

IMPLICATED
FEEDING
RE, HAUN
TUBYP
OFECTI
ON

Implicated in Care, Haunted by Protection: The Violence of Bronze and Stone Bodies

As living human bodies move through their everyday urban environments riding in their cars, taking buses or trains, rushing to work on foot, or strolling leisurely through a park, they often pass the bodies of other humans who are not alive. These nonliving humans are always there. They never leave their designated space. They never move unless they are moved. These other bodies are not flesh and blood. They are bronze and stone. They have been sculpted deeply into the surface of cities. They are a central element in the infrastructures establishing modern urbanization and transforming urban dwellers into modern bodies.

What follows serves as an introduction to thinking through the meanings of the copresence of living and nonliving modern bodies in shared public urban environments and performs a slight but significant shift in perspective on these nonliving modern bodies, aka figurative statuary and monuments: *they are bronze and stone bodies and they are part of the making of modern urban infrastructure*. The umbrella term *bronze and stone bodies*, defined here as an infrastructural concept, includes allegorical as well as historical figures. In

methodological terms, this move allows for the development of a conceptual approach that combines history and theory, bringing into view the idea that all bodies, extending to bronze and stone bodies, have needs that require care to exist and act in the world.

First, this move leads

to archival materials, their making and their legal care and protection, as well as all kinds of source materials on mundane and commemorative practices in

The umbrella term bronze and stone bodies, defined here as an infrastructural concept, includes allegorical as well as historical figures. In methodological terms, this move allows for the development of a conceptual approach that combines history and theory, bringing into view the idea that all bodies, extending to bronze and stone bodies, have needs that require care to exist and act in the world.

response to bronze and stone bodies. Second, this move explores changes to urban fieldwork training and how observation on the bodily, spatial, and infrastructural dimensions in the encounter between living and nonliving modern bodies can be rethought. Third, this move allows for new analyses of existing literature on modern figurative statuary and monuments in fields such as art history, architectural history, anthropology, history, digital humanities, environmental humanities, legal studies, philosophy, urban planning theory, urban studies, memory studies, gender studies, critical race studies, queer and color studies, and crip studies. Central to understanding bronze and stone bodies as bodies and as infrastructure is that these bodies are fully dependent upon us, the living, to be present with us and to act upon us or together with us. Monument care and monument protection are modern philosophical and legal concepts developed in the context of modern processes of urban infrastructuralization. The care and protection of historical monuments was

The care and protection of historical monuments was relevant to the formation of the nation-state and its legacies, in turn supporting the making of modern monuments that are considered equally worthy as representatives of the progress of the present that will endure into the future.

relevant to the formation of the nation-state and its legacies, in turn supporting the making of modern monuments that are considered equally worthy as representatives of the progress of the pres-

ent that will endure into the future. Progress and preservation are central to modern processes of urban infrastructuralization and associated requirements for monument care and protection.

Building on the first part of the chapter, the second part provides a framework for a feminist history and theory of bronze and stone bodies based on the following three premises: bronze and stone bodies have a body; they occupy a space; and they have a history. Connecting these premises to the need for care and protection not only provides the tools for a critical methodological frame-

work but raises profound concerns for future monument care and monument protection and what their ethical and legal dimensions mean to the practices and actions of public administrators, members of civil society, policymakers, and political representatives. These concerns raise awareness that care and protection given to bronze and stone bodies is “implicated” in and “haunted” by historical violence—including antisemitism, racism, sexism, domination, plunder, and death-making—that is kept present in public urban environments precisely by the means of monument care and protection.¹ Consider, for example, the care and protection given to bronze and stone bodies representing those who, in their own time, were imperial rulers, war leaders, invaders of territories that did not belong to them, colonial mining magnates, or proponents of political antisemitism and proponents of racism.

Bronze and stone bodies occupy space as part of the infrastructures that created classed, gendered, racialized, and sexualized divisions and inequalities in public urban environments.

