Patrick Bade | Memorialization: The World Wars and the Shoah | 05.19.21

- [Judi] Great. Well, Patrick, it's... Yeah, that's great. I see that. And sorry, Wendy has had, she's just struggling with her connections to get on. She'll be on as soon as she can. So, welcome to everybody, and over to you, Patrick.

- Thank you, Judi.

Images and music are displayed throughout the presentation

Well, what I'm going to try and do today is to look at how the great disasters and tragedies of the 20th century have been memorialised, how they could be memorialised with monuments, with art, and with music. And I'm really jumping in the deep end here with the extremely controversial project to build a new Holocaust memorial and information centre in the Victoria Gardens, right next to the Houses of Parliament. This is extremely controversial, and there are, numbers of people are unhappy with it, for various reasons.

I think what I'm going to present you with some of the questions around this, and I'm certainly not going to give you the answers. I'll let you come up with those. So, first of all, do we need another Holocaust memorial and information centre in the centre of London? You can, from Victoria Gardens, you can actually just cross the bridge, and it's a short walking distance to the Imperial War Museum, where there is a really excellent section of the museum, large section of the museum, devoted to the Shoah. And so you may think, well, why do we need another quite so close by.

There is also the question, is this the right place for this kind of memorial? There are practical questions. This is an area of London which is very prone to flooding, so that could be a problem. And also, is it appropriate to have it so close to our Houses of Parliament? The Shoah was a crime in which the British were bystanders rather than perpetrators, so some people say, "Well, we've got quite a range of our own crimes to commemorate." Off the top of my head, I can think of, you know, the slave trade, the Boer War, the Tasmanian genocide, the Bengal famine. I mean, the list goes on and on. So you might think it might be more appropriate in this position to commemorate crimes in which the British were more directly involved.

Then there's the question of cost, which is estimated at 50 million. So you could say is this the right moment to spend 50 million on another monument? Could that 50 million be spent more usefully to tackle some of the problems in the world at the moment? And lastly, I know that many people, I mean, I've had long conversations about this with Trudy and with Anita, Anita Lasker-Wallfisch, and they are anxious that this could be very counterproductive, that it actually could incite antisemitism, it could attract terrorist attacks. So altogether, it's not straightforward.

But I want to move on to other very important Holocaust memorials. This is a huge one, which I'm sure many of you've seen, in Berlin. It was designed by the architect, Peter Eisenman, and it

takes up 200,000 square feet, and there are 2,711 concrete slabs. Some of you may have heard Anita Lasker-Wallfisch being interviewed about this. Well, it's one of the things she talks about in her interview with Trudy. She was not in favour of this either, actually. She said she would've preferred to use this space for a garden in which people could sit and with maybe reminders in the garden of the horrors of the Holocaust. Here's another, I think, slightly more flattering view of it. There's no doubt that it gives you a sense of the vastness of the crime, and it is somehow awesome.

This is the monument in Vienna by Rachel Whiteread. Also, I think a building that, it's a chilling, disturbing image, so you could say that it fulfils its role in that way, but it actually, this idea of casting things in negative space, it's just an extension of her normal work. And so, again, you can think is it actually appropriate for a monument of this kind to pay large sums of money to a celebrity artist or architect, starchitect, they call them. This is the Libeskind Monument, which again, I'm sure many of you're familiar with.

If you go to Budapest, I know many of you have been listening to Trudy talking about the Holocaust in the Shoah in Hungary over the last couple of weeks, and this is the monument right next to the Great Synagogue in the centre of Budapest. And it's beautiful. And again, you can think, is that... And it's impressive, and you may think, well, is that really what we want? I think that, in Budapest, the monument that actually, having taken groups there several times over the last couple of years, the monument that really affects people, where they actually really take away something and think about it, is this one, which must be, certainly by a very, very long way, the least expensive of the monuments I've shown you so far. And it commemorates this terrible incident towards the end of the war, when the Arrow Cross rounded up people on the shores of the Danube and they tied them together. They made them take their shoes off first, so the shoes weren't lost, and then shot them into the river so that they drowned in the river. Terrible, terrible incident. And I find this is an extraordinary, it's a simple, but a very, very poignant monument.

