Rebordering Berlin: transforming urban space and negotiating history in the former Borderland

Mirjana Ristic
Abstract

After the fall of the Berlin Wall, the borderland between the former East and West Berlin stood as a wound in the cityscape of the re-united Berlin. This strip of urban space, also known as ‘the death strip’, embodied a painful history of division, oppression, and violence during the Cold War. After the Wall was removed, the questions remained: what should be done with the death strip and how should its painful history be handled in a way that does not impose further trauma, nor impede Berlin’s post-Wall unification? This paper sets out to examine these questions by investigating the urban transformation of a series of historic sites, relics, and traces in the former Cold War borderland in central Berlin since 1989. Firstly, it will discuss the variations in the discourses of the Cold War history that were inscribed in these places. It then elaborates on the manners in which people who visit these sites encounter, use, and receive these places. The paper shows how multiple interpretations of Berlin’s Cold War history co-exist and remain negotiated through architecture and urban space.

Introduction

At the beginning of the Cold War, Germany and Berlin were divided between the Western Allies and the Soviet Union. The Western Allies, including the United States, the United Kingdom and France, controlled the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany) and West Berlin, while the Soviet Union governed the German Democratic Republic (East Germany) with the capital in East Berlin. West Berlin was positioned as a political enclave of West Germany within the East German territory. It operated as the major route by which East Germans fled to West Germany, looking for better economic opportunities and seeking refuge from the authoritarian East German regime. In order to stop the out-migration, the East German regime constructed the Berlin Wall on the 13th of August 1961. The Wall stood as a physical barrier in urban space, which completely separated East and West Berlin. It was also a segment of the national border between East and West Germany, a part of the geopolitical frontier between the Communist and Capitalist Blocs, and a symbol of the Cold War. It comprised a set of fortifications including the inner Wall on the side of East Berlin, the outer Wall on the side of West Berlin, and a series of check-points, watchtowers, obstacles and traps designed to control and prevent the movement of people. The borderland in between the inner and outer walls, which was 43 km long and five to 300 m wide, was known as the ‘death strip’ as many East Berlin citizens who attempted to escape to West Berlin were killed in this space.

On the 9th of November 1989, thousands of protestors took to the streets in East Berlin in a peaceful revolution, which led to the fall of the Wall. After the re-unification of the East and West Germany in 1990, most of the Wall was removed from Berlin’s urban landscape. So-called ‘wall peckers’ had broken off chunks of the Wall as souvenirs, while some of its segments had
been sold or gifted to cities around the world. By the end of 1990, the former East German soldiers dismantled most of the border architecture, leaving only sections of the Wall as historic monuments (Dolff-Bonekamper 2002). Although the physical barrier that severed Berlin was largely removed, the divided city remained inscribed in the spatial memories of its citizens. The former ‘death strip’ became exposed as a wound in Berlin’s urban fabric. It embodied memories of the political oppression by the former East German authoritarian regime, the prevention of civic rights and the freedom to move or gather in the city, as well as violence against people who attempted to reclaim these rights. The spatial transformation of the former borderland and dealing with relics and traces of its contested history became key issues for the city’s post-Wall urban development. The challenge for architectural and urban design was to deal with the socio-spatial trauma that the Wall left in Berlin’s urban fabric, while also reconciling contested desires to remember and forget the ‘ghosts’ of Berlin’s contested history, which haunted its cityscape (Ladd 1998).

Although the Berlin Wall has largely lost its tangible presence in the city, the former borderland has morphed into a fragmented memory landscape (Flierl 2006). It consists of a diverse morphology of architectural and urban forms, including: historic relics, voids, traces, infills, memorial sites, artworks, and museums. In 2006, the Berlin Senate produced an overall ‘Wall Concept’ (Flierl 2006)—a master plan that coordinated remembrance of the Wall and its impact on the city’s urban fabric. The document encouraged the co-existence of multiple memory places, arguing that such a decentralised approach reflected the nature of Berliners’ experience of the Cold War border. The document also provided guidelines for the spatial integration of diverse sites within the former borderland into a cohesive network of places that would make the city’s Cold War past more accessible, visible and comprehensible to residents and visitors.

