

DECONSTRUCTIVIST ARCHITECTURE AS THE ONLY WAY TO RETELL GERMAN-JEWISH HISTORY:

A LETTER FROM NATHAN BODER

by Boder Nathan

ABSTRACT

The focus of this in-depth work revolves around the extension of the Jewish Museum Berlin by Daniel Libeskind within the broader theme of Berlin architecture around 1989. It takes the form of a letter directly addressed to the architect, requiring a personal involvement from the author. The author presents himself as an architecture student and expresses his interest in exploring the unique architectural expression of the museum. The emphasis is on Daniel Libeskind's deviation from traditional architectural conventions to develop a unique solution. To address this, the letter is divided into four parts, raising questions about the relationship between Libeskind's architecture and the deconstructivist movement, seeking to clarify the distinct character of the museum's expression. It also explores the implementation of architecture and its ability to convey the experiences of the Nazi regime on the German Jewish population. The origin of deconstructivist architecture is also addressed, establishing connections with the exhibition by Philipp Johnson and the philosophical ideas of Jacques Derrida. Lastly, it discusses the sources of inspiration for the museum extension and its abstract nature, highlighting the layers of meaning and interpretations offered by Libeskind's work. Overall, the letter expresses curiosity in understanding Libeskind's perspective and gaining a better understanding of the architectural choices made in the creation of the Jewish Museum extension.

Vertiefungsarbeit
In-depth Study

Deconstructivist architecture as the only way to
retell German-Jewish History:
A Letter from Nathan Boder
Nathan Boder

Rue de Boujean 123
2504 Biel/Bienne

Dozenten / Lecturers

Prof. Dr. Oliver Dufner
Dr. Marcel Bächtiger
Dipl. Ing. MAS Caroline Ting

Lucerne University of
Applied Sciences and Arts

HOCHSCHULE LUZERN
Technik & Architektur
Technikumstrasse 21
6048 Horw

Master in Architektur
Datum: 13.06.2023

CONTENT

1	A Letter from Nathan Boder	7
2	Comments and references	14
3	Sources	22
4	Declaration of originality	23

1 A LETTER FROM NATHAN BODER

Dear Daniel,

I am writing to you in the context of an in-depth essay that I am conducting on the theme of Berlin architecture around 1989. As you may have noticed, this date is not insignificant, as it marks the fall of the wall. This event represents a crucial turning point in the history of Berlin. As a matter of fact, you have yourself experienced the consequences of this historic moment. These include, among others, your first winning competition, the "City Edge" Project in Berlin's Tiergarten district, which unfortunately did not materialize. Thus, I imagine that you understand where I am going with this. Contacting you, Daniel Libeskind, regarding architecture in Berlin in 1989, it is clear that we will be discussing your impressive achievement for the extension of the Jewish Museum in Berlin. Like many others, the architectural expression of this building intrigues me, and it has piqued my curiosity. I am eager to learn more about it.

First and foremost, I would like to address you in the form of a letter, as I find this method of communication quite customary during the 1990s. This is particularly evident in your exchanges with Jacques Derrida and Peter Eisenman. This mode of correspondence requires of course to know the person who is sending the letter and their intentions. Although I briefly mentioned my objectives at the beginning of our exchange, allow me to formally introduce myself and provide a clearer picture of my architectural background. By doing so, I hope to offer you a better understanding of my approach, the questions I will be exploring, and the perspective from which I will be conducting my inquiries.

My education in the field of architecture began in 2006 at the age of 15 with an apprenticeship as a building draftsman. I then went on to complete my Bachelor's degree in architecture at the School of Engineering and Architecture of Fribourg from 2010 to 2013. Until then, my education had been quite technical and Cartesian, so to speak. After that, I specialized in architectural visualization and started my own studio in this field in 2015. I primarily collaborate with architectural offices to create images for competition. As the years went by, I honed my eye and developed a critical perspective on projects. In 2021, I returned to architectural studies with a more liberated attitude, free from the technical constraints of my previous education, in a way. In the context of the Master's program at the Lucerne School of Engineering and Architecture, I wish to continue this work of "liberation". It is with this mindset that I am interested in your work, a project that has freed itself from all architectural conventions.

