Neil MacGregor

Wrestling with the Past

Exhibiting German History*

There are several commemorations these years, among them the three-hundredth anniversary of the Hanoverian succession, and of course the twenty-fifth year of the fall of the Wall. Both countries, Britain and Germany, have a long tradition of commemoration, and at first sight, you might think that we do the same thing in the same way. The Siegestor in Munich is commemorating the Bavarian engagement in the wars of liberation; the Wellington Memorial Arch at Hyde Park Corner is commemorating the British engagement in the same anti-Napoleonic campaigns. The two arches look very alike on the front; it is when you go to the back of the Munich arch that you realise that not only our history is different, but our monuments. Written on the front of the Bavarian arch is "Dem Bayerischen Heere" ("To the Bavarian Army"), on the back, on the side you see when you come up from the city, along the Ludwigstraße, are the words "Dem Sieg geweiht. Vom Krieg zerstört. Zum Frieden mahnend." ("Dedicated to Victory. Destroyed by War. Mourning and Admonishing to Peace.") It is, I think, the distinction between commemorations in our two countries: the British commemorations look back, talk about the past, the German commemorations, for the reasons that we all understand, constantly, and admirably, look forward. The Siegestor in Munich can be seen as an emblem of how German monuments to the past are reworked, refigured, sometimes involuntarily, always consciously, subsequently, into an admonition to the future.

During the year 2014, the British Museum will be putting on three consecutive exhibitions about aspects of German history, and as you know, this is a highly contested field. It is a field that we enter with considerable apprehension. Yet we think it is important because not only the monuments between the two countries suggest a very different approach to history, but indeed our understanding of our own histories could hardly be more different. At the opening of the Olympic Ceremony in London in 2012, the British presented to the world a narrative of their history. It was one long hilarious celebration about the things that make us proud to be what we are, starting with Mary Poppins, and of

* Unscripted ANGERMION lecture given by Neil MacGregor at Queen Mary, University of London on 27th January, 2014. The lecture was transcribed by Margit Dirscherl. We are grateful to Neil MacGregor for his permission to publish this transcript. The lecture was lavishly illustrated by visual material that cannot be represented here.

DOI 10.1515/anger-2014-0001

course finishing with the great humorous moment when Her Majesty herself arrived. But, and I think this is a very striking "but", this history omitted any mention at all of an empire, of imperial militarism, no mention at all of the wars of the twentieth century, and no mention of the darker pages of our history, as Doctor Adam referred to of slavery. We can present a narrative of ourselves in which we simply forget that slavery was not just a Keep out! of British history, but that was fought for very energetically. Slavery was not just a trade and a practice that we were part of, it is one that was defended at the highest level, a narrative that we have written out of the script. And indeed if you are thinking about the public presentation of British history to the British, you are constantly brought up against a certain self-congratulatory complacency, where the facetious is never far below the surface. Willingness to confront the other side, the darker side, is conspicuously absent. Our flag we can honour in some ways, but we can also, of course, at the Last Night of the Proms, mock what it represents, and repeat our history while apparently undermining it. The singing of *Rule Britannia*, the Proms, the singing of *Land of Hope and Glory*, is a very fascinating phenomenon, the extent to which it is still being meant in any way as a historical thing to admire, whether it is simply being laughed at, or whether the humour allows the denial of the realities of recent history. But what I think it suggests is that through this mixture of selective memory and humour, we have constructed a national narrative with which most people can be comfortable. It is a national narrative, which everybody knows to be flawed, but it is inhabited by most people with comfort and with confidence.

That is of course not the case with the narrative of the German flag. And in the first of the exhibitions that the British Museum will be showing this year, opening next month from the collection of Christian Graf Dürkheim of late twentieth century German drawings, we will be showing works by Georg Baselitz that are far away from the Last Night of the Proms, and whose response to the traditional heroic German eagle, used proudly throughout the centuries, is also one that is uncomfortably denying, doubting, and challenging. For the reasons that we all know, German history has no comfortable overarching narrative, which can contain the noble and the ignoble. And for the reasons that we all know, the ignoble aspect, particularly the Holocaust is so powerful that it cannot be omitted or overlooked from any narrative. This means that any attempt to present the history of Germany is to wrestle with different parts of the past, leaving us not with one overarching narrative but with a fractured story, elements of which form a kaleidoscope that needs to be reconfigured at regular intervals, fractured histories that are mostly unknown to the British public. And it is this that we want to attempt to address in the exhibition opening in October to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the fall of the Wall, to address some

aspects of German history which will be familiar to any German, but which may not be so well known to people in this country, and to use, in order to present those narratives, only objects made by Germans in Germany – what this history means through the things that the people made.