The bodies of modern humans considered powerful and exemplary—historical figures and allegorical figures alike, who can be identified as central to the violent, cruel, and lethal systems of domination over humans, all other beings, and the shared planetary environment—are bodies now kept permanently present. The very bodies of modern humans who have unleashed, and are thus responsible for, the death-making culture of modernity, paving the way for genocides, ethnocides, ecocides, and mass extinction, are today allowed to occupy space in public urban environments and to occupy time, understood as both hegemonic History (with a capital H) and as individually experienced and shared time resulting in personal keepsakes and memories. I am acutely aware that many bronze and stone bodies are different from the ones who are the focus of my discussion here. Historical modernity has also made animals, in particular the horses that formed a part of imperial power and warfare, permanently present. In addition, activist monument makers use figuration and the materials of bronze and stone to make present the bodies of those who lived in the wake of and suffered from historical violence. Recent decades

1 I use the terms *implicated* and *implication* following literary scholar Michael Rothberg’s conceptual framework. See Michael Rothberg, *The Implicated Subject: Beyond Victims and Perpetrators* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2019). My use of the term *haunting* is based on the conceptual approach put forward by sociologist Avery Gordon. See Avery Gordon, *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008).

have seen a return to figurative sculpture and an insistence on adding to public urban environments bronze and stone bodies representing those who had previously been absent from them. Representing and making publicly present the bodies of “victims” and those who resisted the cruelties of historical regimes of oppression, discrimination, and death-making can be seen as a form of activist and ethical healing, as well as a strategic political response to the occupation of urban environments by the bodies of historical “perpetrators” of violence.²

To discuss the implications of care and reflect on the haunting that results from acts of protection, this chapter focuses on the continued violent presence of bronze and stone bodies depicting those who held power and defined modern nation-building, colonial expansion, and modern urbanization. The infrastructures that constructed this new and modern world rested on the twin ideologies of human supremacy and colonial patriarchy, known in the history of ideas as the Enlightenment and since the turn of the century as the Anthropocene epoch, a geological period marked by the catastrophic impact of humans having become a geological force. Urbanization gave built form to these ideologies, which were founded on inequality, nesting at its core the new technologies of steam industrialization and the economies of extractive fossil capitalism.

2 Rothberg, *The Implicated Subject*.



Attica figures from parliament roof ready for removal
Attica figures on the ground, 07-20-2018 © Parliamentary Directorate / Michael Buchner

Local school children in Vienna are taken to these statues to learn about them. I recall having been taken there about fifty years ago. We learned that the statues are from the nineteenth century and that this style is called neoclassical or neo-Hellenistic. We were also taught that Greek statues are always white. The white-washing of Greek statues forms part of the formation of coloniality and racism and is charted by Nell Irvin Painter in her book *The History of White People*, where she explains how Johann Joachim Winckelmann, considered the first to write a systematic art history, elevated Rome’s white marble copies of Greek statuary into emblems of beauty and created a new white aesthetic.³ Throughout this chapter, I use photographs and narrative captions to share some of my own encounters with bronze and stone bodies as an urban researcher and cultural theorist, as a professor teaching at a public university, as a living and moving body in public urban environments, and as feminist concerned with care, socioecological reproduction, and memory practices in the built environment.

In the chapter’s conclusion I emphasize the ethical and political dimensions of future monument care and protection and insist that a profound rethinking is necessary so that public urban environments can be restituted and freed from their occupation by bronze and stone bodies who subject the living to the monumental glorification of violent historical regimes of discrimination, oppression, and death-making and who, through their bodies, imprint this History on the surface of cities.

Bodies and Infrastructural Intimacy

Every day, they are there. Bronze and stone bodies never move. They do not stop occupying their space. We cannot escape their being present. Their presence performs a political ontology through their materiality and the space their bodies have been endowed with, a presence enacted through bronze and stone. Their presence transforms public urban environments into environments shared by living and nonliving bodies. Much like other urban infra-

3 Nell Irvin Painter, *The History of White People* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2010).

structures, such as drinking water, sewage, transport, power, or communication systems, their presence defines how we as humans live together, shaped, supported, and, to a degree, defined by these infrastructures or their absence.

