's projection of a scholarly image, while the scope and structure of the exhibitions demonstrates how the displays effectively reinforced the historical image presented in the Ruhmeshalle. After 1888, the Zeughaus assumed an even greater role in the public spectacle of Wilhelmine militarism. The second part of the chapter situates the Zeughaus within the context of Wilhelmine society, revealing growing tensions and the continuing importance of projecting a unified national image, particularly after the departure of Bismarck from the political scene in 1890. It also continues to track changes in the exhibitions and the development of the collections, which grew exponentially under Wilhelm II. Finally, the role of the museum during the First World War, seen within the context of broader national exhibitions as well as the establishment of significant World War collections in the English speaking world, allows for an examination of the changing perception of objects and exhibition modes, and the way in which the Zeughaus adapted, whilst still maintaining its traditional role.

Building the collections

As magnificent and important as the weapons collection of the Royal Zeughaus is, it is nevertheless a creation of recent times, acquired under the impression of the great German victories as a demonstration of the size and power of the German nation and its historical deeds.

[So großartig und bedeutend die Waffensammlungen des königlichen Zeughauses in Berlin auch ist, so ist sie doch erst eine Schöpfung jüngster Zeit, erstanden unter dem Eindrucke der großen deutschen Siege als eine Versinnlichung der Größe und Kraft der deutschen Nation und ihrer Thaten in der Geschichte.]

- Wendelin Böheim, 1890

These words, from one of the fathers of the historical study of arms and armour (Waffenkunde) in the German-speaking world, speak to the importance of the historical-political context for the formation of the Zeughaus collections. Though the collections had developed since the 1830s and included works from much older royal collections, the majority of the existing European weapons collections had developed, albeit with varying biographies of prosperity and loss, over the course of

---

17 Boeheim, Handbuch der Waffenkunde, p. 622.
three, four, and even five centuries. The expansion of the collections under the guidance of Zeughaus Commander, Lieutenant Colonel Ising and technical Director, Professor Hermann Weiß, nevertheless represented their elevation, as their inclusion in Böheim’s *Handbuch der Waffenkunde* attests, to the ranks of the most significant collections of arms and armour in Europe. According to Böheim, however, much of the Zeughaus material was not typical of that which should be considered within the scope of an arms and armour collection: ‘it contains to a great extent,’ he wrote, ‘also uniform and equipment pieces, plans, models, and commemorative pieces that do not belong in the arms field, but, according to the historical character of the collection, could not be absent here.’

Several factors contributed to the expansion of the collections. The specialisation of both academic disciplines and museums not only defined the field of knowledge within which the museum itself was situated, but also shaped its collecting rationale, the tensions between the scholarly requirements of *Waffenkunde* and the museum’s historical role notwithstanding. That the museum was presided over by both Ising and Weiß typifies the institutional changes. Ising, as Lieutenant Colonel and “Commander” of the Zeughaus, fulfilled the traditional military leadership role that had characterised decision-making regarding the collections and their display since the end of Schinkel’s involvement in the initial museum project. Weiß, on the other hand, was a professor and author of a number of influential publications in the new field of costume studies (*Kostümkunde*). He therefore represented the aforementioned professionalisation of museum personnel, exemplified in Berlin by the appointment of Richard Schöne to the directorship of the Royal Museums (1879) and the career of Berlin’s most celebrated museum director, Wilhelm von Bode, which began with his appointment as Assistant to the Sculpture Gallery in 1872 (he became General Director in 1905). Such observations should not detract from the significance of Ising’s contribution, however. ‘With astounding skill and zeal,’ wrote Julius Lessing.

---

18 Examples of significant European weapons collections established over a much longer period than those of the Zeughaus include, the Musée d’Armures in Brussels, the Historical Weapons Collection in Copenhagen, the collections of the Tower of London, Madrid’s Armeria Real, the Musée d’Artillerie in Paris, the Museum of Weapons and Historical Costume in Stockholm, the collections of the Venice Arsenal, the Waffensammlung des kaiserlichen Hauses in Vienna, the Landeszeughaus Graz, and closer to home the Königliches historisches Museum and königliche Gewehrgalerie in Dresden. A summary of the establishment and development of twenty-one collections considered by Böheim to be among the most significant in Europe can be found in ibid. pp. 622-640.

19 ‘…sie enthält zum großen Teile auch Uniform- und Ausrüstungsstücke, Pläne, Modelle, ferner Gedenkstücke, welche nicht eigentlich in das Waffenfach gehören, aber, dem historischen Charakter der Sammlung entsprechend, hier nicht fehlen durften.’ ibid. p. 623.

20 Richard Schöne was an altogether different man to his predecessor Guido von Usedom, a ‘career diplomat’ and friend of Wilhelm L Schöne on the other hand was a professor or archaeology with a desire to turn the Royal Museums into internationally competitive research institutions. Giloi Bremner, "Ich Kaube mir den Kaiser!,” pp. 224-225. Sheehan also
As was typical for collections of arms and armour and military-historical material, military involvement remained a significant factor for the Zeughaus throughout the Imperial era, despite the inclusion of academically trained specialists. Though financed by the Prussian state, the museum remained under the administration of the national war ministry (through the Allgemeine Kriegsdepartment), with dual institutional leadership in the form of a commander and a director, held by a serving officer and civil servant respectively.22

Ising’s method of procurement from existing collections highlights another significant factor in the construction of the collections, itself linked to continuing specialisation—the final dissolution of the Royal Kunstkammer. Following the separation of a number of its collections during the 1820s, the Kunstkammer had been re-organised as a national historical collection (chapter 1).

The remaining weapons were displayed accordingly, while ethnographic objects and small artworks were re-conceived according to cultural historical principles.24 With the construction of the Neues Museum (1843-59), much of the Kunstkammer was relocated and distributed throughout the museum’s departments, but many objects, principally the royal relics, remained incongruous within the museum’s disciplinary framework and were relegated to storage.25

Debora Meijers et al. have referred to the Neues Museum itself as a “Kunstkammer in transformation,” whereby the encyclopaedic collections did not disappear, but re-emerged in the form of a multi-disciplinary...

---

22 On the administration of the Zeughaus during the Imperial era; Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 167; Verien für die Geschichte Berlins, ‘Das Königliche Zeughaus in Berlin,’ Mitteilung des Vereins für die Geschichte Berlins, no. 4 1912, pp. 50-51. This was not an uncommon structure. Boheim had begun life as a sculptor before entering the Austrian army and gaining the rank of officer. He served in the Austro-Prussian 1866 (perhaps another reason for his highlighting the historical nature of the Zeughaus collections) before being pensioned due to ill health in 1877. The following year he took the post of curator (Kustos) of the weapons collections of the Imperial House, and has been credited as the co-founder of historical Waffenkunde and with transforming the royal collections into a scientific institution, also with regard to exhibition technology. See Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften and Ernst Bruckmüller (Editor 2nd Online Edition from 2011), ‘Boheim, Wendelin,’ Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815-1950 Online-Edition Bd. 1, Lfg. 1 1954, Available at http://www.biographien.ac.at/oebl_1/95.pdf [accessed 15 July 2012].
24 Ibid. p. 142.
25 Selected royal relics were displayed for a period within the Neues Museum, but it became increasingly clear that they did not suit the scope of the museum. Giloi, Monarchy, myth, and material culture, pp. 145-149.
museum divided into specialised departments. These kind of transitional spaces are an important reminder that old modes of collecting and display did not simply vanish with new museological developments, but re-surfaced in different constellations throughout the century. Indeed, one particular category of object—the “secular relic”—returned to prominence in two quite distinct forms in the Zeughaus and the newly established Hohenzollern Museum in Monbiju Palace, opened in 1877 (below). Following the successful claims of the Applied Arts Museum in 1875 (chapter 2), the only objects remaining in the Kunstkammer were a selection of historical objects, its remaining weapons collections, and a collection of architectural models. These were distributed the following year between the Hohenzollern Museum, the Zeughaus, and the Academy of Architecture respectively. Additional objects displayed in the Hohenzollern Museum after 1877 were later moved to the Zeughaus, most notably Napoleon’s medals and hat captured by Blücher at Waterloo and held in the Kunstkammer since 1815.

The final important factor in the establishment of the Zeughaus museum was the acquisition of the collections of Prince Carl of Prussia following his death in January 1883. These collections, totalling almost two thousand objects, significantly enhanced both the size and breadth of the Zeughaus holdings. They comprised works from the late Middle Ages to the seventeenth century, including a number of civil weapons (hunting, riding, and tournament weapons) and pieces associated with Brandenburg rulers and generals, thus enriching the Zeughaus claims to a comprehensive collection of medieval and early modern works as well as enhancing its historical profile based on the Hohenzollern lineage. They also included a significant number of oriental weapons, with important pieces from Turkey, Persia, India, Spain (Moorish), Morocco, and Java.

29 Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, pp. 153-161.
30 The official number of objects acquired from the estate of Prince Carl of Prussia, according to the first Zeughaus guide produced after the purchase was 1893 objects, comprising 1,258 European pieces, and 625 oriental works. This figure is also repeated in Böheim’s 1890 publication, Waffenkunde. More recently, both Heinrich Müller and Gerd Quass have given a total figure of 1,726 objects, being 1,151 European weapons and 575 oriental pieces. Müller points out, furthermore, that a number of the listings included multiple pieces, which perhaps accounts for the higher figure provided in the 1890s. Konigl. Zeughaus-Verwaltung, Wegweiser [1885], p. 123; Böheim, Handbuch der Waffenkunde, p. 623; Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 161; Gerhard Quass, André Konig, and Deutsches Historisches Museum, Verluste aus den Sammlungen des Berliner Zeughäuses: während und nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg (Berlin: Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, 2011), p. 12.
Both Regina Müller and Gerhard Quaas have referred to the acquisition of the Prince Carl collections as an important caesura in the collecting history of the Zeughaus, with the latter adding: 'Never before and never again thereafter was such an extensive and significant collection purchased.'

Purchased just over six months prior to the opening of the museum, the princely collection was originally displayed separately, later being integrated into the existing organisational scheme of the Zeughaus. Heinrich Müller notes that at the time of acquisition, Kaiser Wilhelm expressed the desire for the collections to remain together, but the Zeughaus administration argued strongly for their incorporation within the museum's developmental sequence, as only such a display philosophy could support the scholarly aims and the study of form and use of weapons 'as a whole, as well as in detail.' Before examining these structural considerations further, it is important to consider the museum's design philosophy and how this too reflected museological changes with regard to the role of objects and the requirements for their displays.

**Internal architecture and design philosophy**

Unlike the ambitious *Ruhmeshalle* programme, the structural conversion for the museum remained minimal. Apart from the establishment of the entrance hall and new flooring throughout, the most significant alteration was the vaulting of the upper floor ceilings and the ornamentation of the same with the emblems of the Hohenzollern house, Electoral Brandenburg, and Prussia. In addition, forty portrait busts of statesmen and officers were placed in niches throughout, extending the...
programme of the *Feldherrenhalle* by honouring additional figures associated with the expansion of the Prussian state. In comparison with the opulence of the *Ruhmeshalle*, the museum rooms therefore remained relatively understated. 'The entrance hall,' wrote the editors of the *Centralblatt der Bauverwaltung* shortly before the museum's opening, 'thus distinguishes itself through richer treatment from the simply kept adjoining halls.' For the displays, Hitzig commissioned a series of dark oak cabinets so that the objects themselves would come to the fore; the original gilt cabinets by Schinkel, he believed, would reduce the effectiveness of the objects presented. Such design considerations reflected changing requirements for the proper study and appreciation of objects. Given the kind of architectural and artistic embellishment that hit its peak mid-century in Berlin with the construction and decoration of the Neues Museum, the Zeughaus exhibition halls were modest indeed. The Neues Museum, like Leo von Klenze’s Alte Pinakothek in Munich (1836), Gottfried Semper’s Dresden Painting Gallery (1855), and the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Wien (1891), included an elaborate interior decorative programme, which called upon history to frame the displays. In the case of the three art galleries, in addition to celebrating the particular (usually royal) patrons of the given institution, the decoration laid out the specific historical means by which the collections should be understood, illustrating the stages of artistic development as determined by the increasingly influential discipline of art history.

The Neues Museum, a hybrid cultural-historical museum, incorporated a number of distinct collections: the Egyptian collection, the then Museum for Patriotic Antiquities, today's Museum for Prehistory and Early History, ethnographic collections, the Museum of Paintings and Drawings, and the remaining *Kunstkammer* collections. Friedrich Stüler’s modest exterior was countered by a fantastic decorative interior, including a 31-meter high vestibule housing the central staircase, which depicted stereochromic scenes from the development of human civilisation by Wilhelm von Kaulbach (1805-74). This grand entrance was complimented by a series of thematic exhibition

---

38 Plans to include civilian portraits, including the architects of the Zeughaus, Andreas Schlüter, Johann Arnold Nering and Jean de Boldt, as well as scholars and poets who had contributed to the elevation of Prussia are mentioned in Müller, *Vom Arsenal zum Museum*, p. 129; Müller, *Die Baugeschichte*, p. 177. This plan was never carried through and only military personnel are named among those represented in the portrait busts.  
39 [‘Die Eintrittshallezeichnet sich somit durch reichere Behandlung vor den anschließenden einfach gehaltenen Hallen.’] Sarrazin and Eggert (Eds.), *Der Umbau des Zeughauses (Fortsetzung)*, p. 103. 
40 Müller, *Vom Arsenal zum Museum*, p. 129.  
41 The Munich, Dresden and Viennese examples are discussed in Sheehan, *Museums in the German art world* pp. 120-137. Other contemporary examples include the decoration of the North and South Courts of the South Kensington Museum (decorated 1862-71) and the vestibule and central courtyard of the new Berlin Applied Arts Museum (1881). See John Frederick Physick, *The Victoria and Albert Museum, the history of its building* (Oxford: Phaidon, Christie’s, 1982), Ch. 5. The decoration of the Gropius Building is detailed in Architekten-Verein zu Berlin and Vereinigung Berliner Architekten, *Berlin und seine Bauten. Bd. 2-3. Der Hochbau*, pp. 223-227.  
42 Sheehan, *Museums in the German art world* pp. 120-137.
rooms designed to provide the historical contextualisation for the objects on display. Thus, the Egyptian court, a one third scale replica of the tomb of Ramses II, included painted columns and ceilings, wall murals, flat relief carvings, maps, and hieroglyphs to create a theatrical, yet historically grounded didactic backdrop for the displays. This scheme was extended throughout, with each collection provided its own historical scenography.

In the Zeughaus the Ruhmeshalle acted as this frame. Above all, this was the filter through which the objects displayed were intended to be viewed and understood, reinforced by the circuit that led the visitor from Unter den Linden, through the grand entrance hall and courtyard to the Ruhmeshalle and collections beyond. The modesty of the exhibition rooms, however, placed emphasis back on the collection pieces as objects of serious study. The Architekten-Verein zu Berlin, describing the Neues Museum’s interiors in 1896 wrote of the ‘objections, which one could raise against this principle in the interest of the old works and their study.’ Of the recently converted Zeughaus, on the other hand, they wrote: ‘The interior decoration of the exhibition rooms is kept quite simple throughout in order not to distract the gaze of the visitor from the exhibited objects through the architectural decoration of the rooms.’ This display philosophy was also reflected in the museum’s scholarly approach; each object displayed was now accompanied by its own label indicating its main characteristics, period, and place of origin (Fig. 3.1). The first Zeughaus catalogue published in 1883 also gave detailed descriptions of the items deemed most significant, and provided a series of essays on the evolution of arms and armour and the technique of warfare. The establishment of a specialist library containing works related to arms and military history, uniforms, medals and decorations, and heraldic and art history, as well as photographs and illustrations of arms and armour and colours and standards is a further example of the museum’s scholarly agenda.

---

47 [‘Die innere Ausschmückung der Ausstellungsräume ist durchaus einfach gehalten um den Blick der Besucher nicht durch den architektonischen Schmuck der Räume von der zur Schau gestellten Gegenstände abzulenken.’] ibid. p. 236.
49 The library was open by appointment with the Zeughaus Director. Königliche Zeughaus Verwaltung, Das Königliche Zeughaus [1910], p. 146.
The new approach is perhaps better demonstrated by comparison with the previous Zeughaus displays than with other institutions, which may have been conceived in quite different terms. During the decades prior to the construction of the public museum the Zeughaus exhibits had developed in an ad-hoc fashion, particularly following the influx of new material with the succession of military victories between 1864 and 1870/71. In both 1860 and 1864 the Zeughaus displays had been re-made, but with little consideration afforded the historical or scientific contextualisation of, or formal relationship between, objects. The resulting displays were characterised by an overtly ornate aesthetic and general clutter (Fig. 3.2). Object upon object was amassed together to create decorative ensembles according to their similarity or difference of form, rather than their age, origin, or place within a technical sequence. Neither were the objects identified, either with labels...
or via catalogues or scientific texts, rather it was the volume of material displayed that was designed to convey an impression of awe and a sense of the achievements of the Prussian army.\(^{52}\)

While Prussian glory remained central after 1883, it was enacted very differently in the new displays. Informed by the emerging field of *Waffenkunde*, the scientific arrangement of the collections came to the fore, which in turn helped legitimise the historical image presented by recourse to specialist knowledge and the institutional authority of the museum. Many objects were still displayed in decorative arrangements throughout the new exhibition halls (Fig. 3.3). Where such ornamentation differed from earlier object tableaux, however, was that despite the ornate presentation, decorative elements were also broadly subject to guiding organisational principles and corresponded with the overarching periodisation. They were designed to extend the associated

\(^{52}\) Ibid. p. 120.

\footnote*{Das königliche Zeughaus ("Ruhmeshalle") in Berlin, Die Gartenlaube, no. 2, 1888, p. 35.}}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure3.3.jpg}
\caption{Illustration by William Pape featuring a number of views of the Zeughaus museum circa 1883 (Image courtesy Galerie Gärtner GmbH)}
\end{figure}

\textbf{Scope and structure of the collections and exhibition}

The value of the collections and artworks exhibited in the Zeughaus is in every respect inestimable, here the muse of history unfurls her pages to the German people.

[Der Werth der im Zeughaus ausgestellten Sammlungen und Kunstwerke aller Art ist ein nach jeder Richtung hin unschätzbarer, hier entrollt die Muse der Geschichte ihre Blätter dem deutschen Volke.]

- \textit{Die Gartenlaube, 1888}\textsuperscript{54}

From 1883 the Zeughaus museum was divided into three overarching categories. Despite a number of changes in focus, this would remain the defining structure until 1936, when whole sections of the collections were re-categorised and moved off site to make space for an extensive new exhibition (chapter 4). The three museum collections comprised an artillery collection (\textit{Geschützsammlung}), and a collection of engineering equipment and models (\textit{Ingenieurwesen und Nachbildungen}), both on
the lower floor of the museum, and a collection of arms and armour (Waffensammlung) above. The artillery collection, displayed in the eastern wing and central courtyard, consisted of cannons dating from the close of the fourteenth century to the immediate past (Fig. 3.4). With an eye to the practical and aesthetic arrangement of the space, they were displayed in chronological order to demonstrate their development from the earliest examples to the (then) present and according to the catalogue, 'thereby give as it were an image of the development of the artillery in general'.\textsuperscript{55} The exception was the courtyard, which presented the cannons captured during the last Franco-Prussian war alongside a series of French flags dating from 1789 to 1804, thus serving a historical-memorial function rather than the technical sequence and once again merging 1813/15 with 1870/71.

![Figure 3.4: View of the Zeughaus artillery collection, lower floor west (Postcard image Adolf Halwas, Berlin, 1900, author's own collection)](image)

The west wing housed the library and museum administration, and was home to the engineering and model collection, which contained scale models of fortresses, fortified cities and battle-scenes, historical paintings, keys to Prussian and captured fortresses, and replicas of military engineering equipment, hardware, cannons, and vehicles.\textsuperscript{56} These collections clearly reflected the historical scheme of the museum—particularly the fortresses and battle scenes, which brought to


\textsuperscript{56} Ibid. pp. 44-48.
life those scenes depicted in the *Ruhmeshalle*, including the Storming of the Düppel (Dybbøl, 1864) in 1:1000 scale and the Battle of Königgratz (Sadová, 1866) in 1:1500 (Fig. 3.5).

![Figure 3.5: Illustration by Ludwig Dettmann showing visitors inspecting a model of the battlefield at Königgratz in the engineering collection, lower floor (*Die Gartenlaube*, Kröner-Verlag, Leipzig, Band 23, 1888, p. 21)](image)

These key battles were supplemented by models of further conflicts, primarily from the most recent wars, and of fortresses from contested territories, particularly along Germany’s western boundary (Sedan, Fort Rhein, Bitsch, Thionville, Landau, and Straßburg). Paintings, plans, and drawings extended the mediation of the individual battles, presented as part of a much longer patriotic narrative of struggle and victory, as the description of one such model makes clear:

French Fortress Sedan, on the right bank of the Maas. It was already taken by the Prussians in 1815; remained under their occupation until 1818. It became famous through the glorious victory of the Germans won on 1st September 1870 [...] through the previous arrest of the
Emperor Napoleon III in said place and the hand over of the French army of Marshal MacMahon.


This was underscored by the inclusion of original material taken from the sites themselves, such as the abovementioned keys and the ubiquitous conquered colours and standards.

Finally, the entire upper floor, with the exception of the north wing housing the Ruhmeshalle, was provided for the display of the collection of arms and armour: defensive armour including suits of armour, mail shirts, helmets, gauntlets, shields, barding and spurs, and offensive weapons comprising edged weapons (swords, sabres, rapiers, daggers), pole arms (spears, pikes, lances, halberds, glaves), concussive weapons (maces, hammers, axes), and projectile weapons (bows, crossbows, firearms) (Fig. 3.6). Among the collection were both civil and military arms illustrative of the technical development of arms and armour as well as richly decorated parade, tournament and hunting pieces often intricately engraved or inlaid with precious metals, ivory, mother of pearl, and jewels. Many of the unique pieces, some with royal provenance, demonstrated the work of Europe’s most accomplished master armourers from the Gothic and Renaissance eras. The collection was arranged into three sub-divisions: oriental weapons, occidental weapons, and a sample collection—the latter a purely technical collection illustrating the evolution of side arms and firearms according to their development from the battery lock to the needle pin.

The oriental weapons were not historically conceived; even by purely technical-developmental criteria these collections were separated from their European counterparts both physically and conceptually. Comprising predominantly Turkish, Persian, Arabian and South Caucasian weapons and armour, the majority of which were richly decorated, many smelted from gold or silver with inscriptions from the Koran, they were perceived as largely valuable for their ornamentation rather than their contribution to the development of weapons technology (Fig. 3.7). Indeed, they were not considered sufficiently varied, at least until the beginning of the nineteenth-century, to warrant their display according to such criteria at all.58 Artistic considerations therefore became the deciding factor in their arrangement.59 A small selection of Chinese, Japanese and Indian

57 Königl. Zeughaus-Verwaltung, Führer durch das Königliche Zeughaus [1892], p. 199.
59 Ibid.
weapons also made up the collection, but according to the 1883 catalogue at least, the museum did not hold any particularly outstanding examples from these regions.60

Figure 3.6: Two views of the weapons collection on the upper floor of the Zeughaus (Postcard images Adolf Hahas, Berlin, 1900 and 1899, author’s own collection)

The European arms, on the other hand, were displayed in chronological sequence according to their period of origin, beginning with the oldest works in the north-east corner of the upper floor, and continuing around to the same point at the north-west.61 The earliest pieces dated from the fifth to the fifteenth century, with the bulk of the collections beginning in the fifteen hundreds, organised by century up to the 1870s in accordance with the essays provided in the catalogue. At the scholarly level, this facilitated the study of form and decoration within a developmental framework, by now a dominant form of organisation not only for natural history collections, but also for cultural-historical material. The Zeughaus also drew upon other contemporary examples, which served as models for display principles and collecting guidelines. In particular, the Tower of London and the Musée d’Artillerie were cited by the Zeughaus commission for their systematic grouping of objects, for the breadth of their collections (they were both temporally and geographically broad-ranging

60 Ibid. pp. 50-51.
61 Ibid. p. 50; Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 128.
and included arms, armour, uniforms and equipment), and for their particular usefulness for the purpose of instruction.\textsuperscript{62} As Heinrich Müller has shown, however, this approach conflicted with clear guidelines provided by the War Ministry for the prioritisation of historical material reflective of the principles and goals of the \textit{Ruhmeshalle}.\textsuperscript{63} Essentially, it was the army historical material, the trophies of Prussian victory, the Brandenburg-Prussian weapons, and the relics of Prussian rulers and generals that should form the core of the collections and displays.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure37.png}
\caption{Figure 3.7: A selection of Turkish, Japanese, Hungarian, Indian, and Persian weapons presented together as “Oriental Weapons” (Zeughaus Verwaltung, \textit{Das Königliche Zeughaus Führer durch die Ruhmeshalle und die Sammlungen}, Bard, Berlin, 1914, Taf. XXVI)}
\end{figure}

These kinds of priorities were reflected not only in the type of objects displayed but also in their organisation, and despite the contradictory goals, the structure eventually adopted for the European collections effectively served both the scholarly agenda and the need for a dominant historical narrative. By incorporating a dynastic periodisation into the larger developmental sequence, the museum not only provided a framework that allowed the historically oriented material to sit within a broader technical and cultural developmental model, it also further reinforced the validity of the former by reference to the latter; recourse to the scientific principles of

\textsuperscript{62} Oberstleutnant von Bülow quoted in Müller, \textit{Vom Arsenal zum Museum}, p. 134.
\textsuperscript{63} Letter from the War Department to the Zeughaus Administration regarding the acquisition of historical objects, dated 10 November 1880, quoted in ibid. p. 136.
the collections provided a powerful authenticating device for the history on display. As in the Ruhmeshalle, the dynastic organisation began with the reign of the Great Elector in 1640, concluding with Wilhelm I and the foundation of the Reich. Clustered around the dynastic periodisation, the relics of the Hohenzollern leaders and their generals—the “great men” of the German past—provided an intimate point of contact with the Prussian-national idea, personifying the figures and the battles represented in the Ruhmeshalle and providing the material “proof” for the narrative enacted there. This was a technique utilised in the Musée des Souverains opened in the galleries of the Louvre in 1853, which, Felicity Bodenstein argues, used “authentic” souvenirs as the proof for the primarily artistic representations in Versailles’ Musée Historique.64 In this respect, the Zeughaus combined both gallery and museum in the form of the Ruhmeshalle and its associated collections.

In the nearby Hohenzollern Museum relics also predominated, but here, in contrast to the Zeughaus, a combination of historical and personal relics were set within a faux domestic frame, engendering a familiar, sentimentalised, even feminine vision of the ruling house.65 This was exemplified by its memorialisation of Queen Luise (1766-1810) as the “mother of the nation,” with displays including items as intimate as her stockings and garters, Wilhelm I’s cradle and childhood toys, and Frederick the Great’s beloved horse Condé.66 While both museums upheld the vision of Germany as Prussian destiny (the Hohenzollern Museum employing a reverse chronology beginning with unification and working back through time),67 objects that passed through the Hohenzollern Museum on their way to the Zeughaus such as Napoleon’s hat and decorations (Condé too eventually found his way across the Spree) demonstrate the very different visual and experiential modes employed by the two museums. In the Hohenzollern Museum these objects were placed in an emotive, melancholy coupling opposite Luise’s “private” rooms, underscoring the mythology of the Prussian queen as national heroine—she died, so the legend goes, of heartbreak following the royal family’s flight from Berlin during French occupation and her personal, humiliating plea to Napoleon for her beloved homeland.68 In the Zeughaus, by contrast, the relics found their home among the memorial objects associated with the reign of Friedrich Wilhelm III, including his uniform and weapons, a number of decorative weapons carried by defeated French officers as well as allied commanders (the sabre of the Duke of Cambridge, for instance), Blücher’s decorations and medals,

66 Ibid.
Gneisenau’s hat, a display of allied uniforms from the Wars of Liberation (Prussia, Austria, England, and Russia), and memorial objects commemorating the victories of 1813 and 1815 (Fig. 3.8). The Zeughaus displays were thus rooted in a tradition of national history as military history. The inclusion of souvenirs provided the tangible link to the past that gave evidence to the narrative presented. As Paul Lindenberg exclaimed in his description of the displays in 1895, ‘if only all of these things could speak!’

Figure 3.8: Memorial room of Friedrich Wilhelm III in the north-west wing adjacent the Feldherrenhalle (Postcard image Stange & Wagner, Berlin, 1905, collection Thomas Weißbrich)

Ceremonial functions and collection development: the Wilhelmine context

The flag is the sacred relic of the soldier, it represents for him the person of his highest commander-in-chief, to whom he swears loyalty upon it, he follows it in the battle, for it he goes to his death.

Under Kaiser Wilhelm II (1888-1918), who was widely known for his penchant for spectacle, the Zeughaus became an important site for new military rituals. Ceremonies such as the Fahneneweihe (consecration of flags) and Fahnennagelung (flag nailing), the annual New Year’s reception for the commanding Generals, the Kaiser’s Birthday celebrations, and the associated Paroleaustgabe, at which the Kaiser presented the assembled troops with a new “password,” were held in the courtyard and Ruhmeshalle and demonstrated the religiosity of the cult of the flag, the enormous pomp built around military ritual during the Wilhelmine era, and the centrality of the Zeughaus within the state ceremonial apparatus (Fig. 3.9). While the Zeughaus had always served symbolic military purposes, with Wilhelm I carrying out a Fahneneweihe ceremony there following the re-organisation of the Prussian Army in 1861 and numerous occasions in which it was lavishly decorated for public festivities (and mourning—it was draped in black following Wilhelm’s death in 1888), it was now co-opted into a regular calendar of events that should be seen as part of the intensification of invented traditions in the decades leading up to the First World War. That so many of these new traditions were militaristic by nature should come as no surprise. Christopher Clark’s example of Friedrich Wilhelm Voigt, the so-called “Captain of Köpenick,” a con-man who swindled 4,000 Marks from the council chambers at Köpenick with the assistance of an oblivious military guard by impersonating a Prussian officer, demonstrates well the power of the Prussian uniform in ‘a social setting marked by a servile respect for military authority’.73

---

73 Clark, Iron Kingdom, p. 598. "The holy coat of Köpenick... or the power of the Uniform" (“Der Heilige Rock von Köpenick...oder die Macht der Uniform”) was also the title of a Simplicissimus cartoon published in a special issue devoted to the incident. The use of the term "holy coat" no doubt a refers to the holy coat of Jesus held at Trier Cathedral and thus nicely encapsulates the idea of the uniforms of Prussian military heroes being re-cast as relics, as discussed above. Albert Langen and O. Gulbransson, 'Der Heilige Rock von Köpenick,' Simplicissimus: Spezial-Nummer Köpenick, 11, no. 33, 1906. The title page of this special issue humorously depicted the king of Sweden bestowing Voigt with the Nobel Peace Prize ‘weil es ihn in unübertraglicherweise gelungen ist, den Militarismus lachernlich zu machen.’ Ibid. p. 413 Karl Liebknecht also linked the idea of the Trier cloak with the incident, writing: ‘The frequently mentioned coup of the cobbler Captain of Köpenick presents us with the catechism of militarist methods of education and their results. The most sublime point in the catechism is the sacred manner in which the whole of bourgeois society regards the officer’s uniform. In the six-hour examination by which this convict put our army, our bureaucratic apparatus and our subjection to Prussia to the test, those under examination passed so brilliantly that even their teachers’ hair stood on end in the face of this quintessence of their pedagogy. No hat of Gessler has ever met with such obliging servility and self-humiliation as the hat of the immortal Captain of Köpenick, no sacred cloak of Trier has found so much credulous devotion as his uniform.’ Karl Paul August Friedrich Liebknecht, Militarism & anti-militarism: with special regard to the international Young Socialist movement, trans. Grahame Lock (Cambridge Rivers Press Limited, 1979), p. 41.
Militarism was particularly associated with the image of Prussia and its army, and new traditions, including Sedan Day, the annual commemoration of the French capitulation of 1870, demonstrated attempts to extend the national appeal of the army by emphasising its role in the national foundation. Increasingly, the figure of the Kaiser himself became central to state commemorations. His birthday (27 January) became a public holiday, and his image became inextricable from that of Prussian militarism; he was the ultimate embodiment of 'an elaborate culture of military display'. This connection was important because of the nature of German federalism, within which the Kaiser's actual authority had been eroded by constitutional considerations. 'The army,' writes Clark,

> with its imperial command structure, was an extra-parliamentary, institutional legacy of absolutism within an otherwise constitutional Rechtsstaat. It was the foremost carrier of Hohenzollern and Prussian particularist tradition within the Reich and, as such, a piece of the compromise struck in 1871.

Building national traditions around the twin-symbols of Kaiser and army therefore became increasingly important as the gap between Wilhelm's 'wishful absolutist rhetoric' and his actual power grew during the 1890s.

---

**Figure 3.9:** Assembled military in the Zeughaus courtyard for the Fahnenweihe held on 1 January 1900 (Postcard image Gustav Horn, Berlin, 1900, collection Thomas Weiβbrich)

---

74 The Sedan Panoramas opened in 1880 in Frankfurt am Main and 1883 in Berlin should also be seen as part of these attempts to fuse the military victory with the national idea and to extend the popular appeal of the Prussian army. See Wolfram, *Geschichte als Waffe*, pp. 15-16.

75 Clark, *Iron Kingdom*, p. 600.


77 Ibid. p. 71.
The army, furthermore, remained a Prussian dominated institution, without the broad national appeal that would come with the extensive naval programme around the turn of the century. Under these circumstances, the role of the Zeughäus in fusing the national idea with the narrow Prussian military vision remained paramount. This was reflected in collecting aims and priorities, changes to the exhibition structure and layout, and the increased visibility of the institution within the ceremonial practice of army and Empire. The personal affiliation between Wilhelm II and the museum, as demonstrated by his frequent presence at the Zeughäus and the initiation in 1897 of an annual birthday exhibition in which the new acquisitions of the previous year were presented (in addition to the abovementioned birthday and new year's events), elevated the status of the institution, but also reflected the continuing duality of the Zeughäus as a public institution functioning under royal patronage and military administration. Indeed, the Kaiser's personal authority over aspects of museum practice, as a key benefactor as well as through the direct control of collecting policies and exhibits, is a crucial facet of the institutional history of the museum during this period. If, as Clark maintains, the army was 'the only institution in which

78 Ute Frevert argues that the role of the army in the unification of Germany ensured its acceptance within society during the Kaiserrreich – its prestige and influence growing enormously thanks to its role as Nationalstifter (national founder). Nevertheless, it is clear that the army continued to be associated with particularist and conservative Prussian elites. Under the Imperial system Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, and Württemberg maintained their own armies, and there was no overarching Imperial War Ministry. At the ministerial level the Prussian War Minister assumed the role of authorised representative of the Federal Council and head of the Federal Council Committee for the Army, being responsible for the administration of the army budget and the representation of the army in the Reichstag. Within this system the Prussian army also numerically outweighed the representatives from the other states. Of the 18 Army Corps, 14 were Prussian, 2 Bavarian, and one each from Saxony and Württemberg (at 1875). By 1914 the total number of Army Corps had risen to 25, but proportionately Prussia remained dominant. The navy, by contrast, was fully incorporated as a national institution after 1871. In addition its leadership was drawn from the bourgeoisie rather than the Prussian aristocracy, as in the case of the Prussian army, providing it with a more broad-based appeal. Moreover, the Imperial Navy's extensive propaganda campaigns and the close fit between a strong navy and imperial hopes also helped secure support. A comparison of the number of members of the German Fleet Association (Deutscher Flotterverein) and the Defence Club (Wehrverein) also demonstrates the relative popular appeal of the navy versus the army. The former claimed over one million members in 1914, while the latter could only count 100,000. Ute Frevert, Militär und Gesellschaft im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1997), p. 17; Karl-Volker Neugebauer, 'Des Kaisers "schimmernde" Wehr - Militärgeschichte des Deutschen Kaisserreichs 1871 bis 1914,' in Grundkurs deutsche Militärgeschichte 1. Die Zeit bis 1914, ed. Michael Busch (München: Oldenbourg, 2006), pp. 438-441; 458-460; Clark, Iron Kingdom, pp. 602-603; Stig Förster, 'The Armed Forces and Military Planning,' in Imperial Germany: a historiographical companion, ed. Roger Chickering (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996), pp. 454-488.

79 On the presence of the Kaiser at the Zeughäus and the annual birthday ritual in the central courtyard see Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, pp. 164-167. Müller also provides two illustrations showing the Kaiser's birthday displays (held 27 January) for the years 1910/11 and 1913/14, the latter of which shows the uniform of Friedrich the Great, acquired in 1913 and among the most significant acquisitions of the era. Contemporary reports also place the Kaiser at the museum and demonstrate its use for military ceremonial purposes; O. Hammann, 'Politische Tagesfragen. Der Neujahrsfempfang bei den Majestäten,' Neueste Mittheilungen, IX, no. 1, 3 January 1890, 3; 'The German Court,' The London Standard, 23 December 1890, p. 5; 'Foreign News. The German Emperor's Birthday,' The Birmingham Daily Post, 28 January 1891, p. 1; 'To-Day,' The London Standard, 9 June 1891, p. 7; 'The German Emperor's Birthday,' The Manchester Courier, and Lancashire General Advertiser, 28 January 1892, p. 5; 'Kaiser Wilhelm's Birthday,' London Daily News, 28 January 1893, p. 5; 'Germany,' The Morning Post, 18 October 1894, p. 5; 'New Year's Day on the Continent. The Kaiser and his Generals,' The Manchester Evening Standard, 2 January 1895, p. 2; 'This Morning's News,' London Daily News, 28 January 1897, p. 5; 'Germany,' The Morning Post, 28 January 1897, p. 5; 'The German Emperor. Birthday Celebrations,' The London Standard, 28 January 1898, p. 5; 'The Fetes in Berlin. Speeches by the Emperor,' The London Standard, 7 May 1900, p. 5; 'King of Italy's Tour,' Southerland Daily Echo, 29 August 1902, p. 6.
[Wilhelm’s] authority remained unquestioned’, then the Zeughaus, as the foremost site for the representation of army history and tradition, was of utmost importance in the display of Imperial power. The staging of a large special exhibition of ship models in the courtyard in 1898 represents an attempt to incorporate the Navy into the Zeughaus programme, but it remained first and foremost an army institution.

Military ritual also helps elucidate some of the defining characteristics of the Wilhelmine era. For the Fahnenweihe held in 1894, flags for newly formed regiments were laid out on tables in the Ruhmeshalle where, according to one reporter, a milestone in the history of the German army reminiscent of the great flag consecration outside Paris in 1815 took place (Fig. 3.10). Beginning with the Emperor, followed by the Empress, princes and other military guests in order of rank, 132 colours were ceremonially nailed to their flagstaffs. They were presented to the regimental commanders the next day following a consecration service on Unter den Linden under the watchful eye of Rauch’s Friedrich the Great and a 32-Gun salute on the Lustgarten. In the presence of the Imperial couple and King Alexander of Serbia the gathered crowd was reminded of the victories of Prussia and Germany and the divine grace of God that accompanied the German army into battle under the motto of the Imperial standard and the Prussian Order of the Crown before it: Gott mit uns (God with us). The assembled soldiers were entreated by the Kaiser to propagate the glorious tradition of 1870/71 with absolute obedience and devotion until death, against external and internal enemies. At the New Year’s Day reception the following year Wilhelm once more reiterated the presence of an internal threat when he stated: ‘As in 1870, we now find ourselves confronted with serious happenings, but our enemies are not abroad but at home. God, however, will help us triumph over them, and our best support is our strong army.’

The perception that Germany must contend with both foreign and domestic enemies grew markedly during the course of Wilhelm II’s reign. On the external front, shifts in foreign and colonial policy, an aggressive naval programme, and expanding commercial and industrial interests, increasingly placed Germany in an antagonistic role, particularly after Bismarck’s ousting in 1890. Having established German nationhood and sought to consolidate national identity around the political structures of the Kaiserreich during the reign of Wilhelm I, the national agenda now shifted to Weltpolitik, characterised by a desire for Germany to assert itself internationally. The shift in

84 Kaiser’s speech reported in ‘New Year’s Day on the Continent. The Kaiser and his Generals,’ p. 2.
German foreign policy after 1890 from one of carefully balanced diplomatic alliances to an increasingly precarious course of “brinkmanship,”\textsuperscript{85} heightened the spectre of external enemies and the ‘self-fulfilling nightmare of the encirclement of Germany by mistrustful and finally hostile foreign powers.’\textsuperscript{86}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.jpg}
\caption{Illustration by William Pape showing the \textit{Fahnennagelung} in the \textit{Ruhmeshalle} in October 1894 (\textit{Zur guten Stunde}, Band 15, 1895, p. 455)}
\end{figure}

But, as Wilhelm’s entreaty to his soldiers indicates, a growing international focus did not obscure the reality of deep divisions at home. When war did eventuate in 1914, the oft-cited public displays of jubilation were largely predicated on a perceived fulfilment of national unity, of societal fractures being healed through national fervour, and of the transformation of German society (\textit{Gesellschaft}) into a community (\textit{Gemeinschaft}).\textsuperscript{87} While Jeffery Verhey has questioned the prevailing belief, perpetuated both in August 1914 and in the many decades thereafter, of widespread German “war enthusiasm,” painting a more nuanced picture of diverse and conflicting reactions among groups and individuals alike, there is no doubt that the “spirit of 1914”

\textsuperscript{85} This is aptly captured by the analogy ‘Bismarck had played chess; Wilhelm II played poker.’ Holger H. Herwig quoted in James N. Retallack, \textit{Germany in the age of Kaiser Wilhelm II} (Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Macmillan; St. Martin’s Press, 1996), p. 73.
\textsuperscript{86} Evans, \textit{Rereading German history}, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{87} Jeffrey Verhey, \textit{The spirit of 1914: militarism, myth and mobilization in Germany} (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 2-5.
represented a powerful idea predicated on its symbolic erasure of the class, gender, confessional, generational, and political rifts that had deepened over the course of the Imperial era.\textsuperscript{88} Despite the Reich’s nation-building cultural agenda, so demonstrably enacted in the Zeughaus museum, at the dawn of the Wilhelmine era anxiety about internal divisions remained strong.\textsuperscript{89}

\textit{Internal unification, persistent divisions}

In many ways, the attempted suppression of minorities begun under Bismarck had itself contributed to the emergence of more coherent and organised opposition groups. While legislative measures against the Catholic Church were dismantled after 1879, the years of persecution had only strengthened Catholic solidarity and political mobilisation.\textsuperscript{90} The same was true for other perceived dissidents, most notably the Socialists, whose meagre 350,000 votes in the Reichstag elections of 1874 rose to 1.4 million in 1890, the year that anti-socialist legislation in place since 1878 was lifted.\textsuperscript{91} By 1912 the renamed Social Democratic Party (SPD) received the largest number of seats in the Reichstag with 4.25 million votes; at the same time its membership rose from 300,000 (1905) to one million (1914).\textsuperscript{92} But the same period also saw the rise of the ultra right, claiming a large support base among farmers.\textsuperscript{93} Even where their numbers could not compete with those of the Social Democrats, the influence of nationalist pressure groups was often disproportionate to membership numbers, particularly where their goals reflected those of entrenched conservative elites, who were often prominent members of both pressure groups and conservative parties.\textsuperscript{94}

Whatever the particular agenda, these right-wing groups all opposed socialism and more often than

\textsuperscript{88} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{89} Clark, \textit{Kaiser Wilhelm II}, p. 45.
\textsuperscript{90} James (Ed.) Retallack, "Forging an Empire: Bismarckian Germany, 1866-1890, Politics II: Parties and Political Mobilization," German History in Documents and Images: German Historical Institute, Available at www.germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org [accessed 25 August 2012].
\textsuperscript{91} Ibid. See also Kaiserliches Statistisches Amt, ‘XI. Die Wahlen zum Deutschen Reichstag,’ \textit{Statistisches Jahrbuch für das Deutsche Reich, Erster Jahrgang (1880)}, 1881, p. 140; Kaiserliches Statistisches Amt, ‘XI. Die Wahlen zum deutschen Reichstage,’ \textit{Statistisches Jahrbuch für das Deutsche Reich, Elfter Jahrgang (1890)}, 1891, p. 135.
\textsuperscript{93} Clark, \textit{Kaiser Wilhelm II}, pp. 56-57.
\textsuperscript{94} James Retallack, "Liberals, Conservatives, and the Modernizing State: The Kaiserreich in Regional Perspective", in Geoff Eley, \textit{Society, culture, and the state in Germany, 1870-1930} (Ann Arbor, Mich: University of Michigan Press, 1996), p. 221. On the character, goals, and leadership of the various pressure groups that emerged during the 1890s, including the Pan-German League (begun as the German German League in 1891 and changing its name in 1894), the Navy League (1898), the Colonial Society (1887), the Society for the Eastern Marches (1894), and the German Union (1895) see Geoff Eley, \textit{Reshaping the German right: radical nationalism and political change after Bismarck} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), Ch. 3.
not sought solutions for disunity at home in national goals abroad (colonisation, aggressive foreign policy, armament, and naval expansion).95

Like the attempted suppression of Catholicism and socialism, the "Germanisation" of the Polish population east of the Oder-Niesse also proved fruitless. Backed by right-wing interest groups such as the Pan-German League and the Society for the Eastern Marches (Ostmarkverein), efforts to suppress Polish nationalism via the enforcement of German language in schools, discrimination in employment, the changing of place names, and the purchase, sub-division and on-selling of Polish estates to German settlers (from 1908 by means of force), failed to stop Polish population growth exceeding that of ethnic Germans and only succeeded in fostering hostility.96 Jews also felt the force of discrimination, despite having achieved emancipation in many states prior to 1871 and the right to meritocratic advancement enshrined in law since 1869.97 But an increase in anti-Semitism (for instance the expulsion of non-naturalised Jews along with Poles in 1885 and the establishment of the anti-Semitic organisation, the Reichsschammerbund in 1912), did not necessarily equate to a steady rise in anti-Semitism in the latter part of the Wilhelmine era. Rather, the fate of Germany's Jewish population was more often tied to economic factors, so that the height of anti-Semitism during the pre-war years coincided with the economic depression following the crash of 1873 and began to recede again as the economy picked up from 1896.98

The Wilhelmine era was thus marked by a continuation and strengthening of divisions along political, confessional, ethnic, and class lines, but such polarisations were often quite complicated, as the example of women's movements demonstrates. Challenges to traditional social and economic structures were reflected in the changing roles for women, who worked through an increasing number of organisations and associations to improve the lot of the working poor, to advocate for women's access to higher education and a broader range of professions, and to fight for legal and political rights, including suffrage.99 But between these groups, a number of tensions persisted;

---

95 Eley, Reshaping the German right, pp. 44-46.
96 Clark, Iron Kingdom, pp. 579-583.
99 Universal male suffrage had been granted for national elections in the 1871 constitution, however women remained legally disadvantaged. Anti-association laws in place in Prussia since 1850 denied women the right to join political parties or partake in political activities. These were lifted in 1908, however many parties themselves maintained restrictions to women's membership. Bourgeois women's organisations had begun to form as early as 1865 with the foundation of the Allgemeine Deutscher Frauenverein (ADF), but they proliferated especially during the 1890s and in the period leading up to the First World War. This period also marks the establishment of the Federation of German Women's Associations (Bund Deutscher Frauenvereine), a non-partisan umbrella organisation that encompassed a broad spectrum of groups (est. 1894).
between "radicals," who advocated women's suffrage, and "moderates," who sought educational and vocational advancement but did not demand political rights, between feminists advancing the equal status of women and those who argued for reform on the very basis of women's difference, between bourgeois and socialist women's groups (the latter often maintaining solidarity with male workers over middle-class feminists, even if they did not always enjoy support in return), and between an increasing variety of goals and agendas as the movement grew and diversified encompassing a broad political spectrum.100 There remained, according to Carole Adams' study of one professional group but applicable more broadly, a 'dynamic, unresolved tension between class and gender', and Marion A. Kaplan's explication of German Jewish women and the bourgeoisie during the period is a strong reminder that not only groups but also individuals might often hold a number of diverse, even conflicting affiliations, thus complicating attempts to delineate between spheres of interest.101

Increasing social divisions, including the continuance of unresolved contradictions between local, regional, and national affiliations (Clarke argues that regional affiliations actually grew during the last quarter of the nineteenth century),102 suggest that the "internal unification" project—the desire to create a uniform national culture—was not only a feature of the 1870s and 1880s, but remained an important imperative throughout the Wilhelmine era as well.103 Enormous scientific and technical innovation, often brought spectacularly to the public's attention with the appearance of motor cars on the streets and airships in the skies, accelerated industrialisation, urbanisation, and modernisation also radically changed the face of German cities, where population growth was


101 Carole Adams study is summarised by Quataert, 'Introduction 2: Writing the History of Women and Gender in Imperial Germany,' p. 57; Marion A. Kaplan, The making of the Jewish middle class: women, family, and identity in Imperial Germany (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 3-21.

102 Clark, Iron Kingdom, p. 684. See also Eley, Society, culture, and the state in Germany, 1870-1930, p. 223.

103 This is supported by the continuation of a vast number of national memorial projects after 1890, with significant attention also given to Bismarck following his death in 1898. Wilhelm's 1889 national education bill, with its focus on the teaching of German history, was another portent of a continuing priority for national edification and fortification during his reign. On the education bill Clark, Kaiser Wilhelm II, pp. 60-61.
matched by appalling living conditions and the growth of the urban poor (Fig. 3.11). Against this backdrop, in which so many Germans reportedly ‘felt that every dimension of their personal, communal, and political existence was in flux’, the Zeughaus remained a bastion of the Prussian Imperial image, expanding its collections and incorporating structural changes to significantly strengthen the museum’s historical mission and its patriotic agenda.

Figure 3.11: Count von Zeppelin’s rigid airship over the Berlin Zeughaus (Postcard Lichtdruck der Graphischen Gesellschaft AG, Zeppelin-Serie No.1, Kunstverlag Max O’Brien & Co, Berlin, 1909, author’s own collection)

Too much for the Epigone eye: the museum after 1890

A 1905 Berlin guide published the following account of Zeughaus:

Stimulating and exciting incarnation of the heroic ages, cultural, historical and artistically valuable weapons and costumes of all generations since the XVth Century, too much for the eye from Epigone periods. The colours and standards covered in glory with the black cross

---

104 Significant innovations in Germany alone included Werner von Siemens’ electric elevator (1880), the discovery of electromagnetic waves by Heinrich Hertz (1888), Rudolph Diesel’s engine (1893), the first mass-produced vehicle manufactured by Benz Patent Motor Car Co. (1894) with the appearance of private motor cars on the streets of the capital around 1901, the discovery of the X-Ray by Wilhelm Röntgen (1895), the establishment of quantum theory by Max Planck and the ridged airship flown by Ferdinand von Zeppelin (1900), the development of the spark plug by Bosch (1902), the recognition of chromosomes as the basis of heredity by Theodor Boveri (1903), Einstein’s special theory of relativity (1905), and the invention of the double piston engine by Hugo Junkers (1907). Indeed, between its inauguration in 1901 and the close of the Wilhelmine era German scientists received no less than seventeen Nobel Prizes in the fields of chemistry, medicine and physiology, and physics. Bernard S. Schlessinger and June H. Schlessinger, The who’s who of Nobel Prize winners, 1901-1995 (Phoenix, Ariz.: Oryx Press, 1996), Here pp. 3-8; 57-64; 94-99; 149-154; 176-183.

and the rising eagle, hundreds of captured colours, in the courtyard over Schlüters masks, unfortunately, almost as many Chinese pennants.


At the turn-of-the-century the Zeughaus museum still very much reflected the goals of its creation in the glorification of heroic victories, remaining rooted in the period of the Reich foundation but also incorporating colonial endeavours as evidenced by the flags won in the suppression of the Boxer Rebellion in 1900. While there is insufficient space here to address the complex and important question of Germany’s colonial history and its role in the construction and maintenance of German cultural and national identity (both during the colonial period and beyond) it is clear that the colonial idea held a far greater role in the German imagination (and in practice via commercial activity, scientific expeditions, emigration and missionary activity pre-dating state sanctioned acquisitions) than is suggested by the oft-cited brevity of actual colonial rule (1884-1919). As Sara Friedrichsmeyer, Sara Lennox and Susanne Zantop contend, ‘a colonist mindset existed before the object, the colonies, came within Germany’s reach [...] the dream of nation and the dream of colonial possession [were] inextricably intertwined.’ Certainly the presentation of colonial trophies as well as uniforms (below) in the Zeughaus may have catered to an imperial enthusiasm among the German public, promoting a vision of German strength and international status firmly centred on the army and its role in in the fulfilment of imperial desires.

For the author of Berlin und die Berliner, who maintained the mood of the Zeughaus remained ultimately that of 1870, the Zeughaus presentations carried with them a hint of melancholy for past glories that the present could not match, particularly following the loss of Bismarck, in Christopher Clark’s words the ‘foremost integrative public figure of the empire.’ Wilhelm himself, he has written elsewhere, ‘saw more clearly than his predecessors how completely the Prussian Crown had failed to establish itself as a point of reference in the public life of the German Empire.’ In this context, changes at the Zeughaus during the era should be seen as part of

106 Berlin und die Berliner, p. 200.
109 Clark, Kaiser Wilhelm II, p. 178. On Wilhelm’s self perception as a public figure and his status as a media monarch: Clark, Iron Kingdom, pp. 589-590.
110 Clark, Iron Kingdom, p. 594.
ongoing efforts to fortify Prussian army tradition as German tradition and to further align the Hohenzollern house and the broader Imperial idea.

*The expansion of the collections: priorities and public engagement*

These efforts become clear in relation to the expansion of the collections under Wilhelm II, but so too does the continued difficulty of marrying political-historical requirements with the Zeughaus’ scholarly concept. Published acquisition reports during the period reveal a number of collecting channels, which represent not only the kind of influence that various elites and organisations had over the collecting practice of the museum, but also how the Zeughaus came to be perceived by military organisations and personnel, the aristocracy, and sections of the bourgeoisie as a central site for the donation of war souvenirs and historical weapons. Direct acquisitions were made by the museum from its annual budget and from the small income it generated from the sale of doubles. These included individual objects, groups of objects, and on occasion large existing collections purchased with funds made available directly from the Kaiser, such as the Victor Gay collection purchased in 1911, which consisted of approximately 170 pieces including swords, pole arms, bludgeoning weapons, spurs, guns, and helmets. Valued for its comprehensive type-series, the sword collection alone illustrated an almost unbroken medieval and Renaissance development sequence and was thought to fill a ‘sensitive gap’ and elevate the Zeughaus’ already extensive collections to the forefront of European collections.

Acquisitions were also made by transfer and exchange with other institutions, not only collections of arms and armour like the Dresden armoury, with which the Zeughaus had an established relationship, but also among the Royal Art Collections. Thus, in 1906 a number of European and oriental pistols, crossbows, knives, swords and daggers dating from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries were transferred from the Museum of Applied Arts, while the following year sixty-six weapons dating the fifth to the fifteenth century were received from the ethnographic museum. This is significant because it speaks to the conception of the Zeughaus within a broader museum landscape, each of Berlin’s royal collections having a set of clearly defined parameters. While the Zeughaus remained under military administration, it was nonetheless perceived within

---

111 Quaas notes that all acquisitions, including gifts, had first to be approved by the War Ministry. Quaas, Nützmann, and Deutsches Historisches Museum, ‘Jagdwaffen,’ p. 25.
112 Müller, *Vom Arsenal zum Museum*, p. 167.
114 [‘empfindliche Lücke’] ibid.
this network. It is telling that acquisitions published during the period fell under the rubric of the Prussian Art Collections, even if the Zeughaus, technically, did not.\footnote{Published in the \textit{Amtliche Berichte aus den Königlichen Kunstsammlungen: Monatlich Erscheinendes Beiblatt zum Jahrbuch der Kgl. Preußischen Kunstsammlungen} (G. Grotesche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Berlin) between 1896-1918.} In 1895 an expert commission made up of weapons connoisseurs and prominent museum authorities, among them Nikolaus von Dreyse, Franz Freiherr von Lipperheide, and Wilhelm von Bode, had been established to oversee Zeughaus acquisitions, creating further links among the museums, though this did not prevent competition where collecting interests overlapped.\footnote{The commission was set up following criticism in the press of a number of Zeughaus acquisitions. Quaas alludes to the purchase of fakes. Quaas, Nützmann, and Deutsches Historisches Museum, 'Jagdwaffen,' p. 25.} An offer of a collection of helmets by Lipperheide in 1901 provides a pertinent example of persisting questions over museum boundaries.

Heinrich Müller outlines the nature of the resulting "profile problems" when the Zeughaus came into competition with the Royal Museums over the helmets.\footnote{Müller, \textit{Vom Arsenal zum Museum}, pp. 178-183.} Part of the scholarly aim of the Zeughaus during the Wilhelmine era was to "complete" its developmental sequence of medieval and early modern arms and armour. The museum also, however, sought to extend its modest holdings of much earlier pieces dating from the early Middle Ages and antiquity, also seeking examples of prehistoric weapons and those from the migration period to demonstrate the earliest forms of weaponry.\footnote{This argument, made by Zeughaus Director von Ubisch in \textit{ibid.} p. 182. By this stage the Zeughaus had, indeed, acquired some prehistoric pieces. As the acquisitions reports show, landowner Herr Fischer of Prössenberg donated two stone axes made of Syenite to the Zeughaus in 1896, reportedly dating from the end of the Neolithic period; Edgar von Ubisch, 'Zeughaus,' \textit{Amtliche Berichte aus den Königlichen Kunstsammlungen}, 17, no. 1, 1896, p. 9.} These objects were particularly valuable where they also reflected the museums’ patriotic agenda by demonstrating the evolution of "German" weaponry from its earliest beginnings. One of the most important acquisitions of the period in this respect (again supported directly by the Kaiser) was the Lombardy Spangenhelm, a conical sixth century plated helmet found at Giulianova and thought at the time to be the earliest example of weaponry featuring Christian iconography. 'Now our Helm is altogether, as far as is known to date,' wrote Zeughaus director von Edgar von Ubisch, who was appointed in place of Weiß in 1895, 'the oldest piece of weaponry decorated with Christian religious scenes. Such motifs first on Germanic weapons!'\footnote{('[Nun ist unser Helm überhaupt, soweit bis heute bekannt, das älteste mit christlich religiösen Darstellungen verzierte Waffenstück. Solche Motive zuerst auf germanischen Waffen!']" Edgar von Ubisch and Oskar Wulff, 'Ein langoberhailscher Helm im Königlichen Zeughause zu Berlin,' \textit{Jahrbuch der Königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen}, 24, no. 3, 1903, p. 211. 

('[...große Epoche vaterländischer Geschichte']"

ibid. p. 214.) It thus linked the Zeughaus collections to the ancient Germanic tribes, and in Ubisch's words, a 'great epoch of patriotic history'.\footnote{('[...große Epoche vaterländischer Geschichte']) ibid. p. 214.} It also, however, represented a collecting area of interest to other Berlin museums, most notably the Applied Arts Museum and the Antiquarium.
Lipperheide’s offer of 78 helmets sharpened institutional rivalry because the benefactor had stipulated that the collection should not only remain together, but that it should be united with the existing helmets disbursed among a number of Berlin museums.\textsuperscript{122} While Ubisch fought to retain the Zeughaus examples, the director of the Antiquarium mounted a strong case by arguing that the unification of the objects—for which he was able to provide a dedicated display hall—would create the most significant collection of helmets worldwide, rivalling even the British Museum and the Museo Nationale in Naples.\textsuperscript{123} As a result of the dispute the Kaiser stepped in to delimit the scope of the Zeughaus collections to the Christian era (beginning 1 CE).\textsuperscript{124} This determination not only demonstrates the continuing personal authority of the Kaiser over the Zeughaus collections, it can also be seen as a significant statement about the museum’s national-historical role, one that also raises the important question of where Germany history begins. It also highlights the difficulty of determining the Zeughaus’ collecting terms within its broadly defined scope. Chronologically, geographically and also structurally/thematically the Zeughaus encompassed almost two thousand years of European and non-European weaponry, reflecting art and cultural-historical, technical, national and army historical aims.

Priority during the period was given above all to the expansion of the army collections, particularly the uniform collections, which grew from a small selection of allied uniforms from the Napoleonic Wars, plus a handful of German, Danish, Austrian, and Russian uniforms dating from 1850-66, to an extensive collection of representative pieces from across Europe, as well as the different German states from the seventeenth century through to the contemporary era.\textsuperscript{125} Prussian uniforms in particular were a collection strength; over the course of the period an almost complete series was assembled demonstrating the evolution of the Brandenburg-Prussian army from its establishment under Elector Friedrich Wilhelm through to the 1910s (Fig. 3.12). For the Imperial era this also included the uniforms of regiments stationed in German East Africa, Southwest Africa,

\textsuperscript{122} Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 182.
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid. On the transfer of the helmets to the Antiquarium, including a description of some of the helmets deemed most significant, see Kekule von Stradonitz, ’Königliche Museen 1. Oktober - 31. Dezember 1904: C. ANTIQUARIUM,’ Amtliche Berichte aus den Königlichen Kunstsammlungen, 26, no. 2, 1905, pp. 3-5.
\textsuperscript{124} Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 182.
\textsuperscript{125} From the wars of Liberation Prussian, English, Russian, and Polish uniforms were presented under the rubric "The Time of Friedrich Wilhelms III of Prussia, 1797-1840" as per the 1883 catalogue. The additional uniforms came under the sections "From the death of Friedrich Wilhelm II until the establishment of the German Empire, 1840-1870"; Königl. Zeughaus-Verwaltung, Wegweiser [1883], pp. 108-110; Compare this with the items listed in the 1910 catalogue which include army weapons, instruments, accessories, and uniforms from the seventeenth century to 1906; Königliche Zeughaus Verwaltung, Das Königliche Zeughaus [1910], pp. 64-74; 104; See also Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, pp. 183-186.
and East Asia. In 1901 alone, forty-six complete uniform figures of Brandenburg-Prussian infantry and cavalry troops representing the period 1680-1900 that had been displayed at the Paris Exposition the previous year were transferred by the Kaiser to the Zeughaus. After 1900 the uniform collections were given a dedicated display area and were presented along with the complete equipment of the soldiery for each given period (Fig. 3.13). Uniforms, along with souvenirs of distinguished officers, remained a top collecting priority. They also now included examples from all ranks and divisions of the army—that is to say, the army commons, rather than just the officer classes. Where original pieces could not be sourced, replicas served to “fill in the gaps.”

![Figure 3.12: Display of Prussian uniforms purchased from the Paris Exposition in 1900, west wing of the upper floor, facing north towards the Feldherrenhalle (Postcard image Stange & Wagner, Berlin, c. 1910, collection Thomas Weissbrich)](image)

126 German colonial uniforms listed in Königliche Zeughaus Verwaltung, Das Königliche Zeughaus [1910], p. 71; A number of Chinese flags were also displayed in the courtyard Königl. Zeughaus-Verwaltung, Das Königliche Zeughaus [1907], pp. 100-103.
128 Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 186.
The expansion of the uniform collections reflected more than just the Kaiser’s oft-cited love of uniforms. Appealing to those ranks below the officer class was important in the context of the expansion of the army as well. Between 1890/91 and 1914 the standing army increased by over 62 per cent, with army commons jumping from 468,595 to 761,438. This was not just numerically significant. Since the mid-nineteenth century the industrialisation of warfare had led to a dramatic shift in both the technological capabilities of weaponry (greater firepower, range, accuracy, and potential damage), and the tactics of war, with much larger field units being supplied and commanded by means of modern communication and transport infrastructure. These increased capabilities were employed to great effect in the Wars of Unification, but they also spelled the erosion of the traditional power of conservative political leaders and professional soldiers in military matters as the army became more reliant on the industrial sector for the supply of its weapons, which was compounded by conscription and the increasing influence of parliament, and hence public opinion.

129 Statistics taken from Kaiserliches Statistisches Amt, ‘XVI. Kriegswesen,’ Statistisches Jahrbuch für das Deutsche Reich, Elfter Jahrgang (1890), 1891, p. 151; Kaiserliches Statistisches Amt, ‘XIV. Kriegswesen,’ Statistisches Jahrbuch für das Deutsche Reich, Fünfunddreißigster Jahrgang (1914), 1915, p. 348. During the same period officers rose from 19,737 to 30,739 (55.74%), non-commissioned officers from 55,727 to 105,595 (89.95%), and ancillary service staff such as military doctors, veterinarians, armourers, gunsmiths and saddlers more than doubled to 8,469.
131 Ibid. pp. 455-459.
In the Prussian case, the constitutional role of the King as supreme warlord and the retention of these traditional rights even after 1871 limited much of the parliament’s influence, a situation that was magnified under Wilhelm II. Indeed, not only was the army relatively independent of parliamentary control, it also saw itself as the first line of defence against the internal threat of Social Democracy, trade unions, workers’ movements, and, potentially, the parliament itself. But by opening its ranks, which it needed to do even more so in the lead up to the First World War, the army also became vulnerable to these very threats and the army leadership went to extraordinary measures to ensure its recruits held appropriately conservative values.\textsuperscript{132} In this context the inculcation of Prussian army traditions, conservatism, and monarchical values among ordinary soldiers was paramount. Creating a museum that was not just dedicated to the glorious deeds of famous generals, but that represented the whole range of army activities should be seen as part of this task.

The central role of the Zeughaus in promoting and safeguarding army tradition is demonstrated also by the involvement of army authorities, institutions, and the army corps in its collecting activities. Much material came through the war ministry, but individual army units and personnel also participated in the expansion of the collections through donations of uniforms, equipment, colours and standards, and medals and decorations—another fast growing collection area during the period.\textsuperscript{133} In the case of the Corps Command of the East Asian expedition, a significant number of captured historical weapons in addition to the Boxer flags mentioned above were transferred to the Zeughaus. These included 108 “old Chinese” bronze cannons, 24 mortars and wall guns, 12 cast steel guns of European origin, and 2,000 cutting and thrusting weapons.\textsuperscript{134}

In addition to serving military personnel, the museum also received donations from civil servants, industry, German and foreign dignitaries, and royalty. Of the latter, for example, the King of Sweden and Norway donated the full dress and field armament of a Swedish body-servant

\textsuperscript{132} Measures included recruitment based on “suitable circles,” so that conservative members of the upper bourgeoisie who could maintain the values of the monarchy and the protestant Prussian elites were selected while most Catholics, and all Social Democrats were excluded. Education was also kept to a minimum below the general staff as a protection against liberal ideas, and non-commissioned officers were predominantly drawn from rural conservative strongholds. Further expansion of the army was therefore a contentious issue, but preparations based on the Schlieffen Plan necessitated a stronger army. Ibid. pp. 463-469.

\textsuperscript{133} The first 155 items listed in the Amtliche Berichte for July to September 1899, for instance, were medals and decorations. Edgar von Ulisch, ‘Zeughaus 1. Juli - 30. September 1899,’ Amtliche Berichte aus den Königlichen Kunstsammlungen, 21, no. 1, 1900, p. 9. See also Deutsches Historisches Museum and Klaus-Peter Merta, ‘Auszeichnungen im Museum. Aus der Geschichte einer Sammlung,’ Magazin: Mitteilungen des Deutschen Historischen Museums., 5, no. 13, 1995, pp. 20-25. Merta shows that although the Zeughaus possessed important holdings of medals and decorations prior to 1890, including of course, the Napoleon medals, and although Commander Ising had sought out major collections of medals prior to 1890, there was until then no systematic or targeted collecting of medals.

(Liebtrabant) dating from 1697 in 1902.\textsuperscript{135} Bequests from private individuals mostly came from the aristocracy in the form of souvenirs of personal or family glory, but civil servants and businessmen also felt compelled to donate. The Hydraulic Engineering Inspector for Potsdam, for instance, donated a thirteenth century Gothic sword found on the Havel River near Paune in 1903-04, while Herr Müller, a master cabinet maker in Berlin gave an incendiary bomb and a hand grenade unearthed in the Markausstrasse during the construction of the pneumatic post there.\textsuperscript{136} Other professionals listed during the period include businessmen (including the great benefactor of the Art Museums, James Simon), artists (including a major bequest from Adolph Menzel in 1905), publishers and book handlers, foresters, a magistrate, the crown jeweller, and a locksmith.

The status of the Zeughaus as the central national institution for arms, armour, and military history was also reflected in donations from the expat community. D. Burchardt, a German citizen in Damascus, provided six hand grenades that were thought to have dated from the siege of the city by Emperor Conrad III during the second crusade (1148); Paul Kümmel, based in Yokohama donated a thirteenth century Japanese curved sword; and Max Rosenheim of London gave an English and an Indian flintlock gun (both nineteenth century).\textsuperscript{137} Manufacturers and industrialists also did their part by providing examples of the goods they supplied to the army. The sewing machine, typewriter, and bicycle manufacturer Naumann & Seidel gave an army bicycle in 1901-02 and in the same period the firm Tippelskirch & Co., army contractors supplying the bulk of clothing and equipment to the colonial forces, offered the complete uniform and equipment for the rank of Sergeant of the East African colonial troops (Schutztruppe).\textsuperscript{138}

\textsuperscript{135} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{138} Ebisch, 'Zeughaus 1. Juli 1901 - 30. Juni 1902,' p. 12. In 1906 the Tippelskirch company was at the centre of a political scandal following the arrest of Major Fischer, of the Imperial Commissary Department, over charges that he had accepted bribes from the company in exchange for lucrative government contracts. The revelations that Prussian Minister for Agriculture Viktor von Podbielski held a large investment in the company in his wife’s name fuelled a press campaign against him, which pitted Chancellor von Bülow, who supported calls for his resignation, against the Kaiser, who refused to have his prerogative to appoint and dismiss his ministers infringed upon by public opinion. Despite the eventual resignation of Podbielski the scandal dealt a ‘heavy blow’ to the relationship between von Bülow and the Kaiser, which had remained strained since foreign policy clashes the year before, and a series of personal appointments aimed at asserting Wilhelm’s authority and shoring up his control. The incident, along with issues of imperial authority, also points to political conflicts over colonial policy, and indeed it was in November of 1906, the same month that Podbielski resigned, that the Reichstag debates began over retroactive funding for the quelling of the Herero and Nama “uprising” (1904-07), officially acknowledged by the German government in 2004 as an act of genocide, which resulted in the dissolution of the Reichstag in 1907. It is also worth noting that the Podbielski was a Zeughaus donor. Terry Cole, ‘Kaiser versus Chancellor: The crisis of Bülow’s chancellorship 1905-6,’ in Society and politics in Wilhelmine Germany, ed. Richard J. Evans (London; New York: Croom Helm ; Barnes & Noble, 1978), pp. 54-57; Katharine Anne Lerman, The Chancellor as courtier: Bernhard von Bülow and the governance of Germany, 1900-1909 (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 155-158; Clark, Kaiser Wilhelm II, pp. 99-104; Jürgen Zimmerer, ‘Colonial Genocide: The Herero and Nama War (1904–8) in
Whether companies like Tippelskirch donated to the Zeughaus out of national conviction, a sense of duty, or to win favour with the Kaiser, such actions could certainly not have harmed business interests, and there existed a long tradition of close ties between the crown, the military administration, the Zeughaus, and the industrial capital behind the Prussian military. The Krupp family’s relationship with the Hohenzollerns over a number of generations is indicative of this. During the 1860s Krupp had set up its own hall on the ground floor of the Zeughaus where it displayed models of its new cast-steel cannon for military personnel. After 1867 the models were incorporated into the collection upstairs and the firm began to display full-sized cannons, which the Zeughaus administration incorporated into a small artillery museum it set up on the lower floor in the period prior to the full conversion of the museum. By 1910 there were a number of Krupp cannons on display in the artillery collection including the huge cast-steel cannon that had been displayed at the Great Exhibition in 1851, on the basis of which one British commentator had bemoaned ‘the military character of the principle state of the Verein, and indeed of all the German states.’

Whatever their influence at the Zeughaus, it is clear that these manufacturing concerns became extraordinarily powerful during the Imperial era and especially so between 1890 and 1914. SPD representative and, later, co-founder of the Spartacus League and the Communist Party of Germany (Kommunistische Partei Deutschland; KPD), Karl Liebknecht (1871-1919) referred to both Krupp and Tippelskirch in his 1907 publication Militarism and Anti-militarism as part of a ‘paradigm case of militarism, the Prussian-German bureaucratic-feudal-capitalist form—that very worst form of capitalist militarism, that state above the state.’ In order to meet its goals, militarism, according to Liebknecht’s account,

must transform the army into a manageable, flexible and effective instrument. It must raise it to the highest possible level on the military-technical side; in addition, since it consists of men and not of machines and is therefore a living mechanism, it must be filled with the right “spirit”.


Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 106.


Ibid. Also on display was in 1910 a Krupp gun designed for mounting on an air balloon constructed for the siege of Paris in 1870, which was shown with a model of a French air balloon. Königl. Zeughaus-Verwaltung, Das Königliche Zeughaus [1910], pp. 128-135; Quote from The Crystal Palace and its contents, p. 86. The cannon presented in London in 1851 had been a gift from Krupp to King Friedrich Wilhelm IV following the exhibition and from the King it was transferred to the Zeughaus. Letter from Herr Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach to the Staatssekretär of the Prussian State Minisry dated 4.3.1939 (DHM-HA: Rep Z 243, unpaginated).

Liebknecht, Militarism & anti-militarism, p. 30.

Ibid.
This "spirit," which should manifest in the willingness to turn against external and internal enemies, he referred to as "military spirit," "patriotic spirit" and, in the Prussian-German case, the "spirit of loyalty to the king." While there is insufficient space here to provide analysis of militarism and its relationship to capitalism within socialist thought (although East German perspectives are considered in relation to the Museum for German History in chapter 6), Liebknecht's comments are pertinent because they reflect the importance of the Zeughaus as a place for the creation and dissemination of this "spirit." All three elements were central to the Zeughaus displays, which simultaneously sought to provide edification and motivation for the army itself, to extend military enthusiasm to the wider population, to bolster patriotic allegiances, both in favour of the nation and against its enemies, and to position the Kaiser and King as the central figure of the army and the fatherland.

**Structural changes: memorial rooms, monuments, and modern machinery**

There were a number of important ways in which this last aspect was extended during the reign of Wilhelm II. In addition to the expansion of the uniform collections, Brandenburg-Prussian objects remained a priority. Although the museum strove to "complete" its technical-developmental and cultural-historical survey collection of arms and armour and also developed its non-European collections over the period, the museum's patriotic mission remained paramount. Published reports show a strong Brandenburg-Prussian bias among new acquisitions, as well as a prevalence of memorabilia of the Hohenzollern house and its military leaders. Indeed, the creation of designated memorial rooms (Andenkenräume) dedicated to selected Prussian leaders reflects not only the continuing importance of "secular relics" within the museum's collecting paradigm, but also the further centralisation of key royal figures within the displays.

The new memorial rooms represented an intensification of the earlier dynastic periodization, serving as shrines around which the relics of the great leaders were clustered. This element had been present on a smaller scale in the first displays in 1883 in the form of an area dedicated to Friedrich Wilhelm III and the Wars of Liberation, which had contained the relics of Napoleon, Blücher, and Gneisenau (above). In 1889 it was remade specifically as a memorial room, the first of four such rooms that were present on the Zeughaus floor plan by 1910. Also in 1889 the Zeughaus received large bequests from the estates of Wilhelm I and Friedrich III. These objects were incorporated into the displays in 1891, with one British paper reporting that the Kaiser had

---

144 Ibid. pp. 30-31.
145 Müller, *Vom Arsenal zum Museum*, pp. 175; 188.
146 Date for the erection of the memorial room to Friedrich Wilhelm III provided in ibid. p. 170.
'personally superintended last week the arrangement of the compartment [...] in which a great number of swords and uniforms belonging to his two predecessors have been placed.'147

In addition to swords and uniforms, the "compartment" featured an extensive collection of medals and decorations worn by the emperors, the flags and standards of their regiments, and a number of memorial pieces such as silver and gold commemorative columns (*Ehrensäule* and *Denksäule*), laurel wreaths, and daggers inscribed with the battles in which they had taken part.148

In 1897, in conjunction with the centennial celebrations for the birth of Wilhelm I, these displays were transformed into a dedicated memorial room, situated in the centre of the upper south wing. It included elaborate display cases, which represented a stark departure from the aesthetic considerations that had governed the 1883 displays (Fig. 3.14).

![Figure 3.14: Memorial room to Wilhelm I](Postcard image Stange & Wagner, Berlin, 1906, author’s own collection)

These contained the relics of both Kaisers, but the focus was squarely on Wilhelm I, the Wars of Unification, and the Reich foundation. References to the space as the souvenir room of "Wilhelm the Great" reflects attempts to imbue the Kaiser with cult status by employing the

---

established epithet of Friedrich II, to whom a memorial room was also established in the south-west corner of the hall (Fig. 3.15).\textsuperscript{149} Despite such efforts, the term never entered the vernacular. 'The public', writes Eva Giloü, 'never voluntarily used the epithet when it spoke about the old emperor, and it far preferred to erect towers to Bismarck, not Wilhelm I, as the forger of the Empire.'\textsuperscript{150}

![Figure 3.15: Memorial room to Friedrich Wilhelm I and Friedrich the Great (Postcard image Stange & Wagner, Berlin, 1906, collection Thomas Weissbrich)](image)

\textsuperscript{149} The term "Wilhelm the Great" is used in the 1907 catalogue for the description of the room, but not in the index. By 1910 it was used in both the description and the index. Königl. Zeughaus-Verwaltung, Das Königliche Zeughaus \textit{[1907]}, p. 59; Königliche Zeughaus Verwaltung, Das Königliche Zeughaus \textit{[1910]}, pp. III; 59.

\textsuperscript{150} Giloü Bremner, "Ich Kaufe mir den Kaiser!" p. 386; Clarke also refers to the modeling of Wilhelm I as "Wilhelm the Great," deeming the results mixed; Clark, \textit{Iron Kingdom}, p. 590.
The propagation of the Wilhelm cult, already begun in the Ruhmeshalle with the Barbarossa/Barbablanca pairing, was enthusiastically taken up by Wilhelm II and saw its expression in over 250 memorials built to his grandfather.\textsuperscript{151} Berlin’s largest and most significant of these, also unveiled for the centennial celebrations, was the National Memorial by Reinhold Begas (Fig. 3.16)\textsuperscript{152}. Facing the western façade of the city palace, this monumental work rose twenty meters from street level and featured a nine meter equestrian statue led by a palm-bearing muse, four protruding plinths at the base, each with a lion atop an assemblage of trophies, two colossal figures representing war and peace (the former bearing a striking resemblance to the warriors featured on the Zeughaus staircase), and a semi-circular colonnade.\textsuperscript{153}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{national_memorial_berlin}
\caption{The National Memorial in Berlin by Reinhold Begas, completed 1897 (Postcard image W. Berrenhusen, Berlin, c. 1910, author’s own collection)}
\end{figure}

Though billed as a memorial to the whole nation, for which the Reichstag had granted four million Reichsmark,\textsuperscript{154} Wilhelm I clearly built the dominating figure. This is perhaps why \textit{Berlin und}
die Berliner referred to it as the ‘so-called national memorial.’ In his speech at the laying of the foundation stone, made on the anniversary of the Battle of Gravelotte, Wilhelm referred to the ‘blood-stained seed which was sown in the war with France’ from which had sprung ‘a harvest of peace and German unity.’ He went on to praise the army for its courage, honour, and ‘implicit obedience’ and urged the continuation of this spirit.

The final of the memorial rooms constructed in the Zeughaus was the Kurfürstenraum, or Electors’ Room, a space for the memorabilia of the Margraves and Electors of Brandenburg before the establishment of the Prussian Kingdom, thus providing an even longer lineage for the presentation of German history cast in the Hohenzollern image. Once again, the ideas expressed in the Zeughaus found their counterpart in the memorial landscape of Berlin. In celebration of his thirty-sixth birthday in 1895, Wilhelm II had announced a gift to the city of Berlin in the form of a “Victory Avenue” (Siegesallee) that would be carved out of the Tiergarten from the Königsplatz before the Reichstag in the north and culminating with a huge fountain at Kemper Platz, on the southern edge of the park. This ‘half-mile of history in marble’ was unveiled progressively between 1898 and 1902 and contained a total of 32 ensembles of statues, each set within a semi-circular marble bench. These sculptural works, which were carried out by a team of thirty artists under Begas’ leadership, documented each of the rulers of the Mark Brandenburg from its foundation under Margrave Albrecht the Bear (†1170), to the establishment of the Empire under Wilhelm I (Fig. 3.17). Each group displayed a full-length portrait of the ruler flanked by two portrait busts of leading figures from the period.

Announcing his intended gift, Wilhelm once again reiterated the glorious victory and difficult sacrifices that had culminated in the formation of the Reich, in which “his” city of Berlin had played such an important role. ‘As a token of my appreciation for the city and to the memory of the glorious past of our fatherland,’ he announced, ‘I will therefore donate an honorary ornament for my residence and capital city, Berlin, which should represent the development of the history of the fatherland from the foundation of the Mark Brandenburg to the re-establishment of the Reich.’

---

155 Berlin und die Berliner, p. 185. Author’s emphasis.
157 Ibid.
159 ‘[Als Zeichen Meiner Anerkennung für die Stadt und zur Erinnerung an die ruhmreiche Vergangenheit unseres Vaterlandes will Ich daher einen bleibenden Ehrengschmuck für Meine Haupt- und Residenzstadt Berlin stiften, welcher die Entwicklung der vaterländischen Geschichte von der Begründung der Mark Brandenburg bis zur Wiederaufrichtung des Reiches darstellen soll.]’ Kaiser Wilhelm II, speech at the Berlin town hall on the occasion of his birthday, 27 January 1895,
The lesson here was quite clear. 'Berliners pretend to ridicule the Siegesallee as too funereal,' explained one English commentator in 1909, 'but if you chance to meet troops of schoolboys receiving an object-lesson in patriotism before these silent heroes you grasp the idea the Kaiser had in mind when he had the street hewn out of the Tiergarten to make room for this open-air hall of Hohenzollern fame.'\textsuperscript{160}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Figure3.17.png}
\caption{Statue group along the \textit{Siegesallee} featuring Kaiser Wilhelm I, Bismarck and Moltke by Reinhold Begas (Postcard image unattributed, c. 1910, author’s own collection)}
\end{figure}

It is noteworthy that the creation of this ostentatious promenade (which locals dubbed the "Puppenallee," or "avenue of dolls") was not only personally financed by the Kaiser, but its artists were directly commissioned by him, side-stepping the usual procedure of public competitions and selection committees.\textsuperscript{161} Neither was the choice of the "leading figures" for each period from the realms of politics, art, literature, science, and the military negotiable, being placed in the hands of Professor Reinhold Koser, who succeeded von Treitschke in 1898 as the official "Historiographer of the Prussian state."\textsuperscript{162} A report of the Kaiser's speech at the unveiling of the final sculptural group in 1902 betrayed a vehement anti-modernism in his artistic tastes and a national arrogance bordering

\textsuperscript{160} King's Visit to Berlin. Germany and its Capital. Some of the Changes,' p. 5.
\textsuperscript{161} On the reference to the "Puppenallee" 'Life on the Continent (By an Australian Girl),' \textit{The West Australian}, 13 October 1908, p. 6; On the commissioning process 'The Kaiser on Art. An interesting speech,' \textit{West Gippsland Gazette}, 11 February 1902, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{162} Bernhard vom Brocke, 'Koser, Reinhold,' \textit{Neue Deutsche Biographie}, no. 12, 1979, pp. 613-615.
on xenophobia in relation to cultural production. ‘Great ideals have been to the Germans a lasting good,’ he stated, ‘while they have more or less been lost with other peoples. It only remains for the German nation to preserve, foster and hand down these great ideals.’¹⁶³ No doubt he felt his marble dolls fulfilled this task.

