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ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis is to investigate whether The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization’s (UNESCO) mission of “building peace in the minds of men and women” can remain relevant by promoting World Heritage sites in countries like Germany. European and traditionally Christian, with 39 properties already inscribed on the list, how can Germany further contribute to the spectrum of cultural diversity, and in turn, to peace-building in the 21st century? A study carried out by the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) concluded that Europe and Christianity were overrepresented on the list and that “living cultures” (from the 20th century onwards) and “traditional cultures” were underrepresented. In 1994, UNESCO adopted its “Global Strategy”, expanding the definition of heritage to include sites which would reflect a more balanced spectrum of the diversity of the world’s cultural heritage.

What implications does this have for Germany, currently permitted to submit only one cultural and one natural site per year? Can countries like Germany further contribute to the spectrum of cultural diversity vital to furthering UNESCO’s peace-building mission? This thesis examines three German cultural sites, in three cities, and in three different chronological and developmental stages of the application process to the UNESCO World Heritage list, then filters the sites through criteria draw from the foundational theories as well as from those conceived by the continuing architects of the evolution of UNESCO thought in relation to World Heritage, global education, global culture and planetary peace-building.

UNESCO’s purpose has always been to preserve culture and heritage through education of the world to the world, so that the past and the present is not only championed by UNESCO, but also protected by global citizens. UNESCO World Heritage sites still have a relevant place in peace-building, because promoting the preservation of these sites allows humanity to share places where one country’s tangible history can be learned as our collective history. This thesis should convey a deeper understanding and internalization of the continuing relevance of UNESCO’s original mission in today’s global landscape and Germany’s role in aiding UNESCO with peace-building in the 21st century by continuing to share its World Heritage.
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Introduction

In New Zealand, a country of approximately 4.4 million people, is a city of approximately 126,000 people about three-quarters of the way down the east side of the South Island, called Dunedin. In the middle of this university town, at 149 Flanagan Street, is a relatively small, newly-built, apartment building rising out of the 19th century foundations of what used to be the house of the owner of the first trap-taxi service in all of Dunedin. In December 2012, an archaeological investigation was carried out by New Zealand Heritage Properties Ltd. following the demolition of the original pre-1900 structure in order to ascertain whether the site could be put on the New Zealand Heritage List. During the excavation, hundreds of articles and artefacts were unearthed, including a copper spoon, a child’s marble, a horseshoe and embossed liquor bottles. The final report, made in September 2013, concluded that these findings demonstrated the domestic life of a working class immigrant family at the turn of the century. However, the site simply remain registered with the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, and was not added to the New Zealand Heritage List, on which there are 218 sites from Dunedin, including an Old Jewish Synagogue (ca. 1864).¹

Across the globe in Germany, in a town called Erfurt, there is another Old Jewish Synagogue waiting to be included onto another list; a decision that will be not be made until the next decade. This list include sites such as: Ankor, Cambodia; The Historic City of Lyon, France; the Berlin Modernism Housing Estates, Germany; The City of Samarkand, Uzbekistan; Bikini Atoll Nuclear Test Site, Marshall Islands; and Tongariro National Park, New Zealand. What exactly do these places all have in common? They have undergone the exhaustive process of ratification to be declared UNESCO World Heritage Sites. These sites are seven of 1031 in the entire world that have met the UNESCO World Heritage Committee’s criteria of “forming part of the cultural and natural heritage” and having “outstanding universal value”.² In 2014, along with Erfurt, the city of Leipzig, Germany also had a site in contention.

Each year, the UNESCO World Heritage Committee meets to consider new sites for inclusion. Germany currently has 39 World Heritage Sites on the list, most recently, the Bergpark Wilhelmshöhe in the city of Kassel, inscribed as a result of the June 2014 conference in Phnom Penh. The Bergpark was the only German site out of 34 German candidates chosen, and was in a group of 19 chosen overall. It joins other German sites featured on the UNESCO World Heritage List, such as the Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the Ancient Beech Forests, the Town Hall and Roland on the Marketplace of Bremen, the Wadden Sea, and the Cologne Cathedral. One could say that Germany has a rather high representation of sites on the list; from among the 161 states parties, only Italy, France, Spain, and China have a comparable number of sites.1 In a world in which an increasing emphasis is put on buzzwords and concepts such as diversity, multi-culturalism, and globalization, why would it still be important to promote places in a country like Germany, in all its traditional, Western, largely Christian, European glory? In the contemporary global landscape, how is it useful to UNESCO’s peace-building mission to continue to promote German cultural heritage sites? Can the promotion of UNESCO’s World Heritage sites still have relevance to 21st century peace-building?

In order to answer these questions, this thesis examines three German cultural sites, in three cities, and in three different chronological and developmental stages of UNESCO World Heritage Status contention. These sites were chosen for their location in the region known as Mitteldeutschland (Central Germany) and for the diversity of German culture in this region that they represent. The first is the Bauhaus and its sites in Dessau and Weimar, in the Free German States of Saxony-Anhalt and Thuringia, respectively. The Bauhaus School, founded by Walter Gropius in 1919, was the foundational school of Modern Architecture, conceptualizing architecture in a way that revolutionized how people thought about form and function in regards to modern living and modern industry, in the context of the socio-political environment. The Bauhaus was inscripted onto the UNESCO World Heritage List in 1996. The second site is the Leipzig Notenspur. Located in Leipzig, in the Free State of Saxony, The Leipzig Notenspur, brainchild of Physics Professor Werner Schneider, is a guided, marked trail which runs through the city, featuring 23 buildings, monuments, 

---

museums and original installations that highlight Leipzig’s vast and impressive centuries-old musical heritage and culture. Dr. Schneider and The Notenspur Initiative have been waiting for two dependent, consecutive decisions: firstly, whether it has been accepted as one of the two Saxonian candidates; and secondly whether it has been accepted for inclusion onto the German Tentative UNESCO List, to be submitted to the UNESCO Tentative List. The final subject of the study is located in the medieval town of Erfurt, in the Free State of Thuringia. The site proposed is a collection of Jewish buildings and artefacts, including the Old Jewish Synagogue, a medieval mikveh, a treasury, and religious manuscripts. The team promoting this site have also been waiting for the consecutive results which could end in their application being submitted to the UNESCO Tentative List.

The methodological approach to this study is built around a post-formal bricolage (a methodology to account for factors of creativity, complexity, multidimensionality, and interdisciplinarianism), as the paper includes a diverse range of subjects - political science, economics, tourism, history, sociology, and music. The aim is to integrate the subjects in a narrative, hermeneutic manner. Due to the many and varied topics and subjects tackled in the length of this thesis, I felt it would help its ebb and flow to approach it in a way that would promote a circle of understanding, which would be reached by reading though the study as if following bread crumbs, and will allow the most coherent integration of every component within in an accessible and seamless manner. As the reader proceeds through the thesis, the threads of the narratives will intertwine as if ribbons around a maypole and the reader should come to a full understand of the conclusion by the finish. Each section will follow a logical, chronological order, from the theories championing peace-building to soft security communities, which then shaped the events that influenced UNESCO as an educational organization for humanity and spawned UNESCO’s World Heritage List, through to the introductions of the sites discussed, and then finally to the analysis by means of my criteria drawn from both the foundational theories as well as those conceived by the continuing architects of the evolution of UNESCO thought in relation to World Heritage, global education, global culture and planetary peace-building. The theoretical basis is essentially centered on the idea of building a soft global security community by means of the purposeful construction of a collective memory through a global education, a mission that UNESCO has formulated, re-formulated, and re-re-formulated to bring about a stable peace. Finally, each site will,
as befitting this narrative, have their own analysis section as per criteria I formed, followed by the overall conclusion. In this way, the questions asked above will be answered in parts, yet completely and cogently.

As I have researched this thesis, I have come to admire the years of dogged commitment by a great many people from a range of organizations within the countries involved – in this case, Germany. As events unfolded throughout the year, it has been illuminating to learn how intrepid national and international teams must be in their quest towards final inscription onto the UNESCO World Heritage List, even though it can end in heart-break. By the end of this study, the hope is for a greater appreciation for the German legacy, German culture and the German willingness to evolve as well as their willingness to share that evolution with the world. In addition, I wish to convey a deeper understanding and internalization of UNESCO’s original aim, which has always been to preserve culture and heritage through education, so that the past is championed and protected not only by them, but by humanity as global citizens, for the now, the 21st century and beyond.
Chapter 1: Striving for a Peaceable Kingdom

1.1. Theoretical Trails

That since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed. (UNESCO, 1945)

Today’s society is in a transition stage in which there is a breakdown of connections to a specific group or even to a nation-specific group or a culture. Migration, immigration and transmigration have created a world in which there are whole groups of citizens for whom a natural, intrinsic, collective memory is problematic, because they have little or no anchor to a cultural and historical past with which to devise a blueprint for the future. Beginning with the years preceding World War I and continuing from the post-World War II period, through the Cold War and post-Cold War periods, various political theorists and philosophers have tried to introduce more nuanced theoretical frameworks to facilitate dialogue between nations in order to bring about a more effective peace-building process. Such theories have been continually evolving with the times, and supranational organizations such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) have adapted them to institution-building with forward thinking, long-term goals in mind. Most recently, there has been a movement to return to theoretical roots in order to examine the juxtaposition of culture, community, and values in a more globally integrated and multi-disciplinary context. For this epistemology, we begin with theories proposed by Karl Deutsch and move through the decades to cover theories which have conscripted, built upon and adapted different disciplinary outlooks to form a way of tackling peace-building by broadening the discourse of education in a way that not only takes a global view (politico-economic) into consideration, but also a forward-thinking, planetary (anthropo-socio-cultural-economic) view.4

In 1957, Czech-German/American political theorist, Karl Deutsch with colleagues, Sidney A. Burrell, Robert A. Kann, Maurice Lee, Jr., Martin Lichterman,

Raymond E. Lindgren, Francis L. Loewenheim, and Richard W. Van Wagenen, published a study entitled, “Political Community and the North Atlantic Area”. In it, they concluded that a stable world order could be brought about by creating a “we-feeling”, in order to facilitate the integration of the global population, and that this “we-feeling” could only be created if the actors shared a common set of values. However, such integration doesn’t happen overnight and must be developed over a long period of time and involve interactions between people from the “politically relevant strata of society”. Deutsch and his colleagues realized that, due to the nature of modern warfare, war could mean the end of mankind. Therefore, envisioning a viable model for long-range international cooperation with permanent peace in mind—the aim, to end war as a social institution—was integral for the survival of human civilization.

As a result, Deutsch and his colleagues conceptualized the idea of security communities. An example of a security community is the European Union (EU). According to Deutsch, a security community is “a group of people which has become ‘integrated’”. Integration, in this sense, means that the actors have developed a “sense of community” through the “we-feeling” which, over time, develops the belief, expectation, and possibility of being able to solve social conflicts which arise due to “peaceful change” (solving conflicts through non-violent measures), incorporating reliable and expected institutionalized procedures agreed upon by all the actors within the security community. There are two kinds of security communities - amalgamated and pluralistic. An amalgamated security community is defined as any kind of “formal merger of two or more previously independent units into a single larger unit, with some type of common government after amalgamation”. A pluralistic security-community is made up of separate entities which are integrated, yet still legally independent. The United States of America (USA) is an example of an amalgamated security community and the United Nations (UN) is an example of a pluralistic security community. According to Deutsch and his cohorts, there can be amalgamation without integration as well as integration without amalgamation.

---

6 Ibid.
7 Ibid, 2.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
However, as the purpose of integration is peace-building (without large-scale violence), where there is amalgamation without integration there can be no security community. Their 1957 study found that: “Any political community, be it amalgamated or pluralistic, was eventually successful if it became a security community – that is, if it achieved integration – and that it was unsuccessful if it ended eventually in secession or civil war”. While both amalgamated and pluralistic communities can and have been successful, the study found that pluralistic security communities are easier to attain and maintain than amalgamated security communities and have almost always been successful in history as a mechanism to prevent large-scale wars. The study also found that amalgamated historical communities were “far superior” to pluralistic communities, due to the fact that before the nuclear age, men were more willing to risk civil war or war among the actors in the community in order to assure cooperative action. In the modern age, pluralistic security communities were perceived as the option most conducive to global peace.

Through their study, Deutsch and his colleagues realized that there were three conditions absolutely essential for a pluralistic security community to have a chance at global peace: mutual compatibility of main values relevant to political decision-making; a marked increase in political and administrative capabilities of at least some participating units or governments to respond to each other’s needs, messages, and actions quickly, adequately, and without resort to violence; and considerable mutual predictability of behavior. Furthermore, while easier to attain and maintain, pluralistic security communities were found to have often risen from harsher circumstances, but succeeded despite those circumstances and survived environments that would have been destructive to amalgamated security communities.

The idea of the “we-feeling” is the over-arching canvas of Deutsch and his colleagues’ study. Within the possible conditions for integration are several crucial, compatible pillars upon which this “we-feeling” can be supported and highlighted as avenues towards peace-building in the modern age. Technology, globalization, transnational migration, ease of mobility, ease of communication, ease of transaction between societies, as well as the heightened ability for mass destruction have

---

11 Ibid., 12.
culminated in a manner in which many of the integrative conditions of the above possible conditions for a pluralistic security community may already be clear and present. However, due to ever rapid changes in the global political stage, increasing interdependent transnational relations, and constantly shifting socio-cultural and identity norms, the concept of building a global “we-feeling” is more important than ever - not only on the official international political stage, but on the domestic level, where it has taken on new nuances. Pluralistic security communities like the UN, the EU, as well as the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) have come to represent an increasingly popular way of states exercising co-operative power in the face of rapidly changing power structures since the nuclear age.

Such security communities, based on Deutsch’s conceptualization of community, co-opt many elements of the idea of “soft power” (as opposed to “hard” military power) which, according to the term’s conceiver, American historian and diplomat, Joseph Nye, is “when one country gets other countries to want what it wants” by putting the emphasis on the components of values, norms and knowledge, rather than on coercion.13 These three components are central in constructing a “sense of community” that can contribute to building the “we-feeling” which can help chart a 21st century path towards global security and stability.14 Oleg Piletsky, a researcher at The University of Limerick’s Centre for European Studies, believes that achieving and maintaining the “we-feeling” in the 21st century global environment is increasingly something that must be learned, and that this is critical in developing the “sense of community”, which, in turn, is essential to the success of pluralistic security communities in the modern world:15

Learning and not balancing thus becomes part of the mechanism of change, in other words, “a change of change” By learning I do not mean exclusively the internalising of some idea or belief by individuals. Rather, I also mean an active process of collective redefinition and interpretation of reality, which, based on new causal and normative knowledge, becomes institutionalised and, thus, has practical effects. (Piletsky, 2002)

14 Karl Deutsch et al., ”Political Community and the North Atlantic Area” in The European Union: Readings on the Theory and Practice of European Integration, 17.
A social organization based upon this concept can take on the form of a kind of pluralistic political community, built upon the idea of people as citizens of the world who act as “agents” of peace and security-building. Piletsky asserts that, “agents are not simply the puppets of social structure, since they can actively challenge the validity claims inherent in any communicative action. At the same time, they are social agents that produce and reproduce the intersubjective structures of meanings through their communicative practices.” With citizens of different countries acting as agents, it is possible to form a stable pluralistic political community that, according to Piletsky, is defined as a “group of people who have been able to accept and transcend their differences regardless of the diversity of their backgrounds (social, spiritual, educational, ethnic, economic, political, etc.), and have reasons to trust that the use of large-scale military and economic coercion in their mutual relations is unlikely.”

In order to form a pluralistic political community with the goal of promoting and furthering global peace through its citizenry, concerted efforts must be made to convey and share values, norms and knowledge. As it cannot be assumed that people will simply stumble into a pluralistic political community, a path can be illuminated by promoting “communicative action”, keeping in consideration an environment which can be and often is interrogative and challenging, by nature of people with different and identities and interests. Communicative action, a concept introduced by German philosopher and social theorist, Jürgen Habermas, states that agents in society can “seek to reach common understanding and to coordinate actions by reasoned argument, consensus, and cooperation rather than strategic action strictly in pursuit of their own goals.” To further this idea, he put forth the complementary concept of the “lifeworld” and its three components: culture, society and personality.

---

17 Ibid.
By culture I mean the stock of knowledge upon which participants in communication draw in order to provide themselves with interpretations that will allow them to reach understanding [with one another]....By society I mean the legitimate orders through which participants in communication regulate their membership in social groups, and thereby secure solidarity. Under personality I understand the competences that make subjects capable of speech and action, and thus enable them to participate in processes of reaching understanding, and thereby assert their own identity. (Habermas, 1987)

According to Habermas, there are also three corresponding conditions that run parallel to the transmission of culture, society and personality. The first is socialization, which allows "the acquisition by the younger generation of generalized capacities for action" (to act as agents themselves) in order for the "attunement of individual life-histories and collective forms of life." The second is social integration, the "coordination of action through legitimately recognized interpersonal relations" and the acquisition of "the identity of groups to a degree sufficient for everyday practice." The third is cultural reproduction, the aim of which is to "secure the continuity of tradition and a coherence of knowledge that is sufficient for everyday practice." This last component has major implications for the first two components of society and personality, because in pursuing the goal of cultural reproduction, this promotes the “formation and legitimation for fundamental social institutions” and the establishment and maintenance of attitudes and behavioral patterns that are crucial for enrichment through “self-formation” (Bildung) as well as for the acquisition and realization of "educational goals".

German International Politics scholar, Thomas Risse, takes Habermas’ concept of a lifeworld further in promoting the concept of a “common lifeworld”, which is defined as “a shared culture, a common system of norms and rules perceived as legitimate, and the social identity of actors being capable of communicating and acting”. The existence of a common lifeworld, in conjunction with the ability to empathize with each other and to see world through each other’s eyes, promotes communicative action that, in turn, can lead to a common understanding. This ability to transmit the culture, society and personality contained in different lifeworlds among countries is the key to common understanding and building community. It is the

---

23 Ibid.
evolution of ideas such as these over the decades that encourages the blending of cultural and communicative memory as it contributes to cultural education and experience, and has led to new formulations for constructing a global community relevant to the modern age. Notably, a key avenue towards discovering new formulations for mapping peace for organizations like the UN has been through long-term ideological and practical partnerships from within the diverse global community.

1.2 The Ideological Evolution of UNESCO

In 1972, a study called the “The Limits of Growth” was published by American environmental scientist, biophysicist, teacher, and writer, Donella Meadows and her husband, systems manager Don Meadows. The study was commissioned by the Club of Rome, an international association over 100 people of influence and stature in the science, industry, politics, and cultural studies, founded in 1968 by the Italian industrialist Aurelio Peccei and by Alexander King, then the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Director-General for Science and Technology. The critical and scientific study was groundbreaking because in contrast to painting a rosy picture of a future technologically advanced utopian global society, it warned that humankind was heading towards a point of instability due to the factors of economic growth, population explosion, and the resulting inevitable exhaustion of natural resources:

The world system is simply not ample enough nor generous enough to accommodate much longer such egocentric and conflictive behavior by its inhabitants…Our present situation is so complex and is so much a reflection of man's multiple activities, however, that no combination of purely technical, economic, or legal measures and devices can bring substantial improvement. Entirely new approaches are required to redirect society toward goals of equilibrium rather than growth. Such a reorganization will involve a supreme effort of understanding, imagination, and political and moral resolve. We have no doubt that if mankind is to embark on a new course, concerted international measures and joint long–term planning will be necessary on a scale and scope without precedent…Such an effort calls for joint endeavor by all peoples, whatever their culture, economic system, or level of development. (Meadows et al, 1972)
The study, which drew a correlation between industry, the environment, and population, warned that the human race could no longer put such unrelenting pressures on our natural and social environments and still expect to be successful in striving for sustainable peace and global stability. This study impacted the international stage by influencing the evolution of security communities like the UN through the guidance of globally forward-thinking organizations like the World Future Society (WFS) and the World Future Studies Federation (WFSF), who, in view of the modern age and its implications, began to collectively examine approaches to global peace from new dimensions.