It is of course the history that shaped and transformed modern Europe. If you had to choose a moment at which Europe is born, I think you would have to choose Mainz around 1450, with Gutenberg's invention of movable type. From this point on, the whole of Western life is transformed. And, along with the invention of printing, of course the impact of the Reformation connected with it, leading to an intellectual revival across the whole of Europe, the consequences of which we are still living with today. It is a narrative that would also include the first Europe-wide artist, the first artist to be able to sell his works across the whole continent, to be known across the whole continent: Albrecht Dürer is representing that Europe begins to think beyond itself – and it thinks through German imagery. One would also want to present, in this narrative, some of the technical achievements that made Germany the envy of Europe, such as the invention of porcelain in Meissen and Dresden in the early eighteenth century. Very importantly, as with the printing, these are Chinese techniques that are not copied and stolen from China, but examined, developed, reinvented, and extended, by Germany: a quite different kind of engagement with technology from abroad.

And, of course at the heart of any view of a Germany that all Germans acknowledge as theirs, and of which they are all heirs, would have to be Goethe. The Tischbein painting (Städel Museum, Frankfurt) is coming to the exhibition, the most extraordinary gift and generosity the part of our colleagues there, to lend this icon of German culture to the British Museum for three months.

To present a story of Germany immediately starts with the classic question: Where is it? Friedrich Schiller writes: „Deutschland? Aber wo liegt es? Ich weiß das Land nicht zu finden,/Wo das gelehrte beginnt, hört das politische auf." ("Germany? But where is it? I cannot find the country,/Where the scholarly begins, the political ends.") Unlike France or Britain, in the eighteenth century, Germany is a scattered accumulation of tiny states, but also reaches far beyond the boundaries that we now know, particularly in the west. *Deutschland? Aber wo liegt es?* If you want to tell a story of Germany, one of the places you would have to include is Strasbourg; one of the centres of German technology; the imperial free city, where great clocks are made in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, which are the envy of Europe. Shakespeare compares a wife to a German clock: absolutely reliable, terrific, but very high maintenance. Strasbourg is at this point an entirely German city, and it remains so until the great French aggression of the late seventeenth century. Against all norms of international

law, France appropriates Strasbourg in 1681, and it remains under French rule until it returns to German rule in 1870. It is a very good example of the fact that this is a city now in France, which is an integral part of a German narrative. When Goethe wants to talk about the narratives of Germanness, German architecture is one of the key ones, and the epitome of German Gothic architecture is Strasbourg. This is what it means to be German, to be part of the people that build this cathedral.

Deutschland? Aber wo liegt es? Not only Strasbourg is central to this narrative. One of the many centres that are now outside Germany is Prague, where the first German university is set up, the Karls-Universität; Prague, where Kafka lives, writes, without which Kafka is not comprehensible. You cannot construct twentieth-century German literature without Prague being part of that narrative. Prague was never a part of Germany in that contemporary sense, although part of the Empire, but where a German-speaking community flourished there for centuries and enriched the German culture. And just as a twentieth century without Kafka would be unthinkable in literature, in the history of art you could not construct a twentieth-century view of German art without Käthe Kollwitz. Käthe Kollwitz, born in Königsberg, the great coronation city of Prussia; the city of Kant; you couldn't write a story of German culture without Königsberg – now Kaliningrad, part of Russia. There is no other European culture of which this is true, where to write the narrative of French, Italian, British, Spanish culture, you would need to include cities that are not now within the polity. For Germany it is unthinkable.