The establishment of the memorial rooms in the Zeughaus is an immediate example of the way in which exhibition and collecting priorities were directly reflective of, and influenced by, Wilhelm II’s political and cultural agenda. The focus on relics of the Hohenzollerns did, however, result in a number of important acquisitions, including an intricately designed wheel-lock rifle made by Jacob Zimmerman in 1646 for the Elector Friedrich Wilhelm, featuring scenes from his life and a unique brass firing mechanism in the shape of a deer.¹⁶⁴ One of the most significant acquisitions for the period was the 1913 purchase of the uniform of Friedrich the Great, worn during the last year of his life and complete with coat, vest, shirt, stockings, wig, sash, gloves, and a pair of long boots.¹⁶⁵ Modern equipment and models also extended the army-historical collections, and for the Kaiser’s birthday display in 1910 (Fig. 3.18), the acquisitions of the previous year were thought to accurately convey the character of the time. ‘The program is airships and flying machines’, proclaimed the editors of Die Welt under the rubric “The latest from around the world.”¹⁶⁶ These included three scale models of airships, showing the three systems in use in Germany, each modelled in minute detail and accompanied by a schematic diagram.¹⁶⁷ Also featured were three airplane models (the Wright, Latham, and Blériot Flyers), and a 1:7 scale replica of Otto Lilienthal’s Glider.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁷ ‘The three systems represented in the displays were the rigid Zeppelin ZIII, the non-rigid Parseval PIII, and the semi-rigid MII. Otto Kümmel, ‘Erwerbungen des Zeughauses im Jahre 1910,’ Amtliche Berichte aus den Königlichen Kunstsammlungen, 32, no. 9, 1911, pp. 13-14; ‘Das Neueste aus aller Welt. Im Berliner Zeughause,’ p. 411.
As these examples show, military technology was now advancing at an unprecedented pace. The Zeughaus leadership, by contrast, were those who had served in the Wars of Unification. While modern weapons were incorporated into the displays, the atmosphere remained entrenched in that era, and it was through the lens of these past glories that the modern soldier, and increasing the public on whose cooperation a large-scale modern conflict would rely, was educated in the “spirit” of war. But the linkage between the heroic past and the needs of the present was never far away. For the twenty-fifth anniversary of the French capitulation in 1895, a year of celebration for 

169 This was true of many of the personnel involved in the display of material during WWI also, a point made by Christine Beil in relation to the lingering nineteenth century attitudes in many museums after 1914. Certainly in the case of Zeughaus Commander von Ubisch, his participation in the Franco-Prussian war, about which he published a memoir in 1896, reflects his membership of the older generation; Edgar von Ubisch, Kriegserinnerungen eines preussischen Offiziers 1870/71 (Berlin: Mittler, 1896).
170 Also in 1910, the National Gallery transferred thirteen historical paintings to the Zeughaus. By the likes of Bleibtreu, Camphausen, Rocholl, and Schuch, these featured traditional battle scenes from “Blücher’s March on Paris, 1815” (F. Diez), to “Crown Prince Friedrich Wilhelm before Paris, 19 January 1871” (Bleibtreu), with a nod to more recent exploits of the army gerontocracy with “March of Field Marshal Count Waldersee in Beijing” (Rocholl). Kümmel, ‘Erwerbungen des Zeughauses im Jahre 1910,’ p. 14.
the German Empire and unease in France, von Treitschke's address to the students of the Berlin University had made this clear. *The London Standard* reported the event:

He spoke of the moral forces which, more than all others, had prevailed in the war of 1870-71 [...] He concluded with an injunction to his hearers to defend German manners against foreign influences. He trusted that the young men whom as students he saw before him would bear in mind that they had hitherto contributed nothing out of their own capacities to the fruits of the great and glorious time which they now enjoyed.171

Likewise, the Emperor's birthday speech that year had given, according to another London source, 'fresh impulse to the development of a war-like spirit among the men who are spurred on to show themselves worthy of their fathers.'172 New struggles were thus embedded in the Germany's historical mission as well as the protection of its morals and culture, and the ceaseless line of victories presented in the Zeughaus made success in an eventual struggle seem inevitable.173 If the younger generation needed any further convincing of the heroic sacrifice that was required of them, the Kaiser had thirty-two honour rolls mounted on the columns of the Feldherrenhalle inscribed with 278 names of those who had met a heroic death in 116 battles between 1639-1871.174

When war did come, the shadow of that history lay over it. ‘There are some who wonder why,’ wrote one British Press correspondent during the first weeks of August 1914,

after these years, the 1870-71 wound should not have healed. Go to Berlin, inspect its statuary, its war memorials, wander through the great arsenal Zeughaus with its captured French cannon and flags and trophies, enter the art gallery and see the hundreds of yards of canvas depicting the humiliation of French armies and honour, and you will get the key and why so few Frenchmen visit the German capital.175

If, indeed, there was any widespread "war enthusiasm" in August 1914 it was, in the minds of many, 'the ecstasy that accompanies the belief that eternal truths and reality have become one.'176 In the Zeughaus, the construction of these "eternal truths" had been central to its very conception. Karl Liebknecht had spoken of ‘all the tinsel and splendour’ with which military enthusiasm was produced and maintained among the professional army, then the reserves, and finally the general

173 Förster makes the point that the successes against Austria and France had promoted the myth of infallibility, clouding the fact that these victories, and particularly the latter, had actually provided new and difficult challenges due to changing conditions of war. Förster, 'The Armed Forces and Military Planning,' pp. 458-459.
174 Edgar von Ubisch, 'Königliches Zeughaus,' *Amtliche Berichte aus den Königlichen Kunstsammlungen*, 31, no. 9, 1910, p. 17. The names inscribed on the plaques were published under the title "As leaders of the brave Brandenburg-Prussian troops named on these boards the generals and commanders 1639-1871 who died the heroic death"; Edgar von Ubisch, *Als Führer taperfer brandenburgisch-preussischer Truppen starben den Heldentod die auf diesen Tafeln genannten Generale und Kommandeure 1639-1871* (Berlin: Mittler, 1910).
175 'Holiday Memories of the Battlefield. In Berlin,' *The Western Times*, 11 August 1914, p. 5.
public. In a war that would call upon the whole of society, the images and objects of past glory, the colours and standards imbued with sacred awe, the shiny brocade of the uniforms, and the precious polished medals were more important than ever in promoting loyalty, honour, and obedience well beyond the serving military. But not only had the technology, tactics, and scale of warfare dramatically changed, so too would the conception of museums, the type of objects that could stand in for wartime experience, and the means of conveying such momentous historical events to the public.

**The stage of war: the Zeughaus during WWI**

During the course of the First World War, an enormous explosion of collecting and exhibition activity occurred across Europe and beyond. The opening of major national institutions dedicated to both the portrayal of events and the memorialisation of national sacrifice in the aftermath of the war went hand in hand with the innumerable commemorative walls, plaques, monuments, honour rolls, memorial halls, and parks dedicated across the globe, from the fractured landscape of the battlefields of Europe to the shattered communities of remote towns as far away as Australia and New Zealand. Many of these projects began not after the cessation of fighting, but rather as spontaneous acts of commemoration in the form of honour rolls and shrines in workplaces and public spaces during the course of war itself. Partly a reflection of the enormous loss of life and the unprecedented impact of the war at home, and partly in awareness of the monumental nature of the historical events themselves, both the commemoration and preservation of evidence of the war, in all its forms, became a priority and an impulse for the establishment of national war museums.

Institutions like the Imperial War Museum in London and the Australian War Memorial (AWM) in Canberra, represent not only the enormous impact of the Great War on the national self-understanding of these countries, but also the flood of activity that occurred during the war to secure the material culture of each nation’s wartime experience. For the Imperial War Museum, whose mandate was to record and mediate the war as well as to remember the dead, the ‘immediate priority’, writes Gaynor Kavanagh, ‘was to form extensive and representative collections, before the opportunity was lost.’ To do so the museum established a number of special sub-committees,

---

177 Liebknecht, Militarism & anti-militarism, p. 38.
179 Gaynor Kavanagh, ‘Museum as Memorial: The Origins of the Imperial War Museum,’ *Journal of Contemporary History*, 23, no. 1, 1988, pp. 77-97, quote p. 82. In its early stages the museum was not labelled the "Imperial War Museum", but the "National War Museum" and the initial collecting was carried out under the auspices of the National War Museum.
responsible for different collecting areas and the War Office placed the War Trophies Committee, which by war's end had distributed some 100,000 captured weapons to British and colonial authorities for display in local museums and parks, in the service of the new museum.  

The establishment of the Canadian War Records Office in London in 1916 represented one of the earliest of these collecting initiatives. The Australians, too, set up a London office in 1917 under the auspices of the Australian War Records Section (AWRS) and the leadership of the future director of the AWM, John Treloar. During the war the AWRS collected approximately 25,000 objects in addition to printed material, documents, photographs, films, and artworks detailing Australians at war as the foundation of the future museum. Echoing von Treitschke’s notion that ‘only in war does a nation become a nation’, the forging of a newly federated Australia on the battlefields of France and, particularly, on the beach at Gallipoli, would prove a powerful and lasting foundational myth steeped in heroic sacrifice, national courage, and masculinity. The drive to document the national experience through the use of official war historians and artists and a broadly conceived material culture strongly links the foundation of the War Memorial to the establishment of some of Australia’s strongest national narratives. But, as Christine Beil argues in her study of WWI exhibitions held in Germany between 1914 and 1939, although the lasting effects of these initiatives were far greater than in Germany, where no major lasting institutions were established, none of this came close to the intensity or the scale of German collecting and exhibition activities during the war itself. Whereas London’s national museums had been closed in 1916 as ‘a public example of economy in wartime’, German museums and exhibitions flourished, with practically every large city either organising its own exhibition or expanding existing museums to include new departments for the presentation of the war. The public display of trophies remained an important aspect of efforts to bolster civilian morale in Britain as elsewhere. The scale and impact of the German activity, however, is aptly illustrated by British fears, conveyed in a series of
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collecting directives for its nascent war museum, that without such an institution, ‘future historians would have to use German museums for their research.’\textsuperscript{187}

What is most interesting about the German exhibitions is not only their profusion, but the enormous variety of methods they employed. As evidenced by the collecting activity of the large war museums in planning, the First World War witnessed an expansion of the type of material that should be collected, preserved, and displayed to adequately represent the radically new wartime experience. No longer were trophies, flags, medals, and uniforms of famous generals the only means of mediating the war. Now, diaries, letters, maps, documents, printed material such as flyers and posters, postcards, films, photographs, drawings, and even representative objects of the home front—in short, the entire material culture of the war—found its way into museum collections. Sue Malvern’s reference to the Imperial War Museum as an ethnographic collection ‘whose ethnographic subject was the nation at arms’ reflects this changed approach.\textsuperscript{188} In Germany, the forms of display that these broadly conceived collections took ranged from the grandiose to the intimate.

At the large end of the scale huge public spectacles like the trophy exhibitions organised by the Red Cross in 1916 that travelled to numerous German cities featured masses of captured cannons and machine guns brought together in large exhibition halls. They also included uniformed mannequins (of both friend and foe) arranged in highly stylised three-dimensional dioramas, complete with foliage, barbed wire, and, in the case of the colonial troops shown in Dresden, a stuffed zebra.\textsuperscript{189} A similar theatrical mix of “authentic” objects and artistic representations was utilised in pre-show performances and tableaux-vivant presented in movie theatres and circuses, featuring miniature U-Boats, Zeppelins, and battle scenes under such sensational titles as “Europe in Flames,” while in Berlin, Frankfurt am Main, and on the outskirts of Hannover, life-sized trench recreations were constructed—some fitted with wooden cannons or decorated with idealised “homely” features like tables, ovens, benches, and pictures—through which visitors could progress.\textsuperscript{190}

Much of this activity was directed toward fundraising for war widows and orphans under the aegis of welfare organisations and the use of popular immersive techniques that already had a

\textsuperscript{187} Kavanagh, ‘Museum as Memorial,’ p. 83.
\textsuperscript{188} Malvern, ‘War, Memory and Museums,’ p. 187.
\textsuperscript{189} Zwach, Deutsche und Englische Militärmuseen im 20. Jahrhundert, p. 83.
long history in waxworks, panoramas, dioramas, and even the *Kunstkammer* with its wax figure Friedrich the Great, or in the living ethnographic displays of the world exhibitions that showed real “natives” in their “natural” state, added much to the financial success of the exhibitions. The Hannover trench recreation alone had over 300,000 visitors in three months, raising over 115,000 Marks.\(^1\) But as Lynn K. Nyhart has shown, while still a matter of debate among museum professionals at the beginning of the century, these methods of display had also begun to find legitimacy in the “scientific” realm of the natural history museum, where notions of authenticity and truth were upheld by the scientists’ own expertise and testimony and “real” specimens were set into carefully constructed “realistic” scenes.\(^2\) If the large-scale wartime exhibitions were meant to draw big crowds to boost the coffers of welfare organisations, they were also supposed to be read as authentic representations of the Frontline experience, as evidence of the success of German troops, as places for accurate information about new events and technologies, and as a convincing demonstration of the benefit of the war effort at home. This kind of reinforcement became increasingly important as trench warfare ground to a halt, casualties mounted, and extreme domestic shortages of food and coal began to disrupt the so-called “civic truce” (*Burgfrieden*) that initial belief in a swift victory had generated.

At the other end of the scale, the “*Kriegsschulmuseen*” (school war museums) were displays created in schools by children, for children, that included hand-made soldiers and battle scenes, naval ships, and collected ephemera, part of a patriotic education that instilled militaristic values in the soldiers of the future.\(^3\) Soldiers on the front also collected and displayed material in the so-called “*Frontmuseen*” (Front museums), cobbled-together displays of found objects: destroyed enemy weapons, gas masks, mangled shells, and objects that showed the signs of survival amidst the carnage, such as a cigarette case that had taken the force of a bullet.\(^4\) Between the extremes of the large-scale travelling exhibitions and the intimate and immediate creations at the Front, a plethora of local war museums and war departments in existing history, *Heimat*, and Folk museums sprang up, re-focusing the presentation of war from the “great men” presented in the large army institutions like the Zeughaus and its counterparts in Dresden and Munich, to the local level, via the idea of a “people’s war” (*Volkskrieg*).\(^5\) In these institutions the enormous, unfathomable, and remote events of the war were mediated via the local; photographs and memorabilia of local troops,
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\(^{1}\) Brandt, ‘Nagelfiguren,’ p. 69. 
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\(^{5}\) Beil, *Der ausgestellte Krieg*, pp. 48-49.
reports of their campaigns, and honour rolls of those lost. The home front was also presented here, as part of the “every day” history of the war; Heimat and Volk, already nationally charged concepts, became the filter through which national military values were transported and the preparedness for war (Kriegsbereitschaft) and will to persevere (Durchhalten) were promoted and maintained.

All of this museum activity, the enormous array of objects displayed and the many different forms of war exhibitions also led, as in Britain and Australia, to the idea of a large national institution and calls for the systematic collecting of objects from all facets of the war to remind future generations of their glorious past. The plans and preparations for the unrealized Imperial War Museum (Reichskriegsmuseum; RKM) in Berlin have been dealt with extensively elsewhere. It is worth noting here that the project, which foresaw a vast thematic scope including the army, navy, air force, weapons, equipment, means of fighting, colonial presentations, progression of the war, occupied territories, and the home front with its own sub-sections (schools, hospitals, industry, transport, forestry, agriculture, and youth and sport), encompassed a breadth of collecting and exhibition aims that engaged directly with the diversity of contemporary museum forms and new theories that had begun to emerge in the museum literature regarding the presentation of war.

Director of the National Gallery, Ludwig Justi, presented a concept for the World War museum in April 1916 and in doing so he proposed a departure from the existing organisational structure of military museums by drawing on social and cultural historical models and integrating military, technological, and “every day” history into a thematic structure. His proposal also shifted focus from the military leadership to the combined performance of the German forces, and advanced new display techniques through the use of models, life-sized recreations, artwork, drawings, graphics, statistics, photographs, and staged scenery, designed to work together to create a didactically effective and lively presentation. Above all, this approach was aimed at the lay visitor and although it would still rely on the presentation of war trophies, the proposed museum methodology...
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consciously departed from the traditional presentation of military subjects according to the model presented in institutions like the Zeughaus.\textsuperscript{203}

Justi’s plan, along with the multiplicity of World War presentations, serve to highlight the accelerated development of new museum forms that had already begun around the turn of the century, but that now gained enormous momentum. To men like Justi, the Zeughaus began to look increasingly anachronistic.\textsuperscript{204} Certainly it did not re-evaluate its primary collecting focus—captured enemy flags, weapons, trophies, and uniforms of German, allied, and enemy troops. The planned new RKM, moreover, underlined the limitations of the Zeughaus as a place for the representation of the \textit{whole} war experience and the \textit{whole} German Empire. Because the Zeughaus did not represent the navy, it neglected one of the important rallying points of the war (during the early years at least). Its Prussian emphasis was also at odds with the new reality of a war that involved the whole nation. ‘All German tribes’, wrote Major von Beczwarzowski in a memorandum regarding the RKM, ‘have spilled their blood on the battlefields. […] This common experience of all German tribes should find a lasting reminder in a memorial collection.’\textsuperscript{205}

The Zeughaus continued to play an important role, however. With the RKM in planning during the war, the Zeughaus remained the de facto "national" institution (Fig. 3.19). It was also a premiere site for the reception of new war trophies (those that could not be re-purposed for further use) from the collecting points set up by the War Ministry’s War Booty Officers.\textsuperscript{206} Early victories made these objects enormously popular and their perceived value for the morale of the civilian population and its support of the war effort is demonstrated in an urgent request made by the War Ministry to the General Staff in late-August 1914 for trophies and flags from the Russian campaign to be sent to the Zeughaus ‘in consideration of the Berlin population.’\textsuperscript{207} Indeed, the Zeughaus maintained a powerful symbolic position, particularly during the early stages of the war. ‘The Zeughaus as a historical backdrop,’ writes Beil,

against which well-dressed men and women gathered over and again as a result of the victory reports announced since the end of August from Lüttich, Namur, Antwerp and Tannenberg, was a frequently used motif in the circles of the bourgeois press and journalism in order to set the events of August 1914 within a scene of national community experience.
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In the context of these early victories the historical frame was important because in the Zeughaus the new trophies could be placed within an existing historical narrative that accentuated the progressive mission of the German nation, supporting ideas of German national superiority, the “divine” nature of Germany’s destiny in war, and the “natural” state of war as a site of national renewal. In particular, the narrative based on continuity between 1813/15 and 1870/71 was extended to include 1914, so that the glory of the past could encode the reading of the present (Fig. 3.20). As the war drew on and many of the overtly positive aspects of other museums and exhibitions began to lose their trustworthiness, moreover, the Zeughaus’ continued reliance on minimal interpretation and the intrinsic value and effectiveness of original objects meant that it retained an important function for the re-assurance of the German public—its objects spoke directly of German victories rather than mediating information via artifice.\(^{209}\)
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The nature of trophies themselves had, however, fundamentally changed. The type of trophies the Zeughaus had traditionally displayed had been unique pieces, often richly decorated artistic creations or examples of the highest technical achievements of the enemy forces. As such they were more than just functional objects, they had a symbolic worth beyond their mere status as enemy weapons. At the beginning of the war colours and standards continued to fulfil this function as highly valued trophy items symbolising the honour of the regiment.\textsuperscript{210} In an era of industrialised warfare, however, the weapons themselves were mass-produced, faceless objects. The Zeughaus priority was to collect representative examples of each type of weapon in use to document the technology of the war, the complete armour of each German unit, and samples of the British, French, Belgian, and Russian machine guns, mortars and grenades (Fig. 3.21).\textsuperscript{211} This represents a continuation of the existing technological development scheme and a dramatically different approach to the large travelling exhibitions, which used captured weapons \textit{en masse} to make their point. Like the soldiers with their Front Museums, the Zeughaus also sought out objects that had been made unique not in their creation, but in their destruction—maimed and battle scarred weapons that could demonstrate the force of the German attack.\textsuperscript{212} Some objects also upheld the traditional function of souvenir as modern relics, most dramatically the Fokker D-III that had been
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flown by celebrated fighter ace, Oswald Boelcke, and was displayed in the Zeughaus courtyard from May 1917 (Fig. 3.22).²¹³

![Figure 3.21: Inspection of the first Russian war booty to arrive in Berlin, September 1914 (Postcard image Hahlwein und Gircke, Berlin, 1914, author’s own collection)](image1)

![Figure 3.22: Oswald Boecke’s Focker D-III in the Zeughaus courtyard c. 1917 (Image courtesy San Diego Air and Space Museum, Catalogue No: 01-00079541)](image2)

²¹³ Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 198.
That even in an age where the materiality of war had fundamentally changed and the countless dead were matched only by the anonymity of the weapons of their destruction, captured weapons still held enormous emotional resonance and a sacred aura is aptly demonstrated by one British account. In 1917, reflecting on his time in Berlin, a reporter for the *Warwick Examiner* wrote of his encounter with “A Relic of Mons.” ‘Whenever I had to go to the Kommandatur in Berlin’, he wrote,

I always walked on the other side of the broad street and went into the Zeughaus, the great Arsenal Museum. One spot in it became a place of pilgrimage to me. For in one corner there stood a British field gun captured from our little army of heroes who had “kept the bridge” in the brave days of Mons. Its shield was dented and pierced by shrapnel fire from the rear, the wooden spokes and rim of the right wheel were smashed with shot, and the wood had been ripped from the gunlayer’s seat. Oh! gallant Englishmen who died there, surrounded but undaunted! I always stood there with bared head. German soldiers on leave came and gaped and passed without chivalrous word for this British gun crew that had died at their posts.214

This passage may simply represent the way in which the propaganda function of the Zeughaus, which served not only the maintenance of the home front but also as a show of strength to the outside world, could be cleverly turned around by the use of a little creative pathos. Nonetheless, it also reveals that many of the traditional aspects of the Zeughaus displays, though adapted to suit new circumstances, remained fundamentally unchanged. What did change quite dramatically during the period was the perception of museums more generally. No longer seen solely as sites for the self-representation of the bourgeoisie, the inculcation of the museum into the modern propaganda system of the World War alongside illustrated newspapers, film, photographs, posters, and postcards brought the seeds sown in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century for the popularization of museums based on a broad based pedagogic agenda to fruition.

‘At the end of the war’, writes Jeffrey Verhey, ‘the narratives which had previously upheld the values and norms of Wilhelmine political culture were so threadbare that a revolution no one seemed to desire easily pushed them away.’215 Many of these narratives had held pride of place in the Berlin Zeughaus. After over four years of fighting, unfathomable loss of life, and enormous suffering at home, the war was patently unwinnable and the glorious image of German victory, and the civilian compliance it was designed to foster, could no longer be sustained. Strikes, mutiny, and finally revolution led to the abdication, by default rather than design, of Wilhelm II as German Kaiser and Prussian King on 9 November 1918—the same day that Karl Liebknecht and Philipp Scheidemann declared a socialist and a democratic republic from the city palace and the Reich Chancellery respectively. The revolution lasted until August the following year when the Weimar
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Republic was formally established. How, then, would an institution like the Zeughaus, that for over two hundred years had been so intimately tied to the Hohenzollern house and the structures of power based on the military and the monarchy, position itself after the failure of the former and in the absence of the latter? By necessity, the museum would have to deal with the legacy of war and defeat, because under the conditions of the Treaty of Versailles it had to relinquish many of its most prized pieces.
Chapter 4. From revolution to ruins, 1918/19-1945

The Weimar Republic: possibilities and limitations of change

The Directorate has broken with the previous outlook, with which the Zeughaus was considered a type of cross between a museum and a military-patriotic edification institution. Only purely scientific considerations have been decisive for the reorganisation, which does honour to the heads of the institution and makes the Zeughaus into perhaps the best set out collection of arms and armour.

[Die Direktion hat mit der bisherigen Anschauung gebrochen, mit der das Zeughaus als eine Art Mittelding zwischen einem Museum und einer patriotisch-militärischen Erbauungsanstalt betrachtet wurde. Es sind nur rein wissenschaftliche Gesichtspunkte für die Neuordnung maßgebend gewesen, welche den Leitern der Anstalt alle Ehre und das Zeughaus zur vielleicht bestaufgestellten Waffensammlung machen.]

- G. Adolf Cloß, 1921

From today’s point of view, indeed, the Weimar Republic of 1918-1933 looks more like the last phase of the Imperial period than any kind of genuinely new beginning. Its institutions were, broadly speaking, continuations of those which had existed under Wilhelm II. [...] Even the President, elected in a separate national vote, and armed with extensive legal and administrative powers, above all in time of emergency, was a kind of substitute Kaiser.

- Richard J. Evans on Wolfgang Mommsen, 1997

The history of the Berlin Zeughaus during the Weimar period is marked at either end by continuity and change. On the one hand, the new democratic era saw a decisive break at the administrative level, with the institution taken out of military control in early 1920 and placed under the umbrella of the Prussian Art Collections, the former royal, now state, museum authority under the Ministry for Science, Art and Education. There was also an attempt, as indicated above, to reorganise the Zeughaus collections to suit a new institutional agenda based on an art and cultural-historical model, favouring artistic material and a technical-chronological presentation over contemporary army-historical themes. On the other hand, there was a continuity of museum personnel. While it is often emphasised that Zeughaus Director Moritz Julius Binder (1877-1947), as an art historian and collector, represented a decisive break with the past museum concept, he had, in fact, been Director...
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of the museum since 1912. More significant, perhaps, was the removal of the dual military/civilian leadership model outlined in the previous chapter. At the state level, however, the new civilian administration did not contribute greatly to shaping the museum. Christina Beil’s examination of the archives of the Weimar-era cultural ministry and the State Museums of Berlin reveals little political influence over—or interest in—the museum by these authorities during the period. Indeed, the Zeughaus appears to have remained conceptually separated from the Berlin art collections and to have continued to operate within the mould of a traditional military museum, both in terms of its content and its methods of display.

By the end of the 1920s, with the onset of major economic depression and an intensification of the split between right and left extremism, social and political tendencies towards conservatism, revisionism, and revanchism saw the seeds of the future Nazi state played out in a renewal of interest in the World War and a reversal of the Zeughaus’ apparent renunciation of contemporary military themes. A closer examination of the small World War exhibition opened on the upper floor of the Zeughaus in 1932 reveals several core elements of National Socialist historiography already present in the interpretation and presentation of this subject. Thus, while the Nazi seizure of power in January 1933, its subsequent dismantling of Germany’s first democracy, and its establishment of an oppressive and violent one-party dictatorship must surely mark a caesura in the history of Germany and of the institution itself, the fluidity of the boundaries between the Kaiserreich, the Weimar Republic, and the Third Reich are all too evident in the history of the Zeughaus and its collections.

This chapter examines the major developments at the Zeughaus between 1918/19 and 1945. Focussing on the way in which the collections and exhibitions were re-organised to suit the changing needs of the new democratic state and the subsequent National Socialist regime, it reveals a complex relationship between continuity and change at the institutional level, reflecting deeply entrenched national conservative values within German historiography that spanned either side of the Weimar era but that were radicalised and instrumentalised in new ways when subordinated to an all-pervasive Nazi ideology. Within the framework of National Socialist military propaganda and popular education, the museum adopted new display techniques that reflected modern technologies.

---

4 On Binder’s tenure since 1912: Deutsches Historisches Museum and Merta, ‘Auszeichnungen im Museum,’ p. 25. Binder was a collector of Dutch paintings, predominantly from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, including works by Rubens, Van Dyck, and well-known pupils of Rembrandt. He also held a small collection of sculptures from the late Middle Ages and Renaissance. See Jochen Becker, Die niederländischen Gemälde der Sammlung Moritz Julius Binder im museum kunst palast Düsseldorf: Katalog (Hamburg: ConferencePoint, 2002), pp. 7-12.

5 Beil, Der ausgestellte Krieg, p. 223.

6 Ibid. pp. 224-225.
and innovative interpretive devices alongside an array of ancillary programmes aimed at supporting the Nazi vision for the museum and the dissemination of its message to a mass public.

These new technologies also point to changes in the perception of museums and their potential as tools of mass propaganda as well as the value of individual objects within exhibition practice. The outbreak of the Second World War saw a shift in focus as the Zeughaus resumed its traditional role of mediating triumph on the battlefield through the presentation of war booty, a task that became increasingly complex after German fortunes reversed, as the example of an exhibition opened shortly after the Soviet victory at Stalingrad reveals. Finally, viewed in relation to the broader Berlin museum landscape, the mammoth task of air-raid protection and the eventual dispersal and near-total destruction of the collections reveal not only the ultimate legacy of Nazism on the museum, but sets the foundation for an understanding of the much longer-term ramifications for the remaining historical collections in the divided post-war city.

This discussion also prompts the question to what extent the collections were not only determined by, but themselves determined the possibilities and limitations for the re-conception of historical perspectives. In the Weimar era, particularly, practical considerations created significant impediments to change. While lingering conservatism and the museum’s continued self-perception as ‘guardian of the souvenirs and trophies of the Prussian Army’ may have contributed to the limited success of its conceptual reorganisation, it was also hampered by enormous financial constraints, within which any radical re-consideration of the museum’s scope and function remained impossible. From the outset, the Versailles treaty had a momentous impact on the museum, not only via the physical loss of collection items, but through the symbolic and moral loss of important war trophies. Within the context of an almost universal condemnation of the so-called “Peace Dictate,” public reactions to the losses as well as the museum’s own response, reveal just how contingent any attempted break with the past really was. In absence, much more so than in presence, these objects ensured the World War remained central to the Zeughaus presentations despite any illusion of change.

““Deutschland Ueber Alles” was sung while the flags were set afire”

Weimar democracy was born out of war weariness, military collapse, and revolutionary upheaval. It faced massive economic problems, unemployment, hyperinflation, a sudden, unplanned

7 ['Hüterin der Andenken und Trophäen der preußischen Armee'] Paul Post, Der Weltkrieg im Zeughaus. Amtlicher Führer (Rudolstadt: Hofbuchdruckerei F. Mitzlaff, 1933), p. 3.
8 Beil, Der ausgestellte Krieg, p. 229.
demobilisation, restricted coal and food during continued allied blockades, large territorial losses and refugee problems, the loss of wartime production, industrial unrest, continued revolutionary threats (real and imagined), and the rise of extremism and political violence.\textsuperscript{10} ‘Given the acute difficulties which Germany faced after the First World War,’ writes historian Richard Bessel, ‘it is hardly surprising that the compromises which framed the establishment of the Weimar Republic soon began to unravel. The German people’s search for security and stability was profoundly disappointed.’\textsuperscript{11} One of the greatest actual and symbolic blows to the new democracy was the legacy of the previous regime in the form of the Treaty of Versailles. When the final terms of peace were presented to Scheidemmann’s coalition government in June 1919, it resigned rather than sign a document so universally condemned. That burden fell to a new social democratic government led by Gustav Bauer, which reluctantly accepted the cession of territories to France, Belgium, Poland, Lithuania, and Denmark, the loss of all colonial possessions, occupation and demilitarisation in the Saar region and the Rhineland, severe truncation of the German armed forces, the surrender of its fleet and military equipment, and exorbitant reparations payments, initially unspecified, but calculated in 1921 as 132 billion gold Marks.\textsuperscript{12}

The German population was not prepared for the harshness of these terms and the perceived injustice only compounded the sense of national humiliation.\textsuperscript{13} The Treaty of Versailles thus became an important weapon for revisionist and revanchist politics, spurred on by the ‘twin legends’ of war innocence and the “stab-in-the-back,” by which enemies at home, most notably the “traitors” and “criminals” of the November Revolution, were given responsibility for the outcome of the war, rather than the defeat of the army itself.\textsuperscript{14} These related myths helped to undermine liberal democracy during the Weimar era and proved powerful tools in National Socialist hands. Emblematic of the national humiliation, the surrender of war trophies, not only those taken between 1914 and 1918, but also many dating from 1870/71, became a token of dissatisfaction, with which the Zeughaus was directly connected. Due to the requirements of demilitarisation, the museum not only lost its important trophies, but was also forced to scrap many German weapons and in some cases alter historical pieces to render them unusable.\textsuperscript{15}


\textsuperscript{11} Ibid. p. 243.


\textsuperscript{14} Wolfrum, \textit{Geschichte als Waffe}, p. 31.

\textsuperscript{15} Zeughaus Direktion, \textit{Das Zeughaus: Amtlicher kurzer Gesamtführer} (Berlin: Thomann & Goetsch, 1941), p. 31.
The prelude to the signing of the treaty in June 1919 was marked by panic, disbelief, and defiance. Perhaps the most dramatic demonstration of opposition was the scuttling of the naval fleet anchored at Scapa Flow on 21 June, save its surrender to the British. One day later the government’s proposal to sign the Peace Treaty was accepted, despite its failure to secure a number of desired amendments, including the exclusion of the so-called “war-guilt” clause, which placed sole responsibility for the outbreak of war on Germany. Whether buoyed by the example of Scapa Flow, which the Vossische Zeitung described as the ‘last heroic deed of the German marine,’ or in protest against the resolution, on 23 June an officer accompanied by ten soldiers reportedly stole fifteen French flags designated to be returned from the Zeughaus collections, dousing them in petrol before marching them to Daniel Rauch’s statue of Friedrich the Great where, accompanied by a large crowd singing “Deutschland über alles,” they set the flags alight. As with Scapa Flow, questions were raised as to whether this action was state sanctioned or the independent act of extremists, and contemporary accounts of the event certainly leave a number of questions unanswered. At any rate, the Allies issued a communiqué to the German delegates at Versailles calling the incident an ‘act of gross bad faith’ and warning against further violations of the armistice. Also stolen were at least fifteen medals and decorations from the displays featuring Napoleon’s hat and pistols in the memorial room of Friedrich Wilhelm III. While the flags, dating from 1815 and 1870 (but captured

16 Admiral von Reuter was arrested for the destruction of the fleet. Fifty-two of seventy-two warships (battle ships, cruisers, light cruisers, and destroyers) were sunk in the action. They had been surrendered under Article 23 of the Armistice signed on 11 November 1918 and were under British guard whilst awaiting the outcome of the peace negotiations and the final ratification of the Versailles Treaty. Article 31 of the Armistice had specifically provided for the possibility of the destruction of the fleet, which was violated in the action.

17 'Die letzte Heldentat der deutschen Marine,’ Vossische Zeitung, 23 June 1919 [Morgen-Ausgabe], p. 2. This sentiment was echoed in several contemporary newspaper reports regarding the incident, a large selection of which can be found in “Auswärtiges Amt, Teil: Nachrichten- und Presseabteilung [1910-1945], Waffenstillstand, Versenkung der deutschen Flotte in Scapa Flow. Verbrennung französischer Fahnen,” (BArch: R 901/56232-33; R 901/56243; R 901/56245-46).


19 According to the Vossische Zeitung evening edition on the day of the incident, the flags had been removed from display and placed in the library in readiness for their return under the terms of the treaty. It also states that the Zeughaus was closed during the revolutionary fighting, but that access was granted to the officer and soldiers, who had made a prior appointment with the Zeughaus Secretary, who had also confirmed the visit with the Zeughaus director. The group were given access to the library, whereupon they drenched the flags in petrol and took them down Unter den Linden. The officer and soldiers were never identified, though several reports refer to an officer named “Simon.” Given that Napoleon’s medals were supposedly also stolen during the same incident (below), a fact not mentioned in the article, it begs the question as to how the soldiers gained access to the upper floor (the library was in the lower west wing) to retrieve the medals, which would have been displayed in the upper west wing. As the medals were not subject to the terms of the treaty, there is no logical explanation for why they would have been in the library.

20 Communiqué reprinted in 'Allied Note to Germany. Reparation to be Exact,' The Western Daily Press Bristol, 26 June 1919, p. 8.
During ‘the last wars’), we destroyed to deny their surrender to the French, the medals had never been subject to seizure under the terms of the treaty.

Despite attempts to avoid or delay the surrender of trophies, the Zeughaus was eventually forced to relinquish its weapons taken from Belgium and France during the World War as well as its trophies of 1870/71. Particularly in the central courtyard, home of the heavy artillery captured in the Franco-Prussian War, the loss was significant. The museum’s solution was not to re-arrange its existing collections to fill the gaps left by the missing trophies, but rather to highlight their absence in a powerful anti-display technique. Around the perimeter of the courtyard as well as on the memorial in the Kastanienwäldchen, the plinths upon which the trophies had stood were left empty. Text panels and, in some cases, photographs of the missing objects were placed above the plinths, testifying to the loss. In this way, as Christine Beil points out, the Zeughaus ‘consciously placed absence and destruction on display.’ The technique was an unmistakable reminder of the injustice of Versailles, and its potential to underscore revisionist politics and, eventually, extreme right-wing revanchism and expansionism is evident in the retention of the empty plinths well into the National Socialist era. In 1941, long after the museum had redressed any paucity of objects through its extensive acquisition policy (below), and in the same year that then Zeughaus Director Rear Admiral Lorey published a list of over 2,000 items “recovered” from Paris museums, the technique was still in effect. Although the courtyard was now filled with row upon row of field guns, mine throwers, anti-aircraft guns (Flak), anti-tank guns, and tanks the empty plinths remained valuable (Fig. 4.1). As per the Zeughaus direction: ‘Even more urgent testimonials of the harsh Peace Dictate are the

---

21 ‘Französische Fahnen in Berlin verbrannt,’ p. 4.  
23 The process had actually begun well prior to June, with the War Ministry instructed to supply lists of artworks and cultural property taken from museums and private owners in Belgium and France as early as December 1918, with an ultimatum for the return of the objects by 19 January 1919. The Zeughaus delayed the return, but was eventually forced to return almost five hundred guns from the nineteenth century and one standard from the Seven Years War. The Versailles demands concentrated on the French booty, which was returned in allotments up until 1923 and counted around 2,500 objects from large bronze cannons to the flags and fortress keys that had been so integral to the displays opened in the lower west wing in 1883 (chapter 3). See Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, pp. 203-204; Zwach, Deutsche und Englische Militärmuseen im 20. Jahrhundert, pp. 128-129.  
24 Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 212; Beil, Der ausgestellte Krieg, p. 229. The original trophies on the Kastanienwäldchen memorial had been replaced with cannons won in 1870/71.  
25 [‘...gestellte Abwesenheit und Zerstörung bewusst zur Schau.’] Beil, Der ausgestellte Krieg, p. 229.  
26 Hermann Lorey, Liste der 1940 aus Frankreich zurückgeführten militärischen Gegenstände (Berlin1941).  
27 Reporting on major changes to the Zeughaus exhibitions in 1935/36, Zeughaus Director Admiral Lorey announced that the many empty plinths would remain; they reminded the visitor of the “shame treaty” (Schandvertrag) of Versailles. ’Berliner Museen: Was gibt es Neues im Zeughaus?,’ Uniformen-Markt, 2, no. 11, 1 November 1935, p. 8.
orphaned plinths around the courtyard. The brass plates instruct that here were French guns captured on the battlefield of the war 1870/71, whose surrender was demanded at Versailles.\[^{28}\]

Figure 4.1: The Zeughaus courtyard featuring heavy artillery; the empty pedestals are clearly visible around the perimeter of the space (Postcard image unattributed, c. 1936, collection Thomas Weißbrich)

The continuation of this technique into the Second World War demonstrates the enduring political value of Versailles. During the Weimar period, the courtyard display helped ensure that the World War remained, both literally and symbolically, central to the Zeughaus presentation.\[^{29}\] In Nazi hands these ideas were further radicalised and tailored to suit the party’s racist ideology. The stab-in-the-back was fused with anti-Semitism as terms like “November traitors” were joined by “Jewish Republic” and “Jewish-Bolshevik conspiracy.”\[^{30}\] The exploitation of Versailles not only served to undermine liberal democracy in the volatile period following the onset of economic depression in 1929; after 1933 it also helped legitimise the Hitler dictatorship by comparison with the perceived weakness of the Weimar state that had allowed the enslavement of Germany.\[^{31}\]

---


\[^{29}\] Beil, *Der ausgestellte Krieg*, p. 229.

\[^{30}\] Evans, *The coming of the Third Reich*, p. 152.

of the signing of the treaty in 1933 the capital was bedecked with swastikas, Imperial, and Prussian flags in a celebration styled by the new leadership as a “national resurgence.”\textsuperscript{32} In a speech at the Kroll Opera, Nazi ideologue Alfred Rosenberg reportedly linked Versailles directly to the party’s anti-Semitic programme, stating: ‘We deny the right of anyone to accuse us of discriminating against the Jews as long as the degradation of the German nation by the discord-treaty of Versailles is tolerated, let alone defended.’\textsuperscript{33} As Nazi Germany prepared for and embarked upon the Second World War, Versailles remained instrumental in the promotion of a war to avenge past wrongs. If Berliners forgot the lessons of Versailles, they need only walk past the Zeughaus to be reminded: ‘In the small chestnut grove in front of the Zeughaus the mutilated memorial, that bore the cannon Valérie, captured at Mont Valérian in 1871, reminds every passerby of the dictate of Versailles.’\textsuperscript{34}

\textit{The limits of change: reorganising the collections, 1921}

Not only physical losses, but also severe financial constraints restricted the possibilities for the re-interpretation of the Zeughaus collection after 1918/19. In 1924 the museum reported only fifteen new acquisitions, where those between 1900 and 1914 had averaged over 1,000 and quickly climbed again after 1933 to a peak of 2,972 in 1940.\textsuperscript{35} During the Imperial era the Hohenzollern family and, above all, the Kaiser, had acted as important patrons. In their absence, a vital source vanished.\textsuperscript{36} Criticism of the Zeughaus administration, particularly Director Binder, from both the left (for its continuation of Prussian militarist and monarchist traditions) and the right (for its weakness in the face of Versailles and its supposed betrayal of those very traditions), may have also contributed to a loss of donations from the broader sections of society, a situation compounded by depression and hyperinflation.\textsuperscript{37}

Nevertheless, the Zeughaus administration did attempt to reorganise its collections in order to meet the requirements of an institution whose priorities had shifted away from military

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{34} ‘Im Kastanienwäldchen vor dem Zeughaus mahnt das verstümmelte Denkmal, das die 1871 auf dem Mont Valérien eroberte Kanone Valérie trug, jeden Vorübergehenden an das Diktat von Versailles.’ Zeughaus Direktion, \textit{Das Zeughaus: Die Ruhmeshalle [1941]}, p. 6. The original cannon brought to Berlin in 1815 had been replaced by the enormous “Valérie” following 1871.
\textsuperscript{35} Müller, \textit{Vom Arsenal zum Museum}, p. 213. The figure for 1940 also represents the vast plunder of material from occupied territories, particularly France, but the pre-war figured provided by Müller also reflect a marked increase in acquisitions.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.
edification and which, as a civic institution within a parliamentary democracy, no longer directly served the Imperial house. Balancing the technical and cultural-historical requirements with the need for patriotic memorialisation and military instruction had always been delicate. Now museum staff, most notably Binder, curator Paul Post, and weapons expert Fritz Rohde, sought to re-conceptualise the existing collections according to scholarly principles, critically re-appraising the material in order to break with 'so many cherished traditions'.

G. Adolph Cloß reviewed the new installation for the Zeitschrift für historische Waffen- und Kostümkunde in July 1921, confirming the arrangement met the criteria set out by the scholarly field of Waffenkunde and its chief German-language proponent, Wendelin Böheim (chapter 3). Above all, this approach necessitated the use of a 'chronological-synchronic' arrangement, something that is evident in the structure outlined in an extensive catalogue produced for the first new exhibitions by Paul Post (Fig. 4.2). Dealing with the period from the early Christian era and Middle Ages to the eighteenth century, this catalogue accounts for a small proportion of the total display area (just twelve of the 42 bays on the upper floor), but one that was central to the idea of re-structuring the exhibits and the ideological break a new installation was intended to represent.

![Figure 4.2: Floor plan for the upper floor of the Zeughaus showing the reorganised collections in bays 1-12 (Paul Post, Das Zeughaus. Die Waffensammlung 1. Teil Amtlicher Führer, Julius Bard Verlag, Berlin, 1929)](image)

---

38 ['...so vielen liebgewordenen Traditionen'] Cloß, 'Die Neuaufstellung der Sammlungen des Zeughauses in Berlin,' p. 140.
39 Ibid.
40 A promised second catalogue detailing the weapons and uniform collections from the establishment of standing armies up to the first decade of the nineteenth century (bays 13 to 37), the oriental collections (bays 38 to 42), and the gun and model collections (the whole lower floor), never eventuated. A short description of the contents of the proposed second volume of the Zeughaus catalogue is provided in the introduction to the first part: Paul Post, Das Zeughaus. Die Waffensammlung 1. Teil Amtlicher Führer (Berlin: Julius Bard Verlag G.m.b.H., 1929), pp. 5-6.
The structure of the re-organised displays, beginning in the north-east corner of the upper floor, directly adjacent the Ruhmeshalle, reflected a periodization based on cultural eras established by the field of Waffenkunde, the catalogue for which was fashioned as a handbook for the weapons enthusiast.41 ‘The introduction can rightfully claim that the catalogue is also a handbook of Waffenkunde,’ wrote Günther Rudolph of Post’s catalogue in 1930, ‘I would add: not only for the inquisitive layman who wants a glimpse into a new world, but also for scholars and connoisseurs’.42 He went on to explain how this translated into the physical arrangement of the collections: ‘In the chronological sequence of the bays, each constitutes a cross section of the armament of its particular period, is therefore at the same time an overall impression of its culture.’43

Within each period, specific pieces were highlighted both for their uniqueness and artistic value and as typical examples of the development of particular classes of weapon. Unlike the scholarly component of the first catalogue produced in 1883, which provided technical-historical essays for a centurial and dynastic periodization followed by lists of the most significant objects, Post’s description was not only structured according to the overarching chronological-technical categories, but was very much anchored in a description of the displays and objects; he used the objects themselves (both the typical and the unique) to demonstrate the technical, artistic and cultural developments for each period. This, in turn, reflects the concept for the new arrangement, because it was the precise placement and grouping of objects to illustrate the detailed scholarly work that separated this organisation from those that had preceded it.

This reflected not only the influence of Böheim, but also the changed treatment of historical weapons as objects of research and as museum objects. Böheim and his contemporaries, argued Rudolph, had to campaign against the ‘emotive appraisal of weapons’ and the ‘hypertrophy of

---

41 Ibid., p. 6. The term "Handbook of Waffenkunde" is also used on the front plate of the catalogue itself.
43 [‘In der chronologischen Folge der Joche bildet jedes von ihnen einen Querschnitt durch die Bewaffnung der ihm zukommenden Zeit, ist also zugleich der Gesamteindruck deren Kultur.’] ibid., p. 113. The cultural periods represented were: Middle Ages (Bays 1 and 2); From the Gothic to the Renaissance (Bay 3); The era of Maximilian Armour from 1500-1520 (Bay 4); Historical armour and weapons of the High Renaissance in the sixteenth century (Bay 5); Late sixteenth century (Bay 6); Hunting and luxury firearms with fuses and wheel locks of the sixteenth to seventeenth centuries (Bay 8); Cross bows, weapons and equipment for hunting, fencing and horsemanship from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century (Bay 10); Thirty Years War (Bay 11); and Hunting and luxury weapons with spring and battery locks during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Bay 12). Post, Die Waffensammlung [1929], pp. 148-150.
anecdotal content’ that had been introduced in the Age of Romanticism.44 'The best remedy for this', he wrote,

was confinement to the weapon as an object, its scientifically exact individual treatment with respect to the evolution of its form and its master craftsmen, by which the description of the respective cultural and historical constellation must be limited as much as possible, since the task was precisely to free it from the slag left behind by a fanciful enthusiast approach.

[Das beste Mittel dafür, war die Beschränkung auf die Waffe als Objekt, ihre wissenschaftliche exakte Einzelbehandlung inbezug [sic.] auf ihre Formentwicklung und ihre Meister, wobei die Bezeichnung zu der jeweiligen kulturgeschichtlichen Konstellation nach Möglichkeit zurückgedrängt werden mußten, da gerade sie von den Schlacken, die eine phantasiereiche Liebhabereinstellung hinterlassen, zu befreien waren.]45

This, he contended, amounted to a kind of “cleansing” of the unscientific handling of weapons,46 and indeed the changes at the Zeughaus did reflect an attempt to re-claim the collections from their ideological bounds. A more rigorous scientific approach is evident in the removal of decorative arrangements perceived to be without scholarly value,47 the identification and removal of fakes, the re-mounting of armour as it would have sat on the body rather than by purely aesthetic criteria,48 and an increase in scholarly publications, particularly object research.49 These efforts served to ameliorate the broader patriotic agenda of the museum. 'This extensive and, arguably, unique weapons display', wrote Paul Post, 'lends the Zeughaus, alongside the precious treasure of historical souvenirs, its special significance. Here is a place of serious instruction and noble enjoyment of art,

45 Ibid.
46 Ibid.
48 Cloß refers to the removal of fakes and the re-mounting of the suits of armour according to the body of the wearer rather than artificially drawn long for aesthetic reasons, as, he states, was common in the past. He criticised the lack of uniformity for the display of barding, however, which should either all be mounted on model horses, or all on frames, as Böheim had demanded. In addition, all valuable objects were now displayed in glass cabinets. This, felt Cloß, had not detracted from the total effect of the displays, as had been feared. Cloß, 'Die Neuauflistung der Sammlungen des Zeughauses in Berlin,' p. 140.
49 In particular, the publication Zeitschrift für historische Waffen- und Kostümkunde became an important vehicle through which museum staff could exchange research into collection objects with other members in the field. It was the journal of the Society for historical Weapon and Costume Studies (Gesellschaft für Historische Waffen- und Kostümkunde), which also met regularly at the Zeughaus and of which both Paul Post and Herr Rohde were members. The results of research as well as occasional exhibition information and notification of changes to exhibition design and layout were reported at society’s meetings. In addition, important new acquisitions were explored in some depth and reported in Berliner Museen. See for example: Gesellschaft für Historische Waffen- und Kostümkunde, 'Vereinsnachrichten. Sitzungen der Berliner Mitglieder im Zeughaus,' Zeitschrift für Historische Waffen- und Kostümkunde; Neue Folge 1, no. 10, 1923, pp. 75-79; Gesellschaft für Historische Waffen- und Kostümkunde, 'Sitzungsberichte,' Zeitschrift für Historische Waffen- und Kostümkunde; Neue Folge 2, no. 11, 1926, pp. 92-96; Gesellschaft für Historische Waffen- und Kostümkunde, 'Sitzungsberichte,' Zeitschrift für Historische Waffen- und Kostümkunde; Neue Folge 4, no. 4, 1932, pp. 90-95; Paul Post, 'Der Neuerworbene Maximilianharnisch im Zeughaus,' Berliner Museen, 42, no. 3/4, 1921, pp. 42-44; Paul Post, 'Ein Mittelalterliches Wehrgehänge im Zeughaus,' Berliner Museen, 45, no. 2, 1924, pp. 35-39; Moritz Julius Binder, 'Eine Neuwerbung des Zeughauses,' Berliner Museen, 50, no. 4, 1929, pp. 75-61; Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, 'Zeughauszugänge der Letzten Zeit,' Berliner Museen, 53, no. 2, 1932, p. 53.

180.
worthy of the beauty of the building that contains it." As a symbolic moderation of the programme of glory enacted there, the *Ruhmeshalle* was also renamed the "Memorial Hall" (*Gedächtnishalle*).

There were, however, serious limits to the scope of change. While the meagre acquisitions budget was supplemented by strategic exchanges with other institutions, the collections themselves curtailed any attempt at a total break. The changes made accounted for less than fifteen per cent of the total exhibition floor space, less still if the courtyard is taken into account. While the focus had shifted away from contemporary themes, and while the remaining displays progressed towards, but did not include, the World War, as Beil suggests, this may have been less a conscious avoidance of the topic than an unavoidable consequence to the Versailles losses.

Her examination of the enormous diversity of new exhibition forms and techniques during the period, the development of innovative approaches drawing upon experimental new art forms, the use of montage, jarring juxtapositions and alienation techniques inspired by Expressionism and Dadaism, the influence of modern advertising and graphics, shifting relationships between objects, artworks, images, and texts, and the incorporation of modern technologies such as electrification, also reveals just how outmoded the "new" Zeughaus displays actually were. With more and more museums adopting a popular educational approach, the Zeughaus offered little in comparison to the advances in didactic presentation modes elsewhere. Because of its out-dated presentation style and an atmosphere that appeared dark, musty, and dusty, Beil argues, the attempt to re-frame the collections failed; memory of Prussian glory remained at the fore.

In this way the Zeughaus continued to present a positive, pro-authoritarian, perhaps even nostalgic, view of Prussian history and its culmination in the *Kaiserreich*, something that was also reflected in the historical sciences more generally. Given the break of 1918/19, Roger Chickering argues, the conservative historiography now represented a subversive element not present earlier because 'the old regime invited invidious comparisons to the new Weimar Republic, which began in

---


51 Even in the period of the worst economic depression this technique could be used to supplement purchases. In an edition *Berliner Museen* in 1932, for example, the Zeughaus reported, that 'Despite dwindling procurement funds, the department [referring to the Zeughaus as a department of the State Museums] has also recently succeeded, by way of exchange and transfers, in enriching the collection with some notable pieces.' [Trotz versiegender Ankaufsmittel gelang es der Abteilung auch in jüngster Zeit, auf dem Tauschwege und durch Überweisungen die Sammlung um einige beachtliche Stücke zu bereichern.] Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, 'Zeughauzugänge der Letzten Zeit,' p. 28; *On acquisition techniques during the Weimar era see also* Müller, *Vom Arsenal zum Museum*, pp. 209-210.

52 Beil, *Der ausgestellte Krieg*, pp. 223-224.


the throes of its own early history to display much different attitudes.\textsuperscript{56} Anti-democratic values were latent within the historical profession, and a Prusso-German historiography could serve to undermine the fledgling republic. With the onset of depression in 1929, social and political tendencies moved quickly to the right. Where many private World War museums had closed along with those sections of history and \textit{Heimat} museums in the immediate aftermath of defeat, they now flourished again in a climate of militarism and revisionist politics.\textsuperscript{57} In the Zeughaus the World War was revived in a new exhibition at the culmination of the historical sequence on the upper floor, an aviation hall in the foyer, and the entire central courtyard. While this was a small endeavour compared with the later National Socialist exhibitions, the museum’s treatment of the topic in the final days of the Weimar era is a powerful reminder that the seeds of National Socialist historiography had already been sown before January 1933.

\textit{Invincible frontline spirit: WWI in the museum, 1932}

\begin{quote}
At last the structure of the Zeughaus building and the fixed framework of its collections with their evolutionary focus dictate the integration and arrangement of the World War weapons.

[Endlich schreibt die Baulichkeit des Zeughauses und der festliegende Rahmen seiner entwicklungs geschichtlich aufgestellten Sammlungen die Eingliederung und Anordnung der Weltkriegswaffen [...] vor.]
\end{quote}

- Paul Post, Zeughaus Guide, 1933\textsuperscript{58}

As the example of the empty plinths shows, the presentation of the First World War never truly left the Zeughaus after 1918/19. Neither did the acquisition of WWI material cease altogether. In 1920, for example, the Zeughaus received the fighter plane of Manfred von Richthofen, more famously known as the Red Baron, which it displayed along with Boelcke’s Fokker D-III from 1927.\textsuperscript{59} In the new World War exhibition opened in 1932,\textsuperscript{60} the aeroplanes formed part of an aviation hall in the south foyer dedicated to the heroes of aerial warfare and the pride of the Germany’s “feared” air forces (Fig. 4.3).\textsuperscript{61} The planes were joined by aircraft and anti-aircraft guns, cannons, and aerial bombs, and visitors were encouraged to compare the great advances in German aircraft technology

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid. p. 2.


\textsuperscript{58} Post, \textit{Der Weltkrieg im Zeughaus} [1933], p. 3.

\textsuperscript{59} The plane, a Fokker Type DR I 127/17 (built 1917), was donated to the Zeughaus by the Flugzeugmeisterei (an aircraft maintenance facility at Adlershof) following its closure under the terms of the Treaty of Versailles in 1920. It was not placed on display until 1927 because of missing wheels, which were finally replaced with components from another model sourced from Fokker in Holland. Müller, \textit{Vom Arsenal zum Museum}, p. 212.

\textsuperscript{60} At the meeting of the Society for Historical Weapon and Costume Studies in June 1932 Paul Post showed members around the “newly arranged” compartments. There is some evidence that there may have been World War displays in the museum by the end of 1931 as indicated by a letter from an unnamed visitor mentioning World War uniforms and machine guns dated 17 November 1931. Correspondence dated 17.11.1931, (DHM-HA: Rep Z 804, unpaginated); Gesellschaft für Historische Waffen- und Kostümkunde, ‘Sitzungsberichte,’ p. 93.

\textsuperscript{61} Post, \textit{Der Weltkrieg im Zeughaus} [1933], p. 4.
with their humble pre-war beginnings, as displayed in the model collection in the west wing.\textsuperscript{62} The exhibition continued in the courtyard with the presentation of German heavy artillery and mine launchers, providing 'an impressive picture of the achievements of German weapons technology, surpassing all previous dimensions during the World War.'\textsuperscript{63} The final section on the upper floor completed the developmental sequence there with weapons and uniforms divided across three bays titled “Uniforms of the World War,” “War Souvenir Room,” and “Machine Guns of the World War.”

While the Zeughaus administration expressed regret at the separation of the World War exhibition across both floors of the museum, owing to space considerations as well as the still relatively small number of available objects, the arrangement was perceived to have one particular advantage. By incorporating the World War into the existing developmental sequence, the exhibits could serve an assertion of German technical superiority. Thanks to its extensive and comprehensive collections, the Zeughaus, it was felt, offered the best possible measure for the absolute supremacy of Germany’s weapons-technical achievement during the war.\textsuperscript{64}

\textbf{Figure 4.3:} Floor plan featuring shaded areas showing the World War displays opened in 1932 (Paul Post, \textit{Der Weltkrieg im Zeughaus. Amtlicher Führer}, Hofbuchdruckerei, Rudolstadt, 1933)

This kind of revisionism was closely linked to the idea that the German army had left the battlefield undefeated, and thus also dovetailed with the stab-in-the-back mythology and the condemnation of Versailles—a theme carried throughout the new exhibition. In particular, the rejection of war guilt was central to the exhibition, which reiterated long-standing geopolitical

\begin{footnotes}
\item[62] Ibid.
\item[63] ‘...ein eindruckvolles Bild von den alles bisherige Maß überbietenden Kraftleistungen deutscher Waffentechnik im Weltkrieg.’ ibid. p. 6.
\item[64] Ibid. p. 4.
\end{footnotes}
arguments, casting Germany in the defensive role. The World War was thus seen not as a defeat, but as a victory. Germany, it was claimed, had demonstrated superior leadership and ingenious weapons technology, but it was, above all, Germany's "invincible frontline spirit" that had enabled the German people ultimately and alone to prevent a "world of enemies" from penetrating the borders of the homeland.\(^{65}\) It was to the memory of this frontline spirit, through objects as evidence of personal sacrifice, heroism, and courage among officer and common soldier alike, that the exhibition was dedicated.\(^{66}\)

The strategy utilised to demonstrate these ideas was consistent throughout the upper floor bays: to present the weapons and uniforms of Germany and her allies in contrast with those of her enemies. Progressing through the centre of the displays, the visitor was presented with German, Austrian, Turkish and Bulgarian weapons and uniforms on the right and those of the allied forces on the left. This display technique made clear one of the key aims of the exhibition—to show the unfair power relations between Germany and her opponents. As Hans Schleier notes in his discussion of National Socialist historiography, many political-historical accounts both before and after 1933 'neatly divided the world into friends and enemies of the German people'.\(^{67}\) The uniform bay featured several rows of glass cases with the uniforms of the various ranks and units of each side, including German colonial troops, a display of the different forms of the spiked helmet, the steel helmet, and the field cap, and, singled out as "particularly noteworthy," a steel helmet wounded by shrapnel.\(^{68}\) The final bay used the same technique with machine guns. It was in the souvenir room, though, that the enactment of the power relations was most demonstratively played out. Here, the world was quite literally divided in two, with uniformed mannequins lined up in glass cases facing one another under the slogan "four against eight" (Fig. 4.4). The disparity between the forces was visually resonant, reinforced by the placement of the mannequins according to the entry of their respective countries into the war. Thus, against Russia, Serbia, France, Belgium, England, Italy, Rumania, and, finally, the United States, Germany was reassured by the knowledge, as articulated by a number of German intellectuals in the aftermath of defeat, 'that only the mobilized military might

\(^{65}\) Ibid.  
\(^{66}\) Ibid.  
\(^{68}\) Post, *Der Weltkrieg im Zeughaus [1933]*, pp. 9-10. Quote, p. 10.
of virtually the whole world had been able to stop her." As the exhibition guidebook unequivocally proclaimed: 'What can illuminate the balance of power more forcefully than this comparison!'

The inclusion of a World War exhibition during the Weimar era is significant for a number of reasons. As mentioned above, it points to renewed interest in the incorporation of contemporary themes during the final years before the Nazi seizure of power. This development, which Eva Zwach has identified in a proliferation of new exhibitions, planned new museums, and a renewed interest in collecting World War objects during the period is, she states, ‘also to be regarded as a sign of general societal needs and not solely ascribed to the later state indoctrination or party directed museum policy.’ This assertion is supported by the Zeughaus’ acquisition report for the second quarter of 1932. ‘Bearing in mind the great popularity of the World War section,’ it stated, ‘the expansion of this section will also be particularly taken into account.’

![Figure 4.4: Middle bay of the World War exhibition opened in 1932, photo 1934 (DHM Bildarchiv, Inv.-Nr.: BA100782)](image)
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70 ['Was kann schlagartiger das Kräfteverhältnis beleuchten als dieser Vergleich!'] Post, Der Weltkrieg im Zeughaus [1933], p. 9.
71 ['...zusätzlich als ein Zeichen für allgemeine gesellschaftliche Bedürfnisse zu werten und nicht allein auf die spätere staatliche Indoktrination oder partellich gelenkte Museumspolitik zurückzuführen.'] Zwach, Deutsche und Englische Militärmuseen im 20. Jahrhundert, p. 118.
The exhibition also demonstrated a tentative break with the prevailing Zeughaus display principles. While still reflecting a traditional presentation style, and though connected with the broader collection sequence in a demonstrative way, the new displays utilised the placement of objects and the design of the space in a much more consciously didactic way. There was also a shift in the type of object displayed, with an even greater emphasis on the common soldier, pointing to a more popular educational role for the museum; one that would be fully realised with the Zeughaus’ incorporation into Nazi military propaganda.

Finally, several of the assertions made in the exhibition—German technical supremacy, the defensive nature of the war with its implications for Germany’s war innocence and the injustice of Versailles, and the denial of German defeat—foreshadowed the treatment of the subject under National Socialism. This was also true of the glorification of heroic sacrifice, the promotion of the concept of the enemy bent on German destruction (neither of which were new to the Zeughaus), and the mythologisation of a “frontline spirit,” all of which played into the future National Socialist historiography.

After 1933: Nazi cultural policy and administrative change at the Zeughaus

The German term “Machtergreifung,” or “seizure of power,” refers to much more than the appointment of Adolf Hitler, leader of the National Socialist Workers’ Party (NSDAP), as Reich Chancellor on 31 January 1933. Although the strongest party at the time, with over a third of the seats in parliament, the Nazi Party did not hold the required majority to form a government. Hitler’s appointment, made possible through the support of President Hindenburg, was, however, fully within the legal bounds of the Weimar constitution. The “seizure of power,” on the other hand, describes the broader process by which the Nazi Party rendered that constitution redundant by enacting emergency laws grossly limiting civil liberties and facilitating the suppression and persecution of opponents, using intimidation and brutality to gain electoral advantage, taking control of state police forces and ceding power from state and municipal authorities, divesting legislative power from the Reichstag and placing it solely in the hands of Hitler and his cabinet, consolidating power in public and private institutions and replacing existing political organisations like trade unions and women’s associations with its own, establishing new ministries directly under NSDAP control, ousting undesirable elements (Jews and the politically unreliable) from the civil
service, abolishing all other political parties, and, finally, purging its own ranks in a three-day long, posthumously legalised, murder spree known as the “night of the long knives.”

With these measures, the Nazi party established, within a very short period, a centralised one-party dictatorship built on violence, oppression, and the supreme law of the will of the Führer. While the state remained, as Mary Fulbrook has shown, ‘a complex system, riddled with rivalries among competing centres of power and influence’, and reliant on the support of key elites such as the army and industry, between 1933 and 1934 the process of systematic “coordination” (Gleichschaltung) of political and social structures according to the National Socialist mould effectively destroyed Germany’s federated system and allowed for widespread nazification of existing structures and the creation of parallel sets of organisations directly under Nazi control. With President Hindenburg’s death on 2 August 1934 and the passing of the “Law regarding the Head of State” the presidency was abolished and Hitler assumed the role of both Leader and Reich Chancellor, simultaneously becoming supreme commander of the armed forces.

The nazification process was carried out with varying degrees of success across the whole political, economic, and social field, so that very few aspects of life were free from ideological influence or regulation. But, as Fulbrook writes, the ‘Nazis did not only want to control the German people: they wanted to transform them into a cohesive, racially pure ‘national community’ (Volksgemeinschaft), to the exclusion of those ‘deemed inferior, ‘pollutants’ of the social body: Jews, gypsies, homosexuals, the hereditarily diseased, and ‘asocial’ people.’ To this end, and to the ultimate end of building a nation ‘fit and ready for war’, culture, conceived most broadly—from

73 Legislative control was abolished in the Ermächtigungsgesetz (Enabling Act), which came into effect on 24 March 1933. All autonomous women’s organisations were abolished and its members co-opted into Nazi operated organisations. The Federation of German Women’s Associations (BDF) for instance was, according to feminist historian Regula Venske ‘swallowed up in 1933 without discernable resistance’. The complex reasons for the acquiescence of the German women’s movement to Nazism despite its regressive views of the role of women, its exclusion of women from all positions of power, its anti-feminist image, and its negative equivalence of the women’s movement, pacifism, and a perceived international Jewish conspiracy, are explored in Comrades and sisters, Chapter 6, “Feminism and Fascism”, pp. 157-195. Regula Venske quoted p. 173. Independent youth organisations were also forced to merge with the Hitler Youth (HJ) and its subsidiary for girls, the League of German Girls (BdM) soon after January 1933.

74 Fulbrook, A History of Germany 1918-2008, p. 56.

75 This process did, in fact, continue beyond 1934, with further measures at tightening influence and control throughout the regime, but during the first two years of the National Socialist era basic groundwork was laid for the nazification of all aspects of life. Mary Fulbrook describes the emergence of a ‘dual state’ thus: ‘While the Nazis clearly took over the government of Germany, they never entirely took over the state: the tendency was rather to create new parallel party agencies, with spheres of competence and jurisdiction overlapping or competing with those of the existing administration, and armed with plenipotentiary powers directly dependent on the Führer’s will.’ ibid. p. 62. The term Gleichschaltung itself was one of many National Socialist neologisms. See Michael Townson, Mother-tongue and fatherland: language and politics in German (Manchester; New York; New York: Manchester University Press; Distributed in the USA and Canada by St. Martin’s Press, 1992), pp. 138-140.

76 Gesetz über das Staatsoberhaupt des Deutschen Reichs.


“high culture” offerings such as art, theatre, music and literature, to mass entertainment, sport, film, radio, and the press, to the transformation of every day experience through street names, language, advertising, packaging, and organised leisure—became a vital tool for both overt ideological indoctrination and a kind of banal distraction that helped reconcile a broad spectrum of society with the aims and operation of the regime.\(^{79}\) Governing much of this activity, the Ministry of Popular Enlightenment and Propaganda (RMVP) was established under the leadership of Joseph Goebbels in March 1933.\(^{80}\) This was followed by the Reich Film Chamber in July, and the Reich Culture Chamber (RKK) in September, a corporate body of which Goebbels was President, which incorporated the existing film branch along with six new chambers for literature, music, fine arts, theatre, radio, and the press.\(^{81}\) As the professional organisation for each of these cultural spheres, those working in any capacity in the arts and media became subject to its control.\(^{82}\) It was therefore a powerful instrument of both exclusion and conformity.

Richard J. Evans has noted that: ‘Of all modern regimes that of the Third Reich defined itself most clearly by its arts and mass culture.’\(^{83}\) Goebbels was not alone in his attempt to control cultural policy in Nazi Germany. The party’s self-styled “philosopher,” Alfred Rosenberg, was Goebbels’ most prominent rival in the struggle for cultural influence, which he asserted through his competing organisations, the Combat League for German Culture (KfdK), and the National Socialist Cultural Community (NS-KG), as well as in his position as editor-in-chief and publisher of the Party’s daily paper, the Völkischer Beobachter (People’s Observer), and his various functions with regard to culture and surveillance under the elaborate title of “Führer’s delegate for the supervision of the entire spiritual, intellectual and world-philosophical schooling and education of the party and all co-

\(^{79}\) On the regulation of language, which included the creation of new terminology, the redefinition of existing words, particularly the reinterpretation of formerly negative words associated with violence or brutality as positive, the infusion of militarism and concepts of sport and struggle into every day language, and the “resurrection” of old Germanic terms, see Townson, *Mother-tongue and fatherland*, Ch. 4. The usefulness of cultural policy for the “distraction” of the masses was noted by one Social Democratic observer inside Nazi Germany in relation to the Strength through Joy (*Kraft durch Freude*) leisure programmes which, he stated, amounted to: ‘Atomization and the loss of individuality, occupational therapy and surveillance of the people [...] At the very least, Strength through joy distracts people, contributes to the befogging of their brains, and has a propagandistic effect on behalf of the regime.’ Quoted in Evans, *The Third Reich in power*, p. 473.

\(^{80}\) *Reichsministerium für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda*.

\(^{81}\) The Reich Chamber of Culture Law (*Reichskulturkammergesetz*) establishing the new body came into effect on 22 September 1933, with a supplementary law extending powers dated 15 May 1934; *Reichskulturkammergesetz vom 22. September 1933; Deutsches Reichsgesetzblatt Teil I 1867-1945*, 1933.

\(^{82}\) Membership was required for professionals in a broad range of arts related fields. By way of example of the level of influence the Reich Culture Chamber wielded, Richard J. Evans provides membership figures for 1937 for the Reich Chamber of Visual Arts (35,000 members), Music (95, 600 members), and Theatre (41,000 members). Elsewhere he illustrates its scope with the example of the Reich Chamber of Literature, whose membership was compulsory ‘not only for all writers, poets, screenwriters, dramatists, critics, and translators, but also for publishing houses, booksellers first- and second-hand, lending libraries and anything connected with the book trade, including scientific, academic, and technical publications.’ Evans, *The Third Reich in power*, p. 158.

\(^{83}\) Ibid.
ordinated associations.”84 These "co-ordinated" associations included the Nazi leisure organisation, Strength through Joy (Kraft durch Freude; KdF), through which Robert Ley, head of the German Labour Front (DAF), the organisation that replaced the shattered union system mid-1933, also wielded cultural influence.

Within this system museums and exhibitions became an important resource for the dissemination of the Nazi Party's cultural, political, economic, and racial agenda. 'If exhibitions had always been showplaces of a constructed reality,' writes Hans-Ulrich Thamer, 'they now offered the new regime the chance to fully deploy both the institutional possibilities as well as the technical exhibition resources for this purpose.'85 Large-scale propaganda exhibitions and industrial shows operated largely outside the scope of the museum system, though there was some degree of collaboration.86 They were initiated by a wide range of interests, not just the Propaganda Ministry, the various arms of the RKK, the Rosenberg agencies, and the DAF, but also by industrial bodies, exhibition and trade organisations, NSDAP departments such as the Office of Racial Policy and the SS Race and Settlement Main Office, and regional party leadership.87 Even exhibitions with seemingly innocuous subject matter such as The Camera (1933-34), The Street (1934), The Greater Berlin Water Sport Exhibition (1934-35), Film and Photo (1936), or the annual International Automobile and Motorbike Exhibition (1933-39) offered the opportunity to reinforce National Socialist ideas, promoting the illusion of a classless society, emphasising the economic and social achievements of National Socialism, building patriotism, glorifying the Party and its history, and

84 The Combat League for German Culture (Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur) was established in 1928 and operated until it was surpassed by the National Socialist Cultural Community (NS-Kulturgemeinde) in 1934. This coincided with Rosenberg's appointment as Beauftragten des Führers für die Überwachung der gesamten geistigen und weltanschaulichen Schulung und Erziehung der Partei und gleichgeschalteten Verbände. Rosenberg's cultural portfolio is outlined in Jonathan Petropoulos, Art as politics in the Third Reich (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), pp. 28-38. English translation of the DBFU full title after page 85.


87 Examples of exhibition organisers include: The Reichsverband der Automobilindustrie e.V. (Internationale Automobil- und Motorrad-Ausstellung, 1936), the Institut für Deutsche Wirtschaftspropaganda e.V. (Film und Foto, 1936), the Berliner Ausstellungs-, Messe-, und Fremdenverkehrs-Gesellschaft (Die Frau, 1933, Großen Berliner Wassersport-Ausstellung, 1933-35, Grünen Woche, 1934, Das Wunder des Lebens, 1935, and Reichsausstellung der deutschen Textil- und Bekleidungswirtschaft; 1937), the Generalinspektor für das deutsche Strassenwesen (Die Strasse, 1934), the Rasse und Siedlungshauptamtes (Volk und Familie, 1937), the Rassenpolitisches Amt der NSDAP (Deutschland muß Leben, 1939), the Prussian State Library and the Reichsstelle zur Förderung des deutschen Schrifttums (Das wohrhafte Deutschland, 1936), the Gauleitung Berlin (Bolschewismus ohne Maske, 1937), the Reichspropagandaabteilung der NSDAP (Der „ewige Jude“: große politische Schau der NSDAP, 1938, and Das Sowjetparadies, 1942).
consolidating the cult of Hitler. They also contributed to the development of exhibition techniques for maximum mass effect. *The Camera*, for instance, provides an early example of key design methods including the use of large over-scale photographs that could be claimed to be authentic documents while at the same time constituting an ‘emotional appeal’ for the visitor. Likewise, the inclusion of a “hall of honour” featuring typical Nazi iconography—busts of Hitler, swastikas, eagles, oak wreaths, torches, large-scale wall texts quoting the Führer—became a ubiquitous exhibition component. These imposing spaces contributed to the overall monumental aesthetic of the exhibitions as well as the hagiography of the party and its leader.

Common exhibition themes before the war included race and eugenics policies dressed up as “hygiene” or fused with the promotion of the Nazi view of women and family under headings such as *The Woman* (1933), *The Wonder of Life* (1935), *Life* (1936), *Volk and Family* (1937), and the blatantly anti-Semitic *The “Eternal” Jew* (1938). Anti-communism and anti-Semitism were also conflated in exhibitions like *Bolshevism Unmasked* (1937-39), which warned of terror, murder, and destruction by utilising graphic depictions of suffering and death, as well as incorporating an attack on modern art under the banner of “cultural Bolshevism.” Religion, family, and cultural customs were all in peril of the so-called “Judo-Bolshevismus,” with art and culture “misused” in its struggle for world revolution. The denunciation of modern art was, of course, a central vehicle for an attack on both Jews and communists during the Third Reich. The high-profile, and much-researched, *Degenerate Art (Entartete Kunst)* exhibition that first opened in Munich in 1937 was simply the most prominent of a series of “shame exhibitions” (*Schandausstellungen*), which had begun in April 1933 and represented an anti-modernist movement that eventually saw the systematic removal, sale, and destruction of around 17,000 artworks from museum collections across Germany. The counter to
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91 Ibid.
92 On the Nazi confiscation of artworks from museums and galleries prior to the war; Petropoulos, *Art as politics in the Third Reich*, p. 56; Malke Steinkamp, *Das unerwünschte Erbe: die Rezeption "entarteter" Kunst in Kunstkritik, Ausstellungen und Museen der SBZ und frühen DDR* (Berlin: Akad.-Verl., 2008), pp. 57-67; Evans, *The Third Reich in power*, pp. 175-180; Lynn H. Nicholas, *The rape of Europa: the fate of Europe’s treasures in the Third Reich and the Second World War* (New York: Knopf, 1994), Ch. 1. The spectacular discovery of around 1,400 works believed to include a significant number of confiscated pieces in the Munich home of Cornelius Gurlitt, son of Nazi art dealer Hildebrand Gurlitt, early in 2012 (made public in late 2013) and the more recent find of 60 additional works at his Salzburg property (February 2014), represents just a fraction of the art confiscated. The figure above relates only to the confiscation campaign carried out in German
these negative exhibitions was the creation of the monumental House of German Art in Munich and the promotion of state-sanctioned artistic styles via its annual *Great German Art* exhibitions (1937-1944).

Many of the techniques developed for the large-scale propaganda exhibitions drew upon the very artistic traditions they sought to criticise, most notably through the incorporation of photomontage and large-scale graphic representations. They also incorporated highly staged realistic recreations, a hallmark of the large travelling exhibitions during the First World War, as well as the right-wing exhibitions that emerged during the Weimar era. In a 1942 exhibition mounted on the Lustgarten entitled *The Soviet Paradise*, full-sized three-dimensional installations of ruined cities, poor working conditions, and impoverished housing placed visitors in direct confrontation with the perils of communism, once again equating Marxism and Bolshevism with a Jewish plot for world domination, nurturing fears of the “brutal terror” of Bolshevism and its vast army, and promoting German eastward expansion (Fig. 4.5).93

*The Soviet Paradise* followed a film of the same name released the year prior, a technique that reflected the integration of propaganda material across media. Likewise, *Give me Four Years Time* (1937), a monumental exhibition espousing the achievements of the first four years of the National Socialist regime was also accompanied by a propaganda film. Along with the *Deutschland* exhibition, held in conjunction with the Olympic festivities in 1936, *Give me Four Years Time* was represented as the pinnacle of National Socialist exhibition practice.94 This was reflected in both visitor numbers (reportedly 1.5 million between 30 April and 20 July 1937), and its design and presentation style, within which all elements were oriented to an integrated National Socialist concept.95 Large photos and photomontages, oversized wall texts, lighting effects, bold graphics, and, above all, the grand scale of the objects and the staging helped elucidate the realisation of the “national revolution” and Germany's emergence from the chains of Versailles (Fig. 4.6).96 Re-

---

94 Thamer, 'Geschichte und Propaganda,' p. 366.
95 Ibid. p. 366-367.
96 In one hall alone a twenty meter high photograph of the Führer, a sixty two meter long model of an Autobahn ("die Straßen Adolf Hitlers") three full-sized fighter planes, and a U-Boot 42.5 meters long by 3.25 meters wide accompanied numerous other large-scale images and exhibits to provide a panorama of achievements and demonstrate that Germany was once again master of its own *Lebensraum*. Gemeinnützige Berliner Ausstellungs- Messe- und Fremdenverkehrs-Gesellschaft, *Gebt mir vier Jahre Zeit: amtlicher Katalog für die Ausstellung Berlin 1937, 30. April bis 20. Juni; Ausstellungsgelände am Funkturm* (Berlin: ALA Anzeigen-Aktiensgesellschaft, 1937), pp. 138-151.
militarisation was demonstrated through full-scale aircraft hung from the rafters, battleships, tanks, and enormous photographs of troops *en masse* and was presented as essential for peace as well as Germany's great struggle for survival.

![Image of a room for a six-person family, reconstructed.](image1)

**Figure 4.5:** "One room apartment for a six-person family," room reconstruction, *The Soviet Paradise*, May-June 1942 (Postcard image unattributed, 1942, author's own collection)

![Image of a wartime exhibition, 1937.](image2)

**Figure 4.6:** *Give me four years time*, 1937 (Photo Klinker & Co., Verlag C. Köpfer, Berlin, 1937, author’s own collection)
State-run museums were also quickly “co-ordinated” into the National Socialist agenda. Formal administration of the museums was another matter of contention between top party officials, and Goebbels was eager to gain control of them along with the art and music academies, all of which came under the control of the Reich Ministry for Science, Training and Education, established on 30 April 1934 under the leadership of Bernhard Rust (1883-1945). As a member of the Berlin State Museums since 1920, the Zeughaus passed from the Prussian Ministry for Science, Art and Education, of which Rust had assumed control early in 1933, to the new centralised ministry, by which time the effects of the nazification had already resulted in the expulsion of Julius Binder from the directorial post. The “Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service,” passed on 7 April 1933 allowed for the wholesale dismissal of state employees, mostly carried out on racial grounds, leading to the forced retirement of Jews and the “politically unreliable” from the judiciary, schools, universities, museums, and public administration. According to Jonathan Petropoulos’ study of the art world under National Socialism, some twenty-seven museum directors across the Reich lost their positions following the April law and those who remained represented ‘one of the most nazified professions in Germany.’ The final issue of Berliner Museen for 1933 reported the “retirement” (by ministerial decree) of Walter Lehmann (1878-1939), director of the African, Oceanic und American Collections of the Museum for Ethnology, along with three other curators, and the dismissal of Curt Glaser (1879-1943), Director of the Art Library, and Julius Binder.

97 Reichsministerium für Wissenschaft, Erziehung und Volksbildung, On the struggle between Goebbels and Rust for control of the museums and academies see Petropoulos, Art as politics in the Third Reich, pp. 40-43.
98 [Gesetz zur Wiederherstellung des Berufsberechtigten]
99 Evans notes that the main reason for dismissal of civil servants was not political but racial. Evans, The Third Reich in power, p. 14. Paragraph 3 stated: ‘Civil servants who are not of Aryan descent are to be retired (§ 8 ff); if they are honorary officials, they are to be dismissed from their official status.’ An exception was made for ex-servicemen from the First World War, however subsequent amendments further strengthened discrimination, particularly for those of Jewish descent. According to §4, those ‘whose previous political activities afford no assurance that they will at all times give their fullest support to the national State’ were also subject to termination. English translation by Yad Vashem The Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Authority; ‘Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service, April 7, 1933,’ Deutsches Reichsgesetzblatt Teil I 1867-1945, 1933, English translation at http://www1.yadvashem.org/about_holocaust/documents/part1/doc10.html [accessed 9 November 2012].
101 The Berliner Museen personnel report states: ‘By decree of the Minister, Director Lehmann, curator and Professor Volbach, curator Ruhemann, curator Cohn are retired, Director Binder and Director Glaser have been dismissed.’ [Durch Erlass des Herrn Ministers sind Direktor Lehmann, Kustos und Prof. Volbach, Kustos Ruhemann, Kustos Cohn in den Ruhestand versetzt, Direktor Binder und Direktor Glaser entlassen worden.] Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, ‘Personennachrichten,’ Berliner Museen, 54, no. 5, 1933, p. 104. Binder’s actual dismissal occurred on 21 August 1933. Lars-Thümmler contends that Binder was removed due to his Jewish heritage, Jochen Becker, in collaboration with a working group from the Universities of Düsseldorf and Utrecht, has also found evidence in Binder’s file at the State Archive (Landesarchiv) Berlin, that his dismissal was carried out on the grounds of §4 of the civil service law, namely as a result of his political unreliability. It is certainly plausible that both were factors in his dismissal. Thümmler, ‘Das Zeughaus im
The most notable expulsions were reported internationally, with the *New York Times* announcing the ousting of ‘[t]wo of Germany’s best known museum curators and art historians’, Max Friedländer and Ludwig Justi in July 1933. Friedländer had been the Deputy Director of the Berlin Painting Department (*Gemäldegalerie*) under Wilhelm von Bode from 1904, and Director from 1924. Justi, Director of the National Gallery, had been at the forefront of the establishment of the modern art department in the Crown Prince Palace opposite the Zeughaus. In June 1933 he was suspended, before being demoted to a curatorial role at the library of the State Museums. Following Binder’s dismissal Paul Post acted in his place, but on 1 August 1934 the directorship passed to Rear Admiral Hermann Lorey (1877-1954), providing once more for the leadership of a high-ranking member of the military. In the same period a number of key appointments were made in Berlin, including the naming of Otto Kümmel, former Director of the East Asian Museum, as General Director of the State Museums, Hermann Schmitz as Director of the Art Library, and Konrad Hahm as Director of the Museum for German Ethnology (*Volkskunde*). The Zeughaus was fully incorporated back into the military fold after the outbreak of the Second World War and the establishment of a network of Army Museums (*Heeresmuseen*) that included the armouries in Vienna, Dresden, Munich, and Berlin, under the command of the German Wehrmacht. General of the Infantry Friedrich Roese took leadership of the Army Museums, a position that Lorey also

---


103 Wolfgang Freiherr von Löhneysen, ‘Justi, Ludwig,’ *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, no. 10, 1974, p. 706. Richard J. Evans states that it was Hitler who personally removed Justi from his directorship. By 1936 two subsequent directors had succeeded Justi and both had met with senior Nazi opposition to their acquisition and display policies. The Modern Art wing of the National Gallery was closed on 30 October 1936. Evans, *The Third Reich in power*, pp. 169-170.

104 While Lorey was retired from service by 1934, he had acted as a civilian employee of the Navy and had been director of the Museum für Meereskunde in Berlin since 1924. He continued to hold the directorial post there as well as at the Zeughaus until 1945. Hans Jürgen Witthöft, *Lexikon zur deutschen Marinegeschichte. Band 1, A-M* (Herford: Koehler, 1977), p. 179.


106 The order was given by Hitler for the transfer of the German Heeresmuseum to the Wehrmacht in June 1939 and was due to take effect on 1 November that year. A delay in the official transfer occurred due to the outbreak of war, but by 23 March 1940 the Berlin Zeughaus came under the official control of the Wehrmacht. Müller credits this administrative model to the Armoury in Vienna. Unlike its German counterparts that had been administered by either the Education Ministry (as in the Prussian case) or the responsible Culture Ministry (for Dresden and Munich) following WWI, the Viennese armoury had remained under army command. *Berliner Museen* reported the administrative change, thus: ‘The Zeughaus has resigned from the Association of the State Museums and been placed under the leadership of the German Army Museums.’ [Das Zeughaus ist aus dem Verband der Staatlichen Museen ausgeschieden und der Leitung der Deutschen Heeresmuseen unterstellt worden.] Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, ‘Chronik,’ *Berliner Museen*, 61, no. 3, 1940, p. 51. See also; ‘Rund um die Deutsche Wehrmarkt,’ *Uniformen-Markt*, 7, no. 7, 1 April 1940, p. 50; Müller, *Vom Arsenal zum Museum*, pp. 216; 224; Thümmler, ‘Das Zeughaus im Zweiten Weltkrieg: eine Studie zu den Aufgaben der Wirksamkeit des Museums’.
assumed in an acting capacity for a period of time, among other things coordinating the distribution of war booty among the Army Museums after 1939.\textsuperscript{107}

It is often noted just how quickly the Zeughaus was incorporated back into the military agenda after 1933 (Fig. 4.7). This aspect certainly did come to the fore once more, and was exploited in new ways through content choices, presentation techniques, interpretive material, and auxiliary programmes. It is worth remembering, however, that for much of the National Socialist era the Zeughaus remained under the administration of the Prussian State Museums body, and it was under its governance that the majority of changes occurred. While the Zeughaus’ traditional subject matter was clearly suited to Nazi requirements of war preparedness, many other museums also adapted their collections and exhibitions to reflect particular aspects of the Nazi Weltanschauung.

Particularly between 1934 and 1936 National Socialist museology developed into a comprehensive, sophisticated and broad-ranging practice. A concentration of coordinated programmes across the Berlin Museums for the Olympic festivities in 1936 represents a peak of museum activity and the presentation of the developed domestic museums to the outside world, a fact reflected in the high visitor numbers recoded for the Olympiad.\textsuperscript{108} Between 1933 and 1937 Museumskunde, the journal of the German Museum Federation established in 1905, featured at least thirteen articles specifically dealing with the reorganisation or redesign of museums across Germany.\textsuperscript{109} Likewise, Berliner Museen regularly reported on the redesign of the state museums. Otto Kümmel spoke in 1935 of the ‘new face of the German Museums.’\textsuperscript{110} Despite their long tradition and special position in the world of culture, he maintained, the ‘tremendous national awakening’ could not be allowed to pass the German museums by: ‘Our task must now be to provide expression in this area also for the new way of life, to put to the test the ability that rises from the mystical blood strength of the nation to develop meaningfulness.’\textsuperscript{111} It is within this context that the developments at the Zeughaus between 1933 and 1939 should be viewed.