Now, wars, there have been monuments, there have been war memorials as long as there've been wars, so thousands of years, really. And right up to the 19th century, war memorials were usually celebratory and triumphalist. This is the Trajan's column, which was erected in 113 AD, and it celebrates, it's a celebratory monument, it celebrates the victories of Trajan in what is now Yugoslavia. It's not really till you get to the middle of the 19th century that war memorials take on a darker aspect. I don't really know what war memorials for the American Civil War look like, but the American Civil War and the Crimean War are more or less contemporary, in the middle of the 19th century, and they're the first two wars which were recorded by photography.

The inset here is of Roger Fenton, who photographed the Crimean War, the battlefield of, you know, the Charge of Light Brigade and things like that. And I think photography brought home to people that war is nasty. It's no coincidence the American Civil War and the Crimean War have a particularly bad reputation for squalor, disorganisation, brutality and so on. So this is certainly the first major war memorial in London that has a sort of tragic and sombre quality to it.

Of course, when you get to the First World War, and this was a war on a completely unprecedented scale, and it was the industrialization of death, with, in some battles, hundreds of thousands of people dying in a day, you know, the Verdun Battle, which caused millions of deaths. And there was a sense, I think people felt that this was something different, it was something terrible, and then it needed to be commemorated and memorialised in a different kind of way. And so, after the, there were these huge, huge First World War memorials.

This is the British one, but it also includes a strong South African element of, it's the Thiepval Monument designed by Sir Edwin Lutyens. This is a Canadian monument at Vimy Ridge, designed by Walter Seymour Allward. I find this actually very, very powerful indeed. I think it is moving and extraordinary. It took a long time to build this. It wasn't actually unveiled and completed until 1936, when Europe was on the verge of yet another world war.

Because the First World War at the time, the slogan was that it was a war to end wars. There are so many monuments throughout Europe, all the competent countries erected. It was a good time, you could say, after the first World War for sculptors, because every village green, every small town, every big town had to have its monuments. Some are jingoistic, some are banal. I think one of the most moving is this one. Sadly, it's now really on a traffic island at Hyde Park Corner, with buses and cars zooming around it all the time.

This is by a sculptor called Sargeant Jagger. And you can see it's a monument to the Royal Regiment of Artillery. Very, very powerful. And it does something that we'll see picked up by several artists who memorialise both the World Wars and the Shoah. It references the crucifixion. In a way, it's best if you don't immediately think of it. It's best if it's a kind of a subliminal thing. But this pose and gesture, with the arms outstretched, I think it's meant to trigger a memory of the crucifixion. As I said, there are countless, countless, countless memorials throughout Europe to the First World War, and some patriotic, some tragic.

But a new thing during the First World War was the commissioning of artists to memorialise the war while it was happening. And it was actually the British who led the way with this. And initially it was just a branch of the Propaganda Ministry. The British were very, very good at propaganda. They outdid the Germans easily in the First World War with their propaganda, which was not always truthful, and it was sometimes very exaggerated, about German war crimes in Belgium, for instance. And it's one reason why some people were very sceptical when stories began to come out about German atrocities in the Second World War. There where people who said, "Oh, it's those Brits and their propaganda. They're at it again."

So young artists were commissioned to paint pictures, but it went, very quickly, it went way, way beyond propaganda. And particularly it was, well, it wasn't just the young artists, of course, there were older artists who were commissioned, like Sargeant and Orpen, and they were very distinguished, established artists. But it was the young artists of serving age, particularly ones who had served on the Western Front, for instance, who produced the really powerful,

memorable images of the First World War.

This is John Nash, sorry, Paul Nash. Paul Nash, who had, like so many young soldiers, he arrived on the Western Front feeling quite upbeat, quite optimistic, and then who was very quickly disillusioned by the unbelievable squalor and horror of it all. And he saw the tragedy of the First World War, interestingly, not really in human terms. You don't very often see human figures, or they don't play an important role in his pictures. He has seen the tragedy of the First World War in the terms of what it did to nature. And this painting has the ironical title, "We Are Creating A New World". It was a terrible new world that they were creating.

This is Danny Spencer, who served in Macedonia as a stretcher-bearer and certainly saw many, many horrific things. And this is, again, I think a very, very powerful image of a field hospital in the midst of a battle against the Turks, with the injured being brought in and being operated on in the middle of the battle in a field hospital.