Deutschland? Aber wo liegt es? This is something that we need to try to show, and I think it is difficult for British people to understand this floating Germany, and how recently the floating happened. In the world within living memory, Königsberg was part of the German state, as were parts of modern Czechoslovakia. And the way we are going to try to do that is, for example, through showing one of the carts used by the refugees through East Prussia and Silesia, as they fled from the advancing Russian army in 1945. Those populations, which have disappeared, which were transferred, and the traces of the long German life in East Prussia were then removed. Max Egremont wrote recently about this very beautifully, Gräfin Dönhoff has written also very powerfully: "Namen, die keiner mehr nennt" – names and places that have disappeared from the memory, but within the lifetime of those still alive. This was the fate of millions, and this shaped Germany today – it is a history for which the British have no comparable experience. The nearest element in our own history would be the Irish emigration, but that's an *emigration*. This extraordinary immigration of large numbers of people, German in every way, but living in territories that now belong to Russia or Poland or Czechoslovakia. This object, one of

the carts used by the refugees, is going to be lent to us by the Deutsches Historisches Museum in Berlin, our very generous partners in this venture. Besides this, they are going to lend another object, which sets this in a context that might have a resonance for a British public, which is the first stage-set for *Mother Courage*, because of course what Bertolt Brecht is doing with Mother Courage in her caravan, her truck, is picking up the actual events of 1945/46, and setting them the context of the Thirty Years' War.

The significance of the long German presence in the East, abruptly, brutally ended, and how that transformed Germany and German culture in the years after the war, we can demonstrate through objects like this. We will also be able to demonstrate that in some of the drawings of Graf Dürkheim's gift, works by Sigmar Polke, born in Silesia, now in Poland, whose parents fled exactly at this time, or Markus Lüpertz, whose family are born in Bohemia, who also had to flee. It is worth wondering why it is that so many of the artists of post-war Germany whom we know – Baselitz, Lüpertz, Polke and so on – come from families that were in the East, either in the GDR or further east: and what that dislocation generated and the connection of that with the work they produced. This floating Germany, which has now come to rest in the boundaries that we know, is only part of the story, because as well as floating, Germany has always been multiple, and always divided in a way that is literally ungraspable for somebody who grew up with a British history. When George I. arrives in Great Britain in 1714, he finds in his new kingdom one currency only. The whole island has one currency, the Golden Guinea of 1715. In the Germany that he left there were between 180 and 200 currencies, such as the currencies of the Prussian king or the Duke of Saxony-Weimar, promoting themselves in their own territory. Every one of these coins stands for a separate state. There were also religious coinages, such as by the archbishops of Mainz, Trier, or the archbishop of Cologne, Clement von Wittelsbach, who was part of the House of Bavaria. Further to the princes and bishops, the free cities had their own currencies, such as the free city of Worms (in 1717, it used its currency to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the Diet of Worms), the grand city of Frankfurt, or the free and Hanseatic city of Hamburg that was part of this extraordinary network running from Riga to Antwerp and to London.

Every one of these states is not just its own ruler and its own sense of authority, it has its own set of laws and legal structures, its own currency, and usually its own weights and measures. The diversity of Germany is unexaggerable for the British, and it is something that the British traditionally laughed at, such as Thackeray in his heavy condescension in *Vanity Fair*, describing the Duke of Sachsen-Weimar-Eisenach as the "Prince of Pumpernickel", translating "Durchlaucht" as "His Transparency" – this is typical of the mockery. But what

the British did not understand were the huge advantages of this, because next to the obvious disadvantages, legally or commercially, it allowed a high level of emulation and competition, which is precisely comparable with the city-states of Renaissance Italy. The fact that the elector of Saxony is able and determined to focus on one particular thing, the making of porcelain, so that that becomes the USP of Saxony in European diplomacy for a generation, is absolutely typical. It is questionable what would have happened without the rivalry between Saxony and the other large states. So this generated a kind of creativity, but also does something else: the fact that you have the small states with different jurisdictions means that you cannot impose the will of the sovereign in the different states, because as well as law and currency, each state has the religion of the ruler. So Luther's tracts promoting Lutherism and attacking the pope can, in England, be simply eliminated. Cambridge, Oxford and London burn Luther's books without any problem; nowhere in England you would be able not to do so. In Germany you simply move across the frontier, and in the next little state nobody is burning his books because they are supporting him. It is the critical fact not just of the Reformation, but of a kind of intellectual freedom which is a long time coming in Britain and in France – that freedom that diversity offers, with all its disadvantages, allows the spread of ideas, making it impossible to suppress in a way that changes our history as much as it does Germany's.

