NARRATIVE LANDSCAPES OF BERLIN:
CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN THE PAST AND FUTURE IN DESIGN

by
Keely Dobranski

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Architecture

Azrieli School of Architecture & Urbanism
Carleton University,
Ottawa, Ontario

© 2021
Keely Dobranski

TEUFELSBERG,
BERLIN, GERMANY

fig 00.01: TEUFELSBERG
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

“I chamber up the hill with a heavy 16mm Bolex camera, trip and then fall over protruding bricks and fragments of concrete and steel. I am attempting to film the remnants of a city buried more than seventy years ago. The climb over the hill extends over 25 million cubic meters of rubble or approximately 15,000 buildings that lie buried beneath its surface. My attempt is to capture on film the fill that was constructed to shoulder the ruination of a city. This hill built over the humic foundations of a buried city, is a landscape design to be forgotten. In some respects, falling over the ruins, this is a tragic walk. I am a part of my own film, shaping the surface of the buried city through a connection with my body and the camera. I imagine my film being a type of X-ray, sending electromagnetic waves through the hill’s surface to reveal what lies buried. Yet, the film will show only what I see: dirt, grass, shrubs, trees and rubble.”

A 01 . BENEDICT ANDERSON

(2015, p. 75)

A 1 . A B S T R A C T

Across the globe, there are abandoned sites deemed no longer advantageous to societal needs. In Berlin, these locations surfaced due to Germany’s political, social, and economic issues in the twentieth century. Amidst several state-led efforts to revitalize such abandoned sites, this thesis explores the distinct opportunities that exist for Field Station Berlin, a United States National Security Agency surveillance zone constructed in West Berlin during the Cold War. Built atop Teufelsberg, the most prominent of Berlin’s *Trümmerbergs*, or artificial hills—a site with rich layers of complex, buried history—today the former field station serves as a venue for everything from community activities to artist installations and alternative sightseeing tours.

Given this site’s turbulent history, this thesis asks: how can design offer a unique means of site intervention capable of capturing the complexity of existing place meanings—done so while still supporting reactivation by contemporary society? This thesis first investigates several reclaimed sites across Berlin and creates a catalog of *Counterpreservation* that chronicles existing design approaches to their re-activation. It then focuses in specifically on the design potentials of Field Station Berlin/ Teufelsberg, putting forward a series of possible design interventions. Moving beyond an examination of this specific site, this thesis seeks to discover methods for reclaiming the memories of other Trümmerbergs and wastelands, or *Brachen*, of Berlin.

A2 . ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To my advisor, Suzy, thank you for your constant patience, reliance and aid in helping me, through the reading of multiple copies to inspecting every drawing. Thank you for always challenging me through offering of the right questions, while also offering constant reassurance. No words can truly capture my gratitude for your guidance during this challenging and rewarding process. My accomplishment of completing this document could not have been completed with out you.

To my close network of friends, without your constant encouragement this thesis would not have been possible, even if distant during this troubling time in the global climate. Even when I was aloof drawing, documenting, or writing, I knew you all were there in the background silently cheering me on through the process. Thank you for giving me the space and time, while also checking in once and while to make sure I was still sane.

To my parents, who were constantly there during this entire process. Through the check up calls and avoiding calling to not distract me in my process. Thank you for your constant support, amongst any decision / path I decided to take .Thank you for being there always!

To Derek, who saw every high and low of this process, I thank you for being the constant throughout this time. The calming voice behind the storm of emotions faced throughout the entire process. Thank you for being there during the extreme highs of this thesis, offering ways to celebrate, as well as being there during the stressful lows, offering a hug, and always reassuring me that I have done more than enough in the process during this difficult time.

To the explorers of abandoned locations, including Teufelsberg, and documented every inch. I thank you. Without your photos, I would not have been able to experience the site through the virtual environment. Without your same desire to explore unwanted landscapes, this thesis would not be possible!

These words cannot express my gratitude enough. They do not hold enough weight to truly express how much I am grateful for the people mentioned above during this time.

Thank you!

A3. TABLE OF CONTENTS

A1. ABSTRACT	V
A2. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	VII
A3. TABLE OF CONTENTS	IX
A4. LIST OF FIGURES AND SOURCES	X
A5. LIST OF NARRATIVES	XV
01. INTRODUCTION	1
02. PROMOTING REGROWTH FOR REACTIVATION AND THE PRESERVATION OF MEMORY	17
COUNTERPRESERVATION	19
WEATHERING AND DECAY	27
BRACHEN OF BERLIN	35
03. CASE STUDIES	41
LANDSCHAFTSPARK DUISBURG-NORD	43
NATURPARK SCHÖNEBERGER SÜDGELÄNDE	49
PARK AM GLEISDREIECK	55
SPREEPARK	61
TEMPELHOFFER FELD	67
04. LAYERS OF A TRÜMMERBERG: THE LAYERED MEMORIES OF TEUFELSBERG	73
LAYER 1: BEDROCK: FLAT BERLIN	77
LAYER 2: REGROWTH: CONSTRUCTING THE WEHRTECHNISCHE FAKULTÄT (TECHNICAL MILITARY COLLEGE)	85
LAYER 3: SUBSOIL: DEPOSITING RUBBLE	93
LAYER 4: TOPSOIL: BURIAL OF THE PAST	115
LAYER 5: A NEW IMPOSITION: FIELD STATION BERLIN	125
LAYER 6: A LIVING RUIN	139
05. DECAY AS DESIGN AT TEUFELSBERG	161
PHASE 1: INITIAL GROWTH	163
PHASE 2: CONTINUAL GROWTH AMONGST DECAY	191
01. TRACING THE PAST	195
03. SURFACE RESTRUCTURING	231
03. REACTIVATION	241
PHASE 3: OVERGROWTH	255
06. CONCLUSION	257
07. MODEL PHOTOS	266
08. BIBLIOGRAPHY	269

A4. LIST OF FIGURES AND SOURCES

fig 00.01: Teufelsberg

CADMAPPER - Worldwide map files for any design program. (n.d.). Retrieved August 10, 2020, from <https://cadmapper.com>

fig 01.02: Weathering Exploration 1

fig 01.03: Field Station Berlin

Teufelsberg | ehemalige Radaranlage auf dem Teufelsberg | Michael | Flickr. (2011.). Retrieved March 22, 2021, from <https://www.flickr.com/photos/36160766@N02/6134150982>

fig 01.04: Trümmerfrauen

Anderson, B. (2015). Trümmer Geographies. Performance Research, 20(3), 75–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13528165.2015.1055083>

fig 01.05: Decaying Dinning Hall Field Station Berlin

Codel, E. (2011). Exploring Abandoned Teufelsberg [Photo]. <https://www.flickr.com/photos/ekai/6178860290/>

fig 01.06: Decaying Paint Cans Field Station Berlin

Hackert, K. (2019). Abhörstation Teufelsberg / NSA Fieldstation: Verbrannte Farbdosen und Glasflaschen [Photo]. <https://www.flickr.com/photos/kevinhackert/48867541656/>

fig 02.07: Weathering Exploration 2

fig 02.08: Project MoU×rning

Sandler, D. (2016). Counterpreservation: Architectural Decay in Berlin since 1989. Cornell University Press., <https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501706271>

fig 02.09: The Köpi

lean.der. (2007). Köpi [Photo]. <https://www.flickr.com/photos/mattercompiler/4163771912/>

fig 02.10: Centro Cultural Ouvidor 63

Author Image

fig 02.11: Weathered Column of Palazzo Chiericati

Mostafavi, M., & Leatherbarrow, D. (1993). On Weathering: The Life of Buildings in Time. The MIT Press.

fig 02.12: Inside the Dome of a Satellite Communication Station, Zone Broams

Emmett, M. (2016). Forgotten heritage. Jonglez.

fig 02.13: Field Station Berlin

Reagan to Gorbachev: 'Tear down this wall!' - The Local. (n.d.). Retrieved March 14, 2021, from <https://www.thelocal.de/20150612/reagan-to-gorbachev-tear-down-this-wall/>

fig 02.14: Brachen of Berlin

Gandy, M. (2018). Natura Urbana The Branchen of Berlin.

fig 02.15: Ailanthus Altissima (Swingle, 1916)

Gandy, M. (2018). Natura Urbana The Branchen of Berlin.

fig 03.16: Weathering Exploration 3

fig 03.17: Landschaftspark

Landschaftspark Duisburg-Nord | Objektansicht. (n.d.). Retrieved March 13, 2021, from <https://www.kuladig.de/Objektansicht/KLD-268839>

fig 03.18: Landschaftspark

Introduction | Background Knowledge | Landschaftspark Duisburg-Nord. (n.d.). Retrieved October 19, 2020, from <https://www.landschaftspark.de/en/background-knowledge/introduction/>

fig 03.19: Site Collage #1

fig 03.20: NaturPark Schöneberger

Carloni, M. (2014). Natur-Park Schöneberger Südgelände [Photo]. <https://www.flickr.com/photos/fantisola/13144705125/>

fig 03.21: NaturPark Schöneberger

Käßner, A. (2017). Natur-Park Schöneberger Südgelände [Photo]. <https://www.flickr.com/photos/alexkaessner/33813887662/>

fig 03.22: Site Collage #2

fig 03.23: Park AM Gleisdreieck

Park am Gleisdreieck « Landezine International Landscape Award LILA. (n.d.). Retrieved January 5, 2021, from <https://landezine-award.com/park-am-gleisdreieck/>

fig 03.24: Park AM Gleisdreieck

Park am Gleisdreieck « Landezine International Landscape Award LILA. (n.d.). Retrieved January 5, 2021, from <https://landezine-award.com/park-am-gleisdreieck/>

fig 03.25: Site Collage #3

fig 03.26: SpreePark

G, S. (2012). Parkeisenbahn, Spreepark Plänterwald, Berlin [Photo]. <https://www.flickr.com/photos/sludgeulper/8214520536/>

fig 03.27: SpreePark

Grabert, Chris. (2013). Spreepark im Plänterwald [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/chris_grabert/8910374718/

fig 03.28: Site Collage #4

fig 03.29: Tempelhofer

Tempelhofer Feld | NABU Berlin. (n.d.). NABU - Naturschutzbund Deutschland e.V. Retrieved March 14, 2021, from <https://berlin.nabu.de/stadt-und-natur/stadtentwicklung/tempelhofer-feld/geschichte.html>

fig 03.30: Tempelhofer

onnola. (2012). Urbane Gärten auf der Tempelhofer Freiheit [Photo]. <https://www.flickr.com/photos/30845644@N04/7697740758/>

fig 03.31: Site Collage #5

fig 04.32: Weathering Exploration 4

fig 04.33: Narratives of Teufelsberg Timeline

fig 04.34: Layer 1 of Teufelsberg

fig 04.35: Public of Berlin Tool Kit

fig 04.36: Map of Greater Berlin and The Grünewald Forest

Jackisch, B. A. (2014). The Nature of Berlin: Green Space and Visions of a New German Capital, 1900-45. Central European History, 47(2), 307–333. JSTOR.

fig 04.37: Public of Berlin

fig 04.38: Layer 2 of Teufelsberg - W.F.

fig 04.39: Nazi Government Tool Kit

fig 04.40: W.F. Tool Kitfig 04.41: The First Stone, The Wehrtechnische Fakultät

fig 04.42: Layer 3 of Teufelsberg - Burial of the Past

fig 04.43: Divided Berlin

fig 04.44: Structural Column

Klaus, B., & Jüttemann, A. (2012). Berlin Teufelsberg: Outpost in the Middle of Enemy Territory. Berlin Story Verlag.

fig 04.45: Structural Column

Klaus, B., & Jüttemann, A. (2012). Berlin Teufelsberg: Outpost in the Middle of Enemy Territory. Berlin Story Verlag.

fig 04.46: Roof

Klaus, B., & Jüttemann, A. (2012). Berlin Teufelsberg: Outpost in the Middle of Enemy Territory. Berlin Story Verlag.

fig 04.47: Left Tower

Klaus, B., & Jüttemann, A. (2012). Berlin Teufelsberg: Outpost in the Middle of Enemy Territory. Berlin Story Verlag.

fig 04.48: Trümmerbergs of Berlin

De Maio, F. (2013). The green hills of rubble in black and white. 531–541. <https://doi.org/10.2495/STR130441>

fig 04.49: Inside a Trümmerberg

fig 04.50: Humboldtthain

drres15. (2015). English: Humbolthain Flak tower in Berlin. Own work. <https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=64055123>

German Artillery—The Zoo Flak tower. (n.d.). Retrieved March 21, 2021, from http://www.wv2incolor.com/german-artillery/ww2_72.html

fig 04.51: Mont Klamott

Flak Tower in Berlin. (n.d.). Retrieved September 27, 2020, from http://www.cs.utsa.edu/~wagner/berlin/flakturm/trip_flakturm.html

Unterwelten, B. (n.d.). Geschichte. Retrieved September 26, 2020, from <https://www.berliner-unterwelten.de/verein/projekte/flakturm-humboldtthain/geschichte.html>

fig 04.52: Teufelsberg

Gerber, U. (n.d.). Defense technology faculty and university town—Forst Grunewald. Retrieved August 9, 2020, from

Teufelsberg Station | Friday morning satellite program. En.v... | Flickr. (n.d.). Retrieved March 23, 2021, from <https://www.flickr.com/photos/14245546@N00/5809213997>

fig 04.53: Rudower Höhe

De Maio, F. (2013). The green hills of rubble in black and white. 531–541.

Was wird aus Meißens Mont Klamott? (n.d.). Retrieved September 27, 2020, from <https://www.sachsische.de/was-wird-aus-meissens-mont-klamott-3334378.html>

fig 04.54: W.F. Drawing

fig 04.55: Trümmerfrauen Moving Rubble

fig 04.56: Trümmerfrauen Tool Kit

fig 04.57: Public of Berlin Tool Kit

fig 04.58: Layers of Teufelsberg and Soil Sample

Gerd Wessolek, & Toland, A. (2017, March). Devil in the Sand. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319109895_Devil_in_the_Sand_-_the_Case_of_Teufelsberg_Berlin_and_Cultural_Ecosystem_Services_Provided_by_Urban_Soils

fig 04.59: Teufelsberg Bio-Types

FIS broker. (n.d.). Retrieved March 23, 2021, from https://fbinter.stadt-berlin.de/fb/index.jsp?Szenario=fb_en

fig 04.60: Index of Ecology - Pages from the counterpreservation CodeBook

Artemisia vulgaris—Plant Finder. (n.d.). Retrieved December 1, 2020, from <https://www.missouribotanicalgarden.org/PlantFinder/PlantFinderDetails.aspx?taxonid=256948&is-profile=0&>

Chenopodium botrys Jerusalem Oak, Jerusalem oak goosefoot PFAF Plant Database. (n.d.). Retrieved December 1, 2020, from <https://pfaf.org/user/Plant.aspx?LatinName=Chenopodium+botrys>

CROMPTON, C. W., & BASSETT, I. J. (2011). THE BIOLOGY OF CANADIAN WEEDS.: 65. Salsola pestifer A. Nels. Canadian Journal of Plant Science. <https://doi.org/10.4141/cjps85-053>

Environmental Benefits of Pine Trees. (n.d.). Home Guides | SF Gate. Retrieved October 12, 2020, from <https://homeguides.sfgate.com/environmental-benefits-pine-trees-105339.html>

Mugwort: Pollenwarndienst. (n.d.). Retrieved October 12, 2020, from <https://www.polleninfo.org/en/allergy/profiles/mugwort.html>

Pg_satr12.pdf. (n.d.). Retrieved October 12, 2020, from https://plants.usda.gov/plantguide/pdf/pg_satr12.pdf

PlantFiles: Dysphania Species, Australian Goose Foot, Clammy Goosefoot, Small Crumbweed. (n.d.). Dave's Garden. Retrieved December 1, 2020, from [https://davesgarden.com/guides/pf/go/74000/Semnani, K. \(2015\). A Review on Chenopodium botrys L.: Traditional uses, chemical composition and biological activities. Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Research, 1, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.pbr.1.2.1](https://davesgarden.com/guides/pf/go/74000/Semnani, K. (2015). A Review on Chenopodium botrys L.: Traditional uses, chemical composition and biological activities. Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Research, 1, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.pbr.1.2.1)

Stinking Goosefoot facts and health benefits. (n.d.). Retrieved October 12, 2020, from <https://www.healthbenefitstimes.com/stinking-goosefoot/>

Gandy, M. (2018). Natura Urbana The Branchen of Berlin.

fig 04.61: Field Station Berlin

fig 04.62: Field Station Berlin Site Plan

fig 04.63: Field Station Berlin Building Inventory

fig 04.64: Field Station Berlin Employee Tool Kit

fig 04.65: Field Station Berlin Tool Kit

fig 04.66: Stasi Documentation of Field Station Berlin

Stasi Mediathek. (n.d.). Analyse der Struktur und Tätigkeit der US Army Field Station Berlin (USAFSB) Teufelsberg | Mediathek des Stasi-Unterlagen-Archivs. Retrieved August 11, 2020, from <https://www.stasi-mediathek.de/medien/analyse-der-struktur-und-taetigkeit-derus-army-field-station-berlin-usafsb-teufelsberg/blatt/23/>

fig 04.67: Field Station Berlin Employee

fig 04.68: Field Station Berlin Decaying

fig 04.69: Abandoned Government Buildings

Arneson, K. (2019, August 12). An Urban Explorer's Guide to Abandoned Berlin. Culture Trip. <https://theculturetrip.com/europe/germany/articles/an-urban-explorers-guide-to-abandoned-berlin/>

fig 04.70: Abandoned Government Buildings

Arneson, K. (2019, August 12). An Urban Explorer's Guide to Abandoned Berlin. Culture Trip. <https://theculturetrip.com/europe/germany/articles/an-urban-explorers-guide-to-abandoned-berlin/>

fig 03.71: Graffiti Artist Tool Kit

fig 03.72: Graffiti Artists at Teufelsberg

fig 04.73: Field Station Berlin Today

R, M., (n.d.). NSA Listening Post TEUFELSBERG BERLIN. Retrieved January 4, 2021, from <https://3dwarehouse.sketchup.com/model/162c5a52f8f3300e373f094eebec1d8e/NSA-Listening-Post-TEUFELSBERG-BERLIN>

fig 04.74: Field Station Berlin Site Plan

fig 04.75: Field Station Berlin Building Inventory

fig 04.76: Entrance to Site

Teufelsberg | Stas Rozhkov | Flickr. (n.d.). Retrieved March 23, 2021, from <https://www.flickr.com/photos/60482353@N05/30543193792>

fig 04.77: Entrance to Site, Under Dining Facility

Exploring Abandoned Teufelsberg | Teufelsberg is an abandone... | Flickr. (n.d.). Retrieved March 23, 2021, from https://www.flickr.com/photos/35034345972@N01/6178857536

fig 04.78: Outdoor Concert

Open Air Rave @ Teufelsberg | Juska Wendland | Flickr. (n.d.). Retrieved March 23, 2021, from https://www.flickr.com/photos/37218967@N00/7717065972

fig 04.79: Indoor Event

Christoph. (2012). Berlin Teufelsberg—Party location [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/deerisch/7574317514/

fig 04.80: Side of Main Operational Building

Codel, E. (2011). Dead Drop at Teufelsberg [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/ekai/6168092760

fig 04.81: Inside Main Operational Building

Teufelsberg | suziesparkle | Flickr. (n.d.). Retrieved March 26, 2021, from https://www.flickr.com/photos/8397802@N05/1477779054

fig 04.82: Inside Geodesic Dome

Biddulph, M. (2010). Mike and Gem in the Teufelsberg dome [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/mbiddulph/4778712654/

fig 04.83: View From Tower of Main Operations Building

Davies, L. (2013). Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/liamdavies/9540563350/

fig 04.84: Graffiti Overtaking the Architecture

Allen, R. (2014). Teufelsberg art [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/raeallen/14061136974/

fig 04.85: Underground Tunnels leading to Maintenance Buildings

Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany | Teufelsberg, or “Devil’s Moun... | Flickr. (n.d.). Retrieved March 23, 2021, from https://www.flickr.com/photos/40895825@N04/9537782171

fig 04.86: Decaying Inside Structure

Biddulph, M. (2010). Teufelsberg offices [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/mbiddulph/4779809284/

fig 04.87: Ruins of the Building Maintenance Buildings

Hay, A. (2017). Flooded abandoned construction, Teufelsberg [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/andyhay/35914494942/

fig 05.88: Weathering Exploration 5

fig 05.89: Wrapping of the Reichstag

8 Iconic Artworks That Defined Christo’s Legacy. (2020, June 2). Galerie. https://www.galeriemagazine.com/8-iconic-artworks-christo-legacy/

fig 05.90: Pages of the Counterpreservation CodeBook

Author Document

fig 05.91: Redacted Site Event – Site Plan

fig 05.92: Redacted Site Event – Axonometric

fig 05.93: Index of Painting Techniques – Pages from the counterpreservation CodeBook

Author Images

(88) Pinterest. (n.d.). Retrieved November 23, 2020, from https://www.pinterest.ca/pin/281404676692526594/

Common Painting Problems: What is Fading? (2019, February 11). MyBoysen. https://www.myboysen.com/paint-problem-fading/

flaking paint—Google Search. (n.d.). Retrieved November 23, 2020, from https://www.google.com/search?q=flaking+paint&rlz=1C1CHBF_enCA804CA804&ss-rf=ALeKk01bBFN-uvarlE5V27s-u_7KsdsCMg:1606166860245&source=lmns&tbm=isch&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwi4nZ7pzZntAhUEbc0KHRELc_MQ_AUoAXoECBQQA&biw=1280&bih=649&dpr=2#imgrc=p2GxccEU7m44aAm

how does rusting occur on paint—Google Search. (n.d.). Retrieved November 23, 2020, from https://www.google.com/search?q=how+does+rusting+occur+on+paint&source=lmns&bih=646&biw=720&rlz=1C1CHBF_enCA804CA804&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwj13YDu0ZntAhXOGM0KHU4vD1IQ_AUoAHoE-CAEQAA

rusting paint—Google Search. (n.d.). Retrieved November 23, 2020, from https://www.google.com/search?q=rusting+paint&tbm=isch&ved=2ahUKEwj_c_vizzpntA-hURGi6wKHZJJAQQQ2-cCegQIABAA&coq=rusting+paint&gs_lcp=CgNpbWcQAzICCAAAyAggAMgIADIGCAAQBxAeMgYIABAHEB4yBggAEAU-QHjIGCAAQCBAAeMgYIABAIEB4yBggAEAgQHjIGCAAQCBAAeOggIABAIEAcQHIDZ0gNY_OQDYOPoA2gDcAB4ALABc4gB9weSAQM5LjKYAQC-gAQGqAQtnD3Mtd2l6LWltZ8ABAQ&scclient=img&ei=6Cm8X9zqN5G2sAWZk4Ug&bih=646&biw=720&rlz=1C1CHBF_enCA804CA804#imgrc=bBMgftSR5em8TeM&imgdii=jqndna_jBt77CM

saponification paint—Google Search. (n.d.). Retrieved November 23, 2020, from https://www.google.com/search?q=saponification+paint&tbm=isch&ved=2ahUKEwj91c-xz-pntAhUM0KwKHVUaBqQ2-cCegQIABAA&coq=saponification+paint&gs_lcp=CgNpbWcQAzICCAAAyAggAMgQIABAYOgQIABBDogYIABAFEB46B-ggAEAgQHID3EFi2G2DNIHGAcAB4AIABflgBwQSSAQMIJjGYAQCGAQGqAQtnD3Mtd2l6LWltZ8ABAQ&scclient=img&ei=5Cm8X_3TAoygswXVt-JTADg8&bih=646&biw=720&rlz=1C1CHBF_enCA804CA804#imgrc=BtRp8w3Sst8pFM