While one can argue that water, sewage, or power are essential to human sur-

While one can argue that water, sewage, or power are essential to human survival and that bronze and stone bodies are not essential in quite the same way, seeing them as infrastructural components of public urban environments is helpful in understanding how these bodies configure a distinctly modern system that renders those considered makers of History permanently present.

vival and that bronze and stone bodies are not essential in quite the same way, seeing them as infrastructural components of public urban environments is helpful in understanding how these bodies configure a distinctly modern system that renders those consid-

ered makers of History permanently present. This memory infrastructure made up of bronze and stone bodies not only renders the past permanently present, which is the starting point for conventional understandings in everyday use and scholarship, but also makes abundantly clear the distinctly modern feature of the ideology of human exceptionalism that can make certain historical bodies defy death by keeping them forever present. However, these bodies are not simply present forever; they depend on us, on the living, to remain permanently present. They need protection against attacks, displacement, or destruction, be it in times of war or during urban protests or urban development. They need care, maintenance, and repair as the impacts of daily weather events and human-induced climate change age their bodies. Both in everyday language and in legal terms, acts of maintenance are referred to as “monument care” and “monument protection.” Therefore, the public institutions, the legal mechanisms, the provision of infrastructural maintenance, but also individual acts of affection and love displayed around and performed with bronze and stone

bodies, are implicated in the past they keep alive. To fully unfold their performativity, as well as their political ontology, they also need “knowledge care” and “epistemic maintenance.”

In front of the Parlamentsgebäude (Austrian Parliament Building) in Vienna



Pallas Athene

stands the monumental, five-meter-tall Greek goddess Pallas Athene. While I am writing this chapter, the 420 million euro process of restoring Theophil Hansen's 1883 building is underway. To date, this crypto-colonial appropriation of Greek culture has remained largely unnoticed and unquestioned, whereas Pallas Athene has become a popular attraction for those taking selfies. Stone and bronze bodies require structures of support that provide knowledge

about them in the contexts of education and tourism. The bodies are often at the receiving end of learned caring behaviors, including touching, hugging, or being captured in photographs and selfies. They are connected to personal memories of strolling through cities or enjoying vacations with kin, friends, and families. The presence of bronze and stone bodies entangles us. Having been captured in photographs, many of these bronze and stone bodies sneak into people's personal lives. They remain present in the photo albums kept in people's drawers or on bookshelves in their homes. They circulate through social media channels on which people are active, as memorable moments are shared with others. Often little is known about the bronze and stone bodies that are so openly welcomed into the practices and sites of personal memory-making. We can understand their public presence in urban environments and their intimate presence in personal memory-making practices through the Freudian term *unheimlich*⁴. Bronze and stone bodies are so strangely familiar that they are taken for granted, becoming naturalized presences that are part of the aesthetics of the urban surface that can be consumed as a visual backdrop. The very fact that these bronze and stone bodies enter intimately into the lives of living bodies, leaving lasting impressions and traces, links them to features shared by other infrastructural systems, ones being rendered legible through critical feminist (in particular, decolonial, intersectional, material, and materialist feminist) approaches.

Infrastructure operates for, on, with, through, but also against bodies at affective and material levels, impacting the epistemological and the bodily, the personal and the public, the private and the social. Consider the fact that modern bodies entangled in the processes of modern urbanization—that is, infrastructuralization—were made to breathe in the air that new transport systems began to profoundly alter. Modern bodies began to move at the speed and according to the intervals of transport systems. Modern bodies were connected to water systems through pipes intimately reaching into their homes, and this water entered, touched, and left their bodies in multifold ways. Modern water infrastructure connected bodies to water so they

could drink it, cook their food, clean themselves, and wash their clothes. As reproductive life was reshaped by these infrastructures, human bodies passed on these bodily changes to following generations of bodies made modern through urbanization. Modern forms of infrastructural injustice play out on the scales of the environmental, the material, and the spatial but also on the scales of the social and the historical, as well as on individual bodies. This leads to an understanding of the deep impact of infrastructures that can be captured in the concept of infrastructural intimacy. This concept is helpful in raising awareness about how little living human bodies know about the interpenetrative effects of the infrastructures they are intimately bound to and dependent upon. Bringing this thought of corporeal infrastructural intimacy to the infrastructural memory system, composed and upheld by figurative bodies that have characterized the making of modern cities, raises awareness about how little is known about the depth of violence, the abyss of pain, trauma, and dispossession, that is made permanently present and upheld by the bronze and stone bodies surfacing in modern cities and how such violence rendered permanently present creeps into bodies and minds alike, finding its way into photo albums and other keepsakes.