Before I delve into the main subject, I must express my excitement as I sit down to write this letter. It presents a unique opportunity for me to explore the extensive literature surrounding this remarkable new extension. Moreover, my recent visit to Berlin allowed me to physically immerse myself in the depths of this extraordinary architectural masterpiece. This fusion of physical and intellectual experiences has inspired me to reach out to you today. I would like to ask for your thoughts and perspectives on four aspects that have particularly caught my attention.

This brings me directly to the first point, regarding the extension of the Jewish Museum. I embarked on my journey by reading your text, "Between the Lines: The Jewish Museum, Berlin". Your approach resonates with me and, in my opinion, makes complete sense. How could we, as architects, tackle such a weighty subject in history, such as the Jewish community of Berlin, with traditional architectural tools? From the start of the project, you freed yourself from all rationality. To quote your words, it is in the name of reason that acts of destruction and domination are committed in the world. The irrational became your starting point. This opposition, in my view, is most appropriate in the context of the Jewish Museum. The Holocaust, which lies at the heart of the project, is defined as a systematic and bureaucratic extermination carried out against the Jewish people by Nazi Germany during World War II. It was therefore impossible to create a new extension following the principles of traditional architecture, which was the prevalent approach favored by many architects in Berlin at that time, characterized by simplicity and the use of stone facades.

In my opinion, a project should be integrated into its site and engage in a dialogue with its context, encompassing the memory of the place by preserving traces of happiness, sufferings, and hopes of previous generations. This perspective was also encouraged by Josef Paul Kleihues in his concept of "Kritische Rekonstruktion." Although your architectural language was completely different from what had been done up to that point, your intentions seem coherent with this line of thought. You anchored the project in the city of Berlin through intellectual artifices that still fully form part of the building today.

One of these four artifices is the reference to Arnold Schönberg's unfinished opera, which particularly intrigued me. It was while reading the final stanzas, "O word, thou word, that I lack!", that I realized if architecture is a language, it too lacked the words to express an appropriate extension to the Jewish Museum in Berlin.

It seemed more than necessary to develop an architectural language that was specific and unique to this intervention. However, your work is classified as deconstructivist architecture. Yet, the language to express this lack undeniably exists. One might have assumed that the museum extension was a groundbreaking innovation, but that is not the case, as Philip Johnson curated an exhibition on deconstructivist architecture back in 1988, and you, Daniel, were one of the protagonists, presenting your first award-winning design, as mentioned earlier in our exchange. This leads me to question the uniqueness of the expression embodied in the museum's extension. I am eager to hear your thoughts on this matter. Were the preceding works essential for you to master this new language? Furthermore, as you continued to refine your practice of this idiom, the question arises of whether subsequent creations should be deemed imitators. They have nothing to do with the liberation from all rationality to counterbalance the atrocious acts committed in the name of reason. I am intrigued by the relationship between your two architectural achievements, the Jewish Museum in Berlin and the Westside in Bern, for example. They share a similar architectural language, but their functions are radically opposed: a museum dedicated to the repercussions of the Holocaust and a shopping center. What is your perspective on this, Daniel? I am in need of your illuminating insights.

During my visit to the museum, a second matter revealed itself to me. I couldn't help but wonder about the implementation of your architecture. Since a traditional and rational approach was not deemed suitable, how did this deconstructivist architecture address the task at hand? And what does it look like in practice? Access to the new extension is through an underground passage from the existing building. It is from this point onwards that our senses are put to the test. In the basement, you have thematically organized three axes as interconnecting corridors: Continuity, Exile, and Holocaust. Through architecture, you have ingeniously created an experience where visitors can physically feel the repercussions of the Nazi regime on the German Jewish population.

The floor slopes, some walls are askew, and the ceiling gradually descends along the axes. The shortest axis represents the Holocaust, while the most unsettling one is Exile, culminating in the Garden of Exile. The most challenging journey is through Continuity, with its uncertain future depicted by the abrupt end of a long flight of stairs. This underground space constitutes an integral architectural sequence that is an intrinsic part of visitors' journey through the museum. It is a mandatory passage, akin to a prepara-

tory rite for the visitors. While some historical artifacts are presented, it is the architecture itself that must be discovered. These subtleties are not a flamboyant display of the deconstructivist movement. Only the concrete beams that traverse the upper part of the staircase seem to embody the concept of deconstruction.