Here are two images of the insanity of the First. It certainly was the most absolutely insane, pointless war. And on the left, we have Mark Gertler, who is a British Jewish artist. And he was a conscientious objector, which was actually quite a difficult thing to be in the First World war. It was quite difficult to convince the authorities that you could be one. And this his the "Merry-Go-Round", that once you're on this terrible merry-go-round, you can't get off it. And on the right hand side is a German artist who was actually invalided out. He had a total breakdown, and was invalided out of the war. This is George Grosz, and the title of this is the "Riot Of The Insane".

But probably the most powerful indictment of the First World War was from Otto Dix and his great series of etchings called "Der Krieg", "The War". He served on the Western Front and he also saw all these horrors, experienced them directly. Was very lucky to survive. And these are actually, these images are from memory, and they're created considerably after the end of the war. They're actually between 1929 and 1932. And, of course, he came in for very, very harsh criticism from the right wing and the Nazis in Germany for what they saw as defeatist and negative images of war.

When we get to the Second World War, it had been such a success actually, the war scheme, the war artist scheme in the First World War, that a similar scheme was set up in the Second World War, and some very good art came out of it, but actually, nothing as viscerally powerful, intensely-felt as the pictures from the First World War. If you go to the Imperial War Museum, you can see the two collections. It's the First World War pictures which really hit you in the solar plexus.

This is, again, Paul Nash. And I think it's a very, it's an enigmatic and beautiful image of the Battle of Britain, the very decisive battle of Britain that luckily ended in victory for the British Air Force over the Luftwaffe and prevented the German invasion of this country. But you know, for most British people, this was a distant thing. It was something they saw in the sky over the Kent

countryside.

This is John Piper, who produced poetic and rather melancholy images resulting from The Blitz, and in particular what was dubbed the Baedeker Raids, when the Luftwaffe attacked cultural areas, like this is Bath, cities like Bath and so on, that had no military value, it was purely pointless destruction of culture. And the Henry Moore images of course, too, very, very memorable, of people sheltering in the underground in London during the Blitz, from the end of 1940 to May, 1941.

But when we get to this, now, what to do with this? This is so beyond human imagination, so beyond human, the capacity to really understand the horror of the death camps. How could this be represented? How could it be memorialised? And one has to say that the section of the Imperial War Museum of the art to do with the Shoah and the death camps is feeble. What can one say? I just think people couldn't deal with it, they couldn't represent it. And the other problem is that, of course, you've got these images, I deliberately chose not to show you today those photographic images of emaciated bodies, heaps of bodies and so on. We all know them. And actually, I feel that they, in a way, they're, in inverted commas, "precious", precious in that you shouldn't overuse them, because you don't want to diminish the appalling shock value that they have. But they do have such a powerful impact. They're still very, very difficult to look at.

And this is Doris Zinkeisen, who is the official artist sent to Bergen-Belsen. And she, I mean, she's a nice artist, but essentially a decorative artist. This is a photograph of her painting a decorative mural on the left-hand side. And she just really, I don't think could cope with what she saw. I don't think she could come up with appropriately powerful images.

This is Feliks Topolski. Interestingly, she of course was Jewish, and so was the Polish Jewish Feliks Topolski, who I think went on his own steam to Bergen-Belsen. This is maybe more effective than Doris Zinkeisen.

And this is an artist called Zoran Music, who was, I can't remember whether he was Croatian or Serbian, but anyway, from the former Yugoslavia, who was in Italy when he became involved with the Italian resistance after the fall of Italy. And he was captured by the Germans, and he was sent to Dachau. So he did experience it directly, and apparently he made sketches at the time. But the images he came up with, they look to me like they're actually based on the photographs that I've already mentioned, rather than from direct observation, or even from direct memory.

Now, the great artists of the time, how did they deal with it? Well, this is Chagall. This is actually pre-Shoah, but post-Kristallnacht. This was a painting from the end of 1938, and it's his reaction to Kristallnacht. And it seems odd, and I know some people find this quite difficult, that he could only really deal with the horror of the Second World War and the Shoah in terms of Christian imagery, although, as you can see here, he gives Christ a Jewish prayer shawl, and in the background you can see the burning of synagogues and the fleeing and persecution of Jewish

people. Now, I have to say that I think that the Chagall images, well, it's too late in his career as well. I don't think he was actually really capable of coming up with, well, it was so difficult for anybody to come up with the image to equal the horror of the discovery of the concentration camps.