The interconnectedness of scales through infrastructures is constitutive to how living human bodies were made to be “modern.” *Infrastructuralization*, as a new urban ontology, entered human bodies and their everyday lives. The term infrastructuralization refers to all the processes necessary for the production and reproduction of infrastructures—that is, the care dedicated to maintenance and repair—so they can continue to perform their functions. The term not only refers to all the processes through which infrastructure connects to people's everyday lives but constitutes a new way of infrastructural life in which urban environments reshaped by infrastructures enter into human and other bodies. Infrastructural life is life on the level of bios, wherein bodies are penetrated by environmental changes wrought by infrastructures. Bronze and stone bodies form a material and environmental, as well as allegorical and symbolic, part of these infrastructures that create ableist, classed, ecological,

4 Sigmund Freud, “Das Unheimliche” (1919), in *Gesammelte Werke XII*, ed. Anna Freud, Edward Bibring, Willi Hofer, Ernst Kris, and Otto Isakower, 229–68 (Frankfurt: Fischer, 2001).

Bronze and stone bodies form a material and environmental, as well as allegorical and symbolic, part of these infrastructures that create ableist, classed, ecological, gendered, racialized, and sexualized divisions and inequalities in public urban environments.

gendered, racialized, and sexualized divisions and inequalities in public urban environments. Critical scholarship and activism pay close attention to political and social dimensions of infrastructural injustice. Equally important is to understand infrastructures through their effects, which are at once public and intimate, and to grasp the deep infrastructural reach into environments and bodies. This helps us better understand the nexus that runs through interlinked and interpenetrative implications of infrastructures that are at once affective, bodily, environmental, and material. Thinking about infrastructural ontologies of longevity and reliability leads to thinking about the care and protection needed by infrastructures. For infrastructures to last and to perform their support functions, they must be cared for and maintained by humans. Thinking about bronze and stone bodies in infrastructural terms leads us to dimensions of care and to the complex ethical and political implications of caring for such bodies, which is of central concern to this chapter. For bronze and stone bodies to remain permanently present, they need living bodies who care about, and work for, their continued existence and who ensure their care needs are met over time. Continued existence is not only the material and bodily existence in bronze and stone, but also the epistemic and cultural existence through research, teaching, and cultural practices of looking, photographing, and visiting,

Working toward a Feminist History and Theory of Bronze and Stone Bodies

Bringing into clear focus the idea that figurative statues and monuments are bodies while bringing into sharp relief the idea that these bodies are entan-

gled in the politics of modern infrastructuralization requires critical scholarship to take a deeper look at what these bronze and stone bodies need. What do they demand and require from us? What does taking care of them and providing protection for them mean in ethical and social terms and in relation to ecological justice in the public urban environments that living and nonliving bodies share? The care and protection given to these bronze and stone bodies entangles all members of urban publics in their presence. Feminist theories argue that bodies are interdependent insofar as they depend on the provision of care and protection to survive and thrive. Ontologically, all bodies are always in need of care and protection: bodies who are in power and bodies who are subjugated by bodies in power, bodies who are involved in death-making as well as bodies involved in life-making. Care and protection are implicated in what bodies are doing to one another. What do these bodies “care about”? What do they need so they can make present what they care about? How do they move us to “take care of” their needs? And what does “care giving” and “care receiving” between living and nonliving bodies mean in affective, cultural, ecological, economic, environmental, emotional, epistemic, social, and political terms?⁵ A discussion of care leads to thinking about the consequences

of the lasting provision of care and protection to bronze and stone bodies and what it means to have been responsible for contributing to caring for their enduring presence, made seemingly permanent, over years, decades, and centuries.⁶

The three premises outlined above—that bronze and stone bodies have a body, that they occupy a space, and that they have a history—are here connected, for the purpose of developing a feminist history and theory of such bodies, to the central features of presence, occupation, and History. By *History* I posit a hegemonic version of history, or simply History with a capital H. What

Care and protection are implicated in what bodies are doing to one another. What do these bodies “care about”? What do they need so they can make present what they care about?

⁵ Berenice Fisher and Joan Tronto, “Toward a Feminist Theory of Caring,” in *Circles of Care: Work and Identity in Women’s Lives*, ed. Emily K. Abel and Margaret K. Nelson, 35–62 (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990), 40.