Your architecture is laden with meaning, but what about this particular detail, these concrete beams? The audio guide leaves me without an answer, other than stating that these beams exhibit the characteristics of deconstructivist architecture: intersecting lines, a renunciation of symmetry, and the dismantling and reunion of shapes. In my personal view, this is a bit reductive. The primary intent was to eschew reason, but I do not believe irrationality can be justified solely on the basis of its opposition to a certain rationality. These structural elements may appear insignificant when compared to the magnitude of your work and the precisely developed themes such as the nexus of lines on the facades or the voids that punctuate the visit. However, these beams perhaps serve to highlight once again the uniqueness of this building. In concrete terms, what relationship does the constructed architecture of this building have with deconstructivist architecture? Can this building be truly associated with this movement merely because it shares certain formal aspects?

The third point concerns the origin of this deconstructivist architecture. In this regard, I recall the enlightening definition put forth by Philip Johnson in the preface of the "Deconstructivist Architecture" exhibition. As already mentioned, you were one of the protagonists of this exhibition. From the outset, Philip Johnson clarifies that this architecture is not a new style or a defined movement with its own rules and designated architects. It is not linked to religious doctrines either. Rather, it represents a convergence of architectural works sharing a similar approach, giving rise to comparable forms. These creations, though diverse, do not share common roots but rather emerge from different parts of the world. These statements stand in contrast to the modern style, which also serves as a point of comparison: perfection versus deformed perfection. This fascination with deformation seems to be one of the driving forces behind this captivating phenomenon. Furthermore, as I examine the description of your "City Edge" project, I am struck by the verbs used: transform, twist, dismember, bend, deform, and many others. There seems to be a deliberate intention to disrupt pure form, as if it were necessary to conceive a shape first and then modify it. However, it is important to note that there is no direct link here with the contemporary philosophical movement known as "deconstruction".

Jacques Derrida, the French philosopher and figurehead of the philosophical movement "deconstruction", worked alongside Bernard Tschumi and Peter Eisenman on the garden project along the cinematic promenade in the Parc de la Villette. I should point out here that Bernard Tschumi's emblematic Parc de la Villette project was also one of the subjects featured in Philip Johnson's exhibition. Unfortunately, this unprecedented collaboration between a philosopher and architects remained theoretical due to various institutional blockages. However, it did demonstrate how philosophy and architecture can be mutually enriching. Indeed, Derrida's philosophical theory inspired the architects to question the values and constraints that restrict architectural expression. They sought to appropriate Derrida's deconstruction to propose a new architecture. In Derrida's theory, two terms are used: signified and signifier. In his architectural application, Peter Eisenman introduced a third term, the concept of "presentness". He spoke of it in his letter to Jacques Derrida, describing it as a concept situated between absence and presence, between form and function, between the specific use of a sign and the raw existence of reality. In a philosophical essay entitled "Déconstruction philosophique et déconstructivisme architectural", Céline Bonicco-Donato illustrates the suspension of the manifestation of the link between form and function with a garden without vegetation or a staircase that leads nowhere. The first refers to the "Chora L Works" project by Peter Eisenman and Jacques Derrida in the framework of the Parc de la Villette project. The second reminds me of your project for the Jewish Museum in Berlin, with its long flight of stairs ending in a wall.

During the development of the museum extension project, two distinct branches of deconstructivist architecture emerged. On one hand, there was Philip Johnson's approach, characterized by a distortion of pure form in an aesthetic manner. On the other hand, Peter Eisenman offered a broader questioning of the values attributed to architecture, delving into a more philosophical realm. As you may have read earlier, I have been pondering the connection between your intervention and deconstructivist architecture. What was your approach? Can the Jewish Museum be related to either of these two branches? I have a hypothesis that your project aligns more closely with Peter Eisenman's approach, given your intention to connect the museum to the memory of the place by developing an invisible matrix that links individuals who carried the spiritual essence of Berlin. Additionally, there is the distorted and elongated Star of David, which adds to this matrix, much like the two prominent lines that give the name to your project: "Between the Lines." To support my arguments, in Peter Eisenman's Villette Park project,

he envisioned multiple layers resembling strata of memory, creating connections with the past—a sort of palimpsest. However, without dwelling on this point once again, there are these concrete beams that do not align with this approach but clearly represent a Johnsonian influence.