\textsuperscript{107}Thümmler, ‘Das Zeughaus im Zweiten Weltkrieg: eine Studie zu den Aufgaben der Wirksamkeit des Museums’.
\textsuperscript{109}These included the Zoological Department of the Städtischen Museums Osnabrück, sections of the Museum der Stadt Essen für Heimat-, Natur- und Völkerkunde (1933), the Display Collection of the Department "Museum für Naturkunde" of the Erfurter Museumsbund (1934), the Dresdener Skulpturenansammlung (1935), the Paramentenschätzen von St. Marien in the Danziger Stadtmuseum, the National-Galerie, the Wallraf-Richartz-Museum (1936), the insect displays in the Zoologischen Museums zu Hamburg, the Weapons Collection of the Kunsthistorischen Museums in der Neuen Burg zu Wien (1937), and the Altertumsmuseums im ehemaligen Kurfürstl. Marstall zu Mainz (1938).
\textsuperscript{111}’[...] durfte der gewaltige Aufbruch der Nation nicht spurlos an ihr vorübergehen. [...] Unsere Aufgabe muß es nun sein, dem neuen Lebensgefühl auch auf diesem Gebiete Ausdruck zu verschaffen, die aus den mystischen Blutkräften der Nation aufsteigende Fähigkeit zur Sinngestaltung auch hier zu erproben.’ ibid.
“Museum—but lively”: theoretical foundations for a new museum practice after 1933

Kümmel was not the only museum professional endorsing broad-ranging changes after 1933. In Nuremberg, art historian Fritz Traugott Schulz wrote of the necessary “transformation” of German museums.112 He advocated prioritising German artworks, highlighting the national (rather than regional) qualities of German artists and the influence of German traditions on artists of other cultures, urging museum directors to adapt their museums and galleries to the basic concept of the new state.113 The following year Erich Keyser wrote an article for Museumskunde entitled “The Political Museum,” in which he spoke of incorporating the lessons of the large-scale political exhibitions into museum work.114 Though he argued the museum should continue to be a site of preservation and research, he added: ‘Its activity, however, must be expanded according to the

113 Ibid.
114 Erich Keyser, ’Das Politische Museen,’ Museumskunde, 26, 1934, pp. 82-91.
experiences and requirements of recent years and be arranged according to different viewpoints. The museal work must be subject to political goals.'

Both emphasized the role of museums in the popular education of the people, urging a clear shift away from the traditional scholarly museum (Gelehrtenmuseum) towards Volksbildung. Keyser defined Volksbildung according to educationalist Ernst Krieck (1882-1947), who advocated a "national-political education" and saw the task of Volksbildung 'to develop the knowledge of völkisch living space and its relation to other living spaces in as many dimensions as possible, and to incrementally present the youth with this knowledge as an organic worldview.' Volksbildung necessitated new techniques for exhibition practice, new priorities and principles for collecting, and new advertising and outreach methods to attract visitors.

The Berlin state museums reported their shifting practice under titles such as "New ways of museum exhibitions" and "Museum—but lively," in an attempt to dispel the image of the silent, dark, and dusty museum that simply "stands and waits." Even prior to changes in the collections and the permanent displays, initiatives such as the painting of the Zeughaus exhibition rooms, the re-opening of the corner windows in the upper south wing that had been built over in the 1880s (both 1934), and the installation of an electric lighting system (1935), contributed to the brightening of the displays and provided the opportunity to extend opening hours—a symbolic and practical opening of the museum and a first step towards a more accessible and appealing exhibition practice aimed at a popular audience (Fig. 4.8 and 4.9).

---

Figure 4.8: The entrance hall after April 1933, showing the inclusion of some new didactic material but still reflecting the dark atmosphere of the museum prior to the “brightening” of the displays (Bildarchiv Foto Marburg, Aufnahme-Nr.: 825.224)

Figure 4.9: Zeughaus entrance hall after the installation of the lighting system and painting of the walls (Zentralarchiv SMB, Bildarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz, bpk No.: 40012681)
Zeughaus employee Werner Hahlweg contributed to the flourishing National Socialist museological literature with his own paper, in which he discussed the new priorities for army museums (Heeresmuseen), a category of museum that he contended embraced the purely army historical museum, the traditional arms and armour museum with predominantly medieval and early modern collections, and those, like the Zeughaus, that held both.120 ‘Army museums are facing a turning point’, he wrote;

Their task, mainly determined by the resurgent military will and the increasing occupation with questions in the field of army and defence that have been triggered by it appears to be defined clearly: at once to be sites for the military-spiritual education of the people, guardians and preservers of the warlike tradition and the soldierly spirit, on the other hand to actively place themselves in the service of the general development as research, education and teaching institutions.

[Die Heeresmuseen stehen vor einem Wendepunkt. Ihre Aufgabe, vornehmlich bestimmt durch die wiedererwachten Wehrwillen und die durch ihn ausgelöste steigende Beschäftigung mit Fragen auf dem Gebiet des Heer- und Wehrwesens, erscheinen klar umrissen: einmal Stätten der wehrgeistigen Erziehung des Volkes, Hüter und Pfleger der kriegerischen Überlieferung und des soldatischen Geistes zu sein, zum anderen, sich als Forschungs-, Bildungs- und Lehranstalten aktiv in den Dienst des allgemeinen Aufbaues zu stellen.]121

Hahlweg’s remarks, and his suggestions for structuring and presenting army museum collections, were certainly consistent with the broader shift towards Volksbildung. ‘In the struggle for the military-spiritual education of the people,’ he wrote, ‘they stand among the first place.’122 But unlike Schulz and Keyser, he continued to place importance on preservation and scholarship, advocating research in the fields of war and army history, troop histories, weapons and uniforms.123 In Hahlweg’s view, there was a clear distinction between the two areas of museum work, with the museum’s displays, and its display collection (Schausammlung), aimed squarely at a popular audience—above all youth. A separate study collection, on the other hand, could serve as a teaching aid for soldiers and officers. As youth education was to be geared towards instilling a soldierly spirit

---


122 [‘Im Ringen um die wehrgeistlichen Erziehung des Volkes stehen sie mit an erster Stelle.’] Hahlweg, ‘Heeresmuseen,’ p. 272.

123 Indeed, Zeughaus staff continued to publish a substantial amount of specialist literature during the pre-war period in the field of historical weapons and costumes and their technical and cultural development, as well as studies of significant Berlin weapons collectors. Hahlweg’s article on the recently discovered plans to the Zeughaus from 1732 (see chapter 1) was also published during this time. The most significant vehicle for this scholarship was the Zeitschrift für Historische Waffen- und Kostümkunde (founded in 1897 by Wendelin Böheim), the organ of the Society for Historical Weapons and Costume Studies (Gesellschaft für Historische Waffen- und Kostümkunde), of which several museum personnel were members. Paul Post produced the first general register of the journal in 1937.
and fostering the desire among young soldiers to emulate the deeds of older generations, both
branches of museum work served first and foremost the purposes of the army.124

The distinction between objects for display, and those that could be arranged purely for
specialist teaching purposes, was crucial. In 1936 this idea formed the basis for a complete
rationalisation of the Zeughaus collections in conjunction with the establishment of a permanent
full-scale World War exhibition (below). These changes, and the principles upon which they were
based, can be traced to aspects of earlier museum practice, particularly the development of a special
exhibition programme aimed at extending and supplementing the museum’s existing displays and
attracting new visitors through an ever changing offering. Special exhibitions also provided the
opportunity to re-focus museum activity on contemporary themes—most notably the World War—
within a much shorter timeframe than necessitated by the re-organisation of the permanent
displays.

The development of a special exhibition programme, 1933-39

In June 1933 the Zeughaus opened an exhibition in the Herrscherhalle entitled New Acquisitions
since the World War (a list of key special exhibitions between 1933-43 is provided in Appendix F).125
As the title suggests, this was a display in the traditional Wilhelmine mode, featuring a selection of
the most outstanding recent collection pieces. In October, however, the exhibition won unexpected
fame, becoming ‘the destination of thousands’, through the incorporation of several additional
items, which also became the centrepiece for a subsequent, dedicated, historical show.126 These
objects were not new acquisitions, but rather the much sought-after missing Napoleon medals
captured by Blücher at Waterloo. The Zeughaus administration had made several appeals for their
return after 1919, but it was not until the Nazis came to power that unidentified parties returned
the medals—directly to senior party member and Minister President of Prussia, Hermann Göring.127

The new exhibition, opened on 25 December 1933 as a ‘Christmas surprise for the Berlin
youth’, centred on Napoleon’s “Berlin” coach, captured by the 15th Royal Prussian Infantry
Regiment and loaned by the Blücher estate (Fig. 4.10).\textsuperscript{128} Drawing together a variety of objects from public and private collections, the exhibition presented an array of personal items singled out for their direct connection to the Emperor. In a review for Berliner Museen, Jan Lauts cited those items that had not yet been brought to the public’s attention in existing collections or during the extensive centennial exhibitions held in Breslau and Königsburg in 1913.\textsuperscript{129} He described ‘a series of very personal everyday objects of the Emperor, his decorations, his toiletry case, stockings, gloves, handkerchief, and more of the same.’\textsuperscript{130} The most fascinating items appeared to be those with an immediate and tangible connection with Napoleon, such as a pair of suede gloves ‘that characteristically reflect the short, stubby shape of the hand of the Emperor’, silk stockings, a pair of spurs, a green velvet pillow, and, ‘most personal of all’, a small mahogany toiletries case complete with twenty-nine associated objects; a comb, toothbrush, shaving brush, scissors.\textsuperscript{131}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure410.jpg}
\caption{Exhibition of "Blücherbeute" in the Zeughaus courtyard, 1933-34 (Bildarchiv Foto Marburg, Aufnahme-Nr.: 825.473) }
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{128} ['…als Weinachtsüberraschung für die Berliner Jugend'] Acting Zeughaus Director Paul Post letter to Herrn von Kleist regarding loan items for the exhibition of Blücher Booty, 11.12.1933, (DHM-HA: Rep Z 811, Bl. 33 and reverse).
\textsuperscript{129} On the Breslau exhibition see Historische Ausstellung Jahrhundertfeier der Freiheitskriege, Katalog der Historischen Ausstellung: Jahrhunderfeier der Freiheitskriege Breslau 1913, 4. vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage ed. (Breslau: Verlag Jahrhundert-Ausstellung, 1913).
\textsuperscript{130} ['…eine Reihe ganz persönlicher Gebrauchsstücke des Kaisers, seine Orden, sein Toiletteneccessaire, Strümpfe, Handschuhe, Taschentücher und dergleichen mehr.'] Lauts, ‘Die "Blücherbeute”’, p. 71.
\textsuperscript{131} ['…die bezeichnend die kurze, untergesetzte Form der Hand des Kaisers widerspiegeln'] ['Am persönlichsten von allem berührt aber ein kleines Reisenecessaire, von Biennais verfertigt […] Aus Mahagoni, mit einem Klapp- und einem Schiebfach, nutzt das Kästchen auf vollkommenen Weise den geringen Raum, um 29 Gegenstände des täglichen Gebrauchs bequem unterzubringen.’] ibid. pp. 73-74.
Curator and acting Zeughaus Director Paul Post went to great lengths to establish the authenticity of the objects, to show their provenance from the battlefield to the present.\textsuperscript{132} Authenticity was crucial because although many objects were of decorative and material value, their significance was first-and-foremost as relics of Napoleon and symbols of his defeat at the hands of the Prussian army. Confirmation of the authenticity of the medals, missing for fourteen years, was made via inventory numbers, and Post proudly announced that these most valuable trophies had now, after such an eventful fate, found their permanent home in the Zeughaus once more.\textsuperscript{133}

Utilising wooden showcases arranged around the Borussia statue in the central courtyard, the exhibition of Blücher booty did not represent any real shift in display techniques for the Zeughaus. Its importance should be seen in terms of the significance of the returned objects and their potential to underscore the traditional national historical image, as well as the idea of a renewal of German strength under Hitler—a concept that also helped reconcile many national-conservative historians with the new regime.\textsuperscript{134} Indeed, in a letter regarding the loan of the coach, Post spoke of the ‘reawakened national spirit of our times’ as his inspiration for the exhibition.\textsuperscript{135} It was also the first Zeughaus special exhibition to take a historical event as its subject. It presented a variety of objects not traditionally found in the Zeughaus collections and utilised extensive loan items in order to situate the medals within a broader narrative frame.\textsuperscript{136} A more significant shift in exhibition practice came later that year, following the appointment of both Kümmler and Lorey, with the first of a ten-part cycle of special exhibitions that ran from October 1934 to August 1939 under the title \textit{The World War in Pictures}.\textsuperscript{137}

The new exhibition series complemented the existing displays, offering a changing programme of historical and thematic subjects and utilising a broader range of objects and techniques. Each exhibition represented either particular events, presented chronologically to mark the anniversaries of specific campaigns and fashioned as memorial shows (\textit{The Battle of Verdun, The Capture of the Baltic Islands, Operation Michael and the Battle of Kemmel Hill, The Battle of Tannenberg}), or a thematic concern (\textit{Fortunes of a Frontline Troop, War Posters and Notices of Friend}}
Both before and after the creation of the much-expanded World War department, the special exhibition programme was designed to work together with the existing displays rather than as stand-alone events. The first exhibition, for example, was seen to follow “organically” from the existing presentation of World War weapons:

After the visitor has familiarised himself with the armaments of war in the collections, he should gain before the pictures, maps and models as lively as possible an idea of the use of the weapons, their interaction, the tactical use of the weapon types and units and in the historical sequence of the main military actions, constantly gain insights into the strategic planning and goals of twenty years ago.

[Nachdem der Besucher sich in der Sammlung mit dem Rüstung des Krieges vertraut gemacht hat, soll er vor den Bildern, Karten und Modellen eine möglichst lebendige Vorstellung von der Anwendung der Waffen, ihrem Zusammenwirken, dem taktischen Einsatz der Waffengattungen und Verbände erhalten und im historischen Ablauf der Hauptkampfhandlungen laufend Einblicke in die strategischen Planung und Ziele vor 20 Jahren gewinnen.]

As this description suggests, the new temporary exhibitions also sought to provide a diverse and engaging image of the World War, connecting with the broader thematic coverage of history, Heimat, and travelling exhibitions during the war itself and that had developed in a number of exhibitions held by conservative nationalist associations during the Weimar period.

The new thematic concerns went beyond technical weapons history and trophy presentations, incorporating battle sequences, military planning and tactics, and the action and interaction of the various troop elements (artillery, infantry, engineering), to present a ‘multi-faceted image of the war, not only from the military, but also from the human side’. Hahlweg had written that the special character of the army museum lay in its presentation of the soldier and his world. Thus the inclusion of personal items such as war letters, through which, according to one exhibition catalogue, ‘the actual hero of this war, the unknown soldier, speaks.’

---


139 Staatliches Zeughaus, Der Weltkrieg in Bildern I. Vogessenfront, p. 3.

140 On the presentation of the First World War during the Weimar era by nationalist groups see Beil, Der ausgestellte Krieg, pp. 275-299.

141 [‘...wiegestaltige[s] Bild des Krieges nicht nur von der militärischen, auch von der menschlichen Seite’] Staatliches Zeughaus, Der Weltkrieg in Bildern I. Vogessenfront, p. 3.


143 [‘...und nicht zuletzt eine Auswahl von Kriegsbriefen, in denen der eigentliche Held dieses Krieges, der unbekannte Soldat, zu Wort kommt.’] Staatliches Zeughaus, Der Weltkrieg in Bildern I. Vogessenfront, p. 3.
must be read circumspectly. As Beil has shown, the presentation of the soldier in this type of exhibition was highly stylised; he was invariably placed within the context of an idealised fighting community, as a symbol of war, duty, and heroism. The image of soldiers sketched in the exhibitions, she writes, 'locked into the National Socialist concept of man and conjured up memories of war that were entirely dedicated to the National Socialist comradeship myth of a class-superseding community of hard and dutiful men.' Under these circumstances the soldier was not only de-individualised, he became the prototype of National Socialist masculinity; an image promoted by the museum as "eternal manliness" (ewiges Mannestum) and linked to the image of Prussia and the significance of the Zeughaus for the present.

Even Hahlweg made clear that the image of the soldier was far more symbolic than the presentation of personal experience, or even a historically grounded generalised experience. He emphasised instead soldierly ethos, the idea of the soldier and his achievements, the historical expression of heroism and military virtue, and the creation of a meaningful and vivid connection between the past and the forces of the present as a mental and spiritual foundation for the future. The purpose of the soldierly image lay not in understanding the past, but as a means 'to decisively promote the education of the people in the spiritual preparedness for war.' All of the special exhibitions in the World War in Pictures series were subordinated to this one basic goal.

Like the image of the soldier, the reportedly "multi-faceted" presentation was also highly restricted. The appearance of a diverse offering via frequently rotating new exhibitions focussing on a changing calendar of events and themes masked the narrow frame within which the exhibitions were actually conceived. In accordance with Nazi propaganda methods, a set of clear, simplified and repetitive ideas underscored each exhibition: Germany's geopolitical encirclement and the defensive character of the war, the presentation of a world-view set by the binaries of friend and

\[\text{144 Beil, Der ausgestellte Krieg, pp. 356-357.}\]
\[\text{145 '[Das in den Ausstellungen entworfene Soldatenbild rastete in das nationalsozialistische Menschenbild ein und beschwor Kriegserinnerungen herauf, die ganz im Zeichen des nationalsozialistischen Kameradschaftsmythos von einer klassenübergreifenden Gemeinschaft harter und pflichtbewusster Männer standen.] ibid.}\]
\[\text{146 Under the title "Prussianism-Soldiering (The significance of the Zeughaus for the present)" ["Preußentum-Soldatentum (Die Bedeutung des Zeughauses für die Gegenwart)"] Hugo Landgraf held a discussion regarding "eternal manliness" for Berlin Radio on 28.10.1935. Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, 'Vierteljahresbericht des Aussenamts,' Berliner Museen, 57, no. 1, 1936, p. 17; 'Deutschlandsender: Berlin,' Der Deutsche Rundfunk, no. 28 October, 1935, p. 19.}\]
\[\text{147 Hahlweg, 'Die Heeresmuseen: Wesen und Aufgaben,' p. 61.}\]
\[\text{148 ['...die Erziehung des Volkes zur geistigen Wehrbereitschaft entscheidend zu fördern.'] ibid.}\]
\[\text{149 Summarising Hitler's view of propaganda as espoused in Mein Kampf, Michael Townson writes that 'The essence of propaganda is to be restrictive and repetitive, to take a restricted repertoire of ideas and notions and to keep on hammering them home. In order to achieve maximum effect, the discourse must always be pitched at the lowest common denominator—the intellectually most limited listener—so that everyone 'gets the message'. The need for simplicity and repetitiveness requires a uniformity and predictability of discourse, thus precluding originality and creativeness.' Townson, Mother-tongue and fatherland, p. 133.}\]
enemy, the unequal power balance, Germany’s success in battle and the bravery of her troops, the willingness of the German people to sacrifice at home for the soldier at the Front, the demonisation of pacifists (Kriegsgegner) whose actions led to the collapse of 1918, the idealisation of war heroes like Hindenburg and Ludendorff, and the glorification of bloody struggle and heroic death. This last point was underscored by the addition of ten further honour rolls to the Feldherrenhalle in June 1934, commemorating 350 fallen WWI generals and commanders. Speaking on behalf of President Hindenburg at the unveiling, General Werner von Blumberg honoured the two million fallen German soldiers and their leaders, ‘who when the hour came knew how to die as examples to their men.’ In January the following year Hindenburg’s death mask was transferred to the Zeughaus on Hitler’s order and became the central exhibit of the Ruhmeshalle.

All of these elements worked at the emotional rather than an intellectual level, with central exhibition concepts presented in categorical terms, so that emotive statements were delivered as fact. The exclusion of images of suffering, of the monotony of trench warfare, of anything but the most superficial generalisations about the home front, and of German defeat (Beil notes the isolation of the exhibitions to singular campaigns to restrict the presentation to German success), did not deter the museum from emphasising objectivity and historical accuracy in its presentations. Collaboration with the Reich Archive, it was claimed, provided the exhibitions with a ‘pure source’ of historical scholarship. Archival sources, including the holdings of the former Picture and Film Office of the Army High Command, also represented an expanded range of material. The World War cycle incorporated the traditional Zeughaus offerings, most notably captured weapons and flags as demonstration of German success, but also photographs, paintings, drawings, large-scale relief models of battle scenes, maps, models of battle ships (in the case of The Capture of the Baltic Islands, although the inclusion of a Naval subject was rare), and documents, including official letters and war diaries, the aforementioned soldiers’ letters, newspapers, telegrams, battle reports, and directives. Artworks, too, were presented as authentic documents, having been made by war artists in the

154 Beil, Der ausgestellte Krieg, p. 350.
155 [’Diese unerschöpfliche und reine Quelle der Anschauung wird dem Zeughause vom Reichsarchiv zugeleitet.’] Staatliches Zeughaus, Der Weltkrieg in Bildern I. Vogesenfront, p. 2.
circumstances of war.\textsuperscript{156} ‘These are not battle paintings in the old sense,’ stated one catalogue, ‘no heroic compositions, like those that decorate the Ruhmeshalle.’\textsuperscript{157}

These new types of object reflected the acquisition goals for the later permanent World War exhibition and, in the case of \textit{War Posters and Notices of Friend and Foe}, showcased a selection from a recently purchased collection of posters, documents and print material.\textsuperscript{158} Likewise, a number of relief models, weapons, equipment, pictures, and documents had originated in the large-scale travelling exhibition \textit{The Front}, organised by war veterans, that was purchased in its entirety in 1935.\textsuperscript{159} The acquisition of the contents of this exhibition, which had opened with a scale model of the battlefield of Verdun and culminated with the losses of Versailles and the threat faced by Germany’s ‘lonely few soldiers’, surrounded by heavily armed neighbours,\textsuperscript{160} prompted Otto Kümmel to remark; ‘Finally, very, very late, the small seed has now become a museum of the World War.’\textsuperscript{161}

Display techniques, too, reflected the priorities that would come to the fore in the permanent collections after 1936. The exhibitions were clearly organised around central battles and themes, each with its own accompanying guidebook providing a short contextual account followed by details of the exhibits according to the progression of the visitor through the space. They incorporated a clean, pared-back style, both in terms of aesthetics and the volume of objects on display. Simple, modern display cases and bright rooms offered a sharper focus, complemented by the use of interpretive devices such as illuminated texts, captions, and graphics (Fig. 4.1).\textsuperscript{162} These strategies, coupled with the use of models, artworks, and photographs, set the original pieces within a more readily comprehensible narrative frame, reflecting at once the broader developments in museology (and particularly museum pedagogy) that had begun around the turn of the century, and the pointed use of didactic techniques in order to restrict the range of possible interpretations to the authorised Nazi view. These considerations represented a significant shift for the Zeughaus, even if they did not incorporate the more dramatic visual language of the large-scale exhibitions of the era.

\textsuperscript{156} Beil, \textit{Der ausgestellte Krieg}, pp. 343-345.
\textsuperscript{157} [‘Es sind nicht Schlachtbilder im alten Sinne, keine heroischen Kompositionen, wie sie die Ruhmeshalle schmücken.’] Staatliches Zeughaus, \textit{Der Weltkrieg in Bildern I. Vogesenfront}, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{158} The collection had been assembled by Th. Bergmann, partly by exchange with foreign institutions like the British Museum, and purchased in its entirety for the Zeughaus collections. Staatliches Zeughaus, \textit{Der Weltkrieg in Bildern VII. Kriegsplakate und Mauerschläge}, p. 2; Werner Hahlweg, ‘Die Weltkriegsabteilung in Staatlichen Zeughaus zu Berlin,’ \textit{Museumskunde}, 26, 1937, p. 135.
\textsuperscript{160} \textit{Führer durch die Ausstellung „Die Front“}, Veranstaltet von Frontkämpfern.
\textsuperscript{161} [‘Endlich, sehr, sehr spät, ist jetzt der Keim zu einem Museum des Weltkrieges gelangt worden, insofern, als das Zeughaus nun die Ausstellung „Die Front“, früher Unter den Linden, im ganzen erwarb.’] Kümmel, ‘Das neue Gesicht der deutschen Museen,’ p. 19.
\textsuperscript{162} Beil, \textit{Der ausgestellte Krieg}, p. 342.
In this regard, a balance remained between a modernised design and display practice and a degree of aesthetic conservatism, something that suited an assertion of objectivity.

Figure 4.11: The sixth exhibition in the World War cycle, *Fortunes of a Frontline Troop*, 1936 (DHM Bildarchiv, Inv.-Nr.: BA100784)

The *World War in Pictures* series accounted for the majority of special exhibitions held at the Zeughaus between 1934 and 1939. Three further exhibitions, *War pictures and drawings by Ludwig Dettmann* (1934), *The Generals of the Battle of Tannenburg* (1935), and at least one guest exhibition organised by the German War Graves Commission (*Volksbund Deutsche Kriegsgräberfürsorge*), continued the World War theme. Indeed, of the temporary exhibitions held between 1934 and 1939, only three were not directly related to the events of 1914-18. *One Hundred Years of the Breach Loader 1836-1936: the invention of the Prussian needle gun by Johann Nikolaus Dreyse* (1936) was a small exhibition, encompassing just one bay on the upper floor, where it sat comfortably within the existing sequence of the permanent displays between Prussian uniforms 1814-64 and the Wars of Unification.\footnote{The exhibition was opened on 14 November 1936 in Bay 30 of the upper floor according to a report in *Berliner Museen*. The short guide to the Zeughaus published in the same year and reflecting the changes made to the World War presentation, which opened on 25 July, shows the sequence of the permanent displays as follows: Bays 27-29: Prussian Uniforms from 1815 to 1863; Bay 30: Foreign Uniforms, first half of the nineteenth century; Bays 31-35: Campaign against Denmark 1864 (31) and Austria 1866 (32). The narration in the guidebook for Bay 31 also highlights two gun racks} It fulfilled one of the tasks identified by Hahlweg: to highlight the work of weapons
inventors, providing a place of honour for ‘men like Dreyse, Krupp, Maxim, Mauser’.164 Another anniversary exhibition, King Friedrich Wilhelm I (1938), marked the 250th birthday of the Soldier King and featured predominately material from the Zeughaus collections, supplemented by loans from a number of museums and authorities.165 Above all, the special exhibitions offered a chance to attract new and repeat visitors through the appearance of a diverse and dynamic offering. The development of a comprehensive changing exhibition programme should thus be seen as part of a range of measures designed to popularise museums. ‘Whoever believed until now,’ wrote Kümmel in 1935, ‘to be able to get by with a single annual museum visit, will doubtless have to make tracks more often in the future, if he wants to be really informed.’166

“A new approach to museal construction”: The World War exhibition, 1936167

On almost every piece in the house is blood, given for the fatherland - death and life are great and sacred here. The first Friedrich dedicated the house to the "right of arms" and it would certainly be incomprehensible, had the World War really been segregated from this place of national greatness. It belongs there first and foremost.


- Exhibition review, Uniformen-Markt, 1936168

The seed of a World War museum to which Kümmel had referred the previous year finally came to fruition with the re-organisation of the Zeughaus permanent exhibitions in July 1936. The reconfiguration, which included not only a comprehensive new World War department, but also the complete rationalisation of the Zeughaus displays, was supported at the highest levels, with Hitler reportedly expressing his fullest satisfaction when presented with the plans at a visit lasting several

demonstrating the development of the Dreyse needle gun between 1816-1866. It is possible that the display was incorporated in part of in full into the permanent displays. Thümmler indicates that the exhibition remained standing until April 1938, although Berliner Museen states that the expected duration was 6-8 weeks. Regardless of these considerations, it is clear that the special exhibition was integrated into the larger narrative structure of the Zeughaus permanent displays. Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, 'Vierteljahresbericht des Aussenamts,' Berliner Museen, 58, no. 1, 1937, p. 24; Paul Post, Das Königliche Zeughaus: kurzer Gesamtführer (Berlin: Staatliche Museen, 1936), p. 18; Thümmler, 'Das Zeughaus im Zweiten Weltkrieg: eine Studie zu den Aufgaben der Wirksamkeit des Museums'. Endnote No. 65.

164 Hahlweg, 'Die Heeresmuseen: Wesen und Aufgaben,' p. 64.
166 ‘Wer bisher glaubte, mit einem einzigen alljährlichen Museumsbesuch auskommen zu können, wird sich in Zukunft doch wohl öfter auf die Socken machen müssen, will er wirklich unterrichtet werden.’ Kümmel, ‘Das neue Gesicht der deutschen Museen,’ p. 19.
168 ‘UM’ besucht die Staatlichen Museen in Berlin. Die neue Weltkriegsabteilung im Zeughaus,’ Uniformen-Markt, 3, no. 12, 1 August 1936, p. 185.
hours at the beginning of 1935.\textsuperscript{169} The purchase of comprehensive existing collections had been matched by a systematic collecting campaign, beginning with Lorey's appointment in 1934, that included transfers from state authorities and army institutions, private donations, and exchange.\textsuperscript{170} The new department, which Hahlweg hailed as a memorial to the deeds of the World War fighters,\textsuperscript{171} now occupied almost a third of the Zeughaus exhibition space, including the main foyer, the central courtyard (which received a coat of fresh yellow paint for the occasion), and the western wing of the lower floor (Fig. 4.12).\textsuperscript{172}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{plan.png}
\caption{Zeughaus floor plan (L-R, lower and upper floors) with the World War Department in the entrance hall (bays 71-72) the west wing (bays 73-91) and the courtyard (Paul Post, \textit{Das Königliche Zeughaus: Kurzer Gesamtführer}, Staatliche Museen, Berlin, 1936)}
\end{figure}

As it had since 1932, the foyer served as an air force memorial hall and the central exhibits remained the two “modern relics,” the fighter planes flown by Boelcke and Richthofen.\textsuperscript{173} Proceeding through the iron gates into the western wing at bay 73, the exhibition unfolded in a chronological-thematic presentation, looping around the perimeter of the western wing and courtyard, where the heavy artillery was displayed, before culminating with bays 88-90, leading back to the foyer.\textsuperscript{174} Those bays detailing predominantly thematic subjects (mobilisation; uniforms

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{169} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{170} Hahlweg, ‘Die Weltkriegsabteilung,’ p. 134.
\textsuperscript{171} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{172} Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, ‘Chronik,’ \textit{Berliner Museen}, 57, no. 4, 1936, p. 83.
\textsuperscript{174} When the exhibition opened in 1936, the three bays against the northern wall (83-85) served as temporary exhibition spaces and hosted a number of the exhibitions from the \textit{World War in Pictures} series. Later the permanent exhibits were re-configured to include these bays.
\end{flushleft}
of Germany and her allies; enemy uniforms; close combat weapons; the air force; engineering, gas protection and communications; artillery; and medical service, POW camps, and struggle in the *Heimat*) were alternated with a chronological presentation of the major events of the war in five separate bays, each dedicated to a specific war year.\footnote{Post, Das Königliche Zeughaus [1936], pp. 30-35.} In this way, according to Hahlweg, the exhibition offered a clear and unambiguous overview of events and was organised in such a way, 'that its whole form and installation conveys to the visitor an independent guided tour.'\footnote{Hahlweg, 'Die Weltkriegsabteilung,' p. 137.}

This didactic spatial approach was reinforced by a number of design techniques that helped orient the visitor, ensuring a consistent, coherent and easily comprehensible message. The chronological "war year" bays, like those of the small World War exhibits opened in 1932, incorporated a uniform organisational approach, presenting events on the Western front always on the left of each bay as the visitor progressed through the exhibition, and those of the Eastern front on the right.\footnote{Post, Das Königliche Zeughaus [1936], p. 30.} As well as providing a constant point of orientation, this helped reinforce the idea of German encirclement by creating a spatial metaphor for the war on two fronts. Likewise, the use of large coloured maps showing the entry of new opponents into the war under the title “The War of the world against us,”\footnote{Hahlweg, 'Die Weltkriegsabteilung,' p. 137.} offered another repetitive device and focussed attention on Germany's struggle for survival.

The "war year" bays were treated as uniformly as possible to facilitate a clear overview of events and an introductory wall panel detailing the main campaigns of each of the theatres of war (themselves treated individually via text panels within each section) was presented at the entrance of each bay.\footnote{Post, Das Königliche Zeughaus [1936], p. 30.} A band of “explanatory” wall texts snaked around the exhibition, indicating the content of each bay (in the present tense ‘for the sake of greater enlivenment’) and acting as a thread between the separate components.\footnote{"[…größerer Belebung halber"] Hahlweg provides examples of the present tense sentences including: "Mobilisation 1914," "The murder of the heir to the Austrian throne on 28 June 1914 gives rise to the World War, Germany puts its army in place for the struggle, the War breaks out," and "War year 1914: Western theatre of war: The Germans advance in the west begins, in Marne it comes to a standstill and ends in trench warfare." ["Mobilmaching 1914," "Die Ermordung des österreichischen Thronfolgers am 28. Juni 1914 bildet den Anlaß zum Weltkrieg, Deutschland stellt sein Heer zum Kampf bereit, der Krieg bricht aus," "Kriegsjahr 1914: Westlicher Kriegsschauplatz: Der deutsche Vormarsch im Westen beginnt, kommt an der Marne zum Stehen und endet im Stellungskrieg."] Hahlweg, 'Die Weltkriegsabteilung,' p. 137.} In addition, the exhibition was arranged in such a way that those sections utilising predominantly documents and printed material were interspersed with those featuring a more material-based approach in an attempt to keep visitors engaged and prevent mental fatigue.
Like the special exhibitions, the new World War department utilised a range of original objects from uniforms and equipment, flags, medals, and souvenirs, to artworks, posters, photographs, newspapers, and documents. Ancillary material included models, reliefs, maps, statistics, tables, explanatory text panels, and labels. Much of this interpretive material, particularly the replicas, held a similar value to the original pieces, and the inclusion of a full-sized replica of Krupp's giant "Dicke Berta" (Big Bertha) Howitzer serves as an example of the strategic use of replicas in the absence of key objects. Models and reliefs were particularly valued in this regard; a relief of the battle for Tahure (Champagne), the battlefield of Verdun, a model of Fort Douaumont, the German trench system at Argonne, and a life-sized model of German A7V tank were all singled out for special attention (Fig. 4.13).

But traditional weapons and uniforms still formed an important element and the incorporation of a memorial room in the south-west corner of the exhibition featuring the uniforms of Hindenburg, Crown Prince Wilhelm, and Commander of the German First Army, General von

Figure 4.13: Model of an A7V tank in the World War department of the Zeughaus Museum (Photo Heinrich Hoffmann, 1936, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München/Bildarchiv, Bildnr.: hoff-67995)
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181 Ibid. p. 135.
183 Beil, Der ausgestellte Krieg, p. 342.
184 Hahlweg, 'Die Weltkriegsabteilung,' p. 136; Post, Das Königliche Zeughaus [1936], pp. 30-35.
Kluck, along with portraits and souvenirs of army commanders was very much rooted in the Zeughaus tradition. After the outbreak of the Second World War, bays 82 to 85 were re-arranged to expand the exhibits in place of the *World War in Pictures* cycle, and a second memorial room was created in honour of General of the Infantry, hero of Tannenburg, and co-conspirator in the 1923 Beer Hall Putsch, Erich Ludendorff.\footnote{The changes to the exhibition, which can be traced by a comparison between the Zeughau\mbox{ }s guidebooks published in 1936 and 1941 included the expansion of the air force exhibits (formerly bay 81 only, now bays 81-82), the installation of the "War Year" section for 1916 across two bays (83 for the western front and 85 for the eastern front), and the abovementioned Ludendorff memorial room between the two 1916 exhibits in bay 84. The Ludendorff room included a portrait (donated by Dr. Mathilde Ludendorff) and his uniform. Thematically and structurally the exhibits appear to have remained otherwise unchanged. See Post, *Das Königliche Zeughaus* [1936], pp. 30-35; Zeughau\mbox{ }s Direktion, *Das Zeughaus: Amtlicher kurzer Gesamtführer* [1941], pp. 28-32.}

The historical treatment of the World War differed little from the presentation in the special exhibitions. If it included a diverse subject matter including the front, the home front, diplomacy, strategy, tactics, technology, the economy, communications, and the medical corps, it nevertheless focussed on a narrow range of interpretations. 'This is an attempt,' wrote Hahlweg, 'to bring to life a great event of the past in the totality of its multi-layered events.'\footnote{"Es wird hier versucht, ein großes Ereignis der Vergangenheit in der Gesamtheit seines mehrschichtigen Geschehens zur Anschauung zu bringen." Hahlweg, 'Die Weltkriegsabteilung,' p. 135.} But even the Zeughaus administration admitted that it was impossible to offer anything more than an overview. 'The task had to be,' wrote Post, 'to present the main events of the World War, above all to display the most important weapons and means of defence, with which the German people had to defend themselves against the attacks of the whole world.'\footnote{"Es mußte die Aufgabe sein, die Hauptgeschehnisse des Weltkrieges darzustellen, vor allem die wichtigsten Waffen und Verteidigungsmittel zur Schau zu stellen, mit denen das deutsche Volk sich gegen die Angriffe der ganzen Welt zur Wehr zu setzen hatte." Post, *Das Königliche Zeughaus* [1936], p. 28.} This assertion also makes clear that the central frame of the World War exhibition remained unchanged, even if the means with which it was mediated were enhanced by new and sophisticated exhibition principles and techniques. Though Hahlweg contended that these principles were fundamentally different to those employed in the departments arranged according to army historical epochs and the development of weapons and uniforms,\footnote{Hahlweg, 'Die Weltkriegsabteilung,' p. 135.} substantial changes within the remaining permanent displays represented both an attempt to bring a more streamlined design aesthetic to the Zeughaus and a changed understanding of the role of objects, particularly object series, as an effective means of communication. The result was a new-look exhibition and the complete rationalisation of the existing collections. At the collection level, this represented the most significant development since the establishment of the public museum between 1877 and 1883.
“Economy of thought”:: changes to the remaining permanent displays\textsuperscript{189}

The most obvious change to the remaining permanent displays was the removal of the engineering and model collections, which had been closed in the second quarter of 1935 in preparation for the new World War Department.\textsuperscript{190} These collections, along with a number of doubles and secondary objects, formed the foundation for a separate study and teaching collection that was installed across five floors of a former piano factory to create what \textit{Uniformen-Markt} called a “second Zeughaus.”\textsuperscript{191} The remaining collections formed the “display collection,” which Hahlweg described as the visible surface of the internal structure of the army museum.\textsuperscript{192} The display collection should be arranged according to the main epochs of the development of warfare, with the presentation of the soldier, again, as the focus of each period. Indeed, it was in relation to the soldier that all other objects should be oriented: “Through the presentation of the soldier and his character as the central point of the overall picture, every single object of an epoch or room receives its designated place and its particular meaning.”\textsuperscript{193} The priorities for the study collection remained far-reaching and included the systematic collecting and organisation of historical and contemporary pieces within the broadly conceived parameters of the army museum, with particular attention given to the development and progress of warfare and the organisation, function, and administration of the army.\textsuperscript{194} The display collection, on the other hand, was governed by a much stricter set of criteria, which Hahlweg summed up in the following terms: ‘Installation of less, only truly essential objects, determined through a most careful selection—no series—but all the more extensive treatment.’\textsuperscript{195}

In the Zeughaus, only those objects that were thought to capture the spirit of the era remained on display, with the aim of evoking an \textit{experience} for the visitor, to bring him (for the visitor was conceived as male) unconsciously closer to the being (\textit{Wesen}) of each period of warfare.\textsuperscript{196} The selection of characteristic items (and the corresponding reduction of the total number of objects displayed) was complemented by their placement within a clearly defined structure, with detailed explanation via labels, texts and graphics, as part of a total didactic offering.


\textsuperscript{192} Hahlweg, ‘Die Heeresmuseen: Wesen und Aufgaben,’ p. 62.

\textsuperscript{193} [‘Durch die Darstellung des Soldaten und seines Wesens als Mittelpunkt des Gesamtbildes erhält jeder einzelne Gegenstand einer Epoche bzw. eines Raumes seinen bestimmten Platz und seine eigentümliche Bedeutung.’] Ibid. p. 63.

\textsuperscript{194} Ibid. p. 62. A description of the collections held at the Johannisstraße Depot can be found in ‘Studien- und Modellsammlung des Staatlichen Zeughauses. In Berlin entsteht ein zweites Zeughaus,’ pp. 135-136.

\textsuperscript{195} [‘Aufstellung weniger, nur wirklich wesentlicher Gegenstände, bedingt durch sorgsames Auswahl—keiner Serien—dafür um so eingehendere Bearbeitung.’] Hahlweg, ‘Die Heeresmuseen: Wesen und Aufgaben,’ p. 63.

\textsuperscript{196} Ibid.
The split between the display objects and the study collection, and the different treatment of each, mirrors a broader shift with regard to the educational role of the museum. The study collection fulfilled the traditional criteria for practical military training that had emerged during the early nineteenth-century Prussian reform movement (chapter 1), as well as the scholarly concerns that had governed the later nineteenth-century disciplinary-based conception of Bildung (chapter 3). In the museum itself, however, an emphasis on experience, on “unconscious” mediation, easily comprehensible, simplistic, and repetitive ideas, reflected the principles of propaganda and Volksbildung developed in the special exhibitions and World War department. The approach was consistent with Hitler’s own assertion that propaganda ‘must be presented in a popular form and must fix its intellectual level so as not to be above the heads of the [...] lowest mental common denominator among the public it is desired to reach.’

Nevertheless, it also reflected the specific museum-pedagogical theories upon which the Zeughaus practitioners drew, most notably the work of educationalist Georg Kerschensteiner (1852-1932), who had written of an ‘economy of thought’ and the ‘principle of thought according to the least expenditure of energy.’

The spatial arrangement of the Zeughaus exhibitions constituted an active component of its didactic approach. In 1925 Kerschensteiner had spoken of opening the museum to the largest possible audience and using its physical design to aid comprehenasion: ‘If education is a value, [...] then [the museum’s] whole structure must be grown out of pedagogical principles, regardless of all other considerations of a scientific, aesthetic, social, or historical character, which must be subordinated to the pure educational perspective.’ In the World War section this was a conscious aspect of the layout. Arguably however, the organisation of the museum had always played a key role in the production of meaning. Structurally, the re-designed Zeughaus exhibits maintained a remarkable degree of continuity with the previous displays. The tour began, as it had in 1883, in the north-east corner of the upper floor, leading away from the iron gates of the Ruhmeshalle with the oldest collection pieces. Those sections dealing with the medieval arms and armour collections (bays 1-12) as well as the oriental collections opposite (bays 39-42) and the heavy artillery on the lower floor (eastern wing) remained in situ. Indeed, although the number of objects had been
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200 Post, Das Königliche Zeughaus [1936], p. 6.
rationalised, the overarching structural categories governing the collections were virtually unchanged—including the sub-sections of the arms and armour collections that had been developed by Binder and Post during the Weimar era.

So too, the predominantly progressive-developmental approach continued to govern the army-historical collections (displayed in bays 14-33), even if minute technical variances could no longer be traced through object sequences. Many of the traditional events and personalities of the Prusso-German national narrative also took centre stage (The Great Elector, Friedrich Wilhelm I, Friedrich the Great, the Wars of Liberation and the Wars of Unification). These historical figures and events reflected the intrinsic character of the collections themselves, as well as their most significant historical pieces. But structural and thematic consistencies also point to historiographical continuities, particularly with regard to the dominance of a conservative nationalist historiography already inherent in the Zeughaus displays—authoritarianism and nationalism, the centrality of “great men” to the historical narrative, the concept of the enemy (Feindbild) and a perceived threat to (a superior) German culture, the celebration of militarism, heroism and sacrifice, and the presentation of war as an eternal struggle built on both geopolitical and Social Darwinist concepts of the nation-state.

As in the earlier displays, this vision was governed by an essentially teleological approach to German history, allowing the existing narrative to historically ground both the regime and its expansionist aims through the backward projection of the current order and values onto the past. Under National Socialism there was, writes Hans Schleier, ‘no revision of the dominant paradigms and leading ideas that structured the writing of German history’. This was true also of the history presented in the museum. The existing narratives were, however, radicalised and infused with the National Socialist “blood and soil” ideology. Although the Zeughaus remained a primarily Prussian

201 The Army Historical Collections were organised under the heading “The age of the standing army from the Great Elector until the establishment of the German empire (bays 14-38)” divided as follows: “From the Great Elector (1640-1688) to King Friedrich I (1701-1713)” in bay 14; “The Soldier King Friedrich Wilhelm I (1713-1740)” in bay 15; “Friedrich the Great (1740-1786),” bays 16-20; “Uniforms end of the 18th century,” bay 21; “The time of the Wars of Liberation (1896-1815),” bays 22-25; “Prussian Uniforms from 1815-1864,” bays 27-29; “Foreign uniforms, first half of the 19th century,” bay 30; “The time of the Wars of Unification 1864-1871,” bays 31-35 (of which, “The campaign against Denmark and Austria,” bays 31-32, and “The German-French campaign 1870/71,” bays 33-35); and “The era from 1871-1914,” bays 36-38). Ibid. pp. 14-19. A focus on personalities like Friedrich the Great had been recommended by Hahlweg, ‘because they embody the strongest expression of the nature and will of an age.’ […da sie den stärksten Ausdruck des Wesens und Wollens eines Zeitalters verkörpern.] Hahlweg, ‘Die Heeresmuseen: Wesen und Aufgaben,’ p. 64.


204 Schleier, ‘German historiography under National Socialism,’ p. 177.
institution, symbolic changes like the removal of the Borussia statue from the central courtyard helped re-position the existing narratives within a pan-German framework. Prussia, instead, stood in for an idealised soldierly ethos, which the whole of the German Volk could claim as its heritage.

The status of the Zeughaus during the NS-era as a key site of state and military ritual also reflected more than a shade of Wilhelmine ceremonial practice. Both the Ruhmeshalle and the central courtyard acted as a stage for a number of state events, most prominently the annual Heroes’ Memorial Day (Heldengedenktag), at which Hitler regularly spoke before the assembled military hierarchy (Fig. 4.1). For this national day, which Goebbels had inaugurated in 1934 to re-fashion the Weimar Republic’s war remembrance as a celebration of heroic death, the Zeughaus and neighbouring Neue Wache served as the focal point for national memorialisation. ‘The Zeughaus in Berlin,’ reported the Ufa-Tonwoche on 13 March 1940, ‘the place of glory of Prussian-German military tradition, stood at the centre of the ceremony, that bound the whole German people in an hour of commemoration and remembrance.’ Hitler’s speech that year asserted victory against France and England as the ‘most glorious victory of German history,’ drawing the present conflict into a historical lineage for which the Zeughaus served as the perfect stage. This was demonstratively enacted in the exhibitions themselves, which drew a line of struggle from the Germanen in the first century to the most recent world conflict via a comprehensive collection of defensive and offensive weapons mediated as evidence of the constant threat facing the German Volk from “time immemorial” and their superior defensive capabilities.

This unbroken history, in which a war-like spirit was celebrated as the core characteristic and basic necessity of the German Volk through the ages, helped orient the Zeughaus collections as a whole towards the basic agenda established for the World War department—above all the preparation of the German population for war. In order to achieve this, the existing narrative structure needed only minimal alteration. It was far more the accessibility of the museum’s message via the incorporation of interpretive material, the prioritising of key objects over taxonomic sequences, the emotional appeal of the heroes of the German past, and the reduction of the range of meaning to a few core, easily comprehensible concepts that characterised the changes. Beyond the collecting and exhibition practice, this task was complemented by a range of new initiatives, which
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205 In 1934 a ceremony was also held in the Ruhmeshalle following Hindenburg’s death, and a funeral service for General Field Marshal Walter von Reichenau took place in 1942.

206 [‘Das Zeughaus in Berlin, die Ruhmesstätte preußisch-deutschen Soldatentums stand im Mittelpunkt der Feierlichkeit, die das ganze deutsche Volk zu eine Stunde des Gedenkens und Erinnern ausrichten zusammenschloß.’] Ufa-Tonwoche Nr. 497, 1940

207 Ibid.

208 Post, Das Königliche Zeughaus [1936], p. 6-7.
served the popularisation of museums more generally as museum authorities and external Nazi-run organisations experimented with novel methods for attracting new and larger audiences by bringing the worker to the museum and the museum to the worker.

Figure 4.14: Hitler delivers a speech for Heroes’ Memorial Day in the Zeughaus courtyard, 16 March 1941 (DHM Bildarchiv, Inv.-Nr.: BA 90/5434)

“The museum comes to the worker”: beyond the exhibition

Beyond the exhibition, the Zeughaus was co-opted into an integrated propaganda system in which a variety of ancillary programmes further supported the museum’s Volksbildung agenda. These included initiatives at the institutional level, broader state-wide museum programmes, and externally organised events run by National Socialist associations, making use of the expanded communication possibilities resulting from the subordination of the press, radio and film to the propaganda ministry and the RKK. These initiatives are equally as important as the content and design changes because they speak to the development of a variety of methods by which museums...

209“The Museum comes to the Worker” [“Das Museum kommt zum Arbeiter”] was the title of a radio programme featuring Niels v. Holst of the State Museums of Berlin’s “Foreign Office” (Außenamt) and a Frau Dr Nadolny that was broadcast by Deutschlandsender on 16 October 1935. Given the date, it is likely that the programme dealt with the “Außenbezirks” exhibition held in the Siemensstadt in 1935 that was directly aimed at bringing artworks into the workplace (below). In sentiment, however, this is an apt description of the integrated media via which the museums sought to reach a new and larger public, with a particular focus on workers, which is the topic of this section. Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, ‘Vierteljahresbericht des Aussenamts.’ Berliner Museen, 56, no. 1, 1935,’ p. 17.
mediated their collections to the public with the aim of developing new audiences. 'The museum calls,' wrote Niels von Holst of the Berlin Museums' “Foreign Office” (Außenamt), 'it seeks to captivate, it educates!'\(^\text{210}\)

The first means by which the National Socialist museum might attract potential visitors was through advertising. Posters and flyers for an expanded programme of temporary exhibitions and associated activities incorporated the graphic language of fascist aesthetics, which defined a 'total visual identity' for Nazi Germany.\(^\text{211}\) Photomontage, for example, was utilised in an attempt to demonstrate the idea of the museum as a treasure trove of interesting and beautiful things.\(^\text{212}\) The Berlin museums concentrated on mediating the location of their collections, creating simplified schematic city plans showing the museums and their most important transport connections, which they posted in S-Bahn and U-Bahn stations.\(^\text{213}\) For the posters produced for specific exhibitions and events, which were displayed throughout the city on advertising columns, a break from the 'somewhat dry' style employed in the past was sought; 'Here one glance of the passer-by must suffice to comprehend what it is about.'\(^\text{214}\) The effectiveness of the Berlin Museums’ poster design can be measured in some part by the 1937 award of “grand prix” for that category in the museological section at the *Exposition Internationale des Arts et Techniques dans la Vie Moderne* in Paris.\(^\text{215}\) Holst identified a programme of systematic advertising as a significant component of increased visitor numbers from the autumn of 1934.\(^\text{216}\)

The production of shorter, cheaper, museum guides was another museum-wide initiative. Short guides were clearly aimed at a more general audience than the scholarly works of the Weimar era and the *Kaiserreich*. If Paul Post’s guide to the Zeughaus collections of arms and armour published in 1929 was aimed at both the scholar and the interested novice, its audience was still conceived as an educated bourgeois public. The new short guides, on the other hand, were readily comprehensible, providing limited descriptions that served to orient the visitor to the main characteristics of each museum, followed by lists of the most important pieces and their location.\(^\text{217}\)

\(^{213}\) Holst, 'Die Berliner Museen und die Aussenwelt,' p. 41.
\(^{214}\) ['Hier muß ein Blick des Vorübergehenden genügen, um zu erfassen, worum es sich handelt.'] ibid.
\(^{216}\) Holst, 'Das Führungswesen ' p. 44.
They were available for as little as 10 Rpf. and were produced for each of the Berlin museums in the lead up to the Olympics, during which time they were also provided to tourists free of charge via travel agencies and hotels (Fig. 4.15). Entrance prices, too, were reduced; being capped at 10 Rpf. for individual visitors and 20 Rpf. for guided tours, with further discounts for multiple tickets.

The State Museums’ free exhibition Masterpieces of Old German Art held in the Siemens industrial complex in October 1935 serves as an example of the priority to reach working class audiences by both attracting new visitors to museums and disseminating museum offerings beyond the museum itself. The exhibition, which Nils von Holst claimed was the ‘first attempt of its kind in the history of museum practice’, offered a mixture of high art and handcrafts (including weapons and armour) and it was thought that the later recognition of objects viewed in this context would

---


218 The figure of 10 Rpf is given by Holst specifically in relation to the short guides published in 1936. He quotes the Zeughaus booklet at 25 Rpf. The 1941 Ruhmeshalle guide lists a selection of Zeughaus publications available at the time. They range from 20 Rpf. to 50 Rpf. and include two separate publications of the names inscribed on the Ehrentafel in the Ruhmeshalle (1639-1871 and 1914-1918), a short guide to the Zeughaus, Paul Post’s 1929 publication, and a short guide to the World War exhibitions dated 1937. See Holst, ‘Die Berliner Museen und die Aussenwelt,’ p. 42; Zeughaus Direktion, Das Zeughaus: Die Ruhmeshalle [1941], Back cover.

help tentative visitors feel more comfortable in the unfamiliar world of the museum itself.²²⁰ This
should be seen above all as part of a broader programme of inculcating workers into the Third
Reich. The opening up of museums, ostensibly middle-class institutions, served this function well
and was a particular aspect of what Richard J. Evans has identified as ‘spiritual and cultural means
to achieve the integration of the workers into the national community.’²²¹ Other methods by which
the museum came to the worker were via concentrated press campaigns and the adoption of new
media to the museum programme. By far the most widespread media was radio. The Berlin
Museums estimated in 1938 that a significant proportion of the German population obtained its
knowledge of public life predominantly from radio.²²² The following year German households
reportedly had the highest uptake of radio in the world, with wirelesses in over 70 per cent of
homes.²²³ Museums took advantage of this through a comprehensive series of programmes
featuring museum personnel. These were not, according to Holst, cultural historical lectures like
those already on offer in New York and Paris, ‘that would hardly win the museums new friends’, but
rather live current events stories about special exhibitions, significant objects, and museum work.²²⁴
Zeughaus Director Lorey took part in numerous programmes about, among other things, the World
War exhibition cycle, the Dreyse exhibition, a uniform book of Friedrich the Great, and the
anniversary of Ludendorf’s death.²²⁵

Far less prevalent, but completely innovative, was the use of television. Beginning in 1935,
two and-a-half-hour television broadcasts commencing at 8pm were available three nights a week
within a 30-mile radius of Berlin.²²⁶ If the uptake of television sets was negligible in comparison
with radio—in 1936 a television ‘of really any practical value’ cost around 3,500 Reichsmark, or one
thousand times the price of a small People’s Receiver (Volksempfänger)—a number of television
viewing rooms (Fernsehstuben) set up throughout Berlin were reportedly very well visited.²²⁷

²²⁰ [‘Als erster derartiger Versuch in der Geschichte des Museumswesens wurde in Berlin-Siemensstadt eine Ausstellung
von rund 50 „Meisterwerken altdeutscher Kunst“ im Oktober 1935 eröffnet und drei Wochen der Belegschaft der
Siemenswerke und der Bevölkerung des umliegenden, im Nordwestern der Stadt gelegenen Vororts unentgeltlich
²²¹ Evans, The Third Reich in power, p. 466.
²²² Holst, ‘Die Berliner Museen und die Aussenwelt,’ p. 43.
²²³ Evans, The Third Reich in power, p. 133.
²²⁴ [‘die den Museen wohl kaum neue Freunde gewinnen dürfte’] Holst, ‘Die Berliner Museen und die Aussenwelt,’ p. 43.
²²⁵ Information on Radio programmes per Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Vierteljahresbericht des Aussenamts. Berliner
Museen, various reports published 1935-1939.
²²⁶ ‘GERMANY TO OFFER TELEVISION SERVICE: Broadcasts Thrice a Week to Be Available Within Thirty-Mile Radius of
Berlin. RECEIVING SETS COSTLY Practical Ones Sell at 3,500 Marks - Programs to Include News Reels and Old Movies,’ The
²²⁷ Quoted text and television price from ibid. Comparative price of a Volksempfänger based on the cost of a standard radio
at 76 Reichsmark and a smaller version at 35 Reichmark per Evans, The Third Reich in power, p. 133. Assertion of good
attendance of television viewing rooms (Fernsehstuben) per Holst, ‘Die Berliner Museen und die Aussenwelt,’ p. 43. On
television in the Third Reich see also Monika Elsner, Thomas Müller, and Peter Spangenberg, ‘Der lange Weg eines
museums took up the new medium towards the end of 1937, creating specific programmes featuring individual objects or artworks, as well as replaying the documentary films they had produced since 1934.228 These also often centred on individual objects, as in A World in the Cabinet (1934), showing the famed seventeenth-century Pomeranian curiosity cabinet from the Applied Arts Museum, and The Guelph Treasure (1936), with the medieval bejewelled and enamelled gold reliquaries of the Brunswick Cathedral.229 In addition, an “Artwork of the Month” exhibition programme used specific objects to raise the profile of the museums by highlighting significant items from across the Berlin collections each month. Documentary films also moved beyond the object to showcase particular collections and “behind the scenes” depictions of museum work in films like Secrets of the Mummies (1935), showing the work of restorer Hugo Ibschers from the Papyrus Collection, and the Zeughaus’ offering, At the Zeughaus with the armourer (1935).230

Above all, a concentrated programme of guided tours proved the most effective method for expanding museum audiences. If, according to Holst at least, the number of visitors partaking in tours at the Metropolitan Museum (New York), the Victoria and Albert museum, and across the whole of the Philadelphia museums was sinking during the period, he happily reported a substantial increase in Berlin.231 This was represented in the number of tours on offer; 24 in 1924 against 307 in 1935, as well as participant numbers; 5,050 in 1932 to 36,468 in 1936.232 The Zeughaus offered a comprehensive and varied programme that included guided tours of sections of the permanent exhibition as well as special exhibitions, and historical and thematically structured tours on topics such as the Wars of Liberation, the development of firearms, and German knights in the Middle Ages.233

In terms of visitor numbers, reach, and the potential to underscore the Nazi Weltanschauung, the most significant tours were those organised externally by a range of Nazi-run

---


229 [Eine Welt im Schrank] and [Die Welfenschatz]


231 Holst, ‘Das Führungswesen ’ p. 44.

232 Ibid.

organisations, most notably the Nazi Students’ League and Strength through Joy. These tours far outstripped the official programmes organised by the museums themselves and represented in the figures above. Of a total of 39,387 visitors attending Berlin museums via a guided tour during the second quarter of 1935, only 5,539 did so through a scheduled museum-run tour. KdF ran 165 tours and evening lectures in the same period, attracting 6,154 guests, while the student union held 890 tours for 9,060 people, 640 of which (6,470 guests) took place in the Zeughaus. Tourist sightseeing companies accounted for a further 140 tours with 4,262 attendees. Other non-official groups to register with the museums included regional NSDAP groups, the SA, SS, army groups and associations, school groups, adult education centres (Volkshochschulen), and university lecturers. Of the 14,012 visitors across the Berlin museums via these different groups during the same quarter, Berliner Museen reported over half attended a tour of the Zeughaus.

These initiatives often included some degree of museum collaboration. One KdF poster ran the slogan “Berlin Museum Directors guide for KdF,” and indeed, Lorey provided two-hour Sunday tours as part of this programme. The leisure organisation had been established in late November 1933 under the auspices of the DAF. It offered a wide range of initiatives and activities, with which it sought to boost productivity in the workplace, structure and control leisure time, and offer instruction in Nazi ideology. Workplace beautification competitions, factory concerts, discounted cultural events, mass tourism, most famously its cruises, and sport became means to ‘insert an ideological content into every kind of leisure.’ Many of these activities, and in this respect museums are the perfect example, aimed to ‘bridge the class divide by making middle-class leisure activities available to the masses.’ KdF began its organised tours in the Berlin museums in February 1934, offering tours mostly outside regular museum hours, and their success reportedly exceeded all expectations. Figures for 1936 showed that 362,029 visitors, 21.6 per cent of all visitors to the state museums, had attended as part of a KdF initiative; even more remarkably 70 per cent of those had never set foot inside a museum before. Holst spoke of a fear of museums

235 Ibid. p. 90.
236 Ibid.
237 Ibid. pp. 89-90. Together these groups accounted for 416 tours, 43 of which were conducted by museum employees.
239 ’Sonntags in ein Museum! Neues Werden im “Zeughaus” zu Berlin,’ p. 90.
240 Evans, The Third Reich in power, p. 466.
241 Ibid.
242 Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, ’Chronik.’ Berliner Museen, 55, no. 1, 1934,’ p. 19. The following issue of Berliner Museen reported that students from the student union now had permission to hold public tours of the Zeughaus following a training course with an exam. Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, ’Chronik.’ Berliner Museen, 55, no. 2, 1934,’ p. 39.
244 Ibid.
(Museumsfurcht) that had been successfully combated by the KdF initiatives, adding; 'The notification that they will be guided (ie. need not "actively" deal with the strange museum material), appears to be the necessary prerequisite for overcoming the existing inhibitions.' 245 Of all the tours offered by KdF, Berlin's art museums proved most difficult to penetrate. The Zeughaus, on the other hand, along with the city palace, proved immensely popular:

> The "gateway" to the museums for the working population are the palace and the Zeughaus. The impressions that are to be won there, conform organically to the worldview of the working people, for whom "Old Fritz," the old army ("the Prussians"), Bismarck, Hindenburg, etc. are lively images, as opposed to: Amarna Period, Florence of the Medici!

According to visitor numbers provided by Director Lorey and compiled by Thümmler, total annual visitors to the Zeughaus rose from 390,609 in 1932 to 946,629 in 1942. 246 Monthly figures for paid visitors, much lower than those reported for total visitors but more complete for the period between April 1933 and March 1940, show as many as 121,925 visitors for the month of August 1936—coinciding with the Berlin Olympics—with an average across the period 1934-39 of 31,418 visitors per month. 247

The initiatives undertaken by the Berlin museums were not exclusive to Nazi Germany. Many other nations, particularly the United States, Britain and France, were also experimenting with new ways of broadening museum audiences during the period, introducing evening opening hours and tours (as in the Louvre’s "Le Louvre la nuit" campaign), visitor evaluation (the Brussels museums' education service surveys), special schools’ tours and the incorporation of curriculum subjects, new advertising techniques, and, like Germany, the use of radio and film. 248 Indeed, American museums perceived themselves at the forefront with regard to large-scale educational activities, which one commentator believed to have grown out of the 'social and historical development of the U.S.A.', which had 'created a basic tendency toward civic-mindedness and common public interest which is not paralleled by similar European endeavors.' 249 This may well have been the case, but this kind of deployment of museums for the "common public interest"

245 ['Die Ankündigung, daß mangeführt werden wird (also nicht “aktiv” den unheimlichen Museumsstoff bewältigen muß), ist offenbar die notwendige Vorbedingung, um die vorhandenen Hemmungen hinwegzuräumen.] ibid.
246 Ibid.
247 Thümmler, 'Das Zeughaus im Zweiten Weltkrieg: eine Studie zu den Aufgaben der Wirksamkeit des Museums'. Anlage 4, Tabelle 2 (Appendix 4, Table 2).
248 Based on data provided in ibid.
249 Holst, 'Das Museumswesen auf der Pariser Weltausstellung,' pp. 93-104.
within a system ostensibly built not on state control or even sponsorship but private philanthropy was a very different model. In Germany these projects were both novel and centrally focussed. In conjunction with the changes in exhibition priorities and practice they were part of a total re-orientation of German museum culture towards the realisation of National Socialist goals. Hellmut Lehmann-Haupt, a Civil Arts Administrator with the U.S. occupying forces in post-war Germany, looked back at the Nazi museum practice in the wake of the enormous destruction of the Second World War. 'The Nazis realized with a shrewed [sic.] instinct', he stated,

the enormous potentialities of art as a social factor in Germany. They knew how to activate the German bourgeois’ pride in the artistic heritage of his country and how to play upon the cultural resentment of the underprivileged. They attempted to bridge the traditional gap which separated the intellectual leaders from other social groups. Deliberately, they planned to draw the scientist, the scholar and the artist from his ivory tower [...] They sensed the hitherto neglected opportunity and grasped it.251

In the Zeughaus this amounted to the full exploitation of the museum to prepare the population for war. When it came in 1939 the task of the museum shifted to the maintenance of support through the demonstration of German victory, coupled with the de-humanisation of the enemy. As Berlin’s premier site for war propaganda, the museum remained open much longer than any other, but like all the museums in the capital it also had to take measures to secure its collections against damage and destruction. The ultimate toll of the war the museum helped maintain was, however, just that.

Booty & Bombing, 1939-45

The third-quarter issue of Berliner Museen for 1939 provided, as usual, a brief overview of the work of the museums under the state umbrella—information about publications, lectures, press reports, the “Artwork of the Month,” special exhibitions, and personnel. On conclusion the report simply stated: ‘The State Museums are closed to visitors until further notice. Only the Zeughaus is open daily between 11 and 15 o’clock.’252 Over the following months, selected sections of museums were opened for short periods to the public,253 while in three of the lower floor halls of the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum space was provided for selected exhibits from across the State Museums, with one or two “masterpieces” being shown on a weekly rotational basis.254 But despite these efforts, the

253 For instance, on 5 May 1940 the large hall in the Near Eastern department (Pergamon Museum) was opened for a tour of the Processional Street and Ishtar Gate, which was repeated on 19 May with the inclusion of a recital by young musicians. The museums also held slide shows and lectures after the closure of the actual exhibits. Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, 'Chronik,' Berliner Museen, 61, no. 3, 1940,’ pp. 50-51.
254 Examples for April to August 1940 included Dürer’s Hieronymus Holzschuher and Drahtziehmühle, Brüggemann’s Lautespielende Engel, Vermeer’s Woman with a Pearl Necklace, Rubens’ Perseus and Andromeda and Portrait of Isabella Brandt, Pesne’s Portrait of Friedrich the Great, a statuette of Zeus from Dodona, the Kopfreliquiar des heiligen Cosmos from
outbreak of war essentially spelled the closure of the Berlin museums and the beginning of air-raid protection measures, including the removal of the most precious artworks and objects to museum cellars and the transportation of particularly valuable items to external shelters.\footnote{The Museums utilise a Ushak carpet, Anatolia (6th-Century). Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, 'Chronik.' Berliner Museen, 61, no. 1/2, 1940, p. 50.}

Already in 1938, amidst mounting tensions over the Sudetenland, Zeughaus staff had evacuated objects to the vault of the neighbouring Deutsche Zentralgenossenschaftskasse.\footnote{The museums utilised storage in the basement of the Reichs Bank, the vault of the Prussian National Bank, and the deep vault underneath the Reichs Mint. With no cellar of its own, the Zeughaus made use of these external vaults. Bundesministerium für gesamtedeutsche Fragen, Bonner Berichte aus Mittel- und Ostdeutschland: Die Verluste der öffentlichen Kunstsammlungen in Mittel- und Ostdeutschland 1943-46 (Bonn: Deutscher Bundes-Verlag, 1954), p. 11.} The identification of priority objects had actually begun well prior to the commencement of official air-raid measures in August 1939. In fact, as early as September 1934 Otto Kümmel had written to all Berlin State museums asking for lists of objects for safekeeping in the event of an attack. 'Measures must already be taken,' he wrote, 'to secure the contents of the museums against the possibility of an aerial attack.'\footnote{In February 1935 the Zeughaus administration secured 10 cubic meters in the vault of the Deutsche Zentralgenossenschaftskasse. The museums utilised storage in the basement of the Reichs Bank, the vault of the Prussian National Bank, and the deep vault underneath the Reichs Mint. With no cellar of its own, the Zeughaus made use of these external vaults. Bundesministerium für gesamtedeutsche Fragen, Bonner Berichte aus Mittel- und Ostdeutschland: Die Verluste der öffentlichen Kunstsammlungen in Mittel- und Ostdeutschland 1943-46 (Bonn: Deutscher Bundes-Verlag, 1954), p. 11.} He requested the museums immediately compile three separate lists, namely: I) the absolutely irreplaceable items, which would most likely be secured outside the city as soon as danger of an aerial attack occurred; II) the most valuable items with the exception of Group I, to be evacuated progressively with additional secure storage to be provided in-house or in the immediate vicinity; and III) the remaining collections, which 'must be left to their fate for the time being, apart from the general air-raid protection measures.'\footnote{"Schon jetzt müssen Massnahmen [sic.] getroffen werden, um den Inhalt der Museen Möglichkeit gegen Fliegerangriffe zu sichern." Otto Kümmel, 'Letter to All Departments of the State Museums of Berlin Regarding Air-Raid Protection Measures, 20 September 1934,' (DHM-HA: Rep. Z 475). On Germany's early defences against air attack see Richard J. Evans, The Third Reich at war (New York: Penguin Press, 2009), 435.}

In 1941 two depots were made available in the anti-aircraft bunkers in the Berlin districts of Tiergarten (Zoo Bunker) and Friedrichshain. They were designated for the protection of the first order objects from across the Berlin collections. In a later report, the former State Museums (West),
at this stage under provisional custodianship of a West German trust, described the particular difficulty in securing the Zeughaus material because of the variety of objects in the collections.259 The type of material removed from site, including delicate flags and standards, uniforms, medals, helmets, swords, battle-axes, cross-bows, firearms, complete suits of armour (for both man and steed), and even Friedrich II’s stuffed horse, certainly posed greater logistical problems than less materially diverse collections such as paintings and drawings. Like Old Fritz’ horse, many of the objects considered irreplaceable were historical souvenirs, including the sword of the Great Elector, the uniform of Friedrich the Great, Napoleon’s famed medals and hat, Gneisenau’s hat and Blücher’s cap, orders, and associated memorabilia, Kaiser Wilhelm’s gold and silver chaplets and his uniform, and the uniforms of Bismarck, Hindenburg and Ludendorff, and Hindenburg’s death mask.260

Among the most valuable collection objects not categorised as historical memorabilia were the sixth-century Spangenhelm and thirteenth-century Great Helm, the shield of Henry the II of France, a number of historical flint-lock and wheel-lock pistols, cross-bows, swords, paintings, and a significant number of Prussian flags and uniforms from the era of Friedrich II. These objects were placed in the Zoo bunker, with fifty-three crates being transported there in 1941.261 Gerhard Quaas, who has recently completed a detailed catalogue of the most significant Zeughaus losses, cites the Zoo bunker as the site of 2,400 of the most valued objects.262

By the end of the 1942 the evacuation of objects beyond Berlin had also begun, utilising numerous small storage facilities, mostly private manors, so that many collections were now disbursed throughout Germany.263 The Zeughaus objects were predominantly transported to two locations, both in the eastern occupied territories of West Prussia at Graudenz (Grudziądz) and Deutsch-Krone (Wałcz). At the same time inventories, catalogues and card indexes were photographed. Kümmel stressed the irreplaceability of this material in his address to a national

---

259 The Zeughaus was included in the post-war report despite having been transferred to the Wehrmacht in 1940. All told, the Zeughaus Museum was under the administration of the State Museums for just over 20 of its at that stage 100 years as a museum, from 1919-1940. Ehemals Staatliche Museen Berlin, Die Berliner Museen (Berlin: Verlag Gebr. Mann, 1953), p. 150.
261 The number of crates transported is provided in Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, 228; See also Ehemals Staatliche Museen Berlin, Die Berliner Museen, pp. 150-151; Bundesministerium für gesamtdeutsche Fragen, Bonner Berichte p. 34.
263 Bundesministerium für gesamtdeutsche Fragen, Bonner Berichte p. 11.
conference on air-raid protection for museums and libraries that year.\textsuperscript{264} The importance of securing the records must, however, be balanced against their daily use. ‘A truly satisfactory solution here has not yet been found,’ he wrote, ‘but for some time photo copies are being produced on a large scale.’\textsuperscript{265}

In the final phase, beginning on 6 June 1944 with the intensification of bombing raids over the city, the extensive evacuation of museum objects to storage in makeshift depots (salt mines and collieries) throughout central Germany took place, ceasing only on 1 April 1945 when further removal became impossible.\textsuperscript{266} A last-minute command to evacuate the bunkers at Zoo and Friedrichshain on 8 March 1945 resulted in the partial removal of museum objects, those from the Zeughaus taken primarily to a salt-mine at Schönebeck an der Elbe and a colliery at Kaiseroxod/Merker.\textsuperscript{267} By this stage, however, the frequent relocation of objects had already resulted in significant losses.\textsuperscript{268} With the advance of the Soviet Army in August 1944, those objects in the eastern provinces had been hurriedly moved. Five of seven train carriages of Zeughaus material were seized by Soviet and Polish troops and further losses occurred in the destruction of temporary accommodation organised for the surviving material, which was scattered throughout Brandenburg and Thüringen.\textsuperscript{269}

At the Zeughaus measures were also taken to protect the objects that remained on site.\textsuperscript{270} Unlike the State Museums, the Zeughaus remained open, not only in the immediate period following

\begin{flushright}
\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item "Eine wirklich befriedigende Lösung ist hier noch nicht gefunden, jedoch werden seit einiger Zeit in großem Umfang Photokopien hergestellt." ibid. The Berlin museums' non-movable material culture—frescoes, sculptures, significant architectural works and ornamentation—was also systematically photographed from 1943 to document the most artistically significant museum structures. Bundesministerium für gesamtdeutsche Fragen, \textit{Bonner Berichte} p. 12.
\item Bundesministerium für gesamtdeutsche Fragen, \textit{Bonner Berichte} p. 12. On the escalation of allied bombing Richard J. Evans writes: 'Of the 1.42 million tons of bombs dropped on Germany during the war, no fewer than 1.18 million tons fell between the end of April 1944 and the beginning of May 1945, the war's final year.' This was compounded by the reduced German defences by this time, so that strategic bombing became much more effective. Evans, \textit{The Third Reich at war}, pp. 461-462.
\item Müller, \textit{Vom Arsenal zum Museum}, pp. 228-229.
\item Quaas, Nützmann, and Deutsches Historisches Museum, \textit{'Jagdwaffen,'} p. 27.
\item These locations included Gebersdorf/Dahme and Golzow in Brandenburg. In the latter at least 1,300 flags were lost to fire. Tübingen locations included Saaldorf and Freyburg/Unstrut. Müller, \textit{Vom Arsenal zum Museum}, p. 228. Lists drafted in 1947 held in the DHM Archives also provide details of the numerous storage locations of the Zeughaus objects. 'List II. Aufstellung der aus dem Zeughaus von der russischen Besatzungsmacht weggeführten Sammlungsbestände von A. Plakturn Zoo, B. Zeughausgebäude, 1947' (DHM-HA/Rep. Z.475a) and 'List III. Sammlungsbestände des Zeughauses in den verlagerungsorten Mai 1945, 1947.' (DHM-HA/Rep. Z.475a).
\item Objects were secured them behind pillars and additional fire prevention was carried out, including the painting of the attic with fire-retardant and the doubling of the fire watch. Hermann Lorey. Lorey, 'Director's Report,' 12.5.1941, (DHM-HA: Rep. Z.475).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
\end{flushright}
the outbreak of war, but almost to the last, only closing its doors in September 1944. Given the damage sustained in Berlin from the latter part of 1943 with the intensification of strategic bombing over the capital, it is difficult to imagine how the museum remained open so long, and indeed, it was forced to close for periods of time. At the Zeughaus, the most significant damage prior to the final battle for Berlin in April/May 1945 was sustained on 23 November 1943, with a fire breaking out in the roof trusses.

Following the raids much of the city lay in ruins and the international press reported havoc in the streets of the capital, the destruction of the Friedrichstrasse train station, the Kroll Opera, and the Zeughaus, as ‘acrid smoke from Berlin’s fires drifted as far Northward as the southern tip of the Swedish Baltic Island[s]’. The Zeughaus had not been razed as a number of newspapers claimed, but the operation of the museum was severely hampered by partial destruction and the extreme conditions in the city. During the following months British Bomber Command attacked Berlin on over eighteen occasions, resulting in 9,000 deaths and 812,000 homeless. Major landmarks were destroyed along with the bulk of the train stations. Trams were upturned, apartment blocks and office buildings went up in flames, unexploded shells remained a constant danger, and at one point an elephant and a giraffe were said to be roaming the streets following the destruction of the Berlin Zoo.

But a complete evacuation of the Zeughaus was out of the question. ‘A rescue of all the collection objects would be synonymous with the closure of the Zeughaus,’ wrote Lorey in 1941, ‘which would be irresponsible in view of the importance of the museum during the war. Precisely

---

271 Thümmler states that the Zeughaus remained open until 1944, Thümmler, ‘Das Zeughaus im Zweiten Weltkrieg: eine Studie zu den Aufgaben der Wirksamkeit des Museums’, 248; the more precise date of September 1944 is given by both Regina Müller and Christine Beil; Müller, Die Baugeschichte, p. 246; Beil, Der ausgestellte Krieg, p. 269; On the damage to the building see Müller, Die Baugeschichte, p. 248.

272 Following the bombing raids on 23 November 1943 the museum could not re-open until the construction of a temporary roof. The museum announced to the press on 14 April 1944 that it was open to the public, though only the artillery collections on the lower floor were accessible. Pressenotiz No. 275/44 dated 14.4.1944 (DHM-HA: Rep Z 283). It had also been closed for periods during 1942-43, citing technical reasons. See also Quaas, König, and Deutsches Historisches Museum, Verluste aus den Sammlungen des Berliner Zeughauses, p. 18.

273 Müller, Die Baugeschichte, p. 248.


275 Evans, The Third Reich at war, p. 460.

276 While minimal in relation to the kind of destruction wrought in the firestorms of Hamburg, Magdeburg, the later bombing of Nuremburg and Dresden or, proportionately, the destruction of entire medieval towns along the Baltic coast, many of Berlin's streets were unrecognisable or untrafficable. Roger Moorhouse, Berlin at war: life and death in Hitler's capital 1939-45 (New York: Basic Books, 2010), pp. 323-324. Contemporary foreign reports of the bombing of November 1943 include; 'No Rest for Berlin,' p. 1; 'Russia Danced with Joy in Midst of Berlin Havoc,' p. 5; 'BERLIN SAID TO RESEMBLE BATTLEFIELD,' p. 9; Axelsson, Zoo Animals Roam Berlin Streets,' pp. 2-3.
now it is at the centre of attention and has demonstrated extraordinarily high visitor numbers.'

Thus, despite mammoth evacuation efforts, the fate of many Zeughaus objects was subordinated to the political requirements for continued military edification, the generation of war enthusiasm, and the maintenance of civilian morale.

The Zeughaus didn’t merely remain open during the war; between October 1939 and March 1943 it offered a changing programme of special exhibitions, many of which were modelled on the traditional trophy presentations that had dominated the Zeughaus history. The first of these opened just six weeks after the invasion of Poland under the title *War Booty from Poland* (14 October 1939), and showcased uniforms, machine guns, grenade throwers, field cannons, flags, and close-combat weapons from the “liberation” of Danzig (Gdańsk) and the struggle for Gotenhafen (Gdynia) (Fig. 4.16). In addition, a number of exhibitions centred on the work of war artists. Beginning in November the Zeughaus presented *Pictorial documents from the campaign in Poland*, featuring over thirty sketches by war artist Ernst Vollbehr, whose work had also featured in the World War cycle. 'These are factual reports that speak', reported *Uniformen-Markt* of the tempera sketches made by Vollbehr from the cockpit of a fighter plane, ‘right in the heart of the action’.

In the courtyard a changing display of war booty presented the spoils of the various campaigns and theatres of war. French trophies, in particular, held a symbolic resonance beyond the anonymous weapons of modern-technological warfare, and many came not from the battlefield, but from the French military museums (primarily the Musée de l’Armée). The political significance of the “return” of objects lost to France not only under the Treaty of Versailles but dating back to the Napoleonic wars, is evident in the example of the “Twelve Electors” cannon series displayed along with contemporary French booty in 1940 (Fig. 4.17).

---


278 On the effects the sustained Allied bombing and defeat in North Africa, Stalingrad, the surrender of Italy, and cuts to rationing on civilian morale, including disaffection with the Nazi Party, during the last years of the war see Evans, *The Third Reich at war*, pp. 418-423; 428; 449-450; 463; 467-474. Morale is a complicated issue and in some instances Allied attacks had the opposite effect, strengthening resolve. It is safe to assume, however, that the maintenance of civilian morale was a priority for the Zeughaus exhibitions during the war. On bombing and morale in Berlin Moorhouse, *Berlin at War*, pp. 157-159; 133-135.


281 [Diese mehr als 30 Bilder entstehen in Glaskanzeln von Bomberflugzeugen usw., mit Temperafarben mitten im Geschehen; sie wurden geradezu im Flugzeugtempo gemalt. Das sind redende Tatsachenberichte, überraschend schnell erfaßt; die bewundernswerte Meisterhand des Künstlers hat die Atmosphäre der Schlachtfelder als Wirklichkeit gebannt.’ ibid.
Captured by Napoleonic troops from the arsenal in Vienna in 1805, the cannons, which featured full-length portrait reliefs designed by Andreas Schlüter, had been cast in Berlin between 1708 and 1710 by Johann Jacobi under instruction from King Friedrich I in commemoration of his Hohenzollern forefathers. A thirteenth cannon, the “King's Cannon” featuring Friedrich himself, was also part of the series. All but the “Albrecht-Achilles” featuring Albrecht III (1414-86) had been deployed by Friedrich the Great in his attempt to hold Prague during the 1744 campaign of the War of Austrian Succession, and had been captured and taken to Vienna as his troops made their retreat. It was from there that they were taken to Paris in 1805 (eight remaining in total after four were smelted), while the "Albrecht-Achilles" remained in Berlin and was eventually transferred to the museum collections following unification. After 135 years in French possession the cannons represented a trophy prize of great symbolic value, directly linked to the history of the Zeughaus itself.

283 Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 30.
After German fortunes reversed, the task of mediating victory became much more difficult, as the example of *Fight in Central Russia* makes clear. Opening on Heroes’ Memorial Day at which Hitler officiated on 21 March 1943, the exhibition was organised with the cooperation of the Army Group Centre High Command under Rudolf Christoph Freiherr von Gersdorff (1905-80) and came in the immediate wake of defeat and surrender at Stalingrad. This devastating blow was too significant a setback to ignore and the exhibition instead incorporated a memorial to the last heroic defenders of Stalingrad. It was, according to the exhibition catalogue, ‘a matter of course for the Zeughaus to pay special honour to those brave men of the Sixth Army, whose heroic sacrifice deeply obliges the whole nation.’

Divided into seven sections in the west wing of the lower floor, the exhibition included captured weapons and equipment, a portrait of the “gangs of bandits” (Soviet partisan units) in the central Russian forest, the tactical and logistic preparations of a German

---

285 Also present were Göring, Himmler, Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces Field Marshal Keitel, and Admiral Dönitz.
287 [‘...für das Zeughaus eine Selbstverständlichkeit, jener tapferen Männer von der 6. Armee, deren heroisches Opfer die ganze Nation aufs tiefste verpflichtet, in besonderer Weise zu gedenken.’] ibid.
division, economy, supply, and "spiritual care" of the troops, a selection of sketches by war artists, and finally, a small memorial to Napoleon's ill-fated Russian campaign of 1812.\textsuperscript{288}

Key exhibits included large trophy pieces like the cockpit of an enemy plane with parachute, a Soviet field cannon, superheavy Russian flamethrowers and grenade launchers, and a number of tanks, including an amphibian tank, which was displayed outside on the \textit{Kastanienwäldchen}.\textsuperscript{289} Other items of note included a replica German bunker, Soviet propaganda material and leaflet bombs, and, billed as a means of fighting that only the Bolshevik mind could conceive, a dog strapped with explosives designed to detonate beneath tanks and vehicles (Fig. 4.18).\textsuperscript{290} As captured weapons, these objects served both to verify German success and to demonstrate the baseness of the enemy, whose methods of warfare were contrasted with German discipline and order. The final, historical section detailing the retreat of Napoleon's \textit{Grande Armée} in 1812 was perhaps intended to salve the sting of German defeat. Not only had the Russian winter defeated one of the greatest generals in history, but history itself had proven Germany triumphant in the final confrontation at Waterloo. The current loss could therefore be framed not as a turning point on the path to German defeat, but as part of a larger historical destiny in which German victory was pre-ordained.

\textbf{Figure 4.18:} A Soviet "mine dog" in the exhibition \textit{Fight in Central Russia}, opened 21 March 1943 (Photo Heinrich Hoffmann, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München/Bildarchiv, Bildnr.: hoff-63352)

\textsuperscript{288} Ibid. pp. 1-14.  
\textsuperscript{289} Ibid. pp. 4-6.  
\textsuperscript{290} Ibid. pp. 4-7.
The large Soviet tanks on display further attested to German prowess, and according to Gersdorff’s account, it was Hitler’s eagerness to view the amphibious tank that led him hurriedly through the exhibition and into the western grove, in the process thwarting the officer’s attempt to detonate a time-delayed explosive designed to assassinate the Führer.²⁹¹ While Gersdorff’s claimed assassination attempt was ultimately of no consequence, it does point to the small but persistent resistance movement among senior army ranks that would culminate in the famous 20 July Plot under Claus Schenk Graf von Stauffenberg (1907-44) the following year and the significant losses that precipitated the intensification of these resistance efforts. In any case, the exhibition proved the last of the Zeughaus special exhibitions and while the museum remained open for a further eighteen months, the autumn of 1943 brought the large-scale Allied bombing campaigns that would eventually leave the city in ruin.

The extensive damage suffered by the Berlin museums was primarily a result of this prolonged aerial bombing, a situation made worse by the centralisation of many of the most important institutions. ‘To have some idea of the problem,’ wrote British art critic John Russell in 1960, ‘the Londoner must imagine that the National Gallery the British Museum and the Victoria and Albert are close neighbours and that every one of them has been virtually destroyed.’²⁹² The Zeughaus also bore further damage in the final months of the war with the Ruhmeshalle badly hit, the upper floors of the eastern and western wings gutted by carpet-bombing, and much of the sculptural work on the upper balustrades damaged or destroyed (Fig. 4.19).²⁹³ Berlin’s major collection losses, on the other hand, came not as a result of the air raids or even the final ground assault as Soviet troops advanced on the capital, but were sustained after the surrender of the city.²⁹⁴

A post-war report detailing collections destroyed up to the cessation of fighting cited losses at the Reich Mint (10-11 March 1945), the basement of the city palace (early 1945), the basement of the Gropius Building (3 February 1945), in which Faïence ware, Byzantine and Coptic material and furniture, including the housing of the magnificent Pomeranian curiosity cabinet that had been the subject of its own museum film were destroyed by incendiary bombing, and in the Friedrichshain bunker, where an artillery shell breached a window during the final days of fighting resulting in a

²⁹¹ Rudolf-Christoph Gersdorff, Soldat im Untergang (Frankfurt/M.; Berlin; Wien: Ullstein, 1977), pp. 128-133.
²⁹³ Müller, Die Baugeschichte, p. 248.
²⁹⁴ During aerial attacks the Altes Museum was burnt out, whole sections of the Neues Museum were completely destroyed, and damage to the Pergamon also resulted in minor damage to some of the larger works not removed from site, including the Market Gate of Miletus, the Ishtar Gate, and the Mshatta façade. Geismeier, ‘History of the State Museums,’ p. 20; Mason Hammond, ‘The War and Art Treasures in Germany,’ College Art Journal, 5, no. 3, 1946, p. 212.
fire on the first floor, which destroyed all but eleven of a collection of glass paintings from the Palace Museum. In the case of the Zeughaus, the most significant losses prior to capitulation occurred during a bombing raid in January 1945 in which a large part of the building housing the study collection on Johannisstraße went up in flames. During the final days of battle the Gebersdorf Palace, one of the Zeughaus storage sites holding a large quantity of flags, was also lost to fire. Notwithstanding further destruction and damage to individual consignments throughout the capital and further afield, the bulk of the Berlin museum treasures had, nonetheless, been spared.