⁶ See Rothberg, *The Implicated Subject*.

makes an approach to these three premises feminist? The term is understood here as an epistemic and political approach linking scholarship to the real world of injustice, violence, exploitation, extraction, and oppression while seeking to resist, counteract, and transform this world so all bodies, human and nonhuman, as well as all so-called nonliving matter, can coexist in their interdependencies as best as possible. In what follows I lay out the import of body, space, and History, as they are foundational to the history and theory of bronze and stone bodies. Body, space, and History have been central tenets in several genealogies of feminist epistemic traditions and of feminist scholarly activism connected to feminist movements.⁷ A feminist history and theory of bronze and stone bodies can build on rich, complex, and nuanced feminist traditions. I draw on the epistemological and analytical tradition of feminist care theory to offer a framework of analysis for the nexus that runs through body, space, history, presence, occupation, and History. Simply, care ethics is the core analytic for working toward a history and theory of bronze and stone bodies. All bodies are always in need of care. Care ensures that bodies can have their place in the world and that they can continue to exist in their place in the world. Starting from the foundational premise that bronze and stone bodies are material bodies that need to occupy a place so they can have a history, care ethics brings into focus the question of how the continued existence of bronze and stone bodies is made possible so that public urban environments can be shared by living and nonliving bodies. Education scholar Berenice Fisher and political theorist Joan Tronto have developed a framework differentiating “four intertwining phases” of “caring about, taking care, caregiving, and care-receiving.”⁸ This framework is used here to open a broad and challenging series of questions highlighting the implications of the care given to bronze and stone bodies.

The figure of *Der Sieger (The Victor)* is one of the most popular figurative statues in Vienna and one of the most photographed by tourists. I often take my first-year students at the Akademie der bildenden Künste Wien (Academy of Fine Arts Vienna) to visit this nude bronze body. I ask their opinion of him.

7 A detailed exploration of the different feminist epistemologies and the richness of cultural, social, material, political, and spatial feminist practices engaging with the body, space, and History is beyond the scope of this chapter.

8 Fisher and Tronto, “Toward a Feminist Theory of Caring,” 40.



Der Sieger (The Victor, 1921) by Josef Müllner (1921), Theseustempel, Volksgarten, Vienna

Many think he is beautiful. Others point out that he presents a timeless ideal of classical beauty. When probed, they start to see that this body resembles later bodies made by Arno Breker or Josef Thorak, both of whom the Nazi regime included on the *Gottbegnadeten-Liste* (God-gifted list).⁹

My first premise is that bronze and stone bodies have a body. On an ontological level bodies can be understood through the concepts of life and death. Living bodies are mortal. The art-historical term for sculptures of human and nonhuman bodies is figurative, which means “derived from life.” Bronze and stone bodies are “recognizably derived from life.”¹⁰ Therefore we must ask whose life has been deemed worthy enough to be represented as a bronze and stone body? Figurative bodies have a “recognizable source in the real world,” which is made permanently and publicly present by bronze and stone

9 Thorak also studied under Müllner, who was a professor at the Akademie der bildenden Künste Wien from 1910 to 1948.

10 A.N. Hodge, (New York: Rosen Publishing Group, 2017), 204.

11 Antonia Pocock, “figurative/figural,” in *Keywords*, n.d., *The Chicago School of Media Theory* [blog], <https://lucian.uchicago.edu/blogs/mediatheory/keywords/figurativefigural/>.