It is, as I said, the norm in Germany to be divided in different configurations, and this exception remained in its state until 1871, until the creation of the Reich after the Franco-Prussian War and the creation of *one* currency for the whole of Germany; although the German Eagle was on the front, and on the back the different dukes had their portraits – just in the way the Euro is continued today on this model. But this is the united Germany of 1914. We wanted to mark the commemoration of 1914 in the museum, but we wanted to do it in a way that would enable our visitors to get an idea of what the war looked like from the German side. We will in many, many exhibitions in Britain, be looking at the British experience of the *Urkatastrophe*. The very few opportunities to look at the other way around, and one of the ways that we could do it from the collections of the Museum is through our collection of commemorative medals – not war medals pinned on the chests of soldiers, but commemorative medals. After the war, Britain and France produced commemorative medals, while Germany, of course, did not produce such medals in 1919. However, unlike Britain and France, Germany had produced medals commenting on the war, as the war went along, in a regular pattern, and this does let us see the war from the other side. These images of the First World War were, for example, expressing the fear of the endless supply of British soldiers. In particular, the Germans were able to draw upon their own great tradition of an *Urkatastrophe*, the "Dance of Death"

by Holbein. The German vision of the Western Front, in which a skeleton leads the soldiers on to certain death, is based on the great Holbein series, and the figure and the tradition are wonderfully, movingly evolved. The coin "Weltkrieg zu Land und zu Meer" evokes images of the *Bauernkrieg* and the Thirty Years' War, reworked in 1916. These are serious works of art that need to be looked at as works of art; they are also very powerful indications of how the war was perceived at home. This became critical in the propaganda war in 1915, such as in a coin depicting the sinking of the Lusitania, with the inscription "Geschäft über alles" ("Business Above All"). For the British propaganda, this of course was a gift: they took this as a celebration of the killing of civilians. They made copies of the medal, and they distributed them with explanatory leaflets in Britain. It is why this 'other side' of the medal is such an important thing for us to try to show; and it is particularly the war at sea that is significant, because that is what the most impact is from the British side on Germany. I think coins, such as the one depicting the sinking of the Lusitania, are important to show, as well as our own medals: that will be the exhibition over the summer in the British Museum.

After the war, because of the lack of metal, the small coinage of the *Reichsmark* began to disappear, because the metal was worth more than the face value. So in 1919, with the almost complete disappearance of the one Pfennig coins, a new currency had to be invented. In the British Museum is one of the great collections of the *Notgeld*, the emergency currency produced to meet this extraordinary economic catastrophe. Every city has to make its own, and immediately you revert to these tiny states that we saw in the eighteenth century in the most remarkable way. The different designs of the *Notgeld* were used as statements of what the city *is*: remarkable demonstrations of what is the state of the public mood at the beginning of the Weimar Republic. In the Harz region, winter sports were promoted; Bremen depicted one of the great harbours, despite the war. Bordesholm commemorates its abbey, which had been a great centre, while Eisenach refers on its notes to its Protestant tradition with Martin Luther, and town of Colditz in Saxony reminds of the catastrophe of the Swedes and the Thirty Years' War – the different histories are locally articulated, and sometimes far distant ones. These can be seen as an extraordinary kind of popular history, allowing us to measure the preoccupations of the day. Of course the concern of the fallen – "Ich hatt' einen Kameraden" – was a very typical kind of subject, using the new currency to commemorate the dead. The concern that Germany might be divided by the plebiscites is expressed on the *Notgeld* of Altona: "Mein Vaterland" is written on the front of the currency in high German, "eternally undivided" is added in the local language, Plattdeutsch. What also becomes visible in the design of the new currencies is the nasty side of what is

beginning in the Weimar Republic, such as on the anti-Semitic *Notgeld* from Beverungen. Everything that happens in the Weimar Republic can be read through the *Notgeld* throughout this couple of years. Astonishingly, Meissen *Notgeld* is in porcelain. This is really the localism of Germany, expressed in an amazingly astonishing way in a time of crisis. What is hoped for, as the Weimar Republic gets going, is proclaimed on the *Notgeld* of Weimar, in the city of Goethe, in the city of Bauhaus, where the whole world is being rethought, reimagined and redesigned. One of the great gifts for the exhibition is from Weimar, from the Bauhaus Museum, a cradle conceived of two prime geometric shapes, circle and triangle, painted in primary colours, red, black and yellow. It is a cradle in which not only the baby can rest but a new world can be created – and this transforms the whole of Europe. It is a moment of great, great hope, and Weimar is the centre.