Finally, as the fourth and final aspect of my letter, I would like to revisit the four sources of inspiration for the extension of the Jewish Museum in Berlin. I am impressed by the continued strong connection between these initial references and the new museum extension. Despite the fact that it having been more than twenty years since its opening, the creative process that led to its realization remains vividly present. Notably, on the museum's website, under the tab "About the Museum", there is a brief text that explains the building's significance, the origin of the project, the concept of the standalone structure and entry through the Baroque building, the zigzag and invisible straight line that develops the "voids" at the intersections, and, of course, explanations of the sources of inspiration. In this condensed information, more than a third is dedicated to this final aspect. Yet, these inspirations are truly abstract. What is the connection between an unfinished opera and a building? How does a literary essay translate architecturally? Where can we see the representation of six million names of the victims?

The answers presented to visitors, and thus to myself during my visit, are not very straightforward but appeal to our intellect. From my perspective, you challenge the abstract nature of your approach in the face of something so abstract itself. In fact, you pose the question yourself: *"Who can possibly conceive six million murders? We cannot. But you might communicate that there is something to learn and that there is something to do and that there is hope. Even after such a devastating break."* In the previous part of this letter, we discussed palimpsests or layers. Ultimately, I perceive your thoughts and reflections as an additional layer added to your design. They are intrinsically linked to your architectural work, or should we say, in this specific case, a piece of art? A monumental sculpture, perhaps? As you yourself stated, the new museum extension is open to interpretation by each individual. It is reminiscent of an abstract painting where the artist leaves all interpretations open but also offers a possible reading through their thoughts and reflections. I believe that is what we have here: thinking, feeling, and commemorating.

What I would like to emphasize further is that, contrary to the words used by Falk Jaeger, it becomes evident that this building is far more connected to its broader context than perhaps any other creation, precisely due to your abstract approach, which has become an integral part of it. Do you share my view on this matter?

I have now come to the end of my letter. It has been a fascinating journey that has allowed me to learn more about your intervention for the Jewish Museum and also about deconstructivist architecture from the perspective of your extension. Considering various aspects, I believe that this creation is truly one-of-a-kind, given the time at which it was developed, during the fall of the Berlin Wall, its location in Germany, specifically in Berlin, and its purpose, housing a museum dedicated to the tragic history of the Jewish community in Germany. This building stands as a poignant testament to the resilience and enduring spirit of the Jewish people. It defies easy categorization as a representative of deconstructivist architecture or a mere building or sculpture. Instead, it becomes a powerful symbol that transcends its physical form. It becomes a space that fosters remembrance, commemorations, and a deep reflection on the profound impact of history. The message it conveys goes beyond architectural style or artistic expression; it serves as a beacon of hope and a call to preserve memory.

Finally, I would be grateful if you could share your current perspective on this remarkable achievement. How do you see the significance of this building today, more than twenty years after its completion?

I remain yours faithfully,

Nathan Boder

2 COMMENTS AND REFERENCES

To quote your words, it is in the name of reason that acts of destruction and domination are committed in the world.

The following passage is extracted from Daniel Libeskind's work "Between the Lines: The Jewish Museum, Berlin" (1992, p. 82):
"In my view, the best works of the contemporary spirit come from the irrational, while what prevails in the world, what dominates and often kills, does so always in the name of Reason. The irrational, as a nonbeginning of this project, was my starting point".

...following the principles of traditional architecture, which was the prevalent approach favored by many architects...

In reference to the architectural dispute in Berlin, specifically regarding Vittorio Magnago Lampugnani's call for a certain simplicity in architectural implementation and Hans Kollhoff's insistence on stone facades, a more comprehensive understanding of Lampugnani's position can be gained from his article "Die Provokation des Alltäglichen" (originally published in "Der Spiegel", 51/1993).

This perspective was also encouraged by Josef Paul Kleihues in his concept of "Kritische Rekonstruktion."

The mention of Josef Paul Kleihues is significant in this context, as he served as the chair of the jury for the competition regarding the new extension of the Jewish Museum and displayed a strong commitment to Daniel Libeskind's proposal. Refer to the following article for more information: Jaeger, Falk. "Kuckucksei". Deutsche Bauzeitung 123 (September 1989, p. 133).

One of these four artifices is the reference to Arnold Schönberg's unfinished opera, which...