There are various conceptions of the purpose of futures theory, however it is generally recognized that the impetus and purpose of futures theory in reaching for a better future, is wholly humanitarian in nature. The World Future Society (WFS) is the brainchild of American journalist and futurist, Edward Cornish, who was deeply affected by events such as the Cuban Missile Crisis and influenced by RAND physicist, Herman Kahn’s book, “On Thermonuclear War”. Buoyed by TIME Magazine’s official usage of the label, “futurist” to describe men like American architect, inventor, systems analyst and visionary, Buckminster Fuller and French economic and political philosopher, Bertrand de Jouvenel, Cornish originally conceived the World Future Society in 1965 as a newsletter, in order to attract and bring together like-minded scholars and experts from across all disciplines who were also interested futurists, specifically for insuring the existence of a future by “approaching the future in a rational, scientific manner that would provide practical foresight for individuals, organizations, and even humanity as a whole”. The WFS was eventually formalized as an organization in October 1966 and today, with branches in 80 countries, is the biggest organization of futurists, reaching its members and the public through its magazine, “The Futurist”. Its existence directly influenced the formation of further futurist organizations, including the World Future Studies Federation.

The World Futures Studies Federation (WFSF), originated in Oslo, Norway in 1967, at a conference organized by Norwegian political scientist, sociologist and

---


mathematician, Johan Galtung, who gathered futurist thinkers from disciplines all over the world through his Peace Research Institute. Galtung, the founder of modern Peace and Conflict Studies, established the terms and approaches of peacekeeping, peacemaking and peacebuilding; terms which today are as ubiquitous in the UN vernacular as they are in global vernacular. Like the WSF, the WFSF has been greatly influenced by futurists like American writer, Alvin Toffler, American sociologist, Wendell Bell, and also by Bertrand de Jouvenel. In 1967, de Jouvenel published a book called *The Art of Conjecture*, in which he discussed “the logical and political problems of forecasting and discusses methods economics, sociology, and political science by which the future can be studied” and argues that “it is natural and necessary for the population to have visions of the future.”

In 1973, one year after the UNESCO World Heritage Convention was signed, the WFSF was officially established in Paris with de Jouvenel as its Founding President and Galtung as its first President. In 1974, the 4th World Futures Conference took place in Rome, a conference so successful that it came to the notice of both the President of Italy and of Pope Paul VI (who gave the fledgling organization his blessing). That same year, having already achieved legitimacy in international recognition, with members hailing from Norway, France, Germany, Romania, Egypt, Russia, Italy, and Poland, the WFSF convened its first General Assembly with UNESCO’s assistance.

Since 1974, the WFSF has collaborated with the UN on a number of joint-ventures. Over the years, it has been UN-supported financially as well as intellectually, on projects ranging from joint publications to direct participation in conferences and events and has been in partnership with the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) since 1987; ECOSOC is at the same level as UN General Assembly and the UN Security Council, which then places the WFSF on the same level as the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). In addition, the WFSF collaborates with the UN: Department of Economic & Social Affairs (DESA), the “activities arm” of ECOSOC. Recently, the WSFS also entered into collaboration with the United Nations Development Program.

---

(UNDP), a program on the same level as United Nations Children's Rights & Emergency Relief Organization (UNICEF), with the purpose of using its Knowledge Sharing Platform for implementation of its projects. The WFSF’s official partnership with UNESCO also began in 1974. This collaboration has involved participation in a diversity of events at the UNESCO headquarters in Paris; global debates around the world, joint-publications, and has financial backing from UNESCO for WSFS projects. In addition, WSFS offers continual foresight counseling to UNESCO, a collaboration integrated across a variety of programs and sectors. In partnership with the UN and UNESCO, organizations like the WSFS have been able to contribute to the ongoing evolution of a peace-building and have been instrumental in developing UNESCO’s theoretical framework into platforms from which to map peace.

Currently, UNESCO has five major categories that define the theoretical, operational and thematic framework for all its programs: Education, Natural Sciences, Social and Human Sciences, Culture, Communication and Information. From these broad platforms, UNESCO develops strategies and goals based upon principles and decides how best to implement these principles into policies. For example, in November of 2001, within the framework of the platform of Culture, UNESCO issued a Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity. The principles included in the declaration highlight the complementary nature of cultural diversity and cultural pluralism (defined as policies which promote social cohesion, civil society and peace based on inclusion and participation of all citizens), in addition to stressing that the common heritage of humanity is to be found within that cultural diversity, which should be protected by ensuring access for all to be educated about each other’s cultural diversity, made easier by greater mobility, technology and globalization.30

The Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity followed two major drives by the UN: 2000’s "International Year for the Culture of Peace" and 2001’s the United Nations “Year of Dialogue among Civilizations”. The first encompassed a preliminary effort by the UN to acknowledge and use the internet as a valuable technological tool for sharing cultural knowledge across the globe. The second was aimed at combating prejudice and tolerance by highlighting “mutual contribution, borrowings and interactions” in religious and spiritual realms as well as in culture and civilization.

promoting mutual understanding through the illumination of the convergence of
diversity among cultures as they evolve through time. These declarations,
complementary in nature, were meant to assist in furthering discovery of a common
heritage and as well a discovery of shared ethical values, and harken directly back to
Habermas’ idea of constructing a common lifeworld; building a global community
through transmission of culture by means of communicative action, thereby creating
an active, integrated path towards a global peace.

1.3 UNESCO World Heritage

Since its inception in 1945, UNESCO has held a single, overall, over-arching
goal: that is, to establish a sustainable, lasting peace. The "intellectual" agency of the
United Nations, UNESCO has chosen to promote global solidarity through its
endeavours in its five platforms of Education, Natural Sciences, Culture, Social and
Human Sciences and Communication and Information. Headquartered in Paris, with
over 50 offices throughout the world, UNESCO’s 195 Members and nine Associate
Members are governed by the General Conference and the Executive Board. The
Secretariat, headed by the Director-General, implements the decisions of these two
bodies. As a global, intellectual and educational institution dedicated to its mission of
"building peace in the minds of men and women", UNESCO concerns itself with
initiatives on everything from global literacy and educational development, to
fostering freedom of expression, to promoting sustainable development by creating
educational resources for the teaching of the ethical implications of global
environmental change, to creating knowledge societies for the free and open sharing
of information, to promoting the preservation of cultural heritage.

The origins of UNESCO World Heritage began in 1954, with the decision to
build the Aswan High Dam, the result of which would be the flooding of the Upper
Nile Valley from Aswan, Egypt to the Dal Cataract in Sudan. This area, known as
Nubia, was littered with hundreds of ancient sites and several temple complexes, all
populated with thousands of artefacts. In a bid to save the sites, in 1959, both the
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Egyptian and Sudanese governments requested UNESCO’s assistance to save the ancient temples, sites and tangible history. The project ended up encompassing 20 years of mobilized international effort, expertise, and financing on such a grand scale that by the time it was finished, 22 monuments and architectural complexes were successfully relocated for posterity. As a result of this endeavour, in 1972, the UNESCO Convention formalized an international treaty concerning the "Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage”. In 1979, the Nubian Monuments from Abu Simbel to Philae were finally inscribed onto the UNESCO World Heritage List using criteria influenced by what is now known as the 1972 UNESCO World Heritage Convention, which recognizes that there are places in the world that demonstrate “outstanding universal value” deserving of protection - places having cultural and/or natural qualities “so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity.”

Today, there are 191 member states who have chosen to ratify the Convention, among them 1031 World Heritage Sites with 802 cultural, 197 natural, and 32 mixed properties. Examples of Cultural World Heritage sites are the Kunta Kinteh Island and Related Sites (Gambia), The Historic Centre of Tallinn (Estonia), and the Jesuit Missions of La Santísima Trinidad de Paraná and Jesús de Tavarangue (Paraguay). Examples of Natural World Heritage sites are the Uvus Nur Basin (Mongolia), Yellowstone National Park (USA), and the Jeju Volcanic Island and Lava Tubes (Korea). Examples of Mixed Properties include Tongariro National Park (New Zealand), Ibiza: Biodiversity and Culture (Spain), and the Trang An Landscape Complex (Vietnam).

Cultural Heritage is defined exactly by Article 2 of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention as encompassing: monuments - architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science; groups of buildings - groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding
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universal value from the point of view of history, art or science; and sites - works of man or the combined works of nature and man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view. Natural Heritage is defined as encompassing: natural features consisting of physical and biological formations or groups of such formations, which are of outstanding universal value from the aesthetic or scientific point of view; geological and physiographical formations and precisely delineated areas which constitute the habitat of threatened species of animals and plants of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation; and natural sites or precisely delineated natural areas of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science, conservation or natural beauty.  

Mixed Properties are defined as cultural landscapes that are cultural properties which represent the "combined works of nature and of man" as designated in Article 1 of the Convention and are subject to time as well as the ravages of human society. Since 1992, cultural landscapes have been defined as “significant interactions” between people and the natural environment.

The World Heritage Committee regularly reviews the criteria for the inscription of properties in order to reflect the constantly evolving nature of the concept of World Heritage. These revised criteria are then updated in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention; the latest revision implemented in 2005. The following are the 10 criteria as stated in the latest Convention revision. Nominations must satisfy at least one criterion upon their application to the UNESCO World Heritage List. They must: (i) represent a masterpiece of human creative genius; (ii) exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design; (iii) bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared; (iv) be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates a) significant stage(s) in human history; (v) be an outstanding example of a
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traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change; (vi) be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance; (The UNESCO Committee considers that the following criteria should preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria) (vii) contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance; (viii) be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth's history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features; (ix) be outstanding examples representing significant on-going ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals; and (x) contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation.39

In consideration of the above criteria, a country that wishes to submit a property for UNESCO World Heritage site consideration must have already taken the following important action: it must already have signed the Convention, and as such, can then be considered a State Party and hence, under obligation to follow the Operational Guidelines of the Convention. A State Party may submit a property or properties at any point throughout the year, with all submissions due on the first of February. The first step is for a country to make an inventory of its important natural and cultural heritage sites it wishes to highlight at that particular time. These sites make up a Tentative List. The properties on this list include all the properties a State Party may submit anytime within that five to ten year period; it is not fixed and may be amended over the course of the years. Unless a property first appears on the Tentative List, it can never be considered by the World Heritage Committee as a candidate for nomination to the World Heritage List.

The second step is to prepare and submit a comprehensive Nomination File, comprised of the properties on the Tentative List (including official documentation and maps). After a Nomination File is submitted to the World Heritage Centre for

approval, it is sent to the appropriate Advisory Bodies for evaluation. Three international, non-governmental and intergovernmental organizations serve the UN in an advisory capacity. The two non-governmental organizations which evaluate the natural and cultural merits of the nominated properties are the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS). Founded in 1948 and based in Switzerland, the IUCN provides the World Heritage Committee with technical evaluations of natural heritage properties with over than 1000 members in its global network of specialists, also reports on the evolving conditions of already listed properties. Founded in 1965 and based in Paris, ICOMOS provides the World Heritage Committee with evaluations of cultural and mixed properties. Founded in 1956 and based in Rome, the third advisory organization, the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), is an intergovernmental organization which provides expert advice on preservation, restoration techniques, as well as conservation training, pertaining to existing listed properties.

Finally, once a site has been nominated and evaluated, the intergovernmental World Heritage Committee meets once a year makes its decision; this involves several decisions on several sites per committee meeting. The applications are either denied, deferred until further information from the States Parties is forthcoming, or successful. One success story is the first site examined in this study - the Bauhaus and its Sites in Weimar/Dessau.
Chapter 2: The Bauhaus-Dessau/Weimar

2.1. Origins

Walter Adolph Georg Gropius was born in 1883 in Berlin into a family of architects; his great-uncle and his father were both successful architects. His father worked for the city council, advising on public works. His great-uncle was the architect Martin Gropius, who became director of the Berlin School of Applied Art. Gropius spent Gropius began his training in architecture in Munich and then continued at the Technische Hochschule in Charlottenburg, but never received a degree. Constantly frustrated by his inability to draw, he failed to acquire the skill and throughout his life and career, he was dependent on collaborators and partners to interpret his visions; he gave these draftsman credit next to his own. While a student, in letter to his mother in 1907, the future father of the Bauhaus movement wrote:

My absolute inability to bring even the simplest design to paper is casting a shadow on many otherwise beautiful things and often makes me worry about my future profession. I am not capable of drawing a straight line. I could draw much better as a twelve-year-old. It seems to be almost a physical inability for me, because I immediately get a cramp in my hand and continually break the points of my pencils, so that I have to rest after five minutes. Even my handwriting is the same. It gets worse every day. (Forgács, 1995)

Yet, it was during his years as a student that Gropius formulated the idea that “the construction of dwellings must be based on industrial mass production”, an idea that was percolating during the technological revolution (especially pertaining to machine production) and that influenced his hiring by one of his uncle’s neighbors to build housing on his estate for his employees.40 Between 1907 and 1908, Gropius took a year to travel around Spain and Italy, after which, he returned to Germany and joined the firm of Peter Behrens, one of the most revered architects and designers of the period; his colleagues included Ludwig Mies van der Rohe and Le Corbusier. Gropius was only 24.

---

In the meantime, a movement in Germany arose, aimed at countering the effects of mechanization upon the aesthetics and quality of its products. The movement involved architects, painters, sculptors, art historians, manufacturers and educators, and politicians, all with one common goal: the melding of art, history and handicraft. Quality was defined as “not only excellent durable work and the use of flawless, genuine materials, but also the attainment of an organic whole rendered sachlich (objective), noble and, if you will, artistic by such means”. The result of this movement led to the formation of the Deutsches Werkbund (German Work Federation) in 1907. Among its leaders were Peter Behrens (Gropius’ first employer and a designer of industrial plants) and the architects, Hermann Muthesius, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Henry van de Velde and Theodor Fischer. Gropius joined the Federation in 1910.

Once in the Deutsches Werkbund, Gropius immediately began to solidify his own philosophy around the notion of “the prosperous union of art and technology” and maintaining that “works of industry and technology must give rise to new forms”. That same year, he left Behrens’ firm and opened his own firm with another employee, Adolf Meyer, designing furniture, wallpaper, objects for mass production, automobile bodies, and even a diesel locomotive. In 1911, Gropius collaborated with Meyer on what is considered one of the pioneering works of modern architecture - the cubic steel and glass design of the facade of the Fagus-Werk, a shoe last factory located in the Lower Saxonian town of Alfeld-an-der-Leine. In 1913, Gropius published a highly influential article entitled, “The Development of Industrial Buildings,” which included photographs of factories and grain elevators in The United States and Canada. In it, he wrote that the reinforced grain elevators were “almost as impressive in their monumental power as the buildings of ancient Egypt.” He also admired the “independent and clear vision” of their designers and noted the marked difference from European builders, crediting the architectures’ clear lack of “sentimental reverence for tradition” due to the lack of embellishment. During the pre-war years, Gropius wrote extensively on his architectural philosophy, maintaining
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that even though the future was in the design and manufacture of standardized mass-produced items, artist involvement should never be left out of the equation.

During this time, Gropius was, among his colleagues, noticed not only for his architectural vision, but also for his leadership qualities:

By virtue of his personality and aptitudes, his social and public position, Gropius seemed predestined for a leading role. He was resolute, clear-sighted in pinpointing problems and resilient in debate, had an excellent intuitive grasp of a situation, and displayed a fundamentally far-sighted optimism and extraordinary organizing ability. He was able to remain detached from every conflict, and maintained a coolly correct attitude even in situations that involved him personally. (Forgács, 1995)

This led to an offer of employment by Henry van de Velde, Director of the Grand Ducal Saxon School of Arts and Crafts in Weimar. Van de Velde, a Belgian citizen, had been tasked with finding a replacement, as per the instructions of the Grand Duke of Saxony who, in 1913, had recommended that a German director would suit better the pre-war “spirit of the new nationalism”. In 1915, Gropius traveled to Weimar in anticipation of the new position, however, the war intervened and he was called up for duty. It is perhaps lucky that Walter Gropius survived World War I at all. As a sergeant in the signal corps, he was buried under rubble and dead bodies, and shot down from a plane; for his services, he was twice awarded the Iron Cross. In 1916, during his war service, Gropius wrote a treatise entitled, “Proposals for the Establishment of an Institute Offering Artistic Direction to Industry of Applied Art and Crafts”, aimed at how to reconcile the seemingly mutually conflicting interests of large-scale industry and commerce vs. artistic and craft activity, which he sent the Grand Ducal Ministry of State.

Throughout the events accompanying the end of World War I, and Germany’s loss and resulting political upheaval leading to the formation of the Weimar Republic and the rise of the Social Democratic Party (SDP), Gropius was involved in two important endeavors. The first was the November Group, formed in 1918, involving
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not only architects, artists and artisans like Wassily Kandinsky (Russian painter and founder of Der Blaue Reiter Movement) and Paul Klee (the Swiss painter), but also musicians, writers, playwrights and filmmakers like Berthold Brecht and Walter Ruttmann. The November Group pushed for radical practical proposals by demanding reforms of the art academies, the establishment of Folk Art museums, the institution of public exhibition spaces, and the allocation of art supplies to artists. The second organization Gropius joined was the Arbeitsrat für Kunst (Work Council for the Arts); he eventually became its president when it merged with The November Group in 1919. His presidency followed that of architect and author, Bruno Taut, whose 1914 manifesto entitled, Der Sturm, was revolutionary in describing architecture in tones of reverent, romantic mysticism in which the concept of “a magnificent building” would include sculpture, painting, and all the other artistic endeavors which could contribute to building.48 Together, Gropius and Taut formulated the Work Council’s manifesto, which was concerned with “the evolution and propagation of the theories and aesthetics of the new art and architecture”.49 This manifesto greatly influenced the next stage of Gropius’ career as head of the newly fused Grand Ducal Saxon School of Arts and Crafts and the Grand Ducal Saxon School of Applied Arts, renamed the Staatliches Bauhaus Weimar.

2.2 The Bauhaus-Weimar: 1919-1924

I saw that an architect cannot hope to realize his ideas unless he can influence the industry of his country sufficiently for a new school of design to arise...I saw too, that to make this possible would require a whole staff of collaborators and assistants: men who would work, not automatically as an orchestra obeys its conductor’s baton, but independently, although in close cooperation, to further a common cause. (Gropius, 1965)

Although the word “Bauhaus” literally translates into “building house”, the term stands for “an eagerness to experiment, openness, creativity, a close link to industrial practice and internationality”.50 When Walter Gropius took the directorship of the Bauhaus in Weimar in April 1919, the state of Thuringia was not even formed
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(it would be in 1920) and Germany was still in turmoil, rebuilding and recovering from the ravages of World War I. Thus, it was in the wake of the flight of the Kaiser, amidst the new SPD-run Weimar Republic—Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (Social Democratic Party of Germany)—surrounded by a civil war between the monarchy-supporting right and a socialist-supporting Left, and heralded in by the January 1919’s Spartacist (Worker’s) Uprising in which Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxembourg were murdered, that Gropius set out to distinguish his school and wrote his Bauhaus Manifesto:

…for art may not be taught. They must return to the workshop. This world of mere drawing and painting of draughtsmen and applied artists must at long last become a world that builds. When a young person who senses within himself a love for creative endeavour begins his career, as in the past, by learning a trade, the unproductive “artist” will no longer be condemned to the imperfect practice of art because his skill is now preserved in craftsmanship, where he may achieve excellence. (Gropius, 1919)

In the beginning, Gropius enlisted as teachers Johannes Itten (Swiss painter and designer), Lyonel Feininger (German-American painter), and Gerhard Marcks (German sculptor), as the first three teachers, in addition to himself. In 1920, he also recruited Oskar Schlemmer (German painter and sculptor), Paul Klee and Wassily Kandinsky. In 1922, as per the mission of the Bauhaus to meld various styles of modern design within its philosophy, both Theo van Doesburg (Dutch painter) and El Lissitzky (Russian artist and architect) were visiting instructors. Future instructors who were also drawn from the ranks of former students, all German, including Josef Albers, Marcel Breuer, Herbert Bayer, Marianne Brandt, and Gunta Stolz. The school’s template was based around the idea of workshops, which were run by a Master of Works (a craftsman), who was in charge of design and aesthetics and a Master of Form (an artist), in charge of technical skills. Even though the education in crafting was aimed at material production, artistic design was to be an integral component. Before allowed to participate in the workshops, each student was required to take the preliminary Vorkurs, a six-month course that covered the principles of form, color and the qualities of possible materials the students could work with. Most importantly, it was supposed to encourage students to develop their own creativity.
Another goal of the workshops was to encourage the Masters to develop their own artwork alongside their teaching duties as well. The Bauhaus did not have a unitary style and worked to incorporate the various Modernist movement styles of the day into its curriculum through its illustrious teachers. The workshops, which did not yet include an official department for architecture, covered ceramics, weaving, carpentry, metal, graphic printing, printing and advertising, photography, glass and wall painting, bookbinding, stone and wood sculpture, plastic art, and theater. The teaching of fine arts and the dramatic arts (as well as music) was intended to produce “works well-rounded in conception and execution, melding art and technology”, thereby furthering Gropius’ and the Bauhaus’ mission to train a “universal designer”, capable of working equally creatively whether in architecture, handcrafts, or industry.51 In addition, as the Bauhaus was presented as a vocational school, non-art classes were taught; such as the material sciences, physical and chemical color theory, the history of technology, anatomy and business administration (such as book-keeping and contract management). After completing three semesters of workshops, students generally took a journeyman exam. If they passed, they could move on to the building apprenticeship and eventually receive a Master Craftsman certification. Some 150 to 200 students were matriculating through the Bauhaus at Weimar at any given time. Depending on the semester, this would have included 25% to 50% women and 17% to 33% percent foreign students.52

Influenced by styles ranging from Expressionism to the Neu Sachlichkeit (New Objectivity) and striving to maintain a balance between a utopian spirit and more practical-minded, forward-looking style, the Bauhaus teachings were characterized by strict economy of technique, rationality and functionality, geometry in form, and design considerate of the nature of the materials utilized.53 “Our guiding principle was that design is neither an intellectual nor a material affair, but simply an integral part of the stuff of life, necessary for everyone in a civilized society,” maintained Gropius.54 The Bauhaus school was shaped by the artists and craftsmen

who taught the workshops and especially the preliminary Vorkurs, particularly influential in shaping the Bauhaus students. The first instructor of the Vorkurs from 1919 to 1922 was the Swiss painter, Johannes Itten, who brought to the Bauhaus his concept of chromatic tones and created a 12 hue color wheel that explained how to mix hues and shades, based on his beliefs that emotion can and should be communicated through color and that color mixtures were crucial in creating “harmonious order, simple relationships between colors and form, and spatial effect”. In contrast to the usual methods of teaching, which involved instructing the fledgling artists to copy other artists’ works, Itten allowed his students to create their own designs from the start.