Solved! What Causes Bubbling Paint—And What to Do About It. (2018, February 5). Bob Vila. https://www.bobvila.com/articles/bubbling-paint/

fig 05.94: Phase 1: Redacted Site Event Process

fig 05.95: Phase 2: Redacted Site Event Process

fig 05.96: Phase 3: Redacted Site Event Process

fig 05.97: Phase 4: Redacted Site Event Process

fig 05.98: Phase 5: Redacted Site Event Process

fig 05.99: Redacted Site Event Reveal

fig 05.100: Aftermath of Redaction

fig 05.101: Side of Operations and Teufelsberg 2

Berlin Teufelsberg 08 | Manfred Lentz | Flickr. (n.d.). Retrieved March 26, 2021, from https://www.flickr.com/photos/42833030@N04/4398264263

fig 05.102: Leisure Area Near Entrance

Wiggins, A. (2016). Teufelsberg [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/27467248@N07/28481009974/

fig 05.103: Inside the Main Operations Building Looking Out

suziesparkle. (2014). Teufelsberg [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/suziesparkle/14777346651/

fig 05.104: View From Below

Exploring Abandoned Teufelsberg | Teufelsberg is an abandone... | Flickr. (n.d.). Retrieved March 26, 2021, from https://www.flickr.com/photos/35034345972@N01/6178870864

fig 05.105: Dining Building

Friel, M. (2013). Teufelsberg berlin [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/maddiontour/10017983555/

fig 05.106: Redaction of Architecture Only

Hackert, K. (2019). Abbörsstation Teufelsberg / NSA Fieldstation: Radlader [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/kevinhackert/48867022568/

fig 05.107: Event During Redaction

Open Air Rave @ Teufelsberg | Juska Wendland | Flickr. (n.d.). Retrieved March 26, 2021, from https://www.flickr.com/photos/37218967@N00/7717069134

fig 05.108: Redaction of Teufelsberg

Metz, K. (2015). Teufelsberg [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/kap4001/18563056289/

fig 05.109: Site Photos

Teufelsberg | Stas Rozbkeu | Flickr. (n.d.). Retrieved March 23, 2021, from https://www.flickr.com/photos/60482353@N05/30543193792

Exploring Abandoned Teufelsberg | Teufelsberg is an abandone... | Flickr. (n.d.). Retrieved March 23, 2021, from https://www.flickr.com/photos/35034345972@N01/6178857536

Open Air Rave @ Teufelsberg | Juska Wendland | Flickr. (n.d.). Retrieved March 23, 2021, from https://www.flickr.com/photos/37218967@N00/7717065972

Christoph. (2012). Berlin Teufelsberg—Party location [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/deerisch/7574317514/

Codel, E. (2011). Dead Drop at Teufelsberg [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/ekai/6168092760/

Teufelsberg | suziesparkle | Flickr. (n.d.). Retrieved March 23, 2021, from https://www.flickr.com/photos/8397802@N05/14593618597

Biddulph, M. (2010). Mike and Gem in the Teufelsberg dome [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/mbiddulph/4778712654/

Davies, L. (2013). Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/liamdavies/9540563350/

Allen, R. (2014). Teufelsberg art [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/raeallen/14061136974/

Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany | Teufelsberg, or “Devil’s Moun... | Flickr. (n.d.). Retrieved March 23, 2021, from https://www.flickr.com/photos/40895825@N04/9537782171

Biddulph, M. (2010). Teufelsberg offices [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/mbiddulph/4779809284/

Hay, A. (2017). Flooded abandoned construction, Teufelsberg [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/andyhay/35914494942/

fig 05.110: Design Approach Axonometric

fig 05.111: Site Plan

fig 05.112: View on the Tracing Trail of 1937

fig 05.113: Plan of the Tracing Trail of 1937

fig 05.114: Detail of A Tracing Trail of 1937

fig 05.115: Section A-A

fig 05.116: Plan of A Tracing Trail of 1992

fig 05.117: Detail of A Tracing Trail of 1992

fig 05.118: Section B-B

fig 05.119: Section/ Perspective from A Tracing Trail of 1937

fig 05.120: Plan of A Tracing Trail of 2020

fig 05.121: Detail of A Tracing Trail of 2020

fig 05.122: Section A-A

fig 05.123: Plan of Site Ramps

fig 05.124: Ramp Detail

fig 05.125: Section C-C

fig 05.126: Plan of Site Staircases

fig 05.127: Staircase Detail

fig 05.128: Section D-D

fig 05.129: Design Approach Axonometric

fig 05.130: Surfaces Detail

fig 05.131: Section E-E

fig 05.132: Section F-F

fig 05.133: Combined Section

fig 05.134: Design Approach Axo

fig 05.135: Solar Panel Details

fig 05.136: Reactivation Section

fig 05.137: Reactivation diagrams

fig 05.138: Zoning

fig 05.139: View of Water Tower

Allen, R. (2014). Teufelsberg art [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/raeallen/14080716803/

fig 05.140: Inside Water Storage System Tunnels

IMGP8519-corridors-teufelsberg | Corridor inside Field Stati... | Flickr. (n.d.). Retrieved March 29, 2021, from https://www.flickr.com/photos/

fig 05.141: Outdoor Rave

Wendland, J. (2012). Raving at the abandoned military spying station. [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/juska/7716019554/

fig 05.142: View in Dome

Biddulph, M. (2010). Mike and Gem in the Teufelsberg dome [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/mbiddulph/4778712654/

fig 05.143: Approaching View

fig 05.144: Overgrowth

fig 06.145: Weathering Exploration 6

fig 06.146: Leaving Teufelsberg

Teufelsberg | Stephen Burch | Flickr. (n.d.). Retrieved March 28, 2021, from https://www.flickr.com/photos/97016394@N00/3642919389

fig 06.147: Leaving Teufelsberg 2

Codel, E. (2011). Exploring Abandoned Teufelsberg [Photo]. https://www.flickr.com/photos/ekai/6168372546/

fig 06.148: Site Model of Teufelsberg

NOTE: AS THIS THESIS FOCUSES ON THE MEMORIES AND NARRATIVES OF A WIDE RANGE OF TEUFELSBERG USERS, IT WAS IMPORTANT TO TELL THE STORY OF THE SITE IN A MANNER THAT MOVES BEYOND JUST MY OWN REFLECTIONS. THUS, THROUGHOUT THIS THESIS, QUOTES ARE PLACED DEPICTING EVENTS, LOCATIONS, AND IDEAS, EACH ONE BRINGING THEIR OWN PERSPECTIVE FORWARD—THEIR OWN MEMORY—MAKING THIS THESIS MORE OF A CONVERSATION OF VOICES WITH EACH ONE PART OF THE LARGER NARRATIVES OF BERLIN.

A5. LIST OF NARRATIVES

A01.Benedict Anderson	iv
A02.Marget Drabble	2
A03.Rold J. Goebel	8
A04.Patrick Leigh	12
A05.Adolf loos	18
A06.Daniela Sandler	21
A07.Daniela Sandler	25
A08.Mohsen Mostafavi and David Leatherbarrow	26
A09.Matthew Gandy	34
A10.Matthew Gandy	37
A11.Ellen Ripley	43
A12.Peter Latz	45
A13.Karl Ganser	49
A14.Jana S	57
A15.Gerhand W Steindorf, Tempelhof Projekt chief	67
A16.Martin Wagner	76
A17.Christopher Isherwood	79
A18.Martin Wagner	81
A19.Adolf Hitler	84
A20.Adolf Hitler	87
A21.Albert Speer	91
A22.Heinrich Böll	92
A23.Alfons Baransky	95
A24.Marta Hillers	113
A25.Josef Ernst	114
A26.Joachin Schlör	117
A27.Lew McDaniel	124
A28.Finley *	125
A29.Christopher Mclarren	135
A30.John *	137
A31.Graffiti Lobby Berlin	139
A32.Visiting Students	143
A33.Chole	145
A34.Susan Stewart	260

01

INTRODUCTION

fig 01.02:
WEATHERiNg
EXPLORATiON 1
Date: Present Day

“The past lives on in art and memory, but it is not static: it shifts and changes as the present throws its shadows backwards. The landscape also changes, but far more slowly; it is a living link between what we were and what we have become. This is one of the reasons why we feel such a profound and apparently disproportionate anguish when a loved landscape is altered out of recognition; we lose not only a place, but ourselves, a continuity between the shifting phases of our life.”

A 02 . M A R G E T D R A B B L E

(1979, p. 270)

01 . I N T R O D U C T I O N

A hunting ground. A park. A military college. A burial site of a scarred city. A secretive surveillance station. Each, a layer containing the narratives of millions of people, all imposing their unique footprint upon the landscape. Each part of the living palimpsest that defines the site in question. Even though each place described carried a seemly different program, they were all once a single place within a forest in Berlin, Germany. This thesis investigates the site, known at different times by different titles, but in contemporary times most commonly as the landscape of Teufelsberg, or “devil’s mountain,” located in the Grunewald Forest of Berlin. Currently, the ruins of Field Station Berlin, an abandoned government complex, rest atop Teufelsberg. This landscape raises the primary question of this thesis: how can design offer a unique means of site intervention capable of capturing the complexity of existing place meanings – done so while still supporting reactivation by contemporary society? With the layers of past place meanings, Teufelsberg amplifies the need for a design solution regarding this challenge. Teufelsberg has layers upon layers of history; there are countless stories of events that occurred on site to be told, explored. How does one respect the facts already defining the landscape while also looking toward the future, looking for opportunities of reactivation amidst the decaying structural carcass that rests on top of the grave of narratives below?

fig 01.03:
field STATION BERLIN
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: 2011

Some answers to this question lie within the next chapter’s theoretical research, which covers three core concepts: (1) Counterpreservation; (2) Weathering and Decay; (3) Brachen Landscapes. The section begins by discussing how to conserve architecture and its memories via the unique approach of Counterpreservation. In *Counterpreservation: Architectural Decay in Berlin since 1989*, Daniela Sandler introduces how one can use the appropriation of decay for the reactivation of a structure in a manner that draws from public activism for their own future intentions. As Sandler states, “decay connects social and physical tissues instead of disrupting them. Communities thrive not despite architectural decay, but often through it” (Sandler, 2016, p. 2). The design approach proposed in this thesis seeks to apply this counterpreservation, in which the citizens of Berlin will re-activate the landscape amongst the decaying structure of Field Station Berlin.

Complementing the idea of counterpreservation is an acceptance of weathering and decay. Through decay and weathering, a site exists within the progression of time, as “architectural duration implies a past that is caught up in the present and anticipates the future” (Mostafavi & Leatherbarrow, 1993, p. 64). In *On Weathering: The Life of Buildings in Time*, David Leatherbarrow and Mohsen Mostafavi bring forward an anti-preservation notion of architecture, suggesting designers use weathering and decay as a method of illustrating architecture’s temporality, where connections exist between the past and future. Because of the layers of past narratives existing at Teufelsberg, this concept is useful to keep past narratives in conversation amongst the re-activation of the site. Through an acceptance of decay, Teufelsberg’s past place meanings are bridged with its future site definitions.

fig 01.04:
TRÜMMERFRAUEN
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 1948

Landscape is also intimately connected to notions of counterpreservation and weathering. In the film “The Branchen of Berlin” by Matthew Gandy, one can look at “these sites as they are today as site layers of narratives of ecology, artists, and ordinary people seeking respite from the city” (Gandy, 2018). Similar to counterpreservation and weathering, ecology connects different eras, and registers the history of a site amidst re-activation, a concept desired at Teufelsberg.

Each one of these sources illustrates how to acknowledge the past through reactivation while allowing the traces of the past to be brought in by the surrounding environment. Thus, as is elaborated in the next chapter, these sources suggest how one can both honor a previous site’s place meanings while also allowing it to progress towards the future.

Before peeling back, the layers of memories present at Teufelsberg, Chapter Three investigates five local case studies throughout Germany. These sites feature not only similar historical narratives to Teufelsberg, but also are sites abandoned and now being reclaimed by the public and surrounding ecology. As a result, these sites are prominent public spaces within Germany that support social connectivity while still respecting and providing space for the public to reflect upon the past, bringing together historical narratives and spontaneous ecology. Each site has been transformed not only by the design team, but also by the public and local ecology, which took over when these sites were deemed unnecessary by their previous owners. In each case, both the public and surrounding ecology re-activated the spaces amongst those of existing historical significance. The approaches taken within these projects thus serve as precedents for this thesis’s desired approach toward Teufelsberg.

“The obvious artificiality of partially historic and partially modern spaces, by virtue of their collage like incongruity and continual surprise effect, deliberately draws attention to the work of interrogating the past.”

A 0 3 . R O L D J . G O E B E L

(Quoted by Daniela Sandler, 2016, p. 270)

With knowledge regarding how other designers approach re-activation amongst decaying sites with layered place meanings, Chapter Four peels back the layers of narratives that exist at Teufelsberg, revealing how the layered site definition was previously written and re-written through layers overtime. This section investigates the six layers of constructed narratives that raised the physical elevation of Teufelsberg to its height today. Benedict Anderson similarly discusses the rich history of Teufelsberg and the numerous transformations the landscape underwent to find its newly arose site definition. At each layer, a new political, social, and economic factor, left a historical trace, or what I will call a *narrative impression*, left upon the site which was originally the Grnewald forest. First, starting between 1920 to 1937, the foundational layer that defines this forest became a part of Berlin. Soon, with a change in governmental authority, the first state-led installation upon the site took place with the construction of the technical military college, or *Wehrtechnische Fakultt*, designed by Albert Speer in 1937. It was subsequently left in ruin, partially constructed amongst the battles of WWII. Erasure of memories at the site then started at the conclusion of the war. Berlin was a landscape defined by rubble. In attempts to erase past terrors, Berlin moved the rubble to select rubble landfills, one being Teufelsberg, between 1946 to 1961. As described in greater detail in chapter four, along with new rubble, this brought new ecology to the site. This new ecology paired with the new layer of topsoil placed on top of the rubble, officially erasing the ruins of Berlin’s past that occurred between 1961 to 1972. During this period, the N.S.A took advantage of the newly risen elevation of the site, which was the highest point in Berlin, using it to spy on the Eastern Bloc during the Cold War. Field Station Berlin marked its own narrative impression upon the site, lasting until it was deemed unnecessary when it joined the network of abandoned government buildings littered throughout Berlin in 1991, upon the reunification of Berlin. Today, a living ruin activated by graffiti and ecology sits atop the ruins of

fig 01.05:
DECAYiNg DiNNiNg HALL
fiELD STATION BERLiN
 Location: Berlin, Germany
 Date: 2011

past Berlin. With these layers—each marking their own stake and narrative impression upon the site—what design approach can respect these memories and place meanings while still supporting reactivation by contemporary society?

What today is present on the hilltop of Teufelsberg lies as a living ruin; A living ruin marking the previous burial site of the ruins of the past Berlin, a haunted Berlin. There are layers and layers of objects that tell the memories of the past, each inscribing their mark into the landscape. Each mark an impression that lies upon each piece of rubble, upon each building of the decaying Field Station Berlin, and tells a story, a narrative, a memory. These memories should not be erased, yet, they should also not be preserved behind a glass wall, separating them from society, as “every act of memory carries with it a dimension of betrayal, forgetting, and absence” (Huysen, 2003, p. 4). Once we set a boundary between us and the past, we no longer form a connection with it, and slowly the memories become a distant narrative, not integrated amongst contemporary society. Building on these concepts, the final section of this thesis brings forth a series of design proposals that seek to define a new design approach that lies in-between erasure and preservation, explored through the lens of Teufelsberg. The proposed design seeks to itself become a new precedent for dealing with such sites in Germany, offering a design intervention that allows for the surrounding ecology and public to re-activate the decaying area while entwining themselves amongst former place meanings. Through this design approach, the narratives of past Berlin are in conversation with future Berlin, not erased or artificially preserved.

As Gandy states, spaces such as Teufelsberg, “tell the history of Berlin through the lens of spontaneous nature” (Gandy, 2018). Thus, the design approach will take a Branchen aesthetic

“A spell of peace lives in the ruins of ancient Greek temples. As the traveller leans back among the fallen capitals and allows the hours to pass, it empties the mind of troubling thoughts and anxieties and slowly refills it, like a vessel that has been drained and scoured, with a quiet ecstasy. Nearly all that has happened fades into a limbo of shadows and insignificance and is painlessly replaced by an intimation of radiance, simplicity and calm which unties all knots and solves all riddles and seems to murmur a benevolent and unimperious suggestion that the whole of life, if it were allowed to unfold without hindrance or compulsion or search for alien solutions, might be limitlessly happy.”

A 04 . PATRICK LEIGH

(Quoted in Stewart, 2020, p. 20)

amongst a counterpreservation mindset through the allowance of the current structures to weather and decay. This approach will enable the numerous layers of memories and narratives present at Teufelsberg to be respected amongst re-activation by contemporary society. The design focuses on three phases. First, an initial installation upon the site to bring awareness to the past place meanings. Second, through the addition of new walkways and areas of surface re-activation, the design allows the past narratives to be revisited, tracing the footprints of spaces since buried. Lastly, through an acceptance of decay, the remainder of Field Station Berlin will crumble, leaving only the new proposed design interventions to remain along with narrative impressions left by the public and surrounding ecology, to provide a living memorial of the past amongst the re-activation of today. Through this approach, Field Station Berlin and the artificial mound of Teufelsberg that it rests upon, will act as living memorials to the layers of site meanings. This approach allows the agency of remembrance to lie not solely within the hands of the designer, but also within the hands of the public and surrounding ecology.

Lastly, the approach will not focus only on a design proposal for today, but also for both the near and far future. A design approach over time references a structure’s lifespan. A structure does not only exist through architectural drawings or through the initial construction. A building has a birth, a life full of different programing phases, to its final demise. Put differently, “a building is not a static object, but a moving project, and that even once it has been built, it ages, it is transformed by its users, modified by all of what happens inside and outside, and that it will pass or be renovated, adulterated and transformed beyond recognition” (Latour & Yaneva, 2008, p. 80). Thus, having a design approach to an already moving project full of layers, transformed, and modified, aides in referencing this temporality within structures

and our narratives that inhabit them. From entering a site, to inhabiting a site, and finally departing a site, with only our memories left behind. Thus, this thesis will have three phases: The Initial Growth, the Continual Growth, and the Overgrowth.

Through this layered design approach, this thesis brings forth a solution to the question of how design can offer a unique means of site intervention capable of capturing the complexity of existing place meanings—done so while still supporting reactivation by contemporary society, through the lens of Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany.

fig 01.06:
DECAYiNg PAiNT CANS
fiELD STAtiON BERLiN
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 2019

02

PROMOTING REGROWTH FOR
REACTIVATION AND THE
PRESERVATION OF MEMORY

fig 02.07:
WEATHERiNg
EXPLORATiON 2
Date: Present Day

“The writing table with the ink stain, the picture of his parents, the clock in the kint slipper, and so on. Every piece of furniture and object told a story, all together they narrated family history. As a result, the house was never finished, ‘it grew along with us and we grew within it.’ It possessed neither style, strangeness, nor age, in the sense of being typical of particular period.”

A05 . ADOLF LOOS

(quoted in: Mostafavi & Leatherbarrow, 1993, p. 80).

COUNTERPRESERVATION

The first theoretical frame to help address the thesis question is that of *counterpreservation*, a concept discussed by architect Daniela Sandler. Counterpreservation is covered in multiple ways and taking on several forms throughout Sandler’s work. But it is broadly defined as:

“The intentional use of architectural decay in the spatial, visual, and symbolic configuration of buildings. The word “counterpreservation” serves to identify, analyze, and aggregate tendencies present in a range of examples, indicating coincident social processes and convergent cultural meanings” (Sandler, 2016, p. 19).

The theory of counterpreservation is layered with concerns about re-activating architectural sites for modern society while also respecting their past narratives. In other words, counterpreservation places architecture as a living entity moving throughout time, not just something that is designed and forgotten. It recognizes the layers of memories that impose upon a structure, not just the architect’s architectural design. Thus, counterpreservation does not seek to erase any past impressions caused by the architect, surrounding environment, or the public, but instead “strives to make the solidified, built matter of spaces into a more flexible medium, where multiple historical narratives might be read” (Sandler, 2016, p. 34). An example of counterpreservation is through the project *Mourning*, by Daniel Libeskind, as illustrated in fig 02.08. The proposal involves the increased decay of a Nazi S.S barracks through the introduction

“Exposed chunks of raw masonry, sooty walls, rotting window frames, and rusty railings form the back-drip for collective residential communities, art and cultural centers, and memorial sites. These groups and individuals have transformed decay into a vital part of the urban fabric; decay connects social and physical tissues instead of disrupting them. Communities thrive not despite architectural decay, but often through it.”

A06. DANIELA
SANDLER

(2016, p. 2)

of water. As illustrated in this project, counterpreservation is differentiated from top-down practices of state preservation in that it engages the public’s ideas on using past sites to re-activate them for the future. This engagement allows for the imposition of thought from all those who use the site, from the urban explorers, community groups, to the spontaneous Urbana now inhabiting the chosen landscape. Finally, with the public’s continual engagement that counterpreservation allows, it is a preservation method that enables a site’s unique memorialization. Without erasure through new renovation or preservation blocked by a barrier of protective glass, counterpreservation provides a way for monuments of the past to move *with* history, instead of being frozen in time, “as opposed to museums, where historical narratives are neatly spelled out with no gaps to fill” (Sandler, 2016, p. 104). Thus, through the use of counterpreservation, designers can find a unique approach to site intervention capable of capturing the complexity of existing site narratives while also opening up the space for reactivation through new users.