"Moses und Aron" is a three-act opera by Arnold Schönberg, based on the biblical book of Exodus. Although it premiered in 1954, the music for the third act remains unfinished.

The poignant closing lines of "Moses und Aron" are quoted by Daniel Libeskind in his work "Between the Lines: The Jewish Museum, Berlin" and they resonate as follows: *"Inconceivable God! Inexpressible, many-sided idea, will you let it be so explained? Shall Aaron, my mouth, fashion this image? Then I have fashioned an image too, false, as an image be. Thus am I defeated! Thus all was but madness that I believed before, and can and must not be given voice. O word, thou word, that I lack!«*

...as Philip Johnson curated an exhibition on deconstructivist architecture back in 1988, and you, Daniel, were one of the protagonists,...

Refer to the brochure "Deconstructivist Architecture" published for the exhibition of the same name held at the Museum of Modern Art, New York from June 23 to August 30, 1988. The exhibition was directed by Philip Johnson, with guest curator Mark Wigley and assistance from Frederike Taylor.

... the relationship between your two architectural achievements, the Jewish Museum in Berlin and the Westside in Bern, for example.

In reference to the Westside shopping and leisure center in Bern, Switzerland, which was completed in 2008 by Daniel Libeskind.

During my visit to the museum,...

Visit of the Jewish Museum on Friday, May 19, 2023.

The audio guide leaves me without an answer, other than stating that these beams exhibit the characteristics of deconstructivist architecture...

Transcription of the audio guide of the Jewish Museum in its English version dated May 19, 2023 : *"By the way, the concrete supports that cross the top of the stairs have their own structural function. They too are part of the architectural concept: lines that intersect, a renunciation of symmetry, the dismantling and reunion of shapes. All are characteristic features of deconstructionist architecture, of which Libeskind is the leading proponent".*

... the precisely developed themes such as the nexus of lines on the facades or the voids that punctuate the visit.

In his description of the nexus in "Between the Lines: The Jewish Museum, Berlin", Daniel Libeskind explains: *"This rather irrational set of lines forms a nexus that links up certain anonymous places in Berlin, both East and West. But it is also a series of connections between unreal places and real people. That is one dimension; let's call it the architectonic dimension, the irrational invisible matrix, of the project".* Regarding the concept of the voids Daniel Libeskind describes it as follows: *"The idea is very simple: to build the museum around a void that runs through it, a void that is to be experienced by the public. Physically, very little remains of the Jewish presence in Berlin – Small things, documents, archive*

materials, evocative of an absence rather than a presence. I thought therefore that this "void" that runs centrally through the contemporary culture of Berlin should be made visible, accessible."

From the outset, Philip Johnson clarifies that this architecture is not a new style or a defined movement with its...

Philip Johnson's preface can be found in the exhibition brochure "Deconstructivist Architecture" (1988, pp. 7-9).

... the description of your "City Edge" project, ...

Daniel Libeskind describes the "City Edge" project in the exhibition brochure 'Deconstructivist Architecture' (1988, p. 34).

...there is no direct link here with the contemporary philosophical movement known as "deconstruction".

In his "Deconstructivist Architecture" chapter in the exhibition brochure "Deconstructivist Architecture" (1988, p. 10), Mark Wigley states, *"It is the ability to disturb our thinking about form that makes these projects deconstructive. It is not that they derive from the mode of contemporary philosophy known as "deconstruction"."*

I should point out here that Bernard Tschumi's emblematic Parc de la Villette project was also one of...

Refer to the project of the "Parc de La Vilette" presented by Bernard Tschumi in the exhibition brochure "Deconstructivist Architecture" (1988, pp. 92-101).

...how philosophy and architecture can be mutually enriching.

As stated by Céline Bonicco-Donato, philosopher and author of the essay "Déconstruction philosophique et déconstructivisme architectural" published in the journal "Archives de Philosophie" (April-June 2020, p. 143).

In his architectural application, Peter Eisenman introduced a third term, the concept of "presentness".

According to Peter Eisenman, renowned architect and theorist, in his article "A Reply to Jacques Derrida" published in the magazine "Assemblage" (August 1990, p. 16), he argues, *"In my view, your*

deconstruction of the presence/absence dialectic is inadequate for architecture precisely because architecture is not a two-term, but a three-term system. In architecture, there is another condition, which I call presentness, that is neither absence nor presence, form nor function, neither the particular use of a sign nor the crude existence of reality, but rather an excessive condition between sign and the Heideggerian notion of being: the formation and ordering of the discursive event that is architecture."