Due to creative directions like Itten’s, however, the Bauhaus met opposition from right-wing politicians and academicians. The new regime of liberal Social Democrats in Weimar was increasingly overshadowed by Right factions who were extremely critical of the ideological direction of the school, which, by this time, was funded by the new, Free State government of Thuringia. At a town meeting, the Bauhaus was referred to as a “Spartacist and Bolshevik Institution”, “Jewish”, “non-German” and “alien”, and was judged for departing from the traditions of the Old Fine Arts. The SPD in Thuringia, however, remained supportive. In this political atmosphere, Gropius and the Bauhaus Masters’ Council felt it prudent to mandate that the Bauhaus be politically neutral and prohibited political activity by the apprentice students on pain of expulsion. In an effort to garner wider support for the Bauhaus, Gropius also amassed his own network of nationwide, indisputably respected artists, musicians, playwrights and progressive intellectuals, and involved institutions and even members of the nobility. A letter of protest, written by the Bauhaus in late January, began, “Young artists are under political attack”. Then, in order to prove that the school held enough merit to continue to warrant state funding, Gropius enlisted Schlemmer, Klee, and Kandinsky as Masters. Laszlo Moholy-Nagy became Master of Form and took over the teaching of the Vorkurs upon Itten’s exit in 1923.

1922 was a major year for the Bauhaus, which saw the first students’ exhibition in Thüringen, mostly from the sculpture and weaving students, as they were
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the students making the most regular money from their endeavors. The Bauhaus established a housing cooperative in order to create a more cohesive community at the Bauhaus. Gropius encouraged the exhibition of works by the school’s apprentices and journeymen and even submitted a winning design work, “Lightning Strike”, for a competition sponsored by the Weimar City Museum, in commemoration of the victims of the Kapp Putsch of March 1920. In addition, an architecture exhibition at the Bauhaus featuring works by Gropius and Meyer’s architectural firm culminated in the firm’s entrance into the Chicago Tribune competition for new office designs; their modern design of a high-rise of glass and metal won critical praise and marked the new direction towards the New Objectivity.

In March 1923, the Thuringian parliament met in Weimar to decide upon the matter of funding for the Bauhaus. Defending the Bauhaus from the rumors of being Communists (among other “crimes”), Gropius referred to the need for transferring emphasis from handicrafts to industry, but also pointed out the difficulty participating in the everyday life of Thuringia without commissions and orders from local industry. The SPD Minister of Education suggested that while he still felt that the Bauhaus in Weimar was a boon for Germany, it would be advantageous for the Bauhaus to focus its efforts and education at developing the school’s ties with industry. The resulting agreement to continue financing the Bauhaus came with the request that the school actively contribute culturally and effectively to industrial production and to the construction industry. However, the economic environment was such that the Bauhaus yet needed to find further sources of funding in order to survive.

In 1923, Gropius wrote an essay entitled, “The Theory and Organization of the Bauhaus”, an updated treatise on his original manifesto. In it, he tried to reconcile his original vision with one that could also satisfy the needs of the times. He had been influenced by visiting Dutch artist, Theo van Doesburg who, in 1921, set up a separate studio in Weimar and drawing many students from the Bauhaus into his circle of influence. A proponent of the movement, De Stijl, Van Doesburg championed the Constructivist pragmatic, functional approach and trumpeted the principles of objectivity, impersonality, machine production and technology in the face of
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modernity. While these ideas were at odds with the Bauhaus’ early principles of Expressionism and individual craftsmanship, the rationale, especially in the face of the economic environment, had yet resonated with Gropius. In addition, Van Doesburg, several Bauhaus teachers and students formed *KURI / konstruktiv, utilitär, rational und international* (Constructive, Utilitarian, Rational, International), a short-lived group that nudged the Bauhaus closer to Constructivism. Van Doesburg also inserted stylistic influence into the Bauhaus that became obvious when *DeStijl*-influenced motifs of primary colors and designs with geometric shapes in blocks of solid color began to appear in Bauhaus designs. It was due to his influence, also, that Gropius instituted Moholy-Nagy as the *Vorkurs* instructor to follow Johannes Itten. Moholy-Nagy steered the preliminary course away from Romanticism and Expressionism and in line with the New Objectivity and Realism increasingly favored by Gropius.

Also in 1923, as per the demand by the Thuringian State Government that the Bauhaus justify its funding, the Bauhaus put on its first major exhibition, which ran from April to August. Gropius presented his updated treatise which reflected his new vision, “*Kunst und Technik – eine neues Einheit*” (“Art and Technology – a new unity”), at the opening of the first Bauhaus exhibition, in which several of the Masters put their works on display at their first Weimar exhibition of art in Thuringia. While the exhibition was largely a critical success, within the community of Weimar, the Bauhaus continued to be seen as controversial and an antithesis to German culture. The local press renewed its attacks on the Bauhaus, the harshest critique citing “inconsistent, anachronistic program and its petit-bourgeois tendencies”. After the exhibition, although the Bauhaus received industrial orders and extra funds, and the workshops continued to be prolific and successful, due to the deteriorating, economic situation in Germany, the resulting hyperinflation served to diminish these extra gains.

In February 1924, in addition to the opposition the Bauhaus already faced from the right-wing, the Nationalists and from the local press (which called for its closure), the Nationalists wrested control of the Thuringian parliament from the SDP. In addition, a series of decisions made the Bauhaus’ operation in Weimar untenable. The Ministry of Education dropped its budget from 146,000 to 50,000 marks and placed
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the staff on six-month contracts. The Thuringian chamber of auditors concluded that the Bauhaus was unprofitable and moved to terminate Gropius and the Masters’ contracts by the end of 1925. These decisions resulted in several intellectuals and supporters of the Bauhaus, including Marc Chagall and Albert Einstein, to form a “Freundeskreis” (Circle of Friends) and to write an open letter protesting the treatment of the Bauhaus, followed by an announcement of closure of the school by April 1925 at the latest. In the meantime, however, production in the workshops continued and during this relatively short period of time, many works in furniture, textile and metal were produced by the Masters as well as by graduates of the school, who now possessed the essential professional and technical skills in addition to their intrinsic and learned abilities. Among them, a table lamp designed Wilhelm Wagenfeld, a journeyman student who conceived the lamp as for an assignment given to him by Bauhaus Master Moholy-Nagy, a design still reproduced today.

Figure 1: Wagenfeld Lamp (Photo/NCS)

By the time of the closing of the Bauhaus, the German currency’s value had been stabilized by two main events: the formation of the German Reichsbank; and the

Dawes Plan, constructed by American, Charles Dawes and German, Gustav Stresemann, that specified that Germany was no longer required to pay war reparations and provided Germany with 800 million gold marks in loans from the US in order to reboot the German economy.\textsuperscript{64} Gropius and the Masters, in searching for alternative sources of funding, were also looking for a more politically-friendly location for the Bauhaus. The town of Dessau, with an SPD majority, made the larger effort to court the Bauhaus. Dessau’s mayor, Fritz Hesse, had already visited the Bauhaus with a delegation in order to attend a lecture given by Gropius. In addition, he invited Gropius and Kandinsky to Dessau to give a talk to an audience of a thousand, which included several ministers of the State of Saxony-Anhalt and other prominent citizens. Major supporters of the Bauhaus in Dessau included art historian and state supervisor of historic monuments, Ludwig Grote and aviation pioneer and inventor, Hugo Junker, who owned the airplane manufacturing plant in Dessau; both regarded the Bauhaus in a practical light, as an organization that could help with issues such as the shortage of affordable housing for workers in industrial regions, and also as an influential cultural boon to the city.\textsuperscript{65} In the end, the Bauhaus decided in favor of Dessau and left Weimar for good. Remaining in Weimar in its place was a school of industrial design, eventually named the Technical University of Architecture and Civil Engineering, installed with teachers and staff in line with the conservative political regime. Today, this university is known as the Bauhaus University Weimar.

2.3 The Bauhaus-Dessau: 1925-1931

In March 1925, the Bauhaus officially moved 164km northwest to Dessau. All but one of the masters moved with the Bauhaus; among them, Kandinsky, Klee, Moholy-Nagy, and Schlemmer. The Bauhaus period in Dessau began with a series of changes. A business manager/financial director was brought on board and in the autumn of 1925, the Bauhaus was incorporated as a limited liability corporation, thanks to funds provided by building contractor, Adolf Sommerfeld, a long-time supporter of the Bauhaus. The \textit{Vorkurs} was extended from six months to one year.


Some of the workshops were renamed, restructured, or entirely dropped in order to place the emphasis on modern industrial demands; for example, the printing department became the advertising department and pottery was dropped. Also, workshops began to be partially taught by the Junior Masters, chosen from the journeymen graduates. Among the students who went with the Bauhaus to Dessau were Herbert Bayer (advertising and typography), Marcel Breuer (cabinetmaking), and Gunta Stöhlzle (textiles). These former students who became Junior Masters, along with another former student-turned-instructor at the Bauhaus, Josef Albers (stained glass and handicrafts), represented a new generation of instructors who were trained at the Bauhaus, held the joint qualification in arts and craft, and therefore were products of Bauhaus pedagogical philosophy.

Re-energized, the Bauhaus in Dessau entered a phase of major production and creativity, right down to the very building in which the school was housed in; one of the stipulations of the move to Dessau was the provision of a building. To this end, Gropius proposed to the Dessau municipal council, plans for an architectural complex consisting of a workshop building, a school building and a student dormitory with 28 studio apartments. Arranged asymmetrically in wings, the main Bauhaus building, made of glass and reinforced concrete, had no clear entrance as there was no central perspective and the design of the outside walls of the building corresponded to the different interior spaces of the different wings. The façade of the students’ dormitory is distinguished in the east by individual balconies and in the south by long balconies that continue around the corner of the building. One of the most striking aspects of the building was the suspended, overlapping, glass wall that was wrapped around the building and its corners, allowing the viewer to see the constructive elements around the supporting framework on the inside of the building. The visual effect, which created an “impression of lightness”, embodied Gropius’ philosophy to “develop freely an architectural order derived from science and technology”. The color scheme of the building also reflected the Bauhaus principles. The entire complex was rendered and painted mainly in light tones, creating an attractive contrast to the window frames, which are dark. The interior was designed by differentiating between supporting and masking elements through the use of color, aimed to accentuate the

construction of the building. In addition to the Bauhaus building itself, plans were rendered for the Masters’ homes, including a stand-alone residence for the director. The houses, which sheltered Gropius and the Bauhaus Masters and their families as well as various guests, were based on a pre-fab, interlocking, concrete, cubic design. Although the semi-detached buildings were mirror images of each other, the variations in the interiors were amplified by the resident artists tastes, preferences, and color schemes and were all populated with modern furnishings.

Thus, the Bauhaus was finally operating in an atmosphere which allowed it to flourish. Master of Form and of the Bauhaus Theatre Workshop, and conceiver of the “Triadisches Ballet”, Oskar Schlemmer wrote: “If today's arts love the machine, technology and organization, if they aspire to precision and reject anything vague and dreamy, this implies an instinctive repudiation of chaos and a longing to find the form appropriate to our times.” Focusing on the Bauhaus slogan of “Art into Industry”, the cabinetmaking, metalworking, textile, and typography workshops proved fertile training grounds for Bauhaus-influenced style which would resonate for decades after the school closed. Furthermore, in addition to the workshops, in 1927, Swiss architect, Herman Meyer joined the Bauhaus and presided over the formalized architectural department along with his business partner, Hans Wittwer.

Through the workshops and the Masters, the school’s practical philosophy was effectively disseminated. The cabinetmaking workshop was led by former student, Marcel Breuer from 1924 to 1928. His popular workshop was focused on furniture designs that were intended to translate conventional forms into minimalistic forms. In 1925, the year he became a Junior Master, Breuer conceived a design for a chair that stemmed from his theory that chairs would eventually become obsolete and that people would eventually be sitting on columns of air. Breuer was inspired by the metal tubular bend of his new bicycle’s frames and surmised that he could create a light, steel-framed chair using the similar technique. The chair’s prototype, designated the “B3” in the 1920’s, laid the foundation for creating lightweight, mass-producible metal chairs for domestic use and has been called the “Wassily Chair” since 1969, when it returned from a hiatus in production. Chairs such as these and others designed
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by Breuer are now considered ubiquitous and mainstream. In an interview taken sometime between 1977-1979, Breuer described the conception of the B3:

That is how the first chair was made... I realized that the bending had to go further. It should only be bent with no points of welding on it so it could also be chromed in parts and put together. That is how the first Wassily was born. I was myself somewhat afraid of criticism. I didn’t tell anyone I was doing these experiments actually. [Wassily] Kandinsky, who came by chance to my studio when the first chair was brought in, said, “What’s this?” He was very interested and then the Bauhaus got very interested in it. A year later, I had furnished the whole Bauhaus with this furniture. (Knoll, 2014)

Metalworking was also a popular Bauhaus workshop, in which craftspeople such as Marianne Brandt (the first woman to study at the metalworking workshop), Wilhelm Wagenfeld, and Christian Dell, designed items such as lighting fixtures and tableware. During this time, Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, Lucia Moholy (his wife, a photographer and printing specialist) and Walter Gropius published the “Bauhaus Books”—a series of 14 books that highlighted the accomplishments of the Bauhaus, including monographic contributions by German and international authors—to spread awareness and to promote understanding for the movement in all its diversity. In 1928, following Moholy-Nagy’s tenure as director of the metal workshop, Marianne
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Brandt became his successor. Brandt, a prolific and talented designer, produced work that epitomized the Bauhaus aesthetic, particularly in regards to industrial forms. For example, one of Brandt’s hallmark pieces was a geometrically stylistic silver and ebony teapot that fully displayed the aesthetics of the Bauhaus. While it was never mass produced, with its non-drip spout and heat-resistant ebony handle, it was designed with particular attention to functionality and ease of use.\textsuperscript{71} The metalworking workshop at the Bauhaus was the most successful division in developing design templates for mass production.

The typography workshop also gained importance under the leadership of Moholy-Nagy and Herbert Bayer (graphic designer). In this workshop, promotional materials were produced for the Bauhaus, particularly distinguishable by their use of sans serif and stylistic lower case lettering, and when combined with photography, served to illustrate the Bauhaus’ particular style and became progressively more tied to corporate identity and advertising, the particular Bauhaus’ typography style also served as a visual vehicle of marketing for the Bauhaus.\textsuperscript{72} It was also at this time that the Bauhaus GmbH (a limited liability company) was founded, enabling the students’ direct participation and acknowledgement of their role in the success of products developed at the Bauhaus.\textsuperscript{73}

Designer and weaver, Gunta Stölzl headed the textile workshop that, among other endeavors, developed abstract textile designs used also in the Bauhaus buildings. In her workshop, students studied color theory and design as well as the technical aspects of weaving and were encouraged to experiment with varied materials like cellophane, fiberglass, and metal. The weaving studios were largely populated by female students as they were mostly relegated to weaving for fashion houses and industrial production while the male students participated in the painting, carving and eventually in the architecture workshops.\textsuperscript{74} However, fortunately for the Bauhaus, the fabric conceived in these workshops was consistently commercially successful and brought much-needed funds. Moreover, despite the limitations placed upon them,
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several exceptional female artists emerged from the Bauhaus, like Marguerite Friedlaender-Wildenhain (ceramicist) and Anne Albers (textile artist and printmaker).\textsuperscript{75}

In 1926, the Bauhaus changed its name from the \textit{Staatliches Bauhaus} (State Bauhus) to the \textit{Bauhaus - Hochschule für Gestaltung} (Bauhaus - School of Design) and with the new title came new changes. Whereas in Weimar, the students received a Journeyman Certificate at the end of their studies, graduates now received a diploma. The Masters were henceforth known as Professors, as were the graduates, who upon matriculation, were absorbed into Bauhaus. Courses based on industrial design were now the sole focus of the curriculum and the artistic subjects were phased out. Even the popular dress code altered to suit the modernity: Men wore close-cut suits, and the women wore their hair in a bob and wore pants or skirts just to the knee.\textsuperscript{76} However, even as the Bauhaus at Dessau seemed to flourish, its existence fomented resentment among the middle class residents of Dessau due to its use of municipal funds, which encroached upon finance for housing. In addition, the Bauhaus’ openly bohemian and alternative lifestyle was not entirely accepted within the community. The touted and perceived cultural value added by the Bauhaus was lost upon the surrounding population, already at the mercy of the encroaching global economic crisis. Once again, the Bauhaus was battling for its political survival. In 1928, fed up with having to deal with the political pressure, Gropius handed the reins of the directorship over to Hannes Meyer and moved to Berlin in order to further his own architectural career.\textsuperscript{77}

Hannes Meyer’s leadership of the Bauhaus, although relatively financially successful for the Bauhaus, was controversial and brief. His design philosophy, “\textit{Die neue Baulehre}” (“The New Way to Build”), took the emphasis away from artistic intuition and the principals, and placed it on the social function of architecture and on designs that could meet the requirements of industry and mass-production as well the requirements of an egalitarian social ideal that, in turn, placed the emphasis on the public good rather than on private luxury.\textsuperscript{78} In the workshops, Meyer split the sciences from the arts and introduced subjects pertaining to technology, natural science and the humanities, photography within the advertising department, and lessons in urban

\textsuperscript{75} Glancey, “Haus Proud”.
\textsuperscript{76} Bauhaus Dessau, “Dessau Period 1925-1932 – Prosperity of Bauhaus”.
\textsuperscript{78} Metropolitan Museum of Art, “The Bauhaus, 1919–1933”.
planning. Meyer also garnered the Bauhaus two substantial building commissions that finally had the school making a profit - five apartment buildings in Dessau and the headquarters of the Federal School of the German Trade Unions (ADGB) in Bernau. However, despite his financial successes at the Bauhaus, Meyer’s radical, communist political views became a danger to the school’s existence. He also failed to put a stop to any of the 166 students’ increasingly radical political activities. In Dessau, the Nazis deemed the Bauhaus “un-German” and labeled its design ideas “entartete Kunst” (degenerate art). In August 1930, Meyer was dismissed and he and several students moved to Moscow.