Through the theory of counterpreservation, the site of Teufelsberg can be collaboratively reactivated in a manner where the architect, the public, and surrounding ecology work together to capture the complexity of the existing place meanings while still supporting new uses in the future. Since Teufelsberg is in a city full of tumultuous history, “this intentional incorporation of decay is a hallmark of Berlin” (Sandler, 2016, p. 2). As historical sites do not exist solely in the past but also reside in the present, “counterpreservation points the way toward a communicative architecture whose ever-changing quality lies not so much in crumbling walls and rustling mullions, but in the ever-changing nature of the social realm” (Sandler, 2016, p. 46). Thus, through counterpreservation, the layers of previous site meanings can continue to live on throughout the project without erasure

fig 02.08:

PROJECT MOU×RNING
Architect: Daniel Libeskind
Location: Proposed for S
and S Barracks - Berlin,
Germany
Date: 1992

through continual use and reactivation. Through this natural decay, “the building’s extinction or death becomes part of its life” (Sandler, 2016, p. 38).

An example of continual use amidst decay through counterpreservation is the Kopi project, illustrated in fig 02.09. This is a housing project in the city of Berlin that provides a model of “affordable housing in gentrifying neighborhoods with self-financed, self-built architectural renovations carried out by tenants, not by developers or landlords, restoring buildings in a more conventional way” (Sandler, 2016, p. 72). Although this example foregrounds residential space, counterpreservation can be understood more broadly as a way of affordable re-activation of buildings through activism, one that can be found globally. Pictured in fig 02.10, for example, is Ouidor 63, an artist housing compound, which implies the same re-activation of affordable housing through counterpreservation as the Kopi. This affordable re-activation approach can similarly be applied to the ruins of Teufelsberg, creating a non-residential example of the practice.

With the layers of narratives at Teufelsberg, the question always lingers on what should be remembered or erased. Through counterpreservation, the answer to this question lies within the natural process of occupation and decay in relation to the surrounding ecology and public, not just the architect. Counterpreservation creates a conversation between stakeholders on memorializing and re-activating a landscape’s layered past and bringing that past forward to the future.

Overall, counterpreservation allows for a unique way to reactivate a historical site of complex place meanings through collaborative measures to support current societal needs. By using intentional

fig 02.09: THE KØPI
Location: Berlin, Germany

"This intentional incorporation of decay is a hallmark of Berlin. I call it counterpreservation, so as to indicate that while it runs counter to mainstream preservation, it is a purposeful social practice that should not be mistaken for neglect or destruction. In counterpreservation, decay is neither a contingency nor a handicap. Rather decay is a choice."

A07. DANIELA SANDLER

(2016, p. 2)

decay, counterpreservation allows for the memorialization of the past, acting in the present while also interacting with the future desired programming required for contemporary society. Also, counterpreservation allows a broader range of stakeholders—including those of the future—to contribute to a historical buildings' possible use, not just imposing the architects or government's desires. Therefore, using counterpreservation as a design implementation technique for Teufelsberg and similar landscapes of layered place meanings and narratives, one can find a unique means of capturing the complexity of the existing site while still supporting contemporary society's reactivation.

fig 02.10: CENTRO CULTURAL OUVIDOR 63
Location: São Paulo, Brazil
Date: 2020

“What is the value of the accumulated dirt, or this erosion of a finished edge? Is it not tragic? Alternatively, does it not show the rightful claim nature has on all works of art? Is not this the return of matter to its source, as a coherent body, already implied in its constitution, insofar as every physical thing carries within its deepest layers a tendency toward its own destruction - death as a birthright? If tragic, this metamorphosis is just. The value, then, of works that suffer strains and abrasions is the revelation of the eventuality of this final justice. This is the actual assimilation of an art work back into its location, the place from which it was first taken. in the time after construction, buildings take on the qualities of the place wherein they are sited, their colors and surface textures being modified by and in turn modifying those of the surrounding landscape”

A08. MOHSEN MOSTAFAVI AND
DAVID LEATHERBARROW

(1993, p. 68)

WEATHERING AND DECAY

In addition to using counterpreservation, the natural *weathering* of a structure—instead of erasing the past marks through renovation—is a preservation method to memorialize a historical place. Fig 02.11 illustrates the weathering buildings face of palazzo Chiericati. According to the Merriam Webster dictionary, Weathering is defined as:

“The action of the weather conditions in altering the color, texture, composition, or form of exposed objects, specifically: the physical disintegration and chemical decomposition of earth materials at or near the earth’s surface.”

This theory of weathering discusses allowing the un-pristineness of a building to exist naturally. In *On Weathering: The Life of Buildings in Time*, by Mohsen Mostafavi and David Leatherbarrow, the two describe this theoretical approach to the complex life cycle of an architectural project and its ultimate temporality. Here, temporality links to the problem’s society faces in allowing buildings to decay, such as concerns over structural use, as well as maintenance and ethical implications. The desire to continually preserve a structure subtracts from society’s ability to use it in new ways and reduces the potential for any traces of ongoing history to accrue on a building. A desire for perfect and clean buildings, therefore, ultimately has societal implications, as removing the signs of weathering left upon surfaces, or the “dirty” aspect illustrating the temporality and previous use of a building is unwanted. By contrast, Mostafavi and Leatherbarrow argue that if “the finishing ends construction, weathering constructs finishes” (Mostafavi & Leatherbarrow, 1993, p. 5). Thus, using decay as a

design method with specific surface details and manipulation, one can genuinely articulate the entire life cycle of a building, not just commemorate its creation.

Mostafavi and Leatherbarrow's work illustrates that by not disregarding a building's decay, we as designers can address and add to a project's full architectural meaning. Addressing the temporality of a building and the recognition of the natural process of decay can help with structural maintenance and ethical solutions within society. They highlight that even though architects see their designs as complete once constructed, architecture is ever-changing. A building evolves through ongoing exchanges and collaborations with the architect, the public, and the resulting environmental forces acting upon the structure. Thus, we should consider the completed project not as "the final moments of construction but to see the unending deterioration of a finish that results from weathering, the continuous metamorphosis of the building itself, as part of its beginning(s) and ever-changing 'finishes'" (Mostafavi & Leatherbarrow, 1993, p. 16). Through the ever-changing finishes, weathering creates new atmospheric conditions unintended by the architect (fig 02.12). Through this approach, Mostafavi and Leatherbarrow aim to change the view of architecture as a pure, pristine artifact to something more mutable and evolving.

This process also has implications for the ways we think about architectural authorship. Traditionally, "for modern architects, stains, such as those that resulted from surface accumulation of dirt, were thought of as faults, to be suppressed both technically and morally" (Mostafavi & Leatherbarrow, 1993, p. 88). Allowing a building to instead go through the process of decay allows the forces of nature to be the project's actual, long-term designers. Advocating for a greater sense of co-authorship

fig 02.11:
WEATHERED COLUMN OF
PALAZZO CHIERICATI
Architect: Andrea Palladio
Location: Vicenza, Italy

with the surrounding environment through weathering, the authors explain that, as architects supply a canvas, the public and surrounding environment paint the structure's more complete architectural narrative. Put differently, "in design, art is assumed to be the power or agency that forms nature; in the life and time of construction, however, nature reforms the 'finished artwork'" (Mostafavi & Leatherbarrow, 1993, p. 64). Through the abandonment and the reclamation of Teufelsberg through the public and ecology, the beginning phases of this new finish are applied to the ruins of Field Station Berlin that have already begun (fig 02.13). Therefore, allowing a project to weather introduces the environment's own agency to the architect, and every impression left by the public and nature.

For the site of Teufelsberg, the theory of weathering presented by Mostafavi and Leatherbarrow provides an approach able to capture the complexity of previous place meanings while still connecting the site to contemporary society. Allowing weathering to be a critical part of the design process will enable the acknowledgment of multiple narratives present at the site, not only the ones with the most powerful narrative. In other words, "weathering brings the virtual future of a building into dialogue with its actual present, as both are entangled in its past" (Mostafavi & Leatherbarrow, 1993, p. 112). Also, by allowing the continual decay of materials and surfaces at Teufelsberg, created by both nature and the public, the natural process of decay will alleviate the agency of memorial to be a collective attribute determined by the community and nature. The site becomes an architectural palimpsest, as "the notion of aging as enhancement and the idea that the various marking and layers of a surface record and allow one to recollect earlier stages in the history of a building and the human life associated with it." (Mostafavi & Leatherbarrow, 1993, p. 84). Thus, using the implications of weathering as an asset to

fig 02.12:
INSIDE THE DOME
OF A SATELLITE
COMMUNICATION
STATION, ZONE BROAMS
Architect: NATO
Location: Belgium

a structure, including defects, illustrates the entire life cycle of a building and, in turn, more holistically memorializes its place meanings, while still being accessible for contemporary society. By designing architecture to decay, it no longer solely exists in the past. Instead, it manifests in a flexible moment, where aspects of the past, present, and future are in conversation. Along these lines, by allowing a piece of architecture to decay, designers can reveal a new aspect of the project, previously unseen, allowing a conversation between the past and future. This conversation creates the perfect approach for the site of Teufelsberg, with its numerous layers of hidden history. The act of decay can allow for these layers to be revealed, allowing past narratives to be in constant conversation with contemporary society. Therefore, by using the beauty of letting a project decay, one can design a unique means of site intervention capable of capturing the complexity of existing place meanings while still allowing contemporary society to re-activate the site.

fig 02.13: fiELD STATION BERLIN
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 2009

“Somehow these ‘accidental gardens’ are so much more interesting than the designed and manicured forms of urban nature that characterize pervasive landscapes of speculation, function, and control. Not only are these unexpected and unplanned spaces of nature a continual source of cultural and scientific surprise, as new and often never described combinations of plants and animals emerge, but they can also serve as vernacular kinds of public space that become imprinted in memory and imagination.”

A09 . MATTHEW GANDY
(2018, pp. 2–3)

BRACHEN OF BERLIN

This thesis’s final theoretical framing is to appreciate the reclamation of wastelands by new forms of life—done so in a manner that recognizes that even though some spaces are not deemed useful or productive to some members of society, they are of use to others.

Brachen in German translates to ‘wastelands’ in English. There are many such sites across Germany, the result of various industrial and extractive processes, as well as wartime legacies. These spaces narrate the history of Berlin, through the lens of spontaneous nature and “since no one uses the space, and sometimes nobody even knows how to use the space, there is no criterion for behaviour in relation to a ‘Brachen’ which is very unsettling. It’s very clear that apart from the fence which usually surround the ‘Brachen,’ there is no boundary and nothing to civilize or cultivate the site. What is disturbing about a “Brachen” is that it has slipped out of control” (Gandy, 2018). Today, many such sites are slowly being erased due to the most recent phase of intensified construction activity. Either way, these spaces are being re-activated for use by the public and the surrounding ecology.

In the film *Natura Urbana: The Branchen of Berlin*, Matthew Gandy explores these reclaimed wastelands, focusing on Berlin, to illustrate and document how they act as slowly disappearing places, erasing the lesser known narratives of earlier generations of people and ecology. Branchen have transformed into spaces unimaginable to the initial, primary user. Yet, despite this, these

KREUZBERG ★
BLEIBT STABIL

places are used by the public and ecology, as illustrated in fig. 02.14. Through the film, Gandy promotes the cultivation and preservation of these spontaneous landscapes. He argues that every site is unique, a marvel of non-desire. Through this approach of letting both people and ecology gradually engulf a site of previous waste, new place meanings are born, and new energy emerges; it is an area of rebirth instead of death.

Overall, Gandy's film seeks to document these sites seemingly forgotten by the leaders of society. Through this documentation and an examination of their possibilities, "Natura Urbana explores the spontaneous diversity of plants in these spaces to illuminate the city's complex history through the post-war period until the contemporary era" (Gandy, 2018, p. 1). As discussed throughout the film, the Brachen of Berlin introduce a new typology of space; there are no rules or criteria for using these leftover spaces, which allows for new programming from both the public and new ecologies. "These ostensibly empty sites evolved into laboratories for botanists, artists, and ordinary people seeking respite from the city" (Gandy, 2018, p. 1). Thus, through these spaces' cultivation, they can embody Berlin's history. Put differently, the history of Berlin's historical narratives can carry forward through the preservation of Brachen, while also being activated by a new generation of inhabitants and ecology.

The Brachen Aesthetic is apposed to the current urban direction of Berlin today. Today, the city of Berlin is in constant revision, trying to re-write history through the "New Berlin". Berlin has increased construction in the city center since reunification in 1990, to erase these Brachen, places where history still can be told. As discussed by Karen Till in her text, A New Berlin, "Berlin is a city that cannot be contained by marketing representations of time, of the 'new.' It is a place with 'heterogeneous references,

"I depict Berlin as a living book where every street corner is a potential part of our story"

A10. MATTHEW
GANDY
(2018)

fig 02.14: BRACHEN OF
BERLIN
Location: Berlin, Germany

ancient scars,' a city that 'creates bumps on the smooth utopias' of its imagined futures" (Till, 2005, p. 5). Thus, through the approach of using a Brachen Aesthetic, this allows the old memories that layer multiple sites of Berlin can be brought forward into the future amongst the re-activation by society. This aesthetic can be applied to places such as Teufelsberg.

In line with such discussions, Teufelsberg can be defined as a part of the network of areas determined to be the Brachen of Berlin. As Gandy explains: "The Teufelsberg in Grönwald was the biggest debris mountain, containing about 25 or 26 million cubic meters of rubble. It had been left alone for years and was eventually overgrown with spontaneous vegetation" (Gandy, 2018). Therefore, cultivating a new sense of activation at the site can intertwine the past and the future, memorializing the layers of history that reside in the area, without pristine preservation. Through this cultivation of the past, the new spontaneous growth of the site can determine the trajectory of its future.

New narratives were thus born on these seemingly forgotten landscapes. Similarly, Paul Draus discusses the positives and negatives that Brachen oppose to the Berlin society. He crossed "an unmowed field with a few stray paths worn across it, but it was in fact full of active life: children playing, couples walking and kissing, people napping by their bicycles, and a group of young people boisterously laughing and drinking beer to the sounds of recorded music joined by the live performances of birds and insects" (Draus et al., 2021: p.330). These cracks of society tell the forgotten history of Berlin, amongst the multitude of new narratives brought to these forgotten spaces. Through cultivation, "the multi-layered history of unintentional spaces", can remain with all the marks and memories that define Berlin today (Gandy, 2018, p. 7).

fig 02.15:
AILANTHUS ALTISSIMA
(SWINGLE, 1916)
 Location: Lützowstraße,
 Berlin, Germany

03

CASE STUDIES

fig 03.16:
WEATHERiNg
EXPLORATiON 3
Date: Present Day

LANDSCHAFTSPARK DUISBURG-NORD

“This intentional incorporation of decay is a hallmark of Berlin. I call it counterpreservation, so as to indicate that while it runs counter to mainstream preservation, it is a purposeful social practice that should not be mistaken for neglect or destruction. In counterpreservation, decay is neither a contingency nor a handicap. Rather decay is a choice.”

A11. ELLEN
RIPLEY
(2016, p. 2)

Landschaftspark Duisburg Nord is a former steel plant built in the Duisburg-Meiderich area of Germany during the height of the industrial revolution. Built by August Thyssen in 1901, the plant produced pig iron after a shortage in the market occurred—a product which can be processed into steel, as illustrated in fig. 03.17. The plant thrived until 70 years later when there was a surplus of steel in the market, forcing the closure of the factory. The last shift took place on April 4th, 1985 (Landschaftspark Duisburg-Nord, n.d.-a). The old plant was then re-born when it was added to the 100 projects of the International Building Emscher Park (IBA), located in the Ruhr District. The initiative aimed “to set quality building and planning standards for the environmental, economic and social transformation of an old, industrialized region” (Latz, 2003). Professor Peter Latz, with his firm “Latz+Partner,” transformed the wasteland into a landscape park in 1989, featuring deteriorating buildings of the past, re-activated by ecology and citizens.

The design of the park has features that can be read as precedents for how to re-activate other sites full of past narratives, relying on

fig 03.17:
LANDSCHAFTSPARK
Location:
Ruhr District, Germany
Date: Present Day

"I grew up in a village destroyed by the war and learned early on about the value of materials. I used recycling as a method long before it has been reinvented as 'sustainability.' I feel obliged to recondition disused landscapes for the next generation — to rehabilitate them as sources of life. Who should deal with these landscapes if not landscape architects and urban planners? Better us than casino developers."

**A12 . PETER
LATZ**

(quoted in: Heyman, 2015)

gradual transformation instead of either erasure or preservation. The area's programming focuses on public leisure activities and a public connection to the landscape, with activities such as scuba diving in an old gasometer, one of the largest artificial diving centers (Landschaftspark Duisburg-Nord, n.d.-b). Even though the area was formal reactivated as a park, Latz did not eliminate the spontaneous ecology that he discovered in the area following its abandonment. For him, "the vegetation that has spontaneously sprung up now lies in perfect harmony with manmade water features (Landschaftspark Duisburg-Nord, n.d.-b)." and 700 new plant species calling the site home (fig 03.19). Finally, the design integrates the old architecture of the steel plant into its newly re-activated spaces by transforming them to suit the new programming needed—all done while not erasing the past attributes of this industrial site. Through this re-activation, the past narratives of the old steel plant were not erased, instead throughout the park, the past and future interweave to form new place meanings for the area.

Although the park appears to seamlessly morph into a new landscape, there is one less successful aspect. While the preservation of historical narratives is present at the park through an industrial history trail, these historical narratives are told only through traditional information columns, signs, and pictures, which disjoint today's narratives with those of the past, relegating past narratives to a backdrop for today's events. In addition, the area seems to be focused on becoming a tourist area, instead of being involved in the day-to-day activities of the surrounding community. Overall, the park is quite successful in re-activating an abandoned site for contemporary society, while not entirely erasing the past.

fig 03.18:
LANDSCHAFTSPARK
Location:
Ruhr District, Germany
Date: Present Day

PRESERVATION

The park kept the majority of the steel plant architecture. Most have been repurposed into new programing such as teachers and classrooms.

LIGHT SHOW

At night, the old mill is transformed as lights cover the entire plant.

ECOLOGY CONSERVATION

The vegetation that has spontaneously sprung weaves with man-made water features, green spaces and gardens.

CLIMBING GARDEN

An outdoor climbing garden rock wall renivated fom the old features of the plant to introduce this new public programing.

WATER REMEDIATION AND CONSERVATION

Water is a key element at the park. “The reservoirs serve as seasonal buffers in order to supplement the water shortage that develops in summer as a result of evaporation.”

LEISURE ACTIVITIES

“With diving, climbing, hiking or simply enjoying the view from Blast Furnace 5.”

fig 03.19: SiTE CoLLAgE #1
Location: Ruhr District, Germany
Date: Present Day

NATURPARK SCHÖNEBERGER SÜDGELÄNDE

“Die Kunst ist der nächste Nachbar der Wildnis”. “art is the closest neighbor to wilderness”.

A 13 . KARL
GANSER
(quoted in Groffman, 2017)

Prior to being a conservation park in Berlin, Naturpark Schoneberger Sudgelände was an abandoned urban railway. Built as the freight railyard of Tempelhof in 1889, the area was destroyed during WWII from allied bomber attacks and officially closed in 1952. For four decades, the former railyard was untouched which left it to be reclaimed by the surrounding ecology. As of 1999, however, the area is now accessible to the public through walkways, and “is one of the first official conservation areas in Germany in which urban-industrial nature is protected and made accessible to the public” (Kowarik & Langer, 2005). To allow the public to have access to this newly formed wilderness in the heart of the city, Odious Gruppe installed architecture that allowed for the new ecology of the site to have priority, were the architecture works around the overgrown ecosystem now inhabiting the area and not through it. In this sense, Naturpark Schoneberger Sudgelände was designed for a new type of owner of the site, the new ecology, with people and architecture coming second.

This natural oasis illustrates the ways in which architecture can work around new ecologies, instead of erasing nature’s path, to lay a new foundation. As seen in fig. 03.20, A key aspect of

fig 03.20:
NATURPARK SCHÖNEBERGER
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 2014

the design is a raised steel walkway put in the nature conservation sector of the site. At 600 m long, the walkway is slightly raised “to ensure that they interfere as little as possible with nature” (Natur-Park Schöneberger Südgelände • Future Landscapes, n.d.). The Group Odious also wanted to ensure that the public could leave an imprint on the site, as well. Another pathway leads to an “old retaining wall that graffiti artists can legally use as a canvas from Monday to Saturday (Braconnier, n.d.),” illustrated in fig 03.21. Finally, the design kept the old railway relics that defined the original place meanings of the site, scattered about through the overgrown ecology, including the old administration building and a water tower. Through a desire to keep the spontaneous ecology and old relics of the past, Naturpark Schöneberger Südgelände integrates old narratives with new re-activation.

Although successful in the protection of spontaneous ecology inhabiting the former railyard, Naturpark Schöneberger Südgelände is not as successful in other areas. First, the area seems to keep the ecology and public segregated; there are no places of interaction between the two. In addition, the area only has the one graffiti wall to interact with the public. The other public venue, the site is the former 4000m² locomotive hall, seems to just be used as a backdrop for today’s programming, instead of being actively integrated into the new programming. However, Gruen Berlin GmbH is developing new uses for this hall that “forge links between art, culture, education and sport” (Gruen Berlin, 2013), links currently lacking on the site. Finally, the site once again uses traditional signage to tell narratives of the past railyard through the information pavilion, that stick out, and form barriers between the public, nature and the past instead of finding ways to integrate them together. The former railyard has been transformed successfully to protect new ecology inhabiting the abandoned site, even though the public has not been fully integrated amongst the art, railyard relics and nature.

fig 03.21:
NATURPARK
SCHÖNEBERGER
 Location: Berlin,
 Germany
 Date: 2017

● **ECOLOGICAL CONSERVATION**

In 1999 large sections of the site were classified as landscape and nature conservation areas and are now home to a wide range of rare and endangered animals and plants.

RAILYARD RELICS

The old railyard relics scattered throughout the area help keep the history alive.

RAISED CATWALKS

“Visitors move through the area on a slightly raised steel grating walkway to ensure that they interfere as little as possible with nature.” The architecture works around the nature, instead of the nature working around the architecture.

● **HISTORICAL INFORMATION**

Information Plaques are scattered throughout the walkways to give visitors historical context.