...of the link between form and function with a garden without vegetation or a staircase that leads nowhere.

Céline Bonicco-Donato describes the concept of the "presentness" in "Déconstruction philosophique et déconstructivisme architectural" (April-June 2020, p. 141) as follows: "*La presentness désigne donc le troisième terme du langage architectural qui se manifeste lorsque le lien entre la forme et la fonction est suspendu, comme dans un escalier qui ne mène nulle part ou dans un jardin sans végétation. C'est alors seulement qu'on peut percevoir ces éléments dans leur positivité et leur consistance propres.*"

Translation : Presentness, then, is the third term in architectural language, manifesting itself when the link between form and function is suspended, as in a staircase that leads nowhere, or a garden with no vegetation. Only then can these elements be perceived in their own positivity and consistency.

...he envisioned multiple layers resembling strata of memory, creating connections with the past—a sort of palimpsest.

In her essay "Déconstruction philosophique et déconstructivisme architectural," Céline Bonicco-Donato quotes Jacques Derrida from his interview with Hélène Viale (1988, p.97), where he discusses Peter Eisenman's approach: "*Pour éviter justement qu'il y ait une seule origine ou un seul centre, il [Eisenman] a imaginé dans son projet une multiplicité de couches, de strates, qui peuvent ressembler à des strates de mémoire. L'ensemble est une sorte de palimpseste où des couches de projet se superposent, sans qu'il y en ait un qui soit plus fondamental ou plus fondateur que l'autre. Ces couches, il y en a trois ou quatre : le sol de la Villette, la stratification des anciens abattoirs, le projet d'Eisenman à Venise. Il y a la couche "Tschumi" elle-même (les Folies) et puis il y a la lecture de Platon".*

Translation: Precisely to avoid a single origin or center, he [Eisenman] has imagined in his project a multiplicity of layers,

strata, which can resemble strata of memory. The whole is a kind of palimpsest in which layers of projects are superimposed, without one being more fundamental or foundational than the other. There are three or four layers: the floor of La Villette, the stratification of the old abattoirs, Eisenman's project in Venice. There's the "Tschumi" layer itself (the Folies) and then there's the reading of Plato.

Notably, on the museum's website, under the tab "About the Museum", there is a brief text...

Here is the text presented on the Jewish Museum's website on May 19, 2023:

*The Libeskind Building
Architecture Retells German-Jewish History*

The building zigzags with its titanium-zinc façade and features underground axes, angled walls, and bare concrete "voids" without heat or air-conditioning. With his "Between the Lines" design, American architect Daniel Libeskind did not want simply to design a museum building, but to recount German-Jewish history. Even before the Jewish Museum Berlin opened in the fall of 2001, almost 350,000 people had toured the empty building, which continues to fascinate innumerable guests from Germany and abroad. Today the Libeskind building houses the permanent exhibition. The building allows for many interpretations. For some people it brings to mind a broken Star of David; for others it is a bolt of lightning. Many people are left with a feeling of insecurity or disorientation.

The Libeskind building is outwardly freestanding and independent. To reach the permanent exhibition, visitors must walk through an underground passageway from the entry area in the adjacent baroque Old Building. Daniel Libeskind designed the floor plan based on two lines: the building's visible zigzagging line and an invisible straight line. At the points where the two lines intersect are the "voids," empty spaces that cut through the building from the basement to the roof. The crisscrossing, oblique slashes of windows appear unsystematic and make it impossible to distinguish the individual floors from outside.

Libeskind mentions four different sources of inspiration for his design. Prominent Jewish and non-Jewish Berliners such as Paul Celan, Max Liebermann, Heinrich von Kleist, Rahel Varnhagen,

and Friedrich Hegel stand for the connections between Jewish tradition and German culture prior to the Shoah. Libeskind plotted their addresses on a map, and a network of lines emerged from which he developed the structure of the building and the windows. Other ideas came from composer Arnold Schönberg's unfinished opera Moses and Aaron, from the German Federal Archive's The Memorial Book for the Victims of the Nazi Persecution of Jews in Germany (1933–1945), and from the essay "One-Way Street," by Walter Benjamin.