This paper discusses the spatial outcomes of the urban transformation and commemoration of a series of places within in the former Cold War borderland in central Berlin since 1989 (figure 1). It looks at a range of architectural and urban forms, including: ‘void’ (Mauerpark), ‘trace’ (cobblestones marking the Berlin Wall in the ground), and ‘memorial landscape’ (Bernauer

![Figure 1: Reconstruction and commemoration within Berlin's Cold War borderland](source: Map by Author, 2015, base map courtesy of Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung und Umwelt Berlin).
Strasse). The paper analyses how the variations in the spatial and material character of these places affect the manners in which the city’s contested Cold War history is represented and interpreted in Berlin’s urban fabric. It looks at how design influences the different ways in which passers-by and visitors to these places encounter, experience, and use them. It also investigates how the official discourses embedded in these places by the designers and their clients are received and altered through uses and spatial practices by passers-by and visitors to these places. The exploration draws on site observation, photographic survey and archival research conducted in Berlin in 2013. The paper demonstrates that multiple interpretations of Berlin’s Cold War history co-exist and remain negotiated through architecture and urban space.

City, trauma, memory

Cities do not only include places built to glorify heroes and golden age of the national history, but also urban relics and traces left behind by traumatic events which can destabilise place identities and a sense of collective unity. According to Caruth (1995), even though events, such as political conflict, can be devastating, trauma is not produced by the experience of the event itself, but by meanings assigned to the tragic experience. Walkowitz & Knauer (2004: 2) argue that the interpretation of collective memory in urban space through, for instance, heritage sites, memorials or plaques, is central to shaping the way in which an event is understood and it plays a crucial role in its dissemination and repetition. Depending on who authorises the official interpretations of history, particular social groups can be empowered while the authority of others can be diminished (Walkowitz & Knauer 2004: 2). As such, memory operates as a tool through which the past is contested in the present. In the context of the post-Wall urban transformation of Berlin’s Cold War borderland, the question that arose was how to remember the city’s Cold War division without imposing trauma that could potentially inhibit the city’s post-Wall socio-spatial re-unification? This is a complex question which embodies a number of dilemmas. The first is what should be remembered or forgotten (Saunders 2009)? In the context of Berlin’s former borderland, this involves the issue of dealing with multiple and often contradictory memories embodied in the former borderland. This strip of urban space was a place of the forceful political division and a site where the unity of East and West Germany was triggered by the fall of the Wall (Saunders 2009). The borderland was the site of political oppression by the authoritarian regime as well as a place of victory of the popular democracy. In addition, the borderland embodies diverse layers of Berlin’s difficult history, for example, traces of the Nazi past that were hidden in the former no-man’s land were revealed when the Wall came down and became exposed together with sites related to its Cold War history. The question that arose is how to allow these multiple memories to co-exist without imposing a hierarchy of meanings?

Another significant question is how should Berlin’s Cold War history be commemorated (Saunders 2009)? Conventional memorials, such as statues, columns, and shrines, are commonly erected to celebrate victorious events, national heroes, and their sacrifice for the nation. They involve triumphant symbolic forms and textual inscriptions which convey a didactic narrative that glorifies the past. Yet, how should difficult and contested memories, such as those of the Cold War division of Berlin, be incorporated into the cityscape? A new generation of contemporary artists, particularly in Germany, have experimented with new types of memory spaces, which deal with traumatic and painful memories. These ‘counter-monuments’ (Young 1992), ‘anti-memorials’ (Ware 2004) and ‘abstract memorials’ (Stevens 2009) are conceived to challenge the intrinsic nature of conventional monuments (Young 1992). They are often conceptual, unfinished and temporary objects or spaces aimed to provoke visitors’ experimental engagement with the city’s history through their use. They are often unsettling and disturbing places designed to by stimulate visitors’ feelings or provoke contemplation and self-reflection. Their aim is to provoke rather than console, to change rather than being stable, and to trigger interaction, rather than being ignored (Young 1992: 227).

Berlin embodies a range of strategies of urban reconstruction and commemoration that exemplify such memory spaces. This paper discusses the differences in the ways in which they convey the city’s Cold War history and engage visitors with it. It draws lessons about the various ways in which they work as spatial tools for dealing with trauma embedded in the city’s urban fabric.
Initial proposals for the post-Wall urban transformation of the former borderland included retaining this zone as an urban void. An East Berlin architect, Stefan Straus, suggested turning the entire death strip into a green-belt of trees that would regenerate the city’s urban fabric and heal the scar that the division left (Major 2009). Greening would also have a symbolic role as a sign of urban regrowth. Yet such an idea was difficult to achieve as the removal of the Wall has left portions of the cityscape at prominent locations vacant and attractive for private investments into new redevelopment projects, such as the rebuilding of the business district at Potsdamer Platz. The voids left by the Berlin Wall have largely been filled by new architecture aimed to transform the city into a global metropolis. Only some voids have remained as commemorative imprints of the Cold War division in the city’s urban fabric. A prominent example is a stretch of the former borderland between the Wedding and Prenzlauer Berg districts, which was transformed into a green corridor named Mauerpark (Wall Park) after a preserved section of the inner wall which aligns with its eastern edge (Klausmeier & Schmidt 2004).

Preservation of this portion of the former borderland as an open space was possible as this stretch of land was undeveloped even before the Wall was built. The area served as the military parade grounds from the 19th century until the Second World War, when it became the sports field of a local soccer club (Girot 2004). During the Cold War, this zone operated as a border strip between the former French and the Soviet sectors of the city. In the post-Wall period, the city planners sought to transform its western and southern edges into residential areas and convert its northern edge into a highway ramp for the ring road around Berlin’s city centre. A series of public protests inhibited such rebuilding initiatives (Freunde des Mauerparks e.V). The former borderland was preserved as construction-free park space and transformed into a ‘green band’ that has re-connected the surrounding neighbourhoods that were previously divided.

The Mauerpark was designed by landscape architect, Gustav Lange and opened in 1994 (Girot 2004). It is a linear park that stretches along a one-kilometre-long path, which is a restored section of Schwedter Strasse that was severed by the former borderland. The park’s eastern side lies on a steep embankment, which aligns with a section of the Hinterland Wall (inner wall on the East Berlin side). The area beneath the Wall was designed as the event space. It incorporates an amphitheatre that offers panoramic views of the city and giant playground swings used by both children and adults. The western side stretches over a green field which aligns with residential blocks and includes a series of sport courts, gathering and seating spaces.
The south-west area is occupied by commercial spaces including a flea market, a restaurant, and a forum, while the northwest edge of the park is used as space for community projects.

In terms of its management, regulation and use, Mauerpark is an interstitial space where a relative lack of the formal control by the city’s officials and planners has created the potential for informal appropriation of place by local residents, tourists, alternative subcultures and squatter movements (Girot 2004). It operates as what Sola Morales (2013) has termed ‘terrain vague’—a residual and obsolete space where functions and uses have become ambiguous and the space has become open to creative adaptation, re-use and playful practices of everyday life. It is also a ‘loose space’ (Frank & Stevens 2006), which has no fixed purposes but rather activities that are unplanned, temporary, and changeable. Mauerpark involves leisure activities such as gathering with friends, chatting with strangers, grilling, sun bathing in the summer beach bar, or productive activities such as public gardening and a youth farm. Many uses of the park are playful, for instance, swinging in the former death strip, playing games, and participating in sports competitions. Other uses are creative such as public performances, concerts, drumming, juggling, and karaoke that take place every Sunday. The park also involves transgressive activities such as night parties associated with heavy drinking, drug consumption and even riots (Girot 2004). Such everyday activities and practices of insurgence and disobedience represent the public re-appropriation of an open space that was once prohibited and forbidden to citizens. They challenge the history of this place by turning the former heavily restricted borderland into a ‘smooth space’ (Deleuze & Guattari 1987), where individuals are free to define its meanings and uses. The previous place of oppression is thus inverted into a space of freedom and liberty, where residents can reclaim the ‘rights to the city’ (Lefebvre 1996) that were denied to them during the Cold War: the right to freedom of movement, to encounter, inhabit, and socialise in public space.

Mauerpark is also a vague and loose space, where memories of the Cold War are not stable and fixed. Unlike memory places where meanings are controlled by the state, such as the grounds in Bernauer Strasse, or privatized and commodified memory places, such as Checkpoint Charlie, Mauerpark is largely a memory void. Its design does not embody a purposefully built monument or commemorative inscription. The only remainders of its Cold War history are its name and its historic heritage—the preserved section of the inner Wall that aligns with the park’s eastern edge. Although the Wall was listed as a historic monument in 2001, public interaction with its remains is not strictly regulated. It is used as a canvas that is frequently re-painted with graffiti, which was impossible to do on the inner wall during the Cold War. The spraying of graffiti on the park side of the Wall is legal. The graffiti often display tags and signatures, but also imaginative slogans and murals, which represent artistic interpretations of the city’s past division and operate as forms of contemporary political protest. Such creative uses of the Wall results in the production of multiple personal memories that continually transform collective memories associated with the Wall. They enable individuals to re-interpret the role of its past in the present. They turn the section of the Wall into an unintentional ‘counter-monument’—a memory place that challenges the premises of its existence (Young 1992). A piece of rigid border architecture that was built to restrict behaviour and action has become an adaptable and transformable space that releases potential for individual action, self-expression, and exploration.

Trace

In the early 1990s, different forms of commemorative marking for the former course of the Wall through Berlin were tested. In 1991, an artist, Gervin Zohlen, proposed the installation of a thin copper band along the western course of the Wall. The band was imagined as an alien element in Berlin’s urban fabric, thus echoing the existence of the Wall itself (Schmidt 1998: 148). In a similar vein, in 1992, artist Angela Bohnen proposed installation of two concrete stripes—red, tracing the route of the outer Wall and blue, marking the course of the inner Wall. The gap between the lines was intended to produce an interstitial space between the ideologies of East and West Blocs, which had resulted in the division of Berlin (Major 2009). Rather than producing a ready-made version of the city’s Cold War history, both projects were
imagined as a means of engaging people in a collective will to remember it on their own terms (Major 2009). Both projects were realised only in scattered fragments, as the opponents argued that they do not enable a direct experience of the past in the cityscape (Schmidt 1998).

Despite such arguments, not long after, Berlin’s road department laid a double row of cobblestones intermittently interrupted by brass plates which state the name of the Berlin Wall and its years of existence. There is no data about any public dispute or resistance against this version of commemorative tracing of the former borderland. The cobblestones form a linear pavement memorial (Stevens & Ristic 2015) in the form of a dashed line in the ground which marks the course of the Wall and links its historic relics, see figure 3. The double row signifies the inner and outer Walls, although it aligns mostly with the trajectory of the outer wall and connects only some fragments of the inner wall footprint. It runs across various pedestrian and vehicular surfaces—pavements, lawns or roadways and cuts across previously divided urban spaces—streets, squares, parks, and bridges. It is occasionally interrupted where the construction of new buildings has crossed the boundaries of the former no man’s land or over privately owned parcels. The cobblestones form a minimalist marker in the ground, which turns the city’s public surfaces into screens onto which the past is reflected. It is a scar that evokes the wound that the Cold War has left onto the city’s surface (Stevens & Ristic 2015).

Unlike the conventional memorials designed to convey an undisputable narrative of the past, this minimalist commemorative marker recalls the absence of the Wall by its very presence and through silence. Apart from the name and years of the Wall’s existence, the trace does not contain an inscription of history or tells the passers-by what to think about it. Ehrenhaus (1998) argues that silence should not be understood as merely the absence of speech or the refusal to speak, but rather as an encounter which invites individuals to quest and understand the meanings of silence where we expect speech. The cobblestones do not communicate a fixed narrative about the past or give reassuring answers. Their silence motivates the viewers to ask questions. Rather than passively consuming a particular version of the past, the passer-by is engaged to reflect on it and actively construct their own personal interpretations of history. Memory becomes a bottom-up process of interpretations of the past by initiated by the viewers (Young 1993).

Interpretations of the past are created through the way passers-by encounter and ‘use’ the Wall trail. Unlike conventional memorials which are often designed as sacred spaces, the Wall trail merges practices of commemoration with everyday spatial practices. Although it is unobtrusive, its location within the everyday landscapes of footpaths and roadbeds makes it unavoidable. In Bernauer Strasse, it aligns with facades of residential buildings and it is crossed over frequently by people who are going out of the building or coming back home or by their relatives, friends and visitors. At Nordbahnhof, it is crossed over by commuters who are entering or going out of the subway when travelling to work or other places in the city. At Potsdamer Platz, visitors of a café sit over the commemorative trace of the Wall. Provoking discrete interruptions of urban life, the cobblestones turn practices of urban life into a dialogue with the city’s history, which results in the construction of multiple meanings. For instance, the practice of moving across the former border represents a symbolic gesture of bringing down of the wall that might have remained inscribed in citizens’ spatial memories. Figure 3 was taken during the National
Unification Day in 2013, when a group of people photographed themselves stepping over the trace to celebrate the city’s integration and unity.

The spatial distribution and relation of the commemorative trace of the Wall to its urban context play a role in the way in which visitors construct narratives of the past. The cobblestones form a linear commemorative marker that stretches through Berlin’s central districts in the length of over 10 km. Apart from being crossed over accidentally as a part of everyday journeys, it can be used intentionally as a guideline through the city’s history. Visitors can walk or cycle along the cobblestones trail to explore various portions of the former death strip and gain different perspectives of the Cold War division of Berlin. For instance, in residential neighbourhoods, visitors can imagine how the Wall had divided neighbours; in parks they can get a sense of how it had inhibited play. In the governmental district, the Wall had segregated various state institutions in two parts of the city. Walking or cycling along the cobblestone trace thus becomes a form of story-telling about the city’s history whereby multiple fragments of the past get assembled.

The cobblestones also operate as a dialectic memorial which juxtaposes the past and the present. It remembers the division of the city, while simultaneously enabling unimpeded movements and encounters between citizens in the former East and West Berlin (Stevens & Ristic 2015). The cobblestones thus provoke residents and visitors to the city to think about the layers of time in space and inquire the present through the lens of the past. Not only are passers-by able to reflect on the city’s past division, but also on the ongoing unification process and the ways in which it is mediated through transformations of the city’s urban fabric. The cobblestones turn the practice of crossing over of the former boundary into an everyday spatial practice, thus leaving the division under the feet while simultaneously allowing progress and moving on. They invite passers-by to pause and contemplate about the past and then move on, continue walking and turn towards the future.

**Memorial**

In Bernauer Strasse, south-west of the Mauerpark, a 1.4 km long stretch of the former borderland was transformed into memorial grounds (figure 4). This street was a dramatic site in the first days of the Cold War as its facades became aligned with the division, leaving buildings behind them in East Berlin and the walkway in front of them in the West Berlin. As the lower floors were sealed off by the East German guards, the East Berlin residents jumped from the upper floors of the building or dug tunnels beneath the buildings to escape. Later in the Cold War, the buildings were demolished, while their facades on the boundary were left as the separation barriers which aligned with the actual Wall.

![Figure 4: Memorial at Bernauer Strasse (photo by the author 2013).](image)
After the fall of the wall, the area on Bernauer Strasse was transformed into the central location for commemoration of Berlin’s Cold War history. It is a 1.4 km long stretch of public space that operates as an open-air exhibition where a series of original historical remnants, traces, and photographs of events that occurred in this street are used to make the memory of the past accessible and comprehensible to visitors. The centre-piece of the whole composition is the ‘Monument in Memory of the Divided City and the Victims of Communist Tyranny’, which is a central monument for commemoration of the Wall victims (Flierl 2006). The memorial was designed by Stuttgart architects Kohlhoff and Kohlhoff (Dolff-Bonekamper 2002), and opened on the 13 of August 1998, on the 37th anniversary of the Wall’s construction. Its design includes two 70 m long sections of the inner and the outer wall, which were preserved on the site, enclosed with two steel walls. The inner and outer walls encircle a portion of the former death strip, which includes a reconstructed patrol path, light-posts and a watch tower. The steel walls are rusty on the outside thus making a symbolic reference to the Iron Curtain (Feversham & Schmidt 1999). They are polished on the inside with an aim to create a reflective surface in which the preserved sections of the Wall would reflect and create an impression of the infinity and endlessness of the border (Dolff-Bonekamper 2002).

The encounter, experience and engagement with the Wall Memorial is limited. It encloses the death strip in a way that visitors can only get a glimpse of it through the horizontal gaps in the inner wall, without being able to access it. Some critics argue that this is a powerful element of the memorial as it turns the encounter with history into a sensory experience (Feversham & Schmidt 1999). However, this is a contested experience of the death strip as no resident of the East Berlin was able to approach so close to the inner wall without risk of being arrested or killed (Knischewski & Spittler 2006). The death strip can also be experienced in its entirety from a raised viewing platform at the Documentation Centre, which faces the memorial on the opposite side of the street. Such panoptic vision of the former death strip is criticised as promoting a one-sided experience of the city’s Cold War division that was a privilege of residents and visitors to West Berlin. This is because a number of platforms were installed in West Berlin during the Cold War in order to provide vistas of the other side of the border (Knischewski & Spittler 2006). The reflecting mirror effect of the steel walls is not as effective as it was intended in producing a sense of immensity of the former borderland. The Cold War rawness of the site, which was maintained by treating the soil in the death strip with toxic substances in order to make it infertile and bare, was lost because the vegetation in the area has gradually regrown (Dolff-Bonekamper 2002). The feeling of being in the death strip has thus faded away. For all these reasons, many critics regard the design of the Wall Memorial as ambiguous, unclear and confusing (Knischewski & Spittler 2006; Dolff-Bonekamper 2002; Golden 2013). Despite its limitations, the memorial effectively re-creates an alien physical barrier, which artificially interrupts its surroundings and constrains people’s behaviour and uses. Like the Wall, it is a coercive piece of architecture that controls the way in which people experience and engage with the history of the place.

Apart from the Wall Memorial, the open air exhibition at Bernauer Strasse incorporates a series of historic relics of the border architecture, commemorative traces and artistic markers which reconstruct the death strip and events that occurred in this space. Narrowly spaced rusty metal poles re-create the contours of the Wall and enables visitors to pass through the former barrier and see both sides of the former borderland. Steel stripes in the ground and archaeological windows reveal remains and traces of the buildings that had been destroyed in order to clear the space in the borderland. Metal plates form dashed lines in the ground to uncover the locations of the escape tunnels that had been dug below the death strip. Historic photographs printed on the nearby facades and steel discs in the ground with numbers of people and dates mark the location of successful escape attempts. A Window of Remembrance includes photographs and names, which de-anonymize the identity of victims who died in an attempt to cross the border. Information kiosks, which incorporate archival texts, images and personal narratives, describe the events dramas of life in the former borderland.

In contrast to commodified memory places such as ‘Checkpoint Charlie’ (Frank 2016), the aim of the memorial grounds at Bernauer Strasse is to communicate an authentic and
informative interpretation of history that would inform visitors about the historic situation that led to construction of the Wall, its fall, and the reunification of the city. In contrast to the Wall Memorial, which controls the ways in which users engage in its memory, the open-air exhibition is a memory assemblage which does not impose a particular order or hierarchy in the way in which visitors experience the Cold War history. Rather, it exposes fragments of the past that can be composed into multiple commemorative themes. It is a multi-layered memory space where the Wall and the death strip can be experienced both as places of division and oppression by the East German regime, and as sites of the residents’ defiance and resistance.

Conclusion

This paper has discussed the ways in which the remains of Berlin’s contested Cold War history have been reconstructed and commemorated through architecture and urban space. The examples discussed range from spatial strategies of leaving memory in the form of a void in the urban fabric of the city, transforming it into a minimalist trace in the ground, and materialising it as a monument and a memory landscape. These different memory forms provoke diverse interactions and interpretations of the city’s traumatic history. The creative engagement with the Cold War heritage in Mauerpark has created an inversion of the past—the strip of cityscape that had mediated the city’s division has become a gathering place that brings diverse people together. The cobblestone trace has put layers of time and space into a creative tension—it enables passers-by to understand the transformation of the urban fabric by simultaneously reflecting on Berlin’s past division and the ongoing process of unification. The memorial grounds in Bernauer Strasse provides an informative interpretation of history, which enables visitors to experience multiple memories of the death strip—both that of the oppression by the East German regime and that of the opposition to it by residents.

The examples discussed are only fragments of a broader story about the ways in which the history of Berlin’s Cold War division has been incorporated through urban transformation of the former borderland. They demonstrate that the conflicted and complex history and legacy of the Berlin’s Cold War division cannot be represented by a single memorial form or narrative. Rather, multiple interpretations of history co-exist in different sites within the city and remain negotiated through architecture and urban space. In the city that is haunted by a difficult and contested history, such designs prevent erasure of the difficult history while allowing simultaneous remembrance and moving on. They are at once reminders of division, oppression and violence and symbols of the city’s resilience.

References