![Image](image.png)

Figure 4.19: The north west corner of the lower floor after 1945 (DHM Bildarchiv, Inv.-Nr.: GN 5187)

The city officially surrendered on 2 May 1945, ahead of the total and unconditional surrender of Nazi Germany on 8 May. The day before, the area around Zoo bunker had been occupied and Soviet troops had relieved the Germans of their watch. Otto Kümmel inspected the facilities with Soviet Major Lipskeroff on 3 May and in the following days the wholesale evacuation
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297 Ibid.
of the depot took place. By the time the area was handed over to the British occupying forces there was little trace of the contents of the bunker. At Friedrichshain, the withdrawal of Soviet troops from guard duty on 5 May resulted in looting and fire, causing further damage to the first floor. A subsequent fire on 15/16 May destroyed the second and third floors of the depot, predominantly housing artworks from the Kaiser-Friedrich Museum, the National Gallery and the Egyptian Museum. While a proportion of medieval and Renaissance paintings and sculptures had been removed to a Thüringen salt-mine, thus eventually finding their way to the British and US collecting points set up at Celle and Wiesbaden, the fires were catastrophic, prompting one American observer to write: ‘This loss bids fair to outrank even those of such cities as Munich, Warsaw, or Leningrad as the most serious single cultural loss of the war.’ Over the following months the remaining depots were cleared and the museum buildings were systematically searched for remaining valuables, so that by April 1946 the Egyptian and Islamic Collections, the Sculpture Department and Painting Gallery, the Prints and Drawings Cabinet, the Applied Arts Museum, Far Eastern Department, Coin Cabinet, Museum for Pre- and Early History, and the Zeughaus had all been plundered. Individual looting in all occupation zones was also a contributing factor to the loss of museum holdings, but nothing compared to the government-sanctioned expropriation of artworks in the Soviet occupied territories.

The vast majority of the Zeughaus collections were, like the building itself, located in the Soviet zone and the aforementioned Zoo bunker. Approximately 1,000 Zeughaus objects made their way to the American collecting point at Wiesbaden, but most were subject to the Soviet evacuation policy. Gerhard Quaas estimates the total Zeughaus losses to be in the realm of 40,000 objects, many of those comprising industrial mass-produced weapons that were subject to destruction under Allied Control Council regulations, but also numerous items considered to be of irreplaceable cultural value. While weapons produced before 1850 or of particular artistic or historical significance were supposed to be spared the wholesale destruction, in practice thousands of such items were scrapped, including over 500 military and civil weapons dating from the eighteenth-

299 Ibid.
302 On the circumstances of the fire itself see Bundesministerium für gesamtdeutsche Fragen, Bonner Berichte pp. 14-15; See also Hammond, ‘The War and Art Treasures in Germany,’ p. 213.
306 Ibid. p. 9.
century. Paul Post’s claim in 1934 that Napoleon’s medals had finally found their permanent home in the Zeughaus also proved premature. They formed part of the Soviet haul at Zoo and have never returned. Eight of the nine remaining cannons of the “Twelve Electors” series (including the “King’s Cannon”), made their way back to Paris; as one post-war report noted, some making the journey for the second time.

On 13 May 1946 the Allied Control Council issued Directive No. 30 pertaining to the Liquidation of German Military and Nazi Memorials and Museums. It stated:

Every existing monument, poster, statue, edifice, street or highway name marker, emblem, tablet, or insignia, of a type the planning, designing, erection, installation, posting or other display of which is prohibited by Paragraph I of this directive [which tends to preserve and keep alive the German military tradition, to revive militarism or to commemorate the Nazi Party, or which is of such a nature as to glorify incidents of war] must be completely destroyed and liquidated by 1 January 1947; also all military museums and exhibitions must be closed and liquidated by 1 January 1947 throughout the entire German territory.

In February the Prussian state followed; together with its central government and all its agencies it was abolished on the grounds that it had ‘been a bearer of militarism and reaction in Germany and [had] de facto ceased to exist.’ The remnants of the Berlin State Museums now resided in a city partitioned into four zones of military occupation, its objects separated by an increasingly widening East/West divide. The dissolution of the Prussian state compounded the situation, in the West at least. With no legal successor within the federalised cultural landscape of West Germany, the remaining Prussian art collections were a legal and administrative anomaly. Those remaining in Wiesbaden and Celle were placed in the trust of the respective states until an adequate solution was found with the establishment of the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation (Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz; SPK), ten years after the dissolution of Prussia in 1957. No such problem existed in the East, where the Soviet-style economic and administrative pattern that was imposed early on
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308 All post-war reports until recently have stated that the whereabouts of the medals is unknown, but have presumed they remain in Russia. In Quaas’ catalogue published in 2011 they have been successfully located in the numismatic department of the State Historical Museum, Moscow. The section is not open to the public. Quaas, Konig, and Deutsches Historisches Museum, Verluste aus den Sammlungen des Berliner Zeughauses; Quaas, ”Weg ist eben nicht weg. Recherche zu den Kriegsverlusten aus der Zeughaussammlung,” p. 6.
provided a centralised state ownership model and the former state museums simply re-emerged as the State Museums of Berlin (East).\footnote{The designation (east) is for the purpose of clarity. The GDR never sought to clarify the museum body in relation to its western counterpart, just as it never referred to itself as East Germany or to the capital as East Berlin. West German references to the museum administration as well as international bibliographic references often use the bracketed clarification to distinguish between the Berlin museum authorities as they emerged in East and West.}

The Zeughaus, however, had spent its last days not under that state umbrella, but under the Wehrmacht and its dissolution came about in the autumn of 1945, well prior to the issue of Directive No. 30. A severely damaged building and some 4,950 objects were all that remained of the 250 year old Zeughaus by the close of the decade.\footnote{The estimated number of objects remaining on site at the Zeughaus is provided by Heinrich Müller, who was directly involved in the post-war efforts to recover the dispersed collections. The number is provided for the year 1952, when the Museum for German History was established and commenced its salvage of the material. Müller, \textit{\textquoteleft Die Bestände des Zeughauses: Probleme der Rückführung}, p. 69. See also Quaas, Nützmann, and Deutsches Historisches Museum, \textit{\textquoteleft Jagdwaffen}, p. 27. More recently Quaas and Konig have again stated that the number of remaining objects at the end of the war was close to 5,000. Quaas, Konig, and Deutsches Historisches Museum, \textit{Verluste aus den Sammlungen des Berliner Zeughauses}, p. 23.} But by then a whole new nation state had emerged in the form of the German Democratic Republic and it had its eyes firmly set on its own version of German history, and the Zeughaus as the site of its enactment.
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Chapter 5. The Zeughaus and the Museum for German History, 1945-52

The legacy of the Zeughaus museum, 1945-49

The hasty dissolution of the Zeughaus museum in October 1945 reflected its centrality to Prussian and later Nazi military propaganda and the Allied conception of a causal relationship between the two.1 Its very existence stood in contrast to the Allied political goals for Germany, which according to the agreement reached at Potsdam, centred on denazification, demilitarisation, and democratisation,2 even if specific definitions of the latter differed between the Soviet and western Allies. But simply willing a museum out of existence was one thing; its physical remnants were quite another. The building, though severely damaged, had retained enough structural integrity for its use from January 1946 as a site for Berlin’s rapidly re-emerging cultural life.3 Initially administered by a trust for confiscated assets in the Soviet sector, the Zeughaus passed to the Magistrate for Greater Berlin (Magistrat von Groß-Berlin) on 1 October 1947, which operated as a citywide authority.4 In the context of increasing polarisation and a rapidly deteriorating relationship between the Soviet and western sectors, the Soviet Military Administration (SMAD) took the decision less than one month later to transfer the Zeughaus yet again, this time placing it under the auspices of the German Central Administration for Popular Education (Deutsche Zentralverwaltung für Volksbildung; DVV), an authority set up by SMAD in July 1945 as the German counterpart to its own Department of Popular Education (Abteilung Volksbildung) and responsible for a broad range of areas; not only schools and universities, but also press, radio, film, art, and literature.5 Despite these administrative
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1 Regina Müller, for instance, illustrates the Allied belief that Prussian militarism had logically led to Nazism by quoting Winston Churchill, who in 1943 referred to Prussia as the “root of all evil.” Müller, Die Baugeschichte, p. 249.

2 The Potsdam Conference took place between 17 July and 2 August 1945. Mary Fulbrook refers to the protocol of the proceedings as ‘a vaguely worded compromise [...] which left many areas open to a variety of interpretations.’ Fulbrook, A History of Germany 1918-2008, pp. 115-116. The political goals agreed at Potsdam are often referred to as the “Four D’s.” In addition to the three mentioned above, both decentralization and decartelization are alternatively given as further political aims.


4 The transfer was actually reported in the Berliner Zeitung five days prior, but an internal report of the DVV states that the Zeughaus was administered by the Department of Education of the Magistrate for Greater Berlin from 1 October 1947. Untitles report, Deutsche Verwaltung für Volksbildung, Abteilung Kunst und Literatur, Berlin, den 24.11.1947, (BArch-SAMPO: DR 2/878, Bl. 3); Schoß und Zeughaus unter städtischer Obhut. Übergabe an die Abteilung Volksbildung, Berliner Zeitung, 26 September 1947, p. 6; See also; Pfundt, “Die Gründung des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte,” p. 1.

changes, between 1946 and 1948 the Zeughaus played host to several new exhibitions organised by a range of authorities and organisations, before the commencement of a lengthy reconstruction programme.

Perhaps even more problematic than the bricks and mortar legacy of the two-and-a-half-century-old armoury were its surviving collections. The Zeughaus itself housed remnants of the collections, as did the ruins of the Johannisstrasse depot, which was also held in trust following the dissolution of the Prussian state. Further caches remained dispersed throughout Germany (with minor holdings in the West), while the fate of those items expropriated to the Soviet Union was uncertain at best. With the transfer of the Zeughaus to the DVV, the decision was also taken to liquidate the remaining collections by distributing them among the Berlin museums. A chronic lack of suitable storage (indeed, many museums were looking to the Zeughaus itself as a comparatively secure and undamaged storage option), and a lack of interest in military objects halted the

was established on 27 July 1945 according to SMAD directive No. 17 and placed under the direction of Paul Wandel (1905-95), a member of the KPD in Soviet exile. He had returned to Berlin in June 1945 and headed the DVV from its establishment until it was dissolved and transformed into the Ministry for Education (Ministerium für Volksbildung) after the establishment of the GDR (1 January 1950). The DVV received its orders directly from the SMAD departments for propaganda and censorship (Verwaltung für Propaganda und Zensur), and culture (Kulturbteilung). By 1946 the DVV was dominated by SED party members (52 per cent), of whom the top personnel were ex-KPD. Helga A. Welsh, 'Deutsche Verwaltung für Volksbildung (DVV),’ in Martin Broszat et al., SBZ-Handbuch: Staatliche Verwaltungen, Parteien, gesellschaftliche Organisationen und ihre Führungskräfte in der Sowjetischen Besatzungszone Deutschlands 1945-1949 (München: R. Oldenbourg, 1993), p. 229; Dagmar Buchbinder, 'Die Staatslichen Kommission für Kunstengelegenheiten (1951-1953) - eine Kulturbörde "neuen Typus," in "Die Eroberung der Kultur beginnt!": Die Staatslichen Kommission für Kunstengelegenheiten der DDR (1951-1953) und die Kulturpolitik der SED, ed. Jochen Staadt (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2011), pp. 9-10. The decision to transfer the Zeughaus from the Berlin Magistrate to the DVV was made by the Commander of the Soviet Sector, Major Kotikow. The logistical transfer of the Zeughaus is documented in; Report dated 19.12.1947, "Protokoll über die am 19. December 1947, 10 Uhr stattgefundenene Übergabe des Zeughauses," (DHM-HA: MfDG/407/unpaginated).

The building in Johannisstrasse, formerly the property of the Prussian state, was initially administered by the Bau-und Finanzverwaltung before passing to the Finanzverwaltung für Liegenschaften, and then to the Treuhandstelle. According to a 1947 report, approximately 60 per cent of the surviving collections were housed there. At that time there were no alternative storage facilities available for the removal and secure storage of these items; "Protokoll über Übergabe des Zeughauses, 19.12.1947," (DHM-HA: MfDG/407/unpaginated). A more detailed description of the conditions of the building and the surviving collection objects is provided in an inspection report dated 14 May 1949. The inspection was attended by representatives of the DVV, the German Central Financial Administration (Deutsche Zentrale Finanzverwaltung) and members of the former Zeughaus administration, Paul Post and Messrs Suderburg, Opitz, and Rochow; "Protokoll der am 14. Mai 1948 stattgefundenen Besichtigung der Magazinräume des Zeughauses in Berlin, Johannisstr. 5, 14.5.1948," (BArch-SAPMO/DR 2/878/BK: 18-19)


Several newspaper articles report proposals from the side of the State Museums for the use of the Zeughaus as badly needed storage for their collections. Such suggestions were made on the basis that the Zeughaus was relatively undamaged in comparison with the buildings on the Museum Island, many of which could not secure their remaining objects from either theft or the elements. In addition, the basements of the museums on the Museum Island were more prone to damp than the Zeughaus rooms, which was a major concern for the protection of museum objects. See, for instance, H.B., 'Wer rettet unserer Museumsgeut? Kunstenkmäler zerfallen und vermiichten / Gespräch mit Geheimrat Justi,' Berliner Zeitung, 15 August 1947, p. 3; 'Schloß und Zeughaus unter städtischer Obhut,’ p. 6; 'Berlins Museen bleiben erhalten. Kostbare Kulturgüter von dem Verfall gerettet,' Neues Deutschland, 1 October 1947, p. 3.
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liquidation plan. In 1952, following the foundation of the German Democratic Republic (GDR) and a series of historical initiatives and broad-ranging education and cultural reforms, both the Zeughaus and its collections became the cornerstone of the new national historical museum, the Museum for German History (Museum für Deutsche Geschichte; MfDG).

This chapter explores the legacy of the Zeughaus museum during the immediate post-war era and the initial years of the GDR. Beginning with Allied occupation and cultural policy, it examines the role of the Zeughaus as a site for political re-education in the wake of Germany’s immediate National Socialist past, the decisions regarding the fate and function of the building and its collections, and the relationship between the Zeughaus and the other cultural institutions resurfacing in post-war Berlin. The foundation of the MfDG with its roots in the national historical programme of the Socialist Unity Party (Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands; SED) forms the next section, which traces the changing plans for the Zeughaus and the emergence of the museum idea through the highest Party organs. The earliest MfDG exhibitions produced by a small museum collective in the period immediately prior to the formal establishment of the museum provide insight into the historiographical priorities formed in close collaboration with SED ideologues and propagandists, as well as the paucity of museological experience among participants. Collecting strategy was also problematic in this regard and a focus on the early collecting methods and priorities lays the foundation for the discussion of the early exhibition practice, with which the subsequent chapter begins.

“Berlin will be an exhibition city more”

Those of us in Military Government who have to do with German art life can see that the museums are at a crossroads today. Their leaders can either grasp the opportunity for public service the like of which has rarely presented itself to the cultural institutions of a country; or they can maintain a position which in its ultimate effect has proved disastrous in the past.

- Hellmut Lehmann-Haupt, Civil Arts Administration Officer (OMGUS), 1947

Museums and exhibitions did, indeed, form an important part of Allied attempts to set a new civic and cultural course for the German population after 1945. In each of the occupation zones cultural initiatives became important tools in the “re-education” of the German public, with art exhibitions

---

9 Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 231.
10 Title of a newspaper article regarding the first exhibition planned for the Zeughaus after 1945. 'Berlin wird wieder Ausstellungsstadt, Vorbereitung einer Industrie- und Handelsausstellung im ehemaligen Zeughaus,' Berliner Zeitung, 19 December 1945, P. 2.
11 Lehmann-Haupt, 'German Museums at the Crossroads,' p. 121.
an integral aspect of strategy. In Berlin, the museums and their collections remained divided across four administrative territories, each having “inherited” different aspects of the former museums in terms of buildings as well as the physical location of their scattered holdings. Each of the four occupying powers also held its own ideas about the treatment and development of their respective cultural inheritance.

Nominally at least, broad-level decisions about the re-establishment of the Prussian Art Collections, known as the “former State Museums” (ehemals Staatlichen Museen), under the authority of the Berlin Magistrate since shortly after the German collapse, needed to meet the approval of Allied authorities across administrative boundaries. The dismissal of Otto Kümmel as General Director and the appointment of Ludwig Justi as his replacement, for instance, both took place with approval of all four Allied powers and Marion Deshmukh writes of British and American “black” and “white” lists which governed the removal of a number of Nazis from museum positions in the immediate aftermath of Potsdam. Of the denazification programme in the German museums, one contemporary observer noted that new museum administrators had to be ‘chosen from the preciously small group of Anti-Nazis’, primarily ‘men over fifty, frail in health, undernourished and very tired.’ Though many museum directors were able to successfully re-cast their brown past and establish careers in the post-war museum sector despite complicity in the Nazi regime and its mass theft of art from across Europe during the war, high-profile positions like the General Directorship of the Berlin State Museums represented important political appointments for the appearance of democratic change.

Despite an official policy of central-coordination and administration at the municipal level, tensions between the Soviet and western Allies commenced early, as differing attitudes towards
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13 Deshmukh, ‘Recovering Culture,’ pp. 426-427. Justi was appointed in August 1946 by the Berlin Magistrate. Despite his impeccable (“white”) credentials, there was some resistance to Justi’s appointment, particularly on behalf of British Art Protection Officer Norris, who believed Justi too old for the position (he was 70 years old when he assumed the role in 1946 but was often reported as older). His long absence from the museum world following his dismissal in 1933 (see chapter 4), was also felt to be problematic. See Petra Winter, ‘Ich habe in vielem mehr Hoffnung auf die Zukunft als bisher.’ Briefe des Generaldirektors der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin Ludwig Justi, Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen, 47, 2005, p. 125. Between Kümmel’s dismissal at the end of July 1945 and Justi’s appointment, art historian Herbert Dreyer (23 June 1945 – 7 August 1945) and Director of the Antiquities Collections Carl Weickert (6 October 1945 – 17 August 1946) served as provisional General Directors. See Irene Kühnel-Kunze, Bergung, Evakuierung, Rückführung - die Berliner Museen in den Jahren 1939-1959: ein Bericht mit 43 Anlagen (Berlin: Mann, 1984), pp. 78-79.


occupation policy (particularly the handling of reparations and economic matters) exacerbated the conflicting worldviews that would eventually result in the establishment of two separate political and economic systems in East and West Germany. Even between the western Allies differences of opinion emerged, so that until the establishment of the Bizone (the economic merger of the British and American zones in 1947) and the Trizone (France joining in 1949), basic elements of policy remained divergent. Mary Fulbrook notes that this lack of consistency was also apparent within each of the zones of occupation, where policies were not always clearly delineated, and where priorities changed over time in relation to international political developments.\(^{16}\) These various tensions were very much evident at the level of museums and cultural policy, too. Officers of the US Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives division (MFA&A), for instance, held very different views about the role and value of art in meeting democratising goals than did their superiors in the Office of Military Government, which maintained an official position of “restitution” rather than “re-education” when it came to art policy, rejecting government intervention in favour of a declared artistic freedom.\(^{17}\)

Despite the difficulties of quadripartite governance, efforts on behalf of museums themselves to secure buildings and collections began immediately.\(^{18}\) Irene Kühnel-Kunze, one of the core museum staff continuing to work for the protection and recovery of the Berlin museums through the final days of fighting and into the post-war period, describes the situation, thus:

> Until mid-May we were left entirely to ourselves, a small group from the large staff of the museum members was there and attested to the fact that the museums had not given up, but wanted to continue to exist. We stood available as experienced carriers of the knowledge of the collections, their recovery and evacuation, and about the condition in Berlin, in the firm belief in the reconstruction. Fundamentally, there was no “zero hour.”

[Bis Mitte Mai waren wir uns völlig selbst überlassen, eine kleine Gruppe aus dem großen Stab der Museumsangehörigen war da und bezeugte dadurch, daß die Museen sich nicht aufgegeben hatten, sondern weiter existieren wollten. Wir standen als erfahrene Träger des Wissens über die Sammlungen, ihre Bergung und Evakuierung und über den Zustand in Berlin, im festen Glauben an den Wiederaufbau, zur Verfügung. Eine “Stunde Null” hat es im Grunde nicht gegeben.]\(^{19}\)


\(^{18}\) Deshmukh, ‘Recovering Culture,’ p. 418.

\(^{19}\) Kühnel-Kunze, *Bergung, Evakuierung, Rückführung*, p. 76.
With the German collapse, the Prussian state authorities effectively ceased to function, creating a *de facto* dissolution well prior to the official Allied command of February 1947.\(^{20}\) In its stead, museum workers took responsibility for the urgent tasks of clearing rubble, securing buildings, sealing broken windows and constructing makeshift workspaces.\(^{21}\) They also documented the further expropriation of artworks by Soviet authorities in the days after Berlin’s surrender.\(^{22}\) The difficulties they faced, chiefly a lack of materials, transport, and labour, poor storage conditions, and difficulty accessing works stored outside Berlin and across zones, continued well into the occupation period. Edith Appleton Standen, a captain with MFA&A reported persistent poor conditions, limited transport and unavailable basic materials (glass, thumb-tacks, plywood, paper, paint) in January 1948.\(^{23}\) At the Zeughaus, both Hermann Lorey and Paul Post formed part of the small recovery staff in the months following capitulation.\(^{24}\)

Initially at least, Allied priorities lay not with the German museums themselves, but with the location and repatriation of art looted from third-party countries and/or re-education through the promotion of their own cultural agenda.\(^{25}\) In the American sector, where a great deal of looted art was located, these efforts continued throughout the occupation period, with "internal" restitution—the return of artwork stolen from Jews within Germany—a secondary priority.\(^{26}\) The British, holding less looted art, were able to begin sooner with German restitution, which was also perceived within the frame of denazification and democratisation. Mason Hammond, an American monuments officer with Allied High Command, wrote:

> And the efforts of the Allied military governments to protect and preserve German monuments and art objects have won the enthusiastic support of those elements of the population who, despite the Nazi regime, kept alive something of the liberal culture of Europe and are therefore the best hope for the re-education of the German people.\(^{27}\)

The Soviet removal of German cultural property *en masse* presented a stark contrast. If the presence in the United States of just over two hundred paintings from the Berlin collections (returned to

\(^{21}\) Kühnel-Kunze, *Bergung, Evakuierung, Rückführung*, p. 76.
\(^{22}\) Ibid.
\(^{24}\) A list of museum staff involved in the early salvage efforts is provided in Kühnel-Kunze, *Bergung, Evakuierung, Rückführung*, p. 79. Though the Zeughaus museum no longer existed, a provisional administration of the “former” Zeughaus remained active for some time, so-ordinating with the DVV’s Department for Art and Literature for the salvage of scattered collections. Paul Post was still involved as late as 1948. “Ministerium für Volksbildung, Rückführung von ausgelagertem Kulturgut aus dem ehemaligen Zeughaus, 1946-1949,” (BArch-SAMPO: DR 2/7433).
\(^{25}\) Mason Hammond, also of the MFA&A, wrote in 1946 that “...emphasis during the summer was laid primarily on the identification, recovery, and return of loot and only secondarily on the salvage of well-stored German-owned objects.’ Hammond, ‘The War and Art Treasures in Germany,’ p. 210.
\(^{26}\) Appleton Standen and Brendel, ‘Report on Germany,’ p. 212.
Wiesbaden in 1949 following a US tour) caused concern among MFA&A officers regarding the morality of the decision and the ill-will it caused, potentially undermining their own efforts,\textsuperscript{28} the scale of the Soviet expropriation, involving entire public institutions as well as private collections, is all the more staggering.\textsuperscript{29} Beyond restitution, however, the Soviets were at the fore, establishing an active exhibition programme within their sector at the earliest opportunity to place art and industry in the service of cultural and political re-orientation.

The first of these exhibitions in the Zeughaus, and one of the earliest large-scale exhibitions of the post-war period, was the industrial and trade show Berlin rebuilds (Berlin baut auf), opened on 24 January 1946 under the auspices of the Berlin Magistrate’s Office for Planning. Announcing plans for the exhibition in December 1945 the Berliner Zeitung declared "Berlin will be an exhibition city once more," expressing the view, strangely reminiscent of that of the Illustrierte Zeitung on the occasion of the first all-German industrial exhibition in 1844 (chapter 1), that the Zeughaus ‘will thereby host an exhibition that only serves the purposes of peace.'\textsuperscript{30} The transformation was immediately evident, and not merely because of the physical condition of the building:

\begin{quote}
[T]he interior of the house is completely transformed. There, where previously war enthusiasts scrabbled around guns, airplanes and tattered flags, we find today agricultural machines displayed. One sees household items, radios or medical instruments. These are all things that serve the peaceful reconstruction and testify to the will of Berlin’s economy to live.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{28} Both Appleton Standen and Hammond wrote of their concerns regarding the export and continued presence of 202 works of art in the USA. Both cited the moral problems of US claims to be holding the works on the grounds of preservation and safe-keeping. Hammond, in particular, mounted a convincing argument about the problematic nature of such claims, particularly in the face of Nazi art theft and its official justification on the same grounds. A contemporary report of the US tour of Berlin Masterpieces is provided by Karl M. Birkmeyer; Appleton Standen and Brendel, 'Report on Germany,' p. 213; Hammond, 'The War and Art Treasures in Germany,' pp. 216-218; Birkmeyer, 'Observations,' pp. 19-24.


\textsuperscript{30} ['...wird damit eine Ausstellung herbergen, die nur den Zwecken des Friedens dien.‘] 'Berlin wird wieder Ausstellungsstadt,' p. 2.

\textsuperscript{31} 'Neues Leben im Zeughaus. Morgen Eröffnung der Ausstellung "Berlin baut auf"); Berliner Zeitung, 22 January 1946, p. 2.
The exhibition brought together a number of firms that had already exhibited at a series of smaller trade shows held within the Soviet sector. Central to the exhibition were displays organised by the city's own enterprises, along with those that had played a key role in reconstruction efforts, with heavy industry and agricultural products offset by furniture, electronics (including the first post-war radio receiver), household goods, chemicals and pharmaceuticals. All commercial goods were reportedly ready to ship, so that the exhibition was at once a demonstration of industrial and economic achievements during the first six months of Soviet administration, an appeal to further effort for the reconstruction of Berlin, and a commercial trade fair. It was also an opportunity to stress the re-education agenda. Berlin's first post-war Mayor, Arthur Werner, spoke at the opening of the need to draw upon the consequences of the devastating defeat brought about by the Hitler regime, which was illustrated in the exhibition by a “harrowing” photomontage showing Berlin prior to the NS-era and in ruins, lending the show, according to Neue Zeit, the quality of an anti-war exhibition. The inclusion of a pedagogic programme for school groups further demonstrates its significance for youth education, beyond any potential interest to the "Berlin Housewife" who may, it was thought, delight in the 'feather-light handcart' on display.

Whatever the appeal, Berlin rebuilds had counted 20,000 visitors by 19 March, shortly before it closed. In comparison with 1844, when 5,000 visitors per day were reported, such a figure is perhaps not as impressive as inferred by claims of 'continued strong interest.' As a more contemporary comparison the Berlin Stamp Exhibition (Berliner Briefmarken-Ausstellung), held at the Zeughaus in December, counted 20,000 visitors on its closing day alone, having taken 130,000 in its brief one-week run. On the opening morning thousands reportedly waited impatiently outside the Zeughaus in a line stretching from the university to the Palace Bridge, with U-Bahns ‘completely overcrowded’ by midday. The exhibition featured rare and historical stamps from each of the

---

32 Ibid.
38 ["Die seit Januar d.J. im ehemaligen Zeughaus geöffnete Leistungsschau des Magistrats "Berlin baut auf", in der acht Berliner Bezirke einen Ueberblick über ihre bisherige Friedensproduktion geben, findet auch weiterhin starkes Interesse.”] Ibid.
occupying powers, as well as the French colonies, and Germany (though not its former colonies).41

Attended by representatives of the military government, the Mayor’s office, and the city administration, the exhibition was also a venue for philatelists, with sixty stamp dealers occupying stalls, a special “Sonderpost” on site dispensing a custom postmark and dispatching letters and telegrams, and a commemorative stamp set featuring three of the mutual Allied Control Council stamps.42

With its inclusion of exhibits from each of the Allied powers, organisation across the Soviet and British Zones,43 and its seemingly benign content, the Berlin Stamp Exhibition appears less politically motivated than perhaps one might expect from a large-scale initiative held in the Soviet zone a full nine months after Churchill’s Iron Curtain speech. It did, however, meet a number of requirements for the Soviet administration as well as the Socialist Unity Party, which had been formed through the forced merger of the KPD and SPD in the eastern zone in April 1946. As a joint British-Soviet initiative, it demonstrated continued commitment to German unity, the rhetoric of which remained central to SED policy long after the establishment of the separate German states. It also functioned within the bounds of the anti-fascist re-education agenda. Dramatist Fritz Ernst Bettauer spoke at the exhibition opening of the educational and economic importance of philately, labelling stamps the calling card of a people and urging the replacement of military motifs with those of labour in order to express the will of the German people for democratic renewal.44 The use of stamps also illustrates the broad definition of culture, through which communist-run organisations in the Soviet zone sought to influence public opinion, particularly the intelligentsia (also a broad category in the SBZ/GDR),45 and bolster the interests of the party. David Pike writes that the cultural-political structures that developed within Soviet occupied Germany, made up of communist-dominated political “blocs” and cultural “alliances” which operated in close collaboration with SMAD, ‘fostered the illusion of vitality in a program of democracy whose sponsors actually felt no obligation to subject their ideas, political or cultural, to genuine competition.’46 This is perhaps best articulated by SED leader Walter Ulbricht’s much-quoted maxim, ‘It must appear democratic, but we must have everything in control.’47

41 U.S., 'Drei Marken helfen,' p. 6; 'Weihnachtsmarkt und Briefmarken,' p. 6.
42 The commemorative stamp set was included in the entry fee for the exhibition (DM 5), and proceeds went to organisations for refugees and the elderly.
43 The exhibition was organised by the Gastbezirk Mitte (Soviet sector) and the Genossenschaft “Volkshaus” Wilmersdorf (British sector).
45 On the definition of the intelligentsia in the GDR; Fulbrook, Anatomy of a dictatorship, pp. 77-78.
47 ['Es muß demokratisch aussehen, aber wir müssen alles in der Hand haben.']
Stamp Exhibition was not directly affiliated with the major party associations, its programme certainly contributed to this “illusion of vitality” without disrupting any of the ideological or political-cultural goals of the communists.

Other education initiatives had far more pressing practical objectives. In August 1946 the Zeughaus played host to the German Hygiene Museum’s travelling exhibition, Venereal Diseases, Combat and Cure (Geschlechtskrankheiten, ihre Bekämpfung und Heilung). With a reported 1,100 new cases of sexually transmitted diseases in Berlin during one week in July alone (and four times as many cases of women as men), the exhibition focussed on preventative measures and encouraged early treatment using ‘very simple, yet clear graphic display boards and models’ (Fig. 5.1). While the Berliner Zeitung cited a number of causes for the alarming statistics including National Socialist health policies, the movement of troops throughout Europe, and the influx of millions of refugees, no mention was made of the two most significant factors in the spread of sexual disease in occupied Germany—prostitution (including prostitution in exchange for food) and the mass rape that accompanied the Red Army on its advance towards Berlin, with extraordinary levels of sexual violence enacted against women and girls. The exhibition also elided the issue of rape, though in its curious mix of medical and moral information boards it did warn men against the lure of prostitutes and offered both men and women the healthy alternative of companionship to be found in communal reconstruction efforts. The exhibition coincided with an increased effort on

48 [‘Mit Hilfe einfachster, jedoch anschaulicher Tafeln und Modelle werden die Besucher mit einem Kapitel Vertraut gemacht, dessen Verschweigen schon unendliches Unglück über viele Familien gebracht hat.’] Preventative measures, it was thought, had already successfully averted a potentially far greater catastrophe resulting from the influx of millions of refugees over the previous winter; ‘Hygine-Ausstellung eröffnet. Aufklärung über Geschlechtskrankheiten ist notwendig,’ Berliner Zeitung, 11 August 1946, p. 6; Quote from ‘Hygine-Ausstellung. Heute Eröffnung durch Oberbürgermeister Dr. Werner,’ Berliner Zeitung, 10 August 1946, p. 6.

49 Norman M. Naimark writes that levels of sexually transmitted diseases were actually remarkably low at the outbreak of war in both Germany and the Soviet Union. Naimark, The Russians in Germany p. 97.

50 ‘Hygine-Ausstellung,’ p. 6; ‘Hygine-Ausstellung eröffnet,’ p. 6. Berlin hospital reports are considered a relatively reliable source for figures on rape in the capital in the period surrounding the city’s surrender. They estimated between 95,000 and 130,000 women and girls were subject to rape in Berlin alone. Elisabeth Jean Wood, ‘Variation in Sexual Violence during War,’ Politics & Society, 34, no. 3, 2006, p. 310; Evans, The Third Reich at war, p. 711. The Soviet policy of punishment and isolation rather than treatment for cases of the “bourgeois” disease syphilis, coupled with a chronic shortage of penicillin, only exacerbated the problem; Naimark, The Russians in Germany pp. 97-99.

51 The exhibition focused on three core messages: 1) that sexually transmitted diseases were contagious, 2) that they were preventable, and 3) that they were curable. It utilised predominately display boards, but also included a number of wax models of diseased body parts. The boards were in some instances purely medical, while others focused on behaviours that could lead to infection, thereby infusing a moral element. In some of instances this was also linked to the political agenda, with one board showing the ruins of a city under the caption: “Due to sexually transmitted diseases there was a deficit of 133,163 work days in 1938... Today the deficit has become much higher” [‘Durch Geschlechtskrankheiten entstand 1938 ein Ausfall von 333,163 Arbeitstagen... Heute ist der Ausfall viel höher geworden’]. Images of the display boards and wax models are held in the archives of the German Hygine Museum, Dresden.
behalf of the German administration and medical authorities within the Soviet zone to combat venereal disease.\textsuperscript{52} It toured the Soviet sector until 1948, counting over 700,000 visitors.\textsuperscript{53}

![Figure 5.1: Medical and moral; display boards from the 1946 Venereal Diseases exhibition (L-R) “Early Syphilis [2nd Stage]” and “Healthy gathering arises when the youth invests in building” (Artwork by Rudolf Kramer, Deutsches Hygiene-Museum Dresden, Inv.-Nr.: 2013/483.71 and 2013/483.97)](image)

Other uses for the building prior to its transfer to the DVV included a rabbit breeder's and fur show held 18-19 January 1947 featuring around 300 breeders and angora spinning demonstrations and, the following weekend, a bird show, also with close to 300 breeders and a total of about 1,500 geese, ducks, turkeys, chickens, and doves on display.\textsuperscript{54} It was, however, art that proved the dominant vehicle for allied re-education, and in this regard the Zeughaus again provides important examples that highlight the Soviet agenda as well as revealing some of the complexities of

\textsuperscript{52} Measures included compulsory medical screenings for women in particular professions (waitresses, cooks, musicians, and workers in dance halls and bars), the re-definition of prostitution to capture a broader range of activities, and an education programme, of which the exhibition was part, which also included films, information pamphlets, and lectures. On the inclusion of lectures held by doctors accompanying the Berlin exhibition, 'Kleine Berliner Chronik. Ausstellung über Geschlechtskrankheiten,' \textit{Berliner Zeitung}, 25 August 1946, p. 6; On the broader initiatives to combat disease, Naimark, \textit{The Russians in Germany} pp. 99-100.

\textsuperscript{53} Visitor numbers per Deutsches Hygiene-Museum Dresden online collection database available at http://www.dhmd.de/emuseum/emuseumPlus [accessed 13 March 2014].

\textsuperscript{54} At the latter, Luitpold Steidle, Vice president of the German Central Administration for Agriculture and Forestry had to strain to be heard over the ‘penetrating “cock-a-doodle-doo”’ during his opening address. 'Kaninchenschau im Zeughaus,' \textit{Berliner Zeitung}, 15 January 1947, p. 6; 'Geflügelausstellung im Zeughaus,' \textit{Berliner Zeitung}, 24 January 1947, p. 8; '11 Millionen Küken in der nächsten Brutperiode. Geflügelausstellung im Zeughaus,' \textit{Berliner Zeitung}, 26 January 1947, p. 8; 'Kaninchen- und Geflügelausstellungen im Zeughaus,' \textit{Neue Zeit}, 26 January 1947, p. 5.
relationships both between and within the occupation zones, as a number of interested parties
recognised the value of the central armoury for the emerging cultural life of Berlin.

**German art, French sculpture, and the “Museum in the Schlüter Building”**

Initially at least, all four occupying powers perceived the value of modern art and the rehabilitation
of those artists marginalised or banned by the Nazis as one of the most significant weapons in their
re-education efforts. In 1948 Appleton Standen reported that the French had accomplished the most
through their circulation of fine arts and encouragement of cultural activity.\(^{55}\) French policy, she
noted on the other hand, differed from the other Allies with regard to its national focus: ‘what they
show the Germans is “la belle France” alone.’\(^{56}\) Many of the French exhibitions included not art
sourced within Germany, but loan items from their own museums including Paris’ Musée d’Art
Moderne and Musée Rodin.\(^{57}\) A series of three exhibitions featured, in turn, French graphics,
paintings and sculpture, the last of which, titled *French Sculpture from Rodin to the Present Day (La
sculpture française de Rodin a nos jours)*, opened in the Zeughaus on 12 July 1947 under the auspices
of the French Group Control Council, Division of Education and Cultural Affairs (Fig. 5.2).\(^{58}\)

This exhibition, as the title would suggest, traced French sculpture from the 1880s onwards
(the most recent pieces dating from 1946) and featured seventy-four works including the large
*Vénus Victrix* by Renoir (1914), a Gauguin wood relief (1888), six Degas bronzes, and works by
Astride Maillol, Constantin Brâncuși, Joseph Bernard, Antoine Bourdelle, and Joseph Csaky.\(^{59}\) Jean
Cassou, curator of the Musée d’Art Moderne, expressed the hope that these works might achieve the
degree of the recognition already afforded French painting.\(^{60}\) The French painting exhibition, held in
the city palace in October the previous year, had been hugely successful—according to Enno Kind of
the Socialist Unity Party’s daily newspaper *Neues Deutschland*, it practically became a pilgrimage for

\(^{55}\) Appleton Standen and Brendel, ‘Report on Germany,’ p. 211.

\(^{56}\) Ibid.


\(^{58}\) A committee of patronage for the exhibition comprised: M. George Bidault, Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. René Naegelen, Minister of National Education, M. Pierre Bourdan, Minister of Information, Arts and Letters, M. Louis Joxe, Director General of Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, M. Jacques Jaujard, Director General of Arts and Letters. In addition the exhibition was presented under the honorary presidency of General Koenig, Commander of the French Forces in Germany and the chairmanship of Major General Noiret, Deputy Chief Commandant of the French Forces in Germany for GFCC. The Commissioner of the Exhibition in Paris was Secretary of the Musée Rodin, Mme. Cécile Goldscheider. Groupe Français du Conseil de Contrôle, *La Sculpture française*.

\(^{59}\) The exhibition also featured eighty-eight working drawings designed to compliment the sculptural works. Heinz Lüdecke, ‘Rodin und was nach ihn kam. Zur Ausstellung französischer Plastik im Berliner Zeughaus,’ *Berliner Zeitung*, 12 July 1947, p. 3; Vogt, ‘Plastik um Rodin und Maillol,’ p. 3. A complete list of sculptures and drawings are provided in the exhibition catalogue; Groupe Français du Conseil de Contrôle, *La Sculpture française*, pp. 23–31.

Berliners.\textsuperscript{61} It had featured a stellar line up of 130 paintings by artists including Manet, Monet, Degas, Sisley, Renoir, Picasso, Gauguin, Toulouse-Lautrec, Cézanne, van Gogh, and Matisse.\textsuperscript{62}

Both exhibitions, though organised by the French Group Control Council, actually took place within the Soviet zone—the palace and the Zeughaus were not merely relatively well-preserved exhibition spaces, a rarity in the city, but prestige buildings in the heart of Soviet Berlin. Whether designed to foster a closer Franco-Russian alliance in the context of Russia’s growing isolation, or to demonstrate commitment to German unity in the face of an increasingly permanent-looking division, the exhibitions were certainly supported by the Russian Military Administration as well as the SMAD-approved organisation of artists and intellectuals, the Cultural Association for the Democratic Renewal of Germany (\textit{Kulturbund zur demokratischen Erneuerung Deutschlands}, later \textit{Kulturbund der DDR}). The \textit{Kulturbund}, under the presidency of KPD-SED member and later Minister for Culture of the GDR, Johannes R. Becher, was a nominally independent, non-partisan, and interzonal organisation that was, Magdalena Heider points out, structurally and programmatically

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{61} Enno Kind, ‘Triumph der französischen Malerei,’ \textit{Neues Deutschland}, 31 October 1946, p. 10.
\end{flushleft}
compliant with the broad anti-fascist worldview of the communist party. Specifically, it aimed at
the destruction of National Socialist ideology in all areas of life and fields of knowledge, the
‘cleansing and keeping pure’ of public life from fascist elements, and the revival of humanist
national traditions, including a revision of the historical development of the German people, in the
name of a ‘rebirth of the German spirit in the character of a militant democratic worldview.’ At a
reception held for the exhibition at the city palace, SMAD representatives expressed the hope that
the exhibition would not be the only example of French assistance in the cultural renewal of
Germany, citing France and Soviet-Russia’s combined struggle against nationalism. Painter and
graphic artist, Karl Hofer of the Kulturbund reiterated the significance of the exhibition as a gesture
of peace, a view squarely in line with the association’s stated aim of fostering relationships with
intellectuals across national borders and making the great cultural achievements of other nations
available to the German population as part of its struggle for the moral health of Germany.

But despite efforts to re-introduce non-German culture, Heinz Lüdecke of the Berliner Zeitung felt the long years of German isolation had left visitors unsure of how to approach French modern art; they apparently walked hesitantly around the sculpture exhibition not knowing where to begin. He expressed the view, no doubt in accordance with the organisers, of the power of the artworks to promote cross-cultural understanding and combat long-held prejudices, particularly with regard to the image of France: “Relearn!” their shapes call to us in unmistakable sign language. “Supplement the distorted one-sided image of the French!” But in the same breath, Lüdecke reiterated deep-seated notions of intellectual and cultural superiority in his comparison of the French works with those of German Expressionists like Ernst Barlach and Wilhelm Lehbruck:

They [German sculptors] embody within themselves German possibilities for which France has no space. They raise problems that are remote to French sculptors. As a result, grace, elegance, esprit and charm are of secondary importance. It is decisive that the French since Rodin have sought after form in and of itself, while in its most important representatives modern German sculpture tends towards intellectual and emotional significances, for which form is only of value as a medium.

63 Magdalena Heider, "Kulturbund zur demokratischen Erneuerung Deutschlands”, in Broszat et al., SBZ-Handbuch, p. 714.
64 ["Säuberung und Reinhaltung"] ['Neugeburt des deutschen Geistes im Zeichen einer streitbaren demokratischen Weltanschauung."
Der Kulturbund zur demokratischen Erneuerung Deutschlands anlässlich der bevorstehenden Wahlen,’ Neues Deutschland, 1 August 1946, p. 3.
65 'Ausstellung französischer Malerei,' Neues Deutschland, 3 November 1946, p. 5.
66 Ibid.
67 "Um Deutschlands geistige Neugeburt. Vom Kulturbund zur demokratischen Erneuerung,' Berliner Zeitung, 15 August 1945, p. 3.
69 ["Umlernen!" rufen uns ihre Gestalten in unüberhörbaren Gebärdensprache zu. "Das verzerrte einseitige Frankenbild ergänzen!"] ibid.
In ihnen verkörpern sich deutsche Möglichkeiten, für die Frankreich keinen Raum hat. Sie werfen Probleme auf, die den französischen Bildhauern fernliegen. Dabei sind Grazie, Eleganz, Espirit und Charme von sekundärer Bedeutung. Entscheidend ist, daß die Franzosen seit Rodin nach Formen suchen, die sich selbst genügen, während moderne deutsche Skulptur in ihren wichtigsten Vertretern zu geistig-seelischen Bedeutsamkeiten neigt, denen die Formen nur als Mittel gelten.\footnote{Ibid.}

The notion that German art reflected a deeper intellectual and spiritual dimension and the wholesale castigation of French art as “form for form’s sake” reflects a persistent unconscious nationalism, which Lehmann-Haupt identified in a preoccupation with German art among museum professionals after 1945.\footnote{Lehmann-Haupt, ‘German Museums at the Crossroads,’ p. 123.} It also points to an ongoing tension between form and content and the political negotiation of this relationship, particularly once the early communist art policy characterised by openness, variety, artistic freedom, and aesthetic tolerance, gave way to an emphasis on Soviet-style socialist realism and a corresponding (albeit tentative in the light of the Nazi’s “degenerate art” campaign) distancing from modern and abstract art as “pseudo-art” or “non-art.”\footnote{Rueschemeyer, ‘State Patronage in the German Democratic Republic,’ pp. 31-37; Goldstein, ‘The control of visual representation,’ p. 285; Pike, ‘Cultural Politics in Soviet-Occupied Germany 1945-46,’ pp. 91-123.}

Indicative of the initial period of tolerance were the earliest large-scale exhibitions of German art organised in the Soviet zone under the auspices of the DVV. In 1946 two exhibitions, one held in Dresden and the other in the Zeughaus in Berlin, focussed on providing a venue for Nazi-persecuted artists. The Berlin exhibition, while not as significant as the latter Dresden show, was the first extensive exhibition reflecting the focus of the many smaller exhibitions that had emerged during the first half of 1946.\footnote{‘German Art Reborn,’ The New York Times, 15 July 1946, p. 93.} Under the title First German Art Exhibition (Erste deutsche Kunstausstellung), it featured almost 600 works including oils, watercolours, pastels, woodcuts, sketches, cartoons, and sculptures.\footnote{Paul Wandel, president of the DVV (later Minister for Education in the GDR), opened the exhibition, emphasising the complete artistic freedom afforded the artists: ‘The exhibition is subject to no programmatic demand, rather it is an expression of a time that indeed has politically clear-cut goals, but which struggles for new forms and contents in the entire artistic creation.’\footnote{Zentrale Kunstausstellung in Berlin, Neues Deutschland, 19 May 1946, p. 1; Deutsche Zentralverwaltung für Volksbildung in der Sowjetischen Besatzungszone, I. Deutsche Kunst Ausstellung (Berlin: Max Lichtwitz, 1946).} Artists included Otto Nagel, Georg Kolbe, Gerhard Marcks, Ernst Barlach, Max Pechstein, Oskar Moll, and Karl Hofer.\footnote{[‘Die Ausstellung steht unter keiner programmatischen Forderung, sondern sie ist Ausdruck einer Zeit, die politisch zwar fest umrissene Ziele hat, die aber im gesamten künstlerischen Schaffen um neue Formen und Inhalte kämpft.’ ‘Erste Deutsche Kunst-Ausstellung,’ Neues Deutschland, 22 May 1946, p. 3.} Single out by both the (East) German and
international press was Magnus Zeller’s painting Hitler State, for its confrontation with Nazism, Kurt Schumacher’s wood sculpture Falling, and Käthe Kollwitz’ bronze fragment The Complaint.77 Once again, the Zeughaus became an important aspect of the way in which the exhibition was mediated to the public. Erich Vogt of Neues Deutschland remarked on the choice of venue as a symbolic expression of a new artistic intent (Kunstwillens),78 while another journalist wrote:

Especially agreeable is the fact that art has moved into the building that over many decades housed the trophies of war. It is hoped and wished that the armory will act in the future as an exhibition space for manifestations of peace and no longer as a place for things that are reminiscent of war.

[Besonders wohltuend ist es, daß in dem Gebäude, das über viele Jahrzehnte Kriegstrophen beherbergt, die Kunst eingezogen ist. Es ist zu hoffen und zu wünschen, daß das Zeughaus in Zukunft als Ausstellungsraum für Manifestationen des Friedens gilt und keinen Platz mehr für Dinge, die an Krieg erinnern.]79

The idea that the Zeughaus could shed its legacy of militarism and serve a new purpose—as a venue for art—also reflected the hopes of Berlin’s core museum personnel, who were not merely looking to the building as a storage solution, but as a possible home for the tentative reestablishment of the state art collections and the revival of museum culture in Berlin.

According to Kühnel-Kunze, plans for a State Museums exhibition in the Zeughaus emerged in late 1945, in order to offer something to the public and demonstrate the continuing existence of the Berlin museums.80 The first exhibition was realised under Justi’s leadership in December 1946 in the palace, not the Zeughaus.81 This small offering represented the symbolic “re-opening” of the Berlin museums and included a range of material from across the collections presented as a chronological history of humanity from ancient Egypt (with a statue of Hatshepsut) to the present (with a room of contemporary art featuring Max Lieberman, Oskar Moll, Karl Hofer, and Erich Heckel).82 Whether presenting millennia of human history via such a limited selection served the intended purpose is questionable. One reporter completed the exhibition circuit very quickly and

80 Kühnel-Kunze, Bergung, Evakuierung, Rückführung, p. 82. Contemporary newspaper articles from late 1945 support this assertion. Neue Zeit, for instance, reported plans for the use of the building for an art historical or ethnographic museum; ‘Zeughaus wird Kulturstätte,’ p. 1.
81 Kühnel-Kunze, Bergung, Evakuierung, Rückführung, p. 82.
remarked: ‘In addition, the visitor asks himself with anxious concern: Is that all? Is it only this relatively small selection that remains from the treasures of the Berlin museums?’

A seemingly more permanent solution eventuated in October 1947 with the transfer of the Zeughaus to the Magistrate (above). In a discussion with the Berliner Zeitung in mid-August, Justi had expressed the desire not only to use the Zeughaus for exhibitions, but to take it under the State Museums umbrella: ‘I hope that the Zeughaus, too, will also be available in the future mainly for art exhibitions after it has finally been allocated to the responsibility of the former State Museums’. He also warned against the complete loss of the Zeughaus unless measures were taken to rescue it.

Other parties took an interest in the building too, with the Free German Trade Union Federation (Freier Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund; FDGB) announcing a joint exhibition with the State Museums planned for the centenary of the 1848 revolution to be held in the very building that had been one of the principal centres of unrest (chapter 1). Indeed, this exhibition was announced along with the Magistrate’s plan for the creation of a “central museum,” for which the Zeughaus was felt to be a sufficiently representative, large, and well situated location. A re-construction programme was planned, but it was thought it would be quite a lengthy process—the Berliners would have to contend with seven months construction time—not only were these plans thwarted by the sudden transfer of the building to the DVV, but the reconstruction, which commenced in 1948, was not fully completed until 1965—seventeen years instead of the anticipated seven months! Even after the transfer and the commencement of the DVV’s own plan for the building, the Zeughaus remained a much-coveted location. The Kulturbund put forward its own suggestion in 1948 for the establishment of a contemporary art collection there as part of its broader proposal for the improvement of Berlin’s cultural life, which included university and school reforms, suggestions for the State Museums, and the establishment of culture houses, youth clubs, artists’ housing, and ateliers.

85 Ibid.
88 Ibid.
90 ‘Das neue Programm des Kulturbundes Berlin,’ Neues Deutschland, 19 December 1948, p. 5.
Nonetheless, when the Commander of the Soviet Sector, Major General Kotikov ordered the transfer of the Zeughaus to the DVV on 24 October 1947, Justi’s second, and more significant, exhibition was already in situ. Greeted with a great deal more enthusiasm than the palace exhibition of 1946, Masterpieces of German Sculptors and Painters (Meisterwerke deutscher Bildhauer und Maler), opened on 20 October, not only reflected the “preoccupation” with German art identified above, but was also a much stronger sign of the continued existence of the Berlin collections, as the title used in two Berlin newspaper articles makes clear: “Berlin has a museum again.” The exhibition catalogue referred to the Zeughaus as “Museum im Schlüterbau” (Museum in the Schlüter Building), a reflection of a perceived long-term arrangement rather than a temporary exhibition (museum), as well as the re-conceptualisation of the building itself via the adoption of a new name (Schlüterbau).

This claim to the building and its conceptual reorientation is much more significant from the perspective of the central concerns of this thesis than the content of the exhibition itself, which traced German painting and sculpture from the Middle Ages to the Baroque, with a small selection of twentieth century works envisaged as a changing exhibition programme to offset the permanent collection (Fig. 5.3). As with prior exhibitions, much was made of the reappropriation of the building for peaceful purposes, and one article went by the rather evocative title, “Mars, yielded to the muses.” The appeal to poetics didn’t end there:

The October sun shines upon a collection of cannons waiting in the courtyard of the former armory to be melted down to more useful things. They remind us of that not-so-distant time when they and their kind were regarded as the most important witnesses of a German cultural history that measured the development of our people by the amount of suffering and destruction which it had caused over the centuries. The building itself stands there in its present state as a tragic example of this type of history: the instruments of murder, for which it was so long a shelter, have turned against their own home so to speak.

[Die Oktobersonne bescheint eine Kollektion von Kanonenrohren, die im Innenhof des ehemaligen Zeughauses darauf warten, daß man sie zu nützlicheren Dingen umschmelze. Sie

---

92 Berliner Kunstmuseen, Meisterwerke deutscher Bildhauer und Maler
93 Heinz Lüdecke, ‘Mars, den Musen gewichen,’ Berliner Zeitung, 16 October 1947, p. 3; ‘Berlin hat wieder ein Museum,’ p. 3; ‘Meister des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit. Zur Museumseröffnung im Schlüterbau zu Berlin,’ Neues Deutschland, 22 October 1947, p. 3. The modern works included in the exhibition at the time of its opening in October 1947 were: Sculptures by Georg Kolbe (1877-1947) and Käthe Kollwitz (1867-1945), and paintings by Karl Hofer (1878-1955), August Macke (1887-1914), Franz Marc (1880-1916), Oskar Moll (1875-1947), Christian Rohlfs (1849-1938), and Horst Strempel (1904-1975). Of these, only Kolbe, Hofer, and Strempel were living artists, the latter two providing post-war works, including Strempel’s evocative 1945/46 triptych “Night over Germany 1944” (Nacht über Deutschland 1944). Kolbe died shortly after the exhibition opening. Works listed in, Berliner Kunstmuseen, Meisterwerke deutscher Bildhauer und Maler p. 24.
94 Lüdecke, ‘Mars, den Musen gewichen,’ p. 3.
erinnern an jene nicht allzuferne Zeit, da sie und ihresgleichen als die wichtigsten Zeugen
deutscher Kulturgeschichte galten, da die Entwicklung unseres Volkes an der Menge des Leids
und der Zerstörung gemessen werden sollte, die es im Laufe der Jahrhunderte angerichtet hat. Das Gebäude selbst steht in seinem heutigen Zustand als ein trauriges Beispiel für diese Art von Historie da: die Mordgeräte, denen es so lange Unterkunft war, haben sich gleichsam gegen ihr eigenes Heim gewandt.]

The “re-christening” signified the new role for the museum and the rejection of its past history. The selection of name was most likely Justi’s. He later led the campaign for the re-naming of the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum to the Bode-Museum in 1955, citing Wilhelm von Bode’s accomplishments, his service to the Berlin museums, and his recognition in the international art world as Berlin’s most famous “museum man.” In that case, the existing name evoked something of its past within the Imperial-Prussian tradition; it was clear that such a name was unacceptable in the new German Democratic Republic (it had long since been removed from the façade) and Justi fought for the more befitting “Bode-Museum” as part of his campaign to ensure the survival of the institution.

The evocation of Schlüter also drew upon an alternative reading of the past, linking it to its most significant artistic figure. In the catalogue Justi simply stated: ‘Since Schlüter temporarily directed the construction and bestowed such a high value upon it through his sculptural masterpieces, the term “Schlüterbau” has now been proposed for the former armoury.’ In that case, the existing name evoked something of its past within the Imperial-Prussian tradition; it was clear that such a name was unacceptable in the new German Democratic Republic (it had long since been removed from the façade) and Justi fought for the more befitting “Bode-Museum” as part of his campaign to ensure the survival of the institution.

The following year the last of the occupation-era exhibitions completed the cycle where it had begun—with an industrial exhibition under the title Industrial Exhibition 1948: 1 Year German Trust Administration (Industrieleistungsschau 1948: 1 Jahr deutsche Treuhandverwaltung), marking the anniversary of the establishment of the agency responsible for the administration of confiscated and sequestered Nazi assets and foreshadowing the creation of the “peoples’ own factories” with the further nationalisation of East German industry, the Volkseigene Betriebe (VEBs).

---

95 Ibid.
96 Justi had first promoted the idea in 1952. He went to great pains to point out Kaiser Friedrich’s exceptional patronage of the arts (referring to him repeatedly as the ‘longstanding Crown Prince’ in a rhetorical amelioration of his membership of the ruling dynasty), but was aware that the original name could not be retained. Letter to Alexander Abusch, Acting Minister for Culture (GDR), 13 October 1955, reproduced in Winter, ‘Ich habe in vielem mehr Hoffnung,’ pp. 134-135.
97 Ibid.
98 [Da Schlüter den Bau zeitweilig geleitet und ihm durch seine bildhauerlichen Meisterwerke so hohen Wert verliehen hat, ist für das ehemalige Zeughaus nun die Bezeichnung “Schlüterbau” vorgeschlagen worden.] Ludwig Justi in, Berliner Kunstmuseen, Meisterwerke deutscher Bildhauer und Maler p. 4.
Forbidden Flyers: Industrial exhibition, 1948

Opened on 27 July 1948 under the motto “Produce more, distribute more fairly, live better!” the exhibition featured 389 industrial enterprises, representing around 40,000 workers employed in the Berlin trust companies created as part of the Soviet economic re-structuring and denazification programme—at least, those not dismantled and transported en bloc to the Soviet Union or placed directly under Soviet ownership (the Soviet joint-stock companies, or SAGs) as part of its extraction of reparations.100 ‘The purpose of the exhibition’, wrote the Berliner Zeitung, ‘is not only to show

---

what the *Treuhandbetriebe* produce, but also that they are at the forefront in the construction of our democratic economy.\footnote[101]{[‘Der Sinn der Ausstellung ist nicht nur, zu zeigen, was die Treuhandbetriebe herstellen, sondern auch, daß sie beim Aufbau unserer demokratischen Wirtschaft in vorderster Front stehen.’] ibid.} ‘It should show the youth,’ wrote the same author the following week, ‘how we can restore Germany’s status in the world through practical achievement.’\footnote[102]{[‘Sie soll der Jugend zeigen, wie wir durch praktische Leistung Deutschlands Geltung in der Welt wiederherstellen können.’] M.N., ‘Leistung aus eigener Kraft. Industrieschau der Berliner Treuhandbetriebe eröffnet,’ Berliner Zeitung, 28 July 1948, p. 1.} Exhibition organisers wanted to show that the workers, in whose hands these companies had been entrusted, were capable of developing exemplary factories and industrial enterprises and leading them to success.\footnote[103]{Treuhandbetriebe – die Aktivisten des demokratischen Wiederaufbaus. 40,000 Arbeiter stellen aus - Eindrucksvolle Leistungsschau im ehemaligen Zeughaus,’ Neues Deutschland, 28 July 1948, p. 2.}

Despite these assertions, in some cases former company directors and specialists were re-engaged to provide managerial and technical expertise—regardless of their political histories—and with widespread resentment about poor wage conditions and profits being syphoned off by the Soviets, workers’ morale (and productivity) was far from exemplary.\footnote[104]{This practice was more prevalent among the Soviet owned factories (SAGs) than the “People’s Own Enterprises” (Volkseigene Betriebe; VEBs), but there were cases of a blind eye being turned to a potential Nazi background in the interest of company performance. Naimark, *The Russians in Germany* pp. 191-192.} Just over two months after the exhibition opened, desperate SED leaders orchestrated the celebrated feat of “labour heroism” (based on the Soviet Stakhanov example) carried out by coal miner Adolf Hennecke in the fulfilment of his production targets by over 380 per cent, thereby engineering the “Hennecke movement” for workplace activism.\footnote[105]{Ibid. pp. 198-202.} The exhibition itself utilised illustrative panels and diagrams to demonstrate that the firms were, indeed, capable of exceeding their production plans, espousing the organisation of the companies according to the proposed model of the VEBs, including planning commissions, a control commission, and guaranteed workers’ rights to co-determination.\footnote[106]{M.N., ‘Leistungsschau der Treuhandbetriebe,’ p. 5.}

Whatever the validity of its claims, the exhibition epitomised the radically different socioeconomic structures and political foundations that had now developed on either side of the East-West divide, particularly following the western Allies’ shift from a policy of retribution to recovery with the introduction of the Marshall Plan and the implementation of separate currency reforms in the western zones and the SBZ. Posters for the exhibition featured the new logo of the *Berliner Treuhandbetriebe*, showing a hammer in the clenched fist of a worker, which were plastered around the entrance of the Zeughaus to a height of around six meters (Fig. 5.4). According to the East Berlin press, the exhibition posters were banned in the American sector by order of the US
military administration. 'The Americans show thereby not only their hostility toward monopoly-free production,' declared the SED newspaper, 'but at the same time they make clear what all Berliners should well comprehend, that they, just as in West Germany, want to suppress every German competition.'

Opening as it did just one month after the commencement of the Berlin Blockade, it is hardly surprising that the Soviet-style posters should cause provocation, and within this context the exhibition itself can be seen as part of an ongoing propaganda war between the eastern and western powers.

Figure 5.4: Front entrance of the Zeughaus showing exhibition awnings for the industry exhibition in, July-October 1948 (Puck Pressedienst, DHM Bildarchiv, Inv.-Nr.: Puck 30274)

The Blockade, and the extraordinary fifteen-month airlift carried out by British and American pilots in response, transformed Berlin from the central symbol of German militarism, as capital of the Third Reich and the Prussian Empire before it, into to the last bastion of democratic freedom and Frontstadt—the city at the front line of the Cold War (Fig. 5.5). Less than two weeks after the blockade was lifted in May 1949, the Basic Law of the new Federal Republic of Germany came into effect. It was followed in October by the foundation of the German Democratic Republic, a move that coincided with the SED’s shift away from its initial rejection of the national past towards a specifically German historiography that drew upon progressive national traditions for the

\[107\] ["Die Amerikaner zeigen damit nicht nur ihre Feindschaft gegenüber monopolfreien Produktion, sondern sie geben gleichzeitig zu verstehen, was alle Berliner gut begreifen sollten, daß sie, ebenso wie in West Deutschland, jede deutsche Konkurrenz unterdrücken wollen."] 'Unerwünschtes Plakat im USA-Sektor,' Neues Deutschland, 28 July 1948, p. 1.

strengthening of patriotic consciousness. This new historiographical path began to emerge in the public realm with the “Goethe Year” in 1949, gained strength with GDR President Wilhelm Pieck’s call for the scientific “working out” (Ausarbeiten) of the German past and the history of the German labour movement at the Third Party Congress of the SED in July 1950, and was further enshrined in 1952 with the official announcement of a new political course for the GDR—the systematic construction of socialism. With it the SED leaders declared a break with the negative portrayal of the German past (the so-called “German misery”), emphasising national cultural traditions and the resurrection of “progressive” German figures. Step-by-step with each of these developments—and always in close connection with the broader political relationship between the two Germanys and the larger world power blocks—plans emerged for a central museum in which to house the new German history.

Figure 5.5: May Day demonstration before the Zeughaus shortly before the lifting of the blockade, 1 May 1949. The Zeughaus bears the slogan “Solidarity and friendship with the Soviet Union” (DHM Bildarchiv: Inv.-Nr.: BA 96/168)

The Zeughaus and museum plans, 1948-52

The formal establishment of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic in 1949 marked the official division of Germany into two separate states. As shown above, this process began much earlier and escalated throughout the occupation period, with 1947/48 representing a key turning point in the sharpening Cold War conflict and the solidification of political and economic differences between the eastern and western zones. Conversely, the door to a potentially unified Germany did not completely close in 1949, but remained ajar (however slightly) until mid-1952, by which time the integration of the two states into their respective political, economic, and defence communities was wholly underway.\(^\text{110}\) It was during this period, against the backdrop of East-West division, that crucial decisions were made about the long-term use of the Zeughaus. Initially separate, this period also saw the emergence within the SED of the idea for the creation of a central historical museum that would come to define itself as the leading historical museum of the German Democratic Republic. Changes relating to the Zeughaus architecture, interior design, and content, which eventually came to include the SED’s history museum, reflect the broader political shifts and the growing need to appropriate a national identity for the fledgling GDR as it vied with its western counterpart to assert itself as the German nation.

A “House of Culture”

The first concrete plan to emerge for the Zeughaus after its transfer to the DVV was the creation of a “House of Culture,” an idea that drew upon the Soviet model of socialist culture houses that had grown out of the pre-1917 Russian workers’ clubs—particularly the Central House of Art Workers established in Moscow in 1930 and emulated in numerous examples throughout the Soviet sphere.\(^\text{111}\) Indeed, the proximity of the Soviets’ own House of Culture of the Soviet Union, located in the former Palais Donner to the rear of the Neue Wache, which staged commemorative events, exhibitions, concerts, plays, film screenings, and lectures, offered Russian language courses, and included its own 22,000-volume library, provided a more immediate example for the project.\(^\text{112}\)

\(^\text{110}\) 1952 was also the year in which Stalin put forward a proposal for a peace treaty with Germany that called for the creation of a unified neutral Germany, the famous “Stalin Note” of 10 March. Mary Fulbrook writes that 1952 represents a turning point in the possible reunification of Germany, which has also become the focus of debate regarding the lost opportunities for an alternative political and social configuration of post-war Germany. Fulbrook, *A History of Germany 1918-2008*, p. 151.


\(^\text{112}\) The same building was also the home of the Society for the Study of the Culture of the Soviet Union (established 30 June 1947), the forerunner of the Society for German-Soviet Friendship, which became the second largest mass organisation in the GDR after the FDGB. The House of Culture of the Soviet Union was founded by the Soviet military authorities in
Such institutions also had a strong left-wing tradition in Germany in the form of Volkshäuser, worker’s assembly halls that had originated with the labour movement towards the end of the nineteenth century, providing a number of educational opportunities, cultural offerings, and leisure activities in addition to meeting rooms for German workers.\textsuperscript{113} Peaking in the late 1920s, when around 200 existed throughout Germany, the Volkshäuser were almost exclusively union-run and were systematically targeted in May 1933, at which time they were either confiscated or co-opted under the banner of the DAF.\textsuperscript{114}

After the war the Volkshäuser returned to union ownership in the West never regained their significance, none the least because of changes in the nature of unionism in the FRG and the growth of anti-Communism during the Cold War.\textsuperscript{115} In the East, on the other hand, firmly within the grasp of the party and geared towards political education, they were developed as cultural venues offering a variety of events and activities along the lines of the Soviet example.\textsuperscript{116} The eventual creation of the grand “House of the People,” the Palace of the Republic (\textit{Palast der Republik}) opened in 1976 on the site of the demolished city palace (below), with its theatre, concert venues, dance hall, disco, cafes, heavily subsidised restaurants, wine bars, beer rooms, bowling alley, and the assembly hall for the Volkskammer (People’s Chamber), became the ultimate fusion of the political, cultural, and economic vision of Honecker’s GDR; in Lara Knesi\-ler’s words, the “dream of the GDR.”\textsuperscript{117} Although constructed in a very different climate and to different social ends, as an ambitious and centralised cultural-political project, shades of the Palast can be seen in proposals for the Zeughaus almost three decades earlier.

In February 1948 architect Werner Harting was contracted by the DVV to develop plans for the project that involved the reconstruction of the Zeughaus and its conversion to a multi-purpose cultural facility.\textsuperscript{118} Discussions within the SED regarding the creation of a central history museum, first mooted between 1946-47, originally centred on Dresden as a possible location.\textsuperscript{119} The Zeughaus, on the other hand, should house a number of cultural venues including exhibition spaces,

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{114} Gorr, ’Volkshäuser,’ p. 7, 10.
\textsuperscript{115} Ibid. pp. 10-11.
\textsuperscript{116} Kneisler, ’Die ”erträumte DDR”,’ pp. 42-43.
\textsuperscript{118} Ewald, ’Zum Wiederaufbau des ehemaligen Zeughauses,’ p. 25; Müller, Die Baugeschichte, p. 259.
\textsuperscript{119} Ebenfeld, Geschichte nach plan?, p. 62.

a 600-seat cinema, a 500-seat theatre, a dual-purpose lecture theatre and chamber music hall, two "club rooms" with mezzanine library facilities, and a rooftop garden with a restaurant and viewing platform (Fig. 5.6). The formidable plan, for which construction work commenced on 1 July 1949, included Harting’s proposal to retain the historical exteriors of the building, but exclude the reconstruction of the nineteenth-century additions detailed in chapter 2. Thus the Zeughaus would return as far as possible to its original form, with no domed Ruhmeshalle, no grand flight of stairs in the courtyard, and no “monstrous” glass roof overhead. As Regina Müller has pointed out, despite many subsequent changes in content, interior design, and indeed, authorities responsible for the project, this core idea to restore the building’s original baroque form remained constant throughout.

Harting’s plan diverged from a purely historical reconstruction in its treatment of the interiors and the severely damaged rooftop sculptures. For the interiors he envisaged a fusion of old

---

120 The cinema was to be located in the upper west wing of the Zeughaus, with the theatre in the corresponding position to the east. The chamber music and lecture hall, seating 350, was envisaged for the lower floor, with the front entrance facing Unter den Linden providing exhibition space. Additional space in the courtyard was envisaged as an outdoor exhibition space as well as a concert venue. The numbers provided above for the theatre and cinema seating are taken from Werner Harting’s own description of the project in July 1949. Werner Harting, ‘Eine ganz grosse Auftrag,’ Sonntag, Berlin, 24 July 1949. Available at http://architekturmuseum.ub.tu-berlin.de/index.php?set=1&p=79&Daten=108272 [accessed 20 February 2013]. See also Ewald, ‘Zum Wiederaufbau des ehemaligen Zeughauses,’ p. 25; Müller, Die Baugesichte, pp. 259-262.


123 Müller, Die Baugesichte, p. 261.
and new as a way of meeting conservation requirements for salvageable interior elements (most significantly the vaulting throughout the lower floor),\textsuperscript{124} whilst also incorporating features like self-supporting concrete stairs and a state-of-the-art theatre, for which Harting sought to design a new type of stage, abandoning the proscenium arch and removing ornamentation to create a unity of stage and auditorium thought more appropriate to the current social order (Fig. 5.7).\textsuperscript{125} Very little had survived of the rooftop sculptures and it was not thought possible at this stage to restore them in any significant way. Instead, as Harting reported in 1948/49, an assemblage of the remaining components would be brought together to make composite sculptural groups, while the vacant spaces would eventually be filled with new, modern works designed specifically with the proportions of the original figures in mind.\textsuperscript{126}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure57.png}
\caption{Harting's 1948/49 drawing for one of two concrete staircases to lead from the ground floor (Linden wing) to the upper floor east and west wings (Architekturmuseum TU Berlin, Inv.-Nr.: 38078)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{124} Compared with the relatively well preserved exterior shell of the Zeughaus, the interiors were much more severely damaged. Harting estimated in 1949 that the interior was around 40 per cent destroyed. Harting, 'Eine ganz grosse Auftrag,' unpaginated.

\textsuperscript{125} Werner Harting, 'Das Interview der Woche. Professor Werner Harting,' \textit{Deutsche Woche}, 9 November 1949, p. 16; Quote Harting, 'Eine ganz grosse Auftrag,' unpaginated.

\textsuperscript{126} Harting, 'Das Interview der Woche,' p. 16; Harting, 'Eine ganz grosse Auftrag,' unpaginated.
From July 1949 to March 1950 work progressed on the reconstruction, including the repair of large holes in the western and north-eastern exterior walls, the removal of badly damaged vaulting on the upper level, the installation of temporary roofing, and the further removal of debris from collapsed building sections. An indication that the Zeughaus might eventually be more clearly anchored to the national idea came about almost immediately after the foundation of the GDR with a change of name—without any substantial change in concept—to the "House of German Culture." In January 1950 the Ministry for Education (Ministerium für Volksbildung; MfV) succeeded the DVV, becoming the new administrator of the building. At the end of February the planed House of German Culture was still being referred to in the East German media, though Stefan Ebenfeld has traced the first verifiable reference to the use of the Zeughaus for a planned historical museum to a Politburo report dated 14 February 1950. Under the agenda item 'Use of the Zeughaus,' the Politburo resolved: 'The Zeughaus will be used for exhibition purposes with the prospect of establishing it later as a historical museum.' The first public acknowledgement of a change in plan came about the following month, with the publication of the March 16 "Cultural Regulation" (Kulturverordnung) of the new GDR—the "Regulation for the development of a progressive democratic culture of the German people and for the further improvement of the work and life conditions of the intelligentsia."

128 The Berliner Zeitung, for instance, ran a story on the project on 18 October 1949, just eleven days after the establishment of the GDR, which provided details much the same as those already publicised by Harting in July.
129 The MfV was established on 1 January 1950. Paul Wandel, president of the DVV, remained in the top position, becoming the first Minister for Education, a post he held until 1952. "Ministerium für Volksbildung," in Bundesministerium für Innerdeutsche Beziehungen Germany (West) et al., DDR Handbuch: Band 2 M-Z, pp. 911-912.
130 Reference to the "House of German Culture" on February 15, one day after the Politburo discussion regarding the creation of a historical museum at the Zeughaus per 'Das Zukunftsgesicht Berlins. Vorschläge namhafter Architekten,' Berliner Zeitung, 15 February 1950, p. 6. Likewise Harting’s November interview with Deutsche Haus der deutschen Kultur,' Berliner Zeitung, 18 October 1949, p. 6. Likewise Harting’s November interview with Deutsche Wirtschaftskommission (DWK), and developed in conjunction with the DVV and SMAD. Under the title "Verordnung über die Erhaltung und Entwicklung der deutschen Wissenschaft und Kultur, die weitere Verbesserung der Lage der Intelligenz und die Steigerung ihre Rolle in der Produktion und im öffentlichen Leben," the regulation sought the establishment of workers' and farmers' faculties within the universities, established the endowment of national prizes and awards for teachers, academics, and doctors, and provided for more material support for intellectuals, including the support of publications for politically valuable literature. The March 1950 Kulturverordnung drew on the earlier regulation, announcing several further measures for the support of the cultural and intellectual sector in the GDR. See Buchbinder, 'Die Staatlichen Kommission für Kunstangelegenheiten,' pp. 11-15.
Nation, unity, and cultural tradition

The *Kulturverordnung* codified the goals of the GDR cultural policy and outlined a series of specific measures for the support of artists and intellectuals. These measures were presented as a “national duty” in the struggle for peace, national unity, and the progressive development of Germany, in direct opposition to a charge of neo-fascist cultural barbarism at the hands of American imperialists in the Federal Republic. It is important to note that at this stage the GDR was not perceived as a separate “nation” to the FRG. When its leaders spoke of the German nation, they drew upon Stalin’s 1913 formulation that defined the nation as a ‘historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture.’ This was reflected in the first GDR constitution, which referred to Germany as an indivisible democratic republic, the foundations of which are the German Länder, adding: ‘There is only one German nationality.’ While the “two states, one nation” concept appeared increasingly problematic as the two Germanys became more and more entrenched in their opposing world systems, prompting an assessment of the contradictions between Stalin’s emphasis on language, territory, and culture, and the basic tenets of

---


134 'Verordnung zur Entwicklung einer fortschrittlichen demokratischen Kultur,' p. 4.


136 Article 1 of the constitution of 7 October 1949 stated: 'Germany is an indivisible democratic republic, the foundations of which are the German Länder [...] There is only one German nationality.' [Deutschland ist eine unteilbare demokratische Republik; sie baut sich auf den deutschen Ländern auf. [...] Es gibt nur eine deutsche Staatsangehörigkeit.] "Staatsangehörigkeit" could also be translated as "citizenship," as per Dorpalen in his discussion of the development of the national concept in the early GDR; Dorpalen, 'Marxism and National Unity: The Case of Germany,' p. 512. English translation here, with the use of the term "nationality," taken from “Constitution of the German Democratic Republic (October 7, 1949)” in Volker Berghahn and Uta Poiger (Eds.), *Founding of the Two States: The Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic,* *German History in Documents and Images*, German Historical Institute, Washington DC, available at http://www.germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=2859 [accessed 1 March 2013]. Herwig Roggemann points out that the inherent fictional element of the approach to the "German Question" in the first GDR constitution (as well as the 1946 draft constitution drawn up by theSED), stating 'The GDR constitutions presented themselves (unrealistically) as unity-constitutions of a unified Germany then no longer in existence.' [Die DDR-Verf. Setzten sich (unrealistisch) als Einheitsverfassungen einer schon damals nicht mehr vorhandenen Einheit Deutschlands voraus.] He also makes reference to the supposition of the existence of a unified German people (einheitlichen deutschen Volkes) in the preamble of the 1949 GDR constitution and the Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany as well as the legal institution of a unified German citizenship (einheitlichen deutschen Staatsangehörigkeit) in both; Herwig Roggemann, *Die DDR-Verfassungen. Einführung in das Verfassungsrecht der DDR. Grundlagen und neuer Entwicklungen*, Quellen zur Rechtsvergleichung aus dem Osteuropa-Institut an der Freien Universität Berlin (Berlin (West): Berlin Verlag, 1989), p. 65.
historical and dialectical materialism which required an economic structural explanation and hence implied the existence of two German nations on the basis of their different social and economic character, this idea was nonetheless enshrined in the GDR’s second constitution of 1968 under the concept of the ‘socialist state of the German nation.’ 137 It was not revised until the third and final constitution of 1974, which reflected a shift in the basic national concept ushered in by both a change in SED leadership in 1971 and the realities of Ostpolitik and the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two Germanys (chapter 7).

The assertion of a German nation incorporating two separate political-economic units was not the only contradiction in the GDR’s national concept. Vaguely defined notions such as “national character” not only resembled nineteenth-century bourgeois-conservative definitions that Marx himself had rejected, 138 they also presented an ahistorical vision of an eternal nation, placing it outside the laws of progress through class struggle and revolution, which were the core of Marxist-Leninist historical materialism and the ideological foundation of the GDR historiography. 139 For this reason Jörg Kirchner has recently characterized the national question as an unsolved problem in the theory of Marxism-Leninism. 140 Furthermore, where Marx and Engels believed that national differences were vanishing, and that the supremacy of the proletariat would accelerate their disappearance, 141 the strengthening of national consciousness in the GDR was increasingly linked to broader ideological aims and also became an essential element of the SED strategy for the development of socialism. 142

137 It should be noted that there was a shift in the conception of the GDR state traceable in the 1968 constitution, most obviously in the context of the physical division of Germany with the erection of the Berlin Wall in 1961 and therefore more pronouncedly reflects the existence of two separate states. Roggemann’s analysis is again useful here. He examines the “German Question” as reflected in both the FRG and the GDR constitutions not only in concrete terms with regard to the definition of the state itself, but in a number of other areas where reference is made to the German people (Volk), the German nation, German citizenship, the legal relationship between the two German states, the future organisation of Germany, and the German states in European context. In the 1968 constitution he identifies a shift in the image of Germany (Deutschlandsbild) with reference given to a separate people of the German Democratic Republic, two German citizenships, and two German cultures (via reference to a “socialist culture”), however he also points out that these separate entities were still dealt with under the umbrella concept of the “German nation”; Roggemann, Die DDR-Verfassungen. Einführung in das Verfassungsrecht der DDR, pp. 64-81. On the critique of the existing Stalinist conception from the early 1960s “Nation und Nationale Frage” in, Bundesministerium für Innendeutsche Beziehungen Germany (West) et al., DDR Handbuch: Band 2 M-Z, pp. 924-927.


140 Kirchner, "Architektur nationaler Tradition," p. 55.


142 Jörg Kirchner links the ‘nationalisation of politics and culture’ during the late 1940s and early 1950s to the Stalinist notion of ‘Socialism in One Country.’ Kirchner, "Architektur nationaler Tradition," p. 55.
The *Kulturverordnung* was a significant reflection of this emerging national idea. It spoke of a “new” culture for the GDR, but one that was also rooted in national heritage.\(^{143}\) While a focus on the negative traditions believed to have led to fascism—Prussian militarism, imperialism, Junker class interests, and monopoly-capitalism—that had dominated the communist approach to the national past remained, the *Kulturverordnung* drew upon progressive German traditions as well as providing the ubiquitous nod to the importance of Soviet culture. Its measures, which included the building and expansion of schools, universities, research institutes, and academies, increased educational opportunities for farmers and workers, the inauguration of awards, honours, and scholarships, improvements to work conditions and prospects for artists and academics, including greater access to materials and substantial benefits in the realm of housing, coal, food, and electricity supply, should also be seen as an attempt to encourage skilled professionals and intellectuals to remain in the GDR in the light of burgeoning economic prosperity in the West and to inculcate those who did stay into the service of the party. It was under the rubric of schools, universities, research institutes, and cultural sites that the announcement was made for the creation of a “cultural historical museum” in the Berlin Zeughaus, with the promise of 1.5 million DM for 1950 for the completion of 3,000 square meters of exhibition space.\(^{144}\) On 9 May the Marx-Engels-Lenin-Institute (MEL), the scientific institution of the SED later re-named the Institute for Marxism Leninism (IML),\(^{145}\) was officially charged with the preparation of plans for a historical museum of the revolutionary movement.\(^{146}\)

With these changes major elements of the building programme including the theatres were scrapped in favour of increased exhibition space.\(^{147}\) The Ministry for Education planned an exhibition for 1 July, which would focus on the history of the German labour movement, but the collapse of a pillar and a large vaulting section in the ground-floor space envisaged for the exhibition revealed unforeseen weaknesses in the fabric of the building necessitating major new structural

---

\(^{143}\) ‘Verordnung zur Entwicklung einer fortschrittlichen demokratischen Kultur,’ p. 4.

\(^{144}\) Other measures included the further development and support for the German Academy of Sciences, the creation of the German Academy of Art, and a series of special cultural measures such as the “Bach year” in celebration of the 200\(^{\text{th}}\) anniversary of the death of the composer, increased publishing opportunities for “progressive” writers, music and theatre initiatives, and the promotion of cultural activity in factories and villages.

\(^{145}\) The Marx-Engels-Lenin-Institute was founded in 1947 in Berlin and commenced operations in 1949, its main areas of responsibility being research into the works of Marx and Engels and the history of the German and international labour movement, the publication of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, care for the bequests of KPD and SED functionaries, and the publication of memoirs of the leaders of the German labour movement. It was briefly re-named the Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin-Institute in honour of Stalin following his death in 1953, receiving its final name, Institute for Marxism-Leninism, in 1956 following the Twentieth Party Congress of the CPSU; Institut für Marxismus-Leninismus beim ZK der SED; Bundesministerium für Innen- und Außen-Beziehungen West Germany; DDR Handbuch, Band 1 A-L, 3rd ed. (Köln: Verlag Wissenschaft u. Politik, 1985), pp. 655-656.

\(^{146}\) Tagesordnungspunkt Nr. 7: “Schaffung eines Museums der revolutionären Bewegung in Berlin,” Protokoll Nr. 87, Sitzung des Politbüros am 9. Mai 1950, (BArch-SAMPO: DY 30/IV 2/2/87, Bl. 3)

\(^{147}\) Müller, *Die Baugeschichte*, p. 262.
works. Eventually it was deemed impossible to retain the lower-floor vaulting and Harting's new designs envisaged a completely modern interior instead (Fig. 5.8). But despite major setbacks in the building schedule, efforts for the creation of a permanent history museum were strengthened over the following months as the SED leadership identified the consolidation of Marxism-Leninism as the theoretical foundation of the Party and its dissemination to the broader GDR citizenship as its most urgent ideological task. To this end, the Third Party Congress of the SED (20-24 July 1950) called for the scientific “working out” (Ausarbeitung) of German history and the history of the German labour movement for the political-ideological development of the Party.  

Figure 5.8: Sketch for an alternative interior for the Zeughaus by Werner Hartig (Architekturmuseum TU Berlin, Inv.-Nr.: 38865)  

The consolidation of Marxism-Leninism and the proto-museum  
Couched in terms of the “struggle for peace,” the resolutions of the Third Party Congress, which included a five year plan for 1950-55, the “democratic renewal” of German culture, further education reform, the development of the SED as a “party of a new type” (Partei neuen Typus)
according to the Stalinist model, and the mediation of the lessons of the German workers’ movement to the youth, were set against the threat of a war of annihilation at the hands of the “Anglo-American imperialists.” The recent Schumann Declaration (9 May), foreshadowing the integration of West Germany into a future European union, was seen as a tool for rearmament in a war of aggression against the Soviet Union; part of the US-led “cosmopolitanism” that threatened the very existence of the German nation. The further nationalisation of the GDR politics and culture was therefore presented as a defence against US colonisation, or, as Party ideologue Kurt Hager remarked, the “national nihilism” which posited that Germany no longer existed as a nation. Far from contributing to further division, the establishment of the GDR was, in Stalin’s words, the ‘foundation stone of a unified, democratic, and peace-loving Germany.’ A unified Germany was, naturally, to be on the GDR’s own terms, according to its own definition of democracy in the form of democratic centralism.

In his closing speech at the Congress, Wilhelm Pieck called the struggle for a unified, democratic and peaceful Germany ‘our holy, national right’, emphasising the role of Berlin as capital of the whole of Germany. Later the Museum for German History would look to Pieck’s remarks about the legacy of princely and bourgeois collecting as the inspiration for the creation of the new museum, though he was speaking more generally about the museums of the GDR:

In the museums of our German Democratic Republic some petty princes still find much space and attention. I think that we must put an end to this, and give the real German people, the workers and peasants, the liberal thinkers and writers, the place they deserve, that is owed to them, in history.