bodies and thus leads to the “historical survival” of the specific “source” that is being made “recognizable.”¹¹ The presence of bronze and stone bodies places a demand on living human bodies to recognize them as who they have been historically or as what they stand for symbolically or allegorically. In this relation to the living, bronze and stone bodies adopt a political life that is not characterized by permanency, in the sense of remaining unchanged, but rather by what their permanency means to those who are copresent with them during their own lifetime. Precisely in this relation between unchanging permanent presence, which these bronze and stone bodies make a claim to, and the possibility of or right to changeability, which living bodies articulate and express, does the political dimension of this relation unfold and take shape. Whose bodies are kept alive and made permanently present in bronze and stone? Who cared about these bodies enough to maintain their public afterlife in public urban environments after their bodily death? Who cared about the choices of bodies that make present allegorical or symbolic meaning? Who took care of all the things needed so that a bronze or stone body could come into existence? How were pressure groups or lobbying groups dedicated to the memorialization of specific bodies formed? How was the money collected and procured? How were politicians lobbied to give their agreement? How did the sculptors get access to these historical bodies to figure them? Who, for example, made the death masks of historical figures and provided those to the artists? Who chose the clothes they should wear and made them available? Who cared about the body ideals made present in allegorical statuary? Who took care that these bodily norms, which join together normative ideas of beauty and of ethical virtue, were produced by allegorical bodies? Who wrote the laws that determine that bronze and stone bodies are protected from removal or destruction? Who understands their needs for conservation, restoration, maintenance, and cleaning? Whose bodies are tasked to perform the labor of care? Whose bodies gather in front of them to show their respect and to give expression to acts of memory? Whose bodies respond to them with their affects and emotions? Whose bodies bring flowers or give hugs, take

photographs or provide information so that bodies remain recognizable? How are those who perform such labor and such acts of caregiving affected by the bronze and stone bodies? How has the care received by bronze and stone bodies been documented over time? How are bronze and stone bodies affected by the care and protection they receive? Who researches how care and protection have been provided and received over time?

My second premise is that bronze and stone bodies occupy space. Ontologically, bodies can be understood by their existence in space. Living bodies are spatial. So are nonliving bodies. The general architectural-historical term for the statuary that forms part of buildings is *architectural sculpture*, which is understood as the decoration of buildings. The commonly used general art-historical term for monuments is *art in public space*. Not distinguishing here between architectural sculpture as decoration and monuments in public space is foundational for developing a broader conceptual approach to the space occupied by bronze and stone bodies. Thinking through these spaces of occupation has led me to use the formulation “public urban environments,” which is more encompassing than the standard terms *buildings* or *public space*. The term *public urban environment* includes all kinds of buildings, built structures, and, of course, public space. Bronze and stone bodies are found almost everywhere: in central squares, on the rooftops and facades of buildings, on boulevards, in parks and cemeteries, in the entrance halls of train stations, in museum foyers and school atriums, and in hallways at city hall—to name just a few. Modern cities created new public urban environments into which were incorporated public statuary and monuments. These include cultural, educational, health, housing, leisure, transport, traffic, and work infrastructures that fulfilled in material terms the ideologies of growth, progress, and innovation. New infrastructures of modernity include train stations, parliament buildings, museums, opera houses, theaters, swimming pools, squares, and parks—all of which provide civic space for bronze and stone bodies. These nonliving bodies contribute to deep processes of infrastructuralization, as well as to the modern aesthetic of the infrastructural surfaces of cities.

Who provides space to bronze and stone bodies? Who plans space for such bodies? Who designs the squares and boulevards where they are installed? Who designs the architectures, buildings, and infrastructures they form a part of? Which spaces are provided to which bodies? Where is their space located in the context of an urban environment, which is marked by different notions attributed to center and periphery, inclusion, exclusion, segregation, and differently distributed accessibilities? Is the space where they are installed publicly owned and administered or privately owned and cared for? What was in the space before the bronze and stone bodies came to occupy it? What did they displace? (This question includes the large modern infrastructures that reshaped urban land adorned by architectural sculpture.) Who protects spaces where such bodies are installed from the encroachment of urban development? From which spaces were the material resources extracted that were necessary for sculpting and casting stone and bronze bodies? Where are the marble quarries and the sites of copper or tin mining from which bronze and stone bodies can trace their material beginnings? Where are the studio spaces of the sculptors who made them? Who is responsible for the provision of care and maintenance of these spaces? Whose bodies are made to come into daily contact with these bronze and stone bodies as they use public urban environments (transport infrastructures, streets, squares, etc.) to move from one space to another? Whose bodies perform the labor of care and maintenance for these spaces where bronze and stone bodies are found?