In 1930, German architect, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe became the Bauhaus’ last director. Under his leadership, the school orientated towards architecture while the workshops, the Interior Design department, and the preliminary courses were eliminated, and the architecture departments were merged into one building. However, due to the increasingly hostile surrounding political climate, the diminishing lack of socio-political context caused teachers like Klee and Stölzl to leave the Bauhaus. Van der Rohe, wanting to distance the Bauhaus from political controversy, banned all political activity; several students were expelled as a result. With the discontinuation of the Bauhaus GmbH and its production lines, the Bauhaus also lost much of its independent revenue. As the chances of survival of the Bauhaus became increasingly slim, efforts were made to keep it open, including a failed petition by the students and an article written by Bauhaus supporters. The Bauhaus also organized a festival exhibit in which each Bauhaus Master designed an exhibit of their own. The festival was somewhat of a success, but in the end, just one year after Van der Rohe took office, the city council of Dessau, now dominated by the Nazi party, passed a resolution to abolish funding for the Bauhaus. Consequently, all of the instructors were dismissed and the Bauhaus in Dessau was ordered closed by September 1932.

Van der Rohe tried vainly to save the Bauhaus school by securing rights to the Bauhaus name and license profits and also by moving the school to Berlin in October 1932. The short-lived Bauhaus in Berlin, called the Independent Institute of Teaching and Research, was essentially Van der Rohe’s private school and was housed in an old
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telephone factory. However, in April 1933, the school was searched by the Sturmabteilung/SA (Storm Detachment), the paramilitary organization of the Nazi party, and resulted in the arrest of 32 students. By July 1933, the Bauhaus in Germany was closed for good. In subsequent years, many of the Masters and students of the Bauhaus emigrated to the United States where their ideals and work have continued to influence generations upon generations of designers and architects. Breuer and Albers taught at Yale, Gropius at Harvard, and Moholy-Nagy eventually founded what was to become part of the Chicago Institute of Design, now part of the Illinois Institute of Technology.

2.4 Reaching UNESCO World Heritage Status

In 1943, during World War II, an air raid completely destroyed the inside of the Bauhaus School in Dessau and badly damaged the Director’s and Masters’ Houses. This could have been the end of the Bauhaus in Germany, however, in the following years, the main school building was patched up and used as a school. Actual reconstruction and restoration work on the school was only initiated in 1956. Then, in 1974, after years of opposition, the political climate was favorable enough to have the Bauhaus school building listed as one of the German Democratic Republic’s (GDR) Significant Monuments. Reconstruction began in earnest in accordance with the preservation measures of the time, and in 1992, work finally began on the Director’s and Masters’ Houses.

In the successive years, three organizations were established within the Bauhaus. A Wissenschaftlich-Kulturelles Zentrum/WKZ (Academic Cultural Centre) was created and tasked with re-discovering Bauhaus history by re-building, re-claiming and exhibiting the Bauhaus collection and revitalizing the Bauhaus theatre through cultural events. In 1994, the WKZ, together with the Educational Center (1984) and the Center for Design (1986) coalesced to form the Dessau Bauhaus Foundation, officially established by city, state and federal government entities. The Dessau Bauhaus Foundation, comprised of three departments—the Workshop, the Collection and the Academy—was tasked with the missions “to preserve, transmit and study the legacy of the historic Bauhaus, as well as to contribute to solving the

problems involved in designing today’s environment”. Thus fortified for almost a decade, in 1994, the Bauhaus Sites at Dessau (Federal State of Saxony-Anhalt) and Weimar (Free State of Thuringia) were submitted by Germany (as a UNESCO State Party) for consideration onto the UNESCO World Heritage List. The sites proposed were the Bauhaus school building and the Masters’ Houses in Dessau and the Main building of the Weimar Academy for Architecture and Building Arts University, The Van de Velde building of the Academy for Architecture and Building Arts University, and the “Haus am Horn” in Weimar.

![Bauhaus Building by Walter Gropius](Photo/NCS)

Figure 3: Bauhaus Building by Walter Gropius (Photo/NCS)
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The Bauhaus building in Dessau is a central work of European modern art, embodying an avant-garde conception directed towards a radical renewal of architecture and design in a unique and widely influential way. From the point of view of art history this building must be considered to be one of the most important monuments of modern building style and as a building that most fully reflects the creative principles of Functionalism. It stands at the very beginning of the worldwide development of this type of building complex. The power of its artistic expression is not equaled by any other Functionalist building. (ICOMOS, 1996)

In 1996, the bid for UNESCO World Heritage Site Status was successful, and the Bauhaus became the 18th German site to be listed. The criteria by which the UNESCO World Heritage Committee deemed the sites worthy of cultural heritage were the following: (ii) the Bauhaus building in Dessau is a central work of European modern art, embodying an avant-garde conception directed towards a radical renewal of architecture and design in a unique and widely influential way; (iv) the Bauhaus itself and the other buildings designed by the masters of the Bauhaus are fundamental representatives of Classical Modernism and as such are essential components of the image of their period of the 20th century; and (vi) the Bauhaus architectural school was the foundation of the Modern Movement which was to revolutionize artistic and architectural thinking and practice in the 20th century.85

After its inscription, further projects were undertaken, including the full re-design and restoration of the Directors’ and Masters’ Houses, based on an original design which used Bauhaus architectural principles, a project completed in May 2014.

Also in 2014, the Bauhaus was successful in adding another two properties to the official German Tentative UNESCO List—an apartment complex project (1930) designed by Hannes Meyer in Dessau and General German Trade Union Confederation (ADGB) trade union school building (1928), designed by a Bauhaus team in Bernau [in the State of Brandenburg]. Further analysis of the UNESCO World Heritage status of the Bauhaus sites in Weimar and Dessau will be presented in the final chapter of this thesis. Next, in neighboring Saxony, is Leipzig, a city with one of the richest classical musical histories in the world, and where the Leipzig Notenspur is located.
Chapter 3: The Notenspur - Leipzig

3.1 Origins and the Sites

Known as the “The City of Music”, Leipzig, Germany was established around 1015 AD. Home to composers Johann Sebastian Bach, Richard Wagner, Gustav Mahler, Franz Schumann, and Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy, Leipzig holds everything from Bach’s final resting place at the Thomaskirche (where he was resident Music Director) to the Grassi Museum of Musical instruments (which houses valuable and rare European instruments spanning from the Renaissance to the present), to The Arabian Coffee Tree cafe (where Robert Schumann and friends debated themes of music and life over cigars). Even today, Leipzig has not lost its integral relationship to music and has an abundance of musical heritage to offer, set around its historical composers’ residences, archives, music halls, museums, and music libraries. Adding to the general ambiance, a myriad of musical events and festivals take place over the course of the year, including a Honkytonk Night, Jazz Week, alternative bands during GothFest, and the internationally-renowned Bach Fest.

In 1996, local Professor of Physics, Werner Schneider—prompted by an observation by his wife, who noticed that the house of her favourite composer, Robert Schumann, was so completely dwarfed by the modern traffic trappings of two major auto thoroughfares that it was even difficult for interested parties to find—began to wonder where all the other sites that showcased centuries of musical life in Leipzig were located. Dr. Schneider, an avid fan of classical music, made a list of all the most important sites pertaining to Leipzig’s musical history and then realized that if he could link the sites in some tangible way, he could bring them more readily to the public. As Dr. Schneider, himself, articulated:

Music connects and we make this connection audible and visible. In Leipzig, we have been entrusted with a great musical heritage of global significance. And mainly, we do not want to keep it to ourselves, but we want to share it with as many people as possible because the great music which evolved in the midst of us does not belong to us alone, but to all. (Schneider, 2013)
Thus evolved the idea for the Leipzig Notenspur (Leipzig Music Trail). Between 1996 and 1998, Dr. Schneider enlisted locally-based cohorts from organizations and establishments like The Robert and Clara Schumann Association, the Grieg Memorial Centre and the Grassi Museum of Musical Instruments. Together with several musically-motivated volunteers, they conceived a plan featuring 23 sites ranging from houses to museums to churches, strewn in and around the city of Leipzig, which can be visited during a leisurely stroll through the city.

The sites were as follows:

1. The Neues Gewandhaus (New Gewandhaus), completed in 1981, is one of the finest music halls in the world. It is the third home of the Gewandhaus Orchestra (ca. 1781), which once boasted Felix Mendelssohn as its musical director. The hall was encouraged by both Erich Honecker (Head of State of the German Democratic Republic in 1981) as well as by the Gewandhaus Orchestra’s then musical director, world-renowned conductor, Kurt Masur. Years later, Masur played a major role in the “Peaceful Revolution” in the autumn of 1989, when he made the hall available for roundtable discussions about the future of East Germany. A popular venue for visiting musicians from around the world and in varied genres, the hall continues to play a major and vital role in Leipzig’s musical environment.

2. The Oper Leipzig (Leipzig Opera House), opened in 1960, was built on the same site as its predecessor, the New Theatre (destroyed in 1943), which was built on the site of the Old Theatre (ca. 1766), originally named the Komödien (House of Comedies). While special focus was given to works by Mozart, Weber and Gluck, particular pains were taken to perform works by Wagner. In 1878, it was the site of the first performance of his “Ring Cycle” outside of the Bayreuth Festival Theatre, where it had traditionally been performed since Wagner’s day. The opera house is home not only to the Leipzig Opera, but also to the ballet company.

3. The Mitteldeutscher Rundfunk (MDR - Central German Broadcasting Station) building, home to MDR Symphony Orchestra (ca. 1923) as well as to the MDR Radio choir and the MDR Children’s Choir, is linked to the Gewandaus by a glass bridge, an intentional physical link “symbolizing that there are not two separate houses music at Augustusplatz,
but a huge centre of music at the heart of the city”. The shiny, black cube of a building, designed by German architect, Peter Kulka, was finished in 2001 with rooms specially equipped for sound recordings. The musical entities housed within are busy throughout the year with public concerts, several opera performances, as well as the production of soundtracks for MDR’s radio and television programs.

4. The **Grieg-Begegnungsstätte (Grieg Memorial Centre)** was the Leipzig guest residence of Norwegian-born, Edvard Grieg, composer of the Peter Gynt Suite (written in Leipzig in 1888). Grieg knew Leipzig well, having studied for four years at the music conservatory founded by Felix Mendelssohn and gaining a great many ties in the city, including an exclusive contract with the music publishing house of C.F. Peters, which was based in Leipzig at that time. In its common room, Grieg hosted Johannes Brahms and Peter Illyich Tchaikovsky. Today, that same room is a concert hall as well as a friendship space for German and Norwegian citizens.

5. The **Ehemalige Musikbibliotek Peters (Former Peters Music Library)** houses musical manuscripts comprised of approximately 500 autographed scores, the most valuable by Bach, Haydn, Mendelssohn, Schumann, Brahms and Grieg. Founded in 1800, the building originally contained the “Bureau de Musique” - part publishing house, part sheet music and music retailer. In 1880, the building was converted into the world’s first public music reference library by publisher Max Abraham (a close friend of Edvard Grieg’s), who named it the Musikbibliothek Peters/ Peters Music Library, as the building had been owned since 1814 by bookseller Carl Friedrich Peters. Today, it remains a lending library as part of the Leipzig library system.

6. Bartolomeo Cristofori, Italian inventor of the pianoforte, lived and worked in Padua and Florence during the second half of the 17th century. Only 10 instruments crafted by Cristofori have survived; five are in Leipzig’s **Grassi Museum fur Musikinstrumente (Grassi Museum of Musical Instruments)**. The museum houses the largest collection of musical instruments in Germany.
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(as well as the world’s oldest intact pianoforte). First opened in May of 1929, the Grassi Museum was deemed part of the university and was used for teaching and research. Today, it serves the very same purpose and is also part of the Leipzig library system.

7. Clara and Robert Schumann’s flat housed the influential musical couple from 1840 to 1844 as they hosted salons with contemporaries like Mendelssohn, Liszt, Berlioz, Wagner, and Hans Christian Andersen. Wrote Robert Schumann in his marriage diary, “We often indulge in our little garden. After all, I enjoy being in my Inselstrasse so much that I have no desire for anything else.” Today, the Schumann-Haus (Schumann House) is a private primary school with an emphasis on the arts. It also holds special exhibitions like Schumann’s piano sheet music as well as a piano the couple used to compose upon. It also serves as a concert hall and is open for regular use.

8. Breitkopf & Härtel, Brockhaus, C & F Peters are some of the publishing houses located east of the city centre in the Grafisches Viertel (Graphic Quarter). In 1719, Bernhard Christoph Breitkopf started his publishing house in the Graphic Quarter, the first music publishing house in the world. Breitkopf Publishing signed on composers such as Hadyn, Mozart and Beethoven. In 1795, after some financial difficulties, Breitkopf’s son, Johann Gottlieb Immanuel, formed a company with Christopher Härtel, which survives today. By 1900, the Graphic Quarter boasted over 2,200 branches of companies involved in bookselling, music publishing, music selling, print shops, binderies, stationary shops and more. During World War II, however, 80 percent of the quarter was destroyed and 50 million books were estimated lost. Breitkopf and Härtel and C&F Peters both still have branches in Leipzig.89

9. One night in 1796, Constanze Mozart, travelled to Leipzig from Berlin in possession of the score to W.A. Mozart’s Requiem Mass, which was to be performed on April 20th at the Gewandhaus. She stayed at the Hôtel de Saxe, a hotel which has sheltered many famous guests, including Goethe, Napoleon and Chopin. The hotel held concerts, music society meetings, and was also the birthplace of the independent workers educational society,
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Vorwarts (Forward), in 1865. The building suffered heavy damage during World War II, but was rebuilt in 1978 and finally remodelled in 2010 as a business complex.90

10. At the instigation of Robert Schumann, a secret society of musicians and wandering artists called “The League of David” would meet at the Zum Arabischen Coffe Baum (The Arabian Coffee Tree). This cafe was where this creative group discussed the state of music and the arts in Germany, Schumann founded the “Neue Zeitschrift fur Musik” (New Journal of Music) with Friedrich Wieck (his father-in-law) and several other colleagues. Among other notables frequenting the coffeehouse were Johann Christoph Gottsched (author, critic and philosopher), Goethe, Liszt and Mendelssohn. Ca. 1711, the cafe is one of the oldest remaining coffee houses in Europe and houses a museum as well as a Schumann room.

11. Clara Josephine Wieck Schumann was the daughter of two accomplished musicians. She made her solo debut at the old Gewandhaus at age 11 and eventually made her own impact upon the Classicist Romantic music scene. British music critic, J. A. Fuller Maitland later wrote of her, “The tiny list of her compositions contains things of such deep feeling, such real power, and such high attainment, that in strict justice, no account of German music [...] could be complete without reference to them.”91 A plaque is all that remains on the site (now a shopping mall), of the Geburtshaus Clara Wieck (Clara Wieck’s Birthplace) in recognition of the pianist and composer.

12. The word, “Gewandhaus” means textile house, a building where cloth was traded. The building originally housed a as a hall of cloth makers, armoury, and the municipal library. After the first concert hall was established, in 1743, a concert society was founded by wealthy merchants who funded a group of 16 musicians called “Große Concerte”, a name which survives today. The concerts they gave were called “Gewandhaus Concerts” and the ensemble ultimately became known as the Gewandhaus Orchestra. In 1884, the orchestra moved out of the Erstes Gewandhaus (First Gewandaus) into its new home.

90 Leipzig Notenspur Initiative, Leipziger Notenspur, 37.
A plaque marking its entrance is located at the *Städtisches Kaufhaus* (Trade Fair).

13. In 1835, at age 26, Berliner, Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy was named resident director of the Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchestra – a post he held until his death in 1847. Today, the *Mendelssohn-Haus* (Mendelssohn House), in which he held salons for his friends (including the Schumanns and Hans Christian Andersen) and the public, is run by The Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy Foundation as “living museum” with interactive displays and is used as a concert venue.²

14. Kurt Masur, Sir Adrian Boult, Leoš Janáček, Edvard Grieg, and Alfred Hill were all alumni of the *Hochschule für Musik und Theater Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy* (Felix Mendelssohn College of Music and Theatre). In its first incarnation as the Leipzig Conservatory of Music Mendelssohn, instructors included Felix Mendelssohn and the Schumanns. Opened in 1843, due largely through the efforts of Mendelssohn, *The Altes Konservatorium* (Old Conservatory) is the oldest institute of higher musical education in Germany and operates in conjunction with the Gewandhaus Orchestra, the *Oper Leipzig*, and the *Schauspiel Leipzig*.

15. In 1829, while studying at the *Alte Nikolaischule* (Old St. Nicholas School), 15 year-old Richard Wagner wrote two piano sonatas, a concert aria and a string quartet. The St. Nicholas School is one of the few original, surviving locations in Leipzig where Wagner left his mark. The school closed in 1872, but in the early 90’s, it was restored by the Leipzig Cultural Foundation and houses a restaurant, a museum and the Richard Wagner Auditorium.

16. J.S. Bach became music director of the *Thomaskirche* (St. Thomas Church) in 1723 and remained so until his death 27 years later, when he was buried in an unmarked grave at another church. His current resting place, however, is in the *Thomaskirche*, where his remains were moved in 1950. Today, the church celebrates its most famous Musical Director as the central venue of the yearly Bach Festival.

17. The Nikolaikirche (St. Nicholas Church) was, most recently in history, the site of the Monday Prayers for Peace that led to the Peaceful Demonstration on October 9th, 1989, which precipitated the fall of the Berlin Wall. However, it was also the site of J.S. Bach’s first performance as its Music Director. Bach was responsible for the programme at the Nikolaikirche and the Thomaskirche, as well as two other churches in Leipzig. The Nikolaikirche also debuted his St. John’s Passion and the Christmas Oratorio. Today, regular services as well as performances are held there.

18. In 1711, merchant and jewellery manufacturer, Georg Heinrich Bose and his family moved into the house to the south side of the St. Thomas Church at No. 16. When Bach and his family moved into the house connected to the St. Thomas School across the street, the two families became close. Today, the Bose House has been transformed into the Bach Museum, highlighting the life of the great artist and composer as well as containing the Bach Archive and Research Library. The Bach Archive contains items from the remaining inventory of the St Thomas Church, including the 44 original performing parts from Bach's second Leipzig cantata cycle and the chorale cantatas of 1724-25. In addition, there is a small concert hall and musicians’ gallery that can be rented for events.

19. In 2004, a 3.10 metre high sculpture of Ludwig von Beethoven was moved from the Gewandhaus to its final resting place in Leipzig at the newly built Museum der bildenden Kunste (Museum of Fine Arts), which houses some of Germany’s oldest collections (ca. 1500). Beethoven visited Leipzig only once in 1796, when he was a 25 - the age he composed his first concerto. Although due to health concerns, he never returned, many of his works were published in Leipzig between 1808 and 1812 under an exclusive contract with then Leipzig-based music publishers, Breitkopf & Härtel. The marble, alabaster, amber, bronze, ivory sculpture sits in the Klinger Hall, named after Leipzig-born artist and writer, Max Klinger, who conceived the monument in the 1880’s.
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20. Only a plaque on an outside wall of the shopping mall at Brühl 3 marks the location of Richard Wagner’s birthplace. Over the years, in between wars, revolutions and politics, several ineffectual efforts were made to commemorate the composer. In 1913, Max Klinger began the designs for a statue, but his death and World War I put a halt to the effort, however, a three meter base was almost completed and placed temporarily in the Leipzig Klinger Garden. Klinger’s design was not realized until 1983, when a bronze bust based on his drafts was erected in a park at Swan Lake, behind the opera house, during the “Richard Wagner Festival to the GDR”. In 2011, another competition was held to design a statue to complete the memorial. Finally, in May 2013, a completed Wagner-Denkmal (Wagner Memorial) was placed above the Leipzig Promenade Ring, a short walk from Wagner’s birthplace.

21. The Altes Rathaus (Old City Hall) contains the conductor’s podium from the first concert hall in Leipzig, at which Mozart, Strauss, Wagner, Clementi, Weber, Schumann, Liszt, Mendelssohn and many others once stood. In 1723, J.S. Bach signed his employment contract in the council chamber. The Old City Hall, built upon the original foundations of the older town hall (ca. 1480), has been a museum since 1906. Today, there are 1200 permanent exhibits recounting the history of Leipzig: Everyday Culture/Ethnology, Arts/Handicrafts, City and State History, Archaeology and Ancient History, Music and Theatre History, Economics, and Military History, Leipzig’s Musical History, a comprehensive photographic collection, a library and a sports exhibit.