● **ARTIST ENGAGEMENT**

There is an old retaining wall that graffiti artists can legally use as a canvas.

fig 03.22: Site Collage #2
Location: NaturPark Schöneberger Südgelände, Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

PARK AM GLEISDREIECK

Another new park situated within the Berlin landscape is Park Am Gleisdreieck. The former freight and rail yard linked Anhalter Bahnhof and Potsdamer Bahnhof starting in 1874, until its final destruction in WWII (Works - PublicSpace, n.d.) . Similar to Naturpark Schöneberger Südgelände, the area was left abandoned, eventually reclaimed by an overgrowth of ecology. The site was eventually turned into a new public park in 1997, as seen in fig. 03.23. Alternative developments were planned for the area, but the public intervened, calling for the need of more recreational space in Berlin. Designed by Atelier Loidl, the park’s landscape was “planned around a large central meadow, crossed from east to west by a concrete footpath and from north to south by a pair of railway lines” (Gruen Berlin, n.d.). In addition, the design wanted to feature the spontaneous ecology that claimed the space upon its ruin. Park Am Gleisdreieck focuses design around interweaving the new re-activation desired by the public amongst the old narratives of ruin and ecology found on the site.

Overall, Park Am Gleisdreieck illustrates unique ways of allowing the narratives of the past to remain on-site, while re-activating the area for contemporary society. Primarily, the design was established around what the public of Berlin wanted as a priority: more

fig 03.23:
PARK AM gLEISDREIECK
Location: Berlin,
Germany
Date: Present Day

"I love this place. This is the place for meeting people, for have a picnic there, have a sport time there. It is ideal for everything. Restaurants and bistros around there aren't so cheap, but its OK."

A14. JANA S

(quoted in (Park Am Gleisdreieck (Berlin)
- All You Need to Know BEFORE You Go -
Updated 2021 (Berlin, Germany), n.d.)

fig 03.24:

PARK AM gLEiSDREiECK
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

recreational space. Throughout the design process, the needs of the public were placed first with their active contributions to the development of the area. In addition to public needs, the design aimed to not remove any new ecology found in the ruins as a result of human absence, as "the park has been able to conserve to some extent the spirit of the non-place that preceded it" (Works - PublicSpace, n.d.). Finally, the ruin integration is weaved throughout the park, such as old posts turned into swing sets (fig. 3.24) illustrating a connection between the past and future instead of a memorialization of the past. Through an investigation into the design intentions of Park Am Gleisdreieck, one can find ways to re-activate a space of historical presence while moving it toward a contemporary future.

Although the landscape successfully re-activates the area into a contemporary setting not all aspects of the design were successful. The majority of the park is described as generic with manicured lawns instead of spontaneous nature, even though stated throughout the design concept as a design intended to work around what was already inhabiting the area amongst the decades of human absence, as priority came to the "citizens, more than stressing the overgrown-railyard-theme as the driving force for the design" (Dooren, 2019). In the desire for the site to become a park for public and recreational purposes, the designers erased some of the past narratives, favoring re-activation for the future. Finally, the designers chose which history to be remembered, the narrative of the former railway, neglecting others, "such as the adjacent grave monument for the Grimm brothers, famous authors of numerous fairy tales, or the national memorial for the liberation wars, The Prussian National Monument for the Liberation Wars, in the adjacent Viktoriapark—narratives that could have been embedded into the park in an alternative way" (Dooren, 2019). The future of Teufelsberg can learn from the positives and negatives of the new Park Am Gleisdreieck.

CONNECTION FROM NEW TO OLD

The elevated transportation system that glides over the park references the previous parks history and memories.

ECOLOGICAL INTEGRATION

Unique ecological diversity evolved at Gleisdreieck and has been retained in the new park

SPORTING FACILITIES

The park was created by the public and for the public. “Skaters and joggers, young and old, walkers and beach volleyball players, picnickers and sports enthusiasts, nature explorers and technology fans can all find plenty of space and facilities.”

INTEGRATED PLAYGROUNDS

Through the use of wood as a main material, the playgrounds for children can seamlessly blur into the landscape of the park.

OLD RAILWAY RUINS

Interweaves throughout the park are the old railway tracks, signaling equipment and buffers

fig 03.25: SITE COLLAGE #3
Location Park AM Gleisdreieck, Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

SPREEPARK

Founded in 1969, originally named VEB Kulturpark Berlin, SpreePark was the first and only amusement park within the German Democratic Republic (G.D.R.). This attraction brought citizens from all over Eastern Germany into East Berlin. When reunification occurred in 1991, the attraction was shut down, as East Germans now had access to other forms of amusement. 1991 also marked the year of the area’s privatization, as it separated from GDR and East German State. Over 20 years later, the old rides still stand, decaying, overgrown with ecology (fig. 03.26). However, in June 2016, the municipal planning company Grun Berlin GmbH is designing the park for the future, “developing the picturesque scenery at the historic site into an art and culture park, making it an important component with the city’s ‘green urban development’” (Spreepark, n.d.). Even though its re-design is not complete, Spreepark can still provide notable insight into how to approach re-activating sites with layered place meanings.

Although currently in the designing stages of development, Grun Berlin proposes a plan that integrates both the past layered site meanings and narratives with new areas for public re-activation amongst the new ecology present in the area. The development

fig 03.26: SPREEPARK
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 2012

team primarily wanted to not erase the past narratives of the site, but instead to “transform old rides and relics of the past, to rethink their use and to harmoniously combine them with the themes of art, culture and nature”(Spreepark, n.d.), and use relics like the roller coaster pictured in fig. 03.27, as key moments throughout the design proposal. The proposition uses raised walkway platforms to approach ecological conservation in the similar way of NaturPark Schoneberger Sudgelände. Finally, with the new design approach, the key decisions are made for the public with the public through schedule planning workshops to be attended, with an aim of developing and substantiating the framework planning in individual areas” (Spreepark, n.d.). Thus, through this proposed design, Grun Berlin successfully interweaves the desires of key past, present and future narratives of the site.

With the park still in development, stating the un-successful notions of the design are difficult. Yet, even though the design offers access to this iconic historical site, it seems to fail to act as a day-to-day recreational area for the people of Berlin, acting more as a tourist spot for the city. In addition, although the concept seems to mention the history of the park, the only notion in the design in referencing the history is through leaving the relics untouched. The design un-successfully links the past narratives of the people of the park with future narratives, as the site will be a “park that allows art and culture to be experienced by everyone in unique urban nature” (Spreepark, n.d.). Even though the design has yet to be implemented, Spreepark provides insight into ways to better improve a design intervention that allows for the cohesion of contemporary society’s desires with former place meanings.

fig 03.27: SPREEPARK
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 2013

PRESERVATION OF ELEMENTS

The current plan for the park is to keep various elements, such as old roller coaster tracks and convert them into other elements, such as a catwalk.

ECOLOGY CONSERVATION

The team also is determined to maintain the new ecology of the park since abandonment.

ART AND CULTURE PARK

“The goal is to transform the old rides and relics of the past, to rethink their use and to harmoniously combine them with the themes of art, culture and nature.”

fig 03.28: SITE COLLAGE #4
Location: SpreePark, Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

TEMPELHOFFER FELD

“Now that the field’s future is safe we can continue to have more events like that.”

A15. GERHAND
W STEINDORF,
TEMPELHOF
PROJEKT
CHIEF

(quoted in: Fahey, 2015)

The last case study features Tempelhof Feld, an old iconic airport located in Berlin. The airport is a part of Berlin’s historic past and was “once the largest and busiest in Germany, and one of Europe’s iconic airports of the pre-WWII era” (Patowary, 2015). With the airport no longer being useful to the Berlin government, it was closed in 2008. However, although deemed unnecessary to the government, the local public and ecology re-claimed the site, and re-activated its 386-hectare open space (Patowary, 2015), with wildlife claiming home to the open plane as illustrated in fig. 03.29, and the public using the space as a community garden, fig. 03.30. With little architectural design, the future activation of the area has been left in the hands of the public and surrounding ecology. The vast area is an example of where the “residents of Berlin successfully experiment with artistic, horticultural and social ideas” (Gruen Berlin, 2021). This central historical site of Berlin has thus been successfully transformed into an open space venue, where the narratives of the past linger amongst public and ecological narratives of the present.

fig 03.29: TEMPELHOF
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

In terms of design approach, Tempelhof Feld is an example of how through just providing the public with the tools and the

HIER BRÜTET DIE FELDLERCHE
VON APRIL BIS JULI.
THE SKYLARK BREEDS HERE
FROM APRIL TO JULY.

Bitte nicht stören.
Please do not disturb

space, they will program and re-activate a site based on their own needs. One method the designers used was signage for circulation, something done in the least imposing way possible, through new painted lines on the asphalt, as illustrated in fig. 03.31. In addition to providing circulation markers, Gruen Berlin provided transportation networks around the expansive site through bike lanes to moped rentals, to ensure Berliners can access the entirety of the landscape. Finally, through small interventions in several areas, such as retaining the old architecture of the airport itself and fostering the surrounding ecology, the area now offers “an important shelter in the middle of the metropolis for rare animal inhabitants and protected plants” (Gruen Berlin, 2021). Tempelhof Feld illustrates that, if given the freedom and tools, the surrounding public and ecology will rejuvenate an old historic space.

Although successful in its light-handed interventions, some initiatives introduced into the site are less successful. Located in the park is a historical “information trail” that marks “20 commemorative and memorial sites with texts and pictures that explain eras in Tempelhof Feld’s history to visitors” (Gruen Berlin, 2021). These traditional memorials do not immerse the visitor into the site, creating instead a division between the past and the public today. The old narratives and architecture present have merely become a picturesque backdrop, instead of being integrated into the sites programming. Overall, the minimal design approach was successful at Tempelhof. It gave the public the freedom to activate the site as desired. However, some further thoughtful design intervention is required to ensure that the past place meanings are not erased by contemporary society.

fig 03.30: TEMPELHOF
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 2012

INFORMATION TRAIL

An “Information trail” marks 20 commemorative and memorial sites with texts and historic pictures that explain eras in Tempelhofer Feld’s history to visitors.

ECOLOGICAL PRESERVATION

The law for the preservation of the Tempelhofer Feld (ThFG) protects a total area of approx. 303 hectares in the central meadow area and divides the Outer Wiesenring.

COMMUNITY GARDENS

Since 2011, 19 cultural, gardening and social projects have been adding to the recreational activities taking place on Tempelhofer Feld.

OLD TEMPELHOLF AIRPORT

Holds Berlin’s Police Department, Berlin Traffic Control, A Kindergarten, A Dance School, Stage Theatre

HOME FOR REFUGEES

In October 2015, was the home to about 1000 refugees, and at peak housed 2500.

ON SITE INTERVENTION

Little design intervention has been imposed upon the site, as the site has been given to the public to design and create the programing.

fig 03.31: SITE COLLAGE #5
Location: Tempelhofer Feld, Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

04

LAYERS OF A TRÜMMERBERG:
THE LAYERED MEMORIES OF
TEUFELSBERG

fig 04.32:
WEATHERiNg
EXPLORATiON 4
Date: Present Day

1920

October 1st, 1920

The Grünewald neighbourhood was incorporated into the greater Berlin area.

1937

November 27th, 1937

Wehrtechnische Fakultät (The Military College) work began building laid the foundation stone by Hitler, the start work on Germania. "As a world capital, Berlin will only be comparable to ancient Egypt, Babylon or Rome! What is London, what is Paris against it!"

1940

February 1940

The law to suspend construction of all non-war related building projects came into affect. This stoped the construction of The Military Collage, only the shell of the collage remained.

1946 - 1952

The site was designated a ruin collection area for the rubble and ruins of Berlin buildings destroyed during the air raids. Workers collected the rubble and moved to designated sites throughout Berlin. At Teufelsberg, 75 million cubic meters of ruins were collected and piled to form the new typography.

1955 - 1962

Berliners took advantage of the newly formed ruined hill. A ski-hill and jump were constructed near by, which was expanded in 1962 for a grandstand for 5000 visitors.

1963

Secret construction began for the new United States National Security Agency, Field Station Berlin. At the peak of the Cold War, 1500 employees of the NSA worked at Teufelsberg.

1965

The Grünewald forest became a place for day trippers and citizens of West Berlin who were stuck inside the confinments of the Berlin Wall.

1969 - 1972

The US NSA built and constructed the white domes, which are used to protect the antenna for the station. These domes will forever be the trademarks of Teulefsberg and Field Station Berlin.

1970 - 1984

Part of the hill is used as a local Berlin winery. 120 liters of wine are made yearly on the south side of the hill.

1992

August

After the Cold War over with the fall of the Berlin Wall, the NSA left the building to be abandoned with no longer any use for the facility. The site was privalely bought and became the property of Wilmersdorf for 5 million Deutsche Mark.

1994

The owners of the site attained a building permit to consturct villas on the mountain.

1995

The attenas inside the large white domes were dismantled.

1998 - 2002

The Hotel Complex that was starting to be constructed upon the site, ended up never coming to fruition due to the stoppage of construction in 2002 when the council changed from the CDU to SPD in 2001, which resulted in frozen building plans.

2006

The original building permit expired. After the expiration of the building

Today

The decaying facility and Teufelsberg are being restored by srlists, as well as welcoming visitors and events at the site. The Teufelsberg Community of Interests has also opened the site to graffiti artists. In addition, under supervision, parties, events, movie filiming and historical tours are held at the HILL.

2012

May

BrightSightOut, a event planning company within Berlin, signed a contract with the properity owners to rent out the space for developing tours of the space and as art spaces for local artists.

fig 04.33: NARRATiVES Of TEUFELSBERG TiMELiNE
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 1920 - Present Day

“We cannot solve the green space problems of the large cities ... simply through the existence value of forests and parks on the one hand and promenades on the other. The problem can only be solved on the basis of actual use of green space in the form of sports- and playgrounds, allotment gardens, public parks, and biking opportunities afforded by forests and fields.”

A 16 . MARTIN WAGNER

(quoted in Jackisch, 2014, p. 313)

LAYER 1: BEDROCK: FLAT BERLIN

Prior to being known for the rolling, ecological hills that define Berlin today, the city maintained a flat profile contained in a densely packed city limit. A continual increase in the population resulted in an even more densely packed city limit resulting a change in the population density, which was a primary factor impacting the political, social, and economic situation that Berliners faced in the early twentieth century. The rush of migration into the city as a result of the industrial revolution led to Berlin becoming “the world’s largest barrack style rented city” (Arandelovic & Bogunovich, 2014, p. 4). It was an urban centre created from the rapid industrialization facing the world, leading to a rapidly increasing urban population. This sharp increase in Berlin’s population led to cramped urban areas and poorly ventilated mass apartment buildings that packed a large percentage of Berlin’s working-class residents into a total area encompassing only 70 km² (Moss, 2020, p. 35). The population thus needed room to breathe, places to escape the new clouds of smoke overtaking the city, such as the Grnewald Forest.

The Grnewald forest appeared frozen in time. Prior to development on the site in the 20th century (fig. 04.29), the Grnewald comprises approximately 3,000 hectares of land located in one of Berlin’s wealthiest suburbs of the same name (“District Profil Berlin Grunewald,” n.d.). This area was included in the city limits through the amalgamation of Greater Berlin, created on April 25th, 1920 through a vote to pass the Law of

1920 - 1946
Grünwald:
Berlin maintained a relatively flat landscape prior to World War 2 clean up.

“Most of the richest Berlin families inhabit the Grunewald. It is difficult to understand why. Their villas, in all known styles of expensive ugliness, ranging from the eccentric-rococo folly to the cubist flat-roofed steel-and-glass box, are crowded together in this dank, dreary pinewood.”

A17. CHRISTOPHER
ISHERWOOD
(quoted in Scraton, 2012)

Creation of Greater Berlin. The vote passed with a “narrow majority comprising social democrats, independent social democrats, and pro-republican democrats, coming into force on October 1st, 1920”(Moss, 2020, p. 35). According to Moss, this newly amalgamated Greater Berlin was only possible due to the November 1918 revolution and the election of a democratically constituted Prussian assembly in 1919. This civil conflict, as a result of internal pressure and external pressure from World War 1, caused a more democratic system in the German government, as “the weighted franchise that had corrupted state politics were gone, including Prussia’s notorious three-class voting arrangement” (Constantine, 2017, p. 11). The civic upheave changed the governmental system of Germany to a democratic parliamentary republic, the Weimar Republic, replacing the previous federal constitutional monarchy. Thus, though legislative change, the people of Berlin were able to enjoy more recreational space within their much larger municipality.

Before Berlin expanded to include the Grünewald Forest into the city boundaries, it was an exclusive Prussian royal hunting preserve in the mid-sixteenth century. It even housed a former hunting lodge and used the vast landscape to hunt wild boar and deer (Jackish, 2014). The site’s use as a hunting preserve led to it being left largely untouched by development and instead solely being occupied by the sprawling wildlife dominated by coniferous trees. As author Jackish (2014) describes, residents adored the forest’s lush greenery, something they could not find in the city. Because of Berlin’s economic expansion and growth prior to World War I, the area was under development pressure for neighborhoods that featured large mansions near the center of the city, or “villa colonies” (Jackish, 2014).

To prevent this from occurring, the special purpose resident’s

fig 04.34: LAYER 1 OF
TEUFELSBERG
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: 1920

Tool Kit:
1. Bootprints
2. Hiking Boots
3. Bicycles
4. Grapes
5. Canoe
6. Skis

association, Zweckverband Grob-Berlin, or “the Association of Greater Berlin,” purchased the Grönewald Forest from the Prussian state to secure the land. Through this purchase and resultant territorial amalgamation, a contract was established to maintain the site as a leisure destination and an area for escape for Berlin citizens (fig.04.30). This was accomplished through the new ‘Comprehensive Green Space Plan’ for Berlin, introduced in 1929. This plan focused on incorporating radial green strips to link Berlin’s parks, playgrounds, and gardens with the open ecology existing on the city’s outer edges (Jackisch, 2014, p. 316). As a part of this process, the Permanent Forest Agreement was created, requiring the forest to be preserved in its natural state. Importantly, the agreement “forbade any future sale or development and would create a wide range of recreational opportunities for Berlin’s growing population.” (Jackisch, 2014, p. 325)

“One of urban plannings fundamental tasks is the maintenance of city dweller’s health and working strength. Is it better to create green space than to build hospitals? If a city can only be restructured and expanded at the cost of recreational areas, then the plan must be abandoned for it has already lost one of its essential foundations. It would then be better to build a new city in a different location.”

A18. MARTIN WAGNER
(quoted in “Die Grünflächenpolitik der deutschen Gemeinden,” 1939)

fig 04.35:
PUBLIC OF BERLIN TOOL KIT
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 1920

Whose authority lead to this plan of protection over ecology and the needs of the Berlin’s public? During this time, the Weimar Republic ruled over Germany and appointed Martin Wagner as the leading city planner of Greater Berlin. In 1915, Wagner wrote his dissertation discussing the importance of green space in city planning. “Wagner wanted to establish a systematic analysis of the usefulness of different types of green space (e.g., parks, gardens, playgrounds, forests), even going so far as to propose a statistical basis for a proper ratio of total green space per citizen in major urban centers (Jackisch, 2014, p. 311).” Wagner also argued for the need for green space legislation that would allow green space to become a prominent part of city planning. Without the efforts of Martin Wagner, the Grönewald Forest would not exist. However, despite this his initiatives, political changes would result in the transformation of Grönewald Forest.

fig 04.36:
MAP OF GREATER BERLIN
AND THE GRÜNEWALD
FOREST
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 1920 +

Before Wagner and any governmental planning body could assert their power over the urban landscape of Berlin, ecology and the public activated the site on their own terms. Memories of the site from the 1920s into the 1930s, therefore, largely belonged to the public. Even though there was a governmental desire to develop the area as an extension of the city due to its proximity to Berlin's center, the public resisted and instead the site was remained a leisure area (see fig 04.37). The lobbying of people by pro-forest groups resulted in the city government protecting the area from any future development.

This lobbying on the development of the area resulted in it gradually being overtaken by the site's residing ecology, enhanced by the political and social needs during the time. However, when the political, social, and economical status of Berlin changed, so did the place meanings of the Grunewald Forest. The forest remained a luscious green space free from urbanization until the Nazis party's appointment in 1933. Thus, the Bedrock foundation that first situates the site - the first layer of Teufelsberg – began with the Grunewald Forest, belonging largely to the public of Berlin.

fig 04.37:
PUBLIC OF BERLIN
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: 1920 +

“the former residenz city of the Hohenzollern princes, Kings and Kaisers will from now on become the eternal capital city of the first German Volksreich. The scale of this project and its constructions should not be measured by the years, 1937, 1938, 1938, or 1940, but should be determined by the recognition that it is our task to build for a millennial nation, with a thousand-year heritage of history and culture, a worthy, thousand-year city for the distant future that lies before it.”

A 19 . ADOLF HITLER

(quoted in Shaffer, 2001, p. 129)

LAYER 2: REGROWTH: CONSTRUCTING THE
WEHRTECHNISCHE FAKULTÄT
(TECHNICAL MILITARY COLLEGE)

In 1933, a new political power had taken over Germany and seemed to be very secretive regarding its future development intentions for the Grnewald Forest. Rumors started to circulate that the leadership was planning on building something in the area.

When the National Socialist German Workers’ Party (NSDAP or Nazi party) came to reign in 1933, it began to focus on a grand plan to turn Berlin into a dramatic new capital city for Germany. Known as ‘Germania, ‘a project akin to a new Roman empire for Adolf Hitler where he could leave his lasting impression on the world. Germania was to feature “two huge east-west and north south boulevard axes,” including the imposition of a technical military college in the Grnewald Forest, situated along the east-west axis (Jackisch, 2014, p. 319). With this change, new legislation over land control was put in place starting with ‘The Nazi Reich Nature Protection Law’ of 1935, which placed specific Berlin areas under new nature protection regulations. Impressing many, this new legislation created the “possibility for protecting entire landscapes and curbing the destructive effects of economic development on the countryside [...], areas worthy of protection for the entire nation, a long time goal old German advocates for *Naturschutz* (nature protection) (Brggemeier et al., 2005, p. 18),” including the Grnewald forest. This new urban plan was to take precedent over any other green plan previously put in place and was prioritized over any future planning initiative for

February 1940
Reichsmarschall
Hermann Göring of
building structures not
considered important
for War

“The greater the demands of today’s state are of its citizens, the more powerful the state must also appear to its citizens... our buildings arise to strengthen this authority! ...Therefore, these buildings should not be thought of for the year 1940, also not for the year 2000, but rather like the cathedrals of our past project into the millennia of the future... So precisely they will help politically to unite and strengthen our Volk more than ever; they become communally an element of the feeling of proud togetherness for Germans; they will demonstrate socially the ridiculousness of other worldly differences compared to these powerful and gigantic witnesses of our community; and they will fill psychologically the citizens of our Volk with an endless self-awareness, namely this: to be German! These powerful works will also simultaneously constitute the most exalted justifications for the political strength of the German nation.”