---

150 Ibid. pp. 4-7.
151 The term “cosmopolitanism” was also used internally in the context of SED membership reviews. Helmut Eschwege, a German Jew who returned to the GDR in 1946 and who worked in the local SED leadership in Dresden during 1950-51, wrote of the use of the term “cosmopolitanism” thus: “The term “cosmopolitan” was a theoretical ingredient of Stalin’s for Marxism Leninism, which was not known to the early classics of Marxism. The discriminatory term was intended to mark particularly Jews and emigrants, who had returned from the western countries, as Party enemies.” [Der Begriff “Kosmopolitismus” war eine theoretische Zutat Stalins zum Marxismus-Leninismus, den die früheren Klassiker des Marxismus nicht kannten. Der diskriminierende Begriff sollte besonders Juden und Emigranten, die aus westlichen Länden zurückgekehrt waren, zu Parteifeinden stempeln.] Helmut Eschwege, Fremd unter meinesgleichen: Erinnerungen eines Dresdner Juden (Berlin: Ch. Links, 1991), p. 65.
152 In 1950 Kurt Hager’s role was Head of the Department of Party Training and Propaganda and Professor of Dialectical Materialism at the Humboldt University. Kurt Hager, ‘Von Stalin lernen - heißt siegen lernen,’ Neues Deutschland, 28 July 1950, p. 4.
153 [‘Grundstein für ein einheitliches, demokratisches und friedliebendes Deutschland’] Joseph Stalin on the foundation of the GDR, quoted in ‘Die gegenwärtige Lage’, p. 5.
154 With the strengthening of Marxism-Leninism and the assertion of the party’s “vanguard” role as a “party of a new type” the organisational and leadership principle of “democratic centralism” was provided ideological legitimisation, reinforcing the primacy of the party and further hindering political opposition. See ‘Demokratischer Zentralismus,’ Bundesministerium für Innerdeutsche Beziehungen Germany (West) et al., DDR Handbuch: Band 1 A-L, pp. 268-269.
Just over two weeks later the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the SED (Zentralkomitee der SED; ZK) formally approved the appointment of personnel for the new history museum, leading to the establishment of a small museum collective under the leadership of Edward Ullmann within the Marx-Engels-Lenin-Institute.157

Over the same period, plans were unveiled for the strategic re-building of Berlin as the political and cultural centre for the whole of Germany, with the Lustgarten and its adjacent historic buildings, though significantly minus the city palace whose demolition commenced on 7 September, forming the old/new heart of the city.158 With the removal of the palace the Zeughaus became the oldest remaining structure on Unter den Linden, save one preserved portal of the former palace (portal IV), from which Karl Liebknecht had spoken in 1918, thereby conferring ideological significance on an otherwise politically unsound relic of the Hohenzollern past. Portal IV was preserved and earmarked for display in the new museum, making it one of the first—objects envisaged for the museum.159

Under the auspices of MEL and the direction of Central Committee Secretary, Politburo member, and former Head of the Department for Agitation and Propaganda in the Central

---

156 Wilhelm Pieck's "Rechenschaftsbericht" at the Third Party Congress of the SED, 20-24 July 1950, quoted immediately after the formal establishment of the Museum for German History in January 1952. The quote was also used by the museum itself in a hand-made album presented to the delegation of the Fourth Party Congress in 1954, which detailed the establishment of the museum and its achievements since 1950, bag, 'Winkelfürsten verschwinden. Vorbereitende Arbeiten zum Museum für deutsche Geschichte in Berlin,' Berliner Zeitung, 25 January 1952, p. 3.
157 Ebenefeld, Geschichte nach plan?, pp. 63-64; Helmut Heinz, 'Die Gründung des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte und die Konzeption der ersten Ausstellung 1952,' Beiträge und Mitteilungen des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte, 7, 1981, p. 10; Müller, Die Baugeschichte, p. 272. Ullmann was joined at the MEL by two staff members: Kurt Dünow and Heinz Tropitz, the latter of whom was appointed by the Secretariat of the ZK at its sitting on 14 September 1950, with effect from 1 October 1950. He had been an instructor in the propaganda department of the ZK. Tagesordnungspunkt Nr. 1: "Bestätigung des Genossen Heinz Tropitz als Mitarbeiter des geschichtlichen Museums," Protokoll Nr. 12 der Sitzung des Sekretariats des ZK am 14. September 1950, (BArch-SAMPO: DY 30/1 IV 2/3/138, Bl. 1). Dünow transferred to the MfDG in January/February 1951 from his position at the MEL. After the formal establishment of the museum in January 1952 he was named the first department head for the museum section "Lenin and Stalin" (later scrapped). Tropitz became the assistant director of the department "1918-1945" specialising in the period 1924-1929. W.S., 'Gründung des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte. Direktor: Prof. Dr. Alfred Meusel / Stellvertretender Direktor: Eduard Ullmann,' Neues Deutschland, 19 January 1952, p. 4. See also, untitled document regarding the MfDG organisational structure and position descriptions c. 1952. (DHM-HA: MfDG/064/Bl. 20).
159 'Schatzgräber im Schloß. Südwestecke der Schloßruine abgerissen,' Berliner Zeitung, 24 September 1950, p. 8. The portal eventually found its way into the façade of the modern Staatsratsgebäude (Council of State Building), today's European School of Management and Technology, built between 1962-64 to the south of the Palace Square.
Committee of the KPD, Fred Oelßner, Ullmann developed plans for the new museum. These were put to the Secretariat of the SED’s Central Committee on 18 September 1950, and outlined the basic concept for a museum—now officially named the “Museum for German History”—based on the Marxist-Leninist interpretation of German history and its principle of the lawful progression of societies through class struggle and revolution. The plan listed a series of chronological-thematic subjects that would form the content of the exhibitions, presenting the struggle between progressive and reactionary forces from the Reformation and Peasant War to the ‘struggle for a new Germany’ in 1945. The importance of the development of Marxism-Leninism by Lenin and Stalin and the lessons of the Bolshevik struggle should also be made clear. Key German figures cited included Marx and Engels, August Bebel, Wilhelm and Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, and Ernst Thälmann. Beyond the identification of historical events and personalities, however, the subject matter received no detailed treatment or definition at this early stage. Nevertheless, the core purpose of the museum was clearly articulated:

The museum serves as the fundamental supplementary material and teaching material for school teaching throughout the entire school system; for the Party school system in all branches; for the training work of the administration and mass organisations; for the enlightenment and political education of the broad masses.

Das Museum dient als grundlegendes Ergänzungsmaterial und Lehrmaterial für den Schulunterricht im ganzen Schulsystem; für das Parteischulsystem in allen Zweigen; für die Schulungsarbeit der Verwaltung und Massenorganisationen; für die Aufklärung und politische Erziehung der breiten Massen.

160 Fred Oelßner (1903-1977) was a life-long communist whose father was a union and KPD functionary. He was active in the communist youth and was expelled from school for political activity. In 1919 he joined the USPD and the following year the KPD. Holding several positions within the Central Committee of the KPD including work for the “Agitprop” (Agitation and Propaganda) department and lecturing positions for the Party school, he emigrated in 1933 and joined the Communist Party in Paris. He was personal secretary to Walter Ulbricht and eventually made his way to the USSR in 1935 where he once again took up leadership positions within the fields of propaganda and Party training. Oelßner became Head of the Department of Agitation and Propaganda in the Central Committee of the KPD in 1945, Head of Party Schooling in 1946, and the Department of Party Schooling, Culture and Education between 1947-49. Between 1949-58 Oelßner was a member of the Volkskammer, 1949-55 a member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the SED, 1950-58 a member of the Politburo, and 1950-55 Chief Editor of the Party’s primary ideological publication Einheit. See Hagen Scheirzel and Peter Erler, ‘Oelßner, Fred (Larew),’ Helmut Müller-Enbergs et al., eds., Wer war wer in der DDR? Ein Lexikon ostdeutscher Biographien. Band 2, M-Z (Berlin: Ch. Links Verlag und Stiftung zur Aufarbeitung der SED-Diktatur, 2010), pp. 968-969. See also Ebenfeld, Geschichte nach plan?, p. 66.


163 Ibid, Bl. 16.


165 This point is also made by Ebenfeld; Ebenfeld, Geschichte nach plan?, p. 65.

Museological considerations regarding the means and methods by which these goals would be achieved, or the conceptual treatment of original objects and supporting material, were given limited attention, though a small section titled “Means of expression” (Auszdrucksmittel) did specify original documents, souvenirs, “valuable” paintings, sculptures, and statistical representations as key items. However this material was to be utilised, a popular scientific presentation was deemed a priority for the museum.

In the light of the new proposal, the Zeughaus plans were again amended. The architectural collective of Hässler/Volker took over from Harting at the end of September 1950, designing a series of elegant classical modern spaces for the interior, including an entrance hall in the lower ground Linden wing with two flights of stairs leading to the upper floor, a library and administrative offices in the west wing, and a lecture hall and refreshment room in the east. The majority of the floor-space was now dedicated to exhibition purposes. After the establishment of the Building Academy in January 1951 and the adoption of the “national tradition” architectural style, a rejection of formalism in favour of socialist realism, which reflected broader principles for the visual arts as well as a heightened national focus in politics and culture (though both owed more to Soviet than German tradition), the Hässler/Volker designs were superseded by a historicist style under a third architect, Theodor Voissem. While the new artistic guidelines shaped the architectural language of the Zeughaus interiors, the basic ground plan as conceived by Hässler/Volker remained relatively unchanged.

At the beginning of 1951 the museum was placed under the Ministry for Education but the collective continued to work out of its offices at MEL and the Central Committee, particularly Fred Oelßner, continued to exert direct influence over the project. Education reform in February led to

\[167\] Helmut Hinz, a researcher at the IML in the early 1980s, claimed that the proposal did, indeed, address a number of questions regarding the museum’s design and implementation (museumsgestalterischen Fragen) in conjunction with the discussion of content. He specifically identified the decisions regarding the type of material to be displayed and how they could be made effective for the historical-ideological and propaganda goals of the museum. While the concept document does outline a number of object types under the heading "Means of expression," as above, further detail was extremely limited and the document provides no indication of the museological concept for the presentation either in terms of a design philosophy or the central question of how such material would be treated. Compare "Vorschläge über die Gestaltung des Museums," 18.9.1950, (BArch-SAMPO: DY 30/1 IV 2/3/139, Bl. 16); Heinz, 'Die Gründung des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte,' p. 10-13.

\[168\] "Vorschläge über die Gestaltung des Museums," 18.9.1950, (BArch-SAMPO: DY 30/1 IV 2/3/139, Bl. 16).

\[169\] Ewald, 'Zum Wiederaufbau des ehemaligen Zeughauses,' pp. 29-30; Müller, Die Baugeschichte, p. 272-280. The first designs by Hässler/Volker placed the Library and reading room on the eastern side of the building and the refreshment area and lecture hall on the western side. They were reversed in a subsequent draft plan from January 1951. Regina Müller also points to political reasons for the removal of Harting from the project on the basis that he continued to reside in West Berlin despite his engagement by the GDR authorities. Ibid. p. 264.


\[171\] Müller, Die Baugeschichte, p. 281.

\[172\] See, for instance, Correspondence between the ZK and the MfDG for the period 1950-57, (DHM-HA: MfDG/288).
the establishment of the State Secretariat for Higher Education (Staatssekretariat für Hochschulwesen; SFH), which began as an independent division of the Ministry for Education and later became the stand-alone Ministry for Higher and Technical Education (Ministerium für Hoch- und Fachschulwesen; MHF),\(^{173}\) the final administrative body responsible for the MfDG until the changes that came about with the collapse of the GDR in 1989/90. Like the museum itself, education reform was very much anchored in the resolutions of the Third Party Congress, and in particular the strengthening of Marxism-Leninism, greater orientation to the Soviet model, and the intensification and centralisation of Party control within the academic realm.\(^{174}\) Under the reforms the SFH became responsible for the regulation and coordination of higher education, “scientific” libraries, museums, and related institutions of a scientific character.

It is important to note, however, that the distinction “scientific” only applied to a small number of specialised museums in the GDR. The vast majority of state-level museums were administered not by the SFH but the Ministry for Culture, particularly the important art collections in Berlin and Dresden, while local authorities also retained control of a number of regional (Heimat) institutions, which formed the largest single category of museum.\(^{175}\) The central coordinating,

\(^{173}\) The Ministerium für Hoch- und Fachschulwesen was established in August 1967 as the successor of the Sekretariat für Hochschulwesen.

\(^{174}\) The Regulation for the Reorganisation of Higher Education (Verordnung über die Neuordnung des Hochschulwesens) from 22 February 1951 §1 stated: ‘Das gesamte Hochschulwesen einschließlich der Durchführung des wissenschaftlichen Lehr- und Forschungsbereiches an den Universitäten und Hochschulen sowie die Aufsicht über die wissenschaftlichen Bibliotheken, Museen und verwandten Einrichtungen mit wissenschaftlichem Charakter sind Angelegenheiten der Republik.’ The Staatssekretariat für Hochschulwesen, which was established under §2 became responsible for these institutions, taking over the role of the Department for Higher Education (Hauptabteilung Hochschulwesen) of the Ministry for Education and the various higher education branches of the ministries of the Länder, which were dissolved under the provisions of the same paragraph. The first State Secretary for Higher Education was Gerhard Harig (1902-66). On the education reform of February 1951 out of which the SFH was formed and its relation to the aims of the Third Party Congress; Christa Berg, Christoph Führ, and Carl-Ludwig Furck, *Handbuch der deutschen Bildungsgeschichte* Bd. VI, 2. Teilbd., 1945 bis zur Gegenwart / Deutsche Demokratische Republik und neue Bundesländer (München: Beck, 1998), p. 207. See also ‘Entschließung der 4. Tagung des ZK. Die nächsten Aufgaben in den Universitäten und Hochschulen,’ *Neues Deutschland*, 6 February 1951, p. 4; Jürgen Rühle, ‘Reform des besseren Lernens. Die Umgestaltung der Hochschulen - ein Weg zur echten, fortschrittlichen Wissenschaft,’ *Berliner Zeitung*, 24 February 1951, p. 3.

\(^{175}\) In 1965 there were a reported 415 Heimat museums of a total of 519 museums. The proportion had shifted slightly by the late 1980s and by 1987 there were 363 Heimat museums to a total of 721 (this most likely also reflects changing classification criteria alongside museum growth more generally). Even with the reduction in Heimat museums and the corresponding increase across the other museum types, the Heimat museums still represented the single largest museum category. Staatliche Zentralverwaltung für Statistik, *XVIII. Bildungswesen und Kultur. Museen und Besucher,* in *Statistisches Jahrbuch der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik. 33. Jahrgang* (Berlin: Deutscher Zentralverlag, 1989), p. 327. By the mid-1970s the East German museums were formally divided for the purposes of statistics into a set of categories according to their main discipline; namely 1) history museums, 2) art and handcraft museums, 3) literature, theatre, film and music museums, 4) natural history museums, 5) technical museums, and 6) regional and Heimat museums. Staatliche Zentralverwaltung für Statistik, *XVII. Volksbildung und Kultur. 43. Museen und Besucher nach Bezirken,* in *Statistisches Jahrbuch der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik. 18. Jahrgang* (Berlin: Deutscher Zentralverlag, 1974), p. 385; Staatliche Zentralverwaltung für Statistik, *XVII. Volksbildung und Kultur. 46. Museen und Besucher nach Bezirken,* in *Statistisches Jahrbuch der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik. 19. Jahrgang* (Berlin: Deutscher Zentralverlag, 1975), p. 386. The distinction between “scientific” museums and a second, catchall category that included natural history, Heimat, and art museums reflects an earlier categorization. The first statistical yearbook published in the GDR show the proportion of scientific to “other” museums for the years 1953-55. In 1953 a total of 35 museums were categorised as
advisory, and research bodies, the Museum Council (*Rat für Museumswesen*) established in 1965 and the Institute for Museology (*Institut für Museumswesen*), founded in 1971 also came under the umbrella of the Culture Ministry (chapter 7). Only a handful of the GDR’s museums with specialised subject matter were administered at the national level outside the culture ministry. These included the MfDG and the Ethnographic Museum Dresden under the SfH/MFH, Dresden’s Army Museum, which was administered by the Ministry for National Defence, Berlin’s Postal Museum under the Ministry for Post and Telecommunications, and the German Hygiene Museum (Dresden) under the Ministry for Health.

The small team at MEL continued to work on preparations for the museum during 1951, as well as developing content for a separate project, the Georgi Dimitroff Museum in Leipzig, also under the responsibility of the SfH. Following a topping out ceremony at the Zeughaus on April 30, the museum plans were presented in the *Berliner Zeitung* under the title: “New spirit in the old Zeughaus.” The new museum promised extended opening hours to suit workers, highly qualified guides, and a complete transformation of the building so that it would no longer serve the purposes of war and destruction. ‘Each period should find its museal form, so that the visitor feels himself transposed into that era’, wrote journalist Joachim Schulz, ‘flags, magazines, literature, flyers, historical objects, paintings, statistical images, and work tools will vividly reflect the social

---

176 Both of these institutions use the term *Museumswesen* (denoting the museum system), not *Museologie* (museology). I have translated the title of the *Institut für Museumswesen* as the Institute for Museology here in accordance with the translation given in the English summary of an article by its director, Rolf Kliau, and published in *Neue Museumskunde* (below), which at that stage was the scientific publication of the institute. Accordingly the *Rat für Museumswesen* is sometimes translated as the Council for Museology, but a more common translation is simply Museum Council. For a more detailed discussion of terminological problems, particularly the development of the use of the term “Museology” in the GDR, see chapter 7. Regarding the institutions; Rolf Kliau, ‘15 Jahre Rat für Museumswesen. 10 Jahre Institut für Museumswesen,’ *Neue Museumskunde*, 25, no. 2, 1982, pp. 84-89; Joachim Mückenburger, ‘20 Jahre Rat für Museumswesen,’ *Neue Museumskunde*, 28, no. 2, 1985, pp. 79-80.
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conditions of the epochs depicted.'\textsuperscript{181} This was a first indication of the type of experience the Berlin public might expect from the new museum. The desire to immerse the visitor within each historical period is also reminiscent of the ambitions voiced with regard to the Zeughaus museum both in the 1880s and under Binder and Post during the Weimar era to create historically immersive spaces (chapters 3 and 4).

MfDG staff also carried out some preliminary collecting activity, although the bulk of the early collecting only commenced after January 1952. Where objects were acquired, like a small collection of letters from August Bebel and Karl Liebknecht, they were often assigned directly to the museum by Party authorities; in this case the Propaganda Department of the ZK.\textsuperscript{182} While the proto-museum had not yet developed a conceptually determined collecting strategy, this was by no means the last of the Party's involvement in determining the objects the museum would acquire. It also illustrates the centrality of leading socialist personalities at the conceptual level, as well as in collecting priorities. Like the Zeughaus museum, the MfDG held great stock in "secular relics." Now, however, it was the leaders of the German and international socialist movement who became the object of museum hagiography, one of the chief vehicles for which was the historical-biographical exhibition. Both exhibitions developed prior to the formal establishment of the museum in 1952 were historical-biographical exhibitions—marking the eightieth anniversaries of the births of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht—and they drew inspiration from earlier exhibitions developed directly by the Party leadership, namely the \textit{Stalin Exhibition} opened in December 1949, and \textit{Lenin Exhibition} in April 1950. These exhibitions represent the earliest attempts by the museum, under the auspices of MEL, to meet the challenges set out by the \textit{Kulturverordnung} and the Third Party Congress. They also highlight the nature of the early museum work and the presentation techniques developed.

\textit{Lessons from the past: Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht}

Preparation for the first of these exhibitions, the \textit{Rosa Luxemburg Exhibition (Rosa-Luxemburg-Ausstellung)}, commenced towards the end of 1950 under the watchful eye of Fred Oelßner and Kurt

\textsuperscript{181} ["Jeder Zeitabschnitt soll seine museale Gestaltung finden, daß sich der Besucher in jene Zeit versetzt fühlt. Fahnen, Zeitschriften, Literatur, Flugblätter, historische Gegenstände, Gemälde, statistische Darstellungen, und Werkzeuge werden die gesellschaftlichen Verhältnisse der geschilderten Epoche anschaulich wiedergeben."] ibid.

Hager, with members of the Department for Mass Agitation, Sector for Visual Advertising (*Abteilung Massenagitation, Sektor Sichtwerbung*) assigned to assist the museum collective. In the proposal approved by the ZK Secretariat on 27 December, Ullmann and his museum staff were made responsible for the content of the displays (per the approved concept) and the instruction of exhibition guides, while the Department for Mass Agitation was to oversee its technical execution and the organisation of visitors—a reference to the obligatory group tours for SED party members, mass organisations, military personnel, and schools, which remained a central aspect of the museum’s work throughout. For the Rosa Luxemburg exhibition the Propaganda Department of the Berlin state branch of the SED called on all “propagandists,” primary school teachers, and circle leaders to register for group tours. ‘There must be no circle,’ stated the advertisement, ‘that does not collectively visit this exhibition!’ Neither exhibition was directly credited to the MfDG in the GDR media, nor in fact do they feature in the museum’s own accounts of its history. Fred Oelßner represented the exhibitions publically, as he had done for the earlier ZK exhibitions, presenting them as the work of MEL and the Party leadership more generally.

---

183 The *Rosa-Luxemburg-Ausstellung* opened on Monday 5 March 1951 to mark what would have been Luxemburg’s eightieth birthday. The opening address was given by Fred Oelßner, *’Luxemburg-Ausstellung eröfnet. In Anwesenheit von Wilhelm Pieck / Gedenkfeier im Friedrichstadt-Palast,* Berliner Zeitung, 6 March 1951, p. 2; *’Luxemburg-Ausstellung eröffnet,* Neues Deutschland, 6 March 1951, p. 3. *Colleagues Hinze and Hamann of the Abteilung Massenagitation, Sektor Sichtwerbung* were assigned to the project on 17.11.1950 and were responsible for developing plans regarding the organisation of the exhibition, as well as its proposed location, a matter not settled until 2.01.1951 when the decision was made to utilise the lecture hall in the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute on Friedrich-Ebert-Straße. Regarding the appointment of Hinze and Hamann to the project, File note dated 17.11.1950, (DHM-HA: MfDG/288/Bl. 6); SED Internal Memo to Eduard Ullmann from the Department of Mass Agitation dated 4.12.1950, “Betr. Liebknecht-Luxemburg-Ausstellung,” (DHM-HA: MfDG/288/Bl. 7). Regarding the use of the MEL lecture hall, File note dated 2.01.1950, (DHM-HA: MfDG/288/Bl. 5 reverse side).


185 [*’Es darf keinen Zirkel geben, der dieser Ausstellung nicht kollektiv besucht!’ *’Propagandisten, Grundschullehrer, Zirkelleiter! Habt Ihr euch schon zum Besuch der Rosa-Luxemburg-Ausstellung angemeldet?’ *Neues Deutschland*, 11 March 1951, p. 8. Organising group tours, according to another article, should be viewed as an urgent task for all party teachers; [*’Lehrer des Parteilehrjahres, erachtet es als eure vordringliche Aufgabe, diese Ausstellung euren Zirkelteilnehmern zugänglich zu machen!’ *’Deine PARTEI ruft dich,* Neues Deutschland, 29 March 1951, p. 6.

186 An exception is the inclusion of the exhibitions in a hand-made album presented to the Fourth Party Congress of the SED in 1954, which is held in the DHM Hausarchiv, (DHM-HA: MfDG/Album 1954).

187 See, for instance, P.D., *’Der siegerreiche Leninismus in Bildern. Zur Lenin-Ausstellung des Parteivorstandes der SED im Haus der Presse in Berlin,* Neues Deutschland, 18 April 1950, p. 4; *’Lenin-Ausstellung eröfnet,* Neues Deutschland, 22 April 1950, p. 2; *’Luxemburg-Ausstellung eröffnet,* p. 3; *’Eröffnung der Karl-Liebknecht-Ausstellung,* Neues Deutschland, 4 August 1951, p. 2; Heinz Stadler, *’Die Karl-Liebknecht-Ausstellung in Berlin. Eine Querschaft durch das Heldenleben des großen proletarischen Revolutionärs,* Neues Deutschland, 12 August 1951, p. 4. Ebendorf also makes the point that the MfDG was not publically credited with the exhibitions, although he places all four exhibitions (Stalin, Lenin, Luxemburg, and Liebknecht) under the rubric of the Museum for German History. As detailed above, and as Ebendorf himself avers, the MfDG museum collective was not established until August 1950 in the wake of the Third Party Congress. Both exhibitions on the Russian leaders predated this development (the Stalin Exhibition on 18 December 1949 and the Lenin Exhibition on 21 April 1950). There was, however, a great deal of continuity between the two sets of exhibitions with regard to the Party leadership and agencies involved. The concept document for the Liebknecht exhibition approved in December 1950 specifically referred to the Stalin and Lenin exhibitions developed by the ZK of the SED as a model for the design of the exhibition. Exhibition opening dates per Rü, *’Ein Stück Geschichte. Gang durch die Stalin-Ausstellung,* Berliner Zeitung, 20
According to its concept, the Luxemburg exhibition should present the life of Rosa Luxemburg from her childhood in Poland, through her studies in Switzerland, her contribution to the German labour movement and efforts to bring the lessons of Russia’s 1905 Revolution to Germany, her struggle against militarism and imperial war policy, the founding of the Spartacus League, the October Revolution and its impact on Germany, the November Revolution, foundation of the KPD, and her murder alongside Karl Liebknecht. It aimed to demonstrate the merits of the German labour movement, contribute to the strengthening of proletariat internationalism, and offer illustrative material for study by members of Party schools, mass organisations and schools. While this was squarely in line with the Party’s emphasis on progressive German traditions, it was not unproblematic with regard to the SED’s historical vision. The failure of the November Revolution to usher in an era of socialism, as determined “objectively” by Marxist-Leninist historical laws, presented problems for East German historians that would need to be explained by the ruthlessness of the German bourgeoisie, the betrayal of opportunistic Social Democrats, and the intervention of Britain and America. Indeed, the very nature of the revolution was cause for contention, because the SED’s claim to its vanguard role as a Marxist-Leninist party would be diminished by any assertion of a prior socialist revolution on German soil. According to Oelßner:

The November revolution remained a bourgeois revolution. The power of the monopoly capitalists and Junkers was restored. Instead of friendship with the socialist Soviet Union the Weimar Republic joined the western imperialist powers, which contributed to establishing the fascist domination of finance capital in Germany.

[Die Novemberrevolution blieb eine bürgerliche Revolution. Die Macht der Monokapitalisten und Junker wurde wiederhergestellt. Statt der Freundschaft mit dem sozialistischen Sowjetunion schloß sich die Weimarer Republik den imperialistischen Westmächten an, die das Ihre dazu beitrugen, die fashistische Herrschaft des Finanzkapitals in Deutschland zu errichten.] These themes were underscored by Luxemburg’s own words at the International Socialist Congress in 1893 (in relation to the Polish struggle) in which she spoke of the importance of accepting the


outstretched hand of the Russian comrades.\textsuperscript{193} Praise for Luxemburg and the German Left was, however, tempered by the inclusion of criticism from Lenin and Stalin (Fig. 5.9). ‘This is however not only a Rosa Luxemburg exhibition,’ wrote Rudy Wettengel for Neues Deutschland, ‘rather it is an impressive show of the development of the international labour movement, in which the leading and helping hand of Lenin and Stalin, the leaders of the world proletariat, can be felt in almost every department.’\textsuperscript{194}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{rosa_luxemburg_exhibition}
\caption{‘Despite all of these faults...’ A view of the Rosa Luxemburg exhibition featuring portrait busts of Lenin and Stalin along with a critical assessment of the central figure [DHM-HA: MdG/Album 1954]}
\end{figure}

The same was true of the Karl Liebknecht exhibition, which included not only a biographical presentation, but also an overview of the development of socialism up to 1871 (Liebknecht’s birth), and a Leninist analysis of imperialism as the theoretical framework through which the visitor should understand the protagonist’s struggle.\textsuperscript{195} It was also very much anchored in the present, using Liebknecht’s example to demonstrate how the path now taken by West Germany mirrored the mistakes of the past. Indeed, both exhibitions included a final section after the protagonists’ deaths.

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{193} Rudi Wettengel, ‘Eine Schau der deutschen und internationalen Arbeiterbewegung,’ Neues Deutschland, 23 March 1951, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{194} ‘Dies ist jedoch nicht nur eine Ausstellung Rosa Luxemburg, das ist vielmehr eine imposante Schau der Entwicklung der internationalen Arbeiterbewegung, in der fast in jeder Abteilung die leitende und helfende Hand der Führer des Weltproletariats, Lenins und Stalins, zu spüren ist.’ ibid.
\end{footnotesize}
in which the development of socialism to the present was handled. Oelßner explicitly ruled against concluding the Liebknecht exhibition with his death, writing in a file note:

The exhibition does not close with the murder of K.L, but has a final section on the necessity of the struggle against the remilitarization of West Germany in order to bring peace to the present. Demonstrate that Schumacher and Vetter [West German SPD leadership] continue the policy of the social-chauvinists of 1914.

[Die Ausstellung schließt nicht mit der Ermordung K.L's, sondern hat ein Schlussteil über die Notwendigkeit des Kampfes gegen die Remilitarisierung in West Deutschland und um den Frieden bis zur Gegenwart zu bringen. Aufzeigen, daß Schumacher und Vetter [West German SPD leadership] die Politik der Sozial-Chauvinisten von 1914 fortführen.]

'The selfsame enemy, against which Karl Liebknecht heroically struggled,' stated Oelßner at the exhibition opening, 'German imperialism and German militarism, have been erected again by the USA.' Opening in conjunction with the World Youth Festival, it was clear that the prime lesson for the youth of today was to continue the struggle against imperialism, and by extension the USA and its puppet, West Germany.

How effective these exhibitions were is another matter. Museum staff certainly felt they were successful because they wrote urgently to the ZK's Westkommission in December 1950 regarding the possibility of staging exhibitions in West Germany on the basis that they had proven a valuable instrument for mass agitation. But despite such assertions, the type of objects presented and the mode of display remained limited. A predominance of text-based media, supplemented by photographs and occasionally paintings—not original works, but rather commissioned historical scenes in the socialist realist style—severely limited the visual appeal of the exhibitions. The two-dimensionality of this material and the burden of vast quantities of text were only partially offset by the visual layout of the material utilising collage techniques and modern display cabinets (Fig. 5.10). Ideological content was of far greater concern to the SED leadership than museological considerations, although they strove to make the exhibitions as appealing as possible by including potted plants, flowers and flags, which served as adornment around busts and portraits of heroic figures. While the iconography was different, the effect of these assemblages was not dissimilar to
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199 Letter from the Museum for German History in the MEL to the ZK of the SED (Westkommission) dated 1.12.1950, (DHM-HA: MfDG/288/Bl. 4).
200 See, for instance, Rü, 'Ein Stück Geschichte,' p. 3; Rosemarie Krop, 'In der Stalin-Ausstellung,' Neues Deutschland, 8 January 1950, p. 5. Oelßner, 'Lenin und die Novemberrevolution 1918,' p. 4.
that produced by the use of busts and associated accoutrements in the halls of honour that had accompanied the National Socialist era exhibitions (chapter 4).

Figure 5.10: Wilhelm Pieck strains to read a document in the Karl Liebknecht exhibition, August 1951 (DHM-HA: MfDG/Album 1954)

The dominance of two-dimensional material was probably attributable to a number of factors, not the least the lack of museum experience among participants and the lack of material available to them. Perhaps also, the direct requirements of the SED propagandists and the need to mediate a strictly determined ideological message worked against the inclusion of non text-based objects, which by their nature were ambiguous and open to multiple interpretations. The museum collective did, however, tentatively begin to assess the former Zeughaus holdings. In December 1950 the remaining cannons had been transported off-site, to be stored on the museum island before their (planned) transfer to museums throughout the GDR. By placing them within the context of broader artistic and cultural-historical collections, it was felt, these objects would contribute to
the study of cultural epochs and demonstrate German artistic and technological accomplishments, without serving militaristic traditions as they had when situated within a specialist collection of weaponry.\textsuperscript{201}

In April 1951 Oelßner also discussed the necessity of evaluating the extant flag collections. Those identified as a priority were the flags and standards of "friendly" states—the GDR's socialist allies, Russia, Poland, and China.\textsuperscript{202} While expertise was urgently required to identify holdings, one file note explicitly stated '[Paul] Post is \textit{not} to be used for the appraisal of the flags.'\textsuperscript{203} Ullmann explained in 1952 that the identification of flags was extremely difficult in the absence of a full inventory and with many identification numbers missing.\textsuperscript{204} 'The only person,' he wrote, 'who could quickly carry out this work, is Professor Post [...] We do not want to consult him.'\textsuperscript{205} The solution was merely to store the flags until museum had more time. Though a full list was not completed until January 1953,\textsuperscript{206} this earlier attempt illustrates the difficulty of the collection heritage as well as the way in which certain objects could potentially be re-framed to meet the requirements of the SED historical image; in this instance re-casting former symbols of triumph over the enemy as evidence of bonds of friendship.\textsuperscript{207}

A national collection: the formal establishment of the Museum for German History

In October 1951 the Central Committee announced the resolutions of its Seventh Plenary Meeting under the title "The most important ideological tasks of the Party."\textsuperscript{208} 'We have not adequately taken into consideration,' said Fred Oelßner at the meeting, 'that the new consciousness does not come from itself, that it does not automatically grow from the new conditions, but rather can only develop

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{201} 'Geheimnisvolle Kanonenrohre. Meisterwerke alter Geschützgießer werden geborgen,' \textit{Berliner Zeitung}, 28 December 1950, p. 3.
\item \textsuperscript{202} Fred Oelßner, "Gedächtnisnotiz der Ansprache mit Gen. Juch, 17.4.1951" (DHM-HA: MfDG/288/Bl. 16).
\item \textsuperscript{205} '[Der einzige, der diese Arbeit schnell erledigen könnte, ist Professor Post ... Ihn wollen wir nicht hinzuziehen.]
\item \textsuperscript{206} List of Russian, Polish, and Chinese flags from the Zeughaus holdings accompanied by a letter from Eduard Ullmann to Fred Oelßner dated January 1953, (DHM-HA: MfDG/288/Bl. 70-77).
\item \textsuperscript{207} Under Ullmann, the museum collective also attempted, within its restricted means, to gather some of the dispersed Zeughaus collection objects and catalogue those that had remained under their care as part of their initial museum work. Müller, \textit{Vom Arsenal zum Museum}, p. 239.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
in the active struggle against the old consciousness, against bourgeois ideology, as well as through intensive work of political enlightenment.\footnote{Wir haben nicht genügend berücksichtigt, daß das neue Bewußtsein nicht von Selbst kommt, daß es nicht automatisch aus den neuen Verhältnissen erwächst, sondern nur im aktiven Kampf gegen das alte Bewußtsein, gegen die bürgerliche Ideologie, sowie durch intensive politische Aufklärungsarbeit entstehen kann.] Fred Oelßner, 'Die ideologischen Aufgaben der Partei: dem Referat des Genossen Fred Oelßner auf der 7. Tagung des Zentralkomitees der SED am 18. Oktober 1951 ' Neues Deutschland, 31 October 1951, p. 4.} This negative assessment formed the basis for a raft of initiatives designed to imbue all areas of the political, economic, and academic life with the spirit of Marxism-Leninism.\footnote{These included not only better training for propagandists within the Party, but also the promotion of the study of Marxism-Leninism within the social sciences, particularly among historians, economists, philologists and pedagogues, measures to increase the publication of Marxist-Leninist classics and to popularise them via the press, lectures, brochures, and biographical studies, and the systematic ideological control of the study of the social sciences within institutions and state organs. Beyond the academy, the propaganda work must also address mass organisations and be carried out within the FDJ, factories and farmers’ colleges, sporting associations, the Kulturbund, the Democratic Women’s League of Germany (Demokratische Frauenbund Deutschlands; DFB), the Society for German-Soviet Friendship, and the FDGB, as well as being reflected in the positive assessment of the new sciences, art, and literature within the East German press. 'Die wichtigsten ideologischen Aufgaben der Partei,’ pp. 3-4.} Under the rubric “Questions of German history” the ZK identified the significance of the new museum for the ideological work of the Party, directing the SfH to take immediate measures to accelerate planning.\footnote{The other initiatives announced along with the acceleration of the museum were: the creation of an "Institute for German History" within the German Academy of Sciences, an "Institute for the History of the German People" at the University of Leipzig, a collective of qualified historians to prepare a text book for the teaching of German history, memorial projects for the life and work of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, and the identification and commemoration of memorial sites for the progressive figures from German history; Lessing, Schiller, Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, Leibnitz, Hegel, Alexander and Wilhelm Humboldt, Robert Koch, Euler, Helmholtz, August Bebel, Rosa Luxemburg, Wilhelm and Karl Liebknecht, Clara Zetkin, and Ernst Thälmann. Ibid.} Tasks identified for the MfDG included the development of a new thematic plan, the collection and preparation of exhibition objects, and the creation of a collective drawn from the historical faculties of the universities (both teachers and students), artists and sculptors, and museum and library personnel.\footnote{Ibid. p. 4.} Above all, the new historical measures represented an extension of the SED’s efforts to rehabilitate the German past, restore German honour, and build patriotism; tasks for which the new museum was deemed to be of great importance.

Two months later, work was still perceived to be lagging behind schedule; those responsible at the SfH were thought to have underestimated the value of the museum and the ZK’s Department for Propaganda stepped in to take the project in hand.\footnote{W.S., 'Über die Durchführung des 7. Plenums des ZK der SED. Wie entsteht das Museum für deutsche Geschichte?,' Neues Deutschland, 18 December 1951, p. 3. Neues Deutschland also appointed itself to oversee and report on the progress of the plans.} On 3 December the ZK Secretariat gave Ullmann two weeks to present a new set of plans detailing how the museum could be set up in the Berlin Magistrate’s School of Economics building on Clara-Zetkin-Straße (Dorotheenstraße) until
the Zeughaus renovations were completed.\textsuperscript{214} A detailed plan was then put to the Secretariat on 13 December under Kurt Hager’s name.\textsuperscript{215} It identified the key tasks of the museum, its construction and organisational structure, including specific instructions regarding the development of the collections, and a series of measures for the training of staff. It also included a schedule for the Zeughaus reconstruction, which foresaw the provisional use of the Linden wing for the first exhibition sections from October 1952 and the completion of the whole restoration by the following October, with the museum opening in the Zeughaus by the end 1953.\textsuperscript{216} The provisional exhibitions on Clara-Zetkin-Straße were slated to open on 1 May 1952, in just over five months time.\textsuperscript{217}

Five key tasks were identified for the museum in the plan. They were; 1) the collection and exhibition of historical documents, souvenirs, engravings, artworks, and material culture that reflected the German past and the important events in the history of the German people; 2) the clear presentation of the historical development of Germany, which should also present a memorial to Germany’s greatest sons, Marx and Engels; 3) the implementation of a broad political enlightenment and education programme among the population with the help of exhibitions, tours, lectures, publications, and pamphlets; 4) the location and care of memorial sites connected with the lives and work of the founders of Marxism-Leninism, outstanding German personalities, and the revolutionary struggles of the German people; and 5) the mediation of the lessons of the Bolsheviks under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, their assistance in the German labour movement, and the creation of a new, unified, democratic, and peace-loving Germany.\textsuperscript{218}

The details of these areas of responsibility were by no means complete, but the reference to collecting and exhibition priorities suggests preliminary engagement with the character and scope of the future collections. Under the rubric “Construction and structure of the museum,” a series of directives were given for the establishment of the collections. The ZK had addressed collecting strategy in October, directing the museum to appeal to the public for the donation of objects and documents of historical significance.\textsuperscript{219} Now several other institutions and organisations were


\textsuperscript{217} Ibid. Bl. 124; W.S., ’Über die Durchführung des 7. Plenums des ZK der SED,’ p. 3.


\textsuperscript{219} Die wichtigsten ideologischen Aufgaben der Partei,’ p. 4.
compelled to assist in the development of the collections.220 These included the German Academy of Sciences, the German Academy of Art, the State Commission for Art Matters (the forerunner of the Ministry for Culture), the Ministry for the Interior, the Main Department of Archives, and mass organisations such as the FDGB, FDJ, the Democratic Women’s League of Germany (Demokratische Frauenbund Deutschlands; DFB), the Society for German-Soviet Friendship, the German-Polish Society, the Society of People Persecuted by the Nazi Regime (Vereinigung der Verfolgten des Naziregimes; VVN), and the Kulturbund.221

Assisting the museum in this manner essentially meant the surrender of objects deemed to be of historical significance.222 More problematic still was a stipulation requiring the cooperation of regional and Heimat museums in the construction of the MfDG.223 This provision opened the door for the appropriation of objects from established museums and points to the very serious legal and moral implications of the museum’s collecting practice. Not only were countless objects “transferred” to the MfDG from existing museums, but private collections were also obtained under questionable circumstances.224

In addition to collection development, provisions were made for the establishment of a specialist library and a design department. The museum was to be headed by a director, specified as a ‘renowned scientist known throughout Germany’, and an assistant director, under the guidance of a scientific advisory council (Wissenschaftlicher Rat).225 Eight scientific departments were named, reflecting the scope and periodisation of the museum’s research and exhibition priorities. Significantly, the Reformation and Peasant War no longer signified the start of the programme, which instead began with pre- and early history, followed by the Middle Ages though to the Peasant War (1525); a significant expansion of the historiographical frame, which Helmut Heinz attributes to the influence of Soviet historians.226 The remaining departments were; “From the Peasant's War to the Revolution of 1848,” “The Revolution of 1848 to 1900,” “1900 to 1918,” “1918 to 1945,” and

---

221 Ibid.
222 The German Academy of Art, for instance, was ordered to assist the museum in the creation of paintings, drawings, and sculptures related to historical themes, while the mass organisations were obliged to provide “required material” relating to their own institutional histories and assist museum staff in the research of their organisations and related areas of interest. “Aufgaben, Struktur und Aufbau des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte,” (DHM-HA: MfDG/87/Bl. 7-8). See also, Ebenfeld, Geschichte nach plan?, p. 114.
223 “Aufgaben, Struktur und Aufbau des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte,” (DHM-HA: MfDG/87/Bl. 8).
226 Heinz, 'Die Gründung des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte,' p. 15.
“1945 to the Present,” plus a special department dealing with the lives, work, and influence of Lenin and Stalin, the People’s Republic of China, and the People’s Democratic countries of Europe.²²⁷

Staffing was also addressed in the plan. Qualified employees were to be made available to the museum from within the government and Party bureaucracy, facilitated by the ZK and state authorities.²²⁸ In addition, a three-month course, available to graduates of history faculties, was to be organised by the SfH and the Department for Propaganda for the training of scientific staff and museum guides,²²⁹ thus providing for the ideological training of those staff not drawn directly from within the Party and state apparatus. Museological training was also a consideration, for which the ZK looked not to experienced museum professionals within Germany but to the Soviet Union (chapter 7).²³⁰

Despite these measures, the lead up to the formal establishment of the museum was extremely tight. Museum director Alfred Meusel was appointed only weeks before the official ceremonies and, according to Stefan Ebenfeld, a number of the 32-strong scientific advisory council members, for whom Meusel also acted as president, were only advised of their appointment via the press.²³¹ These would overwhelmingly have been the so-called “bourgeois” (bürgerlich) historians, well-respected non-Marxist historians who were nominated alongside the Marxist historians and Party-faithful to help legitimise the museum at home and in the West.²³² Despite the inclusion of the bourgeois historians and a small number of artists, art historians, and museum professionals such as Ludwig Justi, Martin Jahn of the Museum for Pre- and Early History, Arthur Schule, Director of the State Museums’ Coin Collections, and Wilhelm Unverzagt, an archaeologist who had gained a degree of prominence during the NS-era, the power of the council lay with key Party ideologues, propagandists, and functionaries. In his memoir, historian and early MfDG assistant department


²²⁸ The authorities named to assist in the recruitment of museum personnel were the Central Committee’s Cadre department, the Cadre department of the Department for Propaganda, the State Secretariat for Higher Education, the State Commission for Art Matters, the Ministry for Education, and the "Vocational Guidance Commission" (Berufslenkungskommission) of the Ministry for the Interior; "Aufgaben, Struktur und Aufbau des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte," (DHH-HA: MfDG/87/Bl. 9).

²²⁹ Ibid. Bl. 9.

²³⁰ The provision for a delegation to visit the Soviet Union and the request to be made to the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party for an exchange of personnel to assist the museum was approved by the Politburo on 18 December 1951 and the staff members appointed to the delegation were approved in February 1952; Tagesordnungspunkt Nr. 9: "Delegation des Museums für deutsche Geschichte in der Sowjetunion," Protokoll Nr. 84, Sitzung des Politbüros am 18. Dezember 1951, (BArch-SAMPO: DY 30/IV 2/2/184, Bl. 3); Tagesordnungspunkt Nr. 4: "Delegation zum Studium der Museen in der Sowjetunion," Protokoll Nr. 94, Sitzung des Politbüros am 19. Februar 1952, (BArch-SAMPO: DY 30/IV 2/2/194, Bl. 4).

²³¹ Ebenfeld, Geschichte nach plan?, p. 92. Regarding the choice of Meusel as museum director and president of the advisory council see also ibid. pp. 94-99.

head, Fritz Klein, wrote that the advisory council never truly succeeded in gaining influence over the powerful Party leadership, but rather 'remained decoration.' Most notable among the Party representatives were Fred Oeßner, whose involvement with the museum was well established, Kurt Hager of the Department for Propaganda, who remained a central figure in GDR museum culture as a member of the ZK (from 1954) and head of the Politburo’s Ideological Commission (from 1963), Albert Norden, head of the Main Department for Press of the Prime Minister’s Office for Information, Paul Wandel, Minister for Education, and Hanna Wolf, Director of the Party Training School “Karl Marx” (Section Spoken and Written Propaganda). In this respect the appointment of Meusel as both museum director and council president was shrewd. As the first Marxist historian to hold a Chair at a German University and an SED member who had also been active in Communist activities whilst in exile in England he held the appropriate ideological credentials yet remained genuinely committed to collaboration with non-Marxist and Western

\[233\] Fritz Klein, Drinnen und Draussen, ein Historiker in der DDR: Erinnerungen (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fisher Verlag, 2000), p. 159.

\[234\] Members of the Scientific Advisory Council announced on 19 January 1952 were: Prof. Dr. Alfred Meusel (Professor for Modern History at the Berlin University), Prof. Walter Arnold (Sculptor), Prof. Dr. Gerhard Buchda (Chair of German Legal History at the University of Jena), Prof. Dr. Heinrich Dieters (Dean of the Pedagogical Faculty at Humboldt University), Prof. Dr. Hermann Duncker (Rector of the FDGB Bundesschule), Prof. Dr. Dr. Theodor Frings (Germanist and President of the Saxon Academy of Sciences), Prof. Dr. Karl Griewank (Chair of Modern History at the University of Jena, journal editor, and member of the curriculum commission), Prof. Kurt Hager (Politburo member and Head of the Department for Party Training and Propaganda), Prof. Dr Richard Hamann (Professor of Art History at the University of Marburg and member of the German Academy of Sciences), Prof. Dr. Dr. Fritz Hartung (historian, editor of the Jahresbuch für deutsche Geschichte between 1925-58, and member of the German Academy of Sciences, noted by Iggers as one of the very few conservative national historians to remain in the historical profession after 1949), Prof. Dr Martin Jahn (Director of the Museum for Pre- and Early History), Prof. Dr. Dr. Ludwig Justi (General Director of the State Museums of Berlin), Dr. Otto Korfes (Head of the Department for Archives at Potsdam and Head of the Historical Department of the “Peoples’ Police,” the KVP, forerunner of the National Peoples’ Army; NVA), Prof. Dr. Hellmut Kretzchmar (Archivist and Historian with a Chair at the University of Leipzig), Prof. Dr. Jürgen Kucinsky (Chair and Dean of Economic History at Humboldt University and Director of the German Economic Institute), Dr. Horst Kunze (Director of the State Library of Berlin), Prof. Rudolph Lindau (Historian at the Marx-Engels-Lenin-Institute), Prof. Max Linger (Painter, Graphic Artist, and member of the German Academy of Art), Prof. Martin Lintzel (Historian and Member of the Saxon Academy of Sciences), Prof. Dr. Leopold Magon (Professor of Nordic and German Philology and Theatre Sciences at Humboldt University), Albert Norden (Politburo member and Head of the Main Department for Press at the Office of Information), Fred Oeßner (Economist, Central Committee and Politburo Member, Chief Editor of Einheit, and member of the Volkskammer), Prof. Dr. Karl Obermann (Professor for Modern History at the Pedagogical College Potsdam), Prof. Dr. Fritz Rödig (Historian and Member of the German Academy of Sciences), Prof. Albert Schreiner (Historian at the Marx-Engels-Lenin-Institute), Prof. Dr. Heinrich Sproemberg (Head of the Saxon Historical Commission and Professor of Medieval History at the University of Leipzig), Prof. Leo Stern (Professor of Modern History at the University of Halle-Wittenberg), Prof. Arthur Schule (Director of the Coin Collections, State Museums of Berlin), Prof. Dr. Wilhelm Unverzagt (Archaeologist and Member of the German Academy of Sciences), Paul Wandel (Minister for Education, unofficial Chair for General History at the Institute for Social Sciences of the ZK, and Head of the Coordinating body for culture and education), Prof. Dr. Dr. Hermann Weidhaas (Architect, Art Historian, and Director of the College of Architecture, Potsdam), and Hanna Wolf (Director of the Party Training School “Karl Marx,” Section Spoken and Written Propaganda). Wissenschaftlicher Rat des Museums für deutsche Geschichte berufen,’ Neues Deutschland, 20 January 1952, p. 1; ‘Otto Grotewohl berief Wissenschaftlichen Rat. Bedeutende Persönlichkeiten im Rat des Museums für deutsche Geschichte / Festakt im Haus der Ministerien,’ Berliner Zeitung, 20 January 1952, p. 2; ‘Die Mitglieder des Wissenschaftlichen Rates des Museums für deutsche Geschichte,’ Neues Deutschland, 20 January 1952, p. 4; Georg G. Iggers, ‘New Directions in Historical Studies in the German Democratic Republic,’ History and Theory, 28, no. 1, 1989, p. 62.
historians and, in Georg G. Iggers’ words, ‘represented the social historians committed to standards of critical scholarship.’

The formal establishment of the museum finally took place at a two-day “Constitutive Assembly” held 18-19 January 1952. Economic historian and Secretary of the SFH, Gerhard Harig, announced the appointment of Meusel, with Ullmann as his deputy, and named the department heads for the scientific departments and the design department. The museum’s organisational structure remained essentially unchanged, with the addition of a department for tour guides (later pedagogy) alongside the library and archive. In his opening address, Harig spoke to the topic “The Museum for German History—a contribution in the struggle for the unity of Germany and the protection of a lasting peace.” He reiterated the role of the museum to harness the progressive forces of the past for the present national struggle. Now more than ever, according to Harig, attempts by American war mongers to erase German national traditions made it essential to rewrite German history, free from the distortions and misinterpretations that had placed the historiography of the past in the service of class interests and Prussian militarism.

Harig’s sentiments were shared by Meusel and GDR Prime Minister Otto Grotewohl, both of whom gave lengthy speeches at the House of Ministries the following day. Grotewohl drew upon key issues outlined in an internal document dated 16 January, titled “Thesen: The tasks of the progressive German historians and the construction of the Museum for German History.” The document clearly situated the museum within the ideological propaganda offensive that had escalated since the foundation of the Republic, labelling European integration measures as American imperialism and characterising US-sponsored academic initiatives in West Germany, particularly the establishment of the departments and institutes for “European Studies” at a number of universities and the foundation of the Free University (Freie Universität) in Berlin as a “Schumann Plan for historical research.”

236 The department heads announced on 18 January 1952 were: Pre- and Early History, Dr. Karl-Heinz Otto; History of the Middle Ages, Prof. Dr. Heinrich Sromberg; 1525-1848, Erika Herzfeld (as provisional/ assistant director); 1848-1895, Joachim Streisand (as provisional/ assistant director); 1895-1918, Prof. Dr. Leo Stern; 1918-1945, Prof. Albert Schröner; Contemporary History, Dr. Karl Bittel; Lenin and Stalin, Kurt Dünow; and Art Department, Peter-Paul Weiß. W.S., 'Gründung des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte,' p. 4.
237 Ibid.
238 Ibid.
239 Ibid.
241 Ibid.
Meusel’s opening speech, too, which characterised the “cosmopolitan” idea of a European community as an attempt to convince West German students that German unity was something outdated, unnecessary, even damaging.\textsuperscript{242} For his part, Grotewohl, placed the “European idea” alongside economic and political preparations for a war against humanity, threatening the very existence of the German people, and placing them for a third time before a “bloody slaughter.”\textsuperscript{243}

Against these developments the East German historian held a great responsibility. The formation and strengthening of a national consciousness based on the progressive forces of German history was key to the resolution of the current national tasks.\textsuperscript{244} This was the core of the museum, which Grotewohl characterised as ‘a carrier and mediator of the national consciousness.’\textsuperscript{245} He also spoke of a break from the existing museum types that had grown out of the princely Kunstkammer, its development during the Renaissance, the cultural collections of the church, and the formation of specialist museums during the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{246} Using the established Party language, he declared the MfDG a “museum of a new type.” ‘The Museum of German History is for us neither a sanctum of museums, nor an accumulation of cultural assets,’ he stated, it ‘should rather embody the ideas of the national collection, a collection that grows out of our state and out of our social order.’\textsuperscript{247} Just how such a “national collection” would differentiate itself museologically from existing museum types was not clear. The phrase “museum of a new type” reflected rather its status as a Marxist-Leninist museum and its close relationship to the SED.\textsuperscript{248} It was also conceived as a national institution beyond the confines of the GDR. In Grotewohl’s words, the museum ‘must initiate a

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{242} Transcript of the speech given by Alfred Meusel at the opening of the Museum for German History, 19.1.1952, in the House of Ministries, dated 21.1.1952, (DHM-HA: MfDG/16/Bl. 8).
\item \textsuperscript{244} “Thesen: Die Aufgaben,” 16.01.1952, (DHM-HA: MfDG/16/Bl. 3).
\item \textsuperscript{245} Title of Grotewohl’s speech published in ‘Museum für deutsche Geschichte - ein Träger und Mittler des Nationalbewusstseins,’ p. 4.
\item \textsuperscript{246} Otto Grotewohl’s speech on the occasion of the appointment of the Scientific Advisory Council to the Museum for German History, 19 January 1952, reprinted in full in ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{247} [Das Museum für deutsche Geschichte ist für uns weder ein Heiligtum der Museen, noch eine Anhäufung von kulturellen Werten, es soll vielmehr die Ideen der nationalen Sammlung verkörpern, einer Sammlung, die aus unserem Staat und aus unserer gesellschaftlichen Ordnung erwächst.] Otto Grotewohl’s speech on the occasion of the appointment of the Scientific Advisory Council to the Museum for German History, 19 January 1952, reprinted in full in ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{248} On the role of the SED in directing the GDR historical sciences, Dorpalen wrote: ‘The close connection between history and politics follows also from the Marxist axiom of the unity of theory and practice: both supplement each other; neither has meaning without the other. This gives the political leadership the right to coordinate historical work with its policies—a supervision to which the East German historian as a Marxist can have no objection, and the less so because the Socialist Unity Party (SED) as a Marxist party is guided in turn by the lessons of history in formulating these policies.’ Andreas Dorpalen, ‘The Role of History in the DDR,’ \textit{East Central Europe}, 3, 1976, p. 59.
\end{itemize}
collaboration across all artificially drawn zonal borders and radiate throughout the whole of Germany.  

West German reaction was, however, far from positive. ‘Those who know the Soviet zonal press,’ wrote OEH Becker of the Tagesspiegel, ‘know that here is a propagandistic frontal attack on West Berlin and the Federal Republic, using nationalism as its purpose.’ Becker placed the word “museum” in inverted commas, a common practice in West Germany when referring to allegedly dubious SED assertions, from which the GDR (“GDR”) itself was not exempt. By this estimation the MfDG was no more a museum than the GDR was a legitimate state. Western press titles are indicative of the reception: “Grotewohl’s History Museum,” “History and Agitation,” “Museum for Historical Falsification,” and from a Viennese paper, “East Berlin seeks a genealogy.”

Neue Zeitung described Meusel as an ‘old convinced communist’ and pointed out the party-oriented membership of the museum council with a leadership of Stalinist career functionaries. ‘There can be no doubt,’ it continued, ‘that they will awkwardly annotate Stalinist works with German historical footnotes. They are supposed to convert history into agitation and agitation into political action.’

The West German observations were not incorrect. The museum board was dominated by Party functionaries and the propaganda requirements of the SED were very much at the forefront of its initiatives. The museum itself was conceived not only as a showcase for a new history, but also (initially at least) as the central institutional body—an ‘intellectual and organisational centre’—for the coordination, direction, and control of research and teaching for the new historiography, something that was also evident in the participation of MfDG staff under the leadership of Meusel in the preparation of official history textbooks. But, the hostility of the western press is also indicative of a qualitatively different, though equally potent, political bias. This is reflected in the

249 ['...muß eine Zusammenarbeit über alle künstlich gezogenen Zonengrenzen hinweg anbahnen und auf ganz Deutschland ausstrahlen.']; Museum für deutsche Geschichte - ein Träger und Mittler des Nationalbewußtseins,’ p. 4.
252 'Geschichte und Agitation,' (DHM-HA: MfDG/Zitungsausschnitte/1952-60).
253 ['Es kann kein Zweifel bestehen,' it continued, 'daß sie die stalinistische Werke durch historische deutsche Fußnoten ungeschickt kommentieren werden. Sie sollen die Geschichte in Agitation und die Agitation in politische Aktion verwandeln.']; Geschichte und Agitation,' DHM-HA (MfDG/Zitungsausschnitte/1952-60).
254 ['...geistiges und organisierendes Zentrum'] Museum für deutsche Geschichte - ein Träger und Mittler des Nationalbewußtseins,’ p. 4; See also; Heinz, 'Die Gründung des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte,' p. 13; Ebenfeld, Geschichte nach plan? The status of the MfDG as a centre for historical research and co-ordination is Ebenfeld’s main concern, which he traces until the re-structuring of the historical sciences in the GDR in 1955.
derisive tone of the articles and exaggerated statements like that of a Hamburg newspaper which likened the fate of the Zeughaus to that of the demolished city palace, stating: 'The palace in the Berlin Lustgarten has disappeared and a gallery for communist parades has taken its place. Now the Zeughaus will meet a similar fate, it is to be a "Museum for German History."' Whatever the reaction, the GDR leadership continued to present the museum as an institution for all Germans, and it was in this spirit that the MfDG, in fulfilment of the ZK directive regarding collecting policy, launched its public appeal in March 1952, calling on all Germans to help build a true people’s museum.

“Help build your museum!”: early collecting strategies

In the days after the Constitutive Assembly information begin to emerge about the proposed national collection and how it might be presented. ‘[I]t follows,’ announced the Berliner Zeitung in relation to the plans, 'that the museum should not provide an accumulation of dead material, but a lively, vivid representation of our history, from which the lines of development for the present and future are derived.' The type of materials mentioned included paintings, drawings, engravings, sculptures, books, manuscripts, handwritten documents, posters, and flyers, all of which should characterise the given period on display. Despite earlier efforts to reconceptualise the extant Zeughaus collections, Ullmann announced the collection and preparation of new objects among the museum’s priorities; ‘You can arrange the holdings of the former armoury how you will,’ he wrote, ‘they do not convey the statement that we need.’ While he conceded that individual pieces could perhaps be utilised within specific contexts, new objects, he felt, could more adequately demonstrate historical development and socio-economic structures—they could bring visitors closer to the progressive ideas and personalities represented in the museum. To this end, Ullmann emphasised the importance of objects from “outstanding personalities,” utilising a Soviet

256[’Aufruf des Museums für deutsche Geschichte an allen Deutschen,’ Neues Deutschland, 9 March 1952, p. 5.
258[’Schon aus diesen Festlegungen ergibt sich, daß das Museum nicht eine Anhäufung toten Materials, sondern eine höchst lebendige, anschauliche Darstellung unserer Geschichte geben soll, aus der die Entwicklungslinien für die Gegenwärt und Zukunft abzulesen sind.’] bags., ‘Winkelfürsten verschwinden,’ p. 3.
259[ Ibid.
261[ Ibid.

example: 'Lenin’s clothing in the Lenin Museum, his study, bring us personally closer, illustrate his simplicity and modesty. '

In March the museum formally appealed to the public for objects of historical value. The Berliner Zeitung ran the request under the title “Help build your museum!” quoting from a prepared statement:

This new institution in the capital of our fatherland, Berlin, must become a convincing expression of our national unity. The German nation lives and with it, its history. The museum should show that it is not the Kaisers, kings, army leaders and diplomats, but rather the working people in the city and in the country that are the true creators and designers of German history.

An additional emphasis was placed on the West German population, who should show their solidarity with the museum through participation. This kind of collecting strategy invariably ran the risk of attracting less-than-favourable offerings, particularly when the actual parameters of the museum’s collecting policy were still ill defined. The museum appealed for historical documents and records, bequests from important personalities, photographs, pamphlets, posters, newspapers, work tools, furniture, and clothing. ‘We ask everyone,’ it stated, ‘who have these or similar evidence of our national life, to entrust them to us: for only thereby can they become the common property of the whole people.’

Already in January the museum boasted important collections of memorabilia, including items from the estate of August Bebel, which had been donated by Wilhelm Pieck in the days before the Constitutive Assembly. Another early donation from Pieck was a large collection of gifts he had received during official state visits and events, included Free German Youth flags and neckerchiefs, silk tapestries featuring Mao, Stalin, Lenin, Marx, and Engels, ten original etchings by Käthe Kollwitz, a copperplate engraving of a Dürer etching, and numerous books and photographs
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262 '[Lenins Kleidungsstücke im Lenin-Museum, sein Arbeitszimmer bringen uns menschlich näher, veranschaulichen seine Schlichtheit und Bescheidenheit.]’ ibid.
263 'Baut mit an eurem Museum!*', p. 3; Full transcript in, ‘Aufruf des Museums für deutsche Geschichte,’ p. 5. See also, Aufruf des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte an alle Deutschen in Ost und West, (DHM-HA: MfDG/040/Bl. 25-27).
264 [‘Wir bitten alle, die über solche oder ähnliche Zeugnisse unseres nationalen Lebens verfügen, sie uns zu überlassen: denn nur dadurch können sie zum Gemeingut des ganzen Volkes werden.’] ‘Aufruf des Museums für deutsche Geschichte.’
265 This estate collection was donated by Pieck via the ZK on 17 January 1952. See, Receipt for objects received by the Museum for German History from the Office of Wilhelm Pieck dated 17.01.1952, (DHM-HA: MfDG/001/unpaginated); Handwritten list of complete collections purchased by or donated to the Museum for German History c. 1951-53, “Liste von Geschlossenen Sammlungen die erworben oder geschenkt wurden,” (DHM-HA: MfDG/001/unpaginated). For the public announcement of these collections see, W.S., ‘Gründung des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte,’ p. 4.
from ministries, "people's own" factories, regional authorities, mass organisations, and foreign dignitaries.\textsuperscript{266} One of the most significant gifts in this respect came from Czech president Klement Gottwald in commemoration of Pieck's state visit to Prague. The "Heliand-P" parchment fragment, dating from the first third of the ninth century, was one of only three remaining fragments of the Old Saxon epic.\textsuperscript{267} Pre-dating the \textit{Nibelungenlied} by four hundred years, it is the oldest example of epic German poetry and depicts the gospel stories using language, locations, and customs familiar to the Saxons, produced during the Carolingian Christianisation of Saxony.\textsuperscript{268} Both the Heliand and the Bebel bequest were repeatedly named by the museum among its collection highlights.\textsuperscript{269}

Another important method for building the collections was the acquisition, by purchase or donation, of entire ("closed") collections, some of which certainly represented those obligatory contributions specified by the ZK in 1951. One prominent example was the transfer in January 1952 of a labour history archive assembled in Dresden, complete with its archivist, Helmut Eschwege.\textsuperscript{270} In the context of land reform and the expropriation of private property, as well as persistent political pressure asserted across a broad spectrum, Regine Falkenburg has rightly highlighted the moral ambiguity behind seemingly innocuous terms such as "transfer" and even "purchase," a situation that has led to ongoing provenance issues.\textsuperscript{271} Acquisitions included collections of furniture, household goods, prints, lithographs, and drawings donated by the Berlin Magistrate; books, traditional dolls, vases, sculptures, and pictures from the Central Council of the FDJ; files from the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{266} List of donations to the Museum for German History c. 1950-53, "Aufstellung der Geschenke die dem Museum für Deutsche Geschichte übergeben wurden," ([DHM-HA: MDG/001/unpaginated]). Many of these official gifts had been presented to Pieck for his seventy-fifth birthday. They had been displayed in an exhibition in the House of World Youth on Alexanderplatz in February 1951 under the title \textit{Gifts of the people · Gifts of Trust (Geschenke des Volkes · Geschenke des Vertrauens)}. H.L., 'Geschenke des Volkes · Geschenke des Vertrauens. Ein Gang durch die Ausstellung der Spenden und Glückwünsche zum 75. Geburtstag des Präsidenten Wilhelm Pieck,' \textit{Neues Deutschland}, 16 February 1951, p. 6.
\item \textsuperscript{267} A fourth fragment was discovered in Leipzig in 2006. The "Heliand" is consistently dated to 830 AD. The "P" of the museum's fragment designates Prague, the location in which the fragment was found. The other known fragments are "V" (Vatican), "S" (Strasburg), and "L" (Leipzig). In addition there are two extant manuscripts, one of which was produced later in the ninth century (around 850) and the other the following century (approximately 950-1000). They are designated "M" and "C," for Munich and Corvey respectively. On the "Heliand" itself and the extant copies and fragments, Ronald G. Murphy, 'The Old Saxon Heliand,' in \textit{Perspectives on the Old Saxon Heliand: introductory and critical essays; with an edition of the Leipzig fragment}, ed. Valentine A. Pakis ( Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 2010), pp. 34-62; on the gift to Wilhelm Pieck in 1952, 'Pieck empfängt Wissenschaftler,' \textit{Berliner Zeitung}, 8 February 1952, p. 1; Theodor Frings, '50 Verse auf Pergament. Das Prager Bruchstück des Heiland aus dem 9. Jahrhundert,' \textit{Berliner Zeitung}, 22 February 1952, p. 3; on Pieck's subsequent donation fo the "Heliand" fragment to the Museum for German History in 1952, Museum für Deutsche Geschichte and Abteilung Feudalismus, \textit{Deutsche Geschichte 500-1789} (Berlin: Museum für Deutsche Geschichte, 1978), unpaginated; and descriptions of the "Heliand" in the collections of the German Historial Museum today, Stölzl and Deutsches Historisches Museum, \textit{Bilder und Zeugnisse der deutschen Geschichte} p. 13; Hans Ottomeyer et al., \textit{Deutsche Geschichte in Bildern und Zeugnissen} (Berlin: Deutsches Historisches Museum, Wolfratshausen: Edition Minerva, 2007), p. 27.
\item \textsuperscript{268} Murphy, 'The Old Saxon Heliand,' pp. 34-39.
\item \textsuperscript{269} 'Erste Arbeitstag des Wissenschaftlichen Rates des Museums für deutsche Geschichte,' \textit{Neues Deutschland}, 9 March 1952, p. 5.
\item \textsuperscript{270} Eschwege, \textit{Fremd unter meinesgleichen}, p. 67.
\item \textsuperscript{271} Falkenberg, "Wem gehört was und warum?," pp. 1-9.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Institute for German History provided by the Ministry for Education; a series of police records dating from 1893 to 1945 from Leipzig Police authorities; ship and aeroplane models from the paramilitary youth organisation Society for Sport and Technology; and documents, newspapers, and postcards relating to the history of the KPD from Fred Oelßner’s office. Additional purchases were made at auction, also in West Germany, though restricted availability of western currency posed significant problems for museum staff wishing to participate in external auctions or accept direct offers from West German citizens.273

The early collecting of the MfDG was by no means systematic. While the museum had identified a number of key personalities and events for its presentation of German history, it had developed neither a thorough exhibition concept, nor a set of criteria for its collections. The initial collecting begun under Ullmann in 1950/51 was greatly expanded after the formal establishment of the museum, by which time the staff had risen to 85 and included technicians, assistants, and research associates (Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter), a category that best equates within the museum context to a research and curatorial role.274 But the staff severely lacked museum experience. Many museum workers were drawn from the student body of the universities and had not yet completed their studies.275 Meusel himself freely admitted he had no understanding of museums, going as far as to describe himself as a poor museum visitor and a “non-visual” person, while a later internal report stated that the research associates, architects, graphic artists, and technical personnel who were engaged in the initial construction of the museum in 1952 had little or no prior knowledge in the museum field.276

---

272 "Aufstellung der Geschenke,” (DHM-HA: MfDG/001/unpaginated). The same file contains further receipts and correspondence regarding individual purchases.
273 Details of early purchases made in the West can be found in “Westverkäufe 1954-1956, Sammlungspläne 1963,” (DHM-HA: MfDG/070).
275 In a letter to the SfH in April 1952 regarding the museum’s statute, at this stage still in negotiation, Meusel pointed out the problems with staffing levels. If the museum could not provide periods of leave, he maintained, the majority of research associates would be adversely affected. They were, in the main, third and fourth year university student and wished to obtain leave in order to complete their studies. Letter from Alfred Muesel to Herr Dr. Schrickel of the SfH dated 5.4.1952, Re: “Statute des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte,” (DHM-HA: MfDG/040/Bl.1, reverse).
276 On Meusel’s self-assessment with regard to prior knowledge of museum practice; Heinz, ‘Die Gründung des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte,’ p. 17; and as a ‘poor museum visitor’; Ebenfeld, Geschichte nach plan?, p. 99. In response to a series of questions posed by Kurt Hager in April 1953 regarding the work of the museum, Meusel stated, ‘A second deficiency lies in the fact that I am not a “visual” person, and that before my appointment as the museum director, my connections to museums were exceedingly superficial.’ [‘Ein zweiter Mangel besteht darin, dass ich kein “visueller” Mensch bin, und dass vor meiner Ernennung zum Museumsdirektor meine Beziehungen zu Museen ausserst [sic] oberflächlich waren.’] Prof. Dr. Alfred Meusel, “Arbeitsbericht des Museums für deutsche Geschichte,” Berlin, 12.5.1953, (BArch-SAMPO: DY 30/IV 2/9.04/252, Bl. 134-143, quote Bl. 137). See also; Internal report, “Bericht über die Tätigkeit des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte von 1952 bis 1955,” (DHM-HA: MfDG/1-1/Bl.43). Official histories of the museum also freely admit this initial lack of experience. For the twentieth anniversary of the MfDG in 1972, for instance, then Director
This fact, coupled with the limited timeframe within which to complete the first permanent exhibitions, was not only evident in the quality of the exhibitions themselves (chapter 6), but also had a broad ranging impact on the collections. In a 1955 report, the museum conceded the somewhat arbitrary nature of its early procurement activities. Certainly during the early phase of development, and arguably well beyond, this arbitrariness defined the museum’s approach to collecting and therefore the character and shape of its holdings. The collection department was responsible for the practical and technical aspects of the documentation, care, and storage of objects. As they grew, the collections developed a structure based on a combination of thematic elements and material considerations. Early museum records show the collections divided into five sections: Documents, Art, Militaria (being the former Zeughaus collections), Means of Production, and Film and Photos. By 1989 the collections had expanded not only in size, boasting around 450,000 objects but likely many more, they now encompassed nine distinct categories; Documents, Material Culture, Handwork, Industry and Agriculture (HIL), Art, Numismatics, Militaria, Photographs, Posters, and a Special Inventory (Sonderinventar), consisting primarily of gifts from members of the Party leadership. Collecting strategies across these categories was uneven, with departments such as Militaria developing a strong conceptual basis for its targeted collecting activities, while others developed according to shifting criteria and unclear boundaries. Above all, it was the museum’s exhibition needs that determined the shape and structure of the collections.

Indicative of the subordination of collecting to exhibiting is the discussion that took place regarding the museum’s statute. Three core tasks were initially identified for the museum; the first of which dealt with the collection, systematisation, storage and care of historical material. The second and third tasks centred on, respectively, research and the dissemination of research via seminars and lectures, and the presentation of the development of the German nation. At a meeting of the museum advisory council in May 1952 the statute was discussed at length. Professor Helmut Kretzschmar, an archivist and historian at the University of Leipzig, made the suggestion to reverse
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Wolfgang Herbst and colleague Ingo Manterna wrote, 'Upon the establishment of the MfDG the young museum collective lacked museum specific experience.' [‘Bei der Gründung des MfDG mangelte es dem jungen Mitarbeiterkollektiv an museumsspezifischer Praxis.’] Wolfgang Herbst and Ingo Materna, '20 Jahre Museum für Deutsche Geschichte,' Neue Museumskunde, Jahrgang 15, no. 1, 1972, p. 8; Eschwege, Fremd unter meinesgleichen, p. 67.


278 The collection department was also known as the “archive” during the early history of the institution and was later called the "Fundus".

279 Museum for German History staff plan and job descriptions c. 1952-55, "Abteilung Sammlung." (DHM-HA: MfDG/064/BL.22-24, double sided). This structure is also reflected in the organisational chart drawn up by the museum in 1954, which is provided in appendix H.


281 Ibid. Bl. 21-68

the first and third of these tasks, ‘in order to present the particular character of the institution’.  

After some discussion this suggestion was adopted, and was reflected in the approved statute, which placed the museum’s exhibiting role as its first priority (a), followed by research and research presentations (b), with an additional function for the encouragement, guidance, and support of groups and institutions involved in the presentation of personalities and themes corresponding with those of the MfDG (c). This last point, put forwards by Paul Wandel, was a compromise for the museum which was nearly made responsible for all historical museums. Not only was this well beyond the museum’s capabilities, as council member Hermann Weidhaas argued, the prospect of a kind of "Obermuseum" had already resulted in a degree of distrust among the museum community. While the museum maintained its role as the “central” historical museum of the GDR throughout its history, and was also active in the formation of a socialist museology in the GDR (chapter 7), it held little direct influence over external institutions, instead acting as a model for historical presentations. Collecting was addressed as the last of four tasks outlined in the statute, the final wording of which clearly demonstrated the attitude towards this activity as an ancillary function in support of the other, more significant tasks:

\[
\text{d) In order to do justice to the tasks named under a-c, the museum concerns itself with the collection, systematization, storage and care of historical materials, documents, memorabilia, art and objects of material culture, that are important for the social, political and cultural development of Germany.}
\]

\[
\text{[d) Um den unter a-c genannten Aufgaben gerecht zu werden, befaßt sich das Museum mit der Sammlung, Systematisierung, Aufbewahrung und Pflege von historischen Materialien, Dokumenten, Erinnerungsstücken, Kunswerken und Gegenständen der materiellen Kultur, die für die soziale, politische und kulturelle Entwicklung Deutschlands wichtig sind.]} \]

It is therefore in relation to the MfDG’s exhibition practice that the development of its collections is best understood.

\[283\text{[‘...den besonderen Charakter der Institution herauszuarbeiten.’] Minutes of the third meeting of the scientific advisory committee of the Museum for German History, 24-25 May 1952, “24. Mai Beratung und Beschlussfassung der Statuten,” (DHM-HA: MfDG/40/Bl. 13).}
\]
\[284\text{Statute of the Museum for German History, §3 “Aufgaben a-d,” (DHM-HA: MfDG/64/Bl. 6-7).}
\]
\[285\text{“Beratung und Beschlussfassung der Statuten,” 24.5.1952, (DHM-HA: MfDG/40/Bl. 13-20).}
\]
\[286\text{Ibid. Bl. 19.}
\]
\[287\text{Statute, §3 “Aufgaben a-d,” (DHM-HA: MfDG/64/Bl. 7).}
\]
Chapter 6. New histories and old memories: the Museum for German History, 1952-58

“Beginning of a new conception of history”: the first permanent exhibitions, 1952/53

The first impression that one already gains from a fleeting observation of so numerous and diverse materials: here is truly a presentation of German history as a history of the German people.

[Der erste Eindruck, den man schon beim flüchtigen Betrachten des so zahlreichen und vielzeitigen Materials gewinnt: hier ist wirklich eine Darstellung der deutschen Geschichte als einer Geschichte des deutschen Volkes.]

- Exhibition review, Berliner Zeitung, 16 July 1952

Already in the summer of 1952 we were able to open the first exhibition, an overview of German history from the beginnings to the present. It was a rather adventurous activity, carried out by people, who for the most part had no idea about the specifics of a museal historical presentation, in a building barely suited to the purposes of a museum, with collection holdings extremely begging in exhibitable objects. [...] The most obvious deficit was the absence of clarity.

[Schon im Sommer 1952 konnten wir eine erste Ausstellung eröffnen, einen Überblick über die deutsche Geschichte von den Anfängen bis in die Gegenwart. Es war eine ziemlich abenteuerliche Aktion, übernommen von Leuten, die größtenteils keine Ahnung von der Spezifik musealer Geschichtsdarstellung hatten, in einem für Museumszwecke kaum geeigneten Gebäude, mit überaus kümmerlichen Beständen an auszustellenden Exponaten. [...] Die ausfälligste Mangel war die fehlende Anschaulichkeit.]

- Fritz Klein, Drinnen und Draussen, ein Historiker in der DDR

Despite the Berliner Zeitung’s unreserved praise for the Museum for German History’s first permanent exhibitions opened in July 1952, they were, in reality, a hurried together affair reflecting an as yet unresolved official historical image and a less than successful attempt by historians and academics to translate that image into three-dimensional form. The museum’s own later reference to a ‘text book projected onto the wall’ better describes the didactic approach of the exhibitions, both those opened in July 1952—just six months after the commencement of work with a full

---

3 Klein, Drinnen und Draussen, p. 160.
museum staff—and those postponed until April the following year that completed the historical presentation from the beginnings of human kind to the “Liberation of the German people from fascism.”

This chapter begins with analysis of the MdDG’s first permanent displays in order to illustrate the main contours of the Marxist-Leninist interpretation of the “complete” German history and its expression in crude museological form. This also provides the opportunity to assess the specific historical events and personalities that were presented as “high points” in the progressively conceived historical developmental process and how these link to attempts to construct a socialist national consciousness in the context of the political requirements of the early GDR as detailed in the previous chapter. Comparison is also made where these events or techniques overlap with prior representations in the history of the Zeughaus. The type of objects utilised in these first exhibits and the status accorded them by the exhibition makers—including the tentative inclusion of former Zeughaus objects—is also considered here.

The second part of the chapter specifically addresses the perception of the Zeughaus collections and the emergence of their dual status as a stand-alone collection and as part of the
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4 Exhibition wall text per Photo No. F54/275, “Clara-Zetkin-Straße, Erste Aufbau, 1918 bis 1945”, (DHM-HA: HA5 (7)). In its sitting on 22 April 1952 the Politburo of the Central Committee of the SED resolved that the opening of the Museum for German History, originally slated for 1 May (May Day), be postponed to 6 June, ‘in order to enable a thorough, scientifically and technically sound arrangement of the Museum of German History.’ [‘Um eine gründliche, wissenschaftlich und technisch einwandfreie Ausgestaltung des Museums für deutsche Geschichte zu ermöglichen, wird die Eröffnung des Museums auf den 6. Juni 1952 verschoben.’]. At this stage, the opening was planned to coincide with a two-day historical conference, to be organised by the MdDG and held in Berlin with keynote speeches by Alfred Meusel on “The economic treatment of German history” and Prof. Röhrig on “The middle ages and German history” (though differently spelled, they were most likely referring to Fritz Röhrig (1882-1952), Medieval Historian at the Humboldt University and head of the Berliner Dienststelle der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, who died only one week after the decision was made). On 20 May, the plans for the museum opening were expanded to include a large-scale ceremony to be organised by the Staatsssekretariat für Hochschulwesen, at which Wilhelm Pieck was scheduled to speak. One week later, the decision was repealed and the Secretariat was commissioned to provide a report on the acceleration of construction of the Zeughaus and to inform the Politburo of a realistic deadline for the opening of the museum. The historians’ conference, which Neues Deutschland hailed as a symbol of cooperation between Marxist and non-Marxist historians in the GDR and the strengthening of historical materialism as the foundation of the historical sciences, went ahead as planned on 7-8 June, at which Meusel spoke (to the prescribed topic), along with several museum staff members and the Party propagandists Hanna Wolf and Kurt Hager. On 13 June, the Politburo was scheduled to inspect the museum, and when it met again on 17 June it authorised the opening of the first sections of the exhibition to 1848 following the completion of some prescribed changes, stating that it must be opened in advance of the II Party Conference of the SED in July. For the sections of the exhibition after 1848, authorisation was not given. Instead, the problems the Politburo members had identified for clarification (not detailed in the official minutes) were to be formulated in writing and submitted for consideration. See; Tagesordnungspunkt Nr. 8: “Eröffnung des Museums für deutsche Geschichte,” Protokoll Nr. 108, Sitzung des Politbüros am 22. April 1952, (BArch-SAMPO: DY 30/IV 2/2/208, Bl. 8); Tagesordnungspunkt Nr. 12: “Festakt zur Eröffnung des Museums für deutsche Geschichte,” Protokoll Nr. 112, Sitzung des Politbüros am 20. Mai 1952, (BArch-SAMPO: DY 30/IV 2/2/212, Bl. 5); Tagesordnungspunkt Nr. 6: “Museum für deutsche Geschichte,” Protokoll Nr. 113, Sitzung des Politbüros am 27. Mai 1952, (BArch-SAMPO: DY 30/IV 2/2/213, Bl. 2); Tagesordnungspunkt Nr. 15: “Besichtigung des Museums für deutsche Geschichte,” Protokoll Nr. 115, Sitzung des Politbüros am 10. Juni 1952, (BArch-SAMPO: DY 30/IV 2/2/215, Bl. 6); Tagesordnungspunkt Nr. 2: “Museum für deutsche Geschichte,” Protokoll Nr. 116, Sitzung des Politbüros am 17. Juni 1952, (BArch-SAMPO: DY 30/IV 2/2/216, Bl. 2). On the historians’ conference, Ernst Diehl, “Die nationale Aufgabe der deutschen Historiker. Fruchtbare Aussprache auf der Tagung der Geschichtswissenschaftler in der DDR,” Neues Deutschland, 24 June 1952, p. 5.
broader historical vision of the museum. With the example of the exhibition *Weapons and Uniforms in History* (1957), which placed the surviving Zeughaus pieces within the framework of the new GDR historiography, it demonstrates how the value of the objects shifted with changing political requirements and how the exhibition itself served a number of more subtle goals for the museum beyond any military-political agenda. The exhibition also reflected an emerging engagement with museum-specific questions, which serves as a point of reference for the discussion in the final chapter on the emergence of the theoretical foundation of a new socialist museology and analysis of the final permanent exhibitions opened in 1981 and 1984.

While the special exhibitions formed an important aspect of the museum’s profile and provide insight into changes in GDR historiography as well as the development of exhibition techniques, they are not specifically addressed here beyond those related to the integration of the Zeughaus collections because their analysis forms part of a forthcoming project by this author in conjunction with the German Historical Museum and the German Federal Cultural Foundation’s International Museum Fellowship programme. The permanent exhibitions, moreover, provide a basis for direct comparison between the earliest conception of the “complete” German history and its mature expression in the last of the museum’s major re-designs. Though it has been argued elsewhere that the rigidity of the official historical image presented in the permanent exhibitions provides little scope to assess the shifting GDR historiography, the status afforded the permanent exhibitions by the museum itself as the most important form of museum communication, and the very different set of tasks conceived for special exhibitions (for the extension and deepening of themes and events presented in the permanent displays, as a flexible medium to deal with current political requirements, and as a means to contribute to the broader commemorative programme of the GDR), an analysis of the permanent displays is warranted. The most significant published account of the special exhibition is also based on a misreading of a number of permanent exhibition “sections” as special exhibitions, and in museological terms the distinction is important. Finally, the

---

5 The project provisionally titled “*Ausgestellte Ideologie*” (“Ideology on Display”) is a research initiative of the German Historical Museum that has been funded through the Federal Cultural Foundation (*Kultur Stiftung des Bundes*) and its “International Museum Fellowship” programme, which supports the work of foreign researchers and curators in German museums with the aim of developing new work methods and approaches. The project commenced in May 2013 and is due for completion in November 2014.


7 On the relationship between special and permanent exhibitions as conceived by the leadership of Museum für German History; Wolfgang Herbst, ‘Aktuelle und perspektivische Aufgaben von Museen und Museologie,’ *Beiträge und Mitteilungen des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte*, 15, 1988, p. 20.

8 Glenn H Penny cites several sections of the permanent exhibition as part of a discussion of special exhibitions, making comparison between them as part of a core argument based on the separation of the special exhibitions from the permanent exhibitions. While his historiographical observations are generally valid, his argument is therefore flawed. Using catalogues as a key source (which he calls “pamphlets”), he has also misattributed some of the opening dates of the
permanent exhibitions provide an opportunity to assess the significant changes in exhibition practice that are reflective of the development of a theoretical and practical socialist museology in the GDR, in which the museum itself played a central role.

The scope of the exhibitions: from Peking Man to the Germanen

Three core elements defined the MfDG’s first permanent exhibitions, opened in the provisional museum building on Clara-Zetkin-Straße in two stages in July 1952 (Pre- and Early History to 1848/49) and April 1953 (1850 to 1945). The first—the demonstration of the laws of history based on historical materialism—was a key aspect of the Soviet-inspired periodization, which saw the presentation of German history emerge from the earliest traces of humanity in the Palaeolithic and represented the theoretical foundation upon which the whole exhibition was built. The second major concern, as should now be clear, was to trace the revolutionary tradition of the German people from its earliest manifestation in the Reformation and Peasants’ War. Lastly, the German nation and particularly the question of national unity were central to the exhibition, which borrowed from the traditional repertoire of national historical themes and reoriented them to meet the ideological demands of the SED. In addition to these principle components, the history of the German labour movement and the Party itself also featured heavily in the latter nineteenth and twentieth-century sections, as did the significance of the Soviet Union, both in terms of its world historical importance and its specific relationship with Germany across time.

Each of these related elements directly addressed the needs of the present, transforming the political-ideological pillars of the SED into the “lessons” of the past. Preceding the exhibition was an entrance hall featuring a bust of Wilhelm Pieck, the black-red-gold tricolour, and an assortment of potted plants, very much in the style of the Luxemburg and Liebknecht exhibitions and the Nazi
halls of honour before them (Fig. 6.1). A large text panel accompanying the ensemble featured Pieck’s oft-cited “petty princes” quote, at once grounding the exhibits in the ideological programme of the SED and laying claim to its new vision of history. As Veronika Busse, a particularly keen visitor, wrote to the Berliner Zeitung:

Naturally I have seen the Museum for German History. Already a remark by our President, Wilhelm Pieck, that has been installed in the entrance hall shows that the museum no longer serves the glorification of petty princes, but is rather an educational establishment for the workers.