22. The Paulinum – Aula und Universitätskirche St. Paul (Auditorium and University Church St. Paul) stands in the place of The St. Paul’s Church, which was built as a Dominican monastery in 1231, where Martin Luther preached and where J.S. Bach performed and directed services. In 1968, despite mass student protest, the venue, which had become the university’s church and played a vital role in student and community life, was demolished. However, the church was so important to Leipzig’s history and to the university, that in the early 2000’s, city officials held an international architectural competition in search of a new design. Finally, in 2009, a glass
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and concrete building, designed by a Norwegian architect, was opened up to the University of Leipzig and to the public and is now used as a common space, for academic ceremonies, concerts, conferences, and houses an art collection as well as institutional and administrative facilities. Currently, the church vestry is still being completed and artefacts and pieces from the original structure are being restored; several are on display to the public.

23. The final stop on the Notenspur is the original resting place of Johann Sebastian Bach, the Alter Johannisfriedhof (Old St. John’s Cemetery) where he remained hidden in an unmarked grave until 1894. When it was decided that St. John’s church would be rebuilt and enlarged, then rector, Pastor G. Transchel decided that a search was to be made for Bach’s bones. After Bach’s remains were discovered, they were interred in a vault at the newly rebuilt St. John’s Church. When the church was destroyed in World War II, Bach’s remains were moved to the Thomaskirche. No longer in active use, it is now a museum park that contains the graves of people such as Wagner’s mother and sister and Carl Friedrich Zollner, among other philosophers, writers, and activists.

3.2 The UNESCO Application

The Leipzig Notenspur (Leipzig Music Trail), as Dr. Werner Schneider and his team conceived it, was refused permission twice by the Leipzig city planners, once in 1998 and once in 2003. In the autumn of 2005, several employees, officials and professionals from local music organizations, museums and engineering firms, among them, the Schumann Association, the Grieg Memorial Centre and the Grassi Museum of Musical Instruments in Leipzig, the Verein der Freunde des Bauingenieur- und Wirtschaftsingenieurwesens der Universität Leipzig e. V (The Construction and Industrial Engineering Friends’ Association of Leipzig University), the Leipzig Hochschule für Grafik und Buchkunst Leipzig (Leipzig Academy of Visual Arts), submitted a study which illustrated the feasibility of the Leipzig Notenspur—culturally, technically and fiscally—and outlined why the music trail would be beneficial to Leipzig. Finally, in 2006, Dr. Schneider and his team received
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permission to proceed. Still, the next hurdle was financial and it took the next six years to find the funding.

In the ensuing years, Dr. Schneider and his team obtained further funds from the City of Leipzig and local institutions and also received support and exposure from the Leipzig Tourism and Marketing Board. As more supporters and collaborators materialized from within the community, developments for further plans were solidified for the Notenspur and Notenrad (Musical Bike Ride) among other projects. Sponsors included the Leipzig Gewandhaus, The University of Leipzig, the Mitteldeutscher Rundfunk (MDR) Orchestra and Choir, The Leipzig Opera, and the Cottbus University World Heritage Studies Department, and eventually grew to include around 41 organizations from the Leipzig area and surroundings. In a direct bid to involve the community, a design contest, which ran from July to September 2007, offered a reward given by the Notenspur Initiative and the Leipzig Tourist Service for the best Notenspur route guidance system. This resulted in a proposed and eventually implemented design of stylized, metal, curved arrows which, embedded into the pavement or cobblestones, placed in front of each Notenspur site, and point the way through the city. In addition to the educational information in both German and English on blue signs at each site, is a phone number which can be called to hear musical audio clips. In 2008, the Leipzig City Council officially approved the project.

The UNESCO Initiative began shortly after the Leipzig Notenspur was approved by the Leipzig City Council. At end of 2008, the Notenspur team partnered with Cottbus University to initiate the UNESCO application process. Established in 1999, Cottbus University was the first university to have a World Heritage Studies programme with a curriculum built specifically around the UNESCO Heritage Convention. Officially recognized by UNESCO, the university assisted with the application as it had the relevant academic resources and expertise. In 2010, the application was submitted to the state government of Saxony for consideration for inclusion onto its Tentative List, for consideration to be submitted at the federal level. In the meantime, progress was being made with the promotion and implementation of the Notenspur, as well as with the implementation of the Notenspur’s various related
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projects. Most importantly, the Notenspur Fördervereine (“Friends of the Notenspur”) was formed, a volunteer organization that spearheaded and organized many of the Notenspur’s events, initiatives and projects. The “Lebendige Stadt” Foundation (Living City), a national organization based in Berlin that supports creative urban design projects, provided funds for the Notenwand (completed in April 2013), an educational, interactive touch-panel wall that teaches about the development of musical notes. In addition, through the joint planning and advertising efforts of the Notenspur Initiative and the Leipzig Tourism and Marketing Board, the installation of the Notenspur route and audio guidance system was completed by May 2012. On May 12th, 2012, the Leipzig Notenspur was inaugurated by the city in a city-wide parade and festival with musicians, dancers, a speech by the mayor, and even with the premier of an original composition by the Director of the St. Thomas Church Boys’ Choir.

Figure 5: Notenspur Information Station (Photo/NCS)
One month later, in June 2012, the government of the Free State of Saxony promoted two sites from its Tentative UNESCO List to the list of properties for consideration for inclusion onto the German Tentative UNESCO List. The Leipzig Notenspur was one of them, however only eight of the 23 sites on the trail were chosen to be included in the application: the Bose House / Bach Museum, the Mendelssohn House, the Schumann House, the Grieg Memorial House, the St. Thomas Church, the St. Nicholas Church, the "Zum Arabischen Coffee Baum" cafe, and the Old Conservatory of the "Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy" School for Music and Theatre.\textsuperscript{99} Under the title, "Leipzig Music Trail - Places of European Music History", the application was submitted as a cultural heritage site, in consideration of UNESCO World Heritage Selection Criteria (ii) and (iv). (See Appendix A) The Leipzig Notenspur Initiative—the group of people within the Notenspur Fördervereine, tasked with the UNESCO bid—then waited until the summer of 2014 to hear the further results of their efforts. In Germany, the Tentative List is decided by the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder in the Federal Republic of Germany (KMK), and unfortunately they chose not to submit the Leipzig Notenspur application for consideration to the German Tentative UNESCO list. This outcome is critiqued in Chapter Five. Next is the final site featured in this study - The Old Jewish Synagogue & Testimonies, located in Erfurt, the capital of the State of Thuringia.

Chapter 4. The Old Jewish Synagogue & Testimonies
– Erfurt

4.1 Origins

To the southwest of Leipzig, the river Gera weaves through the picturesque, medieval city of Erfurt in the State of Thuringia. Leipzig may have been J.S. Bach’s final choice of residence, but Erfurt was the birthplace of his father, Johann Ambrosius Bach, and where several other members of the Bach family were employed as musicians. Erfurt also educated, sheltered and nurtured the philosopher and theologian, Martin Luther, within the walls of its university and then at the Augustine monastery. However, it is Erfurt’s Jewish history, which left an indelible mark upon the area, which will be put forth by Germany for consideration by UNESCO.

The original name of the river Gera was the river “Erphes”. Erphes (Latin: brown and muddy) appears in the name “Erphesfurt” (“ford at the Erphes River”). In medieval times, this location along the Gera, in addition to Erfurt’s proximity to two trade routes, one covering the Baltic Sea, the Port of Lübeck and including the all-important trade cities of Venice and Milan and the other spanning the length of the Via Regia (ca. 8th century), which stretched across the Holy Roman Empire through France, Germany (Frankfurt and Leipzig), Poland (Wroclaw), and Russia, made the Thuringian city one of the region’s major commercial centres during the Middle Ages. In 1440, Erfurt joined the Hanseatic League—a confederation of merchant cities that dominated trade across the Baltic Sea and the North Sea for the better part of four centuries—along with the two Thuringian cities of Mühlhausen and Nordhausen, thereby maintaining crucial trade relations throughout the Holy Roman Empire.

In addition to trading textiles and grain, Erfurt owed much of its prosperity to one plant: Isatis tinctoria, or woad, a yellow, flowering plant from which a blue dye can be processed. From the 13th to the 16th centuries, the dye was used in everything from cloth to paintings. Along with the neighboring Thuringian cities of Gotha, Tennstedt, Arnstadt and Langensalza, Erfurt participated in the growing and
processing and had a bustling trade from the 13th century. As a result, Erfurt became a prosperous city that was even able to establish its own university by 1389.\textsuperscript{100}

While functioning as a critical commercial centre for the region, Erfurt was also a significant religious and political centre. From the early 11th century, Erfurt was under the auspices of the Archbishop-Elector of Mainz. There were only three Archbishop-Electors (chosen from the most prominent families in Germany), including the Archbishop-Elector of Trier and the Archbishop-Elector of Cologne. As the highest representatives of the Holy Roman Emperor in Germany, they played an important role in the election of its succession of kings. During the Middle Ages, the Archbishop of Mainz, with the largest ecclesiastical province under his jurisdiction, was a major political player in his role as intercessor between the Emperor and his estates in Germany. In Erfurt, particularly after 1250, the office of Archbishop of Mainz was in constant struggle with an independent city council formed in that year, established in an effort to obtain greater local autonomy over Erfurt’s economic and civic laws and policies. A major point of contention was the economic treatment of Erfurt’s Jewish community during the Middle Ages.

Erfurt once had a thriving and bustling Jewish community, fully incorporated into its urban scene. Erfurt's Jewish community is documented from the early 12th century, when it was under the protection of the German king, who collected taxes from the community until 1209, when that duty transferred to the Bishop of Mainz, under whose protection it fell. Even though, early on, the Jewish community in Erfurt was not entirely without persecution—in 1221, anti-Jewish riots broke out in Erfurt during which the synagogue was burned down and a number of Jewish citizens were murdered, while some martyred themselves—the Jewish community in Erfurt continued to flourish, and along with the other German cities with great Jewish influence like Mainz, Worms, and Speyer, became one of the most influential German communities in trade and economics. The medieval Jewish community in Erfurt was considered a kehillah (Jewish governing board), as it possessed all the cultural and religious elements relevant to Jewish life: a synagogue, mikveh (ceremonial bath), and a cemetery that the surrounding Jewish settlements of Arnstadt, Stadtilm, Weimar,

Eisenach and Gotha could look to as their spiritual centre, especially as several religious ceremonies could only be performed on-site.\textsuperscript{101}

While the Jewish centre in Erfurt was located in one general area between City Hall, the Merchants' Bridge and St. Michael's Church, it must be stressed that this was not a Jewish “ghetto”. (The term "ghetto" comes from the Latin word, "\textit{gettare}" meaning "to pour, cast" and was first used by the ruling council and citizens of Venice in 1516, when the Jewish community was forcibly relocated to a small island called Ghetto Nuova near an iron foundry.\textsuperscript{102}) Christians also settled in the same area and Jewish dwellings were no different to that of their Christian neighbours. Jewish money lenders and merchants were integral to local trade as well to the international trade. Much of Erfurt’s economic prosperity could be attributed to the industriousness and prosperity of its Jewish community. While Jews had been consistently marginalized almost everywhere in Europe since the early centuries, in Germany their plight was not always thus.

It is known that by the 8th century, the Jewish community in Germany, which has been dated to the early 4th century, was prospering and even allowed to hold public office, land, and work in any realm of their choice. However, when the Roman Empire fell and Christianity gave rise to the Holy Roman Empire, the Holy Roman Church included in its doctrine that the Jewish people should be rejected and furthermore, separated from Christians. However, even though the Holy Roman Church encouraged its parishes to shun the Jewish people economically and socially, efforts to keep the semi-autonomous tribes that made up what was Germany [sic] together distracted them from crushing the Jews as they were economically a boon to the fledgling country. The Jewish community in Germany gave rise to a prosperous merchant class that travelled extensively and maintained a vast international trade network. This contrasted with non-Jewish merchants, whose trade circles were much closer to their immediate space. In addition, the 10th century ushered in one of the Jewish culture's most vaunted intellectual movements, which began and flourished when the renowned Rabbi Gershom ben Judah (960-1028) founded a \textit{yeshiva} (an Orthodox Jewish school) in Mainz that brought in Jews from all over Europe. This


contributed to the "Golden Age" for European Jewry and to further prosperity for the Jewish communities in Mainz and Worms.  

This relatively untroubled period for Europe's Jewry came to a halt in 1095 with the beginning of the Crusades. On November 26th, Pope Urban made a public appeal from France to his flock, calling for a Crusade. Muslim Turks had closed the city of Jerusalem to Christian pilgrims and were now officially viewed as outsiders. Unfortunately for the Jewish people, this meant that they were also seen as outsiders and therefore allied with the Muslims. So, from the First Crusade, armies wiped out Jewish communities on route to the Holy Land, unhindered and unpunished. In fact, any condemnation by the Pope was superficial and served no purpose but to render the Crusaders even more powerful in their quest to kill in the name of Christianity. During the First Crusade, entire Jewish communities were extinguished in the blink of an eye. For example, in a single day in Mainz in 1096, 1,100 Jews were killed, their synagogue as well as many essential community and religious buildings razed to the ground.  

As a result of these massacres (which continued with further Crusades into the 12th and 13th centuries), Jewish life in Mainz, Worms and Cologne would never be the same.  

A major impact on the Jewish community's standing as a merchant class was the physical effect of the Crusades on the travel landscape. The Crusaders travelled extensively and consequently had to lay roads, cut paths and build bridges. Whereas before, long-distance trade had fallen largely to the Jewish merchants and their vast networks, now, non-Jewish merchants were more willing, ready and able to travel and trade. As a result, Jewish merchants lost their elite standing and many turned to money-lending. Under Christian law, charging interest on loans was illegal; since no such limits existed under Jewish law, the Jewish people took this opportunity to retain their livelihoods.  

From the Crusades onwards, Jewish interaction with the dominant communities in Europe was inexorably altered. Jews were banned from holding public office and even from interacting on a normal social basis with their Christian neighbours. Jewish communities became increasingly isolated as they moved in to the

---

ghettos, which, in Medieval Germany, were locked from the inside as well as out, as it became increasingly unsafe for a Jewish person to wander around the city-at-large. Inside the ghettos, the community once more grew insular, and out of necessity, became largely autonomous. Within the ghettos, the Jewish community had its own governmental body - the kehillah. Each Jewish community had its own representative, who handled any business, economic, or municipal interaction with non-Jewish rulers, businessmen, or with any other non-Jew.

Due to the harsh political and religious climate and also to Jewish communities constantly being expelled from one place and moving to another (casting doubt upon the exact citizenry of the Jewish people within a community), a system of taxation for the Jewish community was established. Each ruler of each German city would draw up a charter granting the Jewish community certain rights. This charter would include tariffs the Jewish people were required to pay, where exactly in a city they could live, and guaranteed them safety and protection (as long as they paid the tariffs, which were enforced and collected by the kehillah). Because of the protection afforded them through these arrangements, the Jewish communities agreed to become the de-facto property of the ruler under whose protection they were living - an agreement that became formal in 1236 when Emperor Frederick II put forth the Servi Camaerae Nostrae ("Servants of the Treasury"). However, also stated in the edict was that the charter could be revoked at any time by the ruler of the region, thereby stripping the Jews of their safety, livelihoods and homes.105

In the meantime, Erfurt's Jewish community was still enjoying a certain "Golden Age". In their roles as merchants, moneylenders and financiers, the wealthy Jews, especially, were essential to local trade. In the 13th and 14th centuries, financial transactions between the Jews and officials of the city, crown, and church were well-documented. For example, two Erfurt Jewish merchants were among the sponsors of the Lübeck City Council in 1290. From 1230 to 1545, Lübeck was the de-facto principal city of the Hanseatic League, and this would have been a financial boon for the Jewish community. In 1293, Albrecht, Landgrave of Thuringia, took out a loan on silver and golden pawns amounting to 1,008 marks of Freibergian silver from Erfurt Jews. In 1336, Landgrave Frederick borrowed a total of 1,600 marks of silver from a
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local Jewish banker.\textsuperscript{106} Evidence shows that the Jewish community was crucial to Erfurt's prosperity as well as to Germany's prosperity. But, in 1349, the fate of the Jewish community in Erfurt as well as the fate of Jews all over Europe became the deadly fallout from Europe's battle with the Black Death.

Before it reached the Port of Messina, Sicily, the Black Death had already laid waste throughout China, India, Persia, Syria and Egypt. Originally, it was thought to have begun in China, but newer research shows its origins could have been near an estuary of the Volga River near the Caspian Sea, an area occupied and ruled by the Mongol Khanate of the Golden Horde, who had converted to Islam and no longer traded with Christians. This resulted in the closing of the Silk Road caravan routes between China - the reason the Black Death stopped at the Mongol borders and did not spread by way of the Russian territories to Western Europe.

The epidemic in Europe was instigated in the autumn of 1346, through a Mongol attack launched on the Italian merchants’ last trading station in the region - Kaffa (today Feodosiya), in the Crimea. By the autumn of 1346, the Mongols had contracted the plague and it spread like wildfire by means of their trading caravan routes, and eventually to the besieged town of Kaffa.\textsuperscript{107} When, in following spring, the Italians eventually escaped from the town by sea, they took the plague with them, transported by rat fleas living on ship rats. By the time they reached the Sicilian port of Messina, most of the sailors on the twelve Genoese trading ships were already dead. By the time the Sicilian authorities realized the gravity of the threat and ordered the ships out of the harbour, it was too late. Since the plague tended to follow trade routes, by land and water, its spread was swift and deadly; from Italy to France, to Spain, and then to England, and from the ports of Marseilles and Tunis to Bordeaux and Barcelona. By the time it reached Rome and Florence, two of the most important trade cities in Europe, there was no stopping it. By 1338, it had also reached Germany, and by 1348, Paris, London and Oslo.

The Black Plague, spread through touch and airborne, manifested itself in three forms: The first, in buboes (hence, aka. Bubonic Plague), swellings appearing around a person's lymph nodes in the armpits, groin, or neck, a result of infected fleabites. The second form, caused by contact, was pneumatic and killed its victims in a quicker
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two to three days. The last was in the form of blood poisoning. The death rate from its pneumatic and septicemic incarnations was 100%.\textsuperscript{108}

Throughout the spread of the plague, a general paranoia had also spread across Europe, one involving the Jewish communities. Rumours spread that the Jews had caused the plague by poisoning the wells or by witchcraft. Jews had already begun to be massacred in Spain, but the paranoia rapidly gained credence in the rest of Europe after September 1348, when a Jewish doctor in Geneva, Switzerland confessed (after being tortured on a rack) to poisoning wells in Venice with powder sent to him by his accomplice, a rabbi in Spain. In October 1348, during yet another trial of a Jewish citizen, it was ruled: "before their end they said on their Law that it is true that all Jews, from the age of seven, cannot excuse themselves of this (crime), since all of them in their totality were cognizant and are guilty of the above actions".\textsuperscript{109} From then on, fear, envy, distrust and scepticism all met in one continental-wide sweep. Another reason why the non-Jewish population grew suspicious the Jews was that it appeared that less of them were becoming infected or dying. The causes of this would have been contributed to several factors pertaining to Jewish customs.