**A20. ADOLF
HITLER**

(quoted in Hagen & Ostergren, 2019)

fig 04.38:
LAYER 2 Of TEUFELSBERG
- W.F.
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: 1937

the city. Although designed by Willi Schelkes, a young landscape architect at the time, this law came secondary to the desires of chief Nazi architect Albert Speer, who had grand plans for the new architecture of Germania (Jackisch, 2014, p. 321). Therefore, regardless of the possibilities of the new landscape-focused legislation, Germania’s urban development remained a priority in the eyes of the government.

In other words, despite being defined as a protected conservation area through legislation, the Grunewald Forest’s priority fell to that of the overarching plan for Germania. The forest thus became a critical part of Germania’s new planning, thoroughly conceived by German Fuhrer Adolf Hitler and chief architect (officially Minister of Armaments and War Production), Albert Speer. The government planned for the construction of the *Wehrtechnische Fakultät*, or technical military college, developed by Speer as part of Germania’s east-west axis. Through the construction of this college, Speer’s design was in direct violation of the 1915 Permanent Forest Agreement, illustrating that “the overarching demands of Berlin’s future architectural plans overshadowed even their stated concern with preserving one of Berlin’s most popular green spaces” (Jackisch, 2014, p. 329). Through this violation, the government imposed a new narrative of Nazi supremacy upon the faintly touched forest land, changing the area’s place meanings now and far into the future.

Construction of the technical military college initiated this change of place meanings defining the Grunewald Forest as illustrated in fig. 04.38. The first stone of the *Wehrtechnische Fakultät* technical military college, and of Germania, was laid by Hitler on November 27th, 1937 (fig. 04.41). The technical military college cost 80 million *Reichsmarks* (approximately \$32 million USD) for the creation of the floor plans alone, “enframed by buildings

Tool Kit:
1. Podium
2. Bootprints
3. Flags
4. Construction Equipment

fig 04.39: NAzi gOVERNMENT TOOL KiT
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 1937

Tool Kit:
1. Site Plan
2. Resilient
Material

fig 04.40: W.f. TOOL KiT
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 1937

“By using special materials and by applying certain principles of statics, we should be able to build structures which even in a state of decay, after hundreds or (such were our reckonings) thousands of years would more or less resemble the Roman models. To illustrate my ideas I had a romantic drawing prepared. It showed what the reviewing stand on the Zeppelin Field would look like after generations of neglect, overgrown with ivy, its columns fallen, the walls crumbling here and there, but the outlines still clearly recognizable.”

A 2 1 . A L B E R T
S P E E R

(quoted in Diefendorf, 1993, p. 4)

like an insurmountable wall [...]. Arranged with precision, the barrack-style buildings in the courtyard – eight altogether – are dominated by a square, fortress-like building with four corners on one side and a structure shaped like a gate on the other” (Klaus & Jüttemann, 2012, pp. 10–11). To Hitler and Speer, Germania would be the next great Rome, meaning that any architecture built during this era needed to be resilient to all forces (Anderson, 2015). The plans for the college followed those of Speer’s “laws of ruins,” or *Ruinenwerttheorie*, stating that after several years, the military college’s design “would be indistinguishable from classical antiquity after generations of neglect” (Smith & Shand, 2016, p. 186). Yet, this idea of building resiliency led to future issues when post-Nazi governments tried to erase the impressions imposed by this fascist political power. Thus, the narratives of the Nazi government and Albert Speer changed the place meanings indefinitely of the Grünewald Forest and of Berlin.

Ultimately, the Nazi promise of a new technical military college—and of the iconic capital Germania—were unfulfilled. In February 1940, when WWII intensified, Reichsmarschall Hermann Göring ordered that the construction of any new project that was not essential for wartime efforts be halted, including the *Wehrtechnische Fakultät*, the technical military college. This order led to the stopping of a new layer of history on this site once again. Thus, this act ultimately changed the site’s trajectory from one of increased urban development back to one dominated by ecology, free to be re-activated by Berlin’s public.

fig 04.41:
THE first STONE,
THE WEHRTECHNISCHE
FAKULTÄT
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: November 27th, 1937

“He found the spot where the building had stood without any difficulty. Perhaps it was the number of steps he had taken from the crossroads, or some aspect of the series of tree stumps that once had formed a tall and beautiful avenue – at any rate, something caused him to stop suddenly, look to the left, and there it was. He recognized the remains of the stairwell, picked his way across the ruins towards it: he was home.”

A 2 2 . HEINRICH BÖLL
(Böll 1994: 17 quoted in Anderson, 2015, p. 79)

LAYER 3: SUBSOIL: DEPOSITING RUBBLE

After WWII Berlin was left in ruin. The dystopian view of ruins shaped the new defining landscape of Berlin. The past political influences and years of war left a physical and mental scar across Germany, resulting in a new political divide. When the war subsided, Germany’s ruined landscape needed repair, but who was take power? How was the war-torn nation to rebuild amongst the ruin that littered the landscape? How was the nation going to repair the physical and mental scars left by the past?

The winning allied forces decided to divide the country amongst the victors who all wanted to claim a piece of their prize. As illustrated in fig. 04.43, the allied forces claimed authority over West Germany, forming The Federal Republic of Germany (F.R.G), dividing the region into three sections, each controlled by their respective allied nation. The French took the north, the British ruled the centre, and the Americans controlled the south. The Eastern side was now politically governed as the German Democratic Republic (G.D.R), a member of the Eastern Bloc during the Cold War (Pugh, 2014). The winning nations also divided Berlin, even though it was completely situated in the Eastern sector of the country. Although this new division seemed to freeze the openly hostile political atmosphere of Berlin and Germany at the time, this division created new dis-union amongst citizens.

With the different political positioning of the First and Second Worlds, there was the beginning of the Cold War, starting in 1947, leaving Berlin and Germany as ground zero. The war situated Germany as a proxy site for tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union. With West Germany being allied with the United States, the F.R.G. situated themselves accordingly. Similarly, the East aligned with the Soviet Union. Berlin became the invisible front line of a global stalemate. The Cold War had an immense effect on the already divided German society, and their political, economic, and social institutions (Leffler & Painter, 2005).

Before the newly established regimes could address the simmering political divide, both East and West Berlin had to repair their ruined capital. In both, the government's answer was to hide the past destruction by planning a new artificial landscape defining liberated Berlin. The new artificial landscape is where the third layer of memories tied to this thesis lies illustrated in fig. 04.42, buried under the site, built between 1946 and 1972 (Klaus & Jüttemann, 2012).

Even though split politically, both the east and west German governments fulfilled the same plan of moving the rubble of WWII to certain sites for deposit. These sites, called *Trümmerbergs* or 'rubble hills', transformed "Berlin's destruction into a swollen landscape, filled with the physical remnants of its past urbanity" (Anderson, 2017: p. xi). As illustrated in fig. 04.48 - 53, the shaping of this new landscape involved diverting rubble to 13 hill topographies, where the introduction of this ruin waste drastically changed the topography. These artificial hills were mostly placed in central areas of Berlin, as a quick solution to repair the city (De Maio, 2013). Specifically, in areas with "geomorphological features that would allow a project of the storage of debris in

"I received my first Iron Cross on the Teufelsberg", Alfons Baransky recalls. Not for the pointless "final battle" of the Nazis in the streets of the destroyed capital, which Alfons had barely survived as a ten-year-old. He picked the award out of the rubble which was continually dumped on the stable ruins [...]."

A23. ALFONS BARANSKY
(quoted in Klaus & Jüttemann, 2012, p. 14)

fig 04.42:
LAYER 3 Of TEUFELSBERG
- BURIAL OF THE PAST
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: 1946

West Germany	East Germany
Governing Body: US, UK, France	Governing Body: GDR
Population: 63.25 million	Population: 16.11 million
Land Mass: 248,577 km ²	Land Mass: 108,333 km ²

fig 04.43: DiViDeD BERLiN
 Location: Berlin, Germany
 Date: 1945

shape of hills with no risk of polluting of the vast network of rivers and groundwater in Berlin. (De Maio, 2013, p. 536).” With some of these artificial hills, such as Rudower Höhe, illustrated in fig. 04.53, the introduction of debris drastically changed the flat landscape to an elevated mountain. Other Trümmerbergs were strategically placed to erase the architecture of Hitler’s Germany, such as at the site of *Wehrtechnische Fakultät*, the technical military college, situated in Grönewald Forest (De Maio, 2013), now ruled under the British and called Teufelsberg. These new deposits of rubble became carriers of the past narratives of Berlin, discarded

04. LAYERS OF A TRÜMMERBERG: THE LAYERED MEMORIES OF TEUFELSBERG

fig 04.44: STRUCTURAL COLUMN
Name: Kaiser Wilhelm Memorial Church
Location: Berlin, Germany
Architect: Franz Schwechten
Originally Built: 1891 -1906
Material: Stone
Sent to: 2. Mont Klamott

fig 04.45: STRUCTURAL COLUMN
Name: Alexanderplatz
Location: Central Berlin, Germany
Architect: Various Architects
Originally Built: 1805 -1900
Material: Concrete
Sent to: 1. Humboldthain

fig 04.46: ROOF
Name: Brandenburg Gate
Location: Berlin, Germany
Architect: Carl Gotthard Langhans
Originally Built: 1788
Material: Sandstone
Sent to: 4. Rudower Höhe

fig 04.47: LEFT TOWER
Name: Wehrtechnische Fakultät
Location: Grunewald Forest, Berlin, Germany
Architect: Albert Speer
Originally Built: Started Construction in 1937
Material: Stone
Kept at: 1. Teufelsberg

fig 04.49: iNSiDE A TRÜMMERBERG
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 1946 +

fig 04.50: HUMBOLDTHAIN
Notable Landmark: Former Nazi anti-aircraft tower offer a new elevated view of the north of Berlin in the summer, and a sanctuary for bats in winter.

fig 04.51: MONT KLAMOTT
Notable Landmark: This bunker reaches a height of 78m covering an old flak tower with debris from war time rubble. Now the old flak tower is covered inn trees, and walkways to form a new park for the citizens of Berlin.

fig 04.52: TEUFELSBERG
Notable Landmark: This trummerberg hides the early construction of the technical military college for Germania. Once filled with rubble, this trummerberg became the highest elevation in Berlin at 120.1m. The decaying Field Station Berlin NSA now rests on top.

fig 04.53: RUDOWER HÖHE
Notable Landmark: Park used for the viewing platform of Berlin and a toboggan run. The rubble mountain has transformed into a park for the surrounding area featuring paths for pedestrians and bicyclists.

fig 04.54: W.f. DRAWING
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 1937

fig 04.55: TRÜMMERFRAUEN MOVING RUBBLE
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 1946 - 1972

Tool Kit:
1. Bootprints
2. Push Cart
3. Gloves
4. Shovel

to hide the traumatic past of the city, in the same time creating their own mark upon the landscape. With this new redevelopment plan in place to fix the traumas of the past, who was to repair Berlin?

“The alarm jangled—time to get up for shoveling. Today I dressed in my blue training pants and tied on a kitchen apron. Once again, the sky was overcast. It was drizzling when we arrived. We shoveled diligently. This time there were even two men shoveling alongside us, at least when the supervisor was watching—otherwise, they didn’t do a thing.”

A 24 . MARTA
HILLERS
(quoted in Boehm, 2004)

One of the many narratives that live within the burial grounds of the Trümmerberg ruins scattered throughout Berlin is that of the *Trümmerfrauen*, or rubble women. Approximately 60,000 women brought over 26 million cubic meters of rubble from war-torn Berlin to construct Teufelsberg (Damaschke, 2014) pictured in fig 01.04 and fig 04.55. These women became the builders of an artificial mountain, with construction lasting between 1946 to 1972. This rubble transfer brought the site’s final elevation to 120.1 m above sea level, Berlin’s peak. These women “were largely responsible for the tedious small-scale operations of separating rubble into reusable building materials and waste for the rubble heaps,” (Gerd Wessolek & Toland, 2017) with the unusable rubble to be transferred to the construction of the new artificial landscapes. The labour implemented by these women was tedious, with “their backs bent and hard pressed as they push carriages filled with debris” (Anderson, 2015, p. 77). It created a permanent connection between the *Trümmerfrauen* and the past buried narratives of the people of Berlin. “The memory of the weight, feel, and smell of the burned bricks dies with the last of the *Trümmerfrauen* (Gerd Wessolek & Toland, 2017, p. 2).” The people of Berlin restructured their worn torn city, to form a new Berlin amongst the rubble. With the removal of the ruins, the burial of the destruction and tremulous past of Berlin begins, and a new Berlin can emerge.

fig 04.56:
TRÜMMERFRAUEN TOOL KIT
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 1946 - 1972

“West Berlin has changed in fundamental ways since it made headlines during the Cold War. Though it is an “enclave” sitting in the middle of Communist East Germany, most West Berliners do not think of their largely green, 185-square-mile metropolis in that way. Embracing nearly three times the area of Washington, D.C., the city is big enough for winter skiing (on Teufelsberg, or “Devil’s Hill,” built from wartime rubble), for summer skinning dipping at a secluded beach, for a three-hour boat ride down the Havel River. Little wonder that West Berliners do not pay much attention to the infamous Wall.”

A 25 . JOSEF ERNST
(1988)

LAYER 4: TOPSOIL: BURIAL OF THE PAST

While ruins and rubble were still being transported to these new Trümmerbergs, the political situation in Berlin was still chaos. This chaos took a dramatic turn with the construction of the Berlin Wall, as illustrated in fig. 04.43. The wall created a physical divide in the city, done to define the new political boundaries that faced Berliners. The process was an abrupt one: “On August 13th, 1961, in the middle of the night, the East German government closed the border between East and West Berlin, halting people, cars, and trams in their tracks and sealing off the western sectors of the city with barbed wire (Pugh, 2014, p. 1).” The Berlin wall led to the Grnewald Forest and Teufelsberg now being situated on the west. Once a new layer of topsoil fully buried the ruins of the past, this new elevated landforms once again became an escape for the people of West Berlin.

With the introduction of this new artificial landscape through the construction of Trmmerbergs, the public of Berlin took advantage of the newly elevated cityscape. Many citizens still took day trips to the Grnewald Forest, while others went canoeing on the nearby Teufelsee lake. “With no access to the surrounding countryside, all of it being part of socialist East Germany, the Grnewald, the lakes and the beach at Wannsee where the only patches of accessible ‘nature’ that did not involve a plane ride or border controls (Scraton, 2012).” The new topographic elevation allowed for the introduction of previously unattainable

Tool Kit:
1. Harness
2. Yoga Mat
3. Bar
4. Information Pamphlet

“Where houses and street corners had been bombed, the rubble would be removed, but few new building projects replaced what once had stood there. Factories, power stations, train stations and their infrastructure, stockyards and breweries, all closed down, and the buildings were left in ruins.”

A 26 . JOACHIN
SCHLÖR
(2018)

fig 04.57: PUBLIC OF
BERLIN TOOL KIT
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

activities to Berliners. From skiing to planting a vineyard to mountain biking, the Berlin public took advantage of their newly constructed landscape, despite the political division surrounding them, (fig 04.57). Therefore, even with the government trying to bury the past, Berlin’s public activated the Grönwald Forest’s newfound landscape.

Along with West Berliner’s re-activating the site of Grönwald Forest, the movement of rubble subsequently transferred new ecological species. This introduction of unique ecology began to hide the ruins, ultimately blurring the worn piles with a layer of 30cm to 1m of topsoil to conceal the war’s remnants, as illustrated in fig 04.58. Along with the topsoil, the planting of oak and pine trees began to create a new mountain within the Grönwald Forest (Gerd Wessolek & Toland, 2017). All this transfer and movement upon the site created the new ecology found at Teufelsberg.

The ecology of the area shifted with the newly formed landscape, creating an elevated, forest-ecosystem, as illustrated in fig 04.59. With the Grönwald being a forest within a city, the ecology now found on the site “is much more dynamic and influenced by human activity” (Gandy, 2018). Species such as *Salsola Pestifer* moved into the site with the rubble, in addition to many other plants. A summary of the species arriving due to rubble transport can be found in the inventory of plant life in the counterpreservation code book, an excerpt of which can also be found in fig 04.60. *Salsola Pestifer* co-habitats with debris and, after fifteen years, fully begins to settle over the area (Gandy, 2018). Despite both the political and physical division occurring in Berlin during the Cold War, new plant ecology and the public came together to reactivate the site of the Grönwald Forest once again.

fig 04.58: LAYERS OF TEUFELSBERG AND SOIL SAMPLE
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 1920 - Present

fig 04.59: TEUFELSBERG Bio - TYPES
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2003 - 2010

LEGEND:

- FORESTS
- DRY AND NEGLECTED GRASSLANDS
- VACANT AREAS
- IMMATURE SOIL
- TRAFFIC AREAS
- HOUSE AND ALLOTMENT GARDEN

1 - 2,500

INDEX OF ECOLOGY:

1. ARTEMISA VULGARIS
2. DYSPHANIA BOTRYS
3. DYSPHANIA PUMILIO
4. PINUS
5. QUERCUS
6. SENECIO INAEQUIDENS
7. SALSOLA PAULSENII

Unique Properties:
Best in poor to moderately fertile
with dry to medium moisture. Does
poorly in moist to wet soils due to
root rot.

- use to hold
water in certain
areas of the site
- cover certain areas(?)
to maintain the topography
of the new site.

Unique Properties:
Originally, planted with the
implementation of topsoil. Aids in
erosion control, with the roots holding
soil in place and layers of pine
needles helping to soften the impact of
falling rain."

Unique Properties:
Extremely water efficient, as it does
not require large amounts of water to
survive and populate.

Unique Properties:
Does well in disturbed soils, or
soils with lots of movement such as
a decaying site. Prefers moist soil,
pollinated by Wind.

Unique Properties:
Does well in sun occupied areas in a
moist soil for water retention.

Unique Properties:
Large foliage coverage, used commonly
for aesthetic purposes. Home for
wildlife of the surrounding area.

Unique Properties:
Seeds are carried and moved through
water, to densely populate this weed
throughout the landscape.

fig 04.60: INDEX of ECOLOGY - PAGES FROM THE
COUNTERPRESERVATION CODEBOOK
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 1945 - Present

“This is all sort of difficult to discuss since we are still bound by oaths of the time. While the NSA admits it had a presence in Berlin, details are still cloaked. That presence was about 100 of us service types for every one of the (NSA headquarters) Fort Meade folks and without us a great deal would have never been known. They get the credit; we did the work.”

A 2 7 . L E W M C D A N I E L

(quoted in “Teufelsberg Tale,” 2015)”

[REDACTED]

LAYER 5: A NEW IMPOSITION: FIELD STATION
BERLIN

“People worked 24 hours a day on the Teufelsberg. A normal working week in the British unit had eight days: the cycle consisted of two night shifts (‘mids’) from midnight to 8 a.m., followed by two late shifts from 4 p.m. to midnight, then two daytime shifts from 8 a.m. to 4p.m., and finally two days off.”

A 2 8 . F I N L E Y ★

(quoted in Klaus & Jüttemann, 2012)

Despite the ruins of past Berlin being reclaimed by ecology and the West Berlin public, the ruling government maintained exclusive control over Grnewald Forest and Teufelsberg. With Teufelsberg having the highest elevation in Berlin at 120.1m, this connected United States allied West Germany directly with Moscow, headquarters of the Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc (Klaus & Jttemann, 2012, p. 22). Teufelsberg quickly became the perfect location for a new surveillance station for monitoring the Soviet Union.

With permission from the British for access to their ruled area of West Berlin, the United States National Surveillance Agency (N. S. A.) constructed Field Station Berlin atop the artificial mountain of Teufelsberg. As a member of the wiretapping network of Echelon, Field Station Berlin’s location was an “aim of listing in on and thereby controlling the entire political and military communication of the Soviet Union” (Klaus & Jttemann, p. 31). The N.S.A. began their use of the site in three construction phases: 1961 – 1966, the late 1960s to early 1970s, and finally, the 1980s to its abandonment in 1992. The mark first made by the organization was temporary, since they relied on mobile surveillance equipment, which then took a more permanent approach in 1964. As known today, Field Station Berlin started construction in 1968m when the N.S.A. took over 2916 square

fig 04.61: fiELD STATION BERLiN
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 1972

- Legend:
1. Main Operations Building	7. Heating Plant
2. Teufelsberg 2	8. Electrical System
3. Document Destruction	9. British Building
4. Arctic Tower	10. Communications
5. Dinging Building	11. Guard
6. Power Station	12. Bar
- 1 - 1000

Skizze 2
Hauptoperationsbasis der "US Army Field Station Berlin-USAFSB"
auf dem Westberliner Teufelsberg

fig 04.62: FIELD STATION BERLIN SITE PLAN
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 1972

ACCORDING TO STASI INTEL: ACCORDING TO NSA:

MAIN OPERATIONS TEUFELSBERG 2 DOCUMENT DESTRUCTION ARTIC TOWER DINING	1 .	<ul style="list-style-type: none">»3 stories»Subsystems for the collection and storage of telecommunications electronic intelligence information»Communication center and office for the registration and»Control of classified documents»Information processing and analysis and data processing departments»Antenna Complexes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">»Date: 1969 - 1972»Size: 61m x 23m supported on a steel framework»Material: solid concrete floors and roof»Separated into 11 bays»Each floor is 5.5m»Concrete frame infilled with concrete blocks»Square concrete base of the central tower»Glazed in bullet proof glass
	2 .	<ul style="list-style-type: none">»Maintenance and repair personnel for the station's electronic equipment»Plant technician»"PA PA" subsystem (SS "PA PA" = detection system for»HF Morse and telex traffic as well as HF direction»Finding system against Soviet and European»Communist communication lines	<ul style="list-style-type: none">»Date: 1980s as part of an expansion and refurbishment program»Size: 42m x 38m x 13»Material: Two story, steel framed building with breeze blocks and clad externally in blue cement sheets on steel framework»Windowless»West is a smaller annex about 35m x 15m
	3 .		<ul style="list-style-type: none">»Date: 1978-1982»Height of 12m»Solid brick walls»Flat concrete roof»Divided into two uneven parts
	4 .	<ul style="list-style-type: none">»Reconnaissance Facilities»The subsystem "O" is installed in the building (S / S O = search and clarification of potential target objects)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">»Date: 1965»Three story, 12 sided steel framed structure»Windowless ribbed aluminum sheeting»Ra-dome 16m in diameter
	5 .	<ul style="list-style-type: none">»Admin Building»Service rooms of the commander of the -Teufelsberg facility / staff area S-3»Headquarters of the staff area»Conference hall»Planning and training office»FSB training center»Dining room»Storage rooms of weapons and equipment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">»Date: 1969 and 1971»Extend between 1978 and 1982»Two story structure dug into a terrace on the southern side of the hill»Basement on reinforced concrete»Upper story is carried on a heavy steel frame

fig 04.63: fiELD STAtion BERlin BUilDing iNVENTORY
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 1972

ACCORDING TO STASI INTEL: ACCORDING TO NSA:

POWER STATION HEATING PLANT ELECTRICAL SYSTEM BRITISH BUILDINGS COMMUNICATION MAIN ENTRANCE BAR	6 .
	7 .	<ul style="list-style-type: none">»Ensuring the continuous and constant supply of energy to the electronic equipment	
	8 .
	9 .		<ul style="list-style-type: none">»Date: 1969 - 1972»Size: 52m x 27m x 10m tall
	10 .	<ul style="list-style-type: none">»Photo lab»Graphics Department»Operational Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">»Date: 1965 - 1966»Size: 14m x 7m x 7m»Second oldest surviving building»Three story windowless brick building»Cast concrete floors and a flat roof
	11 .	<ul style="list-style-type: none">»Seat of the forces for external security of the property	
	12 .	<ul style="list-style-type: none">»Seat of the forces for external security of the property»Provisions

Tool Kit:
1. Pen and Notebook
2. Minifon P55 wire reel recorder with microphone watch and microphone pen
3. Headphones
4. Paperwork
5. Document Destruction Machine

fig 04.64: field STATION BERlin EMPLOYEE TOOL KiT
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 1972

Tool Kit:
1. Site Plan
2. White Fabric
3. Concrete
4. Stucco
5. Steel Beams/Column
6. Steel Dome Frame
7. Brick

fig 04.65: field STATION BERlin TOOL KiT
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 1963

meters of Teufelsberg (Cocroft & Schofield, 2019, p. 64). Thus, without consulting the public of Berlin, the N.S.A. built their facility upon the newly elevated artificial landscape.