My third premise is that each of these bronze and stone bodies has a specific history. Ontologically, bodies can also be understood through their existence over time. Bodies are temporal and thus historical. This also holds true for bronze and stone bodies, whose materiality makes a claim to permanency and thus to History. The historical and everyday understanding of figurative statuary and of figurative monuments is that they render History present and thus serve the functions of public, collective, social, and cultural memory. As a memory infrastructure they have been incorporated into the built canon of national cultural heritage. As subjects of teaching in the context of school

curricula and university courses, as well as for the provision of knowledge in the context of public tours for interested audiences, whether locals or tourists, they are seen as History. They provide the reason for continuing and passing on a specific version of hegemonic History. Today, in the context of post-imperialism, post-coloniality, post-Shoah, post-genocides, post-communism, and the Anthropocene condition at large, the presence of this History has come under scrutiny and attack. The commonly held assumption that bronze and stone bodies manifest the History of those they make present has obscured the fact that they are themselves historical and have their own history that changes as responses to them change over time and as their bodies age in material terms. It is generally assumed that bronze and stone bodies are History; that is, that they make present important historical figures or core values rendered legible through allegory. But the history of bronze and stone bodies is not identical to the History they make present. Distinguishing *history* from *History*—that is, distinguishing the existence of bronze and stone bodies in the spaces they occupy from the History they make present—is central to a feminist history and theory of bronze and stone bodies. Only if we start to differentiate more clearly in critical research between, on the one hand, the specific history that made specific bronze and stone bodies possible and ensured their continued public existence and, on the other hand, their history as it is registered through archival and all kinds of written and visual sources, can we arrive at a more complex understanding of the needs of these bodies and the implications of care. This includes researching and thus constituting their everyday urban history as it unfolds in the responses of living beings to their presence. The Fisher and Tronto framework of caring about, taking care of, caregiving, and care-receiving has been used here to develop the above questions. They are not exhaustive but serve as tools to begin the work of compiling more complex histories and theories of bronze and stone bodies. Such histories are important as they make possible the rethinking and redefining of the current legal, ethical, and political understanding of monument care and monument protection.

Implicated in Care, Haunted by Protection

The specific histories of bronze and stone bodies remain understudied in scholarship, including in the new postdisciplinary and multimethodological work bringing together architecture, art, history, anthropology, archival studies, environmental and material studies, class studies, gender studies, critical race studies, policy studies, international war and security studies, international relations studies, heritage studies, urban studies, and memory studies. Further activist archival work and urban field research will be needed to learn the specific histories of bronze and stone bodies and to understand the implications of monument care and the haunting performed by monument protection. Bronze and stone bodies—that is, figurative statuary and monuments—need care and protection to make possible their continued existence in public urban environments. Building on Michael Rothberg’s notion of the implicated subject, I suggest that subjects are implicated by their provision of care for bronze and stone bodies who glorify and monumentalize violent pasts. Such care ensures the continuance of past violence, maintaining its seemingly unbroken presence. Reading Rothberg, implicated subjects are enmeshed in the prolongation of the legacy of historical violence in the present and perpetuate the structures of inequality that cause suffering and make healing impossible. Rothberg argues, “Although indirect or belated, their actions and inactions help produce and reproduce the positions of victims and perpetrators.”¹² Vis-à-vis bronze and stone bodies, who may have been historical perpetrators of violence or representatives of regimes of state terror, violence, exploitation, oppression, and discrimination or who may have been victims of such systems, those who are the providers of care for these bronze and stone bodies at any given point in time are implicated in their continued presence by care. This means that they may be responsible for both the continued presence of perpetrators and the continued presence of victims. The legal notion of monument care and monument protection does not make the ethical and political dis-

12 Rothberg,
The Implicated Subject, 1.

inction that I make here. This raises a question: How is the continued provision of legally enshrined monument care and monument protection, including acts of conservation, repair, maintenance, cleaning, teaching, and the provision of information as well as everyday expressions of affection, implicated in the continuation of past violence? Concepts such as “bronze patriarchy,” bronze imperialism, marble coloniality, bronze anti-Semitism, or marble fascism, make abundantly clear that bronze and stone bodies present legacies of historical violence and injustice in today’s urban environments. These legacies are maintained as national cultural heritage or even classified as world heritage.¹³ Their presence entangles us, as living bodies, in a deep web of histories of violence, dispossession, oppression, and mass death.

The more-than-ten-meter-tall monument glorifying Karl Lueger, who popular-

ized anti-Semitism as a political ideology, was completed in 1926. In 2026, it will have occupied a central location next to the ring road boulevard in Vienna for a hundred years. The square, also named after Lueger, who was a source of inspiration for Adolf Hitler, has recently become the site of rightwing, neofascist activism. In 2020, a coalition of leftwing activists and artists, including Muslimische Jugend Österreich (Muslim Youth Austria), Jüdische österreichische Hochschülerinnen (Austrian Union of Jewish Students), and Sozialistische Jugend Wien

13 Sharon Crozier-de Rosa and Vera Mackie,
Remembering Women’s Activism (London: Routledge, 2019), 1.



Monument to Karl Lueger, former mayor of Vienna. Copyright: Kasa Fue.

(Socialist Youth Vienna) gathered around the monument and held shame vigils (Schandwachen). Their protest was also expressed by spraying the word Schande (shame) on the statue.

Their presence haunts all those who are exposed to this historical violence and its continued monumental glorification. Avery Gordon says that haunting is “an animated state in which a repressed or unresolved social violence is making itself known, sometimes very directly, sometimes more obliquely. . . . Haunting raises specters, and it alters the experience of being in time, the way we separate the past, the present, and the future.”¹⁴ The haunting dimension of figurative statuary and monuments lies precisely in their joining together History made visible and the histories of violence, oppression, domination, subjugation, exploitation, and extraction caused by those who steered the course of History rendered invisible. The presence of these bodies can be understood to be haunting, unheimlich, as so many who interact fondly with such bronze and stone bodies and invite them into their personal memories, diaries, and other material and digital keepsake, do not even know what they stand for or that they express, for example, allegorical personifications of fascist aesthetics or colonial racial ideologies of beauty.

Monument care is thus implicated in the continued existence of bronze and

Monument care is thus implicated in the continued existence of bronze and stone bodies. Monument protection ensures their continued presence, which to many presents a distinct form of haunting rendered by way of the expression of a violence that is legally protected

ed. Bronze and stone bodies are a distinct form of space and of time. Given that many of these bodies are given space to embody regimes of violence and cruelty, we need to start thinking about what it would

stone bodies. Monument protection ensures their continued presence, which to many presents a distinct form of haunting rendered by way of the expression of violence that is legally protect-

occupation, both of

mean to liberate and restitute public urban environments and begin difficult processes of healing. By thinking about the fact that these nonliving bodies perform their claim to remain present, which is a specific form of insisting on having an afterlife beyond biological death and furthermore an insistence on human-made time, on winning over historical time through the occupation of space, we come to understand that these bodies also occupy time. Their occupation of both space and time renders these bronze and stone bodies historical. Their presence makes abundantly clear that there is not enough space for everybody to be present like this after death in public urban environments. The dead, whether buried or burnt, rest in graveyards and cemeteries. The dead to be publicly remembered are resurrected as bronze and stone bodies. Many of these bodies—emperors, kings, presidents, war heroes, discoverers, philosophers, and slave traders—have informed and formed “topographies of cruelty.”¹⁵

A feminist history and theory of bronze and stone bodies that uses care as an analytic strives for new understandings and new forms of monument care, which includes bringing to an end the topographies of cruelty of which the bronze and stone bodies that occupy public urban environments are often a part. Such occupied spaces must be restituted to the public. New forms of care and protection will necessarily include ways of finding new spaces for such monuments; for example, in the deep storage of museums. Their detailed, well-researched, and nuanced histories can be told through photographic and filmic documentation held in urban museums. Furthermore, space formerly occupied by monuments to figures who perpetuated historical violence can be used as educational sites to learn about these histories, including stories about how easily care can be implicated in historical acts of violence and how protection can manifest as a kind of haunting.¹⁶

15 Achille Mbembe, “Necropolitics,” *Public Culture* 15, no. 1 (2003): 11–40 (here 3).

16 In a colloquium in Vienna on November 7, 2021, Edmund de Waal spoke about the restitution of public space when he addressed the violent legacies of the monument dedicated to Lueger, the anti-Semitic mayor of Vienna. The colloquium was organized by the Ligue internationale contre le racisme et l’antisémitisme en Autriche. See https://www.mumok.at/sites/default/files/marmor_bronze_verantwortung_programm_0.pdf.