The first sections were opened in conjunction with the Second Party Conference of the SED (9 to 12 July 1952), at which the historical programme of the proceeding years was intensified with the official abandonment of the “German misery” and the strengthening of national culture in conjunction with the construction of socialism. ‘Everyone understands’ announced Walter Ulbricht at the conference,

what great importance the scientific study of German history holds for the struggle for the national unity of Germany and the maintenance of all the great traditions of the German people, especially compared with the efforts of the American occupiers to erase the great achievements of our people.

[Jeder versteht, welch große Bedeutung das wissenschaftliche Studium der deutschen Geschichte für den Kampf um die nationalen Einheit Deutschlands und die Pflege aller großen Traditionen des deutschen Volkes hat, besonders gegenüber dem Bestreben der amerikanischen Okkupanten, die großen Leistungen unseres Volkes vergessen zu machen.]

‘May it succeed,’ he added, ‘to present the great traditions of the German people historically correctly in the Museum for German History.’

---

The Party strictly controlled exhibition concepts throughout the life of the museum, making judgements about the selection of exhibition themes, the emphasis of particular events and personalities, the formulation of text panels and labels, the choice of objects and their placement, lighting considerations, and the size and colour of wall texts.\textsuperscript{14} While an excess of paper was generated in the to and fro of exhibition concept documents and “scripts” (\textit{Drehbücher}), documenting each detail of the exhibitions in planning, decisions were often made only once exhibitions were \textit{in situ}.\textsuperscript{15} The first permanent displays were re-worked a number of times to

\textsuperscript{14}See, for example the notes of the Politburo visit on 21 March 1953 to the third floor section of the permanent departments opened in April. The tour of the exhibition was attended by Walter Ulbricht, Otto Grotewohl, and Fred Oelßner. Ulbricht, for example, demanded more commissioned paintings and specifically ordered the inclusion of a copy of a Soviet painting of the Reichstag fire. He also instructed for a wall text reading “Struggle of the Spartacus League against the War” (“\textit{Kampf des Spartakusbundes gegen den Krieg}”) to be changed to red. In this particular instance, while it was concluded that the exhibition contained serious weaknesses, it was nonetheless granted permission to open on schedule. Internal report, “\textit{Bemerkungen zur 3. Etage anlässlich der Besichtigung durch das Pol.-Büro am 21.3.53},” (DHM-HA: MfDG/288/Bl.100-108).

\textsuperscript{15}The scripts included full lists of objects, images, and associated texts. The methodology of exhibition development emerged over the course of the museum’s history and was by no means developed at the time of the creation of the first exhibitions in 1952/53. There were, however, a number of distinct documents produced during the development of exhibitions that are closely linked to those outlined by Heinz Rieck in his description of the process of development of the new permanent exhibitions for the MfDG during the early 1970s. He identifies the following stages in exhibition development: 1) Exhibition conception, 2) Exhibition exposé, 3) Exhibition draft, 4) Exhibition project. A more detailed
incorporate changes dictated by the SED leadership, with the more recent historical periods drawing far greater attention than the more distant past. This point is made by Mary Fulbrook in relation to the historical sciences more generally and is certainly true of the museum, though the relative freedom afforded scholars of earlier historical periods by no means exempted them altogether from Party scrutiny. Thanks to the public visibility of the museum, staff had little latitude, even during the early 1950s, an era in which SED control over the historical sciences had not yet become as entrenched and institutionalised as it would during the latter part of the decade.

Though less contentious than the immediate past, the earliest displays nonetheless fully adhered to the Marxist-Leninist vision. The exhibition, which took the form of a progressive chronological circuit, began with Engels' quote: 'Work is the first basic condition of all human life, in fact to such an extent that in a sense we have to say: it created man himself.' Thus, the exhibition commenced with the earliest origins of humankind, specified simply as 'several hundred thousand years ago', and took as its point of departure the role of labour and production in the development of human societies and, indeed, humans themselves (Fig. 6.2). It showed casts of skeletal fragments alongside stone-age tools and implements to demonstrate the development of production methods in conjunction with the evolution of man from Homo heidelbergensis, through the

work-process was outlined in the museum's major museological textbook produced in 1988, which is dealt with in more detail in the final chapter. See Heinz Reich, 'Etapen der gestalterischen Vorbereitung von ständigen musealen Ausstellungen im Museum für Deutsche Geschichte,' Neue Museumskunde, 15, no. 1, 1972, pp. 36-39; Wolfgang Herbst and K. G. Levykin, eds., Museologie. Theoretische Grundlagen und Methodik der Arbeit in Geschichtsmuseen (Berlin: VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1988), Ch. 9 and 10.

16 Fulbrook, 'Dividing the past, defining the present,' p. 219.
17 On the progress of control of the historical sciences in the post-war era and during the 1950s, ibid. pp. 218-221.
18 '[Die Arbeit ist die erste Grundbedingung alles menschlichen Lebens, und zwar in einem solchen Grade, daß wir in gewissem Sinn sagen müssen: sie hat den Menschen selbst geschaffen.]' Friedrich Engels quote attributed to The part played by labour in the transition from ape to man (Anteil der Arbeit an der Menschwerdung des Affen), utilised as the first panel text of the MfDG exhibition of German history, opened July 1952. See Photo No. F54/22 and F58/399, "Clara-Zetkin-Straße, Erste Aufbau, Ur- und Frühgeschichte", (DHM-HA: HA5 (2)). Also quoted in Paul Gabriel, 'Ein Gang durch das Museum für deutsche Geschichte, Neues Deutschland, 7 August 1952, p. 3.
20 On the Marxist view of production in the development of human society and human society, Dorpalen writes: '[The] view of the fundamental importance of material production is reinforced by the conviction that production shaped man into the social being he is: based on cooperation, production brought forth human society—a process that derived further momentum from the increasing division of labor. Marxism thus sees human societies as systems based on the relations men enter into with one another, knowingly or unknowingly, in the production process.' Dorpalen, German history in Marxist perspective: the East German approach, p. 24.
Neanderthal, to the earliest examples of *Homo sapiens*, later incorporating a cast of a partial skull of *Sinanthropus pekinensis* (*Homo pekinensis*, or Peking Man) donated to the museum by the Academy of Sciences of the People’s Republic of China.\(^{21}\)

![Figure 6.2: Opening of the first permanent exhibition featuring wall text by Friedrich Engels, MfDG, c. 1953 (DHM-HA: HA 5(2), F54/24)](image)

Above the vitrines that bordered the exhibition space, a series of large panels incorporating section titles, crude illustrations, maps, and text boxes, provided the visual clues and broad narrative frame for understanding the objects on display (Fig. 6.3). The periodisation essentially adhered to the established archaeological chronology, progressing from the hunter-gatherer society, through the emergence of agriculture to the bronze and iron ages.\(^{22}\) Nonetheless, the accepted non-Marxist structure sat within an overarching developmental sequence based on the governing laws of historical materialism. ‘The history of the primitive-communal society from which all East German surveys of German history take their departure’, wrote Andreas Dorpalen, noting the lack of distinction between pre-history and history in the East German view, ‘is presented as that of a social order that, by means of improved production techniques and divisions of labour, moved from communal beginnings to hierarchical structures, private property, and a class society.’\(^{23}\)

---

\(^{21}\) The text panel for this object indicates that the find was made in 1956, though this is not verifiable within the scope of this study.

\(^{22}\) Hermann W. Behrens contends that as late as the 1980s the discipline of archaeology had not yet become dominated by Marxists. Behrens, ‘Die Darstellung der Ur- und Frühgeschichte in der archäologischen Geschichtbeschreibung der DDR,’ p. 6.

\(^{23}\) Dorpalen, *German history in Marxist perspective: the East German approach*, pp. 63-64.
to the laws of history, the socioeconomic formation of the primitive communal society then became
the basis for the subsequent formations, being the slaveholding system (though not in Germany),
feudalism, capitalism, and finally socialism and communism.\textsuperscript{24} The exhibition itself focussed heavily
on production methods and socioeconomic structures to show the emergence of a tribal society,
aricultural production, animal husbandry, and handicrafts and trade, with examples of decorative
ceramics, a model of a stone-age house, bronze and iron-age weapons, tools, jewellery, and
reproduction tombs as evidence of the development of social strata and classes.\textsuperscript{25}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image}
\caption{Figure 6.3: View of the exhibition sequence “Pre-and Early History,” MfDG, c. 1953. (DHM-HA: HA 5(2), F54/203)}
\end{figure}

Beginning in seventh century BCE,\textsuperscript{26} the following room traced the development of the
Germanic tribes through to the Migration Period in the fourth and fifth centuries CE (Fig. 6.4). It
was here that the exhibition began to narrow from its essentially world-historical vision to a
specifically “German” one, although even the earlier material displayed was taken largely from
archaeological finds on German territory. Conversely, despite the museum’s clear national agenda,
the depiction of the Germanic peoples was by no means as overtly nationalist as that which had

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{24} See ibid. pp. 23-45, here p. 24.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Sekretariat Ullmann, “Entwurf für Katalog,” 9.7.1952, (DHM-HA: MfDG/064/Bl. 61-76, quote Bl. 61-76, here Bl. 64). See
also Photo No. F58/416, F58/420, F58/425 and F58/426, (DHM-HA: HA5 (2)).
\item \textsuperscript{26} \textit{u.Ztr.} and \textit{v.u.Ztr.} are the abbreviations for “unserer Zeitrechnung” and “vor unserer Zeitrechnung,” which literally
translate to “our calculation of times” and “before our calculation of times.” They equate to the concept of Common Era and
Before Common Era (CE/BCE) and were the standard form in the GDR.
\end{itemize}
developed during the nineteenth century (chapter 2). While Tacitus, again, was called upon to evince the positive qualities of the Germanic tribes (here with a focus on economic, social, and political development rather than their warrior-like qualities),\textsuperscript{27} emphasis was also given to the cultural influence of the neighbouring Celts and Slavs (for instance via the comparison of ceramics). ‘These tribes did not constitute a political unity,’ wrote museum staff in a draft exhibition catalogue, ‘and other than their tribal names did not possess any such common designation,’\textsuperscript{28}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Figure6.4.png}
\caption{"The Germanic Tribes up to the Migration Period," MfDG, c. 1953 (DHM-HA: HA 5(3), F56/1798)}
\end{figure}

The exhibition nonetheless made use of the Battle of Teutoburg and the victory of the Germanic tribes under Arminius as an example of a unified struggle \textit{and} as the first of many struggles against foreign oppression. As it had done in the past, therefore, Teutoburg neatly served the needs of the present. ‘Just as today the doomed imperialist system resorts to wars of conquest,’ wrote Paul Gabriel in an exhibition review for \textit{Neues Deutschland}, ‘so too at the beginning of the common era the Roman slave-holding state endeavoured to stay its inevitable end through raids.’\textsuperscript{29}

\textsuperscript{27} The warring nature of the \textit{Germanen} was attributed to the rise of material culture as the tribes came into contact with the Roman conquered Celtic provinces.


\textsuperscript{29} [So wie heute das dem Untergang geweihte imperialistische System einen Ausweg in Eroberungskriegen sucht, so war es zu Beginn unserer Zeitrechnung der römische Sklavenhalterstaat bestrebt, sein unvermeidliches Ende durch Raubzüge gegen Nachbarländer aufzuhalten.] Gabriel, ‘Ein Gang durch das Museum für deutsche Geschichte,’ p. 3.
It was also with the Germanic peoples in the fifth century CE that the exhibition made the leap to the next phase in the historical process with the transformation to feudalism, explained by the growing power of war chiefs during the Migration Period, the growth of private property (and private ownership in the means of production) precipitated by clashes with Roman civilisation, and the division of the communal Germanic society into classes.30

**Middle Ages**

The following section focussed on peasant resistance to exploitation and the question of national unity as the exhibits traced medieval economic life, the formation of the German Empire under Charlemagne, the growing wealth of the church as the centre of feudalism during the Ottonian dynasty, the development of cities, agricultural relations, and Hanseatic trade, the eastward drive by German princes, the cultural influence of the orders of knights (Ritterorden) during the Hohenstaufen dynasty, the fragmentation of Germany into individual territories, and the growth of particularism.31 National unity was conceived as something fundamental that was thwarted by the interests of the princes and nobility. 'We learn the causes,' wrote Gabriel, 'why Germany did not develop as a centralised nation state at that time, the fight, that the princes waged against the bearers of progress, the cities and the Kaiser.'32 The section concluded as the visitor progressed through a long corridor detailing the decline of feudalism, the importance of book printing for the development of the national literary language, and a series of class struggles and uprisings, perceived as the most important precursors of the “Great German Peasant's War.”33 It also featured reproductions of medieval buildings and sculptures, described in the draft catalogue simply as “decoration.”34

Many of the objects used to illustrate medieval social, cultural, and political developments were reproductions and models: a model farmhouse and plough used in the explication of feudalism in the first room, a model of the city of Tangermünde and Hanse boats in the second room (Fig. 6.5). These objects were singled out for their significance along with the Heliand fragment (chapter 5), though the actual parchment displayed was a reproduction, an illuminated miniature circa 1000,

31 Ibid. Bl. 67-69, quote Bl. 68.
32 ['Wir lernen die Ursachen kennen, warum es in Deutschland damals zu keinem zentralisierten Nationalstaat kam, den Kampf, den die Fürsten gegen die Träger des Fortschritts, die Städte und gegen den Kaiser führten.'] Gabriel, 'Ein Gang durch das Museum für deutsche Geschichte,' p. 3.
early medieval ceramics, incunabula used to illustrate the invention of book printing, and a late nineteenth-century replica of the Martin Behaim's 1492 globe.\textsuperscript{35}

![Image of Tangemünde and Hanseatic ship models, "Middle Ages," c. 1953](DHM-HA: HA 5(3), unnumbered)

**Figure 6.5:** A model of Tangemünde and Hanseatic ship models, "Middle Ages," c. 1953 (DHM-HA: HA 5(3), unnumbered)

Thus, the museum made little distinction between replicas, models, and originals in its selection of exhibition highlights. The overwhelming proportion of the exhibits remained textual, with printed material and museum texts defining the visual aesthetic of the displays. As Fritz Klein later wrote;

> We offered a fairly didactic text written on the walls, supplemented by pictures and illustrations, few objects and yet more written material, which was laid in the vitrines and again had to be read. The nature of the display was for one the almost unavoidable consequence of the lack of objects, insurmountable in the short time. But it also reflected a certain one-sidedness in the basic nature of the task. The objective was an as intensive as possible instruction, that inevitably led to an excess of texts.

Wir boten einen an die Wände geschriebenen, reichlich didaktisch ausgefallenen Text, ergänzt durch Bilder und Illustrationen, wenige Gegenstände sowie noch einmal schriftliche Quellen, die in Vitrinen ausgelegt waren und wiederum gelesen werden mußten. Dieses Erscheinungsbild war zum einen die fast unvermeidliche Folge des in der Kürze der Zeit nicht behebbaren Mangels an Exponaten. Er spiegelte aber auch eine gewisse Einseitigkeit in der

The museum experts on the advisory board heavily criticised the displays ahead of the opening, particularly the deficiency of concrete (gegenständlich) material, and the over-abundance of illustrations. ‘The way the interior designers arranged the museum had led to the situation,’ reported the Department for Propaganda’s Ernst Diehl of the advisory board discussion, ‘that the emphases of the individual sections would often be supplanted by the decoration.’37 One of harshest critics was Heinz Knorr of the State Museum of Halle,38 a leading figure in the early GDR museum development (chapter 7).

Very few Zeughaus objects were included in the exhibition, not merely because of the physical absence of large proportions of the collection held in the Soviet Union, but because, as Heinrich Müller has pointed out, the comparative lack of other concrete material necessitated restraint, lest the Zeughaus objects overwhelm the presentation.39 In the Middle Ages section this amounted to one suit of armour and a handful of medieval hand and pole arms. Even so, the former renunciation of the collections, which at one stage management felt should be completely divested,40 had by now been ameliorated as their usefulness for the portrayal of particular events became apparent.41 Though scarce, the Zeughaus objects represented significant concrete—and original—exhibits among the predominantly flat displays.

The “Early bourgeois revolution” to the “National freedom movement”

The section “1517-1844” was also largely dominated by printed material. The changed periodization from the structure established in January 1952 (chapter 5), represented the designation of the Reformation (marked by Luther’s posting of the 95 Theses in 1517) as the beginning of a national movement against the feudal system and the Church as its ideological representative, which then reached its culmination with the Peasant War of 1525—a conflation of the two events that was squarely in line with Meusel’s own publication on the subject of the same

36 Klein, Drinnen und Draussen, pp. 160-161.
38 Ibid. Bl. 106.
39 Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 241.
40 Interview with Heinrich Müller, 17 August 2010, 10am, Friedrich-Engels-Kaserne, Am Kupfergraben 5, Berlin.
41 At the first meeting of the Expert Advisory Council in March, Ullmann had even described the former Zeughaus collections as valuable for the museum, reporting the creation of a separate department for their administration. ‘Erste Arbeitstag des Wissenschaftlichen Rates,’ p. 5.
year. It saw the Reformation not as the *cause* of the Peasants’ War, but as one of two *stages* of the same movement—Germany’s “early bourgeois revolution.” This was reinforced in the exhibition by an emphasis on political and economic conditions over theological concerns, as in the use of dolls in historical costume to demonstrate the different strata of society, something museum staff felt was a particularly effective method for the instruction of school children (Fig. 6.6).

Figure 6.6: Publicity still, the Knights’ Revolt (1522) with dolls in period dress, MfDG, c. 1953 (DHM-HA: HA 5(4), F54/223)


43 Meusel wrote: ‘In fact, there existed between the Reformation and the Peasants’ War the closest conceivable connection—not in the sense that the Reformation is the “cause” of the Peasants’ War, but rather that the two events form two stages within the same movement.’ [Tatsächlich besteht zwischen der Reformation und dem Bauernkrieg der denkbar engste Zusammenhang—nicht etwa in dem Sinne, daß die Reformation die “Ursache” des Bauernkrieges ist, sondern in dem, daß die beiden Ereignisse zwei Etappen innerhalb ein und derselben Bewegung bilden.] Citing Engels’ *Entwicklung des Sozialismus von der Utopie zur Wissenschaft,* he went on to add: ‘In the years 1517 and 1525 the German people experienced their early bourgeois revolution.’ [‘In den Jahren 1517 und 1525 erlebte das deutsche Volk seine frühbourgeoisliche Revolution.’] Meusel, *Thomas Müntzer und seine Zeit*, p. 41. The conclusion of the exhibition section in 1844 rather than 1848 allowed for a more thorough treatment of the lives, work, and influence of Marx and Engels and the revolution of 1848, which concluded the exhibits opened in July 1952.

But while the Peasants’ War and its main protagonist Thomas Müntzer were treated as historically more significant—his was the Volksreformation (peoples’ reformation) to Luther’s Fürstenreformation (princes’ reformation)—the Reformation was nonetheless praised as a national uprising against the papacy, with Luther’s German translation of the bible given due credit as a great national act.\textsuperscript{45} Though less critical than the GDR historiography that emerged during the latter part of the decade, the treatment of the “Luther question” was by no means uncontentious, with significant debate among members of the museum advisory committee and management continuing well after the opening of the exhibits.\textsuperscript{46} Müntzer, on the other hand, was co-opted unproblematically into the canon of GDR heroes, featured in the Peasant War displays along with drawings and documents, a purpose-built map showing the key centres of unrest, a decorative assemblage of flags, a number of hand and pole arms, and a small cannon originating in Magdeburg in 1515 from the Zeughaus collections (Fig. 6.7). Above all, these weapons were testimony to the revolutionary tradition of the German people, a theme that carried through into the following room dealing with aspects of the counter-Reformation and thirty-years war, with its focus on conditions on the land and in the cities and the resistance of the “peace-loving” people to the war.

Economic considerations were the major focus of the presentation of absolutism which followed, serving as an opportunity to incorporate a number of objects designed to contrast the wastefulness of the courts with the exploitation of the people and to show the development of manufacturing and production methods. These included a large collection of Meissen porcelain, contemporary glassware, reproduction children’s toys, and a miniature eighteenth-century weavers’ workshop. Despite the inclusion of these items, Neues Deutschland found the exhibits lacking, pointing to the lack of concrete material used to express the manufacturing revolution.\textsuperscript{47} This observation again points to the core museological problem of the exhibition. Lacking knowledge of effective display techniques to support the production of meaning, the exhibition makers more often than not simply expected the heavily didactic wall texts to orient the visitors to the desired interpretation. In the case of the Meissen porcelain (Fig. 6.8), which was placed in a dedicated vitrine, the visitor could easily have understood the display primarily in terms of the rarity and delicacy of the objects. Veronica Busse again articulated the intended message when she stated: ‘In the past it [the porcelain] served the princes who sucked the people dry—now it stands

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{46} Debate over the the Luther question within the museum advisory committee, in which non-Marxist historians Weidhass and Kretzchmar argued strongly for a much greater representation of Luther in honour of his role in the development of the nation per “Aufbau und Leitung des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte, Juni 1952 - Mai 1961,” (DHM-HA: MfDG/10). See also Gg. Kr., ‘Diskussion um Luther und die deutsche Reformation,’ \textit{Neues Deutschland}, 31 January 1953, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{47} Gabriel, ‘Ein Gang durch das Museum für deutsche Geschichte,’ p. 3.
there to be admired by the people and to make the workers proud of the work of their forefathers.'\textsuperscript{48} But for a less conscientious visitor the politics could well have been obscured by their decorative value—and even Frau Busse remarked on the particular attraction of the pieces, especially for women.\textsuperscript{49}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Figure_6_7.jpg}
\caption{The Peasants’ War in the museum section “1517-1844,” featuring Zeughaus pole arms and a 1515 cannon. MiDG, c. 1953 (DHM-HA: HA 5(4), F54/232)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{48} ['Früher diente es den das Volk aussaugenden Fürsten—heute steht es dort, um vom Volk bewundert zu werden und die Werkätigen stolz auf die Arbeiten ihrer Vorfahren zu machen.'] Busse, 'Eine Bildungsstätte für Werktätige,' p. 2.

\textsuperscript{49} [Ein weiterer Anziehungspunkt, gerade für uns Frauen, ist eine große Vitrine, in der seltene Stücke echten Meißen Porzellans ausgestellt sind.] ibid.
In both the economic and political realm, it was national unity that came to the fore. The policies of Brandenburg-Prussia, the rise of Prussia as a kingdom, and the campaigns of Friedrich the Great were characterised as anti-national, though as Dorpalen has pointed out, even among GDR historians it was later conceded that 'the conditions for the creation of a unified nation-state simply did not exist.'\(^\text{50}\) It should be noted that the uniform of Friedrich the Great, along with much of the surviving Prussian material that could have enhanced the presentation of the period, was still held by the Soviet Union. Like the thwarted political union, hindrances to the creation of a unified

---

national economy were demonstrated via images and statistics. As was common in GDR historiography, the primary concern was not so much to provide a description to what did occur, as to explain why certain expected developments did not take place. Again, it was the political and economic unity of Germany that was assumed to fit the rightful pattern of development, something that came to particularly strong expression in the following room, where classical German literature and philosophy of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were set within the frame of national culture.

Following directly on, the urgent need for national unity was demonstrated by the defeat at Jena and Auerstedt (1806) and here the Prussian reformers Stein, Scharmhorst, and Gneisenau, along with key figures of the national movement Fichte, Arndt, Körner, and Jahn, were singled out for their leadership as German patriots. In direct contrast to the traditional presentation of the Prussian reform and the victories at Leipzig and Belle-Alliance in the Zeughaus and Ruhmeshalle, particularly the primacy of the Prussian army and the presentation of King Friedrich Wilhelm III as the central unifying figure with the “Appeal to my People” (chapter 2), emphasis was placed on the German patriots and their ability to organise the people, set against the acquiescence of the Prussian king and Junkers to Napoleonic rule (Fig. 6.9). Perhaps the most important function the Wars of Liberation served in the new historiography, however, was to provide an ancestry for the current Soviet alliance in the form of a historically grounded Russo-German brotherhood of arms, an important factor in the decision to re-build the collections (below). In relation to the later development of the permanent exhibitions it is also worth noting that the French Revolution played only a minor role in the overall presentation, with the collapse of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation in the wake of French victory assigned far greater significance as a turning point in the nationally conceived history. While the influence of the French revolution, expressed in the form of unrest and partial uprisings, were included, it was the revolutionary upheavals after 1830, along with the necessity to create a national economy that closed the section “1517-1844.”

51 Gabriel, ’Ein Gang durch das Museum für deutsche Geschichte,’ p. 3.
52 Some of these patriots had found their way into the Zeughaus museum, as evidenced by reference to Theodor Kröner’s pen on display in 1900, but the emphasis had remained squarely on the Hohenzollern leaders and Prussian army. See Königl. Zeughaus-Verwaltung, Das Königliche Zeughaus (1900), p. 148.
53 On the Russo-German aspect of the presentation of the Wars of Liberation in GDR historiography, Dorpalen, *German history in Marxist perspective: the East German approach*, p. 182.
A distinct visual break was then made for the first of the two final exhibition rooms, which made up the section, "1844-1848/49." Once again drawing on the tradition of the hall of honour, this room, titled "Life and Work of the Founders of the Scientific Socialism, Marx and Engels," featured busts of the two figures against a large gold insert wall emblazoned with the slogan, ‘Workers of the world, unite!’ (Fig. 6.10). Mounted to the wall panel between the two busts, a bespoke cabinet atop a pseudo-classical plinth held a first edition of the Communist Manifesto, to particularly dramatic effect with its black backdrop contrasting the gleaming gold wall. This was one instance where the sacredness of the object itself was brought to the fore, not only through these design techniques, but also through the language used to describe it. The draft catalogue spoke of the ‘epoch-making significance’ of the work and emphasised the ‘protection’ of this ‘great creation’ within the custom-built vitrine. Perusing the other exhibits in the room, the visitor may be excused for feeling a touch of national pride in the achievements of these accomplished forebears. If in

---

55 ["Leben und Werk der Begründer des wissenschaftlichen Sozialismus, Marx und Engels"] Wall text, Photo No. F54/256, (DHM-HA: HA5 (4)).
doubt, another wall quote attributed to Lenin provided the suggested basis for interpretation: 'The German people should be proud that it has born these two titans of the revolutionary world-changing theory, that Germany is the birthplace of scientific communism, Marxism.'

The final room dealt with “The struggle for unity and freedom in the revolution of 1848/49,” which included a map of Europe showing the centres of revolution, details of the street fighting in Berlin, a section on the social composition and political activities of the Frankfurt assembly shown in pictures and tables, and a central vitrine illustrating to the print-media of 1848, with a separate wall dedicated to the significance of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. A large room divider then chronicled the struggles in Posen and Schleswig-Holstein under the heading “The National Liberation Movements 1848,” and the final part dealt with the ‘struggle against the advancing counter-revolution’ in the winter of 1848/49 and the campaign for an imperial constitution, under the title “The Struggle for a Democratic Germany.”

’The Revolution of 1848 takes up an outstanding place,’ wrote Gabriel in his exhibition review, ‘whose task would not just have been the elimination of feudalism, but also the creation of national unity in Germany.’ Thus, both the progressive economic model and the movement towards national unity were encapsulated

---

57 ['Das deutsche Volk sollte stolz darauf sein, dass es diese zwei Titanen der revolutionären Weltumwälzenden Theorie hervorgebracht hat, dass Deutschland die Geburtsstätte des Wissenschaftlichen Kommunismus, des Marxismus ist.'] Wall text, Photo No. F54/256, (DHM-HA: HA5 (4)).
59 Internal correspondence, draft exhibition catalogue for the sections “Pre- and Early History” to “1844-1848/49” dated 9 July 1952, (DHM-HA: MfDG/064/BL. 75).
60 ['Einen hervorragenden Platz nimmt die Revolution von 1848 ein, deren Aufgabe nicht nur die Beseitigung des Feudalismus, sondern auch die Herstellung der nationalen Einheit Deutschlands gewesen wäre.'] Gabriel, 'Ein Gang durch das Museum für deutsche Geschichte,' p. 3.
in this one event, a fitting end-point for the time being for the exhibition. Again, the revolutionary activity provided the opportunity for the incorporation of Zeughaus objects, with the inclusion of a small cannon from the period alongside drums and flags, though the latter items were new acquisitions.\(^6\) As the periodization of the exhibition suggests, the revolution of 1848 was conceived as a counterpart to the Peasants’ War, and in terms of the transition from the feudal to the capitalist order, both events, though over three hundred years apart, were conceptually bound in the same process.\(^6\) It also foreshadowed the establishment of the GDR itself, which would be cast as the fulfilment of the democratic movement begun a century prior.\(^6\)

“\textit{The Germany of the past 100 years}”\(^6\)

Despite its delayed opening, the presentation of German history for the period 1850-1945 continued to pose substantial challenges for museum staff, with members of the Politburo voicing criticism and prescribing changes in the weeks before the 12 April opening.\(^6\) For the period 1918-1945, the Party involvement was particularly intense. Though the displays were permitted to open as scheduled, museum management was required to respond in writing to a number of specific criticisms made by Walter Ulbricht and Politburo members, resulting in substantial changes after the exhibition was opened to the public.\(^6\) Like the previous sections, the final displays differed slightly in structure from the existing periodisation. The new sections were divided into three main departments; “1850-1871,” “1871-1918,” and “1918-1945.”\(^6\) The inclusion of a caesura at 1871, not

\(^{61}\) The drums and flags were most likely added to the exhibition towards the end of 1952, having been transferred to the museum by the Politburo. They had been a gift from a “Pioneer Group” to president Wilhelm Pieck. See, Tagesordnungspunkt Nr. 9: “Überreichung einer Trommel und einer Fahne von 1848 durch Pioniere an den Präsidenten der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik,” Protokoll Nr. 137/52, Sitzung des Politbüros am 8. Oktober 1952, in BA/Arch-SAMPO: DY 30/IV 2/2/237, Bl. 3

\(^{62}\) Dorpalen, \textit{German history in Marxist perspective: the East German approach}, p. 217.

\(^{63}\) Ibid. p. 209.

\(^{64}\) Exhibition review title, Joachim Schulz, ‘Das Deutschland der letzten 100 Jahre. Drei neue Abteilungen wurden im Museum für Deutsche Geschichte eröffnet,’ \textit{Berliner Zeitung}, 17 April 1953, p. 3.


\(^{66}\) See “Bemerkungen zur 3. Etage anlässlich der Besichtigung am 21.3.53,” (DHM-HA: MDG/288/Bl. 100-108); Letter from Prof. Schreiner, Director of the Department 1918-1945 to Ernst Diehl, Department of Science and Further Education (Abt. Wissenschaft und Hochschulen) of the Central Committee of the SED, with attachments, dated 12.05.1953, (BArch-SAMPO: DY 30/IV 2/9.04/252, Bl. 158-167).

\(^{67}\) A number of contemporary reports speak of the opening of three new exhibition departments. Between these there are, however a number of disparities. According to Joachim Schulz’ article for the \textit{Berliner Zeitung} the exhibition was divided thus: “1850-1871,” “1871-1895 and 1895-1918,” and “1918-1945.” Paul Gabriel, in his review of the second part of the exhibition, uses the following four divisions: “1850-1870,” “1870-1895,” “1895-1918,” and “1918-1945.” This is not simply a matter of semantics, because a caesura at 1870 would make a very different statement to one at 1871, given the foundation of the German Reich. The retention of the 1895 division appears to be a hangover from the earlier periodization that included a section spanning the period between the birth of Marx and the death of Engels (chapter 5). In a Politburo report regarding the inspection of the exhibits on 21 March 1953 reference is made to a room titled “1850-1871.” The designation of 1871 as the transition point between exhibition sections is therefore accepted for the purpose of this discussion. See ‘Abteilung 1850-1945 des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte eröffnet,’ p. 1; Paul Gabriel, ‘Ein Gang durch die Abteilungen 1850-1945 des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte,’ \textit{Neues Deutschland}, 12 April 1953, p. 4; ‘Drei
present in the earlier concepts, is a significant alteration. Its double meaning in the context of GDR historiography—as signifier of both the German unification and the Paris Commune—neatly divided the emphasis of the first two sections so that the former, which concluded with the Reich formation, was principally concerned with the issue of national unification (though economic expansion, industrial growth, and the role of August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht as the founders of the first German workers' party also received considerable attention), while the latter, which began to the Paris Commune, took the struggles of the labour movement in the context of imperialism and the First World War as its core theme. The narrative included the development of the German left and the Spartacus League under Liebknecht, Luxemburg, Mehring, and Zetkin, and the Bolshevik struggle and “Great Socialist October Revolution,” which received its own dedicated wall, complete with busts of Lenin and Stalin and a large commissioned artwork showing Lenin at Smolny in 1917 (Fig. 6.11). As the culmination of the first new section, the October Revolution marked, in the words of Stalin as quoted in the wall text, a ‘radical turning point in the history of mankind, a turn from the old capitalist world to the new, socialist world.’

The influence of this world-historical event on Germany led neatly to the following section which commenced with November Revolution of 1918 and concluded with the liberation from “Hitler-fascism,” by the heroic Red Army, and Stalin’s efforts at the Potsdam Conference to secure the ‘foundation for the creation of a unified, democratic German state’ in the face of the divisive ambitions of the western powers. Museum staff incorporated a number of quotes from Lenin and Stalin as key wall texts. That this was also a direct Party requirement is demonstrated by a Politburo directive regarding the presentation of the labour movement during the 1900s. ‘For the presentation of the Left,’ it stated ‘Stalin’s summary assessment of the Left is to be displayed. Central
on the wall.\textsuperscript{72} Though events like the October Revolution were designed to act as high points in the narrative flow of the exhibition, the periodization itself was less evident in the displays than the commentary in museum documentation. It is therefore less significant in terms of what was mediated by the exhibits than as an indication of the \textit{intended} production of meaning. Certainly the larger arc of the exhibition, which followed from the national revolutionary movement of 1848 and concluded with the struggle against national division at Potsdam was intended to underscore the continuity between the desire for unity in 1848 and the claims of the GDR in the context of East/West division.\textsuperscript{73}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure6.11.jpg}
\caption{"The Great Socialist October Revolution," MfDG, c. 1953 (DHM-HA: HA 5(6), F54/278)}
\end{figure}

Also significant for the presentation of the national agenda was the handling of the unification of 1871. While it now represented an official break, as a "revolution from above" rather than by the popular masses it was not conceived as a high point but as yet another betrayal by the bourgeoisie, who in aligning themselves with Bismarck and the Junker class facilitated the creation of the Prussian-dominated empire.\textsuperscript{74} Although unification was depicted as “historically necessary”

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{72} ["Bei der Darstellung der Linken ist Stalins zusammenfassende Einschätzung der Linken auszulegen. Zentral an die Wand."] "Bemerkungen zur 3. Etage anlässlich der Besichtigung am 21.3.53," (DHM-HA: MfDG/288/Bl. 101).
\item \textsuperscript{73} "Abteilung 1850-1945 des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte eröffnet," p. 1.
\item \textsuperscript{74} Gabriel, 'Ein Gang durch die Abteilungen 1850-1945,' p. 4; Schulz, 'Das Deutschland der letzten 100 Jahre,' p. 3; Andreas Doppel, 'The Unification of Germany in East German Perspective,' \textit{The American Historical Review}, 73, no. 4, 1968, p. 1071.
\end{itemize}
for the further development of capitalism, and therefore progression towards the eventual victory of socialism, the method by which it was achieved was seen to have retarded the lawful historical process with devastating consequences. For the exhibits dealing with the structure of the Kaiserreich, Walter Ulbricht demanded further explication: “The influence of the Junkers in the state apparatus is missing. Engels specifically referred to this. Capitalism developed; the state apparatus remained feudal.” According to Paul Gabriel: ‘Our fatherland thereby careered onto that fatal path that ended with the catastrophe of 1945.’

This link between the conditions of the establishment of the Reich and the formation, development, and ultimate destructiveness of the Nazi state reflects the core perception of Nazi Germany not as a distinctive political or socioeconomic formation, but as a logical extension of monopoly-capitalist imperialism—something also evident in the fact that none of the officially adopted museum concepts had marked 1933 as a major caesura. In reality, the “Hitler-tyranny” did constitute a room in its own right, but it served mainly as a backdrop for the larger story of communist resistance, which progressed from the November Revolution through the formation of the KPD, the murders of Luxemburg and Liebknecht (the latter’s death mask featuring in the re-worked displays under the title of Liebknecht’s last Rote Fahne piece “Trotz alledem!” at Ulbricht’s direct instruction), and, above all, the anti-fascist resistance efforts of the KPD and its central figure Ernst Thälmann. Weimar era artists and writers were also cast in the mould of resistance, with the works of Berthold Brecht, Anna Seghers, Heinrich Man, and Hermann Hesse, along with artists Käthe Kollwitz and Ernst Barlach, lauded for their contribution to the resistance against imperialism, fascism, and war.

Anti-fascist resistance was also the major through-line for the presentation of the NS-era, whose particular barbarity only served to emphasise the courage of that struggle. Within this vision the racial elements of the Nazi terror were marginalised, so that for instance, a small wall display titled “The persecution of Jews” sat beside the substantially more prominent thematic, “The true...
masters of Germany—The monopolists who stood behind Hitler.”80 The section also included a number of items presented specifically as authentic objects, though investigation after 1990 has proven these claims false; they were described as an original guillotine from the Brandenburg prison, upon which over 1,000 anti-fascist resistance fighters were beheaded, a shrunken head ‘made from the head of a Polish resistance fighter in Dachau’, and a lampshade made by members of the SS from the skin of an internee at Buchenwald.81

The affective value of these gruesome objects, to which the claim of authenticity was integral, was particularly salient in relation to the ubiquitous charge of neo-fascism in the Federal Republic, something that the conflation of Nazism with capitalist imperialism supported. They also underscored the portrayal of communists as the main victims of Nazi terror—each item standing for political rather than racial persecution. In the case of the lampshade, its attribution to the concentration camp at Buchenwald was key. As a principle site for the internment of political dissidents, it was the site of KPD leader Ernst Thälmann’s death, and became the central commemorative site for the enactment of the GDR’s chief foundational mythology of anti-fascism and heroic resistance.82 This myth was not only one of the most prominent legitimising tools of the SED state, and a key point of departure from the West German handling of the Nazi past, it also

80 Wall texts, “Die Judenverfolgung” and “Die wahren Herren Deutschlands – Die Monopolisten die hinter Hitler standen” per Photo No. F53/1438, (DHM-HA: HA5 (7)).

81 Label quote regarding the guillotine per Photo No. F53/1438, (DHM-HA: HA5 (7)). On the claims made by the museum regarding the head and the lampshade, Schulz, ‘Das Deutschland der letzten 100 Jahre,’ p. 3. After the German Historical Museum acquired the collections of the former Museum for German History in 1990, tests were carried out on a number of objects in the collection said to contain human remains and relating to the crimes of the National Socialist era. Both the shrunken head and the lampshade displayed in the 1953 exhibition were part of this testing. The former was shown to be a human head, but it pre-dated the NS-Era. The latter did not contain any material of human origin, being made of pigskin. It is not possible within the scope of this thesis to establish whether the items were deliberately falsified or, in the case of the lampshade, fabricated. They were, however, presented as genuine despite the obvious lack of evidence to support the claim. In addition, the attribution of the shrunken head to Dachau, as per Schulz’ review of the exhibition, seems to have been consciously changed from an original attribution to Buchenwald, which demonstrates a blatant disregard on behalf of the museum for the historical authenticity of its objects and the accuracy of their description. The original attribution to Buchenwald is indicated in a report by the department “1918-1945” regarding the Politburo requirements for the exhibition which stated: ‘It was also pointed out, that not only in Buchenwald, but also in Dachau the barbaric procedure for the production of shrunken heads was utilised.’ [‘Außerdem wurde darauf aufmerksam gemacht, dass nicht nur in Buchenwald, sondern auch in Dachau das barbarische Verfahren zur Herstellung von Schrumpfköpfen angewendet wurde.’] The same object was later presented as the horrific evidence of the crime at Buchenwald in a commemorative publication produced for the opening of the national memorial there. Regarding the Politburo directive to include Dachau in the presentation of the shrunken head see, Abteilung 1918-1945, “Bemerkungen der Mitglieder des Politbüros zur Abt. 1918-1945 am 21.3.1953,” (BArch-SAMPO: DY 30/IV 2/9.04/252, Bl. 166). The later publication attributing the object again to Buchenwald per, Komitee der Antifaschistischen Widerstandskämpfer in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, Buchenwald (Berlin: Kongress-Verlag 1959), p. 71. Information regarding tests carried out by the DHM per; Interview with Dieter Vorsteher, 26 October 2010, DHM Verwaltungsgebäude, Am Zeughaus 2.

82 On the role of Buchenwald in the GDR commemorative landscape a number of post-1990 studies dealing with the reorientation of the memorials after the Wende (as discussed in the introduction to this thesis) provide analysis. See Farmer, ‘Symbols that Face Two Ways,’ pp. 97-119; Azaryahu, ‘RePlacing Memory,’ pp. 1-20. See also Alan Nothnagle, ‘From Buchenwald to Bismarck: Historical Myth-Building in the German Democratic Republic, 1945-1989,’ Central European History, 26, no. 1, 1993, pp. 91-113.
proved remarkably resilient in the face of changing national-political requirements, remaining part of the GDR’s officially promoted identity from the mid-1950s onwards. Though this image was very much in its formative stages in April 1953, the inclusion of a dedicated vitrine housing hand-made objects by Buchenwald internees, presented as symbols of determined resistance, camaraderie, and the ‘invincibility of Marxism’, provides evidence of the emergence of this central myth and the objects the museum engaged for its representation (Fig. 6.12).

One of these objects, a sculpture by communist author and Buchenwald internee Bruno Apitz titled “The last face” (Das letzte Gesicht), held particular resonance for the enactment of the Buchenwald legend throughout the history of the museum. The lore built around the piece, aided by Apitz’ own testimony and the political instrumentalisation of his later novel, Naked among Wolves (1959), which detailed the rescue of the so-called “Buchenwald child” and was subsequently adapted for film by DEFA (1963), helped link the object to a number of important narratives.

83 [Unbesiegbarkeit des Marxismus’] Quote per text panel in Photo No. F53/946, (DHM-HA: HA5 (7)).
84 On the rescue of Stefan Jerzy Zweig, a young boy interned at Buchenwald, and the way in which his story was appropriated, altered, and marketed in the GDR, particularly in the wake of its incorporation into Apitz’ fictional account of the last months at Buchenwald, see Bill Niven, The Buchenwald Child. Truth, Fiction, Propaganda (Rochester, New York: Camden House, 2007).
within the GDR. According to the established account, the sculpture was carved in hiding after Apitz rescued a piece of oak from a tree standing within the camp, which the SS had ordered felled following its damage in an Allied air raid in 1944. Known to the prisoners as the “Goethe-Oak,” because of the connection between Goethe and the Ettersberg near Weimar where the camp stood, the association was reinforced via the official naming of the tree as the “Goethe-Oak” with the incorporation of the remaining stump into the national Buchenwald memorial site (Nationale Mahn- und Gedenkstätte Buchenwald). There were also a number of claims of direct association between Goethe and the tree. As Volkhard Knigge, the current director of the memorial points out, the presentation of the stump in this manner provided ‘material evidence for the intrinsic connection between German Classicism, antifascism, and the GDR.’ He has also shown that those responsible for the configuration of the memorial, namely MfDG staff in the department for memorial sites, were well aware that the tree held no specific relationship to Goethe.

This fact did not deter the presentation of Apitz’ sculpture in the same terms, particularly so because the piece, which shows the death mask of an unidentified prisoner, encapsulates the dichotomy of humanism and barbarism inherent in the narrativisation of the site—a narrative which concluded with the GDR as heir to the classical humanist legacy. Apitz himself described the

---

88 Beyond the direct claims it was also not unusual for writers to imply a connection by referring to the status of the tree prior to its destruction as being under conservation protection, by reiterating Goethe's connection to the area more generally, or by quoting Goethe within the context of discussion of the tree, the sculpture, or the camp and its proximity to Weimar more generally. Even some more recent accounts from outside Germany have accepted the Goethe narrative and repeated the claim. For instance; Farmer, 'Symbols that Face Two Ways,' p. 100. The object is presented in the DHM today along with a photograph of the so-called “Goethe Oak,” thereby alluding to a relationship to the poet without directly stating as much. The extent to which certain (useful) myths have carried over whilst others have been disavowed after unification is a topic for further consideration.
90 Knigge quotes from correspondence between the National Research and Memorial of Classical German Literature in Weimar (Nationale Forschungs- und Gedenkstätten der Klassischen deutschen Literatur) and the memorial staff at the MfDG, in which the former refutes the claim and informs the museum of the destruction of a tree (a beech, not an oak) known to be associated with Goethe (in which he had inscribed his name and about which contemporary correspondence survives) in the mid nineteenth century. Prior to the establishment of the concentration camp at Buchenwald the oak had been referred to as the “Fat Oak” (Dicke-Eiche) and had been placed under conservation protection due to its age. Ibid. p. 151 and note Nos. 292 and 293, pp. 172-173.
91 Bill Niven talks of the ‘inherent and unresolved ambivalence’ of “The last face,” stating that in contrast to the presentation of Buchenwald, which by the 1960s had come to represent the resolution of the contradiction between the humanist tradition and the Nazi terror thanks to its enactment of the narrative of anti-fascist solidarity and triumph, the
piece thus: ‘Relieved from the torment of a painful life, the head of the fighter leans into the wood, which had been consecrated by the genius of the German people and designated by the corrupters of German culture to the furnace.’ By “fighter” he was referring to the communist-led resistance in the camp, whose so-called “self-liberation” was the driving force of his fêted novel and a central component of the memorialisation of the site and its incorporation into the national narrative. The contemporary significance of the entirely fabricated “self liberation” for the GDR, carried forward in the iconography of the Buchenwald memorial, most notably in Fritz Cremer’s bronze ensemble showing the victorious prisoners at the moment of liberation, as well as the continual revival of the novel and its presentation as fact, centred on the fulfilment of the anti-fascist promise in the GDR and the obligation to uphold the “Buchenwald Oath” and eradicate fascism in all forms. In the GDR of the mid-1950s, this spoke directly to the German-German relationship. For this reason, and for its ability to stand in for the progressive German traditions with which the GDR aligned itself, “The last face” remained a key museum object, featuring in numerous museum guide books, journal and newspaper articles, and displayed in the permanent exhibitions throughout the life of the museum.

sculpture itself remained ‘free of any such gesture towards ideological transcendence, whatever the attempts by the GDR to present it as a straightforward example of socialist humanism’, whereby he cites the MDG displays. He credits this ambiguity, which he parallels with Apitz’ novella Esther, also composed at Buchenwald, to the fact that ‘Apitz at Buchenwald was a very different man from Apitz in the mid 1950s’, when he wrote Naked among Wolves. While it is true that “The last face” was not created under the same kinds of political circumstances or for the same (redemptive/defensive) reasons that Apitz sought to portray the “self-liberators” of Buchenwald prior to the wholesale appropriation of the narrative by the SED, as detailed by Niven, the interpretation, contextualization, and instrumentalisation of the piece within the museum and its publications and publicity should not be overlooked. The piece itself may well be free of the kind of ideological content inherent in Apitz’ novel, but it is precisely the way in which the museum sought to create that content through its own technologies, and indeed the very contingency of those meanings, which concerns us here. Typical of the museum’s narration of the piece is, Wernicke, ‘Schätze aus unseren Museen,’ p. 13. ‘[Von den Qualen eines schmerzvollen Lebens erlöst, lehnt sich das Haupt des Kämpfers in das Holz hinein, das vom Genius des deutschen Volkes geweiht und von den Verderbern der deutschen Kultur zum Ofenheizen bestimmt worden war.’ Bruno Apitz quoted in Schönwerk, ‘Bruno Apitz — wie man ihn kaum kennt,’ p. 11.

Niven, The Buchenwald Child, chapter 2.

The “Buchenwald Oath” stated, ‘The annihilation of Nazism with its roots is our motto! The construction of a new world of peace and freedom is our goal!’ [’Die Vernichtung des Nazismus mit seinen Wurzeln ist unsere Lösung! Der Aufbau einer neuen Welt des Friedens und der Freiheit ist unser Ziel!’]

The inclusion of the sculpture in the 1953 exhibition came at a crucial moment in the transition of control of the memory of Buchenwald from local authorities and survivors, most notably the former internees active in the Society of People Persecuted by the Nazi Regime (Vereinigung der Verfolgten des Naziregimes; VVN), to the SED. Having blocked attempts by the VVN to commemorate the site, and having held investigations into the conduct of members of the illegal communist-run International Camp Committee for possible complicity with the SS and involvement in the drafting of transport lists—indeed, Niven details the initial development of the "self-liberation" myth as an act of self-defence in the face of such SED persecution—the Party dissolved the VVN in February 1953, replacing it with its own organisation.\(^95\) Thereafter the SED actively pursued its own reorientation of the site, passing a resolution in July for the creation of a museum and shrine to Thälmann in the crematorium.\(^96\) The MfDG's department for memorials was made responsible for the establishment of this museum, which like its own presentations, focussed heavily on Thälmann and the KPD, eliding the other victims associated with the site.\(^97\) At no time was the problematic post-war history of Buchenwald as a Soviet internment camp (from August 1945 to February 1950) handled, either at the site or in public discourse.\(^98\) While the exhibits were later revised to include a more diverse picture of resistance at the camp, particularly with the inclusion of international solidarity as a significant component of the commemoration by the time the national memorial was dedicated in 1958, the SED had now fully appropriated the Buchenwald symbolism for its own purposes.

In April 1953, however, the myth had not yet been fully moulded in the Party image. The Buchenwald vitrine and "The last face" represented only a tentative engagement with the dominant
future mythology, alluded to by the text reference to preparations for armed resistance, but not specifically enacted as it would be with the inclusion of a plaster cast of Cremer’s memorial sculpture and a reconstructed concentration camp barracks in the 1960s and 1970s exhibits, or indeed the wall-sized photo of the Buchenwald barracks with reconstructed bunks and furniture in the 1980s. These changes came about not only as part of a consolidation of the East German historical image, but also as a result of a developing museological practice in the GDR, influenced by established museums in the Soviet Union and an emerging discourse about the theoretical and practical parameters of a specific socialist museology. Before considering these developments in the final chapter, it is worth returning to the integration of the Zeughaus collections and their emergence as both a valued historical collection in their own right, and as a significant component of the broader vision for the exhibition of German history.

“How many hundredweight of grain?” The Zeughaus collections reconsidered

With the possible exception of colonial uniform pieces, Zeughaus objects did not feature in the MfDG’s first permanent exhibitions beyond 1848/49. This is primarily due to the confiscation and destruction of weapons dating beyond 1850 under Allied Control Council regulations following Germany’s unconditional surrender (chapter 4). It also reflected the as yet unrealised potential of the objects for the GDR’s historical vision and its military-political requirements. The first exhibitions were very much provisional in nature and the need for a major re-design was identified in the light of both Politburo criticism and the practical example provided by the MfDG study tour of Soviet museums. According to Meusel’s assessment in May 1953, a new approach for the

---

99 The barracks itself was not attributed to a particular concentration camp in the museum guides or the annotated photographs of the exhibition. It was simply referred to as a ‘Part of a concentration camp barracks (reconstruction with original materials)’. [Teil einer KZ-Baracke (Rekonstruktion mit Originalmaterialien)]. Exactly which parts were constructed with original materials (if any) and where they supposedly originated was not divulged. Though the piece stood for all concentration camps in this way, it was also clearly signed as a site for the detention of political prisoners, not least by the inclusion of a prison uniform bearing the red triangle, symbol of political detainees under the NS identification system. Its position in the immediate proximity of the Cremer sculpture in the permanent exhibition that stood between May 1963 and the beginning of 1978 also reinforced the reading of the barracks as analogous to Buchenwald. Though it did not bear an exact resemblance to the well-known images of Buchenwald’s cramped rows of tiered bedding, which also featured in the film version of Naked among Wolves, its wooden construction did correlate with the dominant visual representation of the camp interiors. See the guide to the exhibition produced in 1963, Museum für Deutsche Geschichte, Deutschland 1933-1945, p. 16-17. This analysis also per Photo Nos. F79/675, F79/676, F79/677, F79/678, F79/670, “Raumaufnahme, Ständige Ausstellung 1917-1945, Abschnitt 1939-1945”, (DHM-HA: HA 93).
100 Ektachrome ohne Signatur; (DHM-HA: MfDG / Fotos DA Eck 1980-90).
102 The museum delegation, comprising Meusel, Ullmann, Tropitz, and exhibition designer Peter-Paul Weiß, visited museums in Moscow and Leningrad (St. Petersburg) from 3-24 September 1952. Particularly important were the History
exhibitions should be developed in conjunction with preparations for their relocation to the Zeughaus. In reality, the incredibly slow progress of the Zeughaus reconstruction, not least resulting from the redirection of funds and labour to housing projects during the 1950s, substantially delayed the transfer of the permanent exhibitions. Following changes to the second part of the Clara-Zetkin-Straße exhibits, which the party leadership had characterised as urgent, and a complete redesign of the section “1933-1945” in 1961, the first of the new permanent displays did not open in the Zeughaus until the museum’s tenth anniversary on 19 January 1962.

In the meantime, however, sections of the Zeughaus were made available for the development of a special exhibition programme, and it was here that museum staff presented a series of thematic, biographical, and commemorative exhibitions, adopting new interpretive and design techniques, as well as hosting guest exhibitions from East German organisations and authorities and affiliated museums within the Eastern Bloc.

A number of these early exhibitions

---


104 Ewald, „Zum Wiederaufbau des ehemaligen Zeughauses,” p. 32. It should be noted, however, that the Zeughaus reconstruction remained a priority despite the shortage of resources. This is evidenced by the re-allocation of funding from the reconstruction of the State Opera (Staatsoper), diagonally across from the Zeughaus for the completion of the south wing of the Zeughaus in for the installation of the museum’s first special exhibition Karl Marx Exhibition (Karl-Marx-Ausstellung). Tagesordnungspunkt Nr. 125/52: “Fertigstellung des Lindenflügel des Zeughauses für die Karl-Marx-Ausstellung,” Protokoll Nr. 71, Sitzung des Politibüros am 12. August 1952, (BArch-SAMPO: DY 30/IV 2/2/225, Bl. 6).


107 Professor Meusel did not live to see the relocation of the permanent exhibits to the Zeughaus, having died in September 1960. His replacement, historian and party functionary, Walter Nimtz, was not officially appointed until 1 March 1962.

108 The MfDG’s special exhibition programme began in May 1953 with an exhibition entitled “Karl Marx,” which was the museum’s major contribution to the GDR’s official Karl Marx Year, marking the 135th anniversary of his birth and the 70th anniversary of his death. The exhibition was due to open in March, marking the latter, but was delayed until May. Though there is insufficient space to discuss the exhibition within the parameters of this thesis, it was significant not least because it incorporated a large section dedicated to contemporary history—that is post-war history—and was therefore the first of the museum’s attempts to represent the SBZ and GDR. In total, one half of the exhibition was dedicated to the life of Karl Marx (1818-83), and one half to the development of socialism after his death. The exhibition ran until 30.11.1954, though like the recent history in the first permanent exhibitions, it also came in for heavy party scrutiny, with the contemporary sections being substantially overhauled. It is appropriate that the first of the museum’s exhibitions was designed around an anniversary (or, in this case, two), because the vast majority of its special exhibitions over the course of its history were designed around commemorative dates. Even many of its revised permanent exhibition sections were opened for anniversaries (for instance the “Germany 1945-1949” opened for the 15th anniversary of the GDR in 1964, and “History of the GDR (1949-1971 / VIII. Party Conference)” opened for the 25th anniversary of the GDR in 1974.
made use of the Zeughaus collections in a significant way, both demonstrating how they could be integrated into the political-ideological framework of the GDR and their value as a stand-alone museum collection. This involved the reconceptualization of the role and value of weapons and militaria within museums—a discussion that occurred in conjunction with a national symposium hosted by the MfDG in 1957 titled “Historical Weapons in our Museums”—and their potential to speak to a new set of questions arising from the theory of Marxism-Leninism and the method of historical and dialectical materialism. It also represents a resurgence of interest in historical weapons for traditional military education and the popularisation of the GDR’s defence institutions and goals. Though presented very much within the rhetoric of the peoples’ struggle against militarism, the exhibitions can be seen within the context of efforts to build positive traditions for the emerging military institutions in the GDR, most particularly the “camouflaged army,” the People’s Police in Barracks (Kasernierte Volkspolizei; KVP), and its successor the National People’s Army (Nationale Volksarmee; NVA), which were established in 1952 and 1956 respectively.\(^{109}\)

*Re-establishing the Zeughaus collections*

The re-interpretation of the Zeughaus holdings followed directly from these developments, once again highlighting the intimate relationship between the museum, its collections, and larger national-political requirements, now within the context of Cold War relations, re-militarisation, West German entry into NATO, and the establishment of the Warsaw Pact.\(^{110}\) In a sense, the traditional relationship between the museum and the army had not truly been broken, at least in terms of the re-establishment of the former Zeughaus collections, which remained the property of the Ministry of the Interior (Ministerium des Innern; MdI), the state organ responsible for the KVP, while in the custody of the museum.\(^{111}\) It was under the authority (and financial support) of the MdI, represented principally by General Major Dr. Otto Korfes, former Wehrmacht Division Commander, MfDG Expert Advice Council member, and Head of the newly established Historical Department of

\(^{109}\) The KVP was established from the existing Hauptverwaltung für Ausbildung (HVA) by order of Willi Stoff, Minister for the Interior, with effect from 1 July 1952. The term "camouflaged army" is taken from the title of a study of the KVP, which constituted the first volume of a series detailing the military history of the GDR, Torsten Diedrich and Rüdiger Wenzke, *Die getarnte Armee. Geschichte der Kasernierten Volkspolizei der DDR 1952 bis 1956*, ed. Rüdiger Wenzke and Militärgeschichtliches Forschungsamt, Militärgeschichte der DDR (Berlin: Ch. Links Verlag 2001). Müller also notes the interest of the KVP in establishing a progressive tradition prior to the establishment of the NVA in Müller, *Vom Arsenal zum Museum*, p. 243.

\(^{110}\) It should also be noted that it was in January 1957 that the West German Military History Research Centre (Militärgeschichtlichen Forschungsstelle), from 1958 Military History Research Office (Militärgeschichtliches Forschungsamt), was established.

\(^{111}\) Prior to the establishment of the Ministry of National Defense (Ministerium für Nationale Verteidigung) in January 1956 the MdI was the highest organ of state for the GDR armed forces. MdI negotiations with the MfDG regarding the Zeughaus collections per Museum für Deutsche Geschichte, Abteilung Sammlung, “Verhandlungen Dr. Korfes / Ministerium des Innern über Verwaltung der Bestände des ehemaligen Zeughau des und den Aufbau eurer spezifischen Abteilung beim Museum für Deutsche Geschichte, 1952-1965,” (DHM-HA: MfDG/547(Rot)/unnumbered).
the KVP, that the MfDG began the enormous task of unpacking, sorting, cleaning, assessing, cataloguing, conserving, and storing the remaining material. Work commenced in March 1953 with the establishment of a special team within the Sector Militaria headed by Kurt Mylius and comprising two scientific staff (Heinrich Müller and Herr Rochow) and a number of skilled technicians carrying out rust removal, textile repair, metal work, and restoration, for the purpose of which 125,000 DM was provided by the MdI for the year 1953.

The team also undertook the location and retrieval of former Zeughaus objects dispersed throughout Germany, a task made all the more difficult by the loss of valuable inventory books and the further removal of holdings from known storage locations. In this way Zeughaus objects became scattered throughout museum collections, theatres, government agencies, and private homes. Though some were reluctant to relinquish objects in their possession, the SfH and MdI officially criminalised the failure to return former Zeughaus objects in an order dated 24 June 1953. On the basis of the same order, employees of the MfDG were guaranteed access to museum depots to search out material and, where provenance for weapons and uniforms pre-dating 1871 could not be established via the objects themselves, the inventory books and associated records of

---

112 Korfes was General Major and Division Commander in the Sixth Army in Stalingrad. He was in Soviet captivity between 1943 and 1948, where he joined the NKFD. Korfes headed the historical department of the KVP from its establishment in October 1952 until his retirement in 1956. He continued his association with the MfDG beyond that time. Daniel Niemetz and Militärgeschichtliches Forschungsamt, *Das feldgrüne Erbe: die Wehrmachteinflüsse im Militär der SBZ/DDR* (Berlin: Christoph Links, 2006), pp. 94-95; 101; 105; Diedrich and Wenzke, *Die getarnte Armee*, p. 904; Ilko-Sascha Kowalczyk, 'Korfes, Otto', Helmut Müller-Enbergs et al., eds., *Wer war wer in der DDR? Ein Lexikon ostdeutscher Biographien. Band 1, A-L* (Berlin: Ch. Links Verlag and Stiftung zur Aufarbeitung der SED-Diktatur, 2010), p. 704.


114 Müller wrote that the team comprised two scientific staff (Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter), one armurer (Waffenmeister), and several technical staff for restoration. A staffing budget dated 5.3.1953 held in the museum’s house archive lists the proposed staff as follows: Head of Department (Kurt Mylius), two scientific Staff (Müller and Rochow), one shorthand typist, two metal workers (Schlosser), one carpenter, three workers for the transport and cleaning of weapons, one cleaning woman, two freelance scientific assistants. Later in March the list was amended as follows: Head of Department (Herr Mylius), one scientific Staff (Müller), one workshop head (Rochow), one secretary, two metal workers, one carpenter, three workers for rust removal (Entrostungsarbeit), one seamstress, two security guards, and a lump sum for occasional freelance assistance. Disposition zum Referat "Historische Waffenkunde," (DHM-HA: MfDG, Waffen und Uniformen in der Geschichte, Bl. 33). Budget plans for staffing per, "Aktennotiz über die Besprechung mit den Herren Müller, Jähner, Rochow und Dr. Bleckwenn, Chefarzt des TBC-Sanatoriums Klietz am 4.3.1953," dated 5.2.1953, and "Finanzplan über die vom Ministerium des Innern zur Verfügung gestellten Geldmittel für die Einrichtung einer Militaria-Sammlung," undated, (DHM-HA: MfDG/547(Rot)/unnumbered). On the budget provided by the MdI, “Ministerium des Innern Historische Abteilung, Bestätigung” 20.2.1953, (DHM-HA: MfDG/547(Rot)/unnumbered).


117 Müller reported later that the letters sent to authorities and museums regarding the return of Zeughaus items generally went unanswered, crediting the persistence (Hartnäckigkeit) of the unit head, Mylius, with their success in retrieving a good deal of the dispersed collections. Disposition zum Referat "Historische Waffenkunde," (DHM-HA: MfDG, Waffen und Uniformen in der Geschichte, Bl. 33).

the museums as well. This demonstrates the level of official interest that had now emerged regarding in the weapons collections. Museum staff were keen to point out the historical and material worth of the collections, which were at great risk prior to the commencement of salvage efforts, but the scope of official involvement, which not only included support for the retrieval and restoration of existing holdings, but also the expansion of the collections through a number of key new acquisitions, is more reflective of their potential to underscore the historical requirements of the armed forces, particularly in the period prior to the establish a dedicated army museum in Potsdam, than their cultural value.

This not only involved the incorporation of weapons and uniforms into a particular historical narrative, as in the major 1957 special exhibition Weapons and Uniforms in History (Waffen und Uniformen in der Geschichte), discussed below, but also their use in the manner of a traditional teaching collection (chapters 1 and 4). In the case of the exhibition series The development of hand-firearms (Entwicklung der Handfeuerwaffen), which was created as a travelling exhibition (never appearing in the museum itself), firearms were presented in technical development sequences for the direct training of KVP personnel as well as the familiarisation of the broader public, most particularly the youth, with weapons technology. The exhibition toured to seven locations between October 1953 and April 1956, including the Political Officers’ School of the KVP Berlin-Treptow, KVP units at Biesdorf and Strausberg, a district museum in Großenhain, and the FDJ Central Clubhouse for Berlin Youth (twice).

---


120 Quite apart from the potential total loss of objects held in collections and private hands outside the museum, those weapons stored in the Zeughäus were severely rusted as a result of years of neglect and inadequate, damp, storage facilities. Müller reported later that the first task of the salvage team was to sort through weapons in boxes piled haphazardly on top on one another in unsuitable storage. Disposition zum Referat "Historische Waffenkunde," (DHM-HA: MfDG, Waffen und Uniformen in der Geschichte, Bl. 33).

121 The German Army Museum (Deutsches Armeemuseum) was established in 1961 in Potsdam. It was renamed in 1972 to the Army Museum of the GDR (Armeemuseum der DDR) in conjunction with its move to Dresden, where it was housed in the armoury at Albersadt, the former Army Museum of the Royal Saxon Army that had opened to the public in 1897 and been dissolved in 1946 according to the allied regulations regarding military museums (chapter 4). Its collections were transferred to the Bundeswehr in 1991 and it was re-named the Military Historical Museum of the Federal Armed Forces (Militärhistorisches Museum der Bundeswehr) in 2010, prior to the re-opening of its major refurbishment, including a new addition by Daniel Liebeskind, in 2011. Gorch Pieken, Matthias Rogg, and Militärhistorisches Museum der Bundeswehr, Militärhistorisches Museum der Bundeswehr. Exhibition Guide (Dresden: Sandstein Verlag, 2012), pp. 7-13. A file note dated 5.1.1956 in the MfDG archives regarding a discussion between Rolf Kiau, then head of the collection department, and Colonel Assmann, of the MdI, and from January 1956 the Ministry for National Defense (Ministerium für Nationaleverteidigung; MfNV), indicates that Kiau was informed at this time of the MdI/MfNV plans to establish an independent army museum, at this stage labeled as a "Heereskunde-Museum." Kiau expressed the belief that the need for an army museum was not yet acute, particularly seeing as the MfDG always took the wishes of the KVP into consideration. Rolf Kiau, "Abteilung Sammlung: Aktennotiz," dated 5.1.1956, (DHM-HA: MfDG/547(Rot)/unnumbered).

The exhibition therefore met two key priorities for the burgeoning East German military apparatus; the need for improved practical education for serving members of the armed forces, and the preparation of the youth for the duties of service. Both were particularly important in light of what Torsten Diedrich and Rüdiger Wenzke have identified as an ‘inner mobilisation’ with the strengthening and consolidation of all branches of the armed forces in the wake of the uprising of 17 June 1953. In addition, the popularisation of armed service among the youth remained important well beyond the immediate period because, unlike the Bundeswehr (established in 1955) and the remaining Warsaw Pact forces, the KVP/NVA did not introduce compulsory military service until 1962.

The strategy for the re-establishment of the collections was also heavily determined by the traditional structure of the Zeughaus collections, in particular the strength of their development sequences. Despite the devastating losses, within a few years of salvage operations the weapons collection was not only the most important in the GDR, but particular areas were considered of world significance, with many weapon categories boasting near-complete development sequences in addition to rare and valuable pieces. Summarising the systematic collecting plan developed for the “completion” of the collections, Heinrich Müller wrote in 1957: ‘The goal of the museum is to build a collection that can demonstrate as complete a development of weapons as possible.’ This he saw as not only desirable for the museum’s contribution to historical research (and the international recognition of the collections), but also as possible, even if it may require decades of targeted collecting.

But even if the collection was perceived, structured, and developed as a “closed” collection, whose parameters strongly reflected those of its historical forerunner, it also needed to meet the museum’s broader exhibition goals for the presentation of a Marxist-Leninist German history. It was in this context that the collections were incorporated into early special exhibitions like The Great

---

123 [‘Innere Mobilmachung’]. In addition to the KVP, the MdI was also responsible for the German Border Police (Deutsche Grenzpolizei; DGP) and the German People’s Police (Deutsche Volkspolizei; DVP). After 17 June 1953 the decision was also made to dissolve the Ministry for State Security (Ministerium für Staatssicherheit; MfS) and incorporate the State Security Services into the MdI as a State Secretariat (Staatssekretariat für Staatssicherheit; SfS), where they remained until the Politburo decision of 24.11.1955, which re-established the MfS as an independent ministry. Diedrich and Wenzke, Die getarnte Armee, p. 354.

124 ‘Nationale Volksarmee (NVA),’ in Bundesministerium für Innerdeutsche Beziehungen Germany (West) et al., DDR Handbuch: Band 2 M-Z, pp. 931-937. Compulsory military service in the Bundeswehr was introduced in 1956 (Article 12 of the Grundgesetz). It was repealed in July 2011.


German Peasant War (Der Große deutsche Bauernkrieg), which presented a much-expanded vision of this central theme and stood in the Zeughaus between May 1955 and September 1957 before touring the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic from 1958 to 1960. Such exhibitions made significant use of the Zeughaus material, including saddles, armour, cannons, cutting and thrusting weapons, and pole arms that could embody the progressive struggle of the people. ‘Again and again,’ wrote the Neue Zeit, ‘when it came to the natural highlights in a social context of the history of the people, these illustrative objects were shown.’128 They were also used in a number of new ways to demonstrate social and economic relations, principally the exploitation of the peasantry, production methods and relations, and trade, but it was Weapons and Uniforms in History (14 September 1957 – 24 August 1958) that first placed the militaria collections at the centre of a broad historical narrative.

**Weapons and Uniforms in History**

At first, you don’t believe your eyes when you walk past the East Berlin advertising columns. But there it really is, the good old, water-cooled "heavy machine gun 08/15" from the First World War – as a symbol on a poster that advertises an exhibition of "Uniforms and Weapons in History." In the Berlin Armoury! [...] How does this fit with the anti-war policy of the Soviet government?


- Suddeutsche Zeitung, Munich, 5 October 1957129

The exhibition is anything but a continuation of the tradition of the old armoury, the shop window of the Prussian-German militarism in which hatred between peoples was spread by the glorification of war and the smug accentuation of trophies.

[Die Ausstellung ist alles andere als eine Fortsetzung der Tradition des alten Zeughauses, des Schaufensters des preußisch-deutschen Militarismus, in dem durch die Verherrlichung des Krieges und die selbstgefällige Herausstellung von Trophäen Völkerhaß verbreitet wurde.]

- Heinrich Müller, Neue Museumskunde, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1958130

The National People’s Army was officially established from existing KVP units on 18 January 1956. Exactly one month later, Eduard Ullman sent a memo to the Head of the Collection Department, Rolf Kiau, confirming a directive for staff from the Sector Militaria to prepare a proposal for a “militaria

---


130 Heinrich Müller, 'Waffen und Uniformen in der Geschichte,' Neue Museumskunde, Jahrgang 1, no. 1, 1958, p. 29.
exhibition," for which approximately one thousand square meters of floor space would be provided. ‘The particulars’, he wrote, ‘are known to you from our common discussion with Dr. Korfes.’ Plans were to be prepared and circulated as soon as possible. ‘ Doubtless it was a very difficult task’ wrote Heinrich Müller, now head of the Sector Militaria, ‘to present weapons and uniforms—tools and external symbols of violence—according to their function in German history. The Exhibition should have a consciously anti-militaristic, yet not a pacifist character.’ The means of reconciling this anti-militarist stance with a clear rejection of pacifism lay in Lenin’s writing on socialism and war, which formed the ideological foundations for the exhibition—and the SED’s military policy.

According to Lenin, the core difference between the “bourgeois pacificists” and the socialist perspective of war lay in the examination of each conflict on the basis of class interests and the adoption of a dialectical materialist approach. Rather than distinguishing between “offensive” and “defensive” wars, Marxism-Leninism posed the question in whose hands the weapons lay, whose interests were served by the war, and, ultimately, whether the lawful historical progression towards socialism was aided or hindered by the conflict. The defining categories of war as either “just” or “unjust” that emerged from this theory were both moral in character and open to a degree of flexibility, depending on political and practical requirements. The exhibition aimed to help visitors make the distinction between “just” and “unjust” wars, as explicitly stated in the introduction to the catalogue and presented in the entrance hall under the central motto: ‘A weapon is a good thing, when it is there for a good cause.’

These kinds of judgements had, of course, been inherent in the permanent exhibition, particularly the celebration of key struggles like the German Peasant War, the Wars of Liberation, and the revolutionary action of 1848, 1917, and 1918, which also built natural high-points in

---

132 Ibid.
135 ‘Militärpolitik’ in Bundesministerium für Innerdeutsche Beziehungen Germany (West) et al., DDR Handbuch: Band 2 M-Z, pp. 893–897.
Weapons and Uniforms. But here, in the absence of a dedicated army museum, the motivation for the re-telling of German history from the perspective of the museum's militaria collections was far more explicitly linked to the fulfilment of military-propaganda and education requirements. It is telling that among those external to the museum taking part in the development of the exhibition were Rolf Dlubek and Werner Hübner, from the section for security (Abteilung Sicherheit) and science (Abteilung Wissenschaft) of the Central Committee respectively, and high ranking members of the NVA, all of whom had served in senior positions in the Wehrmacht, Colonel Günter Aßmann, Colonel Wolfgang Schiel, and Korfes.\textsuperscript{137} An internal report prepared during development stated that the main task of the exhibition lay in the museum's popular scientific role and education for defence preparedness (Erziehung zur Verteidigungsbereitschaft).\textsuperscript{138} 'At the same time,' it went on, 'the needs of the National People's Army will be taken into account in the exhibition [...] The visual presentation of the combative national traditions of our people is a valuable aid in the education process for the units of the National People's Army.'\textsuperscript{139}

That the exhibition catalogue— with 124 object illustrations the most comprehensive yet produced by the museum— was published by the newly established Ministry for Defence, highlights the value of the exhibition for the self-legitimisation of the recently avowed army and the sense of purpose for (or at least an attempt to guarantee the political reliability of) its personnel. Given the events in Hungary the previous autumn, a stark reminder of the trauma (from the SED perspective) of June 1953,\textsuperscript{140} this function was all the more important, not only for the legitimisation of the GDR's own armed forces, but for the broader alliance with the Soviet Union, whose suppression of the "counter-revolution" could be justified by the framework put forward in the exhibition. The presence of representatives of the Central Museum of the Armed Forces of the USSR at the exhibition opening is indicative not only of the 'common world view and the same standpoint with regard to the fundamental political questions of our time',\textsuperscript{141} as the museum later professed, but of the central importance of the military-political lessons for the leadership of both countries. Whether

\textsuperscript{137} Minutes of meetings regarding the exhibition "Weapons and Uniforms in History," specifically "Abteilungsleiter-Besprechung am 13.3.1957," and "Sitzung vom 1.3.1957," (DHM-HA: MfDG/226 (Rot)/unnumbered). On the former Wehrmacht officers and the KVP/NVA; Niemetz and Militärgeschichtliches Forschungsamt, Das feldgraue Erbe, pp. 90-123; Short biographies of Aßmann, Korfes, and Schiel are also provided in Diedrich and Wenzke, Die getarnte Armee, pp. 891-892; 904; 914.


\textsuperscript{140} Diedrich and Wenzke, Die getarnte Armee, p. 352.

\textsuperscript{141} ["gemeinsame Weltschauung und der gleiche Standpunkt zu den politischen Grundfragen unserer Zeit"] Judith Uhlig, 'Die Zusammenarbeit des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte mit zentralen Museen der Sowjetunion,' Beiträge und Mitteilungen des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte, 2, 1974, p. 97.
members of the NVA accepted these lessons is difficult to say, but it certainly appears that they attended in large numbers, though perhaps more likely via organised tours than from personal motivation. In a review of the exhibition West Germany’s *Berliner Morgenpost* told its readers: ‘One saw plenty of uniforms. Not only in the vitrines. Also in front of them.’

But the Marxist-Leninist approach, in conjunction with the by now extensive knowledge of the Sector Militaria with regard to the collections and their historical foundations, opened up far greater scope for interpretation than implied by such crass military propaganda goals. ‘I want to stress something,’ wrote Müller for the 1957 museum conference, ‘that historical weapons need not only be displayed according to military aspects, but rather that they are excellent pieces of evidence for the different sides of societal life.’ The investigation of weapons and uniforms as historical source material, capable of elucidating and mediating a range of meanings and relationships, was underwritten by the method of dialectical materialism and the supposition of an interrelationship between production, weapons, and society.

Rather than concentrating on particular aspects of the object in isolation—traditionally its formal development viewed from a technical, military historical, or art historical standpoint—this approach sought to examine weapons within their many societal contexts to uncover their total meaning (*Gesamtbedeutung*). Precisely in this vein Heinrich Müller asked: ‘How many hundredweight of grain did a peasant have to deliver, before a knight could buy himself one suit of armour [...] We must encourage the visitor to pose other questions regarding the weapons than

---

142 ['Uniformen sah man genug. Nicht nur in den Vitrinen. Auch davor.'] 'Vom Fränkischen Schwert zum Kosakensäbel. Wieder Uniformen und Historische Waffen im Zeughaus - Wann Ist ein Gerehr eine Gute Sache?,' *Morgenpost*, 15 September 1957, (DHM-HA: MDG/Zeitungsausschnitte/1957-58). The *Suddeutsche Zeitung* was far more explicit in its analysis of the presence of the uniformed visitors: ‘One sees many officers of the People's Army wandering around the exhibition. The sword cannot be completely blunted here either, otherwise the justification for the existence of these uniformed visitors would be denied. The defense against a capitalist war of aggression must of course be good and right. But there also needs to be a certain amount of military spirit, and so the civil functionaries of the SED eventually also have to swallow the Prussian armour.’ [Man sieht viele Offiziere der Volksarmee in der Ausstellung umherwandern. Man darf also das Schwert auch hier nicht absolut entschärfen, sonst würde man diesen uniformierten Besuchern ja die Daseinsberechtigung absprechen. Die Verteidigung gegen einen kapitalistischen Angriffskrieg muß selbstverständlich gut und recht sein. Aber auch dazu braucht man eben einen gewissen militärischen Geist, und so haben denn die zivilen Funktionäre der SED schließlich sogar noch das Preußische Zeughaus noch schlucken müssen.] ‘Lehrreicher Gang durchs Berliner Zeughaus,’ (DHM-HA: MDG/Zeitungsausschnitte/1957-58). The presence of uniformed East German soldiers at the museum, along with police and school groups, was also noted by the SPD Press Service (*Pressedienst*) in West Germany; *Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands* (SPD), ‘Das Zeughaus in Berlin,’ *Sozialdemokratischer Pressedienst* 10, no. 25, 1957, Available at http://www.digitalisiertedrucke.de/record/345758?ln=en [accessed 17 April 2012].


usual.'\textsuperscript{145} In the exhibition this translated into a series of comparative statistics, by which weapons were compared with goods characteristic of the livelihood of the peasantry. An example from the exhibition manuscript reads: ‘Schematic diagram with drawings: Value of the war armaments of a knight. 33 Solidi = 33 Cows.’\textsuperscript{146}

This was more than a mere rationalisation of the use of weapons as key research and exhibition pieces. Although strongly influenced by the socialist worldview and its corresponding research priorities, particularly the economic and production contexts of the objects and the need to provide evidence of social relations and the struggle of the people against exploitation, the expanded opportunities for the interpretation and display of the objects were significant. The result was an exhibition centred on a rich collection of original pieces that were viewed against a number of contexts, utilising a variety of secondary material and interpretive aids and drawing on a range of museum techniques (Fig. 6.13). These were not novel, but rather developed from existing strategies used by other museum types. A comprehensive museal approach was, however, quite a new means of contextualising the Zeughaus collections.

The structure of the exhibition was chronological; commencing with the Battle of the Teutoburg Forest, though a very small introductory section presented the weapons of pre-historic ‘primitive communist’ (\textit{urkommunitsisch}) communities to show war as a development of class society.\textsuperscript{147} It concluded in 1917/18. The latter clearly signed the ideological framework of the exhibition, with 1917 presented as the ‘birth of the armed forces of the workers and peasants’ and an ‘army of a new type’,\textsuperscript{148} and the German November Revolution subordinated under the larger heading of “The Great Socialist October Revolution.”\textsuperscript{149} As in the permanent exhibition, the more

\textsuperscript{147} Wall text per “Waffen in der Urgesellschaft, Wand 1, Leittext,” in “Manuskript und Durchschlag des illustrierten Drehbuches, Waffen und Uniformen in der Geschichte,” (DHM-HA: MfDG/277 (Rot), Bl. 1).
\textsuperscript{149} The November Revolution is not mentioned in the catalogue text for the exhibition, which concludes with the section, “The Great Socialist October Revolution 1917,” though it does list a number of objects, which were included in the presentation of the German events. The exhibition featured two German guns, a painting of the sailors’ uprising by Günter Schulte (1954), a photograph of a naval ship in port in Hamburg under the red flag, another of armed workers in Berlin, Unter den Linden, and a small vitrine containing a postcard, a copy of Wilhelm II’s abdication, a flyer, a caricature, and a red arm band. These were accompanied by three revolutionary flags, one of which featured Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht. The display was, however very modest in comparison with the presentation of the Russian Revolution and many newspaper articles actually reported the conclusion of the chronological exhibition in 1917. It is also worth noting
recent history was subject to a higher degree of scrutiny and political control, but the periodisation was also a function of object availability. Earlier concepts had taken the chronology up to the present, but as reported in the preliminary remarks to a later draft proposal, the museum held absolutely no weapons beyond 1918 and efforts to procure more recent items had proven fruitless. It was thus deemed undesirable to conclude such an object-rich exhibition with a predominantly paper-based presentation.

Figure 6.13: The contextualization of the weapons collections using a variety of objects and interpretive aids including models and graphics, Weapons and Uniforms in History, MfDG, 1957 (DHM-HA: HA 16(1), F57/1762)

that the relative weight of each of these events was a matter of debate during the preparation of the exhibition, with Meusel, for instance, arguing for a greater German focus. The visual evidence as well as the number of objects and amount of text detailed in the manuscript for the exhibition suggest that the November Revolution was certainly present in the exhibition, but that it was secondary to the presentation of the events in Russia the previous year. For the section description in the exhibition catalogue; ibid. pp. 132-133. The exhibition manuscript and images per; “Manuskript und Durchschlag des illustrierten Drehbuches, Waffen und Uniformen in der Geschichte,” (DHM-HA: MfDG/277 (Rot), Bl. 225-229); Photo No. F58/2141 and F58/2140, (DHM-HA: HA16 (2)). Meusel’s comments regarding the November Revolution per "Abteilungsleiter-Besprechung am 13.3.1957,” (DHM-HA: MfDG/226 (Rot)/unnumbered).

150 Earlier exhibition proposal concluding with the section “1917 to the present,” in "Militaria-Ausstellung: Historische Waffen und Uniformen,” undated, (DHM-HA: MfDG/036/BL 33-53). Comments regarding the unavailability of objects per “Vorbemerkungen zum Drehbuch der Militaria-Abteilung,” undated, (DHM-HA: MfDG/036/BL 31). The head of the Collection Department, Rolf Kiau, also noted that the conclusion of the exhibition was dependent on the availability of material in a meeting in March 1957; “Sitzung vom 13.3.1957” (DHM-HA: MfDG/226 (Rot)/unnumbered).

The exhibition was essentially divided into four sections, the above-mentioned "Weapons in Pre-history" notwithstanding, clearly reflecting the stages of historical development per the Marxist-Leninist interpretation. They were; "Warfare in the feudal society," "The army system in capitalism," "Imperialism and War," and the aforementioned "The Great Socialist October Revolution." These built the frame for the portrayal of a series of battles, of which those indicated above—1525, 1813/15, 1848, 1917/18—but also the French Revolution, were singled out for particular praise as the armed actions of the people. The geographic expansion of the parameters of the historical image westward, with the French Revolution taking a far greater role in the progressive development sequence than it had in the permanent exhibition, was consciously tempered by the need to ensure it did not eclipse the museal presence of the Russian Revolution. Large paintings and colour images (mostly graphic prints, commissioned paintings, and reproductions, but also a number of originals including the restored “Lange Kerls” that had belonged to the Zeughaus collections) were utilised to indicate, in Müller's words, the 'leitmotif' for each of the rooms (Fig. 6.14).

The rooms themselves featured an array of objects and aids in addition to the arms and armour, colours and standards, medals and decorations, and (from the end of the seventeenth century onwards) uniforms, that formed the core Zeughaus collections. Additional material included prints and engravings, the above-mentioned statistic diagrams, maps, books, documents, flyers, busts and sculptures (mostly casts), tools, applied arts, numerous scale models, and for later periods photographs and posters, as well as a series of detailed battlefield dioramas. The largest of these measured sixteen square meters and contained over 3,500 tin figures assembled to show the tactics of the Thirty Years War. The dioramas were felt to be a particularly useful pedagogical tool. This was not entirely new; battle dioramas had been an important aspect of the Engineering and Model Collections from the 1880s, and new dioramas had been incorporated into the World War exhibitions during the National Socialist era (as discussed in chapters 3 and 4).


153 Müller, 'Waffen und Uniformen in der Geschichte,' p. 32.


155 Müller, 'Waffen und Uniformen in der Geschichte,' p. 32.

156 The Zeughaus collections were also supplemented by loan items of original material for the exhibition.

157 Müller, 'Waffen und Uniformen in der Geschichte,' p. 33. All of the dioramas presented in the exhibition were loan items.

158 Ibid.
In addition to the chronological sequence of battles, the exhibition included thematic sections designed to provide the contextualisation for the origins of war in the social order, the character and motives of war, and, according to the catalogue the 'the connection between the status of the productive forces, the social structure and the organization of the army, its training, tactics, ideology, and fighting strength.'\textsuperscript{159} These included subsections detailing the historical development and structure of the armed forces and warfare, socio-economic factors and their relationship to weapons production.\textsuperscript{160}

The exhibition also presented specific classes of weapons together, focusing on the traditional elements of technical and artistic development.\textsuperscript{161} A particular feature of these thematic sections, which is illustrative of the use of established museum techniques that nonetheless


\textsuperscript{161} ["Prunkwaffen – Meisterwerke der Waffenschmiedkunst," "Die Entwicklung der Feuerwaffen," "Perkussions-Handfeuerwaffen," and "Mehrladegeräte, Maschinenwaffen, Schnellfeuergeschütze." ]
represented a radical shift in the way in which the Zeughaus objects were conceived and presented, was the inclusion of period rooms. In order to demonstrate the social and economic context of weapons production and changes in production methods, and to draw the worker into the narrative, the exhibition featured three reconstructed manufacturing sites; a sixteenth-century armourer’s workshop, a nineteenth-century gun factory, and the workshop of a gunsmith from the end of the nineteenth century (Fig. 6.15).

![Figure 6.15: Reconstruction of a sixteenth-century armour workshop, Weapons and Uniforms in History, MDG 1957 (DHM-HA: HA 16(2), F58/1683)](image)

"The red come-back of the famous Berlin Zeughaus": West German responses

With over one thousand objects listed in the exhibition catalogue, of which only the weapons and uniforms, not the artworks, dioramas, models, or associated material were counted, Weapons and Uniforms was a significant special exhibition that and in many ways represented a trial-run for the inclusion of the militaria collections into the future permanent exhibitions. Beyond the immediate military goals, the exhibition also served a set of less tangible aims for the museum—as a showcase of the re-established Zeughaus treasures. Before an assembled West German Press, invited by the

---

museum for a special preview ahead of the exhibition opening, management spoke of the rescue, safeguarding, and painstaking restoration of the Zeughaus holdings. They announced they had been able to salvage 120 decorative cannons slated for destruction, twenty-five of which were on display including the “Golden Cannon” (1643) and the “Wild Man” (1586). They also reiterated the continued retention of collections in Wiesbaden (military orders and decorations), directly appealing to the West German press for assistance in their return from the “grip” of the Americans, while more gently expressing the hope that the medieval masterpieces taken to Moscow might someday be returned.

Indeed, the museum had been appealing through official channels for the return of the Zeughaus collections for some time. In April 1955 Ullman had written directly to the Department for Science and Propaganda of the Central Committee, providing a list of objects “safeguarded” by the Soviet occupation powers and requesting assistance in their return. ‘The list generally contains the so-called “highlights” of the former Zeughaus,’ he wrote, ‘that is those pieces, that have provided the Zeughaus a world reputation, and that we would gladly have in our possession again for the same reasons.’ In 1957, the invited press was told of the targeted re-building of the collections with the acquisition of significant private collections, including orders and decorations from the estate of Prussian army reformer Hermann von Boyen, designed to help fill some of the gaps left by the devastation of the war, while a small model Fokker fighter plane was described as an “ersatz” for the original aeroplanes of Richthofen and Boelcke that once graced the Zeughaus foyer.

One of the aims of the exhibition was thus to communicate the museum’s possession of and care for the valuable Zeughaus collections, which became an important aspect of its institutional identity and a conduit through which it sought to establish a degree of legitimacy in the eyes of the international museum world, and more significantly, the West German public. The former it achieved thanks to the significance of the re-established collections and the scholarly reputation of its staff built over a number of decades, most importantly the head of the Sector Militaria (later head of the Department

---
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Feudalism), Heinrich Müller. The latter was more problematic, as the West German responses to the exhibition reveal.

A review of West German press reports indicates a wide range of responses, some of which, though positive, ran counter to the museum’s intentions and uncover a complex relationship between the site and its collections in the memory of the broader Berlin public. Some western newspapers specifically targeted the propagandistic elements of the exhibition, focussing exclusively on the SED military aims, while others welcomed the re-emergence of the collections after so many years of silence regarding their whereabouts, praising the factual selection and classification of the objects (as well as the knowledge of museum guides) in spite of the overarching ideological frame, and recalling fondly the familiar Zeughaus treasures. Der Kurier, while acknowledging the ideological content, particularly in the more recent historical sections, went so far as to exclaim, ‘Berlin is one museum richer,’168 while Die Welt wrote of ‘a pleasant reunion with an old traditional museum.’169

This “reawakening” of memories of the old Zeughaus,170 without a hint of reflection on the role of the museum in imperial and National Socialist militarism, points to the dichotomy between the intended function of the exhibition, as enacted in the catalogue and exhibition texts, and the possibility for alternative readings, something that Müller pointed out many years later when he wrote that the ideological content was far more prevalent in the catalogue and commentary than in the exhibition itself.171 This disjunction is perhaps best summed up by Die Welt, which told its readers, ‘the visitor, so long as he knows the Zeughaus from before, comes with old memories and in his search for familiar exhibition pieces will only slowly become aware of the new subject matter,’172 Or, in the words of the Frankfurter Allgemeine; ‘The medieval armour originates from the famous collections of the old Berlin Zeughaus, the commentary from the slogan-archive of the Agitprop department of the Unity Party.’173

---

171 Müller, Vom Arsenal zum Museum, p. 244.
Weapons and Uniforms remained on display in the Zeughaus for just under one year, closing towards the end of August 1958. It then toured to the Kulturhistorisches Museum Magdeburg and the Festung Königstein, where it remained until October 1963. Throughout the museum’s history, the Zeughaus collections continued to play an important role in the institutional identity, exhibition practice, research output, and international standing of the MfDG. Key exhibitions utilising the collections included Historical Helmets (10.12.1964 – 20.06.1965), Medieval Weapons (as a travelling exhibition 1965-1968), Weapons and Warfare in Feudalism (23.11.1971 – 23.01.1972, and travelling until November 1976), and European Cutting and Thrusting Weapons (19.11.1986 – 22.03.1987), while a number of smaller “Hand-Firearms” exhibitions travelled domestically during the 1960s and 1970s. These exhibitions and the collections more generally also formed the basis for a number of popular and specialist publications, many of which continued to be supported by the military publishing house. Along with the developed poster collections, militaria became one of two main pillars of the museum’s collections in terms of their national and international significance and the museum built scholarly connections well beyond the eastern block thanks to the value of the collections and the reputation of its researchers.

Weapons and Uniforms was the MfDG’s largest and most significant exhibition of the Zeughaus collections and the only one in which the militaria collections were placed at the centre of a narrative encompassing the span of German history. It was also, arguably, the most comprehensive exhibition to date in terms of the richness and diversity of its museal presentation, offering a range of material, a complex structure, and diverse approaches that combined thematic and historical foci to contextualise the weapons in terms of political, social, cultural, technical, and economic developments. It also sat at an interesting point in terms of the development of a socialist

---

174 This exhibition travelled to Hungary, showing at the National Museum in Budapest (25.02.1972 – 25.03.1972) and the Museum of the City of Guyla (08.04.1972 – 29.05.1972), before returning to the GDR, where it was mounted at the Schloßbergmuseum Karl-Marx-Stadt (25.22.1972 – 07.04.1973) and the Festung Königstein (10.04.1973 – 12.10.1973). After a three-year break, an exhibition of the same name was revived for the Military Museum in the Belgrade Fortress (06.10.1976 – 04.11.1976). It is not possible within the scope of this thesis to determine the overlap between the exhibitions staged between 1971-1973 and the revived exhibition sent to Belgrade.


museum practice in the GDR, gracing the cover of the GDR’s first specialist museum journal, *Neue Museumskunde* (1958-1991), which emerged as an important platform for professional exchange both within the GDR and across the broader socialist museum landscape. The final chapter deals with the development of a socialist museum practice, its theoretical and practical dimensions, and the realisation of the final permanent exhibitions in 1981 and 1984, as a reflection of the developed socialist museology.
Chapter 7. Theory and practice: the museum and museology, 1953-89/90

Towards a socialist museology

There were a number of key issues pertinent to the development of a new socialist museum practice in the GDR over the period from the mid-1950s through to the eve of the peaceful revolution. Far from a homogenous field of interest, discourse on museology—both its applied and theoretical aspects—varied across time and among participants, reflecting unresolved terminological differences, varying interpretations of the methodological foundation of museum work, different emphases for the priorities, role and function of museums, and shifting practical and theoretical influences, particularly from the 1970s when GDR museums began to engage in a broader discourse on the international stage via active membership in ICOM and its international sub-committees. While opinion remained somewhat diversified, there was a conscious attempt across the period to establish a set of common parameters for East German Museums, to define the status of the field of museology, and above all, to establish a theoretical and methodological framework that could apply to all museums, regardless of the specificity of their collections or their tasks. Working alongside this, but also asserting its own priorities, was the museological discourse specific to the history museum, to which the Museum for German History and its representatives were central.

Efforts to develop a theoretical and methodological framework for the GDR museums had not yet been concluded when the state collapsed in 1989/90, however significant progress had been made, both in terms of the definition of a Marxist-Leninist museology and the practical application of new and effective exhibition methods, the professionalization of the sector, and the care of cultural property. This was simultaneously a reflection of a particular East German discourse (due to the influence of specific SED directives, the establishment of centralised museological institutions, and the GDR museums’ relationship to their West Germany counterparts), the broader connections between museum professionals and theorists within the socialist world stemming from institutional partnerships, scholarly exchange, and state-level cultural agreements, and the complex interaction between the discourse and developments in the “capitalist world” and those of the socialist museums.

This chapter aims to provide an outline of the most significant stages in the development of a socialist museology in the GDR and the relevant theoretical discussions, focussing on the role of
the museum and museology, collecting and exhibition practice, rather than specialised areas such as pedagogy, marketing, conservation, and storage—though it is important to remember that education as a broad aim informed all areas of museum practice and was a significant factor in the goals and activities of the MfDG throughout. Indeed, the broader-level connection between the historical sciences and education goals in the GDR was also reflected in the core perception of the MfDG and its role in the construction of a socialist consciousness through the mediation of the Marxist-Leninist historical image. But while specific pedagogical programmes and partnerships with schools, adult education facilities, the military, and mass organisations were vitally important to the museum work, these activities are beyond the scope of this thesis.

Instead, this chapter illustrates the particular role of the Museum for German History and its representatives in the shaping of museological discourse at the national, socialist international, and international level, focusing on material relating to the broad-level theoretical foundations of a socialist museum practice and the particular discourse on history museums, including the relationship between history museums and the historical sciences more generally. Discussions specific to other museum types—art museums, natural history museums, applied arts, anthropological and “folk” museums, museums of technology, literature, and theatre—cannot be considered here for reasons of space. Likewise, the specialist historical museum category of memorial museums, though significant, cannot be addressed. Again, it should be noted that the MfDG played an active role in defining the memorial landscape through its participation in the establishment of memorial sites and museums of the German labour movement, anti-fascist resistance, and socialism (including the semi-permanent memorial exhibition “Lenin in Berlin” in the Zeughaus), as well the significant contribution of its staff to scholarship in this area.¹ This aspect of the institutional history of the MfDG requires further attention for which these publications as well as the house archive of the German Historical Museum provide a rich source of material for future scholars.

An examination of the final permanent exhibitions of the MfDG, opened in 1981 and 1984, provides a useful comparison to the early museum work for an assessment of how the developed museological theory was applied in concrete terms. The following sections also consider the shifting priorities for the historical sciences, intimately linked to the increased importance of museums during the 1970s with changes to the national concept precipitated by the process of détente, the emergence of contemporary history as a key priority, and the construction of the “Erbe und Tradition” (heritage and tradition) concept, as well as the implications of these developments for the definition of national history.

The emergence of a new museum practice in the GDR, 1953-71

To begin a discussion on socialist museology is firstly to acknowledge the historical specificity of the term “museology” itself. The German context is complicated by the language, which allows for greater differentiation than the common English-language distinction between “museum practice” (sometimes “museography”), and “museology” or “museum studies.” Various terms have been utilised in their historical context throughout this thesis, with the original German provided where clarification has been warranted, however a brief summary here of the key East German terminology will assist in understanding how shifts in language also reflected the changing status of museums as a field of scientific interest. Primarily, the differentiation between four key terms is important, namely Museumswesen, the nature or system of museums, Museumskunde, the traditional term for the study of museums against which the GDR began to develop a distinctive notion of Museumswissenschaft, or museum science, and Museologie, a term originating in the second half of the nineteenth century, but which only really came to prominence in the GDR during the mid 1970s, and which remained very much in debate. Though Museumskunde, Museumswissenschaft, and Museologie are all listed as the German translations for the English “Museology” in ICOFOM’s 2009 publication, Key Concepts of Museology, they have held distinctive theoretical and political emphases in the East German context over time. The term Museographie (museography) is not used in the East German literature. For practical aspects of museum work the terms Museumsarbeit, literally museum work, and Museumstätigkeit, museum activity or practice, are relatively interchangeable.

---

2 International Council of Museums et al., ‘Key Concepts of Museology’.
3 Rolf Kiau and Institut für Museumswesen, Kleines Wörterbuch des Museumswesens (Berlin: Institut für Museumswesen, 1975), p. 52.
5 Kiau and Institut für Museumswesen, Kleines Wörterbuch des Museumswesens, p. 43.
One of the first significant museum texts to emerge in the early years of the GDR dealt precisely with this practical component. Gertrud Rudloff-Hille’s *Hilfsbuch der Museumsarbeit (Handbook of Museum Work, 1953)* covered a number of pragmatic aspects of museum work including the layout and hierarchy of exhibition texts, inventorisation, conservation, storage, and security—in turn dealing with five primary categories of museum identified as art, scientific, labour, memorial, and *Heimat* museums. Less than a decade after the end of the Second World War, this book spoke to the practical necessities of a museum sector still profoundly affected by loss and destruction and in many cases still dealing with provisional workspaces and physical re-building. It was also a period of extraordinary museum growth, with the transformation of old and creation of new *Heimat* museums across the GDR, something that also places the “model” character of the MfDG into context. Reflecting these changes was Rudloff-Hille’s call for a far-reaching renewal of museums because they were unable to meet the expectations of a new set of visitors, namely workers.

Above all, this was a view of museums firmly centered on popular education, in which all activities should bear a direct relationship to the people, making both collections and scholarship relevant and accessible (understandable) to the broadest population, particularly the youth. The scientific character of museums should not be lost in this process; rather museums should shift their emphasis to the visitor and make their material more effective. Identifying three fundamental tasks for the museum as collecting (and preservation), research, and exhibiting, the handbook repeatedly emphasised the value of original objects and their centrality to museum work. Explanatory material such as diagrams, graphic statistics, and models should be used to supplement original objects, not in their stead.

This last point was a also a key message of the 1955 Soviet publication, *Foundations of Soviet Museology* (Основы советского музееведения), which sought to identify and clarify the specific

---

8 Though the MfDG, as the “central” history museum of the GDR was essentially a nationally oriented institution, the relationship between the *Heimat* and the national idea had always been an intimate one. The MfDG has even been referred to as a *Heimat* museum for the nation. In many ways the museum’s “leading role” with relation to the presentation of history should be seen in the context of the developing network of *Heimat* museums. On the enactment of *Heimat* for the development and strengthening of a GDR national identity; Jan Palmowski, *Inventing a socialist nation: Heimat and the politics of everyday life in the GDR, 1945-1990*, New studies in European history. (Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009). On the longer connections between German national identity and *Heimat* museums; Confino, ‘The Nation as a Local Metaphor,’ pp. 42-86; Confino, *Germany as a culture of remembrance*.
10 Ibid. p. 10, p. 49.
11 Ibid. p. 29.
nature of the Soviet museum, the classification of museum objects, the role and function of specific museum types, and the priorities and methods for the construction of exhibitions.\textsuperscript{12} While it identified the original object—the ‘primary source of knowledge’—as the “specific” of the museum, that which set it apart from other cultural institutions and the reason for its existence, it also placed great weight on the exhibition as the manifestation of the popular scientific work of museums, and its role in determining the content of scientific work as well as collecting practice.\textsuperscript{13} Underpinning all museum activities was the theory of Marxism-Leninism, which represented the principle difference between the Soviet museum and its bourgeois counterpart. ‘The exhibitions tackle the task,’ it stated, ‘to draw the connections between the objects and phenomena, to uncover causes and effects.’\textsuperscript{14} Strongly criticising a prior tendency to allow secondary material to replace original objects as the prime focus of exhibitions (the result of a “false view” propagated at the 1930 Soviet museum congress which placed processes above objects as the core element of exhibitions), the handbook nonetheless argued for the building of meaningful groups of objects coupled with supplementary material in order to show mutual connections and to meet the needs of scientific education for the masses.\textsuperscript{15}

Translated and edited as \textit{Contributions to Soviet Museum Studies (Beiträge zur sowjetischen Museumskunde)}, the handbook was made available to East German practitioners as part of the series \textit{Technical-Methodological Instruction for work in the Heimat museums (Fachlich-Method. Anleitung für die Arbeit in den Heimatmuseen)}, conceived by the Special Department for \textit{Heimat Museums (Fachstelle für Heimatmuseen)} in 1960. The department itself had been established in Halle (Saale) in 1954 under the newly founded Ministry for Culture and the leadership of Heinz Knorr, a significant figure in the GDR museum landscape who produced guides to inventarisation and collecting (1958) and exhibition development (1960), and a handbook of museums and scientific collections in the GDR (1963) under the aegis of the \textit{Fachstelle}.\textsuperscript{16} While predominantly practical works, Knorr identified a number of priorities for the GDR’s regional museums including the

\textsuperscript{13} [‘Primärquellen des Wissens’] ibid. quote p. 26.
\textsuperscript{14} [‘Die Ausstellungen nahmen die Aufgaben in Angriff, die Zusammenhänge zwischen den Gegenständen und den Erscheinungen zu ziehen, und Ursache und Wirkung aufzudecken.’] ibid. p. 22.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
exhibition as the core of museum work (as per the 1960 "Foundational Principles for the socialist reorganisation of the Heimat Museums in the GDR"), and the inadequacy of current collections to meet the requirements for the formation of socialist culture.

As the central agency for the coordination, organisation, technical and methodological leadership of the GDR's local history and cultural museums, the Fachstelle reached beyond the regional level via its publications, in particular Neue Museumskunde (for which Knorr acted as the founding editor), which was conceived as a forum for exchange between museum professionals and technicians and for critical discussion about the tasks and methods, theoretical foundations, and practical possibilities for museums in the GDR. As Dieter Reisenberger has pointed out, the publication both drew a connection with the established journal of the German Museum Federation, Museumskunde (1905-1939), and consciously distanced itself from the earlier publication, particularly in its handling of the social and political function of museums. Museumskunde was revived in West Germany in 1960, two years after the establishment of its East German counterpart.

Also in 1954, the same year the Fachstelle commenced work, the first technical college for museum practitioners was established. Beginning as the Technical College for Museum Assistants (Fachschule für Museumsassistenten) in Köthen (Anhalt), it was the forerunner of the Technical College for Museologists (Fachschule für Museologen), situated in Leipzig from 1966 with subjects in natural, social, and cultural history alongside museum-specific topics including museum history, management, design, pedagogy, and palaeography. The Fachschule was at once a response to the cultural-political requirements laid out at the Second Party Conference of the SED (1952), and the acute lack of trained personnel with which to carry out the socialist transformation of the GDR museums. Though the education initiatives were also clearly designed to meet ideological and political goals, between them the Fachstelle and the Fachschule represented a significant contribution to the technical training of museum personnel, the dissemination of museum-specific
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17 ["Grundsätze über die sozialistische Umgestaltung der Heimatmuseen in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik"]
19 Knorr, '10 Jahre Aufbau des Heimatmuseumswesens,' p. 5; Udo Rösslöing, 'Then and now in the German Democratic Republic,' Museum International, XLII, no. 4, 1990, p. 201.
20 Reisenberger, 'Entwicklung und Bedeutung der Geschichtsmuseen in der DDR,' p. 479.
23 Reisenberger, 'Entwicklung und Bedeutung der Geschichtsmuseen in der DDR,' pp. 484-486.
literature, both practical and theoretical, and the building of museum partnerships, particularly among local and regional museums.

Despite these initiatives the need for better coordination across the whole museum sector and a broad-based theoretical frame within which all museums could work was identified in the mid-1960s, prompted by internal discussion as well as the requirements set out by the VI Party Congress of the SED (15-21 January 1963), which set forth the ‘comprehensive construction of socialism’ at the material, cultural, and intellectual level, and called for higher performance from science and technology to help realise greater productivity.24 This was part of the SED’s broader economic reform programme (the New Economic System) aimed at stemming industrial decline, which the building of the Berlin Wall on 13 August 1961 had failed to rectify despite its effectiveness against “Republikflucht”. The obvious consequence of both the new physical barrier between the GDR and FRG and the economic and other changes that came about in the 1960s, was a more pronounced separation of the GDR from the West. Against this background, the SED leadership identified the development of socialist personalities, patriotism, and the willingness to defend socialism among its goals for the consciousness and morality of the people.25 In response, GDR museum professionals called for a fundamental transformation of the total museum system according to the scientific requirements and political tasks of the “new era.”26 The first step towards this, published as a special supplement of Neue Museumskunde in the third quarter of 1964, concentrated on the development of theses towards a “museum science” (Museumswissenschaft).27

Conceived primarily as a springboard for further discussion, the published theses identified four key areas for theoretical consideration; scientific documentation (the commonality and specificity of the museum among the documentary sciences—archive, library, and museum sciences); the system and definition of museum science (including such questions as “What is a museum?” along with the definition of the science itself, its object of research, its methodology, and the social function museums); the research, collecting, and education tasks of the museum (the nature of the museum collection, preservation of objects, the scope of education work, and the requirements for museum exhibitions); and the organisation of the museum system (chiefly,

27 Ibid. pp. 3-28.
identifying the need for the creation of a unified system of documentation and the training of museum workers).\textsuperscript{28} In addition, the problem of terminology was addressed, with definitions provided for some twenty museum-specific terms, including the differentiation between original objects (\textit{originale Sachzeugen}), understood as the ‘written, material, artistic, as well as acoustic (conserved) results and witnesses of the objective development processes of nature and social life’, and museum objects (\textit{museale Sachzeugen}), a portion of those original objects belonging to the documentation realm of the museum (as opposed to the archive or library).\textsuperscript{29} In line with its Soviet counterparts, the commission also identified original objects as primary sources of knowledge; a value not afforded to helping material (models, graphics, drawings, texts).\textsuperscript{30}

Museum science, as conceived here, was concerned with the tasks of the museum and their systematisation and generalisation on the basis of dialectical and historical materialism into theoretical doctrines.\textsuperscript{31} It saw the object of its research and the specificity of its methodology in original objects—their documentation value as the “results” of given development processes, their effective evaluation and research, the conditions for their preservation, and their ability to communicate within the total context of the exhibition.\textsuperscript{32} Given the specific differentiation of its subject and methodology, museum science was thus conceived as an independent science, though it was based on the general methodology of dialectical and historical materialism and must also make use of the results of other scientific disciplines.\textsuperscript{33} Though it directly opposed “bourgeois museum studies,” critics later remarked that the concept offered no new scientific system, and that ‘the proposed content-structure still basically corresponded to the teaching system of the old “Museumskunde”, being ‘oriented to institutional aspects as before.’\textsuperscript{34}

For his part, Erwin Gülzow of the Museum for German History provided a separate contribution, dealing specifically with historical museums and the question of the presentation of lawful historical processes and phenomena with museal means.\textsuperscript{35} Gülzow placed the emphasis back

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{29} ['Unter den Terminus ORIGINALE SACHZEUGEN werden alle schriftlichen, gegenständlichen, bildlichen sowie akustischen (konservierten) Ergebnisse und Zeugnisse objektiver Entwicklungsprozesse der Natur und des gesellschaftlichen Lebens verstanden.'] Ibid. pp. 20-21.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid. p. 21, 23.
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid. pp. 11-15.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid. p. 12.
\textsuperscript{34} ['…die vorgeschlagene Inhaltsstruktur entsprach im wesentlichen noch der Lehrsystematik der traditionellen “Museumskunde” und war mit ihren sechs Hauptthemen nach wie vor auf den institutionellen Aspekt orientiert. ‘] Arbeitsgruppe Museologie beim Wissenschaftlichen Beirat für die Museen des Ministeriums für Hoch- und Fachschulwesen and Ave, Museologie. Diskussionsmaterial, p. 20.
onto the exhibition rather than the object as the main concern of the museum, and also stressed the
closeness of historical museums to the historical sciences. ‘The essential difference between the
historical scientific work with regard to the presentation of the history of the German people and
the work of the history museum’, he wrote, ‘consists in the choice of medium of demonstration. The
history museum and the historical exhibition use predominantly original historical objects for
presentation, while the historical sciences utilise predominantly the written word for this
purpose.’36 The reluctance of the MfDG to subscribe to a theory of museum science as an
independent field of study reflects its core position, articulated by Ingo Materna for UNESCO’s
Museum journal in 1977, that: ‘The museum was conceived from the outset as a historical
institution. Its theory and method stems from the principles of historical materialism, while its tasks
are performed with the means proper to a museum.’37

This is an important distinction because it speaks not only to the view of history museums
as a branch of the historical sciences, but also to the role of the curator as researcher and exhibition
maker in relation to centrally planned historical work. According to the Marxist-Leninist view, the
role of the historian is not simply to interpret history, but to actively participate in the class
struggle.38 As a Marxist party, the SED’s coordination and supervision of the historical sciences, not
only via the selection of themes and directions for historical research, but also the determination of
conclusions to be drawn,39 was fully in keeping with its avowed role. This not only reconciled the
museum practitioners—publically at least—to the Party control of museum content, but was
promoted as a particular strength of the museum. ‘The success of the museum was above all thereby
possible,’ wrote Gregor Schirmer on the occasion of the MfDG’s twenty-fifth anniversary, ‘that it
always allowed itself to be led by the path-setting resolutions of our Party.’40 Put rather more subtly
for an international professional museum audience, Wolfgang Herbst later wrote;

The recognition that history is the science on which the history museum is grounded entails a
number of scientific (and sociological) consequences, which affect the range and diversity of

36 ['Der wesentlichen Unterschied zwischen der geschichtswissenschaftlichen Arbeit im Hinblick auf die Darstellung der
Geschichte des deutschen Volkes und der Arbeit des Geschichtsmuseums besteht in der Wahl der Mittel zur
Veranschaulichung. Das Geschichtsmuseum und die Geschichtsausstellung benutzen zur Darstellung vorwiegend originale
historische Sachzeugen, während die Geschichtswissenschaft dazu vorwiegend das geschriebene Wort verwendet.‘] ibid.
pp. 32-33.
40 ['Die Erfolge des Museums waren vor allem dadurch möglich, daß es sich stets von den richtungsweisenden Beschlüssen
Mitteilungen des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte, 4, 1977, p. 15.
the work involved in collecting and investigating historical objects and indeed the content of exhibitions.\textsuperscript{41}

While the museum entered into a lively discourse regarding the nature and specificity of museum research and other activities,\textsuperscript{42} it did so always within the parameters of the research and teaching plan and political-historical directives provided by the Party.

A re-assertion of disciplinary boundaries within museums more generally in reaction to the 1964 theses is one reason, according to Joachim Ave, long-time head of the MfDG’s pedagogical department, for their failure to generate the desired discourse.\textsuperscript{43} Nonetheless, a significant outcome called for by the commission was the foundation of the Museum Council (\textit{Rat für Museumswesen}) within the Ministry for Culture in April 1965 and the transformation of the Special Department for \textit{Heimat} Museums into the Institute for Museology (\textit{Institut für Museumswesen}), though the latter was not carried through until 1971 (below).\textsuperscript{44} As an advisory and coordinating organ, the Museum Council sought to facilitate the development of a unified socialist museum system—the formulation of scientifically founded perspective plans, the generalisation of museum methods, and the cultural-political cooperation of museums with other social organisations.\textsuperscript{45} It also assumed control of \textit{Neue Museumskunde} in 1966, resulting in a higher proportion of specialist and national contributions and a concomitant reduction in local and regional content.\textsuperscript{46}

Not to be confused with the Museum Council within the Culture Ministry was the National Museum Council of the GDR (\textit{Nationaler Museumsrat der DDR}) founded in 1964 under the leadership of Johannes Jahn, director of the Museum of Fine Arts in Leipzig.\textsuperscript{47} Its task also lay in the improvement of the scientific, popular scientific, and cultural work of museums, but its focus was the development of international co-operation and in particular the establishment of the requirements for the GDR’s membership of the International Council of Museums (ICOM).\textsuperscript{48} This was

\textsuperscript{41} Wolfgang Herbst, 'New developments in the science of history and their impact on history museums,' \textit{Museum}, XXXIX, no. 213, 1977, p. 61.
\textsuperscript{43} Arbeitsgruppe Museologie beim Wissenschaftlichen Beirat für die Museen des Ministeriums für Hoch- und Fachschulwesen and Ave, \textit{Museologie. Diskussionsmaterial}, p. 20.
\textsuperscript{44} Miethe and Thesenkommission zur Museumswissenschaft, 'Diskussionsbeiträge zur Museumswissenschaft. 1.,' p. 20; Kian, '15 Jahre Rat für Museumswesen,' p. 87; 'Schätze sollen nicht verstauben. Eindrücke von einer Arbeitskonferenz der Museumsfachleuten in Berlin,' \textit{Neue Zeit}, 17 December 1964, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{45} Mückenburger, '20 Jahre Rat für Museumswesen,' p. 79.
\textsuperscript{46} Rössling, 'Then and now in the German Democratic Republic,' p. 201.
an important goal for the museums themselves, opening up opportunities for greater professional contact, though always within the limits of Party control of foreign information and travel.\textsuperscript{49} It was also of considerable symbolic value vis-à-vis the international recognition of the GDR. Indeed, it was in July 1968 at ICOM's Eighth General Assembly held in Munich and Cologne that the GDR National Committee of ICOM was founded (with Jahn as its president) and accepted as a full member of the council alongside the West German National Committee, which had held membership since 1953.\textsuperscript{50} This was a considerable feat given West Germany's active resistance to a second German national committee,\textsuperscript{51} and no doubt the decision caused some degree of embarrassment for the host country, as \textit{Neue Zeit} made clear:

That the recognition of the National Museum Council of the GDR and its acceptance as a full member of ICOM was carried out in Cologne of all places may naturally have some of the "sole representatives" on the banks of the Rhine up in arms; the General Assembly, however, did not let its decision be influenced by this.

\begin{quote}
[Daß diese Anerkennung des Nationalen Museumsrates der DDR und dessen Aufnahme als vollgütiges Mitglied in die ICOM ausgerechnet in Köln vollzogen wurde, mag naturgemäß so manchen "Alleinvertreter" an den Ufern des Rheins in Harnisch gebracht haben; davon ließ sich jedoch die Generalkonferenz in ihrer Entscheidung nicht beeinflussen.]\textsuperscript{52}
\end{quote}

East German museums and museum working groups had in fact engaged on the international level both within and beyond the socialist world prior to July 1968. For the Museum for German History this was a vital component of its development and practice. Commencing with its Soviet study tour in 1953, the MfDG established strong ties with a number of state-level museums in the Soviet Union, most significantly the State Historical Museum in Moscow, with which it negotiated a friendship agreement towards the end of the 1960s, the Central Revolution Museum, the Central Museum of the Armed Forces of the USSR, and the Central Lenin-Museum (Fig. 7.1).\textsuperscript{53} Further study tours facilitated contact between museum professionals as well as the exchange of material and exhibitions, and at the national level the return of cultural property from the Soviet Union in 1955 and 1958 (the latter including a substantial amount, but certainly not all, of the Zeughaus holdings), was billed as a symbolic act in the interest of the strengthening and further development of relations and the crowning of the Soviet efforts for the rescue of East Germany’s valuable art treasures.\textsuperscript{54} The MfDG also received objects from numerous other (mostly no longer

\begin{footnotes}
\item[51] Wanner, '60 Jahre ICOM Deutschland: Ursprung und Entwicklung,' p. 5-6.
\item[53] Uhlig, 'Die Zusammenarbeit des Museums,' p. 97.
\end{footnotes}
existing) collections as a result of the action, including holding from the former Hohenzollern Museum, something that has only contributed to the complications inherant in the collections.55

Exhibition exchange and co-production was a key element of international co-operation. In May 1958 *The Great German Peasant War* travelled to the National Museum in Prague, after which it toured seven Czech museums until December 1960. In exchange, the MfDG showed *The Revolutionary Hussite Movement* (12 April 1958 – 9 October 1958), and facilitated its tour to eleven city museums throughout the GDR (also until 1960).56 This was the first of many similar arrangements to take place throughout the history of the museum with partners in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. To a lesser extent communist countries

---


56 Quaas, König, and Deutsches Historisches Museum, *Verluste aus den Sammlungen des Berliner Zeughauses*, p. 8. The museum also made attempts to acquire collections from existing museums including the State Museums’ Applied Arts Museum, mounting a campaign based on the social value of its Marxist-Leninist interpretation of such objects and the important tasks of the museum in the development of historical consciousness, versus the Applied Arts Museum’s bourgeois approach based on aesthetic criteria rather than social meaning. Correspondence, various, 1959–62, (DHM-HA: MfDG/75 (Rot), unpaginated). On the ongoing complications of many of the collections acquired by the MfDG at this time; Interview with Dieter Vorsteher, 26 October 2010, DHM Verwaltungsgebäude, Am Zeughaus 2.

beyond Eastern Europe also exchanged objects and exhibitions with the MfDG, sometimes organised directly by national embassies in the GDR. These included Vietnam, North Korea, and Cuba.\footnote{57}

Many of the agreements between the MfDG and museums in the socialist world mirror state-level cultural agreements between the GDR and its allies.\footnote{58} An increased focus on museum partnerships from the mid-1960s reflects the GDR’s greater integration into the Soviet Bloc in parallel with further segregation from West Germany. At the broader level of exchange with the "capitalist world" museums were more restricted, particularly after 1961, when informal contact with West German colleagues was effectively cut off. While the MfDG had joined the International Association of Arms and Military History Museums in 1960 and deservedly earned recognition for its militaria collections and scholarship in the field, state-level ties created with ICOM recognition opened a platform for the museum to represent itself on the world stage and to contribute to practical and theoretical discussions. It also precipitated better access to information regarding national and international museum developments (including the ‘systematic evaluation of international museum literature’),\footnote{59} and the inauguration of a new quarterly publication, *Information for the Museums of the GDR (Informationen für die Museen der DDR)* in January 1969 under the editorship of Rolf Kiau, former head of the MfDG collections and now both secretary of the Museum Council and head of the Special Department for *Heimat* Museums.\footnote{60}

The further professionalization and coordination of museum work was also linked to a new set of requirements emerging in relation to museums alongside the idea of the GDR as a "developed socialist society." Constitutional changes in 1968 had enshrined the status of the GDR as a socialist democracy—something that was seen as a stable and long-term social formation, a significant shift from the 1949 formulation of a state ‘on the way to socialism.’\footnote{61} For the twentieth anniversary of the GDR in 1969 museums were expected to contribute to the ‘great mass initiative for the further

\footnote{57}China was never represented in a stand-alone special exhibition at the MfDG, though the museum did send a small exhibition to Peking as part of its mammoth activities for the tenth anniversary of the GDR in 1959.


\footnote{59} ‘[...systematische Auswertung Internationaler Museumsliteratur]’ Rolf Kiau, ‘Vorwort,’ *Informationen für die Museen in der DDR*, 1, no. 1, 1969.

\footnote{60}Importantly, the "Heimat" had been dropped from the department name for the first issue of the *Informationen*, though the department itself had not formally undergone a change in statute from that established in 1954.

strengthening of our socialist state',\textsuperscript{62} for which the Museum Council organised a series of specialist conferences designed to assist museums to more clearly identify their role and function and to define their priorities. The history museum conference, which included three speakers from the MfDG alongside guests from Warsaw, Bucharest, Sofia, and Moscow (the latter being prominent Soviet theorist A.M. Razgon), was held under the title "Consciousness Building and the tasks of history museums in the formation of the developed societal system of socialism in the GDR."\textsuperscript{63} The key priority identified was the presentation of contemporary history—the history of the SBZ/GDR from 1945 onwards—with the construction of socialism over the past two decades at the forefront.\textsuperscript{64} The inclusion of contemporary history had far reaching consequences. As Gerhard Thiele from the Ministry for Culture stated:

That is the main task, and its solution simultaneously means the re-organisation of the representation of the past. One cannot present the past without a view to the German Democratic Republic, and the history of the GDR cannot be presented without making clear its deep roots in the past epochs. 20 years GDR means a completely different view of the history of the German people. It is not just that something has changed. It is chapter II in the history of the German people.

That is the main task, and its solution simultaneously means the re-organisation of the representation of the past. One cannot present the past without a view to the German Democratic Republic, and the history of the GDR cannot be presented without making clear its deep roots in the past epochs. 20 years GDR means a completely different view of the history of the German people. It is not just that something has changed. It is chapter II in the history of the German people.

[Das ist die Schwerpunktaufgabe, und ihre Lösung bedeutet zugleich die Neuordnung der Darstellung der Vergangenheit. Man kann die Vergangenheit nicht darstellen ohne die Sicht auf die Deutsche Demokratische Republik, und die Geschichte der DDR ist nicht darstellbar ohne die Veranschaulichung ihrer tiefen Wurzeln in vergangenen Epochen. 20 Jahre DDR bedeuten eine völlig andere Sicht auf die Geschichte des deutschen Volkes. Es geht nicht allein darum, daß etwas anders geworden ist. Es ist das Kapitel II der Geschichte des deutschen Volkes.\textsuperscript{65}]

Difficulties inherent to this task included a deficit of contemporary collections, but it was hoped that the conference would act as a starting-point for the construction of contemporary history exhibitions.\textsuperscript{66}

The MfDG permanent exhibitions had been re-made in the step-by-step transition to the Zeughaus between 1962-67.\textsuperscript{67} Though the new exhibits included a post-war section, with 1945-49


\textsuperscript{63} This was also the title of Wolfgang Herbst's paper delivered at the conference. Gerhard Thiele, 'Schlußwort zur Tagung,' in Geschichtsmuseen und Bewußtseinbildung, ed. Rolf Kiau (Berlin: Institut für Museumswesen, 1970), p. 147; 'Museumdirektoren beraten. Gäste aus sechs Ländern in Berlin begrüßt,' Neue Zeit, 13 November 1969, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{64} Bork, 'Zur Eröffnung der Tagung der Geschichtsmuseen,' pp. 2-3.

\textsuperscript{65} Thiele, 'Schlußwort zur Tagung,' p. 147.

\textsuperscript{66} Bork, 'Zur Eröffnung der Tagung der Geschichtsmuseen,' pp. 2-4.

\textsuperscript{67} Director Alfred Meusel's had died in 1960 and was replaced by Walter Nimtz in 1963. The exhibition sections established during this period in the Zeughaus were: "1789 to 1871" opened 19 January 1962 to mark the tenth anniversary of the museum; "Germany 1933 to 1945" opened 7 May 1963, coinciding with the anniversary of liberation; "Germany 1945 to 1949" opened 2 October 1964, marking the fifteenth anniversary of the GDR; "German History from the turn of the century to 1919" opened 6 November 1965; "1919 to 1933" opened 21 October 1966; and "1871 to 1900" opened 24 July 1967. See; Museum für Deutsche Geschichte, 'Entwicklung der ständigen Ausstellungen des Museums für
displays opened for the fifteenth anniversary of the GDR in 1964, contemporary history itself was predominately dealt with via special exhibitions linked to commemorative events and anniversaries. The new displays also represented a fragmentation of the once-complete historical development sequence with the pre-and early history, medieval, and “early bourgeois revolution” exhibits remaining in the building on Clara-Zetkin-Straße and the periods from 1789 only making their way to Unter den Linden (Fig. 7.2).68

**Figure 7.2:** Floor plan for of the permanent exhibitions developed from 1962 in the Zeughaus (Museum for German History, *Lebendige Geschichte*, Druckerei Volkswacht, Gera, 1967, pp. 4-5)

The new Zeughaus exhibitions demonstrated a better integration of objects, graphics, models and other auxiliary material than the first displays, though in places outmoded techniques persisted (Fig. 7.3). They incorporated many of the techniques developed by the museum in the course of its special exhibition programme and via its professional exchange with socialist museums including the reconstruction of workshops, factories, and living quarters, often juxtaposed to show the conditions of workers versus the those of the bourgeoisie; as in the re-construction of a cramped

---

68 The Clara-Zetkin-Straße exhibits were also improved in stages, the first of which being an overhaul of the pre- and early history department in the second quarter of 1957. The section “Germany from 1933 to 1945” had been re-made in July 1961, though it too would be transferred to the Zeughaus in 1966, and the “Early Bourgeois Revolution” was re-designed in 1963 but was closed the following year, leaving “Primitive society” and “Middle Ages” in the “temporary” accommodation. See; Museum für Deutsche Geschichte, *Lebendige Geschichte*, pp. 4-7; p. 28; Museum für Deutsche Geschichte, ‘Entwicklung der ständigen Ausstellungen ’ pp. 130-131.
worker’s kitchen at the turn of the twentieth century, which was contrasted with a bourgeois dining room, complete with an equestrian figurine of the much-maligned Friedrich the Great (Fig. 7.4 and 7.5). That the exhibits had been created and installed over an extended period of time also resulted in a lack of internal cohesion, particularly at the visual level. A marked difference in the quality of display techniques across the exhibition therefore left some sections looking decidedly dated, while others represented a well-developed museological offering. The inclusion of permanent contemporary displays, the revision of the periodisation to better reflect the development of German history as part of the (socialist) world-historical process, and the need to improve the integrity and effectiveness of the exhibition as a whole became increasingly important during the 1970s as a number of factors converged to place the museum’s contribution to the building of a socialist “national” consciousness at the fore.

Figure 7.3: Foundation of the GDR, “1945-1949” opened 1964 (DHM-HA: HA 60(2), F66/2796)

69 The periodization itself had significantly changed from that of the first exhibitions (now 1789-1871, 1871-1900, 1900-1919, 1919-1933, 1933-1945 and 1945-1949), and would prove inadequate in coming years.
Figure 7.4: Reconstructed worker's kitchen around 1900, MfDG permanent exhibition "1900-1919" opened 1965 (DHM-HA: HA 57(2), F65/2659)

Figure 7.5: Bourgeois dining room, MfDG permanent exhibition "1900-1919" opened 1965 (DHM-HA: HA 57(2), F65/2661)
“The Prussians are Coming”: nation and nationality / heritage and tradition

According to official GDR historiography the period from the VIII Party Congress in 1971, marking the advent of the Honecker-era and the so-called “unity of social and economic policy,” represented a major caesura—the starting point for a period in which the concept of the developed socialist society was fully and consciously realised. While, as Mary Fulbrook has rightly pointed out, this official break was largely overstated by Honecker in promotion of his own leadership (and 1961 should be seen as far more significant for the purpose of periodisation), the period does mark a turning point in the GDR’s national concept, something that was of vital significance for history museums. It was also the year in which the long-standing exhibition “1871—Questions of German History” opened in the Reichstag building, providing an impulse for the future German Historical Museum and a challenge to the MfDG, as well as a signal of the increasing desire in the Federal Republic to reclaim an “abandoned” national history. Over the course of the 1970s and 1980s, changes to the East German national concept also brought about a significant re-assessment of the historical image on which the nation rested. As Thiele had predicted, the changes in the present would require a reshaping of the past.

The most significant factor in the new national image was the shifting relationship between the two German states. Broad-level changes in policy between the western and Soviet powers, and in the Federal Republic following the election of a social-liberal coalition under Willy Brandt’s chancellorship in 1969, created the conditions for détente. With the Basic Treaty between the two Germanys completed in December 1972 and the subsequent “normalisation” of relations between the states came the long sought-after diplomatic recognition of the GDR but also a renewed threat from the “class enemy” next door. Against this backdrop the previously held definition of nationhood was re-visited, as the GDR sought to shore up its position against the FRG and finally abandoned the rhetoric of unity that had defined the national discourse for over two decades.

70Erich Honecker replaced Walter Ulbricht as First Secretary of the Central Committee of the SED at the Sixteenth Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee on 3 May 1971. Honecker’s appointment was officially announced at the VIII Party Congress (15-19 June 1971), at which he outlined a new economic programme under the concept of the “unity of economic and social policy.”


While this may have served representational goals at the international level, it was harder to explain domestically, and the resulting emphasis on the GDR as an independent socialist nation with its own national culture was not without a number of contradictions, particularly for an understanding of nationality; what it meant to be “German” in the GDR. Honecker called on history for his account at the Thirteenth Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee in December 1974, after the “two German nations” idea had been incorporated into constitutional amendments, emphasising the separate political and societal development of the two German states:

Firstly, the nation is a historical category. It cannot be viewed unchanged in the historical process or even as in a vacuum. Nations develop and change themselves dependent on the concrete historical conditions [...] We have always seen the dominating role in the social aspects of the national question.

[Zunächst ist Nation eine historische Kategorie. Sie kann nicht unverändert im geschichtlichen Wandel oder gar im luftleeren Raum betrachtet werden. Nationen entstehen und verändern sich in Abhängigkeit von den konkreten historischen Bedingungen. [...] Wir haben in den sozialen Aspekten der nationalen Frage stets die dominierende Rolle gesehen.]

Though the GDR had not always considered societal aspects as the determining factor in its national definition (see chapter 5), the supposition that the GDR had reached a stage of historical development beyond that of the FRG now became the rationale for its status as a separate nation. GDR citizens, on the other hand, were still German by nationality: ‘Our socialist state is called the German Democratic Republic because its citizens are in the vast majority German by nationality.’

Honecker’s explanation would require quite a bit of further clarification for the East German public, as Alfred Kosing, Head of Dialectical Materialism at the Institute for Marxist-Leninist Philosophy, and Walter Schmidt, Director of the Institute for the History of the German Labour Movement at the Academy of Social Sciences and head of the research group “Socialist Historical Consciousness,” attempted to do in February the following year. In a full-page article for Neues Deutschland, Kosing and Schmidt sought to elucidate the theoretical foundations of the nation/nationality problem for an understanding of societal development in the GDR and its relationship to the Federal Republic. Reiterating Honecker’s remarks about the historical contingency of nations and the determination of the being (Wesen) of the nation by the character of its social formation (economic, political, ideological, social), they went on to grapple with the

---

75 Importantly, the changes to the constitution in 1974 were made without the participation of the press or public, as had been the case in 1968. See; Roggemann, Die DDR-Verfassungen. Einführung in das Verfassungsrecht der DDR, pp. 60-80.
77 ‘Unser sozialistischer Staat heißt Deutsche Demokratische Republik, weil ihre Staatsbürger der Nationalität nach in der übergroßen Mehrheit Deutsche sind.’ ibid.
question of nationality, which they described as developing out of a territorially-determined common language and a ‘complex of ethnic traits, characteristics and features, such as specific cultural forms, habits, customs, and lifestyle.’

Emerging in concert of this view was the concept of “Erbe und Tradition” (heritage and tradition), for whose formation Schmidt was also a key protagonist. A significant historiographical revision, “heritage and tradition” found its greatest resonance in the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s, though its origins lie in the reconceptualization of the national image and the need to engender the population with a sense of national identification. The assertion of an ancestry for the GDR in the “progressive” traditions of the German past (revolutionary action, humanism, the labour movement, anti-fascism) had formed the backbone of the GDR’s official historical image from the early 1950s. This element of historiography remained relatively unchanged, but it was complicated by the addition of a more differentiated concept of “heritage,” which encompassed ‘the totality of the existing historical circumstances, relationships and ideas, the whole historical process with all its contradictions, progresses and setbacks, the deeds of the previous generations and their results.” While there were certainly nuances in the interpretation and application of the heritage-idea, by drawing on the whole of German history “heritage and tradition” allowed for the resurrection of previously maligned figures and their incorporation into the repertoire of GDR national history.

---

79 [Sie besitzt meist eine gemeinsame Sprache und ist durch einen charakteristischen Komplex ethnischer Züge, Eigenschaften und Merkmale, wie spezifische Kulturformen, Sitten, Gebräuche, Lebensgewohnheiten usw. verbunden.] Ibid.
81 Scholars in both East and West Germany have pointed to the end of the 1970s as the starting-point for the “Erbe und Tradition” discussion in the GDR, so in the immediate aftermath of the altered national concept. Earlier indications of the formation of the idea, particularly use of the term in connection with one of its central aspects, namely the appropriation of the “whole” of German history, can be found at the start of the decade, including Albert Norden’s reference to heritage and tradition as part of the unity on which socialist culture was based, in 1970. Alan Nothnagle even places the origins of the idea in the early 1960s, though it is clear that the concept was much more widely discussed and utilised in the public discourse in during the last decade of the GDR. See; Iggers, 'New Directions in Historical Studies,' pp. 66-67; Georg G. Iggers, 'Historical Studies in the Former German Democratic Republic,' Central European History, 25, no. 04, 1992, pp. 451-455; Wolfgang Kütßler and Hans Schleier, 'Die Erbe-Konzeption und der Platz der preußischen Geschichte in der DDR-Geschichtswissenschaft,' German Studies Review, 6, no. 3, 1983, p. 535; Albert Norden quoted in, 'Kultur des ganzen Volkes. Aus dem Schlußwort Albert Norden auf der Tagung des Präsidiums des Nationalrats und des Ministeriums für Kultur,' Neue Zeit, 30 September 1970, p. 3; Nothnagle, 'From Buchenwald to Bismarck,' p. 107.
83 The historiographical changes during the period also represent a certain opening up of the historical terrain that resulted in the adoption of new methods and a degree of independence for historians in both the selection and interpretation of their subject matter; something that former GDR historian Helga Schultz sees as originating equally from within the historical profession as from changes in cultural policy. On the issue of control and the new methodologies adopted by GDR historians; Iggers, 'New Directions in Historical Studies,' pp. 59-77; On the role of changes in the historical
The figures most clearly identified with the GDR's 'increasingly elastic pantheon of German heroes' were Luther, whose five-hundredth birthday was the occasion for the GDR's official "Luther-year" in 1983 and, inter alia, a major exhibition at the MfdG, and Friedrich the Great, whose restoration was most visibly expressed in the return of Daniel Rauch's equestrian statue to Unter den Linden in 1980. Though the castigation of Luther had proven an issue of contention among historians in the 1950s, his elevation among the ranks of Thomas Müntzer as a great reformer was a significant turn-around, which represented a greater claim on the German past on behalf of the GDR, a potentially lucrative tourist attraction for the stagnating economy, and an outward expression of the agreement reached between the protestant church and the socialist state in 1979 (though in complex ways it was during the 1980s that the church emerged as a site of opposition).

The admission of Friedrich II to the canon was a far greater reversal, but he brought together two important strands of the new historiography, namely a return of the "great men" approach to history (also symbolised by a surge in the production and consumption of historical biographies) and a 'Prussia-euphoria' found in the popularisation of Brandenburg-Prussian history in service of an authoritarian statist agenda. The success of Claus Hammels' satire The Prussians are Coming (Die Preußen kommen), in which both Luther and Friedrich II shared the stage with an assessor from the fictional "Test Institute for the reintegration of historical personalities," indicates the incongruity was not lost on the public; a fact that did not quell the popularity of the newly re-discovered "heritage," which was widely embraced in the 1980s in literature, film, television, theatre, art, and museums.


84 Quote; James M. Markham, 'Who owns the past? As East Germany lays claim to German history, West Germany is both stupified and bemused,' The New York Times, 27 April 1986, p. 88. Luther exhibition; Museum für Deutsche Geschichte, Martin Luther und seiner Zeit. Sonderausstellung des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte (Berlin: Museum für Deutsche Geschichte, 1983).

85 'Beitrag zum Geschichtsbewußtsein. Internationales Pressegespräch zur Lutherehrung.' Neue Zeit, 28 February 1981, p. 2; Mork, 'Martin Luther’s Left Turn,' pp. 585-595; Hoffmann, 'The GDR, Luther, and the German Question,' pp. 246-263. On the differentiated, complex, and changing relationship between the Church and various interests and activist groups over the course of the 1980s; Fulbrook, Anatomy of a dictatorship, Ch. 8; Fulbrook, The people’s state, p. 208.


But as GDR historian Helga Schultz has pointed out, the revival of interest in Prussia was not merely an East German phenomenon, but ‘part of a trans-border Prussian-wave’.\textsuperscript{88} Hammel’s play, which premiered at the Rostock Summer Festival in July 1981 made its Berlin debut in October.\textsuperscript{89} At that time, just on the other side of the Wall in the Gropius Building, the major historical exhibition, \textit{Prussia – an attempt to take stock (Preußen – Versuch einer Bilanz)}, attracted just under half a million visitors in its three-month run.\textsuperscript{90} This was part of a widespread return to history in West Germany and, indeed, the exhibition makers’ intent was not for an uncritical appropriation of the Prussian past, but rather to initiate reflection on the revival of the Prussian-German past in the contemporary Federal Republic.\textsuperscript{91} ‘Should the exhibition have any success at all,’ wrote head curator Gottfried Korff, ‘then it is above all its long-term effects in the formation of a general and specifically not a Prussian historical consciousness.’ \textsuperscript{92} While the emerging West German historical consciousness had clearly taken a very different path towards the re-discovery of Prussia than in the East, both nations now struggled over German history, prompting \textit{New York Times} columnist James M. Markham to conclude that ‘politicians on both sides of the wall have decided that history is too important to be left to the historians.’\textsuperscript{93}

In the light of political attempts to counter a perceived “loss of history,”\textsuperscript{94} the concrete plans that began to emerge for the establishment of the twin national museums, the House of History in Bonn and the German Historical Museum in West Berlin, should also be seen in this context. In 1981 and 1984 the Museum for German History had opened its latest permanent exhibitions, uniting the long-view of the national past from the beginnings of humankind to the latest Roboton computers. Though contemporary history still posed a number of problems, significant parts of the exhibition reflected a developed and sophisticated museological practice, the conceptualisation of which began with the shifting national concept and the identified need to strengthen and improve museum work. A heightened interest in museological questions in the early 1970s was therefore not merely a belated attempt to complete the initiatives undertaken in 1964, but was linked to a broader set of requirements in parallel with the formation and strengthening of the historical foundations of the

\textsuperscript{88} [‘Teil einer grenzübergreifenden Preußenwelle’] Schulz, ‘Die DDR-Geschichtswissenschaft in der Mitte der siebziger Jahre,’ p. 228.
\textsuperscript{91} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{92} [‘Sollte es irgendeinen Erfolg der Ausstellung geben, dann sind das vor allem ihre Langwirkenden bei der Formung eines allgemeinen und eben nicht preußischen Geschichtsbewußtseins’] ibid.
\textsuperscript{93} Markham, ‘Who owns the past?’, p. 88.
\textsuperscript{94} Hinz, ‘Negotiating Histories,’ p. 56.
GDR, the dissemination of a socialist national culture in opposition to that of the FRG, and ultimately, the legitimisation and maintenance of state power.

**Theoretical consolidation and cross-cultural currents, 1971-89**

In order to achieve these goals, the quality of museum work would need to be improved, and the political responsibility of the socialist museum further emphasised.\(^5\) The first major initiative in this regard came with the long-awaited establishment of the Institute for Museology (IfM) within the Ministry for Culture, whose statute came into effect on 1 January 1971 and simultaneously replaced that of the Special Department for Heimat Museums.\(^6\) The IfM represented a centralised national institute responsible for cultural-political and scientific-methodological questions relating to museology, regardless of the administrative governance of the museums in question.\(^7\) Though initiatives continued under different ministerial departments (for the MfDG most notably within the Ministry for Technical and Further Education), this degree of centralised research, planning, and information dissemination was never achieved in the Federal Republic, even after the foundation of its own Institute for Museology (Institut für Museumskunde) under the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation in 1980, primarily due to the strongly federalised cultural governance there.\(^8\)

Also in January, the recently completed “Theses for the perspective development of our museums,” prepared by a working group under the Ministry for Culture, was published in the Informationen, now also administered by the IfM. The theses outlined the status of museums in the GDR as a centre of intellectual-cultural life and as sites of education, their role in the development of socialist personalities through the promotion of a world-view based in Marxism-Leninism, and their strengthening of pride in the socialist Heimat.\(^9\) They also set a number of new priorities. Along with traditional responsibilities for the collection, preservation, and care of collections, these included the responsibility to make the treasures of national and world culture available to the widest audience, the development of diverse forms of visual and social experience, new and differentiated methods of visitor support, an increase in the quality, variety, and quantity of exhibitions, and a constant confrontation with the theory and practice of imperialism (including the evaluation of
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\(^7\) Statut des Instituts für Museumswesen,' Informationen für die Museen in der DDR, 3, no. 1, 1971, pp. 34-38, here p. 34.

\(^8\) Wolfgang Klauswitz, 'Editorial. Institut für Museumswesen "abgewickelt",' Museumskunde, 59, no. 1, 1994, pp. 3-4.

\(^9\) Arbeitsgruppe des Ministeriums für Kultur, 'Thesen zur perspektivischen Entwicklung der Museen,' Informationen für die Museen in der DDR, 3, no. 1, 1971, p. 5.
Western museum literature. For history museums it reiterated many of the traditional priorities, but also pressed for the realisation of the calls made in late 1969 for an increasing focus on contemporary history. Specifically:

By the 25th anniversary of the GDR [1974], above all in the central museums, district and circle museums, the museums in the urban industrial areas, as well as in the large recreational areas, our socialist present should be presented as the highpoint and main attraction of the museal exhibition.


Beyond this, the theses set broad goals for the museum network as a whole, including cooperation among museums and between museums and scientific organisations, further technical and ideological training for museum personnel, and the profiling of museums based on their collections so that each could find its unique and complementary place within the system of socialist museums.

Also in 1971 Wolfgang Herbst, who had become director of the Museum for German History in 1966, completed his doctoral dissertation under the title “The tasks of history museums in the developed socialist society—a contribution to the ideological effectiveness of the socialist history museums.” Herbst had been a long-term employee of the MfDG. An early SED member and student of Marxist historian and MfDG department head Leo Stern, he came to the museum in 1952 as a curatorial assistant, before heading the department “1871-1945” from 1961. Between 1961-66 he acted as one of two assistant directors of the museum (with Erika Herzfeld), and was also a member of ICOM’s International Committee for Museums and Collections of Archaeology and History (ICMAH) and the editorial board of Neue Museumskunde, both from 1967. Herbst’s position had been outlined at the history conference in 1969, in which he delivered the keynote address,
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102 Wolfgang Herbst, “Thesen zur Dissertation. Die Aufgaben der Geschichtsmuseen der DDR in der entwickelten sozialistischen Gesellschaft - ein Beitrag zur Ideologischen Wirksamkeit der sozialistischen Geschichtsmuseen” (Institut für Gesellschaftswissenschaften beim Zentralkomitee der Sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands. Lehrstuhl Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung, 1971). According to two biographical sources, Herbst took up the directorship of the Museum for German History in 1968, having served as assistant director from 1961-68. From July 1967 the GDR press was referring to him as the “Director” of the museum rather than the "Assistant Director" (Stellvertretender Direktor). A biography produced by the museum for its Beiträge und Mitteilungen series in 1987 in honour of Herbst's 60th birthday states that he was appointed director in 1966. It is certainly possible that the official appointment was later, though it seems clear that he had assumed the main role by mid 1967, at least in terms of his representation of the museum publicly. See Museum für Deutsche Geschichte, 'Obermuseumsrat Professor Dr. Wolfgang Herbst 60 Jahre,' Beiträge und Mitteilungen des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte, 13, 1987, p. 5; 'Herbst, Wolfgang,' Lothar Mertens, Lexikon der DDR-Historiker: Biographien und Bibliographien zu den Geschichtswissenschaftlern aus der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik (München: K.G. Saur, 2006), p. 282; Herbert Mayer, 'Herbst, Wolfgang,' Müller-Enbergs et al., Wer war wer in der DDR? Band 1, p. 530.
identifying socialist consciousness building as the key function of history museums and the central question for their future planning. He now set out to elaborate the theoretical and practical foundations of the history museum, attempting to define its key characteristics and disciplinary boundaries. He reinforced the museum’s long-standing position, firmly embedding the history museum within the historical sciences and the system of socialist education; what was unique to the history museum was not the method or subject of its scientific research, but the means by which it communicated its results. Furthermore, its role in the development, formation, and strengthening of the socialist consciousness could not be separated from the core task of mediation, because ‘the socialist historical consciousness [is] not simply the historical side of the socialist consciousness, rather it is a basic prerequisite that is founded in the nature of Marxism-Leninism.’

This assertion was closely aligned with Walter Schmidt’s conclusions regarding the role of history in the constitution of socialist consciousness, and the connection was not merely tangential; Schmidt was one of Herbst’s thesis assessors.

Despite Herbst’s emphasis on the historical sciences, he did stress the necessity to develop a Marxist-Leninist museology as a theoretical basis for the practical work of collecting and exhibiting, and as a counter to a growing interest in museology in the West;

A Marxist-Leninist museology has not yet been worked out in the GDR. Attempts to formulate its scientific subject, its foundations, and its components, have so far led to no results. For the work of the history museum there exists, just as for the other museum types, the objective necessity to elaborate a Marxist-Leninist museology and to set it against the bourgeois museology that negates the specialised sciences and leads to objectivism.

[Eine marxistisch-leninistische Museologie ist in der DDR noch nicht ausgearbeitet. Versuche, ihren wissenschaftlichen Gegenstand, ihre Grundlagen und ihre Teilbereiche zu formulieren, haben bisher zu keinem Ergebnis geführt. Für die Arbeit der Geschichtsmuseen besteht jedoch, ebenso wie für die anderen Museumsgattungen, die objektive Notwendigkeit, eine marxistisch-leninistische Museologie auszuarbeiten und sie der zum Objektivismus führenden und die Fachwissenschaften negierenden bürgerlichen Museologie entgegenzustellen.]

In Herbst’s view, the task of the Marxist-Leninist museology was to increase the effectiveness of museum work through the investigation and systematisation of museum-specific problems and


107 Ibid. p. 34.
experiences; the social function of museums as ideological and intellectual-cultural centres; the history of the museum; problems of preservation, conservation, and restoration; forms of museum organisation; exhibition techniques and technologies; and museum legislation.\textsuperscript{108} Museology in this formulation was a cross-disciplinary science (\textit{Querschnittswissenschaft}) that generalised experiences with consideration for the respective specialist discipline of the museum and knowledge from other fields (among them pedagogy, psychiatry, sociology, and aesthetics), for use in the various tasks of the museum.\textsuperscript{109}

Though Herbst set a number of priorities for collection development, the focus was clearly exhibition-oriented. 'In the exhibition the historical museums achieve the unity of research, presentation, and mediation to fruition', he wrote, '[t]hrough the exhibition they realise their main task as ideology-building institutions, through the dissemination of the Marxist-Leninist historical image for the development and consolidation of the fundamental socialist convictions.'\textsuperscript{110} Not surprisingly, it was in the period between 1968-1972, coinciding with Herbst's leadership at the museum and renewed interest in improving the quality of museum exhibitions, that a number of the existing permanent exhibition sections underwent re-development,\textsuperscript{111} though the major focus at this time was the preparation of the new contemporary history exhibition “Socialist Fatherland GDR,” which did indeed open for the twenty-fifth anniversary of the GDR in 1974 (Fig. 7.6).

The creation of a permanent contemporary exhibition was also a central focus of Herbst’s opening address at the international colloquium held in commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the Museum for German History the following year (19-20 January 1972). Under the title “The history museum and socialist society,” the colloquium brought together museum professionals from within the GDR and from Moscow, Sofia, Budapest, Bratislava, Belgrade, Bucharest, Poznan and Warsaw. Though the history museum conference held two years prior had

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{108} Ibid. pp. 34-35. \\
\textsuperscript{109} Herbst quoted in Arbeitsgruppe Museologie beim Wissenschaftlichen Beirat für die Museen des Ministeriums für Hoch- und Fachschulwesen and Ave, \textit{Museologie. Diskussionsmaterial}, p. 21. \\
\textsuperscript{110} [In der Ausstellung verwirklichen die Geschichtsmuseen die Einheit von Forschung, Darstellung und Vermitteln. Durch die Ausstellung realisieren sie ihre Hauptaufgabe als ideologiebildende Einrichtungen, durch Verbreitung des marxistisch-leninistischen Geschichtsbildes zur Herausbildung und Festigung sozialistischer Grundüberzeugungen.] Herbst, "Thesen zur Dissertation. Die Aufgaben der Geschichtsmuseen der DDR," p. 20. \\
\textsuperscript{111} In November 1968 the section “1917 to 1919” was re-designed, followed by “1945 to 1946” and “1946 to 1949” opened on 8 May 1970 and 1 April 1971 respectively. Though both the post-war exhibits were closed in 1973 ahead of their incorporation into the new contemporary history displays, it is interesting to note the split between the exhibition sections at 1946 (the establishment of the SED), indicating a higher priority for Party history in the displays. This is further illustrated by the re-making of the first section for the twenty-fifth anniversary of liberation and the second for the anniversary of the foundation of the SED (21-22 April 1946). On January 1972 a reworked section “1915 to 1917” was also opened, the last of the major revisions before the opening of “Socialist Fatherland GDR” and the complete overhaul of the sections from Pre- and Early History to 1945 in 1981. See; Museum für Deutsche Geschichte, 'Entwicklung der ständigen Ausstellungen' pp. 130-131.
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included international speakers, Wassilij Gawrilowitsch Wershizkij of the State Historical Museum in Moscow proclaimed the colloquium the first to bring together museum representatives from across the socialist world.\textsuperscript{112} The absence of a representative from the Czech Republic is noteworthy, however, given the leading status of its pioneering museum theorists at Brno University (the first university-level museum training course in Europe) most notably Zbyněk Z. Stránský, Jiří Neustupný, and then ICOM president Jan Jelinek. Indeed, Czech scholars had been among the first to engage in the attempts during the 1960s to define the scientific parameters of museology.\textsuperscript{113} It is certainly possible the ramifications of 1968 were influential here, Jelinek having lost state support due to oppositional activities and statements during the Prague Spring,\textsuperscript{114} and Vinoš Sofka, another Brno theorist, having fled to Sweden during the Soviet-led invasion.\textsuperscript{115}

\textbf{Figure 7.6:} Conclusion of the contemporary displays opened in 1974, in which the Party Congress of 1971 was presented as the culmination of the development of socialist society in the GDR (DHM-HA: Geschichte der DDR Ausstellung/Foto Jürgen Nagel)

\textsuperscript{112} Wassilij Gawrilowitsch Wershbizkij, 'W.I. Lenin über die Museen und ihre Bedeutung. Über die Ausstellungstätigkeit und über die Zusammenarbeit des Staatlichen Historischen Museums Moskau mit einer Reihe von Museen der sozialistischen Länder,' \textit{Beiträge und Mitteilungen des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte}, 1, 1972, p. 49.

\textsuperscript{113} Peter van Mensch, "Towards a methodology of museology" (Ph.D. Thesis, The University of Zagreb, 1992), Online version, unpagedinated, Ch. 2.

\textsuperscript{114} Ibid. Ch. 3.

Much of Herbst's lengthy speech was simply repetition of his core theses. He did, however, raise several points regarding the incorporation of contemporary history into the permanent exhibitions, including the continuing problem of the collections. '[I]t is not permissible,' he proclaimed, 'that in museums there are effective, representative, and valuable objects of the former ruling exploitative classes, while our socialist era is represented by second rate pieces, through photos and newspapers.'116 Kurt Wernicke, head of the MfDG's contemporary history department, expanded on this idea in his speech entitled "The consciousness building function of museum collecting activity," reiterating the importance of emotional affect and the creation of instructive and attractive museal presentations.117 He also spoke of priorities for systematic collecting, though he gave the example of the museum's recent public appeal, hardly a novel strategy (see chapter 5).118 The appeals themselves did, however, provide far more detail of the type of material sought. The key was to educate the public that contemporary material was "ripe" for the museum (museumsreif). 'Often the period [...] after 1945 is not perceived as history but rather still as the present,' Wernicke told Neues Deutschland: 'The objects that come from and reflect this era are frequently not recognized as evidence of struggle, victory, and transformation, but rather just as articles of everyday use.'119 Gaps in the collections should thus be filled with improvised household goods crafted from war materials, clothing from recycled uniforms, early hand tools, construction equipment, prototypes of consumer goods from the 1950s-60s such as the portable radio "Möwe," the "Leningrad" television set, cameras, typewriters, and mopeds, early teaching material, flags, banners, and uniforms from Party and mass organisations, industry and agriculture.120

Several other staff members also contributed to the colloquium, providing practical examples of museum work.121 A recurrent theme was the development of a Marxist-Leninist

118 Ibid. p. 66.
museology as an urgent defence against the strengthening of "bourgeois museology" in the West, specifically the contentions of the recent publication *The Museum of the Future (Das Museum der Zukunft)*, a three-volume compendium by West German museum professionals, which a number of participants identified as an attempt to mobilise museums in service of the historically obsolete and failing capitalist system. The "crisis" in West German museums, they contended, was nothing more than a reflection of the crisis of capitalism itself. Herbst claimed that the museums in the GDR now had nothing in common with those in the FRG: 'In reality there prevails between the museums principally the same insurmountable contrast that exists between socialism and imperialism.'

From the perspective of Cold War competition, the need to counter an increasing interest in museology in the West was not altogether unwarranted, but the assertion of a complete disconnection between East and West is much more problematic. In March 1971 West Germany's National ICOM Committee staged a one-week symposium on the topic of museology, with the aim of critically appraising the 'whole problem area' of museums and generating concrete actions for the most urgent tasks as well as a broad vision for the future. President of the German National Committee, Hermann Auer, identified the need to consolidate and coordinate museum research and called for the creation of an interdisciplinary research institute, though the *Institut für Museumskunde* was not actually established for another decade. According to Auer, museum research efforts had thus far been isolated, uncoordinated, "museum non-specific," and of little value for the strategic and scientific improvement of museums, particularly with regards to education work. This was part of a broader shift towards the social and educational role of museums in the West, also signalled by ICOM's resolutions at its General Conference later that year.
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which—accepting the primacy of collecting, preservation, and exhibiting—placed the social and educational role of museums at the fore.\(^{128}\)

The fact that this shift coincided with a new wave of interest in the museum’s social and educational effectiveness in Eastern Europe suggests a correlation between the museum development on both sides of the Iron Curtain, but such concerns were also a long-standing aspect of socialist museums, as the development of the museum sector in the GDR shows. Though qualitatively different, it is worth asking to what extent the socialist “museum revolution” paralleled a global trend towards the social relevancy of museums, as well as how the process linked to specific German developments, not least the National Socialist emphasis on \textit{Volksbildung} and influential early twentieth-century pedagogues like Lichtwark and Kerschensteiner. For West German museums, experimentation with new visitor-centred exhibition forms, which met with some resistance within the conservative museum culture, undoubtedly reflected greater influence from the United States, the UK and Scandinavia, where such ideas had been in circulation for some time and were becoming increasingly significant during the 1970s, than inspiration from Eastern Europe.\(^{129}\) Nevertheless the eventual adoption of concepts and strategies in West German museums that had long since been routine in the socialist world should not be overlooked.

One example is the heated debate sparked by proposals for the inclusion of cafeterias within museums at the beginning of the 1970s. 'One can no longer imagine today' wrote West German museum professional Detlef Hoffmann in 1996, 'how intensively this innovation was discussed—and how persistently the “conservative front” rejected it.'\(^{130}\) At the MfDG, by contrast, a café had formed part of the plan from the outset (chapter 5). The contention here is not that the socialist museums were somehow ahead of developments in the broader western museology, but rather to highlight the entrenched conservatism in the West German museum sector, something that has had a long-term effect on the German museum culture as a result of an uneven unification process (below). The West German museum reform that did occur in the 1970s was also fuelled by broader changes in the museum profession, technical innovation, the increasing influence of television and
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\(^{130}\) ['Man kann sich heute nicht mehr vorstellen, wie intensiv diese Innovation diskutiert wurde – und wir beharrlich die "konservative Front" sie ablehnte.'] ibid. p. 17.
the mass media, and other social changes including an increase in leisure time (and competition for leisure time) and the challenges resulting from generational conflict that came to a head in 1968.

In his attempt to define museology at the 1971 conference, Auer made the distinction between an applied museology and museology as (per ICOM’s definition), the ‘science of the museum’ with research interests in museum history, the role of museums in society, methods of museum research, education, organisation, and the relationship of museums to the physical world. He provided examples of fruitful exchange between traditionally rigid (object–based) disciplinary boundaries and pointed to a number of new ways in which museums might be conceived and categorised, drawing on what he referred to as the sphere of influence of the museum; being local, regional, national, and international. He also expressed a number of broad hopes for ways in which museological research and teaching might develop new methods for museums to meet the challenges of the present; to create a new museum type through experimentation and targeted deliberation.

None of the contributors to the conference dealt specifically with history museums in the sense of the didactic narrative history museum that had emerged in the GDR. This museum type barely existed in the Federal Republic (the Germanisches Nationalmuseum and the as-yet-unreformed Historisches Museum Frankfurt notwithstanding) where a cultural historical approach prevailed; one that presented cultural material according to artistic criteria—where objects were ‘stylised as artworks with or without history.’ Thus, when Stephan Waetzoldt (General Director of the SMB-SPK) spoke of contemporary challenges facing art and cultural historical museums, he focussed primarily on art museums, mentioning the construction of a historical image only in relation to ‘historically validated aesthetic values.’ Interestingly, along with the need to establish a form of museum council, he identified the necessity for museums to more clearly define their individual collecting goals and acquisition policies, and to establish cooperative research relationships. Though neither would have acknowledged it, these examples suggest that East and West German museum professionals were concerned with a set of related issues. If the ideological,
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theoretical, and methodological foundations of their discussions were worlds apart, the need to establish a foundation upon which to improve museum work (ideological effectiveness in the East German case, relevance or validity in the West) was common to both Germanys. Indeed, in his analysis of international museological trends, pioneering French museologist Georges Henri Rivière claimed there was little difference between East and West; the greater disparity lay between the developed and the so-called third world.137

For its part, the MfDG used the occasion of its twentieth anniversary and international colloquium to launch its own semi-regular annual publication Beiträge und Mitteilungen (1972-1988), which dealt with museum-specific questions. At the same time, efforts to overcome persistent terminological problems were being tackled by an advisory group at the IfM in conjunction with the Scientific Research Institute for Culture in Moscow, the preliminary results of which were published in 1975; in German as the Kleines Wörterbuch des Museumswesens (Small Dictionary of Museology).138 It defined the Marxist-Leninist museology as a social scientific discipline, whose components included museum theory and the method and history of the museum system, whose scientific subject was the relationship between museums and society and the museum’s scientific-cultural achievement.139 The Marxist-Leninist museology should form the theoretical foundation and criteria for collecting activity, documentation, care, and the social function of the museum.140 Contrary to the history colloquium’s full-scale rejection of western museology, the Wörterbuch identified among the tasks of museology the dissemination of the results of progressive bourgeois museology and partisan examination of its reactionary and revisionist conceptions.141 This definition divided museology into a “general museology,” concerned with those aspects of museum theory, history, and practice common to all museums, and a “specific museology,” determined by the particular museum type.142

Though the definition was revised in 1977, Joachim Ave, head of the “Working Group Museology” established by the Ministry for Technical and Further Education in 1979, determined in 1981 that the efforts thus far had tended to reduce the role of museology to technical and practical

138 Kiau and Institut für Museumswesen, Kleines Wörterbuch des Museumswesens.
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considerations ("applied museology") and had failed to establish a theoretical foundation beyond
generalisations within individual museum categories. The group saw its task as the development of
hypotheses for a theoretical and applied general museology. Its “Discussion Material,” which
included new theses regarding the subject and scope of museology from some of the GDR’s key
museum theorists including Ave, Ilse Jahn, Rolf Lang, Heinz Wecks, and Klaus Schreiner, was
conceived in preparation for the development of curriculum for a distance study programme in
museology to be held at the MfDG in conjunction with the Humboldt University, a programme which
commenced in 1982, complimenting the existing practical course in restoration that had been run
by the museum since 1976.

The “Working Group Museology” summarised developments with regard to similar
questions in the Soviet Union, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia, as well as the
museological discourse of non-socialist countries. Even if there was no clear agreement between
(or even within) the socialist countries, the appraisal of western museology was scathing:

The questions regarding a “general museology” and a “specialist museology” remain
unanswered. Also the ICOM definition: “Museology is the science of the museum”, could not go
any further theoretically, has not yet been justified and/or proven, and can not serve as a
starting point for the analysis of a Marxist-Leninist museology.

[Die Fragen nach einer “Allgemeinen Museologie” und einer “Speziellen Museologie” bleiben
unbeantwortet. Auch die ICOM-Definition: “Die Museologie ist die Wissenschaft von dem
Museum”, konnte theoretisch nicht weiterführen, wurde bisher nicht begründet bzw. bewiesen
und kann für die Analyse der marxistisch-leninistischen Museologie nicht als Ausgangspunkt
dienen.] 146

Despite the clear demarcation between the Marxist-Leninist museology and that represented at the
international level via ICOM, this assertion belies an important fact; namely, there were now more
opportunities than ever for cross-cultural communication and platforms had emerged in which
professional dialogue between the political spheres on the question of museology was now taking
place, predominately via ICOM, its sub-committees, and publications. Whatever the internal
restrictions within the GDR and other socialist countries with regard to the selection of
representatives, financial support, and travel permissions to take part in ICOM activities, Anne
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Wanner reports in her recent study on the history of ICOM Germany of a ‘trans-national exchange of knowledge and a Bloc-spanning co-operation’ within the international organisation.\textsuperscript{147}

National and international recognition remained important goals for the GDR museums. In 1979 \textit{Neues Deutschland} reported over thirty-two million visitors across 641 museums for the previous year, while Wolfgang Herbst, president of the National Museum Council since 1978, spoke of the ‘international radiance and effectiveness’ of the GDR museums, citing initiatives through which GDR museum professionals supported colleagues in the developing world.\textsuperscript{148} In 1975 the GDR had even hosted the ICMAH annual meeting and two years later Herbst provided the introduction for a special issue of ICOM’s journal \textit{museum}, “New aspects of the history museum,” in which Riviére referred to him as a ‘theoretician who is an expert in the problems of general history museums’.\textsuperscript{149} His colleague, Ingo Materna contributed a survey piece on the Museum for German History, one of three museums chosen under the rubric national museums.\textsuperscript{150} While Herbst offered no new thoughts, the international recognition of his work and the work of the museum more generally is significant, particularly as it was during the second half of the 1970s and the early 1980s that the discussion regarding the establishment of a national history museum in the Federal Republic solidified around the idea of a “German Historical Museum” in West Berlin.\textsuperscript{151} At ICOM’s General Assembly in Mexico City in November 1980 Herbst was elected Vice President of ICMAH.\textsuperscript{152}

The most important institution for genuine cross-cultural exchange with regard to museology itself was ICOM’s International Committee for Museology (ICOFOM). It had been established in 1977 under the chairmanship of Jan Jelínek, then at the end of his term as ICOM president.\textsuperscript{153} Though ICOFOM had claimed museology for its name, the committee still had not defined the field and much of its early work was concerned with just that, as indicated by the topic of its inaugural "Museological Working Papers" series, or \textit{MuWoP} (1980-81): "Museology—science
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\item ‘ICOM-Konferenz wurde in Mexiko beendet,’ \textit{Neues Deutschland}, 7 November 1980, p. 4.
\item Mensch, ‘Towards a methodology of museology,’ Online version, unpaginated, Ch. 3.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
or just practical museum work?"\textsuperscript{154} While there was heavy Eastern European representation within ICOFOM, which led some to dismiss the work of the committee altogether, broad-level attempts to define the purpose, scope, subject, method, and status of museology did not merely represent internal socialist dialogue but included a number of prominent western theorists and practitioners. The aim of MuWoP was not to synthesise the various contributions, but rather to canvas a broad spectrum of opinion, publishing four offerings from its own editorial board (Villy Toft Jensen from Denmark, Wolfgang Klausewitz from the FRG, Razgon and Sofka) that had been presented at its 1979 meeting under the banner "Museological Provocations," along with fifteen detailed responses from representatives sourced through ICOM national committees.\textsuperscript{155} The board itself also included Andreas Grote (FRG) and Kiu, making a rough split between western and eastern representatives, with the Czech/Swede Sofka holding the balance.

While most MuWoP respondents agreed that museology was already, or was in the process of becoming a science, the concept remained, as Stránský wrote in the follow-up publication, 'full of contradictions.'\textsuperscript{156} He did, however, maintain the importance of museology for conquering museum-specific problems, referring to the role of museum collections as "social memory."\textsuperscript{157} Efforts to overcome the vast disparity of opinion continued both within the GDR and at the international level.

In 1982 Ave published a working definition of the Marxist-Leninist museology in \textit{Neue Museumskunde}, an attempted synthesis of the findings of the "Working Group Museology." He wrote:

\begin{quote}
The Marxist-Leninist museology is the lesson of the museum specific work processes, that is the human activities, through which objects from nature and society become museal objects, their relations to one another and to society. The Marxist-Leninist museology embraces in particular the theory and practice of the museal selection, accumulation, and communication (particularly the presentation) and their history.

[Die marxistisch-leninistische Museologie ist die Lehre von den museumsspezifischen Arbeitsprozessen, d.h. den menschlichen Tätigkeiten, durch die die Objekte aus Natur und Gesellschaft zu musealen Objekten werden, ihrer Beziehungen zueinander und zur Gesellschaft. Die marxistisch-leninistische Museologie umfaßt im einzelnen die Theorie und
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{154} ICOM International Committee for Museology, Statens historiska museum, and Vinos Sofka, 'Museology - science or just practical museum work?', \textit{MuWoP: Museological Working Papers}, no. 1, 1980.

\textsuperscript{155} Ibid. p. 6.

\textsuperscript{156} Zbyněk Z. Stránský in ICOM International Committee for Museology, Statens historiska museum, and Vinos Sofka, 'Interdisciplinarity in museology,' \textit{MuWoP: Museological Working Papers}, no. 2, 1981, p. 19. The broader respondents published included three Czech museologists (Stránský, Anna Gregorová, and Jiří Neustupný), Jurij Piščulin from the Soviet Union, and contributors from France (André Desvallées), Sweden (Bengt Hubendick), Canada (Louis Lemieux), Britain (Director of Museum Studies at the University of Leicester, Geoffrey Lewis), the USA (Daniel R. Porter and James L. Swauger), Australia (Barrie C. Reynolds), Japan (Soichiro Tsuruta), Syria (Bachir Zouhdi) and the GDR (Klaus Schneider). ICOM International Committee for Museology, Statens historiska museum, and Sofka, 'Museology - science or just practical museum work?,' pp. 14-51.

The group also concluded that: ‘Museology is seen as a not yet fully pronounced science (cross-disciplinary science or integration science), that finds itself at present in the phase of transition from the implicit to the emancipation stage.’

The contours of the “inter-disciplinary science” were, however, far from clear and several other attempts were made to synthesize the history of museological theory, to define the relationship between museology and the relevant scientific disciplines, and to link the discussion in the GDR to developments at the international level. Perhaps to some degree in recognition of the East German contribution, ICOFOM held a workshop on museology in conjunction with the National Museum Council of the GDR in Berlin and Alt Schwerin in May 1986 with the aim of evaluating the responses to it’s MuWoP initiative, though as the results were never published and the MuWoP publication itself only ran to two issues, the long-range impact of the workshop is doubtful. The Museum for German History contributed to the further museological discourse with two significant, related activities, namely the international colloquium “Museology and Museum” held 17-19 May 1988, and the publication in the same year of its comprehensive textbook “Museologie”. Both were joint initiatives with the State Historical Museum, Moscow, and were touted not just as the results of a long and fruitful scientific collaboration between the two museums, but as symbols of German-Soviet friendship.

The conference proceedings, published over the final two issues of Beiträge und Mitteilungen, reveal a range of responses to questions of theory and practice clustered around three core concepts; general museological questions, scientific collection development, and museum-specific communication (principally pedagogy and exhibition practice). Contributions from MfDG staff dealt with specific problems, priorities, and research possibilities for the various collecting
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159 ‘Museologie wird als eine noch nicht voll ausgeprägte Wissenschaft (Querschnittswissenschaft, Integrationswissenschaft) angesehen, die sich gegenwärtig im Stadium des Übergangs von der Implizitstufe zur Emanzipationsstufe befindet.’ ibid.
161 Mensch, “Towards a methodology of museology,” Online version, unpaginated, Ch. 3 and Ch. 4 (Note 1).
areas of the museum, as well as its pedagogical and exhibition practice. Both Herbst and his Soviet counterpart Razgon emphasized global museum developments, particularly the growing importance of the institution (the “museum explosion”) and the trend towards heritage preservation in conjunction with increased interest in history more generally. Both also posited the leading role of socialist theorists in the development of museological thought as well as the practical example of the socialist museum for the current focus on education, public engagement, and the democratisation of the institution in the West.

Though many participants reiterated the status of museology as a science still in development, in Razgon’s words, in the stage of “self recognition,” there was broad-level consensus about the importance of museology. As Schreiner put it, museology was the ‘indispensable theoretical armour of a sophisticated and socially effective museum practice’, the ‘compass for practical museal work.’ This was also the starting point for the joint GDR/Soviet publication *Museology: Theoretical Foundations and Method of the Work in History Museums (Museologie: Theoretische Grundlagen und Methodik der Arbeit in Geschichtsmuseen)*; a museological textbook offering an introduction to core aspects of museum practice, including research, collection development, scientific documentation, conservation, storage and transport, exhibition development and design, education and visitor services, and the technical requirements for museum buildings and facilities.

Each of these areas was elaborated in practical as well as theoretical terms, grounding the various tasks in relation to the function of the museum in socialist society and providing terminological clarification for key expressions and concepts that reflected many years of dialogue regarding the nature, value, and status of the museum object, the role of the museum as a research institute, the foundations of exhibition practice in Marxist-Leninist theory, and the museum’s communication goals with regard to the mediation of scientific, propagandistic, and cultural content.

---


167 [‘...unentbehrlichen theoretischen Rüstzeug einer anspruchsvollen und gesellschaftlich effektiven Tätigkeit in den Museen.’ ... ’Kompaß für die praktische Museale Arbeit’] Schreiner, ’Höhere Effektivität der musealen Ausstellungen’ p. 73.
for the purpose of political-ideological, moral, and aesthetic education. As Razgon wrote in his contribution regarding museology as a scientific discipline;

The fulfilment of our social ambitions of achieving a higher standard of museum that supports the general development of the human being, is no longer imaginable without theoretical basis; without thinking through and generalising all of our past experiences and contemporary practice, that is, without a scientific basis.

[Die Erfüllung des gesellschaftlichen Anspruches nach einem höheren Niveau des Museumswesens, das die geforderte allseitige Entwicklung der Menschen unterstützt, ist ohne theoretische Grundlage, ohne das Durchdenken und die Verallgemeinerung der gesamten bisherigen Erfahrungen und der heutigen Praxis, das heißt ohne wissenschaftliche Grundlage, nicht mehr denkbar.] 168

The MfDG’s Judith Uhlig provided an overview essay focussing on German and Russian historical collections from the sixteenth century onwards, itself written within the framework of Marxist-Leninist historiography, linking museum development and specialisation to the various stages of capitalist development and positing a ‘qualitative new stage in the history of history museums’ as a result of the October Revolution. 169 Uhlig also identified the core social functions for the socialist museum as; 1) the scientific verification of the phenomena, processes, and lawful development of nature and society; 2) the collection and conservation of cultural goods and original sources and their preservation for national culture, world culture, and science; 3) carrying out specific research on the basis of which the whole of the museum’s activities could rest; and 4) active participation in the formation of the new human being and the dissemination of the communist world view. 170

While Razgon allowed that ‘[e]ven today there exists no generally recognised definition for “museology”,’ 171 the work represented the most thorough attempt to date to define its parameters and provide a practical guide for students and professionals alike. What is most striking about the work is the influence of the Soviet museological publication of 1955/60, whose principles continued to shape the understanding of the role of the museum and the museal object over three decades later. Where these elements came together, informed by the long-held tenets of East German historiography as well as the more recently developed heritage concept, 172 was in the permanent exhibition. Herbst and Wernicke wrote in 1987: ‘It was a dynamic time of experimentalism, a

\[^{168}\text{A.M. Razgon, ‘Museologie als wissenschaftliche Disziplin,’ in Museologie (1988), pp. 16-17.}\]
\[^{169}\text{[‘Eine qualitativ neue Etappe in der Geschichte der Geschichtsmuseen begann im Ergebnis der Großen Oktoberrevolution 1917.’] Judith Uhlig, ‘Stellung und Funktion der Geschichtsmuseen in der sozialistischen Gesellschaft,’ in Museologie (1988), Ch. 3, quote p. 50.}\]
\[^{170}\text{Ibid. p. 56.}\]
\[^{171}\text{[‘Bis heute existiert keine allgemein anerkannte Definition für ”Museologie”.’] Razgon, ‘Museologie als wissenschaftliche Disziplin,’ p. 18.}\]
\[^{172}\text{Peter Möbus, ‘DDR-Geschichte, Nationalgeschichte, Erbe und Tradition in der Tätigkeit der Geschichtsmuseen in der DDR,’ Neue Museumskunde, 29, no. 1, 1986, p. 12.}\]
learning process, and a maturation, that ended with the opening of the overall presentation of the national history of the GDR—from prehistory to the present (1981 and 1984).\footnote{Es war eine dynamische Zeit des Experimentierens, eines Lernprozesses und des Reifens, die mit der Eröffnung der musealen Gesamtdarstellung der Nationalgeschichte der DDR—von der Urgeschichte bis zur Gegenwart (1981 und 1984)—endete.} \footnote{Wolfgang Herbst and Kurt Wernicke, ‘Museum für Deutsche Geschichte - nationales Geschichtsmuseum der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik,' Neue Museumskunde, 30, no. 2, 1987, p. 107.} Some exhibition changes did take place after 1981, most notably additions to the section 1830-1890 to mark the one-hundredth anniversary of Marx' death in 1983, a new section “13 August 1961” in 1986 for the quarter century of the “Anti-fascist protection wall,” the redesign of section “1917-1945" in December 1988 for the seventieth anniversary of the November Revolution, and the re-development of “Socialist Fatherland GDR” as part of the GDR’s fortieth anniversary celebrations on the eve of the peaceful revolution.\footnote{On changes for the Marx anniversary; Karl-Heinz Mahler, “’Was wie alle sind, wir dind durch ihn...’ Anmerkungen zur Darstellung von Karl Marx’ Leben und Werk in der ständigen Ausstellungen des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte,' Neue Museumskunde, 26, no. 3, 1983, pp. 162-164. On the changes to the permanent displays made for the exhibition 40 Jahre DDR; Andrews, 'The GDR belongs in the museum,' pp. 91-110.}\footnote{Sylvia Kleinteich, ‘Drei Jahrzehnte lebendige Geschichte. Interview der Woche mit Professor Wolfgang Herbst, Director des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte, Berlin,’ Neue Zeit, 16 January 1982, p. 7.} When we speak of a permanent museal exhibition,’ stated Herbst in an interview for Neue Zeit, ‘that doesn’t mean that we are speaking of immutability, but rather it means, as strange as it may sound, that the permanent exhibition must be permanently re-worked from our side.'\footnote{Das Museum für Deutsche Geschichte dokumentiert anschaulich und mit wissenschaftlicher Gründlichkeit unser marxistisch-leninistisches Verhältnis zur ganzen deutschen Geschichte. Die Ausstellung spannt den Boden über...} Neither was it a categorical break from that which came before; many display techniques, significant objects, and motifs were recycled from successful elements of the exhibitions created during the 1960s and 1970s. It is, however, safe to treat the major new permanent exhibitions opened in 1981 and 1984 as the culmination of the MfDG’s museological evolution and a reflection of the developed historiographical treatment of the whole German history as presented in the socialist museum.

The developed museology in practice: the new permanent exhibitions, 1981/84

At the opening of the MfDG’s final permanent exhibition from Pre- and Early History to 1945 in July 1981, Secretary for Science and Culture of the Central Committee Kurt Hager outlined the programme of the new exhibition in the visual and scientifically thorough presentation of millenia of German history, ‘as a complicated conflict between progress and reaction, as relentless class struggle with its victories and defeats.'\footnote{He went on to explain how the Marxist-Leninist world-...}
view allowed for the proper comprehension of Prussian history, at the same time rejecting the embrace of Prussia by the FRG as oriented solely toward reactionary goals.\textsuperscript{177} As the first exhibition since 1952/53 to include all permanent displays under one roof—and in conjunction with the existing contemporary exhibits, the most comprehensive vision of German history to date—it presented the GDR as the continuation of lawful historical progress (both national and global) as well as the high-point and culmination of many centuries of German history. In its structure and scope, the exhibition drew continuity with "everything good" over the course of German history, while presenting the socialist state as an irrevocable break with Germany's reactionary forces.\textsuperscript{178} This was manifest in the "nation of a new type," the socialist nation, and while the exhibition purportedly showed the nation itself as a historically developed category, which Hager contrasted with attempts by imperialist politicians and ideologues in the FRG to portray the nation as somehow "eternal,"\textsuperscript{179} the inclusion of millennia of history under the banner of the "history of the German Volk" illustrates the continuing importance of the national frame during the last decade of the GDR.\textsuperscript{180} By the late 1980s the MfDG was no longer referring to itself as the "central" historical museum as it had for over three decades, but as the "national" historical museum of the GDR.\textsuperscript{181}

At the same time, the relationship between national and world historical events was central to the socialist narrative, as the structure of the exhibition reveals. It was divided into four broad but clearly defined sections: "Pre- and Early History" (much the same periodisation as the 1950s displays), "Feudalism 500-1789," "German History 1789-1917," and "German History 1917-1945." The existing contemporary displays made up a fifth section (1945-1974), which were expanded in 1984 to include the past decade.\textsuperscript{182} These divisions (which were representative of the organisational

\textsuperscript{177} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 225.

\textsuperscript{178} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 224.

\textsuperscript{179} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 225.

\textsuperscript{180} The importance of the new exhibitions is also indicated by the budgetary priority afforded them, for which funds were to be made available from the Ministry for Technical and Further Education through the deferral of other tasks, the mobilization of reserves, and the increase in revenue. See "Anlage Nr. 11 zum Protokoll Nr. 6 vom 14.1.1981. Betreff: Aufbau der ständigen Ausstellung von der Ur- und Frühgeschichte bis zur Befreiung des deutschen Volkes vom Faschismus im Museum für Deutsche Geschichte (MfDG)," Protokoll Nr. 6 der Sitzung des Sekretariats des ZK am 14. Januar 1981, (BArch-SAMPO: DY 30/1 IV 2/3/3166, Bl. 163-173).

\textsuperscript{181} \textit{Herbst} and \textit{Wernicke}, 'Museum für Deutsche Geschichte - nationales Geschichtsmuseum der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik,' pp. 106-114.

\textsuperscript{182} The permanent contemporary exhibitions opened in 1974 encompassed the period 1945-1971 (being the VIII Party Congress and the beginning of Honecker's leadership of the SED). The following year the exhibition was expanded to take the narrative to 1974, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the GDR. Though "lightly reworked" in 1978, the periodization remained the same. \textit{Kurt Wernicke}, 'Sozialistisches Vaterland DDR. Gedanken zu einer Neugestaltung des ständigen Ausstellungsabschnitts im Museum für Deutsche Geschichte,' \textit{Neue Museumskunde}, 27, no. 3, 1984, p. 133.
structure of the museum’s scientific departments) set the frame for the presentation of national history according to political, economic, social, cultural and scientific-technical developmental processes within a world-historical chronology.\footnote{The organizational structure of the museum reported by Herbst and Wernicke in 1987 comprised the following departments: Scientific Specialist Departments (Pre- and Early History, Feudalism, 1789-1917, 1917-1945, History of the GDR), Artistic Department, Fundus (collections), Pedagogical Department, Training and Continuing Education, Memorial Sites, Printed Material and Manuscripts (Library), Security, Administration, and Direction; Herbst and Wernicke, ‘Museum für Deutsche Geschichte - nationales Geschichtsmuseum der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik,’ pp. 107-108.} The significance of the French Revolution for the global development of capitalism had prefigured the inclusion of 1789 as a major caesura in the exhibitions from 1962 onwards.\footnote{In his description of the Museum for German History written in 1988, Kenneth Hudson states; ‘Before it was set up, in 1952, the decision was taken that, for the purpose of the Museum, German History should be taken as beginning in 1789, the year of the French Revolution.’ This is incorrect. As has been shown, the first permanent exhibitions began with pre- and early history and the caesura at 1789 was not a feature of the displays opened in 1952/53 at all. When the new exhibitions were incrementally installed in the Zeughaus beginning in 1962, they did indeed begin with the French Revolution, but this was part of a larger presentation straddling the two museum buildings on Clara-Zetkin-Straße and Unter den Linden. While the commencement of the exhibitions in the main museum building in 1789 is significant, it does not reflect a pre-1952 conception of German history beginning with the French Revolution. Even prior to the inclusion of the pre-historic exhibition sections, the earliest museum plans commenced rather with the Reformation and Peasant War (see chapter 5). Kenneth Hudson, Museums of influence [Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987], p. 139.} The break at 1917 marked a clear emphasis on the Russian Revolution as the transition to the next stage of historical development.\footnote{The Russian Revolution was first included as a caesura in the MfDG exhibitions with the overhaul of the section “1917-1919” on November 1968 and “1914-1917” in January 1972. The prior exhibition, opened in the Zeughaus in November 1965 encompassed the period “1900-1919.”}

This structure also reflects a core principle of the socialist history museum, being the organisation of the exhibition first and foremost according to a periodisation based on the development and dissolution of socio-economic formations, as determined by the Marxist-Leninist historical sciences.\footnote{A.B. Zaks, ‘Die museale Ausstellung: Die wissenschaftliche Vorbereitung von Ausstellungen in Geschichtsmuseen,’ in Museologie (1988), pp. 197-198.} Beyond these broad-level divisions, the exhibition should be arranged chronologically, again according to the scientific periodisation within each of the larger sections. Only after this second-level periodisation could a thematic structure be adopted, with the use of themes and sub-themes made up of single or multiple object groupings (“exhibition complexes”).\footnote{Ibid. pp. 204-205.} While chronological progression was the overriding factor here, a “calendrical” fragmentation of the presentation was to be avoided in favour of the “historical-chronological principle,” in which the selection of events was governed by their significance to the historical process.\footnote{Ibid. p. 205.} The content of the thematic sections could also be arranged chronologically (as in military-historical themes, political events, or revolutionary struggles), or thematically (the presentation of social relations or the culture or ideology of a given era).\footnote{Ibid.}
The sections to 1945 took up the whole upper floor of the Zeughaus, a surface area of 6,300 square meters, with the contemporary displays on the ground floor covering 1,800 square meters (Fig. 7.7). The disproportionately large space afforded the (then) thirty-two year history of the GDR reflected the developed museum theory, which posited the presentation of the socialist society as the most significant political-ideological element of the permanent displays. The space on the upper floor included an additional 960 square meters won through the inclusion of a number of mezzanines for the presentation of self-contained themes related to historical and cultural development; quite literally a "second level" of exhibition organisation.

Figure 7.7: Floor plan of the MDG permanent exhibitions at 1994. Room dividers and mezzanines not shown, not to scale (Author's own representation based on unpublished material in DHM-HA: MDG/Lebendige Geschichte/Teil 1)

Again, this technique was informed by the developed exhibition theory, reflecting an understanding of visitor psychology in which it was determined that the "average visitor" did not exist, but rather each visitor brought with them their own understanding and experience—something that really only emerged towards the end of the decade in the West. Socialist museologists argued that exhibition content should not be oversimplified for passive consumption; visitors should be given the opportunity to actively select information according to their own

---

190 Herbst and Wernicke, 'Museum für Deutsche Geschichte - nationales Geschichtsmuseum der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik,' p. 112.
interests, for the purpose of which exhibition material was organised into multiple levels, with secondary and “hidden” layers which may consist of interactive elements (albums, pull-down panels, drawers) or special rooms dedicated to the deeper study of selected themes.194

The high-level physical organisation of the exhibition was therefore of fundamental importance for the construction of a narrative based on an accepted periodisation, for building thematic foci to promote understanding of diverse and multi-faceted historical developmental processes among visitors of varying ages and levels of knowledge and interest. Beyond this, there were two key elements upon which the theory of socialist exhibition practice rested; the type, selection, and proportion of objects and associated exhibition material, and the arrangement of objects into “exhibition complexes.” Each of these was supported by design and aesthetic considerations that took into account historical collecting practices, socialist museum experience, and research into the psychology of visitor behaviour and comprehension.

**Types of exhibition material and selection criteria**

Like the early Soviet museologists, the museum determined original objects to be the core of the exhibition. Selection was based on their potential reception in terms of information value, emotional appeal, and aesthetic quality.195 According to the theory, the process of selecting, preparing, and situating original objects in the exhibition represented a transformation from historical source to “museal exhibit” (museales Exponat), an ‘actively effective exhibition element, that conveys knowledge and awakens emotions.’196 This combination of understanding and emotion formed one of the central exhibition principles after structural narrative considerations, being the ‘principle of concreteness’ (Gegenständlichkeit), and the creation of opportunities for direct contact with objects to arouse feelings and leave lasting impressions. The displays opened in 1981 alone boasted 8,000 objects,197 and Wolfgang Herbst expressed the hope of creating a special cabinet in which visitors—primarily school children—could not only view, but also touch and feel selected objects.198

Several original objects were singled out for special attention in the media, professional literature, and catalogue texts. These included two sixth century Spangenhelme, a thirteenth-century
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195 Ibid. p. 194.
196 [So verwandelt sich das museale Objekt aus einer Quelle von Wissen in ein aktiv Wirkendes Ausstellungselement, das Wissen übermittelt und Emotionen weckt—ein museales Exponat.] Ibid.
great helm, a fifteenth-century ivory-inlaid saddle, the barding of Duke Friedrich II of Liegnitz, Brieg and Wohla (1515/17), the close helmet of Emperor Charles V (circa 1536), the sword of Albrecht von Wallenstein (1622/25), the “Golden Cannon” (1643), the remaining Schlüter and Jacobi “Kurfürsten” cannons (1708), the uniform of Friedrich the Great, the sabre of Tsar Alexander I, and items from the estates of von Boyen, Blücher, and Gneisenau, all of which had been among the so-called “masterpieces” of the Zeughaus collections. As per the developed dialectical-materialist approach, the militaria objects were presented within a variety of contexts. In addition to those items directly associated with historical events and actors, which were presented in the context of the chronological-historical narrative, they demonstrated production methods, technical progress and limits, the structure and development of the army system, and cultural phenomena (Fig. 7.8).

Figure 7.8: Zeughaus collection pieces arranged under the heading “Artisanship of the Renaissance,” in “Feudalism 500-1789,” subsection “The decline of feudalism 1470-1525” (DHM Hausarchiv: MfDG/Drehbuch/A91 1342-3)

Beyond militaria, it was primarily large exhibition pieces and staged ensembles that received most attention, but the museum was also keen to point out other highlights, including personal items from the possession of Marx, Engels, Bebel, Wilhelm and Karl Liebknecht, and Thälmann, flyers and documents from the Spartacus Group and KPD, and proletariat-revolutionary artworks and posters.\textsuperscript{200} Despite an emphasis since the early 1970s on contemporary collecting, the exhibition sections from 1945 to 1974/84 were markedly less “concrete,” particularly in terms of original objects. Nonetheless, important pieces included make-shift post-war goods and the costume worn by Hildegard Knef in \textit{Die Mörder sind unter uns} (1946) as evidence of post-war emergency production and cultural renewal, Adolf Henecke’s work tools and clothing, a vase featuring Soviet astronaut Jurij Gagarin, and the training suits of celebrated GDR Olympians.\textsuperscript{201}

While “concrete” objects were considered the most effective medium, pictorial material (historical and contemporary paintings and sculptures, dioramas, illustrations, graphics, posters, and original photographs), written and printed material, and original sound recordings were also classed as original objects. In addition, the exhibition theory allowed for the use of scale models and replicas, hence the Magdeburg Reiter featuring Otto I, the Behaim Globe used in the earliest permanent displays, and numerous models of buildings, towns, ships, trams, trains, and industrial equipment, machinery, and factories throughout the ages.\textsuperscript{202} In summary A.B. Zaks noted: ‘If the foundation of the museum exhibition—the museal objects, the originals—remains protected, the replicas cannot destroy the specific of the museal exhibition.’\textsuperscript{203} The same was true of scientific auxiliary material; maps, diagrams, statistics, schematics, and graphs.

As the final element, exhibition texts were divided into four hierarchies, the first of which was guiding texts (\textit{Leittexte}), for which quotes from the classics of Marxism-Leninism, excerpts from Party documents and material and sayings from standing outward social, cultural, and scientific figures


\textsuperscript{202}Holograms were also discussed as a new and potentially useful means of replication, though suited to the special exhibition more so than permanent presentations. Zaks, 'Die museale Ausstellung,' p. 214. The museum did, indeed use holograms in its special exhibition practice, as in the travelling exhibition "Die Leninische Friedliebende Außenpolitik der KPdSU" presented in the Central Lenin-Museum, Moscow in 1985 and parallel the guest exhibition from the same institution in the MfDG "Der heldenhafte Kampf des Sowjetvolkes gegen den Faschismus".

\textsuperscript{203}['Wenn der Grundstock der Museumsausstellung—die musealen Objekte, die Originale—gewahrt bleibt, können die Nachbildungen nicht die Spezifik der musealen Ausstellung zerstören.']. ibid.
were recommended. Together, these texts should frame the scientific and political-ideological objectives of the exhibition, building a unified statement. The next level comprised heading texts; markers for rooms, sections, sub-themes, and exhibition complexes, which should reflect the content structure of the exhibition and help orient the visitor within the sections and in relation to the main circuit. Explanatory texts then provided assessments of the themes, sub-themes, and exhibition complexes, followed by individual object descriptions. This hierarchy was also reflected visually. Though historical fonts were not recommended in consideration of uniformity and readability, the highest-level Leittexte were nonetheless integrated into the broader design concept (Fig. 7.9). In other cases they formed part of the staging as banners or graffiti on purpose-built set pieces, as in the slogan “KPD lives” scrawled on a wooden fence, or the banner proclaiming “Junker land in the hands of the peasants” (Junkerland in Bauernhand) for post-war land reform (Fig. 7.10).

Figure 7.9: ‘Gunpowder is black, blood is red, the flame flickers gold,’ guiding text for the sub-section “1848-1871”, permanent exhibition opened 1981 (DHM-HA: MfDG/Drehbuch/A88 139)
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204 Ibid. p. 216.  
205 Ibid.
In contrast to the museum's earliest exhibitions, the proportion of text was dramatically reduced. As Vera-Gisela Erwald wrote: 'The texts have been arranged hierarchically according to their value as section, complex or explanatory texts for the single object and/or as supplementary explanation, also with regard to the size of the font. Above all, care has been taken to keep them as succinct as possible.' 206 Neue Zeit endorsed the strategy, telling its readers: 'Thereby, a particular weight has been placed on the experientiality of historical events. The text information recedes behind the presentation of important historical witnesses and evidence.' 207

**Design and arrangement of objects and exhibition elements**

Fundamental to the creation of this "experientiality" was a thoroughly conceived strategy for the design and arrangement of the material within the exhibition space. 'It is not only important, what is
shown,' wrote Ja. N. Gračev and A.I. Michajlovskaja, 'but rather, how it is prepared and presented in order to reach the heart and mind of the visitor.\footnote{\footnotesize{\['Wichtig ist nicht nur, was gezeigt wird, sondern auch, wie es aufbereitet und dargeboten wird, um Herz und Verstand des Besuchers zu erreichen.\'] Ja. N. Gračev and A.I. Michajlovskaja, \textit{Die ständige museale Ausstellung und ihre künstlerisch-architektonische Gestaltung,} in \textit{Museologie} (1988), p. 239.}} Without extensive exhibition texts, methods to ensure the correct message was conveyed through visual means were paramount, particularly given the potential ambiguity of an object-based approach. General design principles included the adoption of content appropriate design. This did not mean the historicisation of the exhibits via the creation of an immersive period “style,” but rather that design should always be bound to content and founded in the scientific exhibition concept.\footnote{\footnotesize{Ibid. p. 240.}} In terms of Marxist-Leninist aesthetics, this was the dialectical unity of content and form, a foundational design principle for all socialist museums.\footnote{\footnotesize{Ibid. p. 241.}} According to Soviet theorists, this should take into account the harmony and competition of all exhibition components and the subordination of all parts of the exhibition to the broader exhibition aims.\footnote{\footnotesize{Ibid. p. 239.}} Thus, all furnishings—showcases, podiums, light-fittings, frames—should fulfil both technical and aesthetic requirements. The task of the designer, according to E.A. Rozenbljum, was to create clearly recognisable spatial relationships that simultaneously conveyed to the viewer a feeling for both the present and the era on display.\footnote{\footnotesize{Ibid.}} By logical extension, there was little room for “decoration.”

These broad principles translated into a number of specific methods for the presentation of objects and associated material, both in terms of visual design and arrangement. That these two elements were inextricable reflects the requirement for close collaboration between scientific and design staff (and/or the design firm, in this case the Deutsche Werbe- und Anzeigengesellschaft, or DEWAG, the state advertising agency responsible for cultural and political propaganda). Key principles included the “reading direction” of the exhibition; the exhibition as a whole, as well as each distinct section should progress from left-to-right. Individual rooms or complexes could then take the viewer from the general to the specific, so that the visitor would first perceive the whole space with all its exhibits before being drawn to particular elements, or conversely, displays could be organised to provide specific information before opening progressively outward to reveal a total view.\footnote{\footnotesize{Ibid. pp. 244-245.}} Within each section, methods for the organisation of material drew upon existing display modes including nineteenth-century typological displays, as utilised for the presentation of tools and implements from the end of the Late Stone Age.
Thematic exhibition complexes also reflected display modes garnered from other historical models such as ethnographic and open-air museums, most notably the building of interior ensembles (period rooms) and fragments, of which there were many examples in the MfDG exhibits, particularly in the section “1879-1917,” where there were no fewer than nine period-room ensembles (Fig. 7.11).214 Whether typological sequences, period rooms, or other forms of thematic ensemble building, each “complex” should start from the Marxist-Leninist periodisation, the concrete historical events and revolutionary movements.215 Zaks explained the significance of the thematic complexes using Stránský’s notion of *museality*: ‘In the creation of exhibition complexes, the creative element of museality is particularly evident, that is the opportunity to prove the abstract through the concrete, to form a museal image of past and present.’216

![Figure 7.11: A period weaver’s cottage, exhibition section “1789-1917,” sub-section “1830-1848” designed to show workers’ conditions during the Vormärz (DHM Hausarchiv: MfDG/Drehbuch/A88 139)](image)

A key principle for building room-level exhibition complexes and for guiding the visitor within each thematic sub-section as well as through the exhibition as a whole was the use of guiding objects (*Leitobjekte*)—the most important objects and artworks that should embody the spirit of the

---

214 These included an Empire Room, part of a weaver’s cottage, a Biedermeier living room, the sleeping cell of a groom, an ensemble of applied arts in the Jugendstil, a cellar with illegal printing press for the period of the anti-socialist laws, a small ensemble of reproductions of furniture from the Marx estate (originals in the Marx-Engels Museum in Moscow), the worker’s kitchen and living room from the turn of the century, and a bourgeois living room from the same era that had been present in earlier displays. Again, the positioning of the latter two ensembles in relation to one another also indicates the way in which contrasts were drawn to highlight specific themes and ideas, here class inequality.


216 ['Bei der Schaffung der Ausstellungskomplexe wird die schöpferische Element der Musealität besonders deutlich, d.h. die Möglichkeit, Abstraktes durch Konkretes zu belegen, ein museales Abbild von Vergangenheit und Gegenwart zu formen.‘] ibid. p. 218.
given section, attracting the visitor's attention and orienting their gaze and movement.\textsuperscript{217} These could be outstanding original objects, more often than not particularly large pieces around which the rest of the section could be designed, a strategy that was believed to be particularly effective for the creation of emotional high-points. With consideration for the space as well as the technical requirements for the placement of large objects, exhibition makers were careful to ensure that imposing pieces did not overwhelm the visitor, hindering the detailed study of associated exhibition material.\textsuperscript{218} Examples in the exhibition included the Cape Cross column (1485), emblematic of Spanish and Portuguese sea voyages in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the “Golden Cannon” representative of the Thirty-Years War, textile machines and a neo-gothic cylinder steam engine (1847) to show industrial development on the eve of the March Revolution, the “Columbia” printing press (1827) standing for revolutionary publishing activities, part of an anti-aircraft tank in the section “1939-1945,” and a “Trümmerlok,” a small steam engine used to transport rubble, signifying the national construction work of the early 1950s (Fig. 7.12 and 7.13).

\textbf{Figure 7.12:} Industrial development in the Vormärz featuring a cylinder steam engine and textile machines. Exhibition section “1789-1917” (DHM-HA: MDG/Fotos DA Eck 1980–90)

\textsuperscript{217} Gračev and Michajlovskaja, ‘Die ständige museale Ausstellung,’ pp. 244-245.
A “Leitobjekt” need not be an original object, and indeed, many of those in the MfDG exhibitions were casts or reproductions, like the Magdeburg Reiter, the gravestone of Rudolf von Schwaben from the Merseburg Cathedral (1077) included as an example of medieval political struggles, or the Lilienthal Glider (1895), which was also paired with another large original item, a passenger car System Maurer from the Nürnburger Maschinenfahrzeugfabrik Union (1900), and a small ensemble featuring an original X-Ray machine developed by Wilhelm Conrad Röntgen (Fig. 7.14). Likewise, several other focal points revolved around ensembles of original objects or originals and reproductions, such as the “Halberstadt ensemble,” consisting of part of an original façade of a half-timbered home (1416) together with a full-sized cast of the famed Roland statue (1433) from the western façade of the town hall. Historical and contemporary paintings and sculptures could also serve as focal points, as could large models or groups of models, a technique utilised quite heavily in the contemporary history displays (Fig. 7.15).
Figure 7.14: Lilienthal Glider and ensemble items, exhibition section "1789-1917" (DHM-HA: MIDG/Fotos DA Eck 1980-90)

Figure 7.15: An example of large models on display from the prior installation of "Socialist Fatherland GDR" circa 1980  (DHM-HA: MIDG/Fotos DA Eck 1980-90)
An example of a thematic complex that combined many of these distinct elements to present an emotional “high point” in the exhibition was the Peasants’ War display. It was afforded a relatively large space because, according to Vera-Gisela Ewald, ‘a thread of revolutionary tradition in the history of the German people that continues to have an effect in our time began with the Peasants’ War.’ Two raised platforms were placed opposite one another, as a visual metaphor for class conflict, one featuring the barding of Duke Friedrich II, a rider in full armour, and a mannequin dressed as a mercenary (Fig. 7.16). The ensemble was accompanied by a stained glass window and showcases featuring rich liturgical items to reflect the power and splendour of the church and its common class interests with the feudal lords. The second raised stage featured the peasants, represented by male and female figures, a cannon, and rows of cutting and thrusting weapons arranged to face the knight ensemble (Fig. 7.17). The surface under this ensemble, in contrast to the smooth flagstones opposite, was rough stones. Around the group were maps, documents and illustrations, a bust of Thomas Müntzer, and the painting by Max Linger that had featured in the 1957 exhibition Weapons and Uniforms in History (chapter 6). Primarily through design and placement these ensembles created a sense of tension, reinforcing the intended reading.

Figure 7.16: Peasant War ensemble, the feudal ruling class, “Feudalism 500-1789,” sub-section “The decline of feudalism 1470-1525” (DHM-HA: MFDG/Fotos DA Eck 1980-90)

Other design considerations included the use of light and colour to create atmosphere, aid visitor concentration and comprehension, unify exhibition components, and highlight important objects.\footnote{Gračev and Michajlovskaaja, ‘Die ständige museale Ausstellung,’ p. 253.} The museologists determined that yellows and greens were optimal colours for the visual senses; working against eye-fatigue, while large surfaces of red and orange would quickly tire the eye and were not recommended for extensive use. Other considerations were based on psychologists’ findings regarding the effects of colour to stimulate (warm reds and yellows) or calm (blue-greens) the senses, and the emotional effect of certain colour associations.\footnote{Ibid. p. 239.} In the exhibitions distinct colour schemes were employed for each section, a ‘calm green’ for “Pre- and Early history” and a forest green for “Feudalism 500-1789,” both of which were felt to show the objects well.\footnote{Bailleu, '30 Jahre Museum für Deutsche Geschichte. Ur- und Frühgeschichte,’ p. 18; Ewald, '30 Jahre Museum für Deutsche Geschichte. Feudalismus 500-1789,’ p. 93.} “1789-1917” featured a dark brown, with accents of olive, rust, and natural linen,\footnote{Ingeborg Grau, '30 Jahre Museum für Deutsche Geschichte. Deutsche Geschichte 1789-1917,’ Neue Museumskunde, 25, no. 3, 1982, p. 155.} while “1917-1945” utilised a dark grey-blue, with black featuring in the National Socialist era, a
colour which had been determined to create a sinister effect (Fig. 7.18). Colour was therefore used to create a distinctive atmosphere within each section, as well as to work toward harmony across the whole exhibition. Accents of strong colour and colour contrasts, such as red text against a dark background, were dispersed throughout to draw attention to key complexes and transitions and awaken the attention of the visitor. In the contemporary displays the use of colour was far less effective, with neutrals and grey predominating.

Many of the design elements, motifs, and even specific ensembles had appeared in previous displays. One notable figure repeated throughout the history of the museum was Jewgeni Wiktorowitsch Wutschetitsch’s soldier and child from the Soviet War Memorial at Treptower Park as the symbol of the Red Army liberation, though Fritz Cramer’s Buchenwald sculptural ensemble, which had also been used repeatedly to illustrate the “self-liberation” of the camp (chapter 6) was not included in the final exhibits. The key difference between the exhibitions of the 1960s and 1970s and those opened in the early 1980s was the completeness of the museological vision—the

Figure 7.18: Dark colours to create a sinister effect for the exhibition section “1933-1939” (DHM-IA: MfdG/Fotos DA Eck 1980-90)

application of a theoretically founded exhibition and design strategy within each section and across the whole, the use of well conceived techniques to create continuities and transitions, the integration of technical, content, and design elements, and the targeted use of visually engaging Leitobjekte and ensembles. All of this contributed to a sense of rhythm and movement, which should theoretically lead the visitor through the exhibition and which certainly created a degree of dynamism, though far more successfully in the historical than the contemporary displays.

Thanks to the expanded vision of German history represented by the “heritage and tradition” concept, the narrative presented, though still very much in the service of Party ideology, was also far less monochromatic than earlier offerings. The inclusion of political, economic, military, technical, social, cultural, production, and “every day” histories within an integrated exhibition was not only impressive for its time, even today many museums struggle to create a balance, with political and economic histories often predominating. When British broadcaster, author, industrial archaeologist and museologist Kenneth Hudson included the Museum for German History in his 1987 compendium Museums of Influence, he wrote:

The Museum of German History has earned a place on our list for a number of reasons [...] In the West, it has been sometimes dismissed as mere propaganda, but this is a very superficial view, not least because it ignores the important fact that the Museum of German History is, professionally and irrespective of its politics, an excellent museum.225

Mary Fulbrook captures one of the key dilemmas of contemporary perspectives on the GDR when she writes: 'Of course it was a dictatorship. But it was not only a dictatorship.'226 In the same way, though the political and ideological role of the Museum for German History cannot be ignored, it was never only propaganda, and though extreme, this facet of the institutional history is just one stage in a much longer history of nation-building projects at the Zeughaus, re-envisioned using many of the same objects again and again across time.

Just two years after Hudson penned his words, following the events of Autumn 1989 and the fall of the Berlin Wall, the museum struggled to redefine its role in the changing political and cultural landscape of a future unified Berlin and Germany.227 In doing so it looked to the West, to its counterpart, the embryonic German Historical Museum, as a potential collaborator, but also as a rival.228 It looked to its past, to the immediate past and its complicity in the dissemination of SED

225 Hudson, Museums of influence, p. 139.
226 Fulbrook, The people’s state, p. 11.
227 Andrews, ’The GDR belongs in the museum,’ pp. 91-110; Weißbrich, ”Die (Wieder)Vereinigung im Museum.”
But whatever attempts were made to re-position the museum and shore up its value and its role, the future of the MfDG was out of its hands. In what the TAZ newspaper described as a 'cultural-political coup from on high', the new provisional government of the GDR, in discussion with the FRG’s Ministry for the Interior, took the decision on 29 August 1990 to dissolve the museum on the basis that it had been 'exclusively concerned with the official SED historical representation'. The building, its collections, and “suitable” staff would, instead, be placed in the hands of the German Historical Museum. Though the transfer was due to take effect along with the unification treaty on 3 October 1990, the General Director of the German Historical Museum, Christoph Stölzl, was given provisional custody of the museum on 15 September, at which time the DHM announced its intention to close all existing permanent displays. ‘Until 3 October, the museum remains open as usual’, it announced in a press release: ‘Until then the public has a final opportunity to see the permanent exhibits that, unchanged, reflect the official view of history of the GDR.’

---


avoid any possible confusion, a dilemma notice was placed at the entrance disassociating the DHM from the exhibits.\textsuperscript{234}

Writing for a publication entitled \textit{Museums and Europe 1992}, Zbyněk Z. Stránský made a preliminary assessment of the situation for museums in central and eastern Europe after the fall of communism. In light of the many challenges facing the museums so thoroughly entrenched in the political and ideological education and propaganda work of their respective systems, he asked: ‘Does that mean that our museums should go back and throw away everything they have gained and that enriched them in the past forty years of, admittedly, a totalitarian regime?’\textsuperscript{235} He went on:

I do not think that we can go back. History does not go back either. The Europe that we are entering today is not the historical Europe. We must go on, in agreement with those intentions which have a general importance. [...] To go on, however, means that we must find a new road forward. It is not the same road taken by museums and galleries in the free world.\textsuperscript{236}

The situation in the Czech Republic, in Hungary, in Poland, and in the other new democracies, was not the same as that of the GDR, however, where the new road was not determined by the museums themselves but, largely, externally through the imposition of West German historiographical and museological models. Local history museums across the former GDR quickly closed or re-oriented their displays to suit the western historical vision.\textsuperscript{237} By the time the West German National ICOM committee met in 1990, according to former president of the GDR’s ICOM national committee Günther Schade, most East German museum directors had already lost their posts to western colleagues, who saw their first task as the political “cleansing” of the collections.\textsuperscript{238} Hopes of a merger between the two national committees were quickly dashed when West German members rejected the idea,\textsuperscript{239} and the former East German Institute for Museology was “unwound” in 1994.\textsuperscript{240} The merger of the “twin” museums that had grown up on either side of the Wall during division under the banner of West Germany’s Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation was enshrined in the Unification Treaty as the logical unification of historically developed collections and the massive,
still ongoing, reorganisation of the Berlin museum landscape began.241 Though the German Historical Museum’s use of the Zeughaus was originally conceived as a temporary measure until the completion of its planned new building opposite the Reichstag, the transfer of the national capital from Bonn to Berlin and the creation of the government quarter along that part of the Spree solidified the museum’s residence in the former city armoury and the collections of the Museum for German History and the former Zeughaus Museum before it became the foundation stone of its own collecting and exhibition practice.

Conclusion

The memory of the nation?

Psychologists and neuroscientists have come to understand over the past decades that remembering is a subjective experience. It depends both on the circumstances in which an event is inscribed and the specific triggers for its retrieval. Memory, contends renowned psychologist Daniel Schacter, 'depends as much on what is happening in the present as on what happened in the past.' Yet he also points to the duality of memory's “fragile power,” its many limitations and even distortions coupled with its centrality for understanding how the past shapes the present, how we construct our autobiographies, our very sense of self, from mere fragments. In this sense, memory could serve as a valid metaphor for the museum; not in the sense that it is most often used, as a contention of the museum's particular authority—its ability to speak for groups, communities, nations—as the “holders” of collective memory, but in all its contradictory imperfection. Memory thus understood is far closer to the processes evident in the museum than the traditional model of storage and retrieval.

This thesis has been concerned with how the past is made and re-made in the museum context and its implications for an understanding of the processes by which “nation” is constructed, reified, and mediated via objects and collections. The history of the Zeughaus reflects broader museum developments as well as the specific way in which they have been employed to meet the needs of the changing German context. Well prior to the establishment of the first museum spaces, objects as physical evidence formed an integral component of the claims to military supremacy and political status that were enacted in the building itself. Though the value and treatment of objects has shifted across the history of the site, along with the changing status of the museum itself, its social role and educational function, which has in turn precipitated new exhibition modes and didactic techniques, original objects have acted as powerful authenticating agents across all museum paradigms. Methodologically, this thesis has sought to trace the history of the Berlin Zeughaus and its collections in terms of shifts and upheavals. What becomes clear is that although each regime brings its own requirements for the presentation of history, requirements that are

2 Ibid. p. 25.
3 Ibid.
translated in the re-consideration of objects, over time the site also reveals a surprising degree of continuity in the ways in which nation has been asserted.

“Wir sind ein Volk”: enacting unity

We, the Germans, have learnt from our history. We want to live in peace and we want to live with one another in freedom. We want to come together because we belong together.

[Wir, die Deutschen, haben aus unserer Geschichte gelernt. Wir wollen in Frieden und wir wollen in Freiheit miteinander leben. Wir wollen zueinander kommen, weil wir zueinander gehören.]

- Helmut Kohl, Regierungserklärung, 4 May 1983

[W]e in the West have more in common with the post-war histories of Italy, or France, or the United States, than we do with that of the GDR.

- Jürgen Habermas, The Past as Future, 1994

Perhaps the single-most defining characteristic of the projection of the national idea has been the assertion of German unity, often in contrast to strong social, political, and even physical divisions. Though the territories that made up Germany have had far longer traditions of separation than togetherness, the museum has continually called upon history to verify current political constellations, even in the earlier museum incarnations, where Prussian and later German national history served as the principal frame through which the ostensibly cultural and technical collections were presented. In promoting this vision the museum has acted as a powerful frame for belonging and exclusion. In the earliest museum spaces the Wars of Liberation served as a common rallying point for a proto-nationalism that was nonetheless enacted in the Prussian image. Towards the middle of the nineteenth century the idea of a longing for national unity took shape in the “universal” industrial exhibition held there, but within a few years the tensions between growing national aspirations and strong continuing divisions erupted in violence. The contrasting reactions of contemporaries Karl Gustav von Griesheim and Friedrich Engels to the destruction of the ‘symbols of the nation’s honour,’ the trophies and flags of Leipzig and Waterloo, reveal the potency of the museum’s collections and their significance for the state-sanctioned narrative.

After unification the role of the Zeughaus in the maintenance of a singular Prusso-German vision, one that papered over significant and growing social and political tensions, came to the fore. Here, the idea of a unified German nation as the destiny of the Prussian crown and to the exclusion

---

6 Friedrich Engels, Neue Rheinische Zeitung, No. 20, June 20, 1848, re-printed in English in Marx and Engels, Collected works Vol. 7 Marx and Engels, p. 98.
of significant elements of the German population was manifest in an elaborate architectural, painting, and sculptural programme, which drew upon history and mythology and was reified through the “scientific” frame of the museum’s heavily patriotic exhibitions. This presentation clearly rested upon the construction of a German identity in opposition to others, a core aspect of the museum’s presentations throughout, whether it be France, which acted as the “hereditary enemy” during much of the early history of the site, the idea of a “world of enemies” threatening to destroy German culture, the encroachment of National Socialist racial definitions after 1933, or the “other Germany,” which proved a constant point of reference for comparison and self-definition throughout the GDR. Despite the clearly problematic nature of defining “Germanness,” it has always been presented in the museum as somehow intrinsic, as a natural and uncontested state.

The idea of a unified German nation remained central to the structure and arrangement of the collections even after the failure of the Kaiserreich and attempts to re-cast the collections during the Weimar era, so that they were quickly adapted to a territorially broader but conceptually narrower vision under National Socialism, based around the image of the eternal soldier and the common bonds of a German Volk under constant threat from invading forces. Here too, the Prussian image remained embedded despite symbolic acts such as the removal of Begas’ Borussia statue. While the break of 1945 saw a completely new vision for the Zeughaus as well as the substantial loss of its collection holdings, the remaining objects nonetheless served as an important pillar of a newly conceived national historical collection. Despite the realities of the political and physical division of Germany, the idea of German national unity was absolutely central to the SED’s instrumentalisation of the German past. Even after the “normalisation” of German-German relations and the consolidation of a distinct East German national identity, the unifying figures that were appropriated to help shape national understanding stretched well beyond the borders of the contemporary GDR, creating a paradoxical relationship between the ideas of nation and nationality.

Recurrent patterns of meaning-making at the site, coupled with their repeated failure over time, point to an ongoing and unresolved search for a unified national concept and a singular German identity. In many cases it has been the same events repeatedly employed to meet this need: the Wars of Liberation with which the museal history of the Zeughaus began, the longer lineage of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Reich, the Germanen of antiquity, and throughout the strong leaders who could be relied upon to embody the backward projection of the contemporary national concept. Even the very different emphases of the Marxist-Leninist approach adopted by the Museum for German History, which included a focus on revolutionary action, class struggle, and socialist internationalism, did not exempt the museum from employing many of the established national
historical traditions for its own ends. Each of these narratives reveals the dominance of a progressive developmental concept of German history, one that positions the present as the culmination of a positive national evolution. This is reflective of dominant trends in the German historical sciences, particularly the Prussian school of historical writing, but in the museum such ideas have been inscribed in the very structure of collections. In its exhibitions, progressive chronological narratives have been physically enacted via the movement of visitors through space. Again, the East German reading of the past is no exception and its focus on progressive change through revolutionary upheaval ultimately allowed the museum to position the GDR as the heir to all progressive forces despite the atrocities of the most recent past. An inability to break with chronology as the dominant conceptual frame for the presentation of German history persists into the post-unification era, despite a number of examples of new national museums that have started instead from a thematic approach.\(^7\)

These visible patterns have implications for the treatment of the whole German past in the museum today. Questions with which the museum must contend in its search for a new institutional vision, such as where German history begins and how to incorporate contemporary historical themes, have been present across the whole history of the Zeughaus. The long-term status of the museum as a central site for official national narratives, which as this study shows are often traceable to specific political and ideological agendas, prompts reflection on the role of nation in the museum today and how its presentation may link to larger political projects. Though this was central to the debate that arose during the conceptual development of the DHM in the 1980s, such questions have been far less pressing after 1989/90 as the idea of a “normal” relationship to national identity becomes more and more acceptable.\(^8\) While the museum’s central focus on “German history in a European context” is presented as a trans-national, even post-national approach,\(^9\) might this not be yet another politically determined and historically contingent frame for locating the German nation? Doesn’t embedding German history in a broader (western) European development in fact provide historical legitimation for a focus on European integration that is as much a feature of Angela Merkel’s chancellorship as it was her political mentor, Kohl? And to what extent do earlier cold war tensions complicate a straightforward appropriation of the European

---

\(^{7}\) Examples of national historical museums founded as part of the same wave of national museum construction as the German Historical Museum that have been structured in the first instance according to thematic concerns include the National Museum of Australia in Canberra and Te Papa Tongarewa, the national museum of New Zealand in Wellington.


idea, as the circumstances of the establishment of the Museum for German History as a reaction to West Germany's NATO integration and the emergence of the European Community itself might imply? Given Germany's current economic leadership of Europe, an ever-increasing interest in the consumption of history, and a number of conspicuous capital works projects, these questions are arguably more important than ever.

The way in which the museums within the Zeughaus have traditionally upheld quite restrictive visions of German identity also bears upon contemporary practice. This is particularly pertinent for the presentation of the post-war era and the forging of a common past in the light of almost half a century of division. Recently, progressive voices within the historical profession, both inside and outside Germany, have called for a greater democratisation of historical writing, for a mutual negotiation of the divided past and the incorporation of divergent methodological approaches, an opportunity that was missed after reunification as largely conservative West German perspectives dominated and East German experiences were hurriedly disavowed. Though the practicalities of cooperation in the forging of a new German history in the immediate period after 1989/90 surely posed serious, perhaps insurmountable difficulties, particularly in the light of widespread co-operation with the Stasi, the processes by which a relatively unexamined pre-1989 West German historical vision came to define the national presentation in the museum deserve serious attention. The conclusion of the museum's 2006 permanent exhibition with reunification, and the dominance of one of its key objects, a banner from the demonstration on Alexanderplatz on 9 December 1989 featuring the motto "We are one people," not only conflates the reform agenda that sparked the protest movement in the autumn of 1989 with the reunification agenda that rapidly took hold, it also flattens out persistent problems of disunity in Germany. Echoing Kohl's sentiment, two thousand years of German history culminates in a natural coming together of those

---

10 Current capital works in the centre of Berlin alone include the ongoing Masterplan Museum Island, which will include the first new building to be erected on the island since the Pergamon Museum was completed in 1930, the new U-Bahn stretch along Unter den Linden, and the massive re-construction of the city palace as part of the "Humboldt-Forum" project, which will house the SMB-SPK ethnographic collections currently held at Dahlem. Other new museums in Berlin include two new branches of the HdG, representing its thorough attempts to colonise post-war historical representation not just in Bonn and Leipzig (Zeitgeschichtliches Forum), but also in the capital with the Tränenpalast and the Museum in der Kulturbrauerei ("Alltag in der DDR"), the latter opened in November 2013. Another high-profile institution opening recently was the Militärhistorisches Museum Dresden, whose major new exhibition, complete with Daniel Liebeskind makeover, opened in 2011.

who belong together (Fig. 8.1). Beyond the incorporation of eastern and western perspectives, current social constellations, multiculturalism, gender, class, and religious differences prompt reflection not only on who is represented in the museum today but on the very authorship of historical narratives.

Figure 8.1: “We are one people”, the culmination of the German Historical Museum’s permanent exhibition opened in the Berlin Zeughaus in 2006 (Photo ME Andrews, 2010)

Museums and collections as methodological resources

Beyond historiographical concerns, the museum’s past prompts engagement with the use of objects themselves, the value accorded them and their treatment in the exhibition context. This study makes clear the powerful relationship between collections and institutional identities. The status of the Zeughaus objects as part of a stand-alone historical collection, defined largely by its nineteenth-century scope and structure, and as an integral part of a broader institutional concept has impacted institutional structures and priorities in both the MfDG and the DHM as well as helping transport historical collecting paradigms into the present. In the exhibition this has translated into an over-representation of Prussian history as well as weapons themselves as an object category. The treatment of these collections also highlights recurrent perspectives of value, as each museum has
promoted a familiar set of objects among its “highlights.” Here too, the persistent use of historical relics as a point of contact between the visitor and historical events and personalities demonstrates continuity in the philosophical treatment of objects and their use to underscore particular historical narratives.

The site itself also provides a great deal of scope for further research. Scholars are only now beginning to develop an expanded picture of National Socialist museum practice and the Zeughaus proves an important site for investigation not only because of its centrality to Nazi military propaganda, but because it shared important relationships across a number of museum genres. In particular, the Museum for German History and the broader museum development in the GDR provide a rich source for investigation. Areas that remain relatively unexplored include the museum’s extensive pedagogical programme, its role in the development of memorial museums in the GDR, its international relationships, and the relationship between Heimat and the national idea as the two key points of reference for historical presentations. Though difficult to assess, a more nuanced understanding of the role of the museum could also be gained by an examination of the public perception and reception of the museum; how GDR citizens may or may not have engaged with the museum’s desired message as visitors and participants via the museum’s broad ranging functions and participatory strategies.

This study offers a model for how institutional histories focussing on the development of particular ideas through collections and presentation modes can be used by scholars as a resource for the investigation of social, cultural, and political phenomena, and by museum professionals to better understand the role of the museum and their own position and responsibilities in relation to inherited collections. In this way, the history of the Zeughaus collections, their development, destruction, reappropriation and expansion can inform, for instance, current discussions emerging in Germany as elsewhere regarding the possibilities of de-acquisition as a means of generating much-needed income and contending with large and often unmanageable holdings. Though the targeted exchange and sale of objects has complemented collecting practice throughout the history of the Zeughaus, shifting perceptions of collections and the impact of collecting paradigms demonstrated by this case signal the potential dangers of de-acquisition as a strategy, highlighting instead the importance of a clearly defined set of collecting criteria linked to concrete institutional goals and a historically informed vision as a strategy for managing complex collections into the future.
While each of the museums within the Zeughaus has positioned itself as either the heir or the antithesis of prevailing traditions, this study demonstrates that the museum’s actual relationship to its institutional past is far more complex. The tensions inherent in historically formed collections represent both challenges and opportunities for museum practitioners; they necessitate critical self-reflection on the museum’s past as a foundation for how we engage with objects in the present. The perceptions of the past imprint collections in ways that compel each new generation to define its own position in relation to what remains. Opening a critical dialogue with the museum’s past can not only lead to better understanding on behalf of scholars and practitioners; it is also a crucial first step in re-positioning the museum not as a place for the transmission of fixed official narratives, but as a site for engagement with multiple histories and identities negotiated between the museum and its publics.
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| HA5 (7) | Clara-Zetkin-Straße (erste Aufbau) 1918 bis 1945; 1953-56 |
| HA5 (8) | Clara-Zetkin-Straße (erste Aufbau) 1933 bis 1945 (Erneuerung 1961); 1961 |
| HA16 (1) | Waffen und Uniformen in der Geschichte, Allgemein; 1957-58 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Titel</th>
<th>Beschreibung</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HA16 (2)</td>
<td>Waffen und Uniformen in der Geschichte, Bebildertes Drehbuch; 1957-58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA53 (1)</td>
<td>Museumabschnitt: 1476-1648 Allgemein; 1962-63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA54 (2)</td>
<td>Museumabschnitt: 1648-1789 Bebildertes Drehbuch; 1966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA55 (1)</td>
<td>Museumabschnitt: 1789-1871 Allgemein; 1974-77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA55 (2)</td>
<td>Museumabschnitt: 1789-1871 Bebildertes Drehbuch; 1962-69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA56 (2)</td>
<td>Museumabschnitt: 1871-1900 Bebildertes Drehbuch; 1966-67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA57 (1)</td>
<td>Museumabschnitt: 1900-1918 Bebildertes Drehbuch; 1966-67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA57 (2)</td>
<td>Museumabschnitt: 1900-1918 Bebildertes Drehbuch; 1965-76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA58 (2)</td>
<td>Museumabschnitt: 1918-1933 Bebildertes Drehbuch; 1966-76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA59 (1)</td>
<td>Museumabschnitt: 1933-1945 Allgemein; 1979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA60 (1)</td>
<td>Museumabschnitt: 1945-1949 Allgemein; 1966-72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA60 (2)</td>
<td>Museumabschnitt: 1945-1949 Bebildertes Drehbuch; 1966-72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA93</td>
<td>Ständige Ausstellung: 1917-1945; 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA107</td>
<td>Ständige Ausstellung: Ur- und Frühgeschichte, Feudalismus, 1789-1917, 1917-1945; 1981-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/Fotos DA Eck 1980-90</td>
<td>Ständige Ausstellung: Ur- und Frühgeschichte bis 1949; 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/01 (Rot)</td>
<td>Abteilung Sammlung, Sekretariat: Liste erworbene Sammlungen; 1951-53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/1.1</td>
<td>Direktion: Aufbau und Leitung des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte; Juli 1952 – Mai 1961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/1.2</td>
<td>Direktion: Tätigkeit des Wissenschaftlichen Rates am Museum für Deutsche Geschichte; Sept. 1952 – Mai 1964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/36</td>
<td>Direktion: Exposés, Drehbuchentwürfe und Drehbuch mit kritischen Bemerkungen von Prof. Meusel für die Sonderausstellung &quot;Historische Waffen und Uniformen&quot;; Jan. – Febr. 1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/49</td>
<td>Direktion: Tagungen des Wissenschaftlichen Rates am Museum für Deutsche Geschichte; Dez. 1955, Apr. 1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/64</td>
<td>Direktion: Grundsatzdokumente, Sozialistische Gemeinschaftsarbeit und Publikation; Jan 1952 – Nov. 1954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/75</td>
<td>Direktion: Drehbuch der Ausstellung Historische Waffen und Uniformen; März 1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/75 (Rot)</td>
<td>Übersetzte Listen zurückgeführter Objekte aus der Sowjetunion; 1958-59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/87</td>
<td>Direktion: Grundsatzmaterialien zur Tätigkeit des MfDG. E. u.a.: Konstituierung des MfDG, Exposé für die Ausstellung „15 Jahre Befreiung“, Exposé „10 Jahre DDR“, Aufgaben und Struktur; Dez. 1951 – Apr. 1960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/226 (Rot)</td>
<td>Abteilung Sammlung, Sektor Militaria; Protokoll der Sitzung des Wissenschaftl. Rates über das Drehbuch der Ausstellung &quot;Waffen und Uniformen in der Geschichte&quot;; 27. April 1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/236</td>
<td>Generaldirektion: Direktor für Öffentlichkeitsarbeit, Dr. Wernicke: Grundsatzdokumente und Prognosen; März 1990 – Juni 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/260</td>
<td>Generaldirektion: Profilierung des MfDG; 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/493</td>
<td>Abt. Geschichte der DDR: Sammlungskonzeptionen / Sammlungspläne; 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/613</td>
<td>Stellvertretender Direktor für Presse und Öffentlichkeitsdienst: Grundsatzdokumente und Prognosen über die Entwicklung des MfDG; (1989) 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/615</td>
<td>Stellvertretender Direktor für Presse und Öffentlichkeitsdienst: Grundsatzdokumente und Prognosen über die Entwicklung des Museums; 1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/623</td>
<td>Generaldirektion: Ausstellungtätigkeit 1990; 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/Album/1954</td>
<td>Album an die Delegierten des IV. Parteitages der SED; 1954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/Wernicke/1989-90</td>
<td>Stellvertretender Direktor: Dr. Wernicke, Öffentlichkeitsarbeit und Zeitungsausschnitte, 1989-90;1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/Lebendige Geschichte/Teil 1-2</td>
<td>Manuskripte Katalogentwurf &quot;Lebendige Geschichte&quot;; nach 1984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/Zeitungsausschnitte/1952-60</td>
<td>Zeitungsausschnitte aus der Presse der DDR und BRD über Ausstellungen und Aktivitäten des Museums; 1952-1959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MfDG/Zeitungsausschnitte/1957-58</td>
<td>Zeitungsausschnitte des &quot;Globus&quot; Ausschnittsdienst über die Ausstellungen und anderen Aktivitäten des Museums in der DDR- und BRD-Presse; 1957-1858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**German Historical Museum**

**DHM 1.45** Generaldirektor Prof. Stölzl: Verhandlungen zwischen der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und der DDR über die Verwaltung und Nutzung der Liegenschaften Sammlungsbestände und weiterer Fonds des bisherigen Museums für Deutsche Geschichte; 1990
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DHM 1.47</th>
<th>Generaldirektion: Zusammenarbeit mit anderen veröffentlichten Einrichtungen; 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bundesarchiv (BArch)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stiftung Archiv der Parteien und Massenorganisationen der DDR im Bundesarchiv (SAPMO)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR 2/7433</td>
<td>Ministerium für Volksbildung, Museen und Gedenkstätten, Übergabe des ehemaligen Kriegsmuseums &quot;Zeughaus&quot; an die DZVV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR 2/878</td>
<td>Ministerium für Volksbildung, Museen und Gedenkstätten, Übergabe des ehemaligen Kriegsmuseums &quot;Zeughaus&quot; in Berlin an die DVV, Okt. 1947 - Mai 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR 4/80</td>
<td>Ministerium für Bildung und Wissenschaft, Abt. Ökonomie, Beschluß zur Auflösung des Museums für Deutsche Geschichte, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DY 30/IV 2/2/184</td>
<td>Protokolle des Politbüros des ZK der SED, Protokoll Nr. 84, Sitzung am 18. Dezember 1951, Delegation des Museums für deutsche Geschichte in die Sowjetunion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DY 30/IV 2/2/194</td>
<td>Protokolle des Politbüros des ZK der SED, Protokoll Nr. 94, Sitzung am 19. Februar 1952, Delegation zum Studium der Museen in der Sowjetunion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DY 30/IV 2/2/208</td>
<td>Protokolle des Politbüros des ZK der SED, Protokoll Nr. 108, Sitzung am 22. April 1952, Eröffnung des Museums für deutsche Geschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DY 30/IV 2/2/212</td>
<td>Protokolle des Politbüros des ZK der SED, Protokoll Nr. 112, Sitzung am 20. Mai 1952, Festakt zur Eröffnung des Museums für deutsche Geschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DY 30/IV 2/2/213</td>
<td>Protokolle des Politbüros des ZK der SED, Protokoll Nr. 113, Sitzung am 27. Mai 1952, Museum für deutsche Geschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DY 30/IV 2/2/215</td>
<td>Protokolle des Politbüros des ZK der SED, Protokoll Nr. 115, Sitzung am 10. Juni 1952, Besichtigung des Museums für deutsche Geschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DY 30/IV 2/2/216</td>
<td>Protokolle des Politbüros des ZK der SED, Protokoll Nr. 116, Sitzung am 17. Juni 1952, Museum für deutsche Geschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DY 30/IV 2/2/71</td>
<td>Protokolle des Politbüros des ZK der SED, Protokoll No. 71, Sitzung am 14. Februar 1950, Verwendung des Zeughauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DY 30/IV 2/2/87</td>
<td>Protokolle des Politbüros des ZK der SED, Protokoll Nr. 87, Sitzung am 9. Mai 1950, Schaffung eines Museums der revolutionären Bewegung in Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DY 30/JIV 2/3/139</td>
<td>Protokolle des Sekretariats des ZK der SED, Protokoll Nr. 13/50, Sitzung am 18. September 1950, Vorschläge für die Gestaltung des Museums und über den wissenschaftlichen Apparat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deutsches Reich: Weimarer Republik (1918-1933)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R 901/46232</td>
<td>Auswärtiges Amt, Teil: Nachrichten und Presseabteilung (1910-1945), Waffenstillstand, März - Dez. 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 901/46233</td>
<td>Auswärtiges Amt, Teil: Nachrichten und Presseabteilung (1910-1945), Waffenstillstand, Dez. 1918 - Sept. 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 901/46243</td>
<td>Auswärtiges Amt, Teil: Nachrichten und Presseabteilung (1910-1945), März 1919 - Febr. 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 901/46245</td>
<td>Auswärtiges Amt, Teil: Nachrichten und Presseabteilung (1910-1945), Waffenstillstand, Juni - Sept. 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 901/46246</td>
<td>Auswärtiges Amt, Teil: Nachrichten und Presseabteilung (1910-1945), Waffenstillstand, Juni - Okt. 1919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture archives consulted**

- Architekturmuseum, Technische Universität (TU), Berlin
- Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, München
- Bildarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz (bpk)
- Bundesarchiv, Bildarchiv
- Deutsches Dokumentationszentrum für Kunstgeschichte – Bildarchiv Foto Marburg, Philipps-Universität Marburg
- Deutsches Historisches Museum, Bildarchiv
- Deutsches Hygiene-Museum, Dresden
- San Diego Air and Space Museum Library and Archives
- Zentral- und Landesbibliothek, Berlin
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Appendix A: Hohenzollern rulers, 1640-1918

Friedrich Wilhelm
Elector of
Brandenburg ("The
Great Elector")
1640-1688

Louise Henriette
of Orange-Nassau
(m. 1646)

Friedrich III Elector of
Brandenburg
1688-1713
Friedrich I King in
Prussia 1701-1713

Sophie Charlotte
of Hanover
(m. 1684)

Friedrich Wilhelm I
("The Soldier King")
King in Prussia
1713-1740

Sophie Dorothea
of Hanover
(m. 1706)

Friedrich II
("Friedrich the Great")
King of Prussia
1740-1786

Elisabeth
Christine of
Brunswick-Bevern
(m. 1733)

Augustus William
Prince of Prussia

Luise of Brunswick-
Wolfenbüttel
(m. 1744)

Friedrich Wilhelm II
King of Prussia
1786-1797

Frederika Louisa of
Hesse-Darmstadt
(m. 1769)

Friedrich Wilhelm III
King of Prussia
1797-1840

Louise of
Mecklenburg-
Strelitz
(m. 1793)

Friedrich Wilhelm IV
King of Prussia
1840-1861

Elisabeth
Ludovika of
Bavaria
(m. 1823)

Wilhelm I King of
Prussia 1861-1888
Emperor of
Germany 1871-1888

Augusta of Saxe-
Weimar-Eisenach
(m. 1829)

Friedrich III King of
Prussia and Emperor
of Germany
1888-1888

Victoria, Princess
Royal of Great
Britain and Ireland
(m. 1858)

Wilhelm II King of
Prussia and Emperor
of Germany
1888-1918

Augusta Victoria of
Schleswig-Holstein
(m. 1881)
### Appendix B. State Museums of Berlin 1945; until 31.12.1991; 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ägyptische Abteilung (Egyptian Department)</td>
<td>Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung (Egyptian Museum and Papyrus Collection)</td>
<td>Ägyptisches Museum (Egyptian Museum)</td>
<td>Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung (Egyptian Museum and Papyrus Collection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemäldegalerie (Painting Gallery)</td>
<td>Gemäldegalerie (Painting Gallery)</td>
<td>Gemäldegalerie (Painting Gallery)</td>
<td>Gemäldegalerie (Painting Gallery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunstbibliothek (Art Library)</td>
<td>Kunstbibliothek (Art Library)</td>
<td>Kunstbibliothek (Art Library)</td>
<td>Kunstbibliothek (Art Library)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupferstrichkabinett (Museum of Prints and Drawings)</td>
<td>Kupferstrichkabinett (Museum of Prints and Drawings)</td>
<td>Kupferstrichkabinett (Museum of Prints and Drawings)</td>
<td>Kupferstrichkabinett (Museum of Prints and Drawings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Münzkabinett (Numismatic Collection)</td>
<td>Münzkabinett (Numismatic Collection)</td>
<td>Münzkabinett (Numismatic Collection)</td>
<td>Münzkabinett (Numismatic Collection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostasiatische Kunstsammlung (East Asian Art Collection)</td>
<td>Ostasiatische Sammlung (East Asian Collection)</td>
<td>Museum für Ostasiatische Kunst (Museum for East Asian Art)</td>
<td>Museum für Ostasiatische Kunst (Museum for East Asian Art)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamische Abteilung (Islamic Department)</td>
<td>Islamisches Museum (Islamic Museum)</td>
<td>Museum für Islamische Kunst (Museum for Islamic Art)</td>
<td>Museum für Islamische Kunst (Museum for Islamic Art)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frühchristlich-Byzantinische Sammlung (Early Christian Byzantine Collection)</td>
<td>Frühchristlich-Byzantinische Sammlung (Early Christian Byzantine Collection)</td>
<td>Skulpturesammlung (Sculpture Collection)</td>
<td>Skulpturesammlung und Museum für Byzantinische Kunst (Sculpture Collection and Museum for Byzantine Art)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skulpturenabteilung (Sculpture Department)</td>
<td>Skulpturesammlung (Sculpture Collection)</td>
<td>Museum für Völkerkunde</td>
<td>Museum für Völkerkunde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum für Deutsche Völkerkunde</td>
<td>Museum für Deutsche Völkerkunde</td>
<td>Museum für Deutsche Völkerkunde</td>
<td>Museum Europäischer Kulturen (Museum for European Cultures)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Private Foundation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte (Museum of Prehistory and Early History)</td>
<td>Museum für Ur- und Frühgeschichte (Museum of Prehistory and Early History)</td>
<td>Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte (Museum of Prehistory and Early History)</td>
<td>Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte (Museum of Prehistory and Early History)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorderasiatische Abteilung (Ancient Near East Department)</td>
<td>Vorderasiatisches Museum (Museum of the Ancient Near East)</td>
<td>Institut für Museumswesen (Institute for Museology, established 1971 under the governance of the Ministry for Culture)</td>
<td>Institut für Museumskunde (Institute for Museology, established 1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gipsformerei (Replica Workshop)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institut für Museumsforschung (Institute for Museum Research)</td>
<td>Gipsformerei (Replica Workshop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeughaus Museum</td>
<td>Dissolved</td>
<td>Dissolved</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Adapted from the German provided for the transition 1991/92 in Werner Kopp, Wolfgang Kahlicke, and Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz. Die Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, vol. I. (Berlin: Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, 1994), p. 35. List of departments and collections at 1945 per ‘Verzeichnis der Museumsabteilungen,’ in Ehemals Staatliche Museen Berlin, Die Berliner Museen (Berlin: Verlag Gebr. Mann, 1953), p 9. Updated per “Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Museen und Einrichtungen (SMB-PK website),” Available at http://www.smb.museum/museen-und-einrichtungen.html [accessed 18 January 2014]. Note: This list refers to the collections of the State Museums of Berlin and is not reflective of their physical location, which has also been the subject of a massive (ongoing) re-organisation.
Appendix C: Ruhmeshalle sculpture & painting programme (floor plan)²

2 Author’s representation of the north wing, upper floor of the Zeughaus (Ruhmeshalle), 1891-1945, showing the position of the paintings and sculptures listed in Appendices D and E. Arrows indicate the visitor’s circuit through the space. Not to scale.
### Appendix D: Ruhmeshalle painting programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Painter</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Fig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allegorical Paintings, Herrscherhalle (Rulers’ Hall)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Triumphal Parade</strong></td>
<td>Frieze around the central dome</td>
<td>Friedrich Geselschap (1835-98)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Establishment of the Empire</strong></td>
<td>Northern lunette, opposite the entrance</td>
<td>Friedrich Geselschap</td>
<td>AG1</td>
<td>2.6, 2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reception of the heroes at Valhalla</strong></td>
<td>Western lunette</td>
<td>Friedrich Geselschap</td>
<td>AG2</td>
<td>2.6, 2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peace</strong></td>
<td>Southern lunette</td>
<td>Friedrich Geselschap</td>
<td>AG3</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>War</strong></td>
<td>Eastern lunette, visitor entrance</td>
<td>Friedrich Geselschap</td>
<td>AG4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The four sovereign virtues (tondi): Justice (Gerechtigkeit), Strength (Stärke), Moderation (Mäßigung), and Wisdom (Weisheit)</strong></td>
<td>Spandrels between the lunettes</td>
<td>Friedrich Geselschap</td>
<td>T1-4</td>
<td>2.6, 2.7, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical Paintings, Herrscherhalle (Rulers’ Hall)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coronation Friedrich I, 1701</strong></td>
<td>Rulers’ Hall, northern wall, west of the Victoria statue, painting 1 of 4 proceeding anti-clockwise around the Rulers’ Hall and 1 of 16 proceeding anti-clockwise around the combined halls</td>
<td>Anton v. Werner (1843-1915)</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>2.6, 2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silesia pays homage to Friedrich the Great, 1741</strong></td>
<td>Rulers’ Hall, southern wall, west of the entrance, painting 2 of 4 and 7 of 16</td>
<td>Wilhelm Camphausen (1818-1885)</td>
<td>G8</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appeal “To my people”, 17 March 1813</strong></td>
<td>Rulers’ Hall, southern wall, east of the entrance, painting 3 of 4 and 8 of 16</td>
<td>Georg Bleibtreu (1828-1892)</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imperial Proclamation at Versailles, 18 January 1871</strong></td>
<td>Rulers’ Hall, northern wall, east of the Victoria statue, painting 4 of 4 and 16 of 16</td>
<td>Anton v. Werner</td>
<td>G16</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical Paintings, Feldherrenhalle (Generals’ Hall)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Battle of Fehrbellin, 1675</strong></td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall, northern wall, painting 2 of 16 proceeding anti-clockwise around the combined halls</td>
<td>P. Jansen</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passage of the Curonian Lagoon (The Great Sleigh Drive), 1679</strong></td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall, northern wall, painting 3</td>
<td>W. Simmler</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Battle of Turin, 1706</strong></td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall, northern wall, painting 4</td>
<td>R. Knackfuß</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Battle of Hohenfriedberg, 1745</strong></td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall, western wall, painting 5</td>
<td>P. Jansen</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Battle of Leuthen, 1757</strong></td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall, western wall, painting 6</td>
<td>F. Roeber</td>
<td>G6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Painters</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Torgau, 1760</td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall, southern wall, painting 7</td>
<td>P. Jansen</td>
<td>G7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Battle of Nations at Leipzig, 16, 18 and 19 October 1813</td>
<td>Eastern Generals’ Hall, southern wall, painting 10</td>
<td>W. Schuch</td>
<td>G10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle-Alliance (Waterloo), 18 June 1815</td>
<td>Eastern Generals’ Hall, eastern wall, painting 11</td>
<td>Georg Bleibtreu</td>
<td>G11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storming of the Düppeler Schanzen, 1864</td>
<td>Eastern Generals’ Hall, eastern wall, painting 12</td>
<td>E. Röber</td>
<td>G12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Königgratz, 1866</td>
<td>Eastern Generals’ Hall, northern wall, painting 13</td>
<td>E. Hünten</td>
<td>G13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storming of St. Privat (Battle of Gravelotte), 1870</td>
<td>Eastern Generals’ Hall, northern wall, painting 14</td>
<td>Georg Bleibtreu</td>
<td>G14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the battle of Sedan, 1870</td>
<td>Eastern Generals’ Hall, northern wall, painting 15</td>
<td>C. Steffeck</td>
<td>G15</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix E: Ruhmeshalle sculpture programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Sculptor</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Fig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central courtyard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Borussia</strong> with antique helmet and costume, armoured shins, holding a downward pointing sword and laurel wreath resting against her hip, Carrara marble, 4.5m high, completed 1885</td>
<td>Central courtyard, centre</td>
<td>Reinhold Begas (1831-1911)</td>
<td>Borussia</td>
<td>2.5, 3.9, 3.18, 4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seated Warrior in Roman armour, holding a downward pointing sword and resting against a round shield (young warrior)</strong></td>
<td>Central courtyard, staircase, western arm</td>
<td>Reinhold Begas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.5, 4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seated Warrior in Roman armour, reclining (old warrior)</strong></td>
<td>Central courtyard, staircase, eastern arm</td>
<td>Reinhold Begas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staircase Reliefs featuring two female figures; sea warfare ships (western spandrel) and land warfare (eastern spandrel)</strong></td>
<td>Central courtyard, staircase, spandrels</td>
<td>Reinhold Begas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.5, 3.9, 3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relief work, bronze door with allegorical depiction of the life and death of a warrior.</strong></td>
<td>Entrance to the Ruhmeshalle</td>
<td>Otto Lessing (1846-1912)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria</strong> with victory outstretched arm holding a wreath and the other a palm branch, Carrara marble, 3.9m high, completed 1881</td>
<td>Ruler’s Hall, north wall, centre, opposite main entrance, in arched niche lined with red marble</td>
<td>Fritz Schaper (1841-1919)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>2.6, 2.12, 3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friedrich Wilhelm, Der Große Kurfurst (The Great Elector) (1620-1688). Full-length statue, cast bronze, 2.8m high atop a pedestal of grey marble, completed 1883</strong></td>
<td>Ruler’s Hall, north wall, to the left of the Victoria statue. The statues of the Hohenzollern rulers proceed in chronological order in an anti-clockwise direction. This statue position 1 (of 8)</td>
<td>Erdmann Encke (1849-1896)</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>2.6, 2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friedrich I (1657-1713), as above, completed 1884</strong></td>
<td>Ruler’s Hall, western side, position 2</td>
<td>Ludwig Brunow (1843-1913)</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friedrich Wilhelm I (1688-1740), completed 1884</strong></td>
<td>Ruler’s Hall, western side, position 3</td>
<td>Carl Hilgers (1818-1890)</td>
<td>H3</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friedrich II (Friedrich the Great) (1712-1786), completed 1886</strong></td>
<td>Ruler’s Hall, southern side, position 4</td>
<td>Erdmann Encke</td>
<td>H4</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friedrich Wilhelm II (1744-1797), completed 1884</strong></td>
<td>Ruler’s Hall, southern wall, position 5</td>
<td>Ludwig Brunow</td>
<td>H5</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friedrich Wilhelm III (1770-1840), completed 1884</strong></td>
<td>Ruler’s Hall, eastern wall, position 6</td>
<td>Emil Hundrieser (1846 -1911)</td>
<td>H6</td>
<td>2.6, 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friedrich Wilhelm IV (1795-1861), completed 1885</strong></td>
<td>Ruler’s Hall, eastern side, position 7</td>
<td>Carl Schuler (1847-1886)</td>
<td>H7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wilhelm I, Emperor (1797-1888), completed 1891</strong></td>
<td>Ruler’s Hall, northern side, position 8</td>
<td>Rudolf Siemering (1835-1905)</td>
<td>H8</td>
<td>2.6, 2.12, 3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christoph Freiherr v. Sparr (1606-1668)</td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>Carl Begas</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georg Freiherr v. Defflinger (1606-1695)</td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>Moritz Schulz</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joachim Hennigs v. Treffenfeld (1600-1688)</td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>Carl Bergmeister</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Adam v. Schöninger (1641-1696)</td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>Julius Franz</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopold Fürst v. Anhalt (1676-1747)</td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>M. Neumann</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Christoph Graf v. Schwerin (1684-1757)</td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>Julius Moser</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl v. Winterfeldt (1707-1757)</td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>Rudolf Pohle</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Keith (1696-1758)</td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>Rudolf Schweinitz</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moritz Prinz v. Anhalt-Dessau (1712-1760)</td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>Rudolf Schweinitz</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich Graf v. Geßler (1688-1762)</td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>Rudolf Schweinitz</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich Wilhelm v. Seydlitz (1721-1773)</td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>Julius Moser</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrich August Baron de la Motte-Fouqué (1698-1774)</td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>Max Weise</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferdinand Herzog v. Braunschweig-Lüneburg (1721-1792)</td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>Carl Bergmeister</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrich Prinz v. Preußen (1726-1802)</td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>Max Weise</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian v. Belling (1719-1779)</td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>Ferdinand Hartzer</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joachim Hans v. Zeiten (1699-1786)</td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>Johannes Pfuhl</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrich Reichsfreiherr v. Stein (1757-1831)</td>
<td>Western Generals’ Hall, southern wall adjacent the central dome</td>
<td>Fritz Schaper</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerhard David v. Scharnhorst (1757-1813)</td>
<td>Eastern Generals’ Hall, southern wall adjacent the central dome</td>
<td>Alexander Calandrelli</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>René Baron de l’Homme de Courbière (1733-1811)</td>
<td>Eastern Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>Ludwig Brodolf</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerhardt Lebrecht Fürst Blücher v. Wahlstatt (1742-1819)</td>
<td>Eastern Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>Johannes Pfuhl</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludwig Graf Yorck v. Wartenburg (1759-1830)</td>
<td>Eastern Generals’ Hall</td>
<td>Alexander Tondeur</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich Wilhelm Graf Bülow v. Dennewitz (1755-1816)</td>
<td>Eastern Generals' Hall</td>
<td>Otto Büchting</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emanuel Graf Tautenzien v Wittenberg (1760-1824)</td>
<td>Eastern Generals' Hall</td>
<td>Otto Büchting</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August Graf Reinhardt v. Gneisenau (1760-1831)</td>
<td>Eastern Generals' Hall</td>
<td>Wilhelm Engelhardt</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich Graf Kleist v. Nollendorf (1763-1823)</td>
<td>Eastern Generals' Hall</td>
<td>Julius Franz</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich Graf v. Wrangel (1784-1877)</td>
<td>Eastern Generals' Hall</td>
<td>Heinz Hoffmeister</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August Graf v. Werder (1808-1887)</td>
<td>Eastern Generals' Hall</td>
<td>Max Klein</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August v. Goeben (1816-1880)</td>
<td>Eastern Generals' Hall</td>
<td>Heinz Hoffmeister</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin Freiherr v. Manteuffel (1809-1885)</td>
<td>Eastern Generals' Hall</td>
<td>Max Klein</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich Karl Prinz v. Preußen (1828-1885)</td>
<td>Eastern Generals' Hall</td>
<td>Carl Begas</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedricf Wilhelm Kronprinz des Deutschen Reiches und von Preußen (1831-1888)</td>
<td>Eastern Generals' Hall</td>
<td>Carl Begas</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albrecht Graf v. Roon (1803-1879)</td>
<td>Western Generals' Hall, northern wall adjacent the central dome</td>
<td>Alexander Calandrelli</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmut Graf v. Moltke (1800-1891)</td>
<td>Eastern Generals' Hall</td>
<td>Carl Begas</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otto Fürst v. Bismark (1815-1898)</td>
<td>Eastern Generals' Hall, northern wall adjacent the central dome</td>
<td>Reinhold Begas</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allegorical Figures in the Herrscherhalle (Rulers’ Hall): The four attributes of victory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science of War / Strategy (Kriegswissenschaft)</strong> White carrara marble, 2.2m high, seated female figure with opened book in left hand, completed 1887</td>
<td>Herrscherhalle, western hall, north wall</td>
<td>Reinhold Begas</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power (Kraft)</strong> White carrara marble, 2.2m high, seated female figure with a staff and lion’s pelt, completed 1887</td>
<td>Herrscherhalle, western hall, west wall</td>
<td>Reinhold Begas</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loyalty (Treue)</strong> White carrara marble, 2.2m high, seated female figure with sward, sceptre, palm leaf, Imperial crown, completed by 1887</td>
<td>Herrscherhalle, eastern hall, north wall</td>
<td>Fritz Schaper</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dedication (Begeisterung)</strong> White carrara marble, 2.2m high, seated female figure with oak wreath, sword, and shield bearing the Reich eagle, completed by 1887</td>
<td>Herrscherhalle, eastern hall, east wall</td>
<td>Fritz Schaper</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendix F: List of the main special exhibitions 1933-43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibition Title</th>
<th>English Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Opened / Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Haupterwerbungen des Zeughauses seit dem Weltkrieg</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main Acquisitions since the World War</strong></td>
<td>Herrscherhalle</td>
<td><strong>Opened 24 May 1933</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reisewagen Napoleons I. und die Blücherbeute von Belle-Alliance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Carriage of Napoleon I and the Blücher Booty from Belle-Alliance</strong></td>
<td>Courtyard</td>
<td><strong>25 December 1933 – End July 1934</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Der Weltkrieg in Bildern I. Die Vogesenfront im Kriegsbildern von Ernst Vollbehr</strong></td>
<td><strong>The World War in Pictures I. The Vosges Front in war pictures by Ernst Vollbehr</strong></td>
<td>Lower floor, bays 73 &amp; 100</td>
<td><strong>Opened 2 August 1934</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kriegsbilder und Zeichnungen von Prof. Ludwig Dettmann</strong></td>
<td><strong>War pictures and drawings by Prof. Ludwig Dettmann</strong></td>
<td>Courtyard</td>
<td><strong>1934</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Der Weltkrieg in Bildern II. Ostpreußen und die Winterschlacht in Masuren</strong></td>
<td><strong>The World War in Pictures II. East Prussia and the Winter battle in Masuria</strong></td>
<td>Courtyard</td>
<td><strong>January – March 1935</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Die Rettungsmedaille</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Life Saving Medal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Closed 8 October 1935</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Die Generäle der Tannenbergschlacht</strong></td>
<td><strong>The generals of the battle of Tannenberg</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1935</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Der Weltkrieg in Bildern IV. Die Herbstschacht in der Champagne und im Artois, Gedächtnisschau 1915/1935</strong></td>
<td><strong>The World War in Pictures IV. The Autumn Battle in Champagne and Artois, Memorial Show 1915/1935</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Previewed 22 October 1935</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Der Weltkrieg in Bildern V. Der Kampf um Verdun 1916, Gedächtnisschau 1916/1936</strong></td>
<td><strong>The World War in Pictures V. The battle of Verdun in 1916, Memorial show 1916/1936</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Opened 25 February 1936</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guest Exhibition: Ausstellung des Volksbundes Deutsche Kriegsgräberfürsorge</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exhibition of the German War Graves Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Closed End March 1937</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100 Jahre Hinterlader 1836-1936. Die Erfindung des preußischen Zündnadelgewehrs durch Johann Nikolaus von Dreyse</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 years breechloader 1836 to 1936. The invention of the Prussian needle gun by Johann Nikolaus von Dreyse</strong></td>
<td>Upper Floor, Bay 30</td>
<td><strong>Opened 14 November 1936 (closed March 1938)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Der Weltkrieg in Bildern. VII. Kriegsplakate und Mauerschläge bei Freund und Feind</strong></td>
<td><strong>The World War in Pictures VII. War Posters and Notices of Friend and Foe</strong></td>
<td>Lower floor bays 83-85</td>
<td><strong>Opened 4 May 1937</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Der Weltkrieg in Bildern. VIII. Die Eroberung der Baltischen Inseln</strong></td>
<td><strong>The World War in Pictures VIII. The capture of the Baltic Islands</strong></td>
<td>Lower floor bays 83-85</td>
<td><strong>Last quarter 1937 – 7 March 1938</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918 und Die Schlacht Am Kemmel, April 1918</td>
<td>of Mont Kemmel, April 1918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Weltkrieg in Bildern X. Die Schlacht Bei Tannenberg</td>
<td>The World War in Pictures X. Battle of Tannenberg</td>
<td>Lower floor bays 83-85</td>
<td>Opened August 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ausstellung als Anlass der 250 jährigen Wiederkehr des Geburtstages König Friedrich Wilhelm I</td>
<td>Exhibition as the occasion of the 250 year anniversary of the birth of King Friedrich Wilhelm I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ausstellung polnischer Kriegsbeute (auch &quot;Kriegsbeute aus Polen&quot;)</td>
<td>Exhibition of Polish war booty (also called &quot;war booty from Poland&quot;)</td>
<td>Courtyard</td>
<td>Opened 14 October 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilddokumente aus dem Feldzug in Polen von Professor Ernst Vollbehr</td>
<td>Visual documents from the campaign in Poland by Professor Ernst Vollbehr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Westwall. Bilddokumente von Professor Ernst Vollbehr</td>
<td>The Western Wall. Visual documents by Professor Ernst Vollbehr</td>
<td>Opened 1 November 1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Feldzug in Polen</td>
<td>The campaign in Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vom Westwall nach Frankreich hinein</td>
<td>From the Western Wall into France</td>
<td>Opened 4 July 1940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ausstellung Französischer Kriegsbeute</td>
<td>Exhibition of French war booty</td>
<td>Courtyard</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampf in Zentralrußland</td>
<td>Fight in Central Russia</td>
<td>Lower floor, south west corner</td>
<td>Opened 21 March 1943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix G: List of exhibitions held at the Zeughaus 1946-48

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibition Title (German and English)</th>
<th>Organisers</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Opened / Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Deutsche Kunstausstellung (First German Art Exhibition)</td>
<td>Zentralverwaltung für Volksbildung (Gebiet unter Alliierter Besatzung, Russische Zone)</td>
<td>Deutsche Zentralverwaltung für Volksbildung in der Sowjetischen Besatzungszone, I. Deutsche Kunst Ausstellung, Berlin: Max Lichtwitz, 1946.</td>
<td>19 May – 30 June 1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geschlechtskrankheiten: Bekämpfung und Heilung (Venereal Disease: Prevention and Cure)</td>
<td>Deutsches Hygiene-Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 August – 8 September 1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berliner Briefmarken-Ausstellung im ehem. Zeughaus (Berlin Stamp Exhibition)</td>
<td>Gastbezirk Mitte and the Genossenschaft &quot;Volkshaus&quot; Wilmersdorf</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 – 15 December 1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanninschenschau (Rabbit Show)</td>
<td>Landesverband Deutscher Kaninchenzüchter (rabbit breeding society)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-19 January 1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La sculpture française de Rodin à nos jours (French Sculpture from Rodin to the present day)</td>
<td>Groupe Français du Conseil de Contrôle, Division Education et Affaires Culturelles</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 July – 5 August 1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrieleistungsschau 1948: 1 Jahr deutsche Treuhandverwaltung (Industrial Show 1948: 1 Year German Trust Administration)</td>
<td>Deutsche Treuhandgesellschaft</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 July – 17 October 1948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Museum for German History, structure at 1954

4 Source: DHM-HA: MfDG/Album presented to the delegates of the IV. Parteitag, 1954
Appendix I: List of interviews conducted

**German Historical Museum:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position / Department</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burkhard Asmuss †</td>
<td>Curator / Collection Head Documents II Photo Albums, Newspapers, Flyers, Propaganda Documents, Maps, Autographs since 1914</td>
<td>30 March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemarie Beier-de Haan</td>
<td>Curator / Collection Head Everyday Life I Technical and Medical Products and Equipment, Household Objects, Product Advertising</td>
<td>20 April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regine Falkenberg</td>
<td>Curator / Collection Head Everyday Life II Fashion, Costume, Civil Textiles, Insignia, Religiosia</td>
<td>14 April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carola Jüllig</td>
<td>Curator / Collection Head Everyday Life III Toys, Postcards, Political Objects, Sound Recordings</td>
<td>28 July 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Ottomeyer</td>
<td>Former President of the Foundation German Historical Museum / General Director of the Museum</td>
<td>27 October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dieter Vorsteher-Seiler</td>
<td>Head of the Collections</td>
<td>26 October 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Former Museum for German History:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position / Department</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jürgen Feige</td>
<td>Former Staff Member Continuing Education</td>
<td>11 March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas Michaelis</td>
<td>Contemporary History (History of the GDR)</td>
<td>30 March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrich Müller</td>
<td>Former Head of the Department Feudalism Former Head of the Militaria Collections</td>
<td>17 August, 25 August, and 14 September 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerd Quaas</td>
<td>Former Scientific Co-Worker Militaria Collections / Department Feudalism</td>
<td>26 July 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Wernicke</td>
<td>Former Head of Contemporary History (History of the GDR) / Assistant Director of the Museum</td>
<td>21 April 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>