“What do we listen to? Any radio signal that went through the air - whether it was Morse code or short wave, we listened as much as we could to everything. Much of it was sent in clear text. In the 1960s and the 1970s, they did not have the possibility to encode, send a message, decode, recode and send it back quickly.”

A29. CHRISTOPHER MCLARREN
(quoted in Smith & Shand, 2016, p. 189)

The Field Station Berlin campus comprised 13 buildings, as illustrated in 04.66- 68, all designed and planned with secrecy as the priority. By the 1980s, the facility encompassed the entire summit of the artificial mountain. The architecture is unique in that it was created for one of the most secretive areas of the government, as illustrated by the design of each structure illustrated in the inventory found in fig. 04.63 of this document. It illustrates an approach to design intended to keep secrets in and on-lookers out. A key area to keep this secrecy is the document destruction building, which housed two industrial paper shredders. After documentation was sent to this building for shredding, it was then sent off site to be burned (Cocroft & Schofield, 2019, p. 103). Similarly, two of the main buildings, the British Building and Teufelsberg 2, have no exterior windows, done to ensure the secrecy of the inside work. Just to advance into the main office buildings, one would have to “pass through at least three security checks (Cocroft & Schofield, 2019, p. 113).” The five iconic domes that marked the site, termed ‘arctic domes’ due to the materiality of the protective geodesic domes designed by Buckminster Fuller, an American architect-engineer were used for the protection and security of the radar equipment. These domes “were 75 percent non-metallic and covered in fiberglass panels that are pervious to radar and radio emissions, while offering weather protection and concealment (Cocroft & Schofield, 2019, p. 160,)” also marking the buildings of belonging to the western world. The final finish to the buildings was through a blue and white painted colour scheme, to hide in plain sight and blend in with the Berlin skyline (Cocroft & Schofield, 2019, p. 160). Therefore, in every inch of the architecture, from movement control to the building’s façade

fig 04.66:
STASI DOCUMENTATION of
field STATION BERLIN
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: 1963 - Present

colours, Field Station Berlin was designed to keep privacy in and on-lookers and the surrounding public and ecology out.

As Field Station Berlin was surveilling the Eastern Bloc, the Eastern Bloc was also surveilling Field Station Berlin. Despite West Berlin’s great efforts toward secrecy, the Ministry for State Security (Ministerium für Staatsicherheit) or STASI, the government surveillance sector of the GDR, gained intelligence over aspects of Field Station Berlin. As illustrated in fig 04.66, this thesis features documentation about Field Station Berlin attained from the STASI database. Thus, even with measures of confidentiality and secrecy, Field Station Berlin was not completely secretive.

“Most Teufelsberg soldiers remember their time in Berlin fondly. Especially because we fled that we were playing a meaningful role in peacefully ending the Cold War – by being watchful for 30 years.”

A30. JOHN ★
(quoted in Klaus & Jüttemann, 2012, p. 44)

The operations at Field Station Berlin halted with the fall of the Berlin Wall in November of 1989. This led to a reunification of divided Germany, and was associated with the broader break-up of the Soviet Union (Cocroft & Schofield, 2019, p. 163). The N.S.A. left Field Station Berlin to be closed by the Closure Task Force on Thursday, January 16, 1992. Up until August 1992 the task force spent six months “dismantling equipment and on August 11 its facilities were handed over to the United States Army (Taylor, 2004, p. 223).” Soon forgotten and abandoned by the government, the narratives left by Field Station Berlin’s architecture were forced to face a new layer of history, brought on by the surrounding ecology and public.

fig 04.67: field
STATION BERLIN
EMPLOYEE
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 1972

* Only one narrative was allowed to exist on the site during this time, the narrative of Cold War security. Even to this day, Field Station Berlin’s former employees are “not allowed to reveal technical details and are required to be discreet (Klaus & Jüttemann, 2012, p. 44).” Most literature documenting the narratives of workers uses pseudonyms to protect their identity. In government sources, these narratives of the workers’ lives are often hidden behind redacted text, masking aspects of the site’s greater history.

LAYER 6: A LIVING RUIN

“People have been meeting on Teufelsberg in Berlin’s Grunewald since 2013; for a painting session of a special kind under the motto - THE ART OF LIVING 2016. The artistic exchange between Berlin writers and the rest of the urban art world is promoted by the GRAFFITI LOBBY BERLIN. There are “walls without end” and “the rise from ruins”. Artists from all times and styles of graffiti were brought together. The whole spectrum of aerosol creativity shines, a celebration of styles, characters and colors.”

A31. GRAFFITI LOBBY BERLIN

(Graffiti Lobby Berlin, n.d.)

fig 04.68: field
STATION BERLIN
DECAYING
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 2020

Today, remnants of the old Field Station Berlin can still be found at Teufelsberg, although with a new surface finish, completed by the public of Berlin and environmental forces. The site has been left and forgotten by both the American government and now the Berlin government. In true Berliner fashion, the locals have used the unwanted government ruin as a blank canvas, hosting a wide range of public activities. Teufelsberg has thus been re-activated once again with the public placing their own narrative upon the site.

In reflecting on Field Station Berlin, we see that once the political power in control no longer deems a building or landscape useful, the loss of its rich place meanings can occur. Abandonment of former government buildings is common throughout Berlin due to the tumultuous political environment of the city’s past, and as a result the city’s landscape being littered with abandoned government buildings, as illustrated in fig. 04.69. Every coming change of governmental power resulted in a new place meaning for Teufelsberg and more abandoned government buildings left for the surrounding public and ecology to claim (fig. 04. 72). The Field Station Berlin site was sold to the developers Gruhl and Partner in the late 1990s, to be turned into a hotel and residence and to completely give the site a new place meaning. However, the building permit fell through in 2004, and this new project never came to fruition (Gruhl-Koeln - Gruhl and Partners, n.d.).

fig 04.69: ABANDONED GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: Present

1:50,000

PRIOR TO 1993

1933 - 1945

AFTER 1945

As a result, Field Station Berlin was to be torn down and the afforestation of the grounds was to occur, as ordered by the senate administration, once again erasing the past place meanings of the site. However, the government illustrated that this was not a priority as they could not buy back the grounds with the costly mortgage of over 30 million Euros (Klaus & Jüttemann, 2012, p. 60). Now, Field Station Berlin sits slowly decaying.

“Today, the site is a park. It is a far cry from the prewar construction site or the bustle of a postwar dumping ground. After a hike through the Grunewald – the hill is now sprinkled with trees, even in places where the rubble is still exposed by erosion – visitors to Teufelsberg can relax, visit the listening station, or take in the sights of Berlin from the edge of the city.”

A32.VISITING STUDENTS

(Hartshorn et al., n.d.)

Field Station Berlin has thus been left by the governmental organizations who previously controlled them. As illustrated in figs 04.73-87, the structures on the site have been left to be consumed by the surrounding environment through decay and erosion. “Teufelsberg has spent more time as derelict structures than as operational units, and all now have complex post-abandonment biographies” (Cocroft & Schofield, 2019, p. 163),”as illustrated in the new building inventory of the site in fig 04.75. Notably, the maintenance buildings have been removed, with only their foundations remaining. In addition to environment dictated surface finishing through decay, as “all the windows on the site are smashed, the material covering of the radome tower is ripped, interior walls demolished and fires have destroyed some areas” (Klaus & Jüttemann, 2012, p. 164). Ultimately, although these spaces are wastelands in their original creators’ eyes, both the public and surrounding ecology have always activated them and kept them alive with energy.

Whenever the government did not want total reign over Teufelsberg through either construction or surveillance, the Berlin public has activated the landscape. Due to the Grunewald Forest’s location near the center of Berlin, Berliners desired that the area remain a forest and escape from the city. The public of Berlin continues to activate the site with energy and art through re-surfacing the architecture to a new graffiti gallery and outdoor

fig 04.70:
ABANDONED gOVERNMENT
BUiLDiNgS
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 1920 - Present

Tool Kit:
1. Paint
2. Sketch Book
3. Ladder
4. Spray Cans

leisure space, as illustrated in the site photos in fig. 04.76-87. This site layered with the past now again belongs to the people of Berlin, as of “may 2012 Shalmon Abraham (artist and leader of Verein Berlin Teufelsberg, Association of Berlin Teufelsberg) took over the lease with a view to encouraging artistic use of the site (Klaus & Jüttemann, 2012, p. 166).” However, Abraham imposed his own narrative upon the site, charging admission to the historical layered landmark (Hill, 2014). Not only have the public returned to leave their impressions on the artificial mountain, so too has the surrounding ecology, even with some restrictions to the site still remaining, due to the new caretaker.

“These ‘people’ were parked in some shitty looking boyracer car- two young fellas in their early 20s. [...] They told us they worked for their ‘boss’ who leased the place from the government’.”

A33.CHOLE
(quoted in Fahey, 2020)

In addition to the public of Berlin reclaiming their agency over the site, the ecology has done the same. The overgrown trees have created large canopies: these wastelands or Branchen of Berlin, where the ecology is reclaiming areas of destruction. The ecology is imposing its agency over sites previously taken away from it. “Even a cracked pavement or neglected parking lot, with its own ecological dynamics, can serve as a king of small-scale landscapes (Gandy, 2018).” Therefore, through these landscapes of destruction and abandonment, the surrounding ecology never abandons a landscape but grasps it while telling its own site history. “The wastelands [including Teufelsberg], tell the history of Berlin through the lens of spontaneous nature” (Gandy, 2018). Despite the architectural and political agency formerly forced upon the site, the surrounding ecology will always have a lasting impression on Teufelsberg’s landscape.

Thus, once an area such as Teufelsberg is unusable due to the political situation, a site full of place meanings becomes abandoned and joins the network of abandoned government buildings that litter the Berlin landscape. Although deemed useless by the previous government, the public never abandons

fig 03.71: gRAffiti
ARTIST TOOL KIT
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 2000s

these narrative landscapes. Both the public and surrounding ecology continue to activate them with energy, although different from the government and the architect's original intentions. The legacy of Teufelsberg illustrates that architecture is only temporal, whereas the actual agency over the site belongs with the public and surrounding ecology. But the question remains, how can a designer offer a unique means of site intervention capable of capturing the complexity of existing place meanings while still supporting reactivation by contemporary society?

fig 03.72: gRAffiT*i*
ARTiSTS AT TEUFELSBERG
 Location: Teufelsberg,
 Berlin, Germany
 Date: 2000s

fig 04.73: fiELD STATiON BERLiN TODAY
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2020

fig 04.74: fiELD STATION
BERLiN SiTE PLAN
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: 2020

TODAYS USE:

- »Level 1 used as storage
- »Level 2 and 3 are used as a curated -Graffiti Area, locked to general public
- »Roof used as Event Space, currently locked as it does not meet fire protection guidelines
- »Antenna Domes used as meeting/ event spaces
- » No windows remain

TEUFELSBERG 2
MAIN OPERATIONS

TEUFELSBERG 2
DOCUMENT DESTRUCTION

TEUFELSBERG 2
ARCTIC TOWER

TEUFELSBERG 2
DINING

TEUFELSBERG 2
DINING

fig 04.75: fiELD STAtion BERlin BuiLDing iNVENTORY
Location: Berlin, Germany
Date: 2020

TODAYS USE:

- »Destroyed in the late 1990s to being work on the transformation of the the complex into a hotel

POWER
STATION

HEATING
PLANT

ELECTRICAL
SYSTEM

BRITISH
BUILDINGS

COMMUNICATION

MAIN
ENTRANCE

BAR AND
STORE ROOMS

- »Destroyed in the late 1990s to being work on the transformation of the the complex into a hotel

- »Destroyed in the late 1990s to being work on the transformation of the the complex into a hotel

- »Covered in Graffiti
- »Interior crumbling and falling apart

- »Covered in Graffiti
- »Interior crumbling and falling apart

- »Covered in Graffiti
- »Interior crumbling and falling apart
- »Entrance blocked by ecological artwork

- »Covered in Graffiti
- »Interior crumbling and falling apart
- »Damaged by fire

fig 04.76: ENTRANCE TO SITE
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2016

fig 04.77: ENTRANCE TO SITE, UNDER DINING FACILITY
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2011

fig 04.78: OUTDOOR CONCERT
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2012

fig 04.79: INDOOR EVENT
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2012

fig 04.80: SiDE Of MAiN OPERAtiONAL BUiLDiNg
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2011

fig 04.81: iNSiDE MAiN OPERAtiONAL BUiLDiNg
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2014

fig 04.82: iNSiDE gEODESiC DOME
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2010

fig 04.83: ViEW fROM TOWER Of MAiN OPERAtiONS BUiLDiNg
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2013

fig 04.84: gRAffiTİ OVERTAKiNg THE ARCHiTECTURE
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2014

fig 04.85: UNDERgROUND TUNNELS LEADiNg TO MAiNTENANCE BUiLDiNgS
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2013

fig 04.86: DECAYiNg iNSiDE STRUCTURE
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2010

fig 04.87: RUiNS OF THE BUiLDiNg MAiNTENANCE BUiLDiNgS
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2017

05

DECAY AS DESIGN
AT TEUFELSBERG

fig 05.88:
WEATHERiNg
EXPLORATiON 5
Date: Present Day

PHASE 1: INITIAL GROWTH

The first design approach to the site is an installation that will initiate a conversation about the layers of memory that exist at Teufelsberg. This installation provides a first design step toward providing recognition to the site, marking the remembrance of the conditions of the site today. A precedence for this work is a similarly-intentioned installation by Christo and Jeanne-Claude, entitled the “Wrapping of the Reichstag,” illustrated in fig 05.89. Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s installation of almost 45,000 miles of yarn creates a silver aluminum-coated polypropylene fabric “to mirror the greyness of the skies over Berlin” (Hanssen, 1998). By covering the main government building of Berlin, it provided conversation around the political and social turmoil that Berlin was facing after reunification in 1991.

In addition to drawing from this design precedent, a Counterpreservation codebook has been started to collate design intentions for Teufelsberg. The Codebook and the installation will provide the initial design approach to the site, to create conversations about previous site meanings and to start re-activation, not just through the use of the landscape of Teufelsberg, but also through new oral narratives of the people of Berlin.

fig 05.89:
WRAPPING OF THE
REICHSTAG
 Architect: Christo and
 Jeanne-Claude
 Location: Berlin, Germany
 Date: 1985

The first key part of this design phase was the development of the Counterpreservation Code Book, as illustrated in fig 05.90. This book features tactics for architects and the public to draw

fig 05.90:
 PAgES Of THE
 COUNTERPRESERVATIOn
 CODEBOOK
 By Author
 Date: Present Day

from when choreographing the decay of living structures. They can do so while ultimately still being activated by the greater public and ecology, who ultimately determine the use and programming of the site. Some key tactics include introducing the forces of the natural elements upon the site: air, earth, fire/sun, and water, and thinking about how to use these as a mode of counter-preserving the site, with an index on ecology who have reclaimed the site (a page excerpt can be seen in fig 04.60 and fig 05.98) Also featured in the code book are site narrative tactics, from artifacts to oral histories and public inscriptions, featuring using the Document Destruction Building as a narrative posting board, to portray a counter argument of the precious destruction of narratives that occurred inside the building. Alternate pages such as an index on painting techniques, featuring the decaying of effects of paint to erode specific areas faster upon site. Finally, another section how to improve the structural reinforcement of the architecture, for allowing the continual use of the site, by not only the public, but ecology, as well, such as raised walkways for ecology to not be disturbed while people can roam throughout the site. And finally, program adaptation, focusing on ways the public can impose their own programming and ideas upon the site, with the help of the architect, seen as the choreographer. This catalogue is to be viewed as a palimpsest, which can be rewritten several times, something having diverse layers beneath the surface, passed from architect to architect, each adding their own ideas and layers to the book. The idea of this book is to pass forward concepts of activating a building without compromising by erasing past site meanings, or only preserving these past site meanings through a glass wall.

In addition to the code book, this design phase includes an artistic intervention at Teufelsberg. Many people recognize the visible layers of the site: the decaying surveillance station and the layers of graffiti using the carcass as a canvas (fig.04.73). However, many do

fig 05.91: REDACTED
SITE EVENT - SITE PLAN
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

not know the layers of history buried below. For this intervention, pictured in fig 05.91, the entire architecture of Field Station Berlin will be ‘redacted’ with a water soluble, Vantablack paint, temporarily erasing the marks of the graffiti artists. “Vantablack is a pigment that reaches a level of darkness that’s so intense ,” that what is painted appears to disappear into a wall of black (“Their Dark Materials,” 2020). Although black paint references the redaction and secrecy that took place at Field Station Berlin, it is also the absence of all colour created through the combination of all colour, referencing the temporal re-activation that the site has had through the citizens of Berlin through injecting the multitude of narratives present at Teufelsberg. Over the period of four nights, different buildings will be painted. This will provoke new discussions amongst citizens and the media, in many ways seen as a violation of present site narratives. Importantly, this erasure of the present will bring awareness of the erasure that occurred in the past, when the past narratives of Berlin were suppressed underneath the rubble of this artificial mound. In addition, this event will reference the opposite of what the original Field Station Berlin façade was supposed to reference, namely a completed architecture in a blue and white painted colour scheme, done to hide the buildings in plain sight and to blend in with the Berlin skyline (Cocroft & Schofield, 2019, p. 160). Through this installation, this previous camouflaging of the structures is reversed in which the camouflage from previous is erasure is evoked into a black spot in the Berlin sky. As, in contrast, the Vantablack will cause more eyes to be drawn to the site, as a black scar emerges in the night. Redaction of the site provides the first design approach focused on an initial design of site intervention capturing the complexity of the existing place meanings, giving the site a rebirth amongst the discussions between citizens.

fig 05.92: REDACTED SITE EVENT - AXONOMETRIC
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

THE COUNTERPRESERVATION CODEBOOK

INDEX OF PAINTING TECHNIQUES:

- 1. ACCESS WATER
- 2. ADDITION OF ALCOHOL
- 3. ADDITION OF VINEGAR
- 4. BLISTERING
- 5. FADING
- 6. FLAKING
- 7. RUSTING
- 8. SAGGING
- 9. SAPONIFICATION

TECHNIQUE:
ADD AN ACCESS OF WATER TO APPLY A THIN LAYER OF PAINT.

TECHNIQUE:
ADD AN ACCESS OF OIL TO PAINT.

TECHNIQUE:
SLOW DOWN THE RATE OF DRYING. THIS WILL ALLOW WATER SOLUBLE IRON SALTS TO BE LEACHED THROUGH THE PAINT FILM.

TECHNIQUE:
APPLY AN EXTRA THICK LAYER OF PAINT TO A SURFACE.

TECHNIQUE:
ADD ALCOHOL TO THIN THE PAINT.

TECHNIQUE:
ADD VINEGAR TO THIN THE PAINT.

TECHNIQUE:
APPLY THIN LAYERS TO DIRECT SUNLIGHT AREAS.

TECHNIQUE:
DO NOT PREP THE SURFACE!

TECHNIQUE:
EXPOSE THE PAINT SURFACE TO AN EXCESS OF CHEMICALS, SUCH AS ALKALIS.

- Painting Techniques to help Decay!
LaCeroograp
Choreography

fig 05.93: INDEX Of PAINTiNg TECHNiQUES - PAGES FROM
THE COUNTERPRESERVATION CODEBOOK
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2020

TECHNIQUE 9

- Legend:
- 1. [Redacted]
 - 2. [Redacted]
 - 3. Document Destruction
 - 4. [Redacted]
 - 5. [Redacted]
 - 6. [Redacted]
 - 7. [Redacted]
 - 8. [Redacted]
 - 9. [Redacted]
 - 10. [Redacted]
 - 11. [Redacted]
 - 12. [Redacted]

1 - 2,000

NIGHT 1

NIGHT 1

During Night 1 of the redaction of the decaying Field Station Berlin, only the document destruction building (number 3 in fig. 04.74) will be painted, as illustrated to the left. The paint used for the redaction of this building will be exposed to alkaline chemicals to achieve the decaying affect noted in fig 05.94. Specifically, this effect is chosen to recognize the permanent erasure of narrative impressions that occurred at Field Station Berlin through a chemical reaction. It is a painting style noted in the counterpreservation code book. By starting the site’s redaction process slowly, this will cause initial public interest in what is happening at Teufelsberg, symbolizing the intrigue that occurred when the station was initially installed. Previously, this building represented the utmost security on site, as it maintained the secrecy of the on-goings of Field Station Berlin. “Massive amounts of paper came through this room to be pulped and shredded before being taken off site to be burnt” (Cocroft & Schofield, 2019, p. 102). Therefore, through redacting the document destruction building first, this is a reference to the historical erasure that occurred in this structure.

fig 05.94: PHASE 1:
REDACTED SITE EVENT
PROCESS
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

NIGHT 2

During Night 2, pictured in figure 05.95, accelerated redaction of the architecture will occur. This night will redact the most iconic symbols of the site, the 4 remaining geodesic arctic domes along with the main building of the site, illustrated in fig. 04.74, as number 1 and 4. Every photograph of the decaying site features these domes, deteriorating and ripping at seems. In the past, these domes collected the intelligence information analyzed at Field Station Berlin, as inside the domes were “rotating antennae designed to intercept different radio frequencies” (Cocroft & Schofield, 2019, p. 37). During this night, these domes will be replaced with black integrated solar panels, illustrated in fig 05.136, to symbolize a redaction of the marks and narratives of today, while preparing for re-activation of the site in the future. The panels will be semitransparent to allow light to still enter through the domes, creating a new experience with the domes than previously, implying a light interior with the heavy dark exterior caused by the paint. Through solar energy, these planes will help activate the site and architecture at all times, not just during the day. The paint applied to the structural frame of these domes will be applied in thin coats, another technique taken from the counterpreservation codebook, which will give the surface treatment indicated in fig. 05.95 as technique 5. Through the thin coat, and with help from the direct solar exposure, the paint will fade quicker, re-revealing the past underneath layers, complete with their narratives that were redacted by the black paint. Specially, this technique is chosen for these structures because the main operations building—building 1—is the largest structure serving as a canvas for graffiti. Thus, revealing the past narratives of this structure should occur first, through the thinnest coat of paint. The actions of this night accelerate the redaction process and are intended to cause a larger social stir through the redaction of the most iconic structures of the site.

fig 05.95: PHASE 2:
REDACTED SITE EVENT
PROCESS
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

NIGHT 3

During Night 3, further redaction of Field Station Berlin will occur. Throughout this night, the remainder of the previously heavily secured areas of the site (illustrated in fig. 05.96) will be painted black. Previously, “the security of the more sensitive areas was guarded by a 30-strong platoon of United States Army military police personnel based in the main Guard-room” (illustrated in 04.74 as building number 11). The buildings for this will be applied with a paint with an access of water, resulting in the surface texture shown in fig 05.96 as technique 6, which is one of flaking peeling paint. This technique is another listed in the counterpreservation code book. This flaking paint mirrors the past deterioration that occurred on the site overall, in things like the ripping fabric of the domes. In turn, it helps with discovering previous hidden narratives cloaked by secrecy in these areas. This flaking will act almost as miniature windows revealing previous graffiti narratives marked on these buildings. This effect contrasts with how these two buildings had no actual windows, keeping the secrecy of Field Station Berlin inside. Finally, by Night 3, the majority of Field Station Berlin will be redacted in black paint, causing public intrigue about the site to grow significantly, in turn promoting new site visits and the broader re-activation by the public.

TECHNIQUE 6

- Legend:
- 1. Main Operations Building
 - 2. Teufelsberg 2
 - 3. Document Destruction
 - 4. Arctic Tower
 - 5. [Redacted]
 - 6. [Redacted]
 - 7. [Redacted]
 - 8. [Redacted]
 - 9. British Building
 - 10. Communications
 - 11. Guard
 - 12. Bar

1 - 2,000

fig 05.96: PHASE 3:
REDACTED SITE EVENT
PROCESS
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

TECHNIQUE 8

- Legend:
- 1. Main Operations Building
 - 2. Teufelsberg 2
 - 3. Document Destruction
 - 4. Arctic Tower
 - 5. Dining Building
 - 6. [Redacted]
 - 7. [Redacted]
 - 8. [Redacted]
 - 9. British Building
 - 10. Communications
 - 11. Guard
 - 12. Bar

1 - 2,000

NIGHT 4

The Final Night. This is the final mark of redaction on Field Station Berlin. During Night 4, the remaining dining hall (building number 5 in fig. 04.74) will be painted. This structure is the last to be redacted due to the fact that it was previously the least secure and most public building on the Field Station Berlin campus. This building marked the integration of civilians and employees, as well as interactions amongst the British and Americans working at Field Station Berlin. “Except for some of the smaller kitchen facilities in the operations buildings, this was the principal dining facility and was jointly used by British and American military personnel of all ranks, and civilian employees. The facility was run by the US Army and ran for 24 hours a day providing meals for the thousand-plus personnel who worked on the site” (Cocroft & Schofield, 2019, p. 150). The paint applied to this facility will be thick, with less water added, as illustrated in fig 05.97, since this structure held events where employees gained a closer bond amongst one another and created new impressionable narratives at the site. Thus, after the redaction of this structure, Field Station Berlin would appear to be entirely redacted to the public, all the new narratives impressed upon the site through graffiti and other activities, gone. This final night will cause even more public conversation about the erasing of narratives present on the site. It will, in turn, set the stage for discussions about the past narratives buried underneath Field Station Berlin, set by a final event during this night. This event will feature the erasure of Field Station Berlin as the discussion highlight. It will involve an event of discussions on oral narratives and past narrative impressions imposed on the site to be past from person-to-person.

fig 05.97: PHASE 4:
REDACTED SITE EVENT
PROCESS
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

NIGHT UNKNOWN

The last stage in this site intervention is unique in that it moves away from a human-directed process to one led by the site's ecology. This stage is in collaboration with the surrounding ecology, and its duration is dependent on biophysical processes, including those tied to weather like rain, snow, and sun light. As noted previously, the black painted is water-soluble, which will ensure the non-erasure of the graffiti marks present on Field Station Berlin. As soon as the entirety of the decaying structure is painted black, the surrounding ecology will provide the finishing touches as “in the process of subtracting the “finish” of a construction, weathering adds the “finish” of the environment (Mostafavi & Leatherbarrow, 1993, p. 16),” as illustrated in fig 05.103. The only exception to this process is the document destruction building, which was act as a living memorial of Field Station Berlin, and the collection of secretive information that occurred at the campus. Through the growing presence of the surrounding ecology and public, this will reveal the past narratives of both Field Station Berlin and the more contemporary graffiti artists who claim these structures as a canvas.

fig 05.98: PHASE 5:
REDACTED SITE EVENT
PROCESS
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

fig 05.99: REDACTED SITE EVENT REVEAL
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

Through precipitation and solar exposure, the black paint will fade and wash off, revealing the hidden narratives that lie beneath. The black paint applied is composed of seeds and fertilizer, which will now be transferred to the ground below, as illustrated in fig. 05.100. As the black paint drips to the ground, the seeds and fertilizer infused in the paint will saturate the ground, to allow for surrounding ecology further nutrient needed to reclaim the decaying field station.

Therefore, the black paint will convey the temporality of the site. The layers of narratives present upon a site: the ecology, the public, and the architect are all connected, layered one on top of another, marking their own narrative impressions upon the site, each rewriting the definition of Teufelsberg. In addition, this design process implies the idea of how an architectural idea might be enforced upon a site, it is up to the surrounding public and ecology to activate and claim the site as desired.

fig 05.100:
AFTERMATH Of REDACTiON
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Scale: 1:375
Date: Present Day

fig 05.101: SiDE Of OPERATIOnS AND TEUFELSBERG 2
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2020

fig 05.102: LEISURE AREA NEAR ENTRANCE
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2020

fig 05.103: iNSiDE THE MAiN OPERATIOnS BUiLDiNg LOOKiNg OUT
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2020

fig 05.104: ViEW fROM BELOW
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2020

fig 05.105: DiNiNg BUiLDiNg
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2020

fig 05.106: REDACTiON Of ARCHiTECTURE ONLY
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2020

fig 05.107: EVENT DURIg REDACTiON
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2020

fig 05.108: REDACTiON Of TEUFELSBERG
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: 2019

PHASE 2: CONTINUAL GROWTH AMONGST DECAY

The next phase of the design approach looks at the campus of Field Station Berlin in the near future. This proposal addresses the needs of the four main stakeholders of the site: the past narratives and place meanings still etched into the Teufelsberg landscape, the surrounding ecology, the surrounding public's need for the site, and the decaying Field Station Berlin. The role of the design is ultimately to enhance the ability of use of the landscape by allowing both the public and ecology gain access to all areas and surfaces of the site amongst the decay of Field Station Berlin, while also referencing the past narratives of the landscape's former place meanings. The design proposal will become a larger palimpsest of narratives upon the vast landscape of Teufelsberg, a place where the past holds a conversation with the future.

fig 05.109:
SITE PHOTOS
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

fig 05.110:
DESIGN APPROACH
AXONOMETRIC
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

The design proposal will focus on three key activation strategies. First is the installation of walkways throughout the site. As illustrated in fig 05.115, these walkways each represent a different key layer of the narratives present at Teufelsberg. Second is the removal of portions of exterior walls, which will allow previously inaccessible spaces to be opened to either the public or ecology, becoming completely accessible and open to weathering. Finally, the last key aspect to the proposal is to provide ways to ensure the site becomes a catalyst for re-activation by the public and surrounding ecology through curating spaces that call upon the public to re-activate the structures.

TRANSCENDING TIME

A TRACING TRAIL OF 2020

A TRACING TRAIL OF 1992

A TRACING TRAIL OF 1937

fig 05.111:
SITE PLAN
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

1 - 1,500

fig 05.112:
VIEW ON A TRACING
TRAIL OF 1937
Location:
Teufelsberg, Berlin,
Germany
Date: Present Day

The first design approach applied to the decaying landscape of Teufelsberg is the installation of new walkways to trace the past narratives that previously existed on the site. As additive structures, these walkaways provide re-activation while still respecting previous place meanings that the landscape of Teufelsberg holds. The public will be able to gain further access to all surfaces for marking their narrative impression upon the site, through art and graffiti. As illustrated in fig 05.112, the introduction of a narrative impression walkway provides further surfaces for art installations and graffiti, something currently desired by the public of Berlin. The walkways will also provide more space for navigating the site, and easy cycling routes around the landscape, while other activities also occur, such as community gatherings, workshops, and community gardens, also previously desired by the public. Finally, through the introduction of these walkways, larger events can be held, such as concerts, where an entertainment stage is raised above the ground space below. Instead of just using the decrepit Field Station Berlin as a backdrop for re-activation, these pathways allow today's public and ecology to trace the past individual narratives of actors who once used the site, creating a living monument amongst a living ruin amongst re-activation.

In total, there are four walkways with key moments of interconnection. To indicate a transition in walkway, the orientation of the steel surface will change. Through this approach, users will be able to decipher which walkway they are on without direct signage. As illustrated in fig 05.112, to indicate being on the *Tracing Trail of 1937*, for example, Corten Steel lines the exterior walls, acting as a barrier between the user and the surrounding soil. Similarly, each new walkway will provide a different orientation or pattern of the steel, to be used as both a historical indication amongst reactivation and a way-finding device.

A TRACING TRAIL OF 1937

fig 05.113:
PLAN Of A TRACiNg TRAiL
Of 1937
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

1 - 1,500

fig 05.114:
DETAIL OF A TRACING
TRAIL OF 1937
Scale: 1:55
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

This walkway traces the footprints of the tumultuous past of Berlin in the 1930s. The route follows the building footprint of the Nazi-era Technical Military College, as illustrated in fig 05.113. The walkway is named *Tracing Trail of 1937*, linking to the start of construction for the military college. This walkway allows citizens to trace the footprints of history, while also re-appropriating these areas and creating their own unique impression narratives on the site, through community events, and graffiti installations. This creates a conversation between the narratives of the past and the narratives of the future.

Each feature of this pathway invites for current Berliners to interact with the past, without having to read about previous place meanings on a static plaque. As such, this pathway acknowledges the intended impression of Albert Speer upon the site. By placing this pathway below grade like the rubble-immersed military college, this indicates that the design was the first critical layer that impacted the site, creating part of the foundation of Teufelsberg today. It places users directly beside the buried aspects of Berlin's past, including the mounds of rubble and ruins of the Nazi Technical Military College. Some features of the walkway are open to above, where users will gradually descend into a trench, as illustrated in fig 05.114. This trench will lead to entirely underground areas. This trench is peeling back to reveal the hidden layers of memories buried at the site at a macro scale. This same peeling back occurs through the erosion of Field Station Berlin and peeling of paint from the first step in this design approach.

The main underground pathway traces a scaled down version

path marking the Berlin Wall, conveying the resulting impact of Hitler's impressions upon Germany. Although not imposed as a direct narrative impression upon Teufelsberg, the creation and destruction of the Berlin Wall imposed a resulting impact to the landscape, which is why it is included amongst the design approach. Finally, this path allows users to see the re-activation impacts of the site even from below. Allowing users to inscribe their own mark on the palimpsest of memories Teufelsberg has become. At the centre of the site, it connects to 3 large water storage tanks previously serving as underground maintenance buildings for the campus. As a part of this design intervention, these old foundations and previous old underground passageways of Field Station Berlin, have been retrofitted to hold the water storage tanks, further discussed later on, as illustrated in the Section A-A in fig. 05.115. Thus, through tracing the path of the Nazi Technical Military College, this design captures the complexity of existing place meanings while supporting contemporary reactivation.

fig 05.115:
SECTION A-A
 Scale: 1:250
 Location: Teufelsberg,
 Berlin, Germany
 Date: Present Day

A TRACING TRAIL OF
1992

fig 05.116:
PLAN OF A TRACING TRAIL
OF 1992
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

1 - 1,500

fig 05.117:
DETAIL OF A TRACING
TRAIL OF 1992
Scale : 1:100
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

The next walkway traces the narratives of the past Field Station Berlin, marking the location of the old fence that blocked viewers and citizens from stepping into the site. This key pathway around the site is raised above grade level and encircles the site in two key areas on the outside, marking the location of the old fence and on the interior, marking the secure pathway that allowed employees to traverse the campus, as illustrated in fig 05.116. Both of these new walkways are elevated, allowing viewers to look down upon spaces that were previously hidden, as well provide new viewpoints and access to areas previously band. By allowing users to walk on top of the location of the previous Field Station Berlin fence, this profanes the former boundary of secrecy; Users can view what others are using the site for, such as community gardening, artist installations, and concerts. The elevation will provide easier access for graffiti artists to install their narrative impression upon the structure, as well as safer access to all points of the structure. Ultimately, blurring the boundary previously established upon the site, users can look in upon Field Station Berlin while simultaneously looking out at the landscape of Berlin.

The Corten texture for this pathway is indicated by vertical plank boards, as illustrated in fig 05.117. The gaps between the boards allow this pathway to interact with the pathways below, similar to the *Tracing Trail of 2020*, mentioned later on. These voids allow users to view others who are tracing different layers of the site below. In addition, these voids allow the surrounding ecology to grasp on, as they, too, interact and re-activate the site to slowly decay and reclaim Field Station Berlin trough attaching itself upon these panels, to gain further access to higher areas of the structures. Finally, this raised pathway is supported by the

surrounding ecology itself, as the Corten structure that supports the raised pathway circulates and grasps on existing oak and pine trees, as illustrated in fig 05.118 in Section B-B. These species are also noted in the counterpreservation code book excerpt page of ecological inventory noted in fig 04.60. This new walkway is thus designed in tandem with the surrounding ecology, while also tracing the past narratives that defined the former place meanings of Teufelsberg.

Finally, this walkway crosses over other pathways and movements throughout the landscape. This crossover indicates the overlapping of different time periods and place meanings. These pathways align to create conversations between the different historical narratives located at Teufelsberg. In addition to referencing former narratives, these walkways allow new narratives to access more surfaces of the site. More areas for new narratives to be written over top of old. These overlaps are indicated in the sections present throughout this thesis, as well as in fig 05. 119, a view from in the 1937 pathway.

fig 05.118:
SECTION B-B
Scale: 1:250
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

fig 05.119:
SECTION/ PERSPECTIVE
FROM A TRACiNg TRAIL
Of 1937
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

A TRACING TRAIL OF
2020

fig 05.120:
PLAN Of A TRACiNg TRAiL Of 2020
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

fig 05.121:
DETAIL OF A TRACING
TRAIL OF 2020
Scale 1:55
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

The next key pathway will trace the footprints of people using the site today. Currently, the site is used as a living ruin for the leisure activities of the people of Berlin. This pathway, as illustrated in fig 05.120, traces their most common journey, the path in which visitors to the site take while marveling at the ruinscape in front of them. Although this walkway does not represent any specific previous historical site meanings, the narratives of the people currently using the site are also important memories. The people of Berlin have continuously used the landscape of Teufelsberg, regardless of bouts of governmental restrictions, declaring it theirs; “Berliners were never shy about offering a stage even to basically meaningless things. Even the rubble of their destroyed city could be put to good use!” (Klaus & Jüttemann, 2012, p. 21). This raised pathway will create a directionally tool for moving circulation throughout the site to different activities, such as concerts, group activities, the graffiti covering every surface. This walkway connects each of the new walkways. Therefore, their impressionable layer is marked by this walkway, entitled *A Tracing Trail of 2020*, to memorialize the public of Berlin’s more contemporary impressions on the site amongst the past layers that constructed this artificial mound.

The texture for this pathway is grated Corten steel. As illustrated in figure 05.121, this texture will help users orient themselves on the pathway, due to its translucency. In addition, this pathway is raised above the ground, which provides an armature and space for surrounding ecology, enabling it to move freely amongst the citizens of Berlin. A similar notion of promoting ecology was achieved at Natur-Park Südgelände. This elevated walkway allows the site’s ecology to remain undisturbed, in turn respecting and preserving the past histories of what this spontaneous ecology holds. For example, *Dysphania Botrys*, a now-native species of

Teufelsberg that migrated to the site through war-time rubble, grows throughout the landscape, and can now attach itself to the underside of the grated walkway, moving as it pleases throughout the site. This plant species is marked in the counterpreservation codebook excerpt in fig 04.60, and can be seen in fig 05.121.

In addition, the grated pathway will allow the users visual connections to other walkways, especially when the pathway crosses overtop lower walkways, indicated in Section A-A in fig 05.122. When each of these walkways overlaps, this indicates the transcendence of time, where past place meanings are connected and woven together—each defining part of the narrative of Teufelsberg today. While allowing for places of traditional programming of compliance, such as concert stages, and food markets to exist amongst past site memories, these walkways do not interfere with the definition of the desired programming for the site defined by its re-activators, the site’s users. Thus, users can still interject programming of non-compliance, at all times of day. Night Programming for the intervention is illustrated in Section A-A in fig 06.122, and throughout other sections through the black callouts.

fig 05.122:
SECTION A-A Night
Scale: 1:250
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

TRANSCENDING TIME
- RAMPS

fig 05.123:
PLAN of SITE RAMPS
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

1 - 1,500

4

fig 05.124:
RAMP DETAIL
Scale: 1:55
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

Although the layers of these walkways re-activating the site of Teufelsberg indicates the layers of past place meanings defining the landscape, how users change from one pathway to another is also a critical part of the design approach. Through these changes in elevation, the user transcending time, moving from one previous layer of Teufelsberg's history to another. These elevation changes allow the current users of the site, both the public and ecology, to have conversation with past site place meanings while re-activating the site today, blurring the boundaries of time.

A key pathway component are the multiple ramping features. Similar to the Corten walkways, these ramping features indicate former narratives present at Teufelsberg. As illustrated in fig. 05.123, they connect different surface planes and reference the construction of the artificial mound of Teufelsberg from its previously flat elevation of the Grnewald Forest. The gradual change in elevation symbolizes how rubble deposited by the Trmmerfrauen changed the profile of the surrounding landscape. Thus, these ramps reference the narratives of these women who raised the profile of Teufelsberg Hill. The act of traveling up and down these ramps will trace the same movements of the Trmmerfrauen. Thus, through the continual site re-activation, these actors are simultaneously referencing past narratives.

4

All walkway egresses will be constructed out of concrete. Similar to Corten Steel, concrete contains an impressionable surface capable of staining and cracking due to the surrounding environmental conditions. In addition, concrete will act as way-finding tool to indicate to the user a change in elevation on the site. Illustrated in fig. 05.124, the ramping concrete will allow site users to vertically circulate the site. Through the installation of a metal lattice on the surface, this will also allow the surrounding ecology to inhabit the site, as well.

fig 05.125:
SECTION C-C
Scale: 1:125
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

TRANSCENDING TIME
- STAIR CASES

1 - 1,500

fig 05.126:
PLAN of SITE STAIRCASES
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

fig 05.127:
STAIRCASE DETAIL
Scale: 1:75
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

Similar to the ramps throughout the site, the stairs will be constructed out of concrete. As illustrated in fig 05.127 and can be seen in Section D-D in fig. 05.128, a metal lattice will be applied to allow for not only the public to transcend and interact with all layers of walkways, but also for the surrounding ecology, such as the *Dysphania Botrys*, which does well in disturbed soils, or soils with lots of movement such as a circulation areas. These elevation changes allow for the re-activation of Teufelsberg while respecting the former place meanings of the site.

fig 05.128:
SECTION D-D
Scale: 1:125
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

fig 05.129:
DESIGN APPROACH
AXONOMETRIC
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

The next key design approach for the site of Teufelsberg is through the treatment of existing walls and surfaces. Surfaces are boundaries, whether that be a boundary separating the interior from the exterior, or one separating movements of time. Thus, the treatment of site surfaces will convey the breaking of these boundaries. The boundaries that separate different layers of memory and prevent narratives from blurring together and morphing into one another.

The walls, roofs, and floors of Field Station Berlin are the first boundaries in which this design approach infiltrates. Fig 05.130 illustrates how the key surfaces of Teufelsberg will be counterpreserved. The exterior walls of the British Building and Teufelsberg 2 (indicated in 04.74 and fig 05.130), will be cut into, removing some of the existing breeze blocks. This will allow a blurring of the boundary and open the building to new views of Field Station Berlin. These are areas that were previously intended not to be viewed by society, as both these buildings previously had no windows, intended to protect the secrecy of these buildings from onlookers. The voids will also invite ecology in, such as the *Dysphania Botrys* indicated in the counterpreservation codebook excerpt in fig 04.60, to claim and re-finish the building to its desires, through providing more openings in which plant species can interlock with the structures, finding greater moisture areas, particularly as this species does well in disturbed soils like those upon the roofscapes of the structures. The voids also allow more light to enter into the spaces, as well as water into the cracks. The water will continuously decay the structure amongst reactivation, while more narratives are revealed through the light.

The floors and ceilings will have a metal lattice sub-floor installed, attached to the steel framing of each structure, in which wood tiles can be placed, based on the desired programing of the public. These tiles are not secured, allowing for their re-organization in support of different programs, such as through a graffiti workshop or community meeting, a smoother surface is achieved, but can be transformed by the public as needed. Similar to the pathways, this raised sub-floor will allow for the growth and movement of ecology below, with re-activation by the public above. All of these key surface interventions are visible in the detail in fig 05.130. Thus, the treatment of the surfaces of

fig 05.130:
SURFACES DETAIL
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

Field Station Berlin allows for continual decay amidst a design approach enabling re-activation by contemporary society.

Unlike the prior design approach of revealing and removing surfaces from the site, the next part of this design is to subtract and hide surfaces of Field Station Berlin. Previously, the Nazi Technical Military College was erased and used as a deposit area for the ruins of war-ravaged Berlin, then covered with new topsoil. Now, by excavating the area for *A Tracing Trail of 1937*, new infill will bury a part of Field Station Berlin, introducing a neutrality in the process of erasure between the two governmental structures on the site, as illustrated in fig 05.131. Although this process seems to hide parts of Field Station Berlin, it will also provide access to previously unused areas of the site: the roofscapes. The public can now use these roofscapes for community gardens, stage platforms for the musical events occurring at the decaying site, spaces for large group events such as yoga, and provide more surfaces in which graffiti artists can emplace their own narrative upon the site. In addition to some of the exterior walls being removed through new infill soil, the second floor of the British Building, pictured in fig 05.131, will be removed to create a sloping roof that connects to the *Tracing Trail of 1992* as a part of the new roofscapes of Field Station Berlin. This removal will allow the ecology to gain more direct southern sunlight in this area,

fig 05.131:
SECTION E-E
Scale: 1:250
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

providing areas for gardening and cultivation of ecology. Finally, throughout the site, walls will be removed, like the northern wall pictured in Section E-E in fig. 05.131 and in Section B-B in fig. 05.118. Other walls will also be removed and replaced with safety barriers to open up new connections throughout the site, such as in the Main Building near the top of the tower, illustrated in fig 05.139. This reveals previously invisible connections throughout the site. The opening illustrated in fig 05. 139 allows users to see where the old elevator shaft has been turned into a water collection device, with water coming in from the iconic Arctic dome above. Thus, through the removal of walls, floors and roofs, the site can be better re-activated by contemporary society.

fig 05.132:
SECTION f-f
Scale: 1:250
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

fig 05.133:
COMBINED SECTION
Scale: 1:625
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

03. REACTIVATION

01. ZONING

02. ENERGY

03. WATER

fig 05.134:
DESIGN APPROACH AXO
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

fig 05.135:
SOLAR PANEL DETAILS
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

The last key aspect of the design approach is to place in additional elements that will allow users to continually re-activate the site into the future. This design approach has three key elements: programming, energy production, and water retention.

To further re-activate Field Station Berlin, it needs electricity. Due to the past removal of the maintenance building, (buildings 6,7 and 8 in fig 04.74), Field Station Berlin has no electricity, making it unsafe and unusable at night. Thus, solar panels will overlap the fabric of the domes, providing a new on-site source of electricity. Details for attaching these new solar panels to the old dome are illustrated in fig. 05. 135 and can be seen in fig 05.136 in Section B-B. Electricity is collected through the panels, as indicated at points 6 and 7, and then sent across the site to provide light, like at point 8. Through the installation of electricity throughout the site, Teufelsberg will truly become a living ruin at all times of day, and help the public hold nighttime events, such as community meetings and outdoor concerts.

fig 05.136:
REACTIVATION SECTION
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

1. SOLAR PANELS

2. USABLE SURFACES

3. WATER STORAGE

Another key part of this design aspect is through water storage. Water storage will occur in the old foundational ruins of the removed maintenance buildings. An old underground tunnel connects these buildings to the main buildings of the site (buildings 6,7, and 8 in fig. 04.74). The water will be collected through the highest elevation of the site, the tower of the main building as illustrated in fig 05.139. The water will travel through the old elevator shaft down to the old tunnels (fig 05.140) to the storage takes below. These old foundations will provide a sturdy water storage area due to their foundations being tightly sealed in the past. Today, still water is maintained in these areas when it rains on the site (Places, 2019) illustrated in fig 04.87. In addition, such moisture invites new ecological species to thrive, including *Senecio Inaequidens*, a plant whose seeds are easily carried by water and algae to cultivate the new water-collected areas. With water storage, Teufelsberg users will have access to water to support new re-activation projects throughout the site, such as maintenance of community gardens and future water fountains for the landscape users.

Finally, the entirety of the design has different areas that are lightly programed, with suggestions to the public as how these areas can be activated, as illustrated in fig. 05.138. The proposed design allows what the public of Berlin desires for the site at an enhanced level. The architecture provides better access to all the surfaces of the site, which provide artists with more canvas space for installing their art and narrative upon the site, similar to in the recent past, but with greater ease, offering more possible artists and narratives to take over the landscape. The roof space can also be cultivated into community gardens, while providing larger surfaces for the sorts of public gathering events previously held at the site, such as yoga, concerts, and possible fundraising events. The walkways also provide greater views of the site, and

fig 05.137:
REACTIVATION
DiAGRAMS
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

of surrounding Berlin, a highlight of the area desired by the public. With Teufelsberg being the highest elevation in Berlin, the ramping around the Operations Building Tower allows for a 360 view of Berlin, while taking in the ruins of past Berlin. This Operations Building also features the curated graffiti gallery, previously a focal point of the site and structure, located on levels 2 and 3, and now more accessible through *A Tracing Trail of 1992*. Enhanced lighting provided by the geodesic dome solar panels allows for evening use. Finally, through the connection of all floors to different walkways, the public can access previously restricted areas and use them to hold more gatherings, such as in the rooms buried below. These are complemented by more open public spaces now featured in the British Building and Teufelsberg 2.

Each one of these processes of re-activation helps the landscape of Teufelsberg remain living amongst its decay and helps both the citizens of Berlin and the surrounding ecology to re-activate the landscape, while referencing and respecting former place meanings.

fig 05.138:
ZONiNg
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

fig 05.139: VIEW OF WATER TOWER
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

fig 05.140: iNSiDE WATER STORAgE SYSTEM TUNNELS
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

fig 05.141: OUTDOOR RAVE
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

fig 05.142: VIEW IN DOME
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

fig 05.143: VIEW FROM ENTRANCE
Location: Teufelsberg, Berlin, Germany
Date: Present Day

PHASE 3: OVERGROWTH

The last phase of the design approach is fully giving the landscape of Teufelsberg back to the people of Berlin and the surrounding ecology. During this stage, the above phases of re-activation of the site have occurred. Field Station Berlin has been allowed to decay amidst re-activation by society. As the area is increasingly overtaken by the surrounding ecology and public, the buildings are also re-activated further. The design approach is never just a backdrop for contemporary society but is in constant flux and use with today's society until the campus fully decays. However, with the presence of the walkways installed, a part of the old narratives remains, even though all the past structures will have ceased to exist and been reclaimed by the surrounding landscape. One day, these pathways will also decay and join the layers and layers of past narratives at the site. Teufelsberg will become once again a palimpsest with layers and layers of impressions upon its landscape, joining the network of Berlin spaces in constant revision, becoming a part of a "city text frantically being written and rewritten" (Huyssen, 2003).

fig 05.144:
OVERGROWTH
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: 3000

06

CONCLUSION

fig 06.145:
WEATHERiNg
EXPLORATiON 6
Date: Present Day

06. CONCLUSION

After a muddy climb through an overgrown forest filled with roots scattered about that are ready to trip the unsuspecting hiker, a decaying, run-down structure emerges. Like this structure, “buildings are the symbols and the repositories of memory” (Ladd, 2018, p. 4). Every mark, scratch, stain, and footprint tells one person’s individual narrative on the landscape. At Teufelsberg, many of these narratives, footprints, marks, scars, remain buried under ruins in which a new set of ruins and marks then lie atop. With the tumultuous past Berlin has faced politically, socially and economically, the city has typically approached decrepit buildings with “the impulse to preserve or to destroy - whether motivated by nostalgia,” or the desire to erase past historical trauma (Ladd, 2018, p. 4). This unknowing often leaves places left abandoned for years, turning them into Branchen. However, over these years, the Branchen become markers of history, with the spontaneous ecology re-claiming the space, creating a new memory and narrative to be part of the site. A new memory facing the possibility of erasure or preservation. If we cannot destroy the past, and if we do not want to preserve it under glass, how do we merge memories and place meanings amongst contemporary society? How do we re-activate and morph an old structure to be rebirthed into a new one without sacrificing its past memories, told in the impressions left upon the site?

This thesis has proposed a design approach to address this issue. Through the use of counterpreservation, past narratives can converse with the present and future narratives of a site. This

fig 06.146:

LEAVING TEUFELSBERG
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: 2009

The long duration of ruins as they survived the gestures of force that shaped them has become a model for the artwork as monument and masterpiece.”

A 3 4 . SUSAN STEWART

(2020, p. 259)

design approach “evidences the actions and intentions of the present by drawing attention to the production and transformation of historical buildings, and to the social perception that surround them” (Sandler, 2016, p. 243). Allowing a structure to decay respects past site meanings, since by placing the public in direct interaction with the past removes the boundaries between the preset and the past. Instead, through this method of counter preserving architecture, this thesis illustrates “the idea that the various markings and layers of a surface record and allow one to recollect earlier stages in the history of a building and the human life associated with it” (Mostafavi & Leatherbarrow, 1993, p. 84). The design approach also allows for Teufelsberg to act as a living ruin, where history of the past runs in line with the present, adapting for the future. Through this method, “places are never merely backdrops for action or containers for the past. They are fluid mosaics and moments of memory, matter, metaphor, scene, and experience that create and mediate social spaces and temporalities” (Till, 2005, p. 8). The design approach of this thesis is the living memorial of past site meanings society needs to respect the past amongst our daily lives.

Although this thesis proposes a way to create a living memorial to exist in constant flux within our contemporary society today, this thesis must also look to the future. How will these current site interventions exist in the already layered site of multiple narratives, joining the constant revision of Teufelsberg? How will this new layer, added by multiple forces and site authors, including the public, ecology, and on-site rubble, be viewed by the future users of the site? The future erosion. The future public. The future ecology. Through the introduction of this design proposal, Teufelsberg will spark conservations in the future that a landscape cannot be owned by one party or even by one time period. All landscapes contain multiple layers of history, waiting

to be discovered and retold. In constant flux, shaped by multiple forces, not just the designer or the site owner. For even they do not own the memories and narratives that define a landscape. Even the landscape in the present has only been shaped due to the past memories. Without the past, the site would not be defined as it is today. The design approach proposed for Teufelsberg will aide in future society reimagine spaces as not programmed locations, but as containers for the multiplicities of life.

Every landscape, place, and structure contains memories, some large and politically important, some small and seemly insignificant. However, both are important. As a foreign designer, it is not my place to decide which one of these memories is the most important to be preserved and passed on. I do not possess the agency of remembering the past narratives of the site. Thus, the design approach proposed does not inflict which memory should be preserved but reflects upon the multiplicity of past narratives upon the landscape and allows the layers of past narratives to exist in harmony. Through reflecting upon each past critical narrative, this design approach does not reject or erase undesired narrative impressions but enhances and respects each one, as each define the landscape created today. Designers are not erasers or preservers of past site meanings, but should be seen as “site choreographers” for managing change who help a site morph into a new site meaning amongst the marks of the past. This sway away from monumentalization is also studied by Gustavo Araoz (Araoz, 2011). This design approach allows for society to move forward amongst the past, instead of living in a landscape of memorials, an important aspect of places littered with a tumultuous past such as Berlin. The landscape of Teufelsberg becomes a living palimpsest of layers of past place meanings, waiting for the next user to impose their own personal

fig 06.147:
LEAViNg TEUFELSBERG 2
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: 2011

narrative upon the landscape. One footprint at a time.

A hunting ground. A park. A military college. A burial site of a war-ravaged city. A secretive surveillance station. Each, a layer containing the narratives of millions of people, all imposing their unique footprint upon the landscape. Each, remaining amongst the new ecology, a new public discovering their own connection with a site decaying throughout history.

fig 06.148:
SITE MODEL
Location: Teufelsberg,
Berlin, Germany
Date: 2020

07. MODEL PHOTOS

08. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, B. (2015). Trümmer Geographies. *Performance Research*, 20(3), 75–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13528165.2015.1055083>

Anderson, B. (2017). *Buried City, Unearthing Teufelsberg: Berlin and its Geography of Forgetting*. Taylor & Francis.

Arandelovic, B., & Bogunovich, D. (2014). City profile: Berlin. *Cities*, 37, 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2013.10.007>

Araoz, G. F. (2011). Preserving heritage places under a new paradigm. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 1(1), 55–60. <https://doi.org/10.1108/20441261111129933>

Boehm, P. (2004). *A woman in Berlin: Diary 20 April 1945 to 22 June 1945*. Virago.

Braconnier, S. (n.d.). *Future Landscapes • 3D Visualization and Rendering*. Future Landscapes. Retrieved March 2, 2021, from <https://futurelandscapes.ca>

Brüggemeier, F.-J., Cioc, M., & Zeller, T. (2005). *How Green Were the Nazis?: Nature, Environment, and Nation in the Third Reich*. Ohio University Press.

Cocroft, W. D., & Schofield, J. (2019). *Archaeology of The Teufelsberg: Exploring Western Electronic Intelligence Gathering in Cold War Berlin*. Routledge.

Constantine, S. (2017). The German Revolution of 1918 -1919. *The Historian 135: Revolution*. <https://www.history.org.uk/publications/resource/9278/the-historian-135-revolution>

Damaschke, S. (2014, November 11). *Dismantling the German myth of “Trümmerfrauen” | DW | 24.11.2014*. DW.COM. <https://www.dw.com/en/dismantling-the-german-myth-of-tr%C3%BCmmerfrauen/a-18083725>

De Maio, F. (2013). *The green hills of rubble in black and white*. 531–541. <https://doi.org/10.2495/STR130441>

Diefendorf, J. M. (1993). *In the wake of war the reconstruction of German cities after World War II*. Oxford University Press.

District Profil Berlin Grunewald. (n.d.). *The Red Relocators*. Retrieved December 21, 2020, from <https://the-red-relocators.com/relocation-guides-germany/real-estate-germany/berlin-district-profiles/berlin-grunewald/>

Dooren, N. van. (2019). Park am Gleisdreieck, a dialectical narrative. *Journal of Landscape Architecture*, 14(1), 30–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18626033.2019.1623544>

Ernst, J. (1988). The Berlin Scene. *The Wilson Quarterly* (1976-), 12(3), 123–127.

Fahey, C. (n.d.). *Abandoned Berlin*. Abandoned Berlin. Retrieved August 18, 2020, from <https://abandonedberlin.com/>

Fahey, C. (2015, March 5). *How Berliners refused to give Tempelhof airport over to developers*. The Guardian. <http://www.theguardian.com/cities/2015/mar/05/how-berliners-refused-to-give-tempelhof-airport-over-to-developers>

Gandy, M. (2018). *Natura Urbana The Branchen of Berlin*.

Gerd Wessolek, & Toland, A. (2017, March). *Devil in the Sand*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319109895_Devil_in_the_Sand_-_the_Case_of_Teufelsberg_Berlin_and_Cultural_Ecosystem_Services_Provided_by_Urban_Soils

Graffiti Lobby Berlin. (n.d.). *Graffiti Lobby Berlin—Teufelsberg*. Retrieved October 12, 2020, from <https://www.graffiti-lobby-berlin.de/58.html>

Groffman, A. (2017, October 8). Nature Takes Back: Südgelände Nature Park (Berlin, Germany) + VIDEO. *Happier Place*. <https://happier.place/sudgelande-berlin/>

Gruen Berlin. (n.d.). *About the Park | Park am Gleisdreieck*. Retrieved August 26, 2020, from <https://gruen-berlin.de/en/gleisdreieck/about-the-park>

Gruen Berlin. (2013, February 1). *Schöneberger Südgelände Park by Odious* « *Landscape Architecture Platform | Landezine*. <http://landezine.com/index.php/2013/02/schoneberger-sudgelände-park-by-odious/>

Gruen Berlin. (2021). *Über den Park*. <https://gruen-berlin.de/projekte/parks/tempelhofer-feld/ueber-den-park>

gruhl-koeln—Gruhl and partners. (n.d.). Retrieved February 28, 2021, from <https://gruhl-koeln.de/>

Hagen, J., & Ostergren, R. C. (2019). *Building Nazi Germany: Place, Space, Architecture, and Ideology*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Hanssen, B. (1998). Christo’s Wrapped Reichstag: Globalized Art in a National Context. *The Germanic Review: Literature, Culture, Theory*, 73(4), 350–367. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00168899809597381>

Hartshorn, M., Bennett, A., & Wetzel, J. (n.d.). *Teufelsberg | Ruin Value*. Retrieved August 9, 2020, from <https://u.osu.edu/eng4400bennethartshornwetzel/teufelsberg/>

Heyman, S. (2015, December 30). *Peter Latz: Rehabilitating Postindustrial Landscapes—The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/31/arts/international/peter-latz-rehabilitating-postindustrial-landscapes.html>

Hill, J. (n.d.). *TEUFELSBERG: NUISANCE TO ATTRACTION*. Retrieved March 1, 2021, from <http://jameshillarchitect.com/talkingbuildings/teufelsberg-berlin-adaptive-re-use-nuisance-to-attraction/>

Huyssen, A. (2003). *Present pasts: Urban palimpsests and the politics of memory*. Stanford University Press. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/004309597>

Jackisch, B. A. (2014). The Nature of Berlin: Green Space and Visions of a New German Capital, 1900-45. *Central European History*, 47(2), 307–333. JSTOR.

Klaus, B., & Jüttemann, A. (2012). *Berlin Teufelsberg: Outpost in the Middle of Enemy Territory*. Berlin Story Verlag.

Kowarik, I., & Langer, A. (2005). Natur-Park Südgelände: Linking Conservation and Recreation in an Abandoned Railyard in Berlin. In I. Kowarik & S. Körner (Eds.), *Wild Urban Woodlands* (pp. 287–299). Springer-Verlag. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-26859-6_18

Ladd, B. (2018). *The Ghosts of Berlin: Confronting German History in the Urban Landscape*. University of Chicago Press. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/oculcarleton-ebooks/detail.action?docID=5119728>

Landschaftspark Duisburg-Nord. (n.d.-a). *Introduction // Background Knowledge | Landschaftspark Duisburg-Nord*. Retrieved October 19, 2020, from <https://www.landschaftspark.de/en/background-knowledge/introduction/>

Landschaftspark Duisburg-Nord. (n.d.-b). Retrieved October 19, 2020, from <https://www.landschaftspark.de/en/>

Latour, B., & Yaneva, A. (2008). Give me a gun and I will make all buildings move: An ant’s view of architecture. *Explorations in Architecture: Teaching, Design, Research*.

Latz, P. (2003, September 2). *Landscape Park Duisburg-Nord: The metamorphosis of an industrial site*. Manufactured Sites; Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203361344-21>

Leffler, M. P., & Painter, D. S. (2005). *Origins of the Cold War: An International History*. Psychology Press.

Moss, T. (2020). *Remaking Berlin: A History of the City Through Infrastructure, 1920-2020*. MIT Press.

Mostafavi, M., & Leatherbarrow, D. (1993). *On Weathering: The Life of Buildings in Time*. The MIT Press.

Natur-Park Schöneberger Südgelände • Future Landscapes. (n.d.). Future Landscapes. Retrieved September 8, 2020, from <https://futurelandscapes.ca/natur-park-schoneberger-sudgelände>

Park am Gleisdreieck (Berlin)—All You Need to Know BEFORE You Go—Updated 2021 (Berlin, Germany). (n.d.). Tripadvisor. Retrieved March 16, 2021, from http://www.tripadvisor.ca/Attraction_Review-g187323-d10632057-Reviews-Park_am_Gleisdreieck-Berlin.html

Patowary, K. (2015, June 2). *Abandoned Tempelhof Airport Now Berlin’s Largest Park | Amusing Planet*. <https://www.amusing-planet.com/2015/06/abandoned-tempelhof-airport-now-berlins.html>

Places. (2019, December 22). *Berlin Travel, Walking Tour Teufelsberg 4K ASMR*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Yr2RojRszTw&ab_channel=Places

Pugh, E. (2014). *Architecture, Politics, and Identity in Divided Berlin*. University of Pittsburgh Press. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/oculcarleton-ebooks/detail.action?docID=2041555>

Sandler, D. (2016). *Counterpreservation: Architectural Decay in Berlin since 1989*. Cornell University Press,. <https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501706271>

Scraton, P. (2012, January 6). In the Grunewald Forest, Berlin. *Under a Grey Sky*. <https://underagreysky.com/2012/01/06/in-the-grunewald-forest-berlin/>

Shaffer, E. S. (Ed.). (2001). *Comparative Criticism: Volume 23, Humanist Traditions in the Twentieth Century: An Annual Journal* (Illustrated edition). Cambridge University Press.

Smith, C. L., & Shand, B. J. (2016). Architectural Wounds: Teufelsberg. *Architecture and Culture*, 4(2), 185–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20507828.2016.1189213>

Spreepark. (n.d.). Theme Park Brochures. Retrieved October 10, 2020, from <https://www.themeparkbrochures.net/maps/spreepark/>

Stewart, S. (2020). *The Ruins Lesson: Meaning and Material in Western Culture* (First edition). University of Chicago Press.

Taylor, B. (2004). *Royal Air Force Germany Since 1945*. Midland.

Teufelsberg Tale: Remembering Field Station Berlin. (2015, January 4). *Abandoned Berlin*. <https://abandonedberlin.com/teufelsberg-veteran/>

Their Dark Materials. (2020, January 21). *99% Invisible*. <https://99percentinvisible.org/episode/their-dark-materials/>

Till, K. E. (2005). *New Berlin: Memory, Politics, Place*. University of Minnesota Press. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/oculcarleton-ebooks/detail.action?docID=310700>

Visit Landschaftspark Duisburg-Nord on your trip to Duisburg. (n.d.). Retrieved March 16, 2021, from <https://www.inspirock.com/germany/duisburg/landschaftspark-duisburg-nord-a968661289>

Works—PublicSpace. (n.d.). Retrieved October 19, 2020, from <https://www.publicspace.org/works/-/project/g047-park-am-gleisdreieck>