When the hyper-inflation comes after the *Notgeld*, again everybody produces their own emergency currency. It is a time when, very quickly, things go very badly wrong. Contemporary art, not just that of the Bauhaus, is now declared degenerate. One such drawing is by Emil Nolde, which is now owned by the British Museum. Stamped on its back is "Museum der Hansestadt Lübeck". The drawing was not stolen, it was removed in the purging of the public collections of degenerate art and put on the market, bought, and eventually ended up in the British Museum. The document is itself a narrative. And there is another back and front that tells us about the Weimar Republic: a 500 Million Mark note, which on its back reminds you that it is of course the Jew who has cheated you of your money. And you know what you have to do: you have to vote "Völkisch-Sozial", as it says on the back of the note.

And then later, in Weimar again: Buchenwald. And the terrifying fact that the gates of Buchenwald are designed by Bauhaus artists, and that this tradition morphs into the world of Buchenwald, and written in the gate at the entrance of Buchenwald the words: the German version of the *suum quique*, the First King of Prussia's order, "To each what is due to him", "Jedem das Seine". The perversion of the language, the misapplication of the art: all in the object. These three objects: the Goethe painting by Tischbein, the Bauhaus cradle, and the Buchenwald gate, are all coming to the exhibition. I think this is really the heart of the matter. I began by talking about a story of an overarching narrative – fractured stories. There is simply no narrative that can encompass this. And this is the constant struggle of any German historian. What kind of narrative do you construct that lets you live with whatever little discomfort with all these objects? There is of course no answer.

That is why you wind up with monuments such as the Siegestor in Munich, because all the bits are there together: the initial act of glory, the subsequent

destruction, and then the moral recovery. These monuments are really the only way out of this conundrum. This is one of the ways of making a narrative in a thing that acknowledges what must be acknowledged, but also looks to the future, drawing from the past what needs to be learned. It is of course also the story of the Reichstag, to take a monument that is built by the *Reich* in the heyday of that first great unity and expansion, destroyed in the Second World War, and now remade to make a new Germany out of one bit of history, destroyed and then reshaped: is one of the great statements of how a country can look at its past, live with it, and live into the future. In the exhibition we shall be having the model of the Reichstag by Norman Foster for the rebuilding, which makes one of many of these points.

We will also have one object, which shares this phenomenon of carrying the past in this narrative of a complexity and a discomfort, which is alien to British experience. That is the "Schwebende", the "Hovering Angel", by Ernst Barlach from the cathedral in Güstrow in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern. The Protestant cathedral in Güstrow asked the great sculptor Barlach – whose work was later declared degenerate – to create a monument to the fallen: interestingly, a war memorial, the German word is *Kriegerdenkmal* or *Kriegergedächtnismal*. Barlach wanted to make a memorial which was about the *experience* of Germany, not a response to the phenomenon and the impact of war, not specifically, or only, to the memory of those who had fallen, but to what that had meant for everybody around. He says very explicitly that this is his aim: to talk about the continuing experience of the memory of war. And he creates this bronze figure, like an angel, roughly life-size, and he creates it in this space for the cathedral in Güstrow. It is located above a railing that used to house the font, the font that was no longer there. But he wanted something to keep out the public, so that they could get close to the figure but not actually touch it. He designs the figure very carefully to show how high it should be when it is suspended, so that you can get very close and almost touch – you are in communication with the figure.

The figure itself is a bronze, female figure, arms folded, hovering. It is very important that it is not moving; it is at rest. The pastor of the cathedral, Johannes Schwarzkopf, wrote the following: "Die Gestalt soll die seelische Haltung ausdrücken, die wir heute zu den furchtbaren Geschehen des Weltkriegs einnehmen." ("The figure should represent, should express, the spiritual stance that we now have to take to the terrible memories of the World War.") "Erinnerung und innere Schau." ("Recollection and inward reflection.") That is the purpose: memory of the war, recollection, and inner reflection. Barlach chose for the figure the features of Käthe Kollwitz, his great friend, whose only son had been killed in the war, and who produced some of the most moving

graphics about the loss of her child, of any mother of any child. He put her features, stylised, into the face of the angel.

The figure that floated in the cathedral of Güstrow in 1927, is worth comparing to the cenotaph in London which is entirely about the dead: the powerful symbol of one empty coffin for the millions of dead – but about the dead, about something that had happened and a memory that needed to be honoured. Compared with Barlach's angel, these are very different memories. Barlach reminds much more of Wilfried Owen's "Each slow night, they're drawing down the blinds", as everybody, every mother remembers who is lost, and the continuing shame and suffering of that loss. It was installed in 1927, and the right wing, particularly the Nazi party, did not admire it, they wanted something heroic and grandiose. And so the minute the Nazis came to power, they began a process to try to have it removed. In 1937, it was ultimately taken down by the authorities, after bitter protests from the church. On the 23rd of August 1937 it was removed. Among the many complaints was that the features were "slawisch", and Barlach was not a 'proper' north German; he was also "slawisch", but above all was Käthe Kollwitz. It was taken down, and every year since the early 1980s, there has been a commemorative act on that day to mark the removal of the Güstrow angel.

The debate was immediate: what to do with it, and the idea was that it should be melted down and sold. The church tried very hard to protect it, saying it would be worth far more as a work of art if it were sold. But in 1941, it was consigned for "Einschmelzung für die Wehrwirtschaft" ("To be melted down for the war economy"), to be used for weapons. And so the great anti-heroic pacifist memorial, *Mahnmal* to the First War, would be used to make the weapons for the Second. But luckily, after its removal, Barlach's friends and supporters – just after his death in 1939 – found the plaster cast from which the angel had been made in the Nowak foundry in Berlin, and made a second copy: a great act in 1941, to do that. It was then taken for safety to Lüneburg. In 1944, the plaster cast was destroyed, but one copy survived. After the war, the Barlach Estate, after long negotiations, gave it to the Antoniterkirche in Cologne, where it was installed in the early 1950s. But they changed one thing. It hangs exactly as intended, but below it, they added not just "1914-1918", but "1933-1945". A great moment in the early 1950s; the cathedral in Güstrow was of course very dismayed that there was a second copy, and it was in Cologne. They wanted another copy to be made, but it was too dangerous, it was felt, to send it to Berlin in 1951 to have a cast made. So another cast was made there from the Cologne version, and this was given and sent to Güstrow. So at a moment when the Bundesrepublik and the Demokratische Republik were not at all on good terms, this great gesture of reconciliation took place, and the third cast made from the copy

was sent to Güstrow and installed. In 1981, when Helmut Schmidt went on his historic visit to East Germany, he asked particularly that he and Erich Honecker should go to look at this angel: as an emblem of the noble story of Germany in the 1920s, the survival of an idea through the Second World War, and the generosity that overcame the divisions of the 1950s. On 13th December 1981, Schmidt said: "Wenn Sie gesagt haben, Barlach sei unsrere gemeinsame Erinnerung an unsere gemeinsame Vergangenheit, möchte ich das etwas anders wenden und sagen: Er kann auch unsere gemeinsame Zukunft sein." ("When you said that Barlach is our shared memory of our shared past, I would like to turn that in a different way, and say that Barlach can also be our shared future.") It is, I think, why this object is so extraordinarily important in this exhibition. Like the Siegestor in Munich, like the Reichstag, this object carries in itself the whole story, and the generosity of the Dom in Güstrow cannot be exaggerated. Barlach's angel is the reason people go to Güstrow. If you drive on the Autobahn through Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, a sign shows the angel, telling you that you have to get off the motorway, and go to see it. To lend this object to London is the most remarkable act of generosity. The one thing they asked in return was that we co-operate in some kind of commemoration of the 1914 Christmas truce, which makes it clear, I think, just how deeply they take the idea that this angel can be our shared future in itself.

That is what we are trying to do in these three exhibitions. What does it look like from Germany? How you turn this past, living with it, into something that can be borne, and can be used, while looking at the Holocaust, looking at the aggressions, looking at the shame, remembering the good things, and building them into a future. I would like to finish with the great loan from Frankfurt: the Tischbein painting. This is the bit of history that is always safe. When the currencies after the war are made, the Deutschmark and the Ostmark, the Deutschmark avoids any political connotations at all. All figures on the Deutschmark are artistic figures, mostly by Dürer; later, portraits of Clara Schumann or Annette von Droste-Hülshoff appear – but it is not political, it is entirely cultural. East Germany is quite the reverse, all the people you would expect appear on the notes: Marx, Engels, all the great heroes of the past – but Goethe is also on East German bank notes. Goethe is everybody's inheritance. Gerhard Richter, again in a drawing that is going to be shown at the exhibition, does a little sketch transforming Goethe in a portrait of himself. Here, we can see that it is possible, when you have a safe bit of the history, to be just as lighthearted as the British with their history, with the parachuting Queen and the Last Night of the Proms.