In fact, you pose the question yourself: "Who can possibly conceive six million murders?..."

This question is taken from the interview with Daniel Libeskind given by the audio guide of the Jewish Museum in Berlin in its English version dated May 19, 2023. The full transcript is as follows: *"How long would it take to read six million names? It would be an infinite task. We could not imagine it. And that's part of how I designed the museum. It has to do with a human scale. It speaks about something so abstract – who can possibly conceive six million murders? We cannot. But you might communicate that there is something to learn and that there is something to do and that there is hope. Even after such devastating break."*

...contrary to the words used by Falk Jaeger, ...

In reference to the following passages by Falk Jaeger in his article "Kuckucksei" published in the "Deutsche Bauzeitung" (September 1989, p.133):

"Er ist Architekturtheoretiker, Architekturphilosoph, Architekturpoet, nur kein Baumeister. Von ihm ist noch kein einziger Bau zu besichtigen."

Translation: He is an architectural theorist, architectural philosopher, architectural poet, just not a master builder. Not a single building of his is yet to be seen.

"Entwirft er Gebäude, dann haben diese nicht Dach und vier Wände, sondern sind gleichfalls hochkomplizierte Gebilde aus Balken, Achsen Fragmenten, aus Imagination und Phantasie. Sie sind das Gegenteil von Rationalismus und Funktionalismus. Sie sind von unfassbarer räumlicher Komplexität und zuweilen gar nicht baubar, wie die Berliner schon feststellen mussten, als es an die Realisierung seines Wettbewerbserfolgs Am Karlsbad ging."

Translation: When he designs buildings, they do not have a roof and four walls, but are also highly complicated structures made of beams, axes, fragments, imagination and fantasy. They are the opposite of rationalism and functionalism. They are of inconceivable spatial complexity and sometimes not buildable at all, as the Berliners already had to realize when it came to the realization of his competition success Am Karlsbad.

"Bauen in historischer Umgebung ist hier nicht Anpassung, nicht Dialog, ist nur noch harte Konfrontation."

Translation: Building in a historic environment here is not adaptation, not dialogue, is just hard confrontation.

3 SOURCES

Bonitto-Donato, C. (2020). Déconstruction philosophique et déconstructivisme architectural. *Archives de Philosophie*, 83(2), pp. 125–144. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27157739>

Derrida, J. (1992). Response to Daniel Libeskind. *Research in Phenomenology*, 22, pp. 88–94. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24654491>

Derrida, J., & Hanel, H. P. (1990). A Letter to Peter Eisenman. *Assemblage*, 12, pp. 7–13. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3171113>

Eisenman, P. (1990). Post/EI Cards: A Reply to Jacques Derrida. *Assemblage*, 12, pp. 14–17. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3171114>

Farrell Krell, D. (1990). "I Made It on the Verge": A Letter from David Farrell Krell. *Assemblage*, 12, pp. 52–57. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3171115>

Jaeger, F. (september 1989). Kockucksei. *Deutsche Bauzeitung*, 123, p. 133.

Johnson., Philip, and Mark Wigley. *Deconstructivist Architecture*, 1988. <https://www.moma.org/calendar/exhibitions/1813>

Libeskind, D. (1990). Between the Lines: Extension to the Berlin Museum, with the Jewish Museum. *Assemblage*, 12, pp. 19–51. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3171115>

Libeskind, D. (1992). Between the Lines: The Jewish Museum, Berlin. *Research in Phenomenology*, 22, pp. 82–87. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24654490>

Libeskind, D. (1994). Letter from Berlin. *ANY: Architecture New York*, 6, 48–51. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41845658>

Magnago Lampugnani, V. (1993): Die Provokation des Alltäglichen. *Ausgewählte Beiträge 1993-1995*; Kähler, G.; Volume 104, series *Bauwelt Fundamente*; Birkhäuser.

4 DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I hereby confirm that I am the sole author of the written work:

Deconstructivist architecture as the only way to retell German-Jewish History: A Letter from Nathan Boder

and that no help was provided from other sources as those allowed. All sections of the paper that use quotes or describe an argument or concept developed by another author have been referenced, including all secondary literature used, to show that this material has been adopted to support my thesis.

Nathan Boder

Lucerne, 13.06.2023

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of the initials 'NB' followed by a long, flowing horizontal line.