

Manufacturing Gemeinschaft:
Architecture, Tradition, and the Sociology of Community in Germany, 1890-1920

by

Jeannette Redensek

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Art History
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York

2007

UMI Number: 3283173

Copyright 2007 by
Redensek, Jeannette

All rights reserved.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3283173

Copyright 2008 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2007

Jeannette Redensek

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the
Graduate Faculty in Art History in satisfaction of the
dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Professor Rosemarie Bletter

April 25, 2007

Chair of Examining Committee

Professor Kevin Murphy

April 25, 2007

Executive Officer

Professor Rosemarie Bletter

Professor Rose-Carol Washton Long

Professor Kevin Murphy

Supervisory Committee
The City University of New York

Abstract

Manufacturing Gemeinschaft: Architecture, Tradition, and the Sociology of Community
in Germany, 1890-1920

by

Jeannette Redensek

Adviser: Professor Rosemarie Bletter

This dissertation examines the relationship between social scientific propositions and architecture and planning in Germany during the late Wilhelmine empire, with attention to the use of historical forms as models for modern community. Chapter One, *Sociology Finds Its Subject*, surveys the processes of urbanization in Germany in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and examines the coeval formation of the social sciences in the period. Chapter Two, *Past and Present*, looks more closely at spatial conceptions of community articulated in the sociological theories of Ferdinand Tönnies, Werner Sombart, Max Weber, and Peter Kropotkin. Chapter Three, *Discovering the Vernacular*, investigates the use of traditional building forms in historical discourse and architecture of the Wilhelmine era. The chapter considers philological and ethnographic studies by Rudolf Henning, August Meitzen, Otto Lauffer, and Willi Pessler. It also explores use of the traditional German farmhouse as model by reformers and architects Karl Ernst Osthaus, Hermann Muthesius, Richard Riemerschmid, Paul Schultze-Naumburg, Karl Henrici, Heinrich Tessenow, Georg Metzendorf, Fritz Schumacher, and Paul Schmitthenner. Chapter Four, *Cellular Form and Collective Life*, looks at the melding of

social science and biology in the application of cellular structures and metaphors in modern planning. The chapter examines sociologist Albert Schäffle's evolutionary schema of human society as organism, Ernst Haeckel's Monist philosophy, biologist Oscar Hertwig's extension of the Zellenstaat (cell-state) idea into the social sphere. The chapter discusses biologicistic models in modern city planning, including garden city proposals of Theodor Fritsch and Ebenezer Howard, utopian and built projects of Bruno Taut, Walter Gropius, Theodor Overhoff, and Richard Kauffmann, the Central Place Theory of Walter Christaller, and community planning theories of Gottfried Feder and others in the Third Reich. The conclusion offers a brief exploration of architecture and planning projects of the Wilhelmine era and beyond, which sought to reconcile the spatial and temporal dislocations of modernity by creating environments that promised to foster close community relations within the urban milieu. This analysis of the village-in-in-the-city idea includes Berlin project by Alfred Messel, Bruno Taut, Martin Wagner, Heinrich Lassen, Paul Jatzow, and others.

Acknowledgements

In the course of writing a work such as this, one traverses many worlds, both intellectual and geographical, journeying so far that it becomes hard to conceive of a time before these words, these ideas populated the landscape. I am grateful, therefore, to have this occasion to remember some of the people who have made the passage so meaningful.

I would like to thank my doctoral advisor, Professor Rosemarie Bletter, for her generous knowledge and support, and, above all, for her elegance of mind and spirit. It is a true pleasure to be able to express here my appreciation to the other members of my dissertation committee. I thank Professor Rose-Carol Washton Long, who was a wonderfully sagacious guide to the contradictions of German art and culture, and who persisted in having confidence in this project in spite of all my efforts seemingly to convince her otherwise. I thank Professor Kevin Murphy for his warmth, curiosity, and deeply considered comments. And I extend a special gesture of gratitude to Christian Otto, Professor of Architecture at Cornell University, for his kind encouragement, and even more for the example of his scholarship, which shows so well how one can critically inhabit the literature and ideas of history.

Research for this dissertation was supported by a travel fellowship from the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, a Milton Brown Distinguished Dissertation Fellowship from the Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York, a research grant from the Getty Research Institute, and a year-long residency in the Berlin Program for Advanced German and European Studies at the Freie Universität Berlin.

This project owes a great deal to those people who fill my hours with ideas, questions, images, objects, and opinions, such that I have come to feel that I enjoy possession of not one mind, but several, not one life, but many. And so I thank Robert Riley, Daniel Adler, Robin Clark, Gibbons Cooney, Paul DeMarinis, Bruce Goldman, Michael Gonzalez, Catharina Manchanda, Paolo Polledri, Marilyn Bancel, and Rik Myslewski. If friendship at its best can be likened to having two heads, then an entirely new category of anatomical amity must be created for my friend, Judith Wyle, whose talents in cranial camaraderie are only enhanced by those of her family, Gary, Noah, and Adam Goldman. Finally, I thank my own family, most especially Hazel Freedman, Dolores Cooney, Alta Miller, and my late brother Joel Redensek, who have always reminded me that even across years of change, there is continuity.

Table of Contents	
List of illustrations	vi
Introduction Community as virtue in architecture and the social sciences	1
Chapter One Sociology finds its subject Theorizing modern community in the Kaiserreich	33
Chapter Two Past and present Through history toward a sociology of community	69
Chapter Three Discovering the vernacular: The farmhouse as model for the modern worker's home	132
Chapter Four Cellular form and collective life The concept of the organic community in the social sciences and city planning	220
Conclusion Wohin Gemeinschaft?	289
Bibliography	306
Illustrations	361

Illustrations

1. Satirical cartoon noting that the vernacular just as much as historicism had become a style, 1938. Architect Werner Lindner saw his mission as the preservation of the true vernacular over mere passing fashion. From Werner Lindner, *Das Dorf.Seine Pflege und Gestaltung* (Munich, 1938).
2. Frontispiece of Adolf Bartels, *Der Bauer in der deutschen Vergangenheit* (Leipzig, 1900).
3. Fidus (Hugo Hoppener), postcard from the Verlag Lebensreform, ca. 1900. From Diethard Kerbs, and Jürgen Reulecke, eds. *Handbuch der deutschen Reformbewegungen 1880-1933*. (Wuppertal, 1998).
4. Cottage on the Bölschestrasse, Berlin-Friedrichshagen. The village of Friedrichshagen was founded in 1753 by Friedrich II as part of his efforts to establish textile industries in Prussia. The region along the Müggelsee, southeast of Berlin, was to become a center for silk production. Several hundred mulberry trees were planted along the village main street, and in the late eighteenth century cottages were erected to house silk worm growers and weavers from Bohemia. Photo by author, 2001.
5. Two-story, four-dwelling house type in the Cité ouvrière, Mülhausen, designed by Emile Muller. *Allgemeine Bauzeitung* 54 (Vienna, 1889).
6. Krupp Meisterhäuser (housing for master craftsmen), Essen, 1861/62. From *Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen der Gußstahlfabrik von Friedr. Krupp zu Essen a.d. Ruhr* (Essen, 1902).
7. Krupp Stammhaus. The old family home of founder Friedrich Krupp, built in 1822, was preserved as a symbol (and an office space) at the center of the Krupp works in Essen. From *Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen der Gußstahlfabrik von Friedr. Krupp zu Essen a.d. Ruhr* (Essen, 1902).
8. Workers' Hall, Wasserwerk Müggelsee-Friedrichshagen, 1893. Photograph by Hermann Rückwardt. Collection Museum im Wasserwerk, Friedrichshagen. From *Alte Wasserwerke in Berlin. Historische Fotografien von Hermann Rückwardt und Albert Schwartz*, Berliner Wasserbetriebe Historische Beiträge, Heft 1 (1995).
9. Entrance to the Handwerkervereinshaus, Sophienstrasse 18, Berlin. Designed by Joseph Franckel and Theodor Kampfmeyer. The Berlin Handwerkerverein was founded in 1844. In 1864 it moved to a site in the Sophienstrasse, just a few doors away from the present location. At that time it was the first building in Germany specifically dedicated to the education of workers. The inner warren of old buildings and connecting courtyards housed workshops and assembly rooms.

10. Project for a rural house, from Georg Ungewitter, *Entwürfe zu Stadt- und Landhäusern* (Glogau: Flemming, 1856-58).
11. Workers' homes, Siedlung Altenhof, Essen, 1892. Designed for retired workers of the firm by Krupp company architects. From *Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen der Gußstahlfabrik von Friedr. Krupp zu Essen a.d. Ruhr*, 3 vols. (Essen, 1902).
12. Fränkische Bauernhaus (Franken Farmhouse). Perspective drawn after a 1860 photograph of a farmhouse in Ginheim near Frankfurt; plan by Rudolf Henning. Illustrated in Rudolf Henning, *Das deutsche Haus in seiner historischen Entwicklung* (Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1882). Henning notes that an inscription above the door commemorates renovation of the house in 1656, and therefore estimates its age to be considerably older. He describes the plan of the ground floor plan of the house as so: "a" is the *Flur*, or *Eren*, the entry hall. To the right, "b" designates the *Wohnstube*, the living room. In the *Wohnstube*, there are two windows. One looks out on to the village street, and the other on to the inner court. A bench is fitted into the corner of the *Wohnstube* beneath the windows. The *Küche* or kitchen stands at "c," and the *Vorratskammer*, the storeroom is at "d." The letter "e" designates the animal stall. A staircase in the entry hall leads to an upper floor, with an identical plan.
13. Das deutsche Haus: Ungefähre Verbreitung der volksthümlichen Hausformen (The German House: Approximate distribution of vernacular house forms). Map frontispiece of August Meitzen, *Das deutsche Haus in seinen volksthümlichen Formen* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1882). Meitzen maps the diffusion of four main house types. The Fränkische house form dominates central Germany, Belgium, Poland, and upwards into Lithuania, as well as broad reaches of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (including parts of present-day Austria, Slovenia, Hungary, Slovakia, and the Czech Republic). The Friesische-Sächsische house form is found in northwest Germany, The Netherlands, and Denmark. Southern Germany, Switzerland and the mountainous areas of northern Italy and Austria are home to the Schweizerhaus form. The Nordischen house type is found, as expected, in Norway, but also in Poland along the Wisła River, and southward in Moldavia and Bosnia.
14. *Schwartzwaldhausplan* (Plan of a Black Forest house), from August Meitzen, *Wanderungen, Anbau, und Agrarrecht der Völker Europas nördlich der Alpen. Siedlung und Agrarwesen der Westgermanen und Ostgermanen, der Kelten, Römer, Finnen und Slawen* (Berlin, 1895)
15. German house types, from August Meitzen, *Das deutsche Haus in seinen volksthümlichen Formen* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1882). Keyed to the map of Europe reproduced in Figure 10, the drawings numbered 1-5 illustrate the Fränkische house type; those numbered 8-12 illustrate the Schweizerhaus.