While there is no empirical evidence that fewer Jews than Christians were decimated by the plague in the 14th century, there is evidence from an outbreak of the plague in Venice in 1631 to suggest that Jews could have had half the mortality rate of Christians.\textsuperscript{110} Historians can extrapolate several things from Jewish culture which would have contributed to the reduced rate of mortality within the Jewish communities. First, everyday sanitary measures in the non-Jewish world were unheard of in the Middle Ages; for example, the regular washing of one's hands. In contrast, many of the Jewish customary practices were predicated upon the idea of first being purified. In Jewish life, purity meant cleanliness. As a result, being Jewish involved washing one’s hands throughout the day; before meals, after going to the toilet, and after any kind of intimate human contact. In addition, Jewish law also instructed them to wash for the Sabbath and several religious ceremonies involved full immersion in a purifying bath. Furthermore, Jews maintained strict burial practices. During sicknesses like the plague, leaving corpses unburied certainly would have exacerbated the

conditions that spread a disease. Jewish practice required the burial of bodies, which was preceded by washing the bodies before burial. Another factor was their relative isolation from the rest of the populace in European towns. In many European cities, they occupied either a specific section of the city or were housed in the walled ghettos. This distance may have been enough to shield them from the disease.\(^{111}\)

Finally, Passover, a holiday which celebrates the Jewish people's liberation from slavery in Ancient Egypt, lasts for a week and falls either in March or in April. In the story, set over 3,000 years ago, when the Pharaoh freed the Israelites in Ancient Egypt, the Jewish people vacated the country with such speed that they didn't even wait for the bread to rise in their ovens. In remembrance, on Passover, it is forbidden to eat leavened bread. Leavened bread was made with *chametz*, a rising agent made from either wheat, barley, spelt, rye or oats. During Passover, the Jewish people (to this day) must get rid of all the *chametz* in a household and eat a special, unleavened, flat, cracker-like bread called *matzo*. *Matzo brie* (*matzo meal*) is also used to make other foods for Passover. The peak point of the plague years of 1338-39 occurred in the spring, during Passover. In Jewish households, in the springtime, there would have been no trace of leavened bread or grains, therefore making their community a less attractive habitat for the black rats or their deadly passengers.\(^{112}\)

The first *pogroms* due to the plague began in France in the spring and summer of 1348, after the trials accusing the Jews of poisoning the water effectively cemented their guilt as a whole throughout Europe, especially in France, Switzerland and Germany. Even the two papal orders issued by Pope Clement VI in the latter half of 1348, clearing the Jewish community of all guilt concerning the plague, failed to stop the rising tide of murderous sentiment against the Jews. "*Pogrom*" comes from a Russian word meaning “to wreak havoc, to demolish violently.” The word has come to stand for the attacks made upon Jews by non-Jews over the centuries. The first major massacre of Jews due to the plague took place in Basel, Switzerland in January 1349; 600 Jewish adult were rounded up and burned alive inside a building along the Rhine.\(^{113}\) The children were kept alive, but forcefully baptized. In future massacres,


families often chose to burn themselves and their families alive rather than face forced baptisms. In quick succession, more pogroms followed, decimating one Jewish community after another. In Germany, the Jewish communities in Freyburg, Speyer, Worms, Breslau, Augsburg, Mainz, Nuremburg, and Hanover, along with others, met the same fate. Town councils attempted to put a stop to the massacres, but were met with too much opposition from the townspeople. In such cases, the town council would simply be replaced and spearheaded by a more bloodthirsty religious leader or civil leader. In Strasbourg, on Valentine’s Day 1349, the entire Jewish community was taken to the cemetery and given a choice to be baptized or to burn on a wooden scaffold; this was thought to be a preventative measure as plague had not yet reached Strasbour. Most of the 2,000 Jews died that day. In both Basel and Strasbour, orders then banned Jews from both cities for 200 and 100 years, respectively. In both cases, these orders were rescinded a few decades later when both cities found themselves in financial ruin.114

By the time it raged through all of Europe, the Black Death had claimed 50 million lives.115 Erfurt was not spared. Tragically, although vibrant and integrated, its Jewish community met the same fate as Jews all over Europe. On March 21st, 1349, a pogrom of the Jews in Erfurt was carried out and around 900 Jews were murdered.116 It is thought that not a single Jewish citizen escaped. The Jewish quarter around the synagogue was burned to the ground and the synagogue was severely damaged. Ironically, it is actually due to this pogrom that enough tangible Jewish history managed to survive in the form of the properties put up by Erfurt, to be unde consideration for UNESCO World Heritage Status today.117

4.2 The Sites and the UNESCO Application

In 2005, a gap analysis of the UNESCO World Heritage List was conducted by The International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) - the only global, non-governmental, professional association that works for the conservation and protection

---

114 “When Blaming the Jews Went Viral,” JSpace.
of cultural heritage places around the world. Made up of a vast, international team of researchers, scientists, heritage specialists, lawyers, economists, engineers, artisans, professionals, academics, private consultants, elected officials, state representatives and more, ICOMOS is the advisory body of the World Heritage Committee for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention of UNESCO. In this capacity, ICOMOS reviews the nominations and ensures the conservation status of properties. In 2005, ICOMOS stated that Christian heritage and historic cities are overrepresented on the list in general and even more so in Europe, specifically. Jewish heritage, on the other hand, is underrepresented, especially given Judaism's importance as the oldest of the three monotheistic beliefs, its impact on European culture and society, and the fact that UNESCO had recently strengthened its efforts for the World Heritage List to become more "representative, balanced and credible."  

In July of 2008, the Erfurt City Council chose to aim for UNESCO World Heritage status. The purpose of the application was to highlight the history of the medieval Jewish community in Erfurt. The properties put forth in this application are: The Altes Synagogue (Old Synagogue), which dates from 1094; a medieval mikveh (ca. 1250); the Stone House on Benediktsplatz; and “Complimentary Testimonies”, which include Hebrew manuscripts from Erfurt’s Jewish community, the Erfurt Jewish Oath (ca. latter 12th century - the oldest preserved Jewish Oath in the German tongue), a bronze lamp, (ca. 1160 - the oldest known example of its kind), and approximately 75 preserved tombstones from the 13th-15th century from the former Jewish cemetery. These properties have already considerably expanded the knowledge of Jewish cultural history and settlements of the Early and High Middle Ages. 

The Old Jewish Synagogue, located on a quiet, back street in the centre of town, would have been an oasis away from the hustle and bustle of a lively Erfurt in the Middle Ages. As the centre of Erfurt Jewish life and also that of the smaller towns around Erfurt, the synagogue would have been an essential component of the Jewish communities-at-large. The oldest part of the synagogue dates to the 11th century and is proof that there was a Jewish community in Erfurt as early as that time. The building was completed in three stages. In 1270, the Jewish community incorporated

parts of the older building into a much larger, newer design, including the structural addition of a timber barrel vaulted ceiling. In the beginning of the 14th century, the synagogue was expanded again with additional square meters on the north face and another story was added. This final expansion could have housed the women's synagogue (traditionally separated from the main prayer room) or else served as a schul (school for Hebrew teachings) for the boys.

The building's life as a synagogue ended with the first plague years and the massacre. The fires around the synagogue caused it immense damage and the city of Erfurt eventually sold the building to a local merchant who retrofit the former synagogue and school to fit his needs by converting the synagogue into a warehouse, adding a vaulted cellar, splitting up the vaulted main prayer room into several storeys with two solid timber ceilings and building a new roof. In much later years, from the late 19th century, the former synagogue was used as a ballroom and even had two bowling alley lanes. In fact, the building was so altered that its original use was almost completely overlooked. By the reign of the Third Reich, it was in shambles and so far removed from cultural and historical memory and from being considered a part of Jewish life that it survived largely intact, to be re-discovered in the second half of the 20th century.120

In the late 1980s, before the Berlin Wall fell, art historian Rosita Petersheim, an experienced preservationist who had worked for the Volksegner Betrieb Denkmalpflege (VEB), began investigating the site. VEB's were regional, state-owned, preservation firms; the central office was in Erfurt. By the late 80's, these preservation firms had undergone a change in which they were run regionally by local preservationists and craftsmen, instead of by the Central Institute for Preservation in Berlin.121 In this capacity, Petersheim was in charge of all sites and monuments pertaining to Jewish life and culture. After she retired, Petersheim became an Erfurt city tour guide and came across a note mentioning that behind the town hall was once a Jewish synagogue. Armed with this and a few clues—two of the streets in the area were called die Straßen an der Judenschule (the streets at the Jewish school) and Judengasse (Jewish Alley), a planning application from the local Jewish Community dating 1857 seeking permission build another small synagogue nearby, and a medieval

121 Jason James, Preservation and National Belonging in Eastern Germany: Heritage Fetishism and Redeeming Germanness (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, October 2, 2012), 68.
map of Erfurt—Petersheim eventually discovered the Old Jewish Synagogue. In 1992, a German historian named Elmar Altwasser also began to conduct his own investigations into the site and has since written a series of studies about the Erfurt discoveries, including a book entitled, “The Alte Synagogue” (2009). The re-founding and preservation of the Alte Synagogue is due to their efforts.

In 1996, the city of Erfurt bought the synagogue from the private trust it had belonged to and begun the decade-long restoration. While work was being done on the Old Synagogue site in 1998, some construction workers working nearby unearthed a treasure underneath a cellar entrance. The workers had no idea what they had found and used one of the silver bowls as an ashtray. During the dating and restoration, it was discovered that the treasure belonged to the last Jewish occupant of the house, Kalman von Wiehe. During the pogrom of March 21st, 1349, the von Wiehe family hid their valuables and likely expected to collect them at another time. The pieces date from the mid-13th century to the first half of the 14th century. Because of the treasure’s significance to Jewish life in Germany, it was displayed in London, Paris and in New York before returning to the restored.

The Erfurt Treasure, exhibited in glass cases in the basement of the Old Synagogue, consists of 3,141 coins from Frankfurt, France, Holland and Sicily, 14 silver ingots, and literally hundreds of pieces of Gothic jewellery. Also included are seven hundred individual items of Gothic-period craftsmanship. Among the pieces of jewellery are brooches of different sizes and form, adorned with precious stones and as eight gold and silver rings. The collection also includes clothing ornamentation, such as parts of belts and garment trimmings. The most prized piece of jewellery is a large and intricate Ashkenazi gold wedding ring in the shape of a gothic tower, embedded with precious jewels and engraved with six Hebrew letters that spell out mazel tov, meaning "Good luck"; only three of its kind remain. For the purposes of the UNESCO application, the Erfurt Treasure comes under the heading of "Complementary Testimonies". The other components of the "Complementary Testimonies" include the medieval Hebrew manuscripts which include the largest known Hebrew Bible, the oldest surviving Jewish oath in German, the oldest surviving Romanesque Sabbath lamp, and approximately 75 tombstones from the 13th
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The Hebrew manuscripts were taken after the pogrom of 1349, and until the mid-17th century were kept in the Erfurt Council Library, where they were absorbed into the collection of the Evangelical Ministry at the Augustine monastery. In 1880, the Evangelical Ministry sold the manuscripts to the Royal Library in Berlin, where they have since been studied. The collection consists of several manuscripts and medieval bibles. Among the bibles is the massive, two-volume Erfurt Bible (ca. 1343) each 60cm by 45cm, weighing a combined 100 kg - the oldest and largest medieval bible. Noteworthy are the micrographics that begin each chapter. Micrography, developed within Islamic culture, is a type of abstract art illustrations entirely made up of pictures. In Judaism, traditional illustrations in holy books are forbidden; micrography has been one way of decorating a tome without defying the rule. In the Erfurt Bible, the micrographies of plants, animals, mythical creatures and geometrical shapes are made up of tiny lettering. In addition to this bible, intact medieval Ashkenazi scrolls were found in Erfurt—four out of only ten remaining in the world—including largest known medieval scroll.

A particularly valuable artefact discovery pertaining into Jewish life and culture in Erfurt during the Middle Ages was the physical symbol and written word of the oldest surviving Jewish oath. This oath would have been required for all legal matters (business transactions and political affairs of state). Jewish, Christian and Muslim communities all took oaths based on their beliefs. A Jewish oath would have been mandatory, because no Jewish person was allowed to swear in a Christian or Muslim manner. The Jewish oath was written in accordance with Jewish law and custom and was accepted as the legal assurance of duty and honesty. One of the oldest surviving known Jewish oaths was written by order of the Byzantine emperor, Constantine VII (912-959). This oath would have been based upon a Hebrew or Aramaic original and variations of it would have been utilized throughout Europe during the Middle Ages. The following represents one version of the oath:


About the goods for which this man sues against thee, that thou dost not know of them nor have them, nor hast taken them into thy possession, neither thyself nor thy servants...

So help thee the Law that God wrote with His hand and gave to Moses on Mount Sinai; And that so [if] thou eatest something, thou will become defiled all over, as did the King of Babylon; And that sulphur and pitch rain upon thy neck, as it rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah;

...And that the earth swallow thee as it did Dathan and Abiram; ... So art thou true and right.

And so help thee Adonai; thou art true in what thou has sworn.

And so that thou wouldst become leprous like Naaman: it is true.

And so that the blood and the curse ever remain upon thee which thy kindred wrought upon themselves when they tortured Jesus Christ and spake thus:

His blood be upon us and upon our children: it is true.

So help thee God, who appeared to Moses in a burning bush.

It is true the oath thou hast sworn:

By the soul which on doomsday thou must bring to judgment.

Per deum Abraham, per deum Isaac, per deum Jacob it is true.

So help thee God and the oath which thou hast sworn. Amen.126

Not all such oaths were so condemning of the Jews. However, as prejudice grew, different cities and states altered the oath to suit their view of the Jewish community. Germany and France, in particular, had the tendency to make their oaths particularly defamatory and punitary in tone. Often, an oath would be accompanied by mandatory ceremonial gestures, some more humiliating than others. In France, during the 11th century, sometimes, while reciting the oath, a Jewish person was required to wear a crown of thorns around his necks and knees while thorn branches were pulled in-between his legs.127 In Germany, one ceremony demanded that the person stand on the hide of an animal that had given birth the night before: "The skin shall be cut open along the back and spread on [displaying] the teats; on it the Jew shall stand barefoot

and wearing nothing but nether garment and a haircloth about his body.\textsuperscript{128} Another required the person to stand on a stool wearing the pointed Jewish hat (a horned skullcap, decreed mandatory by the 4th Council of the Laternen of 1213 under Pope Innocent III for all male Jews walking outside a ghetto) and face the sun while swearing the oath.\textsuperscript{129} Not all the cities were cruel. For example, in Madgeburg, all that was required was to place a hand on the five books of Moses [the Pentateuch]. In truth, according to old German custom, Jews taking an oath were simply required to touch a staff held out by the judge or the plaintiff. The 12th century Erfurt Jewish oath survives today as a manuscript and as a seal.

In addition to the Old Jewish Synagogue and the “Complimentary Testimonies”, two remaining Jewish structures are of importance. The first is the mikveh, a venue for the crucial rites of purification under Jewish law. The Hebrew word "mikveh" means "collection"- in this case, a collection of water. A mikveh’s water must be still, stationary and comprised of a certain percentage of water from a natural source, a lake, ocean, river, rainwater, spring or ground water. While in modern day, the mikveh's use has lessened, altered and evolved, in the Middle Ages, it would have been a critical part of daily Jewish life to the point where if a Jewish community held limited resources and had to choose between constructing a mikveh or a constructing a synagogue, the clear choice, according to the Talmud (the Hebrew book of codified teachings and rabbinical discussions), would have been to build a mikveh. Although the mikveh was used by both men and women, the majority of purifying rituals were regarding women's purity. Men were required to take part in a mikveh ceremony after having been exposed to dead bodies, sick people or other ritually impure people or objects before being permitted to enter the synagogue. In addition, all tableware had to be purified in the mikveh before first use or if contaminated. Rules concerning women centered on menstruation and sexual purity concerned the whole family and community. According to Jewish law, taken from the Torah (the Five Books of Moses and the prophetic writings – e.g. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Psalms, Proverbs, etc.), girls and women were considered unclean and impure during their menstruation flow; sex was forbidden. Rabbis set this period at twelve days, after which women were required to bathe in the mikveh in order to achieve ritual.

\begin{footnotesize}
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cleanliness and in order to be permitted to resume sexual activity (within the confines of marriage).\textsuperscript{130}

The medieval mikveh in Erfurt was discovered during renovation of an area nearby, along the Gera behind the Krämerbrücke (Merchant's Bridge), a bridge lined with tiered wooden houses. As the Jewish community were required to pay an annual fee of two gulden for the land it occupied, first to the Bishop of Mainz and then to the City of Erfurt, the mikveh's existence was recorded in the official Mainz Tax Levy Document (\textit{Heberolle}) of 1248/49. It was also recorded in the interest rate registers of the St. Severus Church in Erfurt as far back as 1250. Even though the mikveh was officially described as a frigidobalneo (cold bath) until 1618, by which time it had become obsolete due to the fact that the Jewish community in Erfurt 1453 lost its municipal protection and had left, its ritual purpose remained clear when it was discovered 2007.\textsuperscript{131} Today, only the south wall of original structure built in the 12th century is still intact. Renovated in the 13th century, a new mikveh was attached, and although damaged in the 1349 pogrom, this structure has remained largely intact and the water basin is still situated directly at the river Gera, at the level of what would have been at the height of the water during the 12th and 13th centuries. After the expulsion of the Jews from Erfurt in 1453, the water basin was filled in and the mikveh was converted into a cellar. However, from 1495, the cemetery belonging to the Benedictskirche (St. Benedict’s church) occupied the western half of the former mikveh. As a result, during the excavation of the mikveh, 80 Christian graves also had to be meticulously excavated and documented. When the restoration was completed in 2011, a protective building around the mikveh was constructed. It was opened as a museum in September 2011.\textsuperscript{132}

The last major Jewish structure included in the UNESCO application is a "Stone House" located in the city centre behind the city hall on Benedictsplatz 1, an architecturally significant structure that was in the possession of Jewish owners at the end of the 12th century. The original door and entrance of the building dates from the around 1250; the building itself dates from the 13th century. The only changes to the original structure were made in the 14th century. In addition to the original elements
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of doors leading to both floors, the beamed storey ceiling, a stepped gable, a wooden roof, the upper story interior’s arched section, outer walls with scored joints and an intricately painted beamed ceiling, the ceiling boards are all decorated with different wheel motifs and have been dated to 1241/42. The "Stone House" is an intact, original example of the secular, late-Medieval building style.  

In 2012, Erfurt's application was accepted by the State of Thuringia to be forwarded to the Thuringian Ministry for Education, Science and Culture (TMBWK) for their eventual decision. After a two-year wait, in the spring of 2014, the TMBWK chose to forward Erfurt’s application to the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder in the Federal Republic of Germany (KMK). Fortunately, in June 2014, the KMK chose to promote Erfurt’s application to UNESCO, one of nine added to the German Tentative list for UNESCO in 2014.  

The stated Justification of Outstanding Value as a cultural heritage site are as follows: (iii) Unique testimony to the culture of Central European Jewry in the Middle Ages; (iv) Outstanding examples of medieval Jewish religious and secular architecture; and (vi) Direct association with Judaism and its reception by its Christian surroundings. As Germany already has 39 sites on the World Heritage List, the KMK can only propose one cultural and one natural site per year to UNESCO, so the sites in Erfurt are sixth in line and could be submitted between 2020 and 2022. What are its chances for success? My analysis is forthcoming in the next and final chapter of this thesis.

Chapter 5: Analysis and Conclusions

5.1 Striving for Long-Term Peace-Building Success in the 21st century

Culture takes diverse forms across time and space. This diversity is embodied in the uniqueness and plurality of the identities of the groups and societies making up humankind. As a source of exchange, innovation and creativity, cultural diversity is as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature. In this sense, it is the common heritage of humanity and should be recognized and affirmed for the benefit of present and future generations. (UNESCO, 2001)

UNESCO was founded upon principals that champion educating people of different nations towards a mutual understanding in hopes of finding a citizen-powered path towards lasting, sustainable peace. To this end, UNESCO evolved its criteria for UNESCO World Heritage status in order to reflect unity in cultural diversity. Through the decades, UNESCO has continued to formulate and re-formulate their criteria, aims, objectives, and initiatives in synchronicity with the shifting, global environment.

For example, at the 26th Session of the World Heritage Committee in 2002, 50 years after the ratification of the original UNESCO World Heritage Convention, the Budapest Declaration on World Heritage was adopted. Articulated in this declaration are UNESCO’s Strategic Objectives called the “4 C’s” which, in addition to re-iterating the original need for appropriate site management conservation, take into account the importance of encouraging and considering diversity from among the World Heritage candidates, the drive towards sustainable development of the properties, and the cruciality of the dissemination of the communicative knowledge derived from the World Heritage process. The 4 C’s of the objectives are as follows: to strengthen the Credibility of the World Heritage List as a representative and geographically balanced testimony of cultural and natural properties of outstanding universal value; to ensure the effective Conservation of World Heritage properties; to promote the development of Capacity-building measures, including assistance for preparing the nomination of properties, implementation of the World Heritage Convention and related instruments; and to increase public awareness, involvement
and support for World Heritage through Communication. In 2007, at the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee in Christchurch, New Zealand, a 5th “C” was added to the Strategic Objectives (proposed by the New Zealand delegation) - to enhance the role of Communities in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.\textsuperscript{136} This concept of community takes into account that the inclusion of local population input in terms of consideration of values, direct participation, and the essential sharing of benefits is necessary for the long-term, collaborative success of a site’s survival and to the cooperative dissemination of a particular country’s knowledge and heritage.

The addition of the 5th “C” demonstrates ability of the original UNESCO World Heritage Convention to build upon its fundamental framework, and adapt and evolve in order to face the challenges of the 21st century. Accordingly, UNESCO is directly engaged in taking a transdisciplinary approach to World Heritage conservation. In the modern world setting, the implementation of the programs driven by these Strategic Objectives is assisted by the many partnerships that UNESCO has formed and continues to form with a variety of stakeholders, governments and international governmental organizations in both the public and the private sector, using 21st century ways and means to raise the chances of conservation success. UNESCO’s programs involve diverse and international partnerships with businesses and organizations such as: the Google Cultural Institute through Google’s World Wonders Project, which provides virtual visits of cultural heritage sites so that the sites can be accessible and shared by all; The History Channel (internationally), which develops teaching approaches and materials for teachers to bring awareness of the concept of World Heritage through television as well as online to the future generations; the small-ship Seabourn Cruise Line (a division of Carnival Corporation & PLC), which features World Heritage Discovery Tours that include content on World Heritage as well as information specialists on board, in addition to its regular cruises’ “Entertainment and Enrichment” program with lectures on World Heritage sites; and the Gesellschaft Für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ), a German agency that assists developing countries in conserving and using their natural and cultural heritage in a sustainable manner through bi-lateral agreements, offering technical

development and co-operation aimed at the conservation and sustainable use of the local biodiversity that aids the management of World Heritage sites.137

This vast network of global partnerships, in addition to advisory bodies like the World Futures Studies Federation (WFSF) and the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) assist UNESCO in carrying out its World Heritage conservation mission. From 1987 to 1993, ICOMOS carried out a gap study that concluded Europe, historic towns and religious monuments, Christianity, historical periods and “elitist” architecture (as opposed to vernacular architecture - architecture related to human needs) were all over-represented on the World Heritage List, whereas all “living cultures” (the 20th century), and especially “traditional cultures”, were “underrepresented”.138 In 1994, UNESCO adopted the “Global Strategy”, which expanded the definition of heritage to include sites that are “outstanding demonstrations of human coexistence with the land as well as human interactions, cultural coexistence, spirituality and creative expression” in an effort to reflect a more balanced spectrum of the diversity of cultural as well as natural heritage”.139 In 2004, after the gap study was further analyzed, it was decided that expanding the scope of countries encouraged to submit sites while reducing the number of nominations each member country can submit and the number of nominations the committee reviews during session could contribute to a better representation of cultural diversity. Since then, the UNESCO World Heritage Committee will have been taking these issues under consideration when deciding upon sites’ eligibility for inscription onto the UNESCO World Heritage List.

So, what would be the implications regarding the relevance of the sites proposed by a country like Germany - a European, traditionally Christian country. In addition, with 39 properties already on the list, Germany is only allowed to put forth one cultural and one natural site per year. How can countries like Germany further contribute to the spectrum of cultural diversity? In order to develop my own 21st century criteria for answering these questions, I considered also specific approaches developed by the current president of the WSFS, Australian psychologist, educator and futurist, Dr. Jennifer Gidley. President of the WSFS since 2009, Gidley has built
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theories for her own formulations for peace in our time, influenced by colleagues such as Alvin Toffler and Wendell Bell. Toffler, in 1978, defined futures theory as "new, alternative images of the future, visionary explorations of the possible, systematic investigation of the probable, and moral evaluation of the preferable".\textsuperscript{140} In 1997, Bell (a Professor Emeritus of Sociology at Yale University), in his authoritative volumes, “The Foundations of Futures Studies”, defined the purpose of futures theory "to maintain or improve the freedom and welfare of humankind…some futurists would add the welfare of all living beings, plants, and the Earth's biosphere.”\textsuperscript{141} According to Gidley, the continuing evolution of futurist theory has incorporated a multi-perspective and, importantly, a planetary consciousness, which has produced an “integral/transdisciplinary” approach to futures studies.\textsuperscript{142}

The usage of the term, “planetary”, in this sense, differs from global/globalization in that while the term, “global”, usually denotes politico-economic discussions, “planetary” is a term which is increasingly being used to denote anthropo-socio-cultural and ecological discussions. The term, “planetary”, was first used critically in 1999 in the literature of French philosopher, Edgar Morin, who refers to the present times as the Planetary Era (approx. the last 500 years).\textsuperscript{143} The gradual dissemination of the term has unlocked a path of cross-disciplinary communication towards knowledge-seeking and international dialogue in the rapidly changing global environment of the ultramodern era. The term, “planetary” can be used in the context of critical environmental, transcultural, philosophical and spiritual interests as well as in the political science and international relations vernacular, which would reflect a shift from nationalistic to transnational and planetary/global worldviews.\textsuperscript{144}

Thus, it is by criteria influenced by Gidley and the multi-disciplinary thinkers before her, who laid the theoretical and ideological foundations for the UN and UNESCO that I would like to examine the three German properties presented in this thesis. I propose that, in order for UNESCO to maintain relevance in the 21st century,
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for the purposes of global peace and security, through the sites it champions, UNESCO must focus on: (a) shaping a common lifeworld by conveying the positive synergy derived from promoting unity in a diversity of cultures; (b) building empathy through communicating the “we-feeling” by means of a well-organized system of global knowledge delivery; (c) demonstrating fluid maintenance strategies for sustainability and success complementary to the local and global environment; and (d) conveying planetary intersubjectivity in a relatable manner which contributes to relevance into perpetuity. We return, therefore, in the next three sections, to the three German sites relevant to this thesis: first, to the Bauhaus and its sites at Weimar and Dessau, then to the Leipzig Notenspur, and finally to the Old Synagogue, Further properties and Complementary Testimonies in Erfurt.

5.2 The Bauhaus-Dessau/Weimar: The Champion

In 1996, at the 20th UNESCO World Committee Meeting, the Bauhaus and its sites at Weimar and Dessau were accepted for inscription onto the UNESCO World Heritage List as a Cultural Property. At the time of the Bauhaus’ inscription, Germany already had seventeen sites on the World Heritage List. What made the Bauhaus special enough? Has the recognition that the Bauhaus receives from UNESCO been valid and should it remain so throughout the decades? In view of UNESCO’s Global Strategy in response to the ICOMOS gap study, Germany could teeter on the edge of the being “over-represented”. However, in considering the Bauhaus, UNESCO chose to focus on the gap of “a better recognition of the 20th century heritage”.145

In terms of my criterion (a), which harkens back to Habermas and Risse’s evolution in thinking on the creation of a common lifeworld in order to convey personality, culture and society in a way that generates positive synergy from unity in diversity, the Bauhaus, through trial and tribulation, attempted to forge a modern unity of form in architecture with a human face. Its 20th century emphasis on materials like reinforced concrete, glass and steel and constructions, which included skeleton construction and glass facades, broke with the traditional ideas of space, structure, and form in an attempt to convey their particular world view of beauty in form and function. The distinct Bauhaus form can be seen in the properties in Dessau and
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Weimar and demonstrate how the Bauhaus principles were applied during those decades. However, not only did the Bauhaus design furniture, buildings, and textiles, **but they also developed their own distinctive font, which is arguably one of the most recognized in the world.** The modern version, based on Herbert Bayer’s original Universal 1925 typeface (spawning countless imitators), is used today in everything from movie posters and websites, to this Microsoft Word program.

Bauhaus has influenced everything from furniture and buildings to fonts precisely because its technical and conceptual ideas have continued to translate transnationally, despite the fact that the Bauhaus rose and fell within a period of a few decades and was bookended by two World Wars. The ensuing dissemination of ideas and concepts was assisted by the fact that several Bauhaus Masters and students were able to leave Germany and spread Bauhaus philosophy and influence abroad. By virtue of the fact that the tactile objects involved infused with Bauhaus thinking were buildings and furniture with a particular purpose in mind – vernacular designing for a global, modern technological and industrial age – the aims of the Bauhaus were more easily translated and transmuted across cultures, creating positive synergy for bringing about unity in a diversity of cultures.

My criterion (b) is about how to create empathy in the modern world, in the sense that the creation of a “we-feeling” must be attempted (as Karl Deutsch proposed) by reaching out and communicating innovatively in order to engender empathy. For the Bauhaus, this means, among other things, maintaining its visibility through its website - http://www.bauhaus-dessau.de/english/home.html, on which an inexhaustible supply of information is available about its past, present and future. There is also an information page about the Bauhaus on UNESCO’s website: http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/729 - in English and German.

Furthermore, the Bauhaus participates in its own promotion by being active within its own community of Dessau in very specific ways. For example, one of the projects in development is an “Intercultural, Cross-Generational Park”, a test project-as-research as a precursor to developing housing for elderly people and families in urban areas. The project will renew the existing municipal park and not only provide protection for a public space with a revamped design with safety features, sponsorship for purposes of continued maintenance, and planned community events to keep the
experimental space alive. These kinds of projects indicate that the Bauhaus is actively reaching beyond itself and communicating on several layers both within the local community in the world, thereby building and re-building a global knowledge delivery system which effectively creates the required “we-feeling”. In addition, the Bauhaus runs a variety of educational programs and has partnered with the IKEA Foundation to make such programs possible: symposiums and lectures for international scholars, two Designers-in-Residence programs (one for students and one for professionals), as well as a Bauhaus Intensive Summer Workshops for students and graduates of interior design, art, design and architecture. In this way, the Bauhaus constructs mechanisms to propagate Bauhaus philosophy throughout the world.

My criterion (c) involves the capacity for continued, dynamic and evolving maintenance of a site in order to keep its position sustainable and successful on both the local and global stage. In 1994, the Bauhaus Dessau Foundation was formed in order to facilitate collecting, conserving, researching, and educating, and thus, keeping mechanisms and strategies in place to foment sustainability and cement relevance locally and globally. The Foundation keeps the Bauhaus fluid and vital by functioning much like the workshops of the original Bauhaus in that it depends on an integrated, interdisciplinary team of architects, town planners, sociologists, cultural scientists, artists and art historians to carry out its work. Part of that work is maintaining the second largest collection of Bauhaus objects in an exhibition entitled “Workshop of the Modern Age” that presents objects from the Dessau period. (The largest is housed at the Bauhaus Archive in Berlin.) On November 2014, the German Bundestag chose to contribute federal funds towards the building of a new exhibition center in Dessau, which will finally display the whole collection of 40,000 Bauhaus objects. Partially funded by the State of Saxony-Anhalt, the “Museum in Motion” is slated to be opened in the Dessau City Park by the 100th anniversary of the Bauhaus in 2019. Most importantly, at the June 2014 convening of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee in Doha, Qatar, a review of the Bauhaus and its sites in Dessau concluded that the properties have been suitably restored, maintained and protected by the appropriate agencies in the states of Saxony-Anhalt and Thuringia and that the integrity and authenticity of the sites were being maintained and showed evidence of continuing to

flourish and maintaining relevance as the Bauhaus evolves within the local and global environments.

My criterion (d) is the ability of a site to be relatable on a planetary scale (in the cross-disciplinary sense crucial to success in the 21st century, as described by Dr. Jennifer Gidley), which contributes to its perpetuity. In the 2014 report, the UNESCO World Heritage Committee still considers the Bauhaus properties “important monuments not only for art and culture, but also for the historic ideas of the 20th century”, which includes its philosophy, “to use the technical and intellectual resources at its disposition, not in a destructive way but to create a living environment worthy of human aspirations”.147 Although the Bauhaus’ existence was cut short by global politics and the subsequent dismantling and scattering of its ranks, Bauhaus philosophies and methodologies have survived and thrived for future generations by becoming a living, breathing entity once again with a dynamic and proactive approach to the 21st century world-at-large. One of the future aims of the Bauhaus is to again be a permanent residence and workplace of artists, architects, designers, curators and researchers and to house them in one or two of the Masters’ residences by 2016. To this aim, in regular partnership with the IKEA foundation in regards to its summer workshops, with its the 2015 Summer Workshop entitled “Newly Furnished”, the Bauhaus intends to encourage budding designers accepted into the program “to immerse oneself in the thoughts behind the original idea of the artist colony, and with contemporary interventions, to enable living and working in the heritage-listed buildings once again.”148

Another keystone feature of the Bauhaus is the Bauhaus Lab, which provides a professional training platform through which post-graduate architects, designers and artists interested in city architecture and art or culture and exhibition projects can participate in transdisciplinary and transnational collaborations, a platform also available to post-grads from the fields of humanities, cultural science and media studies. The forward-thinking theme pursued in the Bauhaus Lab 2014 was on the issue of food storage in the 21st century. Entitled, “In Reserve: Concerning the Architecture of the Reservoir”, this theme harkens directly back to Walter Gropius’ 1925 book, “International Architecture”, in which he featured photos of grain

elevators in the USA. Applications include everything from your kitchen cupboard and suburban garden centers to the Svalbard Global Seed Vault in Norway (a reservoir holding over 4000 plant seeds, grain, rice and soya - those deemed vital to the survival of mankind in the event of a global catastrophe grains).\(^\text{149}\) The saving and storage of essentials is a universal, daily task and one that also has world-preserving applications. From May to August 2015, the findings of that project will be presented in a report and exhibition at the Bauhaus called “Haushaltsmesse 2015”.

One of the most important ways to ensure that a site remains relevant is to make education about the site relatable to all ages. As the continuing mission of the Bauhaus was its very first—“Young people, come to the Bauhaus!”—the Bauhaus educates from all angles and for all ages and generations.\(^\text{150}\) Not only are workshops available for university-aged students and older, but also for school students twelve years and older. In these workshops, started in 2011 and funded by IKEA Foundation, school children have a chance to experience the Bauhaus for themselves for a week; to learn, live, design, explore, experience. As a result, a new generation begins to learn everything from handicrafts, installation, and construction, to photography, design and advertising in the way the original Bauhaus operated. The Bauhaus Dessau also gives school tours, individually tailored children’s tours, special guided tours for families and is even available as a venue for birthday parties in which children can “Celebrate with Gropius” during an interactive museum experience.

The original Bauhaus only lasted fourteen years, but its influence has survived for decades. The dissemination of its ideals have been communicated through its architecture and programs at the Bauhaus Dessau and Weimar sites, by its influence and constructions all over the world, and through its recognition as a UNESCO World Heritage Site. According to my criteria, I have deemed the Bauhaus a site has the all the right qualifications to survive and thrive well into the 21\(^{st}\) century. A present and future source of inspiration, in 2019, the Bauhaus celebrates its the 100th anniversary, and the states of Baden-Württemberg, Berlin, Brandenburg, Lower Saxony, Saxony-Anhalt and Thuringia are already working together as “Bauhaus 2019” to celebrate under the theme, “Die Welt neudenken” (“Rethinking the World”). Events and


festivities will involve the Bauhaus-Archiv / Museum of Design, Berlin, the KlassikStiftung Weimar and the Bauhaus Dessau Foundation in cooperation with each other; the main events will be three exhibitions on the global history of the Bauhaus as well as on the continued influence of the Bauhaus sites in Weimar, Dessau and Berlin.

The Bauhaus is part of our planetary heritage. One only has to look at the curved, metal legs of any chair in one’s vicinity to realize the import and impact of the Bauhaus. Its forward-thinking initiatives that strive to build both the “we-feeling” at a community level as well as a common lifeworld at a planetary level will insure its perpetuity. In striving to be dynamic and innovative, the Bauhaus and Gropius’ vision will continue to be a worthy addition to the UNESCO World Heritage List for decades to come.

5.3 The Leipzig Notenspur: The Underdog

In June 2012, Dr. Werner Schneider’s 16 year dream—the five kilometer-long musical trail running through the city, marked by steel, stylized arrows and blue signs, linking 23 sites—was finally realized. People from all over the world may now visit the city, and by following the trail on foot or by bicycle, learn almost all there is about the grand musical heritage of the historical German city of Leipzig. However, in June 2014, after years of hard work and preparation, The Leipzig Notenspur, reduced to eight sites and titled, "Leipzig Music Trail - Places of European Music History", was not chosen by the KMK to be submitted for consideration to the German Tentative UNESCO List. While the proposed sites of the Leipzig Notenspur are undeniably places of fundamental musical history and import, would the inclusion of the sites have been a useful addition to the UNESCO World Heritage List and therefore contributory to UNESCO’s ultimate mission of global peace-building? Filtered through my criteria, we can see that the Leipzig Notenspur would not have been a match.

In regards to my criterion (a), pertaining to shaping a common lifeworld, has the Notenspur been successful? One of the difficulties in promoting sites pertaining music is that music is intangible and has to be shown to be vibrant and alive in order to be appreciated. The problem here is not so much that classical music is…classical music, but simultaneously ubiquitous and inaccessible. The uphill battle alone for the survival of awareness and relevance of classical music in general in the 21st century is
practically Sisyphean. Also, even though Leipzig is a city etched into the minds of most students and lovers of classical music, it is not necessarily one of first cities that comes to the world when touring Europe (as Vienna is). In addition, it is difficult to promote a common lifeworld when that specific experience is something not everyone has had access to in the first place – whether due to education, background, economics, socialization, or simply general exposure. For example, if I say to anyone in the world sitting on a chair with metal legs, “Look at the chair you are sitting on; that is a direct result of the Bauhaus School in Germany,” that person can immediately see and appreciate how much of an impact the Bauhaus has made worldwide. With one sentence, I have already conveyed a common lifeworld, thereby drawing a unifying connection across the planet. The ubiquitousness yet inaccessibility of classical music is, while one can simply turn on a radio or get on YouTube almost anywhere in the world, it takes further exposure, opportunity, and a particular education (inaccessible to everyone in the world), in order to adequately process its importance to world cultural heritage. This is a factor that the Leipzig Notenspur team absolutely addresses locally - through the physical, educational and interactive nature of its presence in Leipzig, which includes co-sponsoring concerts with local groups and organizations, musical “salons” at the site venues, educational afternoons with school children and planned Leipzig Notenrad community tours. However, the Notenspur’s niche musical nature doesn’t necessarily automatically translate into a global mechanism for shaping a common lifeworld for the 21st century.

The criterion (b) of a well-organized system of global knowledge delivery in regard to the Leipzig Notenspur is covered by few tools. The websites http://www.notenspur-leipzig.de/ (English version available) has detailed information about its discovery tours of the Notenspur, Notenrad, Notenbogen as well as maps and the accompanying music clips; its Facebook page (in German) regularly posts articles on music, civic events it is involved in, Notenspur events, media, and further information. The Leipzig Notenspur also gets exposure through its affiliations with organizations like Leipzig Tourismus und Marketing GmbH, the MDR Orchestra und Choir, the Museum of Musical Instruments at the University of Leipzig, and The Leipzig History Museum, however, most of these organization are local. With the exception of the Leipzig Tourist Board, not too many other mechanisms exist for global outreach and exposure. The volunteer organization, the Notenspur Fördervereine (Friends of the Notenspur), has been limited not only the time
allowance of its manpower (even Dr. Schneider has a “day job” as a physics professor), but also in its marketing reach, and must depend on voluntary cultural marketing by its participatory members in order to receive extensive exposure. This reach is also limited as its members are mostly local and it is wholly locally-operated. An organization can loudly trumpet the obvious intrinsic worth of a church in which Bach conducted Sunday mass, however, if its farthest marketing reach depends almost entirely upon people who stumble onto its website, attend concerts it sponsors, pick up one of the pamphlets scattered in various places, or happen to be on a guided Leipzig Notenspur Tour, its global reach will remain limited. These days, simply relying on classical fans to search out and visit distant places from history books is not an effective strategy for exposure. For the Notenspur Initiative, this came down to continuously searching for support, manpower, time, and funding: none of which, unfortunately, seemed to add up to an effective global knowledge delivery system.

In relation to my criterion (c): demonstrating constantly fluid maintenance strategies for sustainability and success complementary to the local and global environment, this is an area in which the Leipzig Notenspur Initiative has not been strong enough. In 2012, the Notenspur seemed to be highly successful; one of its biggest contributors was the City of Leipzig. However, the Notenspur Initiative required at least 50,000 euros to run, and while this was adequate for 2013, the City of Leipzig halved their 2014 contribution. Then, after it was not chosen to be submitted for consideration on the German Tentative UNESCO List in the spring of 2015, the City of Leipzig chose not to grant further funding on the grounds that their vision did not match Dr. Schneider’s.¹⁵¹ This resulted in the expulsion of the volunteer workhorse organization, the Notenspur Fördervereine (Friends of the Notenspur), from their municipally-funded office in the middle of town directly across from the St. Nikolaikirche, as well as the organization’s dissolution for lack of funds. On March 31st, 2015, they officially closed their offices. Not only had this organization established the Notenspur, Notenrad, and Notenbogen, but tirelessly attempted to make the citizens of Leipzig aware of their own cultural heritage through sponsoring events like the classical salons, or walks around the city pertaining to historical events, or promoting musical/cultural events taking place around the city. While the Leipzig

Notenspur failed in its bid for UNESCO World Heritage status, the plan was to apply for European Heritage Label (which places more emphasis on the intangible heritage of a city). Unfortunately, without sufficient funds or, more importantly, the municipal support of the City of Leipzig, that may be no longer an option. Currently, Dr. Schneider and his team are looking for other ways, such as crowd-funding, to gather funding for their further musical and cultural projects.

Finally, while not quite reaching the requirement to fulfill my criterion (c), particularly in terms of perpetuity, the Notenspur Initiative team, despite its fiscal limitations, has tried to take full advantage of Leipzig’s current, fertile, cultural and historical musical environment. An area in which the Notenspur Initiative had many strengths was in conceiving ways in which the local community could get involved. In addition to making possible the Notenspur, Notenrad, Notenbogen, and various related installations throughout the city, the Notenspur Initiative promoted and sponsored various musical and cultural events through the years; events which have this past year included music salons specifically aimed at children and collaborations with the Jewish community to highlight the Jewish culture in music. Most recently, in celebration of Bach’s birthday in March 2014, the Notenspur Initiative helped promote a “Bach in the Subway” concert, in which local musicians performed in the resonant atmosphere of the Leipzig Markt subway. Also, on April 13th, a “Snowflower Walk” was held, commemorating the 70th anniversary of the forced march of 1500 forced laborers - Jewish Hungarians and French political prisoners to Theresienstadt. Events like these led the Leipzig Notenspur to win the prize for “Lebendige Erinnerungskultur” (European Initiative Prize for Culture) in 2013. Also, in 2014, the Leipzig Notenspur was given an award by the “Lebendige Stadt” Foundation (Living City) title for the best project among 437 applicants that demonstrated innovative civil commitment, established identity through memory, and most importantly, gave the city development momentum. The prize was 15,000 Euros and the permission to add the “Lebendige Stadt” label to the City of Leipzig’s cultural promotions.152

What is the future of the Notenspur Initiative? While its installations around the city highlighting its impressive musical culture remain and even though the organization instrumental in its conception and realization has been dissolved for lack
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of official municipal backing and funding, Dr. Schneider and his team are determined to soldier on. However, without the infrastructural and financial support of the City of Leipzig, only projects funded privately or publicly can be proposed and pursued. Many of its planned initiatives were cancelled, among them, a series of educational activities for schools and for primary school children pertaining to the “Little Leipzig Music Trail”; a project introducing Leipzig’s musical heritage to immigrant children; and Jewish music salons in schools during Jewish Week 2015. Fortunately, events still possible in 2015 are a guided, weekend Notenrad tour, a donor-supported Leipzig Notenspur exhibition in the Saxon parliament in Dresden in celebration of Leipzig’s 1000th anniversary, and a collaboration with the Leo Baeck Institute in New York and the EVZ Foundation for Jewish Music Culture. In addition, through support from Leipzig 2015 (the organization responsible for planning Leipzig’s 1000th anniversary events), a November Notenspur “Notenspur-Nacht der Hausmusik” (Night of House Music) will still take place. Still, in conclusion, while there is no question that the Notenspur Initiative has spawned both an indispensable cultural education and lucrative tourist advantages for the city of Leipzig and deserves local, national and international recognition, the Leipzig Notenspur would never have been a viable candidate for the UNESCO World Heritage List.

5.4 The Old Jewish Synagogue & Complimentary Testimonies – Erfurt: The Contender

It is impossible to effectively represent European heritage without the inclusion of Jewish life and even more impossible to document German heritage without the experience and cultural contribution of its Jewish population. As Cilly Kugelmann, Program Director of the Jewish Museum in Berlin said in a recent interview, “It could be that the time is indeed coming when Nazi history is no longer in the foreground, but that there is new attention being paid to the rich Jewish history that existed in Germany before that time.”153 Despite the centuries-long history of the Jewish people in Germany, not one site on the UNESCO World Heritage List reflects

This. There is only one comparable UNESCO Jewish site in Europe, one which also highlights the interconnectedness of Jewish and Christian life in Europe, and that is the Historical Jewish Quarter and St Procopius' Basilica in Třebíčis, in Central Europe, in the Czech Republic. It is important to note that while there is currently no Jewish population in Třebíčis, there exists a population of 500 and growing in Erfurt and approximately 800 in the state of Thuringia. According to the gap study which spawned UNESCO’s 1994 Global Strategy, Christian heritage and historical sites dominate the list, especially those located in Europe. Meanwhile, in the 1990’s Erfurt Jewish heritage was literally being unearthed, and over the ensuing years, various community professionals, scholars and civic leaders gradually realized the global importance of what they had. When faced with the enormity of evidence of a rich and bustling Jewish life that existed alongside Christian life, the drive to have it further studied, recognized, and protected was initiated.

In 2008, the City of Erfurt put in motion its bid for recognition on the UNESCO World Heritage List and submitted the following properties: The Old Synagogue (ca. 1094); the medieval mikveh (ca. 1250); the Stone House on Benediktsplatz (ca. 1250); and the “Complimentary Testimonies”. Six years later, in June 2014, the KMK chose to include the sites, entitled “The Old Synagogue and Mikveh in Erfurt – Testimonies of everyday life, religion and town history between change and continuity” on the German Tentative UNESCO List, in line to be sent for consideration to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee sometime between 2020-2022. What chance does Erfurt have? Are the sites a match for UNESCO’s overall mission of “building peace in the minds of men and women”? Would adding Erfurt’s offerings help UNESCO World Heritage maintain its relevance in the 21st century?

Let us look at Erfurt’s application through the lens of my criteria. Criterion (a) is about shaping a common lifeworld by conveying the positive synergy derived from promoting unity in a diversity of cultures. One of the points the UNESCO application makes is that it is important to make people aware that Jewish and Christian life in Germany effectively co-existed and that the communities did interact positively and were economically interdependent. This was especially evident in Erfurt, which served as the center of the Jewish community in Thuringia, under de-facto government
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protection during the Middle Ages largely because of their vast and lucrative trade networks. In essence, the Jewish business community was critical to the local economy, and, in turn, to the German economy. In the centuries following the Middle Ages, from 1453 and through the Napoleonic Wars, no Jewish community existed in Erfurt. From 1804 to 1932, Erfurt’s Jewish community was re-established and re-integrated itself into the community and grew until it numbered around 1,290.155 So, we can see that, during several periods in Erfurt’s history, Jews continued to prosper, live alongside, interact with, and influence the greater community.

One word that keeps surfacing in conversation with the UNESCO officer, in the media, and in promotional literature for sites is “responsibility”, as in the responsibility to raise awareness of the German-Jewish heritage and history of the Jewish community’s integration into urban society, its involvement in the history of the region, as well as the ability to fill in some gaps in European cultural history. The motivations apparent underscore the idea that a collective German common lifeworld has been shaped by both Christians and Jews. In recognizing the Erfurt properties and the Complementary Testimonies, UNESCO would be championing the unity in that diversity. As Sarah Laubenstien, the UNESCO Officer in charge of the Erfurt bid articulated: “Jewish culture is European culture. They aren’t the others. They are Europeans.”156 This attitude will hopefully continue to be reflected and conveyed by Erfurt today.

The city of Erfurt, the capital of Thuringia, is charming and picturesque, with a medieval-yet-modern vibe. While the tourist websites for Erfurt highlight facts like it was a place where Martin Luther lived and studied, and currently home to twenty-five parish churches, fifteen abbeys and monasteries and ten chapels, they also make prominent and positive mention of the Jewish sites. It is a reflection of how well-regarded, well-respected, and well-promoted the Jewish sites are and demonstrate that the Jewish community is included in the collective cultural and historical heritage of the city and of Thuringia - suggesting that the “we-feeling” needed to build empathy across borders is being built, according to my criterion (b). A continuing work-in-progress, the website (in both German and English) - http://juedisches-leben.erfurt.de/jl/en/index.html - has information from everything from the properties

156 Conversation with Sarah Laubenstein, Erfurt, July 29, 2014.
and complimentary testimonies, to Jewish history in Erfurt from the Middle Ages to the present, to information on its bid for UNESCO World Heritage status. The heading on the left of side of the main page, “Jüdische Geschichte und Gegenwart in Erfurt” (Jewish Past and Present in Erfurt), further illustrates the connection of the past to the future and also the fact that there is actually a Jewish “present” in Erfurt to highlight. The logo on the website features both German and Hebraic script and features the Ashkenazi wedding ring from the Erfurt Treasure, symbolizing the unity of the two cultures.

![Figure 6: Logo (Design by Landeshaupt Erfurt)](image)

In addition, since 2012, scholars studying the sites have been publishing their research results in series of books entitled, “Erfurt Writings on Jewish History”. Thus far, the series is comprised of three volumes - Volume 1: “The Jewish community of Erfurt and Shum communities” (2012), Volume 2: The grave stones of the medieval Jewish cemetery of Erfurt” (2013) and Volume 3: “To Image and Text in the Judeo-Christian context in the Middle Ages” (2015). These publications serve to further inform and to update both interested scholars as well as the general public on current research about Erfurt’s Jewish history as well as about Germany’s Jewish heritage. Also interesting, on the official website are audio samples of Jewish prayer songs and impressions of services in a synagogue during the Middle Ages. Videos available on the website tell about the architectural history of the sites as well as educate through lectures on Jewish religious life and culture. In this way, one can inform oneself about the Erfurt sites and identify with a significant part of Germany’s cultural past and present even before one might travel to Erfurt to view the sites.

Furthermore, outreach has been conducted in terms of scientific research on the medieval Jewish community in Erfurt in order to promote research longevity. For example, the academicians and supporters involved network with other communities in Ashkenaz (the Central European area of settlement north of the Alps); the goal is to
work in concert with other centers to explore more efficiently and effectively the history of the Jewish communities in the Middle Ages. The City of Erfurt also holds workshops and conferences in cooperation with organizations like the University of Jewish Studies in Heidelberg and the *Thüringisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege und Archäologie* (Thuringian State Office of Historic Monuments and Archaeology – TLDA). In these ways, the project disseminates the history and knowledge gleaned from the sites and artifacts across Germany and promotes the idea of a shared culture and heritage.

Another aspect of Erfurt’s possible UNESCO World Heritage application’s success is the depth of local support. From the beginning, the process has received vast organizational support from the community and engendered the kind of municipal support critical for financial security. An entire infrastructure was established to facilitate the application as well as the management of the properties. This support has been conducive to my criterion (c), demonstrating constantly fluid maintenance strategies for sustainability and success complementary to the local and global environment. Since 2009, two academic employees have been placed in charge of the process for the Erfurt municipality with three main objectives: to oversee the scope and breadth of the research on the history of the medieval Jewish community in Erfurt and discover how the community was integrated into urban society, regional history as well into the European cultural arena; to analyze and carry out additional research on specific objects in the collection; and to oversee the application process by coordinating and cooperating with municipal, state and federal partners as well as with public associates.\(^\text{157}\)

Moreover, a steering group was formed, involving the relevant political allies and other key stakeholders. An interdisciplinary advisory board was also formed from among the academicians which experts from the fields of archaeology, history, art history, architectural history and museology. Supporters include the Mayor of Erfurt, representatives from the relevant departments, deputies from the City Council parliamentary groups, the Thuringian Jewish Community, the Thuringian Ministry for Education, Science and Culture (*TMBWK*), the Thuringian State Office for the Preservation of Monuments and Archaeology (*TLDA*) and the Erfurt Tourism and Marketing Ltd. Creating an infrastructure complementary with a local government

\(^{157}\) Jewish Life Past and Present, “Becoming World Heritage: Aims and Activities”.
willing to interact within a global environment and one that can also efficiently handle the vast machinations and strategies pertaining to a project of this kind is fundamental for sustainability. Said Andreas Bausewein, the Mayor of Erfurt, after the June 2014 decision, “We are very proud of the Jewish history of Erfurt.”

Preserving and remembering Germany’s Jewish heritage is necessary and vital in the 21st century. It has taken decades for Germany (and for the world) to come to terms with the legacy of the years before, during and after World War II. However, in viewing the history of the Jewish people in Europe as well as places around the world, one cannot avoid examining centuries of persecution in the rest of Europe and in the world-at-large. According to the Economist, in 2012, the Jewish population numbered at approximately 13,580,000 with 81% distributed within the US and Israel. The rest of the registered Jewish population was spread throughout Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Chile, Argentina, Britain, France, Belgium, Italy, Hungary, The Netherlands, the Ukraine, Germany, Russia, and Australia. Europe holds about 10% of the world’s Jewish population – that is just 0.2% of the Europe’s total population. And, while the Jewish population in Eastern Europe and in the countries of the former Soviet Bloc have fallen significantly due to rampant, resurgent anti-Semitism, the biggest increase between 1945 and 2010 of Jews in Europe has been in Germany, with a population of about 230,000. The continual sociological, cultural, and religious demonization and marginalization of the Jewish people throughout history and still today means that there is still work to do in terms of promoting “cultural coexistence”. The stated importance of achieving inscription onto the UNESCO World Heritage List are the following: strengthening conservation of the historic monuments and their surroundings in the historic center of Erfurt; promoting awareness of regional identity among the people of Erfurt and visitors; and confirming appreciation of the common roots of Jews and Christians in Germany and Europe. The greatest weapon against ignorance is education. This is what has driven the promotion of
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the Erfurt bid - impressing upon the global community that Jewish people in Germany were not the “other”, but were productive, integrated, and essential members of a larger community.

The promotion of the Erfurt properties is valuable because the global population yet holds much prejudice against the Jewish culture. Erfurt and Thuringia should be part of this cultural promotion, for not only was Jewish life interwoven with Christian life socially, economically, and culturally during the Middle Ages and several periods afterwards, but a thriving Jewish community exists in Erfurt today – active in the community through Synagogue concerts, lecture evenings, events held at the Jewish Cultural Center, a Jewish café (which holds concerts, discussion and community cultural events) and a radio station (Radio Shalom). Awareness of the vibrant and vital role that the Jewish community has played throughout the centuries is still relevant in the 21st century. The organizations in charge of the sites and the UNESCO application have worked steadily towards my last criterion (d), conveying planetary intersubjectivity in a relatable manner which contributes to relevance into perpetuity by taking the necessary foundational steps to ensure that not only will the Erfurt sites be valued in the immediate community of Erfurt and the larger region of Thuringia, but also in Germany, Europe and the world. The Erfurt Jewish sites and “Complimentary Testimonies” would make a worthy addition to the UNESCO World Heritage List, but we will have to wait until the next decade for the final decision.

5.5 UNESCO: A Peace-building Mechanism for the 21st Century

This study has traveled through centuries of German history as well as through world history for the purpose of extracting exactly how a particular place in a particular country can be valuable as a tool for “building peace in the hearts and minds of men and women” in the 21st century. I also delved into the evolution of UNESCO thought-development through the decades in regards to peace-building by means of its World Heritage label. Furthermore, I studied three very different German cultural sites, in three chronological stages of consideration for inclusion on to the UNESCO World Heritage List and examined whether these sites in particular would be relevant to peace-building in the 21st century by viewing them through UNESCO World
Heritage criteria and then filtering them through my own criteria, conceived with the juxtaposition of interdisciplinary and intersubjective concepts and ideas developed internationally over decades. In my final analysis, I reflected upon the historical, political, and cultural environment of each of the sites in relation to the needs of peace-building in the ultramodern world. This study has been entirely dynamic, in the sense that as I have been gathering my research, thoughts and writing, pivotal decisions have been made pertaining to the sites during the course of the year, indeed right through to the writing of these conclusions. There was no way of knowing how this thesis was going to end until these time-sensitive decisions were made - the latest decision on March 17th, 2015.

The past year also brought forth a variety of world events, remembrances and conflicts: the FIFA World Cup; the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in Gaza; a Roman Catholic pope’s first visit to Asia in 25 years; the Ukraine and Crimean crisis; the Boko Haram kidnappings of school girls in Nigeria; the Ebola outbreak; the easing of tensions between the US and Cuba; the continual destruction of ancient sites in the Middle East by ISIS; the 25th Anniversary of the Fall of the Berlin Wall, and the Church of England’s ruling allowing female bishops. All of these events and others like them have shaped the collective understanding, shared culture, and common lifeworld of the global/planetary citizenry:

Heritage is our legacy from the past, what we live with today, and what we pass on to future generations. Our cultural and natural heritage are both irreplaceable sources of life and inspiration. They are our touchstones, our points of reference, our identity. What makes the concept of World Heritage exceptional is its universal application. World Heritage sites belong to all the peoples of the world, irrespective of the territory on which they are located. (UNESCO, 2008)

Globalization has enabled us, through faster, easier and cheaper mobility and through quickening technology, both tangible (communication technology) and intangible (social media), to rapidly spread the knowledge we glean around the world to each other. In this ever-changing world whirling faster and faster around us, UNESCO World Heritage sites still have a relevant place in peace-building, because promoting the preservation of these sites allows humanity to share places where one country’s tangible history can be learned as our collective history. UNESCO is
successfully forming policy and objectives that are forward-thinking and also promote planetary thinking.

Guided by its 1994 Global Strategy, UNESCO broadened its definition of heritage to include “outstanding demonstrations of human coexistence with the land as well as human interactions, cultural coexistence, spirituality and creative expression cultural” and is working towards inclusion of underrepresented cultural aspects. By virtue of Germany’s evolving national character due to globalization, immigration, increasing cultural diversity resulting in the shifting of its cultural tectonic plates, and its willingness to confront its history, UNESCO can yet choose to promote sites highlighting underrepresented aspects, like the Erfurt properties, that will educate, illuminate and promote German heritage for generations to come. UNESCO has displayed the ability to continually evolve its criteria and objectives in order to complement the shifting planetary, global, and cultural environment and can be successful in its mission of “building peace in the minds of men and women” well into the 21st century.
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Appendix A

UNESCO World Heritage Criteria

(i) to represent a masterpiece of human creative genius

(ii) to exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design

(iii) to bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared

(iv) to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates a) significant stage(s) in human history

(v) to be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change

(vi) to be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance.

(vii) to contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance

(viii) to be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth's history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features

(ix) to be outstanding examples representing significant on-going ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals

(x) to contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation.164
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Appendix B

My Criteria for 21st Century, Planetary Peace-Building

(a) shaping a common lifeworld by conveying the positive synergy derived from promoting unity in a diversity of culture

(b) building empathy through communicating the “we-feeling” by means of a well-organized system of global knowledge delivery

(c) demonstrating fluid maintenance strategies for sustainability and success complementary to the local and global environment

(d) conveying planetary intersubjectivity in a relatable manner which contributes to relevance into perpetuity

American Israeli Cooperative Enterprise. “Oath More Judaico or Juramentum Judaerorum.” *Jewish Virtual Library*

American-Israeli Cooperative Enterprise. “Germany: The Crusades and Middle Ages.”


http://www.bachdigital.de/content/bacharchiv.xml;jsessionid=996D904A0C2F3CE74FCB6593CEB8B500?lang=en (accessed September 28, 2014).

Bauhaus Dessau. "Chronology: 1924 – ‘Freundeskreis’ is founded.”

---. "IKEA Bauhaus Summer 2015 – “Newly Furnished.”

---. “Dessau Period 1925-1932 – Prosperity of Bauhaus.”

---. “Intercultural Cross-Generational Park.”

---. “Museum learning: Young people, come to the Bauhaus!”

---. “The Bauhaus Building – History of Use.”

---. "The Bauhaus Building by Walter Gropius (1925-26).”


MOMA. “Bauhaus: First Years in Dessau.”
(accessed May 1, 2015).

Norwegian Ministry of Agriculture and Food. “Svalbard Global Seed Vault.”


(accessed December 14, 2014).


UNESCO World Heritage Centre, “Global Strategy.”


---. “Convention Concerning the Protection of The World Cultural and Natural Heritage World Heritage Committee: Thirty-eighth session.” Doha, Qatar: June 2014, 68.


---. “Old Synagogue and Mikveh in Erfurt – Testimonies of everyday life, religion and town history between change and continuity.”


---. “World Heritage Information Kit. (June 2008).”