Now these, these are the breakthrough pictures of Francis Bacon, the "Three Studies for Figures at the Base of the Cross". And these paintings, they caused an absolute, they caused horror and sensation when they were exhibited, first exhibited, in April, 1945. And ever since, I suppose it was the fact that these paintings were shown so soon after those first images of the liberation of the concentration camps, 27 January for Auschwitz, and other camps in early 1945, that ever since, people have tended to associate the kind of visceral horror of these images. And in a certain way, they seem to express it more powerfully than any of the artists who are directly trying to illustrate it. But he, and they certainly probably do actually reflect his response to knowledge of atrocities committed by the Nazis, and the horrors and the brutality of the Second World War. They can't actually, because I think these paintings were made before the discovery, the opening up of the concentration camps, so they're not in any way a direct illustration of that. And I think they're also, Bacon was a man with terrible darkness inside him, and he's fascinated with horror and pain and brutality. So for him, it has as well, there's a sense of attraction and repulsion, and that's what makes these paintings so ambiguous and so powerful in a way.

Other artists who seem to be disturbingly attracted to the horror of the Shoah are the Chapman brothers, and they produced a series of these really enormous, fantastically complicated assemblages in the 1990s that they reference old master paintings, obviously, depictions of crucifixions, and paintings of the dance of death in Northern Renaissance art, Bosch, Bruegel and so on, as well as those photographs of the concentration camps. So I mean, the Chapman brothers, they're clearly out to shock. And you can... Well, it's a matter of debate. Is that a worthwhile thing or not? I mean, shock is sometimes something necessary and valuable. They went even further by buying up, 'cause they were, these young British artists were making absolutely obscene amounts of money in the 1990s, and they could afford to buy up original Goya etchings.

Goya's, "The Disasters of War", which are probably the most powerful denunciation of the brutal of war in Western art, they bought them up and desecrated them, as you can see here. Now, film, I'm not going to talk very much about film, because David and Dennis have done that and are continuing to do that. Again, I think there's a debate about can the Shoah actually be in any way meaningfully or faithfully represented in a film. And I would say, you know, full on, directly, actually, no. I think it can only be approached in a way obliquely.

And one of the first films to do so, and in some ways I think successfully, was "The Search" of Fred Zinnemann. And that came out in 1947, and rather unexpectedly it, well, it starred Montgomery Clift, who I think got an Academy award for it. It also starred, rather bizarrely, the very, very beautiful Czech opera star, Jarmila Novotna. You see her on the right-hand side.

Actually, they did a good job in de-glamorizing her, and she actually gives a very beautiful, very moving performance. But really, the film is stolen by the child, the small child that you see in the ruins there. And I think the two great things about film are the performance of this child, who got a special honorary Academy award for his remarkable performance, although he was, by the time the ceremony took place, the Iron Curtain had come down with a thud and he was trapped in Czechoslovakia and not allowed to go out and receive his award. And the other aspect of the film that I think gives it a certain gritty truthfulness is it was filmed in 1947 in the ruins of the German cities, Nuremberg and other cities that had been completely devastated. And that does, no, these are not film sets, this is the reality. The strange thing about the film is that we're told that the mother and the child are separated in Auschwitz, and so the implication is that they're Jews, but the word Jew is never mentioned in that film, and antisemitism is never mentioned from beginning, again, to the end.

And you think, why? Why is this? Was it still, is that some kind of covert antisemitism, or was it maybe a deliberate choice to universalize the story so that it wasn't just a story that affects Jews? Now, I know David and Dennis have discussed this already, so I'm just going to mention it in passing, this 1979... So it's, for a long time, and I've talked about it as well in the context of the post-war period, this amnesia, that people really actually couldn't take on board the full horror of the Holocaust and did not want to think about it. And certainly an important moment was the commercial success of the television miniseries, "Holocaust" that came out in 1978. And I happened to be in Germany in 1979, when this was shown on German television. And I saw one episode, and I was actually appalled by it. I thought it was simply ghastly. I thought it was a complete travesty, reduced to a kind of awful soap opera level. But I was astonished at the impact it seemed to have on everybody around me in Germany at the time. It really was important, I think, in waking up a whole generation of Germans to what had happened, and you have to give it credit for that.

At that time when I was, around that time when I was in Germany, in Munich, I went to a cinema to see a showing of the film "To Be Or Not To Be". Now, this is a film of 1942, so it's actually made in the middle of the Second World War, and at a time, well, 1942 of course, the Wannsee Conference had just taken place, that the machinery of mass death was just getting going, and there were only maybe the faintest hints getting out of what was happening. People really, really didn't know. And I think this film, it could only really have been made at that particular point, because it has jokes, for instance, about concentration camps, that three years later, when people really knew about them, you just couldn't have made those jokes. But it is a very clever film, it's a very funny film. And I first saw it dubbed into German in Munich in the 1970s, and I've never seen any audience react to any film the way that audience of fairly young Germans reacted to it. They laughed. They didn't just laugh, they screamed. They were hysterical. I've never heard laughter like that. It was pretty chilling, it was pretty frightening, a whole audience absolutely in the grip of hysteria. And just to mention of course, "Schindler's List" again, as a film that was important for raising consciousness of the Holocaust.

Now, I'm going to move on to, I'm going to spend the rest of this talk talking about music. This is

Frederick Delius. His music sounds so English. You may have gathered, I'm, although I was brought up in Britain, and of somewhat mixed ancestry, and so my background is English. But I don't feel particularly English, unless I, if I hear the music of Delius, suddenly, I actually really feel quite English. It has a very English quality, which is strange, because I don't think he had a drop of English blood in his veins. He was German, he was pure German. His musical education was in Germany, and he lived pretty well his entire adult life in France. He was European. He was what the Nazis would've called I think probably a rootless cosmopolitan. You can see him with the Gauguin painting "Nevermore" in the background, which he actually owned.

So I'm going to play you an excerpt from his "Requiem". Now, he actually started this in 1913, so it wasn't originally conceived as a war memorial, but he continued writing it through the First World War, and it's dedicated to all, emphasised, young artists who have died in the First World War. I think that's quite important, because it's a not a work that has any trace of patriotism in it. It's anti-patriotism. It wasn't performed until 1922. And, let me see, ooh, where is my, the music here? I'm trying to think. There should be a little thing for me to click on to play you the music, but I can't.

- [Judi] I think it's just below the, it's below the image, just... I can see it. I can see it on the side.

- Can you? I can't.

- [Judi] So just go down a little bit. It's under the smaller image in the blue.

- Right. Well, just let me just... I'll do that in a minute. I'll just tell you about it.

- Okay.

- It's a work that caused outrage at the time, I suppose because it wasn't patriotic. It's pacifist, very strongly pacifist, and rather strangely, it's also a kind of a peon of praise to free love. It's, you know, in many ways, very 1960s rather than 1922. But the passage that I'm going to play you, which caused most outrage, is anti-religious. So it's a requiem. So, you know, it's in the form of a Requiem Mass in a way, which is a Christian thing, but it's definitely not Christian and it's definitely not religious. And there is this section where you have two choruses competing with one another. One is presumably either Christian or Jewish, or both, and it's shouting, "Hallelujah, hallelujah, hallelujah." And the other chorus is shouting, "Allah, Allah, Allah, Allah." It's a Islamic chorus. I mean, it's not a work I think that has been performed, certainly not in London, in recent years. I'm not sure you could. I think if anybody put on this performance, I think there would be a pretty alarming reaction. It would be considered by Muslims to be blasphemous. But it's incredibly, as I said, ahead of its time in its thinking. And, you know, think of what's going on at the moment, all this hate speech on both sides, people using terrible slogans. People, you know, driving down Finchley Road, "Death to the Jews," through megaphones. And some pretty horrible scenes as well in Israel, with people shouting, "Death to

the Arabs." This is what this is. This is, you know, just the inhumane shouting of slogans. And let's see if I can find. Oh no, I can't. I can't get to the thing that I need to.

- [Judi] You were really, you were almost at it. Is it not hidden by the subtitles, Patrick?

- It is hidden by the subtitles.

- [Judi] Okay, so let me just turn the subtitles off quickly, okay?

- Yeah.

- Try if you can see it now.

- They haven't gone for me. I may have to skip that, because it's going to be a bit too complicated. Anyway, you've got the idea of what it is. It's, you know, two choruses shouting each other down with either Islamic or Judeo-Christian slogans. So I'm moving on to a very contrasting work by Maurice Revel, who did, he himself served in the war, you can see him in his getup here as a ambulance driver, in terrible conditions. Saw appalling things. Many of his friends died. And see, for me, Revel represents everything that one admires and loves most in French civilization. There is a delicacy, a kind of restraint, a sensibility, but a complete, in this piece, there's a total lack of sentimentality. It seems, in a way, curiously detached. And it's made up of six movements, and each one is dedicated to a particular friend of Ravel who died on the Western Front in the First World war. And so I'm going to play you the first.

(Ravel's "Requiem: First Movement" playing)

So nothing... Oh my goodness, I'm going to have the same problem again here, because I still, I can't see the, I can't see. Is there any way of getting rid of this, Judi, at the bottom?

- [Judi] Getting rid of what, Patrick?

- All the things that are covering up. Oh, I see. Oh, I can move it. Yes. Great. I've managed to move it.

- Okay.

- So this is a very, this is a very early reaction to the Shoah. This is Arnold Schoenberg, right at the end of his life. And it's a cantata, and the title is "A Survivor of Warsaw". It's a difficult piece, it's a harsh piece, and it's very concentrated. It's only six minutes long, and it's for speaker, orchestra and male chorus. And I'm going to play you the end of it, which shows the end of the, the putting down of the uprising in the Jewish ghetto in Warsaw. And as the people die and they're slaughtered, they sing a hymn in Hebrew.

- [Speaker] They began again, first, slowly. One, two, three, four. Became faster and faster, so fast that it finally sounded like a stampede of wild horses. And all of a sudden, in the middle of it, they began singing, "Shema Yisrael".

♪ Shema Yisrael ♪

- Now, I'm going to finish with three great pieces of music written all within a very short period of time in the early 1960s, attempting to deal with the tragedies of the First and Second World Wars. And the first of these is by the the German, later American composer, Franz Waxman. He's a composer who's very, very close to my heart. He's a marvellous composer in everything he does. He's a fascinating songwriter. He's a film, writer of film music in Hollywood, of course, in the golden era of Hollywood, and he also wrote major serious compositions for the concert hall. These days, of course, he's probably best known as a Hollywood film composer. We can only speculate on how it might have been. If it were not for Hitler and the Nazis, his career would've taken a very different route, I think. I'm going to be talking about him in two future lectures, as a songwriter and as a composer of film music.

But so this piece, it's called "The Song of Terezin", and it was premiered in 1961. And he took the poems that were, look, I'm sure you know, there were I think something like 15,000 children who went through the concentration camp of Theresienstadt, and only a handful of them survived. But what they left behind, what we discovered at the end of the war, was a collection of a very touching watercolour drawings and poems that the children had written. Of course, poems were, well, I can see there's one here that's written in Czech, but many of the poems were written in German. And so Waxman set these poems to music for soloist, orchestra and choir. Now, I have to say that when I first heard this piece, I think I really misjudged it, probably 'cause it wasn't what I was expecting from the composer of scores like "Sunset Boulevard" and "The Bride of Frankenstein". The more I hear it, the more wonderful I think this piece is. And let me see. Ooh, now I have to. This is the poem. Oh yes, I want to play it with, so you can read the poem. Can I get rid of this now? Very touching poem, written by a child in the camp about another child.

(Waxman's "The Song of Terezin" playing)

Now, that was actually 1964, not '61 as I just said, because it's the same year as a mighty work by Olivier Messiaen, which was commissioned by the French government. And so, I mean, the Waxman is commemorating something very, very specific, a specific aspect of the Shoah, these children in the Theresienstadt camp. The Messiaen we're going to play you, "Et Exspecto Resurrectionem Mortuorum", is a huge, mighty, monumental work, and it's meant to commemorate all the dead of both world wars. And it was commissioned to be premiered in one of the most beautiful buildings in the world, which is the Sainte-Chappelle in Paris. It's a staggering building, with its amazing, intensely-colored mediaeval stained glass.

The image I've got on the screen doesn't even begin to do justice of how wonderful this building

is. It's actually two chapels on top of one another. The lower one has a low ceiling, it's very dark. And then you walk up a staircase and you come into this. You are meant to think that, really, when you walk into this chapel, that you've died and gone to heaven. And it was built in the 12th century by Louis IX, Saint Louis. There are some ironies here. St Louis, he built it. It's really a giant reliquary. He'd spent an immense sum, the equivalent of billions today, on buying a fake crown of thorns that was supposed to be Jesus's crown of thorns. It was recently, it clearly didn't do its work properly, 'cause it was inside Notre Dame recently when that caught fire, and it didn't save the building. And St Louis, one of the reasons he was made a saint was because he persecuted Jews. He was one of the worst mediaeval monarchs for that. So there's a kind of a, there are several layers of irony in all of this.

And the other thing that, of course, the title, "Et Exspecto Resurrectionem Mortuorum", means waiting for the resurrection of the dead. So I mean, that's a very Christian concept, of course, the idea that the dead are going to come back again. And I've inserted here a detail of the Stanley Spencer Sandham War Memorial Chapel, which shows all the soldiers of the First World War coming out of their graves in those mass cemeteries and piling up the crosses on the graves. So here's a detail of this truly awesome, in the original meaning of the word, piece of music by Messiaen.

("Et Exspecto Resurrectionem Mortuorum" playing)

And last of all, I'm going to play you the final movement of Benjamin Britten's "War Requiem". This was 1962, and it was premiered in another famous building, this time a brand new building. It was to commemorate the completion of the new cathedral of Coventry that replaced the mediaeval cathedral that had been bombed during the Second World War. Now, Britten had been a pacifist in the Second World War. He was actually in America for the first part of the war, but came back across the Atlantic at the height of the Battle of the Atlantic, great risk to coming back to this country. And he wanted a pacifist requiem. And he wanted a requiem that would be about healing. So it has various texts. It has texts from the First World War poet, Wilfred Owen, in English, of course, and then he has singers of three nationalities that have been engaged in the war. There's a German baritone, a Russian soprano, who has to sing in Russian, and Peter Pears, the British tenor. And I'm going to play you the final movement with a Latin text, "In Paradisum". This is the standard text for the requiem. It's the same text that you find in the Faure "Requiem", for instance. And again, it, I suppose it's the idea of resurrection, or going to heaven, actually, where it talks about being brought to the holy city of Jerusalem. This is a metaphor for going to heaven.

(Britten's "War Requiem: In Paradisum" playing)

I think I'd better stop it there, as we're running out of time, and see what questions we have.

Q&A and Comments

Sorry. Not. What's this? Somebody's saying that Boston has a very emotional monument to the Shoah.

Q: "Who does support the monument in London?"
A: Well, this is a question. And the other question is, why do they support it? What is the motivation? I think the whole thing is quite strange.

Q: "Has research been done on how memorials serve memory and conscience?"
A: I'd like to know that myself. And do you think that these memorials, do they actually really have a a positive effect? Have they done much good?

"How did they reach the?" I don't know that. It's very interesting, that specific number of 2,711. I presume it must have some symbolic significance.

Somebody's saying that they are not from this country, but they think resources could be better spent spreading educational, informational lectures. I think I would agree with you.

"Monuments, museums, were they lacking, could be used as educational focuses." This is Simon from Toronto. "The Berlin Memorial only has a few tiny signs saying 'Memorial to the murdered Jews of Europe.' No acknowledgement of who murdered those Jews."

It says, "Thelma Rosenberg did not find this monument at all successful. When I was there, many people were lying and sunning themselves on the gravestones." Yes, I know. That's really disturbing.

Yes, the tree in Budapest was donated by, actually, it was the father of Tony Curtis who donated the tree in the synagogue in Budapest. And somebody has said that. Yes, Tony Curtis.

"The Berlin Memorial is definitely not a place of tranquillity and reflection, but maybe that was the idea," somebody is saying.

"American memorials to the Civil War are controversial right now because they are mainly of horseman sitting on a prancing horse and include such military personalities as Ulysses Grant, Robert E Lee." Yeah, I know. Well, we, of course, I should have thought of that. That has been very controversial, hasn't it?

"Over the past year, the BLM group has called their relevance into question and wants them torn down." Well, there's another thorny issue for you to think about.

Somebody's saying it's very noi... The Berlin one is, I presume, close to noisy cafes.

Somebody said, Linda Goldsheft says, "Just spent a month in Richmond. Regarding war memorials, all the monument statues of the Civil War on Monument Boulevard have been

destroyed, pulled down, and the pedestals completely covered in graffiti with disgusting language. All Confederate statues, that is." Mm, I dunno. It's a really, really difficult one, that. Generally, I'm not in favour of tearing down statues, but I can see there is a problem, particularly in America.

Somebody's saying they found the Ossuary in Verdun most moving. No, I haven't visited. I've never been to Verdun.

This is Ariane Behr saying, "I saw a moving memorial in Krakow, empty chairs on a small grassy square." Yes, it's funny, you don't need some huge blingy thing by a famous artist. It can be a simple idea that can be really effective.

"As an expat, I am shocked and horrified to learn of the proposed Holocaust memorial in London. The antisemitism is rampant, and this will only encourage more of the same. As for the cost, I can only imagine how many organisations in need could be assisted by £50 million. Insanity. Whose choice was it?" Well, basically, I agree with you. On the other hand, it's a shocking thought that we hesitate about a monument to the Shoah because we think it will provoke antisemitism. I find that also a very worrying thought.

Somebody's saying that they agree that Boston's is the most powerful. I must look that up and see what that one is about. Somebody also agreeing about the... The whole thing is just worrying. I'm not sure it's been thought through properly.

"There are eight huge first World War memorial paintings in the halls of the Canadian Senate, three metres by two metres, painted by British artists of," they're not the Bomberg ones, are they? I know that David Bomberg, who's an East End London Jewish artist, did major pictures for the Canadians, and I wonder if it's those that you're talking about.

Somebody's asking if I know the late Jenny Stolzenberg's ceramic shoes that used to be shown around museums. And they are very powerful too.

"Christians can relate to Chagall's iconography. In that way, it succeeds well." That's what Sondra Ezrin says.

Somebody's saying they don't understand, Margie Belise, the Bacon pictures I showed. It might be better if you don't. They're really disturbing.

"I think it's a bit harsh," somebody's saying, "to criticise artwork produced by artists who were in the camps or sent immediately post-war. I think the painting done by the decorative painter is very moving."

"There is a beautiful memorial to Raoul Wallenberg near the Swedish Embassy in London, and a copy of the same memorial erected in Argentina. The tree one shows at the beginning of the

lecture is in the Wallenberg Gardens."

Somebody's saying, and I think this is true, Jane Green, "Some of the most poignant images of the Shoah are the drawings by the children of Theresienstadt."

"Wasn't Chagall trying to remind us that Jesus was Jewish, and making us remember where Christianity began?" Ah, possibly. "Chagall made an enormous mosaic called "Le Message d'Ullyse" for the Law Faculty of the University of Nice."

"There's apparently a very powerful Holocaust memorial in San Francisco, and there's already a Holocaust memorial in Hyde Park, so I think the proposed new one is a bad idea."

"One more very moving memorial in Berlin at the Grunewald train station, created by the Polish sculptor Karol Broniatowski in 1991." Under the memorial in Berlin is a sparse but very powerful memorial and database, which this person thinks is very well done.

"Chagall's showing of Christ with a cross and a prayer shawl. I thought that Jesus Christ was Jewish, and perhaps Chagall included Jesus Christ as if he had existed at the time of the Shoah." Jesus Christ certainly was Jewish.

"And while we're in the South, I was wondering if we could one day look at the," oh, I'd so love to go to that, "the Villa Kerylos, Beaulieu-sur-Mer." I have been to the Villa of Wannsee. That is fantastic. That's amazing. Right.

Q: "I don't remember what these are called, the metal plaques of family names that were and continue to be placed. What do they call them?"
A: Stolpesteine, or whatever they are, in Germany, in the streets. I think they're moving. Some people don't like them. They don't like the idea of people walking on them. I don't have a problem with that. I think they're moving, and I think they're a good idea. And I think they do remind people in a positive way.

Erich Kahn. Ah, now that's, he's an interesting artist, an emigre artist who had a very, very sad life in this country. And he's certainly, you know, a very prolific artist, and an artist who needs to be, really, rediscovered.

"The child was called Ivan Jandl. Learnt his English phonetically. His Oscar and Golden Globe are now in the Czech National Film Archive. Had a very sad life apparently, after that film. Never really fulfilled his promise." I don't know who the artist was responsible for the TV guide cover. Somebody's, Alfreda is saying she thinks that the, I don't think I know works by John Bellany about the Holocaust. She says he visited the Buchenwald camp. I must look that up.

And John Bellany painted a body of works entitled "After Goya". That's interesting, thank you. I will look that up.

Somebody's saying despite they knew a lot about the Holocaust, when they saw "Schindler's List" they were really devastated. Yeah, it certainly, I know it had a great impact. I think probably I should stop, because we are really running out of time. Thank you all for your very interesting comments and questions.

- [Judi] Thank you, Patrick.

- [Patrick] Yep. Right, thanks.

- [Judi] Thank you. Thank you, everybody who joined us. And stay safe. Thanks. Bye-bye.

- Bye-bye.