16. The lower picture illustrates a farmhouse in Ruppertsgrün, constructed of plaster over blocks, with framing and shingle roof (Bauernhaus aus Ruppertsgrün i. D. Verputzter Blockbau mit Umgebände und Schindeldach). The upper illustration is meant to show an Ur-form of the German house, in fact an ancient oak structure over a grave site excavated in Baden. From Otto Lauffer, *Das deutsche Haus in Dorf und Stadt* (Leipzig, 1919).
17. Façade elevation of old Saxon farmhouse, with tissue overlay showing the names of different structural features. From Willi Pessler, *Das altsächsischer Bauernhaus in seiner geographische Verbreitung* (Braunschweig, 1906).
18. Indigenous house type in Emslande near Osnabrück (Urwüchsiger Typus im Emslande). From Willi Pessler, *Das altsächsischer Bauernhaus in seiner geographische Verbreitung* (Braunschweig, 1906).
19. Familial idyll around the hearth fire, in Oberijssel, The Netherlands. The caption notes that this Ur-form of the hearth is a fire set in a depression on the floor. From Willi Pessler, *Das altsächsischer Bauernhaus in seiner geographische Verbreitung* (Braunschweig, 1906).
20. Old Fachwerkhaus (half-timbered house) in Bretten, being pulled down in the 1890s. From Emil Lang, "Erhaltung alter Häuser und Stadtbilder in Kraichau," *Die Denkmalfpflege* 6, No. 5 (13 April 1904).
21. The roof profiles of traditional farmhouses in Baden. Drawn by R. Schilling to illustrate his article, "Über eine in Vergessenheit geratene alte Schwartzwälder Bauregel und noch so verschiedenes Andre," *Mein Heimatland* 3, No. 5-6 (1916).
22. Two proposals for transformer towers in the mountains of Bavaria, designed by Munich architect August Thiersch. From A. Blößner, "Über Heimatschutz bei elektrischen Leitungsanlagen," *Bayerischer Heimatschutz Monatschrift* 5 (1914).
23. An example of bad vernacular architecture, from Werner Lindner, *Das Dorf. Seine Pflege und Gestaltung* (Munich, 1938).
24. An example of bad vernacular architecture, from Werner Lindner, *Das Dorf. Seine Pflege und Gestaltung* (Munich, 1938).
25. Perspectives, elevations, plans, and construction details of traditional farmhouse. From *Das Bauernhaus im Deutschen Reiche und in seinen Grenzgebieten*, edited by the Verband deutscher Architekten und Ingenieur-Verein, with a historical-geographic introduction by Professor Dr. Dietrich Schafer (Dresden, 1906).
26. Perspectives, elevations, plans, and construction details of traditional farmhouse. From *Das Bauernhaus im Deutschen Reiche und in seinen Grenzgebieten*, edited by

- the Verband deutscher Architekten und Ingenieur-Verein, with a historical-geographic introduction by Professor Dr. Dietrich Schafer (Dresden, 1906).
27. Herman Muthesius, small houses for the garden city, Hellerau, 1910. From Akademie der Künste. *Hermann Muthesius 1861-1927* (Berlin, 1978).
 28. Hermann Muthesius, houses for workers in the Preußensiedlung at Alt-Glienecke near Berlin, 1913. Commissioned by the Landwohnstättengesellschaft to design the second stage of a small colony for workers, Muthesius created what appeared to be a fairly substantial farmstead, under whose peaked roofs were in fact tucked numerous small three- and four-room dwellings. To reinforce the idea of a rural dwellings or the organic growth of a village settlement, he positioned the houses asymmetrically around a semi-enclosed inner court. From Hermann Muthesius, *Kleinhaus und Siedlung* (Munich, 1918).
 29. Hermann Muthesius's contribution to the 1919 Berlin housing exhibition, *Sparsame Bauweise*, was a baroque vernacular two-story house for a worker's family, constructed of pre-fabricated concrete panels. Muthesius' practical contribution to the problem of acute housing shortages and lack of building materials after the First World War coincided with the reissue of his 1917 book *Wie baue ich mein Haus?* (Munich, 1919). From Hermann Muthesius and Harry Maaß, *Landhaus und Garten. Beispiele kleiner Landhäuser nebst Grundrissen, Innenräumen und Gartenanlagen* (Munich, 1919).
 30. Muthesius devoted an entire chapter in his 1918 book, *Kleinhaus und Siedlung*, to a discussion of plans for the small house. Using illustrations of his own house designs as well as those of other architects, Muthesius offered detailed recommendations for accommodating worker families. The simplest floor plans combined two rooms, one designated as an all-purpose area for living, cooking, termed the *Wohnküche* or *Wohnstube*, and another room devoted to laundry, bathing, and storage, called the *Spüle* (the upper story of such dwellings would also provide one or two additional *Zimmer*, used as bedrooms). In this illustration, Muthesius carefully designated the placement of furnishings within the rooms. In the upper left corner of *Wohnküche*, a bench and two chairs flank a dining table, while a sewing table is tucked into the upper right corner. A bookshelf is positioned against the left-hand wall, and a cabinet for dishes and foodstuffs is set against the lower wall. Next to it stands a small cooking stove, while the tiled platform and large heating stove dominate the room. Meanwhile in the *Spüle*, storage cabinets and bins line the walls. There is a washtub in the lower left corner and a bathtub in the upper right, over which, when it is not in use, a table surface can be suspended. Note that the entrance to the unplumbed toilet is through an exterior door facing on to an inner court.

There were many variations on this basic plan, with each spatial designation conveying small gradations of relative comfort and wealth. For instance, a plan such as Muthesius' house for the Siedlung Friesland in Emden provided three rooms on the lower story: the *Stube*, which functioned as a proper parlor (and might even

be termed in family parlance if not in architectural, the *Gute Stube*), a Wohnküche, as well as the Spüle.

31. Muthesius' *Kleinhaus und Siedlung* illustrated ideal interiors for small dwellings, concentrating on the main living room, the Wohnküche or Wohnstube. The recommendations for simple furnishings rendered in an arts and crafts vernacular were certainly of a piece with Muthesius' desire to create a unity of form between architectural envelope, interior, and the moral values or worldviews of the inhabitants therein. But in the warmth of their simple practicality (and the graphic rendering of relatively spacious and well-lit spaces), these rooms convey a sense of comfort and hominess not necessarily present in the spare plans themselves
32. Dahlhauser Heide near Bochum-Hordel, designed by Krupp architect Robert Schmohl, 1911. Begun in 1907 and expanded in phases until 1915, the housing colony was sited on an old noble estate. The houses at Dahlhauser Heide were patterned after old Westphalian farmhouses. With its picturesque architecture, winding streets, and centerpiece greensward (a portion of the old manorial park was maintained as gardens at the heart of the settlement), Dahlhauser Heide utilized the stylistic idioms of English garden cities. From Hermann Hecker, *Der Krupp'sche Kleinwohnungsbau* (Wiesbaden, 1917).
33. Village houses known as the "Twelve Apostles," in Schömberg in Lower Silesia. Built in 1707 according to a traditional farmhouse form. From Klaus Thiede, *Deutsche Bauernhäuser* (Königstein i. Taunus and Leipzig, 1941).
34. A village street in Brietzig in Pommern. From Klaus Thiede, *Deutsche Bauernhäuser* (Königstein i. Taunus and Leipzig, 1941).
35. Comparative illustrations of good and bad examples (left and right, respectively) of form in small dwellings for workers. From Paul Schultze-Naumburg, *Dörfer und Kolonien*, Volume 3 in *Kulturarbeiten* (Munich, 1908).
36. The simplest fundamental forms of houses. From Paul Schultze-Naumburg, *Der Bau des Wohnhauses*, Vol. 1 (Munich, 1917).
37. Comparative illustrations of good and bad community form (upper and lower, respectively). The modesty, sensitively scaled structures, and incremental growth of the traditional village community are contrasted with the ostentatious intrusion of suburban villas. From Paul Schultze-Naumburg, *Das Gesicht des deutschen Hauses*, Vol. 4 of the new edition of *Kulturarbeiten* (Munich: Georg D.W. Callwey, 1929).
38. Richard Riemerschmid, workers' dwellings for the Hagener Textilindustrie, Walddorfstrasse, Hagen, 1907. From Winfried Nerdinger, *Richard Riemerschmid. Vom Jugendstil zum Werkbund. Werke und Dokumente* (Munich: Prestel Verlag, 1982).

39. Richard Riemerschmid, elevations, section, and plans for a single-family dwelling in the settlement of the Hagener Textilindustrie, Walddorfstrasse, Hagen, 1907. From Winfried Nerdinger, *Richard Riemerschmid. Vom Jugendstil zum Werkbund. Werke und Dokumente* (Munich, 1982).
40. Richard Riemerschmid, the Einrichtung I series of furnishings for the Wohnstube, 1906. Designed for the Maschinenmöbel program of the Dresdener Werkstätten. From *Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration* 9, No. 4 (1906).
41. Karl Henrici, Design of a workers' colony for the Steinkohlenbergwerk in Knurów, Upper Silesia, 1906. From Karl Weißbach and Walter Mackowsky, eds., *Das Arbeiterwohnhaus* (Berlin, 1910).
42. Heinrich Tessenow, an exercise in symmetry regarding the simple house form. From *Hausbau und der gleichen* (Berlin, 1916).
43. Heinrich Tessenow, a group of small houses in the street Am Schänkenberg in the garden city Hellerau. The houses were constructed with a prefabricated wall method invented by Tessenow. From Kristiana Hartmann, *Deutsche Gartenstadtbewegung* (Munich, 1976).
44. Heinrich Tessenow, plans for a worker's cottage in the garden city Hohensalza in Posen, 1911. From *Hausbau und der gleichen* (Berlin, 1916).
45. Heinrich Tessenow, house for the veterans' resettlement colony at Rähnitz near Dresden, 1919. From Marco de Michelis, *Heinrich Tessenow, 1876-1950* (Milan, 1991).
46. Heinrich Tessenow, house for the veterans' resettlement colony at Rähnitz near Dresden, 1919. From Gerda Wangerin and Gerhard Weiss, *Heinrich Tessenow. Ein Baumeister 1876-1950. Leben-Lehre-Werk* (Essen, 1976).
47. Georg Metzendorf, double-houses for workers from the Krupp settlement at the garden city Margarethenhöhe, 1909. From Margarethe Krupp-Stiftung für Wohnungsfürsorge, ed. *Denkschrift über den Ausbau des Stiftungsgelände* (Essen, 1909).
48. Georg Metzendorf, small house with two dwellings for worker families for the Hessische Landesausstellung für freie und angewandte Kunst, Darmstadt, 1908. Rather than a side-by-side and two-storied arrangement of the two dwellings, Metzendorf gave each a full floor. From Hessischer Zentralverein für Errichtung billiger Wohnungen, *Das Kleinwohnhaus*, 1910.

49. Paul Schmitthenner, Dutch-gabled houses in Staaken, the garden city colony for munitions workers, 1914-1917. From Fritz Stahl, "Die Gartenstadt Staaken," *Wasmuths Monatshefte für Baukunst* 3, No. 4/5 (1918/1919).
50. Schmitthenner, variations on a basic house typology, 1943-49. From *Gebaute Form: Variationen über ein Thema*, ed. Elisabeth Schmitthenner (Leinfelden-Echterdingen, 1984).
51. Krieg und Heim, war and home, from a special issue of the Bavarian Heimatschutz journal. From Sonderheft Krieg und Heimat, *Bayerischer Heimatschutz* No. 4-12 (1916).
52. Late eighteenth-century house for colonists in Prussia. From Waldemar Kuhn, *Kleinsiedlungen aus Friderizianischer Zeit* (Stuttgart, 1918).
53. The Kruppsche Arbeiterhaus, a model worker's home, at the 1902 Düsseldorf Industrie-, Gewerbe-, und Kunst-Ausstellung Düsseldorf. From Johannes Cramer and Niels Gutschow, *Bauausstellungen. Eine Architekturgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart, 1984).
54. Plan of the Kruppsche Arbeiterhaus, a model worker's home, at the 1902 Düsseldorf Industrie-, Gewerbe-, und Kunst-Ausstellung. From Richard Klapheck, *Siedlungswerk Krupp* (Berlin, 1930).
55. Single-family model home designed by architect Georg Bähr and constructed at the Internationale Hygiene-Ausstellung Dresden, 1911. From *Architektonische Rundschau* 12 (1911).
56. First-floor plan of a single-family model home designed by architect Georg Bähr and constructed at the Internationale Hygiene-Ausstellung Dresden, 1911. From *Architektonische Rundschau* 12 (1911).
57. Model home for a worker, designed by architect Otto Müller-Jena for Das Neue Niederrheinische Dorf (the new Lower Rhine Village) at the Deutsche Werkbund-Ausstellung Köln 1914. From Richard Klapheck, *Neue Baukunst in den Rheinlanden* (Düsseldorf, 1928).
58. Site plan by Heinrich Tessenow for the research estate housing exhibition at Am Fischtal in Berlin-Zehlendorf, 1928. From *Moderner Wohnbau* No. 11 (1928).
59. Street façade of house for a working woman designed by architect Arnold Knoblauch in collaboration with Gustav Droste for the research estate housing exhibition at Am Fischtal in Berlin-Zehlendorf, 1928.

60. Plan of house for a working woman designed by architect Arnold Knoblauch in collaboration with Gustav Droste for the research estate housing exhibition at Am Fischtal in Berlin-Zehlendorf, 1928.
61. Example and counter-example: Unity in the visual aspect of a settlement as an expression of the inner solidarity of its people, versus disorderliness of a new settlement as an expression of reckless individualism. From Karl Erdmannsdorffer, *Bauberater für Siedlung und Eigenheim* (Munich, 1937)
62. Gastrulation, early stages of cellular division in amphioxus (lancelet), frog, and human embryos. From Ernst Haeckel, *Anthropogenie oder Entwicklungsgeschichte des Menschen. Gemeinverständliche wissenschaftliche Vorträge der die Grundzüge der menschlichen Keimes- und Stammes-Geschichte* (Leipzig, 1874).
63. Varieties of *Pediastrum* (green algae colonies), detail of Plate 34 of Ernst Haeckel, *Kunstformen der Natur* (Leipzig, 1904).
64. Cell division in embryo, from Oscar Hertwig, *Das Werden der Organismen zur Widerlegung von Darwins Zufallstheorie durch das Gesetz in der Entwicklung* (Jena, 1916).
65. Cover of Theodor Fritsch, *Die Stadt der Zukunft* (Leipzig, 1896).
66. Plan of a city of the future. A large, fold-out, colored map from Theodor Fritsch, *Die Stadt der Zukunft* (Leipzig, 1896).
67. General view of the City of the Future and its surrounding area. A-A designates the Altstadt (older part of the city), B-B marks the train stations, H-H the harbors of the canal system, and S-S the stations of the Ringbahn (perimeter rail system). From Theodor Fritsch, *Die Stadt der Zukunft* (Leipzig, 1896).
68. Zoning classification for the City of the Future. There are seven principal zones. Zone I encompasses the center of the city and its monumental public buildings; Zone II accommodates villas of a monumental character; Zone III harbors "better" homes; Zone IV holds more modest homes and businesses; Zone V contains workers' homes and small workshops; Zone VI comprises factories, train stations, and warehouses; Zone VII provides space for gardens, both commercial and private; and beyond the zoned city lie agricultural enterprises. From Theodor Fritsch, *Die Stadt der Zukunft* (Leipzig, 1896).
69. Detail of Zones I and II of the City of the Future with monumental public buildings and substantial villas. From Theodor Fritsch, *Die Stadt der Zukunft* (Leipzig, 1896).
70. Cross-section of a street in the City of the Future, showing upper and lower traffic corridors. The upper level accommodates fine carriages and pedestrian promenades, while the work that makes the city _ laborers, goods, fuel, gaslines,

- electrical cables, postal services, and sewers – are concealed below ground. From Theodor Fritsch, *Die Stadt der Zukunft* (Leipzig, 1896).
71. While continuous building facades line the residential streets of the City of the Future, the center of each block is devoted to common courtyards, gardens, or playgrounds. From Theodor Fritsch, *Die Stadt der Zukunft* (Leipzig, 1896).
 72. The built-up areas of the City of the Future extend out toward the perimeter like the spokes of a wheel, while between each ray wedges of park and garden land reach from the countryside into the center of the city. From Theodor Fritsch, *Die Stadt der Zukunft* (Leipzig, 1896).
 73. Schematic representation of penetration of green spaces into an urban area, set against a larger map showing the practical completion of green spaces in the city of Essen. Plan by Robert Schmidt, 1911. From Leberecht Migge, *Die Gartenkultur des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Jena, 1913).
 74. Plan showing wedge-shaped urban corpus with radiating park areas connecting the inner city to the surrounding countryside. Plan by Bruno Möhring, Rudolf Eberstadt, and Richard Petersen, part of their third-prize-winning presentation in the 1910 competition for a new master plan of Berlin. From Werner Hegemann, *Der Städtebau nach der Ergebnissen der allgemeinen Städtebau-Ausstellung in Berlin nebst einem Anhang: Die Internationale Städtebau-Ausstellung in Düsseldorf* (Berlin, 1911/13).
 75. Schematic representation of a metropolis. The hub of the city is the business district, surrounding by multi-storied buildings of small apartments. Mid-sized and larger homes are located farther from the center, as are low-rise small homes, and large industries. Punctuating the rim of the metropolitan area are circular schema designating suburbs, while beyond lie endless possibilities for expansion. From Paul Wolf, *Wohnung und Siedlung* (Berlin, 1926).
 76. Garden-City. From Ebenezer Howard, *To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* (London, 1898).
 77. Ward and Centre of the Garden-City. A public garden forms the central hub of the Garden City, surrounded by cultural and civic institutions: a library, concert hall, theater, museum, hospital, and concert hall. Businesses along the rim of the city promise economic self-sufficiency for the community, through manufacture of furniture, clothing, boots, bicycles, and jam. The names of the town's streets comprise the Garden-City pantheon: Columbus, Kelvin, Milton, Froebel, Shakespeare, Edison, and Newton. From Ebenezer Howard, *To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* (London, 1898).
 78. Group of Slumless Smokeless Cities. Canals and railways connect the seven Garden Cities, named Central City, Garden City, Gladstone, Justitia, Rurisville,

- Philadelphia, and Concord. From Ebenezer Howard, *To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* (London, 1898).
79. There is room for everyone in the Garden City of tomorrow, including waifs, epileptics, inebriates, the insane, convalescents, the blind, and the deaf. Detail of Group of Slumless Smokeless Cities, from Ebenezer Howard, *To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* (London, 1898).
 80. Plan of a Model Town for an Associated Temperance Community. The avenues radiating from the center enumerate the virtues of the community: Unity, Justice, Faith, Hope, Charity, Fortitude, Concord, and Peace. From James S. Buckingham, *National Evils and Practical Remedies, with the Plan of a Model Town* (London, 1849).
 81. Plan of a Heptapolis, a group of seven cities connected by road and canals. The hub of each city is its church. From Gideon Jasper Ouseley, *Paligenesia: or, the Earth's New Birth* (Glasgow, 1884).
 82. Original sketch by Ebenezer Howard for a "Group of Slumless Smokeless Cities." [From Ruth Eaton, *Ideal Cities: Utopianism and the (Un)built Environment* (London, 2001).]
 83. Gastrulation in embryo. From Ernst Haeckel, *Anthropogenie oder Entwicklungsgeschichte des Menschen. Gemeinverständliche wissenschaftliche Vorträge der die Grundzüge der menschlichen Keimes- und Stammes-Geschichte* (Leipzig, 1874).
 84. Types of small villages: the *Angerdorf*, in which houses are arrayed around an *Anger* or village green; two types of *Strassendorf*, where a central street is the defining feature; the *Rundlingdorf*, with farmsteads arranged around a central green and fields radiating outward from the center; and the *Reihendorf*, in which houses and farmsteads are arranged in rows. From Paul Wolf, *Wohnung und Siedlung* (Berlin, 1926); illustrations adapted by Wolf from Gustav Wolf, *Das norddeutsche Dorf* (Munich, 1913).
 85. Site plan of Hohe Lache, 1921. From Fritz Hesse, *Die Siedlung Hohe Lache bei Dessau* (Dessau, 1921).
 86. Detail of the plan of the *Achteck*, the octagon plaza at the center of the settlement, surrounded by two-story row houses containing two-and-three room dwellings. From Fritz Hesse, *Die Siedlung Hohe Lache bei Dessau* (Dessau, 1921).
 87. Aerial view of Hohe Lache and the *Achteck*, 1921. From Torsten Blume, *Die Siedlung "Hohe Lache," Dessau* (Dessau, 1994).

88. Site plan and aerial view of Nahalal, designed by Richard Kauffmann, 1922. From Arie Sharon, *Kibbutz + Bauhaus. An architect's way in a new land* (Stuttgart, 1976).
89. Bruno Taut and Martin Wagner, Site plan for the horseshoe estate Berlin-Britz, 1925. From Thorsten Scheer, Josef Paul Kleihues, and Paul Kahlfeldt, eds., *Stadt der Architektur/Architektur der Stadt. Berlin 1900-2000* (Berlin, 2000).
90. Examples of village site plans from the late eighteenth-century. From Waldemar Kuhn, "Kleinsiedlungen aus friderizianischer Zeit," *Zeitschrift für Bauwesen* 65, No. 7-9 (Berlin, 1915)
91. Bruno Taut, design for a round estate. From Winfried Nerdinger, et al., eds., *Bruno Taut. Architekt zwischen Tradition und Avantgarde* (Stuttgart, 2001).
92. "The happy inhabitants of the Britz Estate naturally vote for the Social Democrats, to whom they are thankful for their magnificent homes." Election flyer for the Social Democrat Party, 1929. Archiv der sozialen Demokratie, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung Bonn. From Annemarie Jaeggi, "Hufeisensiedlung Britz," in *Siedlungen der zwanzigen Jahre – heute. Vier Berliner Grosssiedlungen 1924-1984* (Berlin, 1985).
93. View of the inner park and gardens at the Hufesiensiedlung Britz. Photo by author, 2001.
94. Detail of balconies and attic story of the Hufesiensiedlung Britz. Photo by author, 2001.
95. Outer wall of the horseshoe, Hufesiensiedlung Britz. Photo by author, 2001.
96. Bruno Taut, competition entry for Rüdeshheimer Platz, Berlin-Wilmersdorf, 1912. From Kurt Junghanns, *Bruno Taut, 1880-1938. Architektur und sozialer Gedanke* (Leipzig, 1998).
97. Bruno Taut, apartment building for unmarried residents, Siedlung Lindenhof, Berlin-Schöneberg, 1918-1921. From Kurt Junghanns, *Bruno Taut, 1880-1938. Architektur und sozialer Gedanke* (Leipzig, 1998).
98. Circular shaped communities and homes for solitary settlers. From Bruno Taut, *Die Auflösung der Städte* (Hagen, 1920).
99. A community of labor. 100 houses, 500-600 people who all work in the gardens and in the craft workshops. Unity and diversity. Five duck ponds. Connecting paths between the houses. No fences, because this is a community. An assembly hall for work and for community. Five workshops, with exercise plazas before each. Work is here a joy. Through exchange each lives from what the collective produces.

- Bread and the missing necessities are obtained through exchange of the products of the community's industriousness. From Bruno Taut, *Die Auflösung der Städte* (Hagen, 1920).
100. Walter Gropius and Frank Moller, perspective of the Wohnberge, 1919. From Reginald R. Isaacs, *Walter Gropius. Der Mensch und sein Werk* (Berlin, 1983)
 101. Walter Gropius and Frank Moller, section of the Wohnberge, 1919. From Reginald R. Isaacs, *Walter Gropius. Der Mensch und sein Werk* (Berlin, 1983)
 102. A Central Place System, developed from the principle of transportation. From Walter Christaller, *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland, Eine ökonomisch-geographische Untersuchung über die Gesetzmäßigkeit der Verbreitung der Siedlungen mit städtischen Funktionen* (Jena, 1933).
 103. A Central Place System that corresponds to the principle of isolation. From Walter Christaller, *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland, Eine ökonomisch-geographische Untersuchung über die Gesetzmäßigkeit der Verbreitung der Siedlungen mit städtischen Funktionen* (Jena, 1933).
 104. Aerial view of the town of Nordlingen. From Gottfried Feder, *Die neue Stadt* (Berlin, 1939).
 105. Bird's eye view of a model of a city for 20,000 inhabitants. From Gottfried Feder, *Die neue Stadt* (Berlin, 1939).
 106. Population density of East Prussia. From Gottfried Feder, *Die neue Stadt* (Berlin, 1939).
 107. Helmut Hentrich and Hans Heuser, design for Hamburg competition for "Ortsgruppe als Siedlungszelle," 1944. From Elke Pahl-Weber, "Die Ortsgruppe als Siedlungszelle. Ein Vorschlag zur Methodik der großstädtischen Stadterweiterung von 1940," in *Planen und Bauen in Europa 1930-1945*, ed. Harmut Frank (Hamburg, 1985).
 108. Alfred Messel, apartment house in the Sickingen Strasse, Berlin, 1893-95. From Heinrich Albrecht, *Das Arbeiterwohnhaus. Gesammelte Pläne von Arbeiterwohnhäuser und Ratschläge zum Entwerfen von solchen auf Grund praktischer Erfahrungen* (Berlin 1896).
 109. Alfred Messel, apartment house in the Stargarder Strasse, Berlin, 1899-1900. Detail of façade ornament, showing a beehive, the symbol of the Berliner Spar- und Bauverein von 1892. Photo by author, 2001.
 110. D. Schwartzkopff and the Vaterländische Bauverein zu Berlin, apartment houses in the Versöhnungs-Privat-Strasse, Berlin, 1903-1904. Illustration of the Altdeutscher

Hof (courtyard in the Old German style). From D. Schwartzkopff, ed., *Der Vaterländische Bauverein zu Berlin eingetragene Genossenschaft mit beschränkter Haftpflicht*, 2nd ed. Berlin, 1906.

111. D. Schwartzkopff and the Vaterländische Bauverein zu Berlin, Strelitzer Strasse entrance to the apartment house, Berlin, 1903-1904. From D. Schwartzkopff, ed., *Der Vaterländische Bauverein zu Berlin eingetragene Genossenschaft mit beschränkter Haftpflicht*, 2nd ed. Berlin, 1906.
112. Martin Wagner and Bruno Taut, with landscape design by Leberecht Migge, Siedlung Lindenhof, Berlin-Schöneberg, 1918-1921. Photo by author, 2006.
113. Heinrich Lassen, Ceciliengärten, Berlin-Schöneberg, 1924-28. Facades along Rubenstrasse. Photo by author, 2001.
114. Heinrich Lassen, Ceciliengärten, Berlin-Schöneberg, 1924-28. Inner court and garden with sculptures *Der Morgen* and *Der Abend* by Georg Kolbe (1926). Photo by author, 2001.
115. Paul Jatzow, garden terrace apartments on Rüdeshheimer Platz, Berlin-Wilmersdorf, 1910-1914. Photo by author, 2006.
116. Paul Jatzow, garden terrace apartments on Rüdeshheimer Platz, Berlin-Wilmersdorf, 1910-1914. The gardens designed by Emil Cauer, Jr., in 1911 give a park-like ambiance to the Tudor-style terrace apartments that ring the central plaza. Photo by author, 2006.

Manufacturing Gemeinschaft: Architecture, Tradition, and the Sociology of Community in Germany, 1890-1920

Introduction: Community as Virtue in Architecture and the Social Sciences

In so far as architect and planners concern themselves with orchestrating human interaction, in so far as they see themselves as creating the stage for modern life, they carry forth some ideal conception of community. Using design to mold and reform social relations, to create ideal communities, better communities – in the many iterations and articulations of those terms – has been one of the driving preoccupations of modern architecture and planning. This dissertation looks at the character of that drive to reform and its consequences for architectural culture in Germany during the three decades leading up to and through the First World War.¹

¹ The pioneering history of Barbara Miller Lane, while not strictly dealing with the Wilhelmine period, provided the first substantial English-language treatment of many of the key figures and ideas in German architectural modernism. Lane's focus on architecture and architects in the rise of the Third Reich, however, tended to relegate earlier developments to the status of prelude or incubator, rather than achievements in their own right. She set progressive modernism, represented by clean lines and functionalist ethos, against reactionary proto-fascism, represented by pitched roofs and sentimental nationalism, thereby obscuring some of the more politically ambiguous tendencies of the period, such as Expressionism and Heimatstil. But it is not fair to criticize a historian for a book they did not write; indeed, Lane's task was to trace the confluence of style and politics in the rise of the Third Reich, and to come to terms with the ways in which Nazi architecture was also a part of the history of modernism. See *Architecture and Politics in Germany, 1918-1945* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968). More recent works have attended to the complexities and ambiguities of architecture before the First World War. Iain Boyd Whyte examined the history of architectural Expressionism in *Bruno Taut and the Architecture of Activism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982). Stanford Anderson's study of Peter Behrens similarly refracts the history and philosophy of the era through the work of a single designer, *Peter Behrens and an Architecture for the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000). Matthew Jeffries focused on industrial architecture as a particularly fruitful way of examining how styles are made to speak for an era's interests and hopes, *Politics and Culture in Wilhelmine Germany: The Case of Industrial Architecture* (Oxford: Berg, 1995). The greatest part of Wilhelmine era architectural scholarship in the United States has focused on architecture as a part of the arts and crafts movement and related institutions, principally the Deutscher Werkbund and the Bauhaus. Recent studies include Frederic J. Schwartz, *The Werkbund: Design Theory and Mass Culture before the First World War* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1996), and John V. Maciuiika, *Before the Bauhaus: Architecture, Politics and the German State, 1890-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005). Major English-language treatments of the architectural and aesthetic theory of the Wilhelmine period include Mitchell Schwarzer,

This period, the late Wilhelmine empire, coincided with the rule of Wilhelm II. It ended with the November Revolution of 1918 and the establishment of a socialist government, the Weimar Republic. An era of rapid industrialization and urbanization, in political and social terms the late Wilhelmine period was a curious mix of economic liberalism, political repression, and radical socialism. As industrialism reshaped the economic foundations of society, the accumulations of capitalist wealth and the growth of an industrial working class sharpened social, economic, and political differences across and within classes. Business and factory owners amassed wealth, the bourgeoisie gathered to themselves property, goods, and political status, and the growing working class grew more mobile, more financially uncertain, and more ambitious. The unsettled character of the working class threatened, at worst (in the eyes of society's elites), revolutionary upheaval of the standing order, and at best, the breeding of a subhuman collectivity: the proletariat. Faceless, soulless, uncultured and unlettered, living in squalid, close quarters – from necessities born of poverty, the workers would drift into a pit of immorality, pulling the rest of society after them. The period of the late Wilhelmine empire saw noblesse oblige and Christian charity metamorphosed into organized social reform. In Germany, the most effective of the leading reformers adhered to an essentially conservative line. They sought a "third way," in the memorable phrasing of the time, *weder Kommunismus noch Kapitalismus*, neither communism nor capitalism, neither

German Architectural Theory and the Search for Modern Identity (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); and Francesco Dal Co, *Figures of Architecture and Thought: German Architecture Culture, 1880-1920* (New York: Rizzoli, 1990). See also *Empathy, Form, and Space: Problems in German Aesthetics, 1873-1893* (Santa Monica, CA: Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1994), which includes the translation of Wilhelmine source material and introductory analysis by Henry Francis Mallgrave and Eleftherios Ikononou.

revolution nor laissez-faire, but rather a middle road that sought the incremental amelioration of social ills.²

The *Genossenschaftssozialismus*, associational or cooperative socialism, undertaken by many social reformers harkened more to the ideas of early socialists like Robert Owen and Charles Fourier than to the revolutionary rhetoric of Karl Marx. It was through the movement for *Bodenreform*, reform of the ownership of land, that this third way ethos made the cooperative socialist movement a compelling shaper of architecture and planning, in the realms of housing reform, the garden city movement, and municipal support for house construction.³

Under the watchwords evolution instead of revolution, during the Wilhelmine era Germany became a world leader in the creation of private- and state-sponsored social programs such as pensions, healthcare, retirement, and housing.⁴ Much like the Progressive Movement in the United States, the successes of social reform in Wilhelmine Germany were borne along not on the most radical of political tracks, but rather on the upper-middling, professional, and academic classes' interests in maintaining the essential lineaments of standing social order. In Germany, this meant the monarchy, the aristocracy, the Bürgertum, and the growing middle and working classes – in the conservative worldview – at peace and satisfied with their portions.

² See Rüdiger vom Bruch, "Bürgerliche Sozialreform im deutschen Kaiserreich," in *Bürgerliche Sozialreform in Deutschland vom Vormärz bis zur Ära Adenauer*, ed. Rüdiger vom Bruch (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1985), 61-179.

³ Elisabeth Meyer-Renschhausen and Hartwig Berger, "Bodenreform," in *Handbuch der deutschen Reformbewegungen 1880-1933*, ed. Diethard Kerbs and Jürgen Reulecke, (Wuppertal: Peter Hammer Verlag, 1998), 265-276.

⁴ Kevin Repp, *Reformers, Critics, and the Paths of German Modernity: Anti-politics and the Search for Alternatives* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000); George Steinmetz, *Regulating the Social: The Welfare State and Local Politics in Imperial Germany* (Princeton University Press, 1993).

The late Wilhelmine period temporally frames this study for other significant reasons.

During this period, urban planning emerged as a distinct profession in Germany, and as an acknowledged responsibility of municipal government.⁵ In German universities of the late Wilhelmine empire, the social sciences – sociology, anthropology, ethnography, and geography – emerged as recognized fields of inquiry.⁶

The governmental, associational, and academic bases of the social sciences and social reform existed in easy proximity to the *Lebensreformbewegung*, the life reform movement. A hydra-headed collection of middle-class associations, tendencies, enterprises, and philosophies, life reform melded hygiene, arts and crafts, mysticism, science, progressivism and archaism, radicalism and conservatism.⁷

This climate of social reform and life reform coexisted with, one could even say was driven by, powerful nationalist sentiments.⁸ German nationalism compelled self- and national-improvement in the interests of chauvinist pride, economic competitiveness, and colonial ambitions. But nationalism is, and was, at heart a product of emotion rather than rational thought. Nationalism was a vehicle for self-identity and social belonging. The creation of a German collective self proceeded through poetry and drama, art and literature, monuments and public spectacle, but also, as this study will show, through

⁵ Brian Ladd, *Urban Planning and Civic Order in Germany, 1860-1914* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990); Anthony Sutcliffe, *Towards the Planned City: Germany, Britain, the United States and France, 1780-1914* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1981).

⁶ Woodruff D. Smith, *Politics and the Sciences of Culture in Germany, 1840-1920* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Harry Liebersohn, *Fate and Utopia in German Sociology, 1870-1923* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1988); Fritz K. Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins: the German Academic Community, 1890-1933* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969).

⁷ Eva Barlösius, *Naturgemäße Lebensführung Zur Geschichte der Lebensreform um die Jahrhundertwende* (Frankfurt a.M.: Campus, 1997); Wolfgang R. Krabbe, *Gesellschaftsveränderung durch Lebensreform. Strukturmerkmale einer sozialreformerischen Bewegung im Deutschland der Industrialisierungsperiode* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).

⁸ Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001); Harold James, *A German Identity: 1770 to the Present* (London: Phoenix Press, 1991).

science and history, social analysis and social theory, architectural theory and architectural practice. The romanticization of Germany's collective past created not just a mythologized history but also a mythic future, a national destiny.⁹

Architecture and the Social Sciences in Late Wilhelmine Germany

This study proposes a history of modern architecture as a dialogue between social scientific propositions and experiments in architectural form and expression. When modernism is so cast, the period of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century becomes an Ur-moment, and Germany of the Wilhelmine empire becomes a central arena. The emergence apace of modern planning and modern sociology comprises one of the key intellectual lineaments of the age. It was at this time, and at the confluence of those two fields, that the "community" became a subject of study in its own right.¹⁰ The nature of human social groups, and the character, origins, and function of human communities, were the essential subjects around which modern sociology developed its theories and practices. In tandem with those developments in the social sciences, the theoretical premises underlying modern community design were given their principle contours. The archetype of the socially engaged architect was established.¹¹ The political and financial mechanisms, such as building associations, common stock groups, and

⁹ Rudy Koshar, *Germany's Transient Pasts: Preservation and National Memory in the Twentieth Century* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998).

¹⁰ Johann Heilbron, Lars Magnusson, and Björn Wittrock, eds., *The Rise of the Social Sciences and the Formation of Modernity*, *Sociology of the Sciences Yearbook*, vol. 20 (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1998); Peter Wagner, "'An Entirely New Object of Consciousness, of Volition, of Thought: The Coming into Being and (Almost) Passing Away of 'Society' as a Scientific Object," in *Biographies of Scientific Objects*, ed. Lorraine Daston (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 132-157.

¹¹ See the profile of the modern, socially engaged architect of the late Wilhelmine milieu in Karl Scheffler's essay, *Der Architekt* (Frankfurt a.M: Rütten & Loening, 1907), published in the series, *Die Gesellschaft. Sammlung sozialpsychologischer Monographien*, edited by Martin Buber. A broader historical perspective of the formation of the architectural profession in Germany is offered by Werner Durth, *Deutsche Architekten. Biographische Verflechtungen 1900-1970* (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1986).

municipal housing offices, which made large-scale, progressively oriented planning and building possible, were first founded.¹² The belief that aesthetics should be put in the service of a higher social ideal became a foundation of professional practice.¹³

Historicism into Tradition

Thus far, the argument being laid out is a fairly conventional, teleological history of modernism, wherein at some point in the mid to late nineteenth century an infusion of scientific thought propels aesthetic practices out of the past and forward into the modernist era. German designers bit by bit uncover the virtues of functionality and technology, and in fits and starts learn to leave history behind. With the Werkbund and the Bauhaus, there is smooth sailing through the end of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth with the untroubled victory of modern design. Except, as has by now been established by careful accounts of the Weimar Republic and the cultural origins of fascism in Germany, that the sailing was not necessarily smooth.¹⁴ Ideas about what was

¹² Clemens Zimmermann, *Von der Wohnungsfrage zur Wohnungspolitik. Die Reformbewegung in Deutschland, 1845-1914* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991); Nicholas Bullock and James Read, *The Movement for Housing Reform in Germany and France, 1840-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); and Sylvia Brander, *Wohnungspolitik als Sozialpolitik. Theoretische Konzepte und praktische Ansätze in Deutschland bis zum erster Weltkrieg* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1984).

¹³ Mark Jarzombek, "The Kunstgewerbe, the Werkbund, and the Aesthetics of Culture in the Wilhelmine Period," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 53, no. 1 (1994): 7-19; Richard Hamman, and Jost Hermand, "Der Kampf um den Stil," in *Stilkunst um 1900. Epochen deutscher Kultur von 1870 bis zur Gegenwart*, vol. 4 (Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, 1977), 212-219.

¹⁴ The classic studies of Wilhelmine politics and culture written in the post-war era are Fritz Stern, *The Politics of Cultural Despair: A Study in the Rise of the Germanic Ideology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961); and George L. Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1964). Having established a pantheon of key thinkers and key themes, those studies remained important touchstones for subsequent histories. As just one example of their continuing influence, it is interesting to note that Stern's positioning of Julius Langbehn and his book of 1890, *Rembrandt als Erzieher*, as key symptoms and even instigators of Wilhelmine cultural malaise has given Langbehn an inordinately prominent position in the historical understanding of the period. Between Stern and today, however, there are many hundreds of studies of the Wilhelmine era, its precedents, and its inheritors. More recent works which can lay claim to the iconic, paradigm-changing status of Stern and Mosse, with reference especially to culture and aesthetics, include, in English, David Blackbourn and Geoff Eley, *The Peculiarities of German History: Bourgeois Society and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Germany*

modern in architecture and design and what was not were ever in contention and inexact, and there was no precise alignment between political sentiment and aesthetic form.

The point to be made here is that history was not left behind when architectural modernism arrived. What changed was the understanding of what history was, its referents, its content, its interpretation, its meaning.¹⁵ The social sciences of the Wilhelmine period developed out of historical philology and historical economics. The early works of the social sciences were essentially histories, albeit it histories told not through the specifics of incident and personality but through origins, concepts, types, and ideals.¹⁶ The model was the *Entwicklungsgeschichte*, the developmental history, through

(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984); Jeffrey Herf, *Reactionary Modernism: Technology, culture, and politics in Weimar and the Third Reich* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); and Christian Otto, "Modern Environment and Historical Continuity: The Heimatschutz Discourse in Germany," *Art Journal* 43, no. 2 (Summer 1982): 148-157. German studies with similar weight and influence include Rolf Peter Sieferle, *Fortschrittsfeinde? Opposition gegen Technik und Industrie von der Romantik bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1984); Wolfgang R. Krabbe, *Gesellschaftsveränderung durch Lebensreform. Strukturmerkmale einer sozialreformerischen Bewegung im Deutschland der Industrialisierungsperiode* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974); and Klaus Bergmann, *Agrarromantik und Großstadt Feindschaft* (Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1970).

¹⁵ The literature on the philosophy and practice of history in Germany is extensive and shot through with often quite vehement differences between generations, schools, and political affiliations. An overview of the development and definitions of historicism in the nineteenth and early twentieth century is provided by Friedrich Jaeger and Jörn Rüsen, *Geschichte des Historismus* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1992). More detailed discussion of the influence of historicist thought on political economy (the forerunner field to modern German sociology) is offered by Annette Wittkau, *Historismus Zur Geschichte des Begriffs und des Problems* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992). Major studies of the cultural ramifications of historicist thought, along with interesting insights into the debates, in the present as well as the past, include the diverse essays in Rüdiger vom Bruch, Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, and Gangolf Hübinger, eds., *Kultur und Kulturwissenschaften um 1900*, vol. 1, *Krise der Moderne und Glaube an die Wissenschaft*; vol 2, *Idealismus und Postivismus* (Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1989 and 1997, respectively); Stefan Haas, *Historische Kulturforschung in Deutschland 1880-1930* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1994); and Johannes Heinßen, *Historismus und Kulturkritik. Studien zur deutschen Geschichtskultur im späten 19. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003). English-language overviews of German historiography and the influence of developmental schemata on other fields of discourse include Georg G. Iggers, *The German Conception of History: The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1968); and Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973).

¹⁶ Lawrence A. Scaff, "Geschichte und Historismus in der deutschen Tradition des politischen und ökonomischen Denkens," in *Historismus am Ende des 20. Jahrhunderts. Eine internationale Diskussion*, ed. Gunter Scholz (Berlin: Akademie, 1997), 127-145; Volker Kruse, "Von der historischen Nationalökonomie zur historischen Soziologie. Ein Paradigmenwechsel in den deutschen Sozialwissenschaften um 1900," *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 19 (1990): 149-165.

which theory was built and justified out of arguments from history, out of arguments of historical evolution.¹⁷ Modes of developmental history may have begun in the eighteenth-century conceit of arguing ideals from ancient and classical origins, but the developmental impulse had been transformed by the anthropological turn of Herder's arguments for the *Volksgeist*, and even more so by the ineluctable march of Hegel's world-spirit, through which history was endowed with omnipotent agency that deigned to alight in the souls of individuals – soldiers, statesmen, thinkers – capable of advancing its forward progress. While the historicism of art history as a compendium of epochs and styles, of Gothic and Renaissance, Classical and Baroque, might have seemed exhausted and infertile at the end of the nineteenth century, the historicism of the social sciences seemed fecund, fresh, and eminently usable.

The social sciences in their early iterations were tales of origins, development, destiny. The developmental histories of the social sciences showed Germans where they came from, who they were, how they should really live. While social scientists themselves might have argued for empirical rigor and value-free analysis, the preponderance of professional musings were colored by romantic ideals and national interests. Sociologists cast the developmental history of human progress as a tragically tinted narrative in which the present destroyed the past, *Gemeinschaft* disappeared into *Gesellschaft*, mechanical

¹⁷ On developmental schemata in historical thinking, see Manfred Riedel, "Die dialektische Begründung der Notwendigkeit des Fortschritts in Hegels Geschichtsphilosophie," *Hegel – Jahrbuch* (1968-69): 89-106; Joachim Ritter, "Fortschritt," in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, vol. 2 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972), 1032–1059; Wolfgang LeFèvre, "Darwin, Marx und der garantierte Fortschritt – Materialismus und Entwicklungsdenken im 19. Jahrhundert," in *Materialismus und Spiritualismus. Philosophie und Wissenschaft nach 1848*, ed. Andreas Arndt and Walter Jaeschke (Hamburg: Meiner, 2000), 167-187; Peter J. Bowler, *Evolution: The History of an Idea* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984); and Johannes G. Pankau, *Wege zurück. Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte restaurativen Denkens im Kaiserreich. Eine Untersuchung kulturkritischer und deutschkundlicher Ideologiebildung* (Frankfurt a.M.: P. Lang, 1983).

society was swallowed by organic society. Anthropologists portrayed the drama of civilization as a triumph of *Kulturvölker* over *Naturvölker*. Ethnographers documented the evolution of technologies through which the primitive metamorphosed into the modern, the crude stone spear point became the sleek steel blade. Geographers traced the mysterious alchemy of landscape and climate, ocean currents and plant life, that transformed peoples into cultures and cultures into nations.

These are the narrative arcs of romantic nationalism. The historical sensibilities of the late Wilhelmine era at issue in this study are not founded in Leopold von Ranke's 1824 counsel to write history as "wie es eigentlich gewesen,"¹⁸ as it really was, but rather Ernst Troeltsch's analysis of 100 years later, whereby the "the penetration of comparative and developmental-historical modes of thinking into all corners of the intellectual world"¹⁹ had yielded a crisis of historicism, a crisis of the purposes and methods of history writing, which in turn had set off the "lapse of all fixed norms and ideals."²⁰ If the historicizing impulse had penetrated into all corners of modern thought, the sociological impulse had likewise entered into history writing.²¹ Historical thinking became a tool of social analysis. History as refracted through the social sciences, through sociology, geography, ethnography, and anthropology, became normative history, idealized history, history

¹⁸ Leopold von Ranke, *Geschichten der romanischen und germanischen Völker von 1494 bis 1514* (1824). *Sämtliche Werke*, vols. 33/34 (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1874), p. VII.

¹⁹ "...Durchdringung aller Winkel der geistigen Welt mit vergleichenden und entwicklungsgeschichtlich beziehendem Denken," in Ernst Troeltsch, "Die Krisis des Historismus," *Die Neue Rundschau* 1 (1922): 572-590.

²⁰ "...der Wegfall aller festen Normen und Ideale," in "Das neunzehnte Jahrhundert" (1913), *Aufsätze zur Geistesgeschichte und Religionssoziologie. Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 4 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1925).

²¹ On the place of Troeltsch's crisis of historicism thesis in the broader context of analyses by Nietzsche, Wilhelm Dilthey, Karl Mannheim, and others, see Otto Gerhard Oexle, "Die Geschichtswissenschaft im Zeichen des Historismus. Bemerkungen zum Standort der Geschichtsforschung," and "'Historismus.' Überlegungen zur Geschichte des Phänomens und des Begriffs," in *Geschichtswissenschaft im Zeichen des Historismus: Studien zur Problemgeschichte der Moderne* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 17-40, 41-72.

available for particular varieties of instrumentalization. In sociological iterations, history could partake of the authority of science. Or it could invoke human habits, national character, or custom as alternative and no less powerful discourses. Sociologically driven historical analysis in the Wilhelmine era came cloaked in the glamour of progress while it participated in the *Gemütlichkeit* of everyday life. As a result, "tradition," the phantasmal zone of folk custom, the vernacular, and the romanticized past, acquired a particularly complex authority: at once baseline, endpoint, and timelessness itself.

The implication here is that the concept of tradition, as philosopher Stephen Watson as described it, is "one of those ancient but paradoxical transcendentals ... conceptually polyvalent: theoretical and metatheoretical, practical and historical at once."²² Such a definition would seem to place tradition beyond any historical specificity. But as scholars such as Eric Hobsbawm and Benedict Anderson have illustrated, invocations of "tradition," especially in the late nineteenth century, were closely tied to the rise of modern nations. Hobsbawm contends that the use of tradition in that period often had about it something of the invented, the manufactured. Indeed, the business of "inventing" traditions, in the interest of advancing nationalism, national identity, and national patriotism, was one of the principle cultural endeavors of the age. For newly emerging nations, such as Germany and Italy, the object was to use history to create historical continuity, to establish a usable past. The invocation of tradition in pageantry and uniforms, architecture and art, used history as a means of legitimating the powers of the

²² Stephen H. Watson, *Tradition(s): Refiguring Community and Virtue in Classical German Thought* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), 23.

state and the nation.²³ But tradition offered more than just an instrument with which to fashion an emotionally resonant façade for power. Although nationalism looms large in the processes of inventing tradition, the roles of tradition in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century are not limited to imperial imagery and state propaganda. Tradition also served to express social identity and shape social cohesion in communities that were both real, in the sense of being geographically determined, and "imagined," in that the inhabitants were bound by common symbols, heritage, and destiny.²⁴

In looking at efforts to invent, to imagine, to "manufacture" community in the late Wilhelmine era, this study attempts to locate specific networks of discourse and architecture by which tradition, the past, was rendered usable. One network arises in the codification and academicization of the vernacular. The interest in local history and the ruins of farmhouses and villages, provincial costumes and old farming tools, moved beyond the antiquarian to become academically respectable. The vernacular became a style in its own right, capable of competing with historicism in high-minded debates about fashion, taste, authenticity, and national style (figure 1). Through this elevation of the vernacular in intellectual discourse as well as popular opinion, folk traditions were infused with immediacy and authority: they became relevant to the needs of everyday life in modern society.

Amid the crisis of late historicism, the past was also an instrument for consolidating social identity. The habits of mind and intellectual practice that compelled reasoning

²³ Eric Hobsbawm and Terrence Ranger, eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1, 12.

²⁴ Hobsbawm and Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition*, 9, 263; Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso, 1991).

from history writ large, that spurred the development of evolutionary schema, *Entwicklungsgeschichte*, met with the arrival of more scientifically, and vitalistically determined rationales for modern community.²⁵

The relationship between tradition and science at that time is better described as dialectical rather than merely oppositional or antithetical. The vernacular was a connective hinge. The rise of anthropology as a science, as practically a master discourse whose principles and methods infiltrated the fields of sociology, economics, and history, gave the vernacular a foundation of theoretical rigor. Through anthropology, the human historical record history extended into pre-history. The vernacular, in the guise of traditions and folk forms, was endowed with the privilege of traversing the boundaries of science and romance, ephemerality and temporality, nature and culture.²⁶ This dialectic between the traditional, as expressed through vernacular forms, and the scientific, as founded in vitalistic imagery and ideas, constitutes a defining figure of architectural modernism in late Wilhelmine Germany.

This conjunction of scientific progress and timeless tradition in sociological discourse was especially acute wherever the social sciences reached into the architectural and planning professions in the Wilhelmine period. *Gemeinschaft*, community, became a key word, a term charged with layers of meaning and hope. What *Gemeinschaft* was, where it came from, how to preserve it, how to resurrect it, how to recreate it were concerns in sociology, social reform, architecture, town planning, and many other fields as well. The

²⁵ Thomas Rohkrämer, *Eine andere Moderne? Zivilisationskritik, Natur und Technik in Deutschland 1880-1933* (Paderborn: Schönigh, 1999), 164.

²⁶ See the discussion in Andrew Zimmerman, "History without Humanism," in *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 201-216.

historicization of community, and the emplacement of community as a product of historical development in factual and physical terms (settlement and building form), as well as moral and emotional terms (tradition, that is the past made palpable in the actions and thoughts of everyday life) are key to understanding the impact of the social sciences on architecture and planning in the Wilhelmine era. History, and its moralized, personalized articulation of continuity as virtue, *tradition*, were employed as instruments in reform and design.

Defining Modern Community: The Resurrection of Gemeinschaft

The German word for community, *Gemeinschaft*, carried many of the same valences that the term "community" carries in our own day. As employed in the Wilhelmine period, *Gemeinschaft*/Community connoted something desirable, an object of hope and striving, something ever in danger of slipping away. The dyadic character of early sociological analysis tended to argue for *Gemeinschaft*/Community as a good against an ever accumulating litany of rather threatening changes, by-products of modernization: the incursions of capitalist industrialization, the anonymity of urbanization, the leveling forces of socialism, the relativism of modernity. In the paradigmatic definition of Ferdinand Tönnies' 1887/1912 book, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, enshrined the duality of the two concepts.²⁷ Whereas *Gemeinschaft*/Community connoted the specific and by definition local and known, *Gesellschaft*/Society was some larger, geographically

²⁷ While *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* was first published in 1887, it did not receive substantial attention until the second, expanded, reworked, and significantly, re-titled, edition in 1912. The sequence of early editions was *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft. Abhandlung des Communismus und des Socialismus als empirischer Culturformen* (Berlin: Fuchs's Verlag [R. Reiland], 1887); *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundbegriffe der reinen Soziologie*, 2nd, considerably revised and expanded edition (Berlin: Curtius, 1912); *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundbegriffe der reinen Soziologie*, 3rd, revised edition (Berlin: Curtius, 1920).

diffuse, and more general construct of politics, economics, and history. If the antinomies of community versus society today, the local and known against the global and unfamiliar, echo those drawn by Tönnies, it is because we are the inheritors of his theories, but also because he was so perspicacious in his analysis of the essential forces shaping modernity.

Tönnies is one of several social thinkers whose works and ideas are examined in this study, along with his fellow founding fathers of modern sociology, Max Weber, Werner Sombart, and Georg Simmel. The definition of sociology ranged more widely in the late Wilhelmine era it does today. This study looks at writers such as the geographer and anarchist Peter Kropotkin and biologist Ernst Haeckel, not conventionally considered sociologists, but whose social theories exercised a powerful influence on late Wilhelmine intellectual culture. In a similar vein of examining the field of sociology as it was construed at that time, rather than in categories determined retrospectively, the investigation of theories of community includes figures from the preceding generation whose ideas and works, now largely neglected, gave formative impetus to the direction and shape of Wilhelmine studies. For example, Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl, ethnographer, social critic, professor, and museum director, first published his major works in the mid nineteenth century.²⁸ His developmental narrative of the emergence of the class structure in Germany provided a historical rationale for critics of modernity and defenders of corporate theories of society well into the 1940s. That the radical reactionaries of the Third Reich considered Riehl a forefather of their own thinking has brought him much

²⁸ Among Riehl's major works of social political analysis was the three-volume *Die Naturgeschichte des Volkes als Grundlage einer deutschen Social-Politik* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1869). On Riehl's life and ideas, see Jasper von Altenbockum, *Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl, 1823-1897. Sozialwissenschaft zwischen Kulturgeschichte und Ethnographie* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1994).

attention from contemporary historians. Similarly, the life, works, and influence of the geographer Friedrich Ratzel have been relatively well considered, and for much the same reason.²⁹ Ratzel's development of the concept of *Lebensraum*, and the subsequent instrumentalization of the term by the Nazis have given him a ready presence in modern German history. The influence of August Meitzen, agrarian economist, historian of ancient settlement form, and early mentor of Max Weber and Werner Sombart, on the other hand, has been little acknowledged. Meitzen's histories of agrarian economies are of occasional historiographical interest today. Meitzen's contemporary, the political economist Albert Schäffle, exercised considerable influence on Tönnies and other social thinkers well into the 1920s. Today, Schäffle is nearly absent from the narrative of intellectual history. His densely argued thesis about the evolution of human society as an organism, wherein the individual figures as a cell and the state as the complex organism, seems to belong more to the realm of pseudoscience rather than modern sociology.³⁰

Scope and Content of Study

The following study is not a conventional history of architecture, not an investigation of specific built works, their form and construction. Nor is it a history of architectural personalities and biographical facts. It is rather an investigation into the ways in which ideas circulate around and through architecture and planning, the ways in which ideas,

²⁹ On Ratzel, see Gerhard H. Müller, *Friedrich Ratzel (1844-1904): Naturwissenschaftler, Geograph, Gelehrter* (Stuttgart: Verlag der Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Technik, 1996). For an overview of Ratzel's place in the history of German geography, see Gerhard Sandner and Mechthild Rössler, "Geography and Empire in Germany, 1871-1945," in *Geography and Empire*, ed. Anne Godlewska and Neil Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), 115-129.

³⁰ Albert E.F. Schäffle, *Bau und Leben des sozialen Körpers: Encyclopädischer Entwurf einer realen Anatomie, Physiologie und Psychologie der menschlichen Gesellschaft mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Volkswirtschaft als sozialen Stoffwechsel*, 4 vols. (Tübingen: Laupp, 1875-1878). There were a number of Weimar-era doctoral theses on Schäffle, including Ignac Adler, *Das organistische Gesellschaftsbegriff. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Herbert Spencers, Paul von Lilienfelds und Albert Schäffles* (Bern: E. Sieber, 1925); and Walter Otto, *Schäffle's Lehre vom Sozialismus* (Bochum: Stumpf, 1923)

ideals, are made manifest in the built environment.³¹ It examines the intertwining

discourses about *Gemeinschaft*, community, articulated in books and magazines, popular

³¹ This study's conjoining of architecture and planning into a single body of discourse owes much to the example of German architectural historians and urbanists, for whom the Wilhelmine era has been a fruitful starting point for reconfiguring the history of modernism. The work of Julius Posener was particularly influential in this regard. See especially his *Berlin: Auf dem Wege zu einer neuen Architektur* (Munich: Prestel Verlag, 1970), which was the first significant history of the architecture of the period. Posener was a native Berliner, a student of Hans Poelzig at the Technische Hochschule Berlin from 1923 to 1929, and, after three decades in exile, a professor at the Hochschule für Bildende Künste Berlin, from which post he exerted a powerful influence on the next two generations of German architectural historians. See his *Aufsätze und Vorträge 1931-1980* (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1981); *Fast so alt wie das Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Siedler, 1990); and the collection of essays and remembrances by colleagues and students edited by Miron Mislin, *Julius Posener: Laßt mich doch, Kinder, hier komme ich wahrscheinlich nie wieder her! In memoriam Julius Posener* (Berlin: Jovis, 1997).

For the first generation of Posener's students, the Wilhelmine era served as the locus of a larger project to re-examine the history of modernism through Marxist theory, and to chart a prehistory for the activism of the 1960s and 1970s. The resulting histories of communal experiments, utopian architecture and planning, and social housing reasserted the socially progressive aims of early modernism, and leavened the extant master discourse of functionalist high modernism with countervailing, and often contradictory, narratives of spirituality, the occult, anarchism, and the visionary. What's more, these new critical histories were often consciously crafted to serve as theoretical rationales and models for contemporary design practice. As Posener student, Franziska Bollerey put it, "Baugeschichte ist hier gedacht als bewußte Auseinandersetzung mit der Geschichte und als Aufforderung zur kritischen Reflektion des Planungsgeschehens. Historisches Architektur- und Baugeschehen wird demzufolge hier dargestellt, um auf Grund der Kenntnis von Alternativmodellen die Phantasie, das soziale Engagement zu provozieren" (The history of architecture is seen here as a self-conscious argument with history, and as an invitation to critical reflection about the current state of planning. Historical architecture and planning are accordingly presented so that knowledge of alternative models of the imaginative might provoke social engagement). See her *Architekturkonzeptionen der utopischen Sozialisten. Alternative Planung und Architektur für den gesellschaftlichen Prozeß* (Berlin: Ernst & Sohn, 1991), quote on p. 8. The book was originally Bollerey's Freie Universität Berlin dissertation completed under Posener. Bollerey's colleague, Kristiana Hartmann, also studied at the FU under Posener's direction, and oriented her historical studies towards similarly praxis-oriented ends. See her *Deutsche Gartenstadtbewegung. Kulturpolitik und Gesellschaftsreform* (Munich: Heinz Moos Verlag, 1976). The work of Jonas Geist, first as collaborator with Janos Frecot in the recovery of the work of the artist Hugo Höppener, known as Fidus, and later in collaboration with Klaus Kürvers on the massive, three-volume history of the Berlin apartment house, also sought to establish a prehistory for contemporary activism and a social relations. See Janos Frecot, Johann Friedrich Geist, and Diethart Kerbs, *Fidus 1868-1948. Zur ästhetischen Praxis bürgerlicher Fluchtbewegungen* (Munich: Rogner & Bernhard, 1972); and Johann Geist and Klaus Kürvers, *Das Berliner Mietshaus*, vol. 1: 1740-1862, vol. 2: 1862-1945, vol. 3: 1945-1989 (Munich: Prestel, 1980-1989).

In the subsequent decades, the "usable past" histories of Bollerey and Hartmann shaded into more overt ideological investigations of architecture and planning. While any historical epoch might serve as the field for such exertions, the latter half of the nineteenth and the early years of the twentieth century seemed to offer an especially lush ground. This was, after all, the moment when the metropolis was formed. In excavating the layers of rhetoric, intention, and built facts, scholars could lay bare the roots of modernity – and the original rationales for cities as they yet stand. See Dirk Schubert, "Stadtplanung als Ideologie. Eine theoriegeschichtliche-ideologiekritische Untersuchung der Stadt, des Städtebaus und Wohnungsbaus in Deutschland von ca. 1850 bis heute" (Ph.D. diss., Freie Universität Berlin, 1981). In this vein, there are a number of collections of historical documents and critical essays about the history of planning in Germany, edited by faculty of the Technische Universität Aachen in conjunction with colleagues elsewhere, which applied the methods of social history and the critique of institutions to city planning and architecture in Germany. See Gerhard Fehl and Juan Rodriguez-Lores, *Stadterweiterungen, 1800-1875* (Hamburg: Hans

pamphlets and professional journals, through exhibitions and exhibition reviews, conferences and *Rundfragen*. It considers the writings of architects and sociologists, town planners and social reformers, those who created propositions in words and deeds about

Christians, 1983); Juan Rodriguez-Lores and Gerhard Fehl, eds., *Stadtbaureform 1865-1900. Von Licht, Luft und Unordnung in der Stadt der Gründerzeit* (Hamburg: Hans Christians, 1985); Juan Rodriguez-Lores and Gerhard Fehl, eds., *Zu den Ursprüngen des sozialen Wohnungsbaus in Europa* (Hamburg: Hans Christians, 1988); Franziska Bollerey, Gerhard Fehl, and Kristiana Hartmann, eds., *Im Grünen Wohnen—im Blauen Planen. Ein Lesebuch zur Gartenstadt* (Hamburg: Christians, 1990); and Juan Rodriguez-Lores, *Sozialer Wohnungsbau in Europa. Die Ursprünge bis 1918: Ideen, Programme, Gesetze* (Basel: Birkhäuser, 1994).

Even in the most critical of these analyses of Wilhelmine architecture and planning there is often a hint of preservation ethos, fed by a desire to save the built substance of the historical city against the *tabula rasa* urbanism of high modernism. When combined with the left-leaning inclination toward political activism from below, in the 1970s and 1980s the preservationist point of view supported historians' involvement in efforts to save Wilhelmine-era architecture from the wrecking ball, notably neighborhoods of working class housing in the Ruhr, detailed in project of a project study group at the Fachhochschule Bielefeld, *Rettet Eisenheim. Gegen die Zerstörung der ältesten Arbeitersiedlung des Ruhrgebietes*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Verlag für das Studium der Arbeiterbewegung, 1973); and Lothar Juckel, *Stadtbildprägende Arbeitersiedlungen. Erhalt und Erneuerung denkmalwerter Arbeitersiedlungen im Rhein-Ruhr-Gebiet* (Dortmund: Institut für Landes- und Stadtentwicklungsforschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, 1992).

By the late 1970s and into the 1980s, Wilhelmine architecture was being presented as a model for the contemporary city – in the eyes of some offering a warm, humanist antidote to cold, rational (and failed) modernism. Through the doctrine of *kritische Rekonstruktion* (critical reconstruction), Berlin-based planners and architects such as Josef Paul Kleihues, Dieter Hoffmann-Axthelm, Harald Bodenschatz, and Hans Stimmann advocated preserving the essential character of historical neighborhoods in the face of major urban renewal projects, and in fact, reasserting formal aspects of Wilhelmine architecture and planning in the construction of new projects. Features such as a neighborhood mix of residential, shops, and small manufacture, buildings capped at the five or six stories of the pre-elevator age, and solid streetscapes of house and shop facades with rear courts and block centers used for common space and businesses were intended to effect continuity between the old, extant urban fabric and the incursions of contemporary infill. See especially the essays and projects illustrated in Josef Paul Kleihues, ed., *750 Jahre Architektur und Städtebau in Berlin. Die Internationale Bauausstellung im Kontext der Baugeschichte Berlins* (Stuttgart: Gert Hatje, 1987); and theory in Dieter Hoffmann-Axthelm, *Die dritte Stadt. Bausteine eines neuen Gründungsvertrages* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1993).

Finally, major monographs on individual architects and on thematic issues in early twentieth-century architectural history produced by the museums and archives of Germany have made a wealth of visual documentation more readily accessible, while also functioning to draw Wilhelmine architecture into the mainstream of modernism. The Architektursammlung der Technische Universität München and the Deutsches Architektur-Museum Frankfurt a.M. have both produced important volumes, including Winfried Nerdinger, ed., *Richard Riemerschmid. Vom Jugendstil zum Werkbund. Werke und Dokumente* (Munich: Prestel, 1982); and Winfried Nerdinger, *Theodor Fischer: Architekt und Städtebauer 1862 – 1938* (Berlin: Ernst, 1988); Vittorio Magnago Lampugnani and Romana Schneider, eds., *Moderne Architektur in Deutschland 1900 – 1950. Reform und Tradition* (Stuttgart: Hatje, 1992). The latter exhibition unloosed a debate about Lampugnani's uncritical and dangerously nostalgic naturalization of reactionary modernism, see "Gespräch mit Vittorio Magnago Lampugnani and Winfried Nerdinger," *Baumeister* 8 (1994), 46. Gerhard Fehl also responded to Lampugnani's work with a call for the necessity to reassert critical interrogation of the uses of tradition in early twentieth-century Germany, and to avoid de-historicization of the period as merely a forerunner to postmodernism, see Gerhard Fehl, "Der aktuelle Blick zurück: Von der "Neomodern" zum "reaktionäre Modernismus," in *Kleinstadt, Steildach, Volksgemeinschaft. Zum "reaktionären Modernismus" in Bau- und Stadtbaukunst* (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1995), 7-25.

the ideal forms of modern German community. It looks at key works that shaped popular views of modern society, at works with wide distribution and with broad and even modish reception, in the case of books by science writers Ernst Haeckel and Wilhelm Bölsche, bona fide bestsellers. But the cultural margins are as necessary to understanding the history of an idea as are the bestsellers. Recovering the ideas and the influence of writers like August Meitzen and Albert Schäffle, giants in their own time but now largely forgotten, gives the past true dimension. The mystical and the pseudoscientific, the utopian and the visionary, the crank essay and the agitational pamphlet all evince an anticipatory power that speaks to the hopes of those who seek to create the future. On occasion the margins yield pronouncements that are later embraced as signal statements of the age, as was the case with Bruno Taut's *Alpine Architektur* of 1919, recognized in its own time as a work of great creative power and long since deemed a classic of proto-modernist architectural thought. Not every anticipatory vision shares in the positive associations that emanate from the term avant-garde. For instance, while a history of the garden city in Germany can proceed neatly down the middle of the road through a recounting of patronage dispensed, town councils incorporated, and streets platted, all along the edges of the garden city idea lurk thinkers and writers who fit rather ill into a tidy narrative of the garden city as a cohesive planning milestone. The movement for reform of land ownership in Germany, of which the garden city was one manifestation, attracted radical communitarians, anarchists, socialists, eugenicists, and reactionaries. There was the poetical approach of the brothers Julius and Heinrich Hart and their colleagues, who in 1901 wrote of a mystical *Neue Gemeinschaft*, which would set the pattern of communal living experiments for a century to follow.³² There was also the

³² Julius and Heinrich Hart, eds., *Die neue Gemeinschaft* (Leipzig: Eugen Diederichs:1901-1902). On the

terser, more technocratic vision of Theodor Fritsch who in 1896 plotted with great detail and passion the lineaments of *Die Stadt der Zukunft*, the city of the future, a community that would generate the new Germany, pure-blooded, Teutonic, without Jews, land speculators, emancipated women, or laissez-faire capitalists.

This study focuses on ideal propositions about architecture and community form, and considers design projects and built works as manifestations of those ideals. Such an approach cannot be exhaustive even of theories of ideal community, but rather endeavors to survey formative conceptions in the Wilhelmine period. It examines patterns of thought and particular concentrations of metaphor and historical rationale brought to bear on the question of the proper form for the modern community. For the facts of architectural lives and works, it relies heavily on secondary sources, published works on the individual architects, monographs and museum exhibition catalogues that have gathered together and made more easily available drawings and photographs of finished works. Of particular importance to this study are the writings of the architects themselves. Many of the leading architects and planners of the time also penned articles and books about their work and ideas. Among the planners, Joseph Stübben, Camillo Sitte, and Karl Henrici, and among the architect-planners, Theodor Fischer, Heinrich Tessenow, Hermann Muthesius, Richard Riemerschmid, Paul Schultze-Naumburg, Bruno Taut, Paul Schmitthenner, Fritz Schumacher, and Walter Gropius all figure in this study

history of "The New Community," as a publication, social movement, and utopian communal experiment, see Rolf Kauffeldt and Gertrude Cepl-Kaufmann, *Berlin Friedrichshagen. Literaturhauptstadt um die Jahrhundertwende. Der Friedrichshagener Dichterkreis* (Munich: Klaus Boer, 1994), 304-322; Ulrich Linse, *Zurück O Mensch zur Mutter Erde. Landkommunen in Deutschland, 1890-1933* (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1983), 62-88; and Eugene Lunn, *Prophet of Community: The Romantic Socialism of Gustav Landauer* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 142-149.

because of the continuity of intention across their theoretical pronouncements and their design work.

Chapter One, *Sociology Finds Its Subject*, looks at the emergence of sociology in Germany in the late Wilhelmine era at the crossroads of historicism, political economy, anthropology, and social reform. While providing a brief overview of the development of sociology as a distinct field of academic study, the discussion also touches on what could be called a sociological mindset, a "sociological turn," which transcended the faculty divisions of university study or polemical pamphleteers, and infiltrated many domains of human endeavor. The examination focuses on the spatial and cultural ramifications of the social sciences, with an emphasis on the spatial framework par excellence – the city. Urbanization, industrialization, and rationalization were the driving forces of modernization, and the principal subjects of inquiry for sociologists of the late Wilhelmine era. Social scientists studying the city, its growth, its ills, its new forms of human identity and interaction, approached their subjects according to certain paradigmatic constraints. There is a generational sequence in the social sciences, both in terms of historical timeline and in terms of intellectual genealogy of methodologies. The frequency and intensity of debates about social science methods around 1900 signified deeper changes underway in social science professions. This chapter summarizes those debates and gives an overview of the professional associations through which they were conducted.

In tandem with academically oriented groups, the social and economic changes in the latter half of the nineteenth century also spurred creation of social reform associations which took up scientific analysis as a conspicuously modern instrument to compel

change. The subject of modern sociology was preeminently the city, and the actors of principal concern in social reform were the worker and the middle classes. The chapter considers ways in which class was defined in the urban milieu.

And finally, just as much as growing urban centers provided the main subjects for the development of modern sociology, so did the rural and small town milieu provide the foil that made the late Wilhelmine social sciences a part of their distinctive historical moment. The dichotomies of *Stadt* and *Land*, of city and country, were persistent themes in sociological analyses, as they were in economics, politics, and cultural polemics. The split was expressed as a battle between idealized rural models and demonized urban milieus, between the small town virtue and metropolitan decadence, or conversely, between the idealized city as arena of intellect and cultivation and the small town as reservoir of poverty and narrow prospects. The chapter concludes, therefore, by sketching out the terrain of the urban-rural debate. The chapter provides an overview of the rural as subject in the late Wilhelmine era, both as a legitimate topic of historical and sociological inquiry and as a constellation of objects and values – traditional farmhouses, vernacular arts, nature, völkisch nationalism, anti-urbanism – within which critics of modernity situated themselves.

Chapter Two, *Past and Present*, looks at the ways in which the historical imagination informed the subjects and methods of German sociology in the late Wilhelmine era, with particular attention to how sociologists' ideal conceptions of community life and form were determined by arguments from history. The discussion focuses most prominently on the role of historical reasoning in the theories of Ferdinand Tönnies, whose developmental dialectic of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* provides a fundamental

theoretical touchstone for this dissertation, as indeed it did for the development of modern German sociology in the Wilhelmine period. The chapter also looks at the role of historical reasoning in the theories of community of Werner Sombart, Max Weber, and Peter Kropotkin. Sombart and Weber were colleagues of Tönnies' in the ranks of the German Sociological Association. Their own ideas about the origins and course of development of modern society drew on Tönnies' work in important ways. Kropotkin was an aging anarchist living in exile, whose works, while written, published, and read outside the circles of professional sociological thought, were sociological in their reasoning, and arguably more directly influential than writings by Tönnies et al. for social reformers and socially engaged architects and planners of the Wilhelmine period.

Chapter Three, *Discovering the vernacular*, examines more closely one of those remedies: the "discovery" of the traditional German farmhouse as a proto-modernist dwelling form especially suited to the needs and aspirations of the working classes. The story begins with something of a historical riddle. How did it come to pass that while in the 1870s the study of old farmhouses was primarily the province of antiquarians, village pastors, and school masters, by the late 1890s old farmsteads and cottages were attended to with great seriousness by philologists and political economists, not to mention architects and reformers? During those decades, the details of farmhouses in Germany's regions were observed and recorded. Philologists chronicled the ancient terminology of farmhouse architecture – the *Diele*, the great central hall for work; the *Pesel*, which sheltered living in some instances and mere storage in others; the *Utlucht*, a type of interior porch that marked the boundary between work and living space in some old houses but referred to the storage rooms in others; the *Flet*, which described both the

central hearth and the surrounding living space; and the *Wohnküche*, the all-purpose living and sleeping and working space of the farm laborer which would later become a hallmark of the modern worker's cottage. Philologists traced the formation of names and created comparative regional lexicons through which they could map the historical pathways of linguistic transmission across the German-speaking regions. Political economists likewise charted the historical evolution of the farmhouse form, still visible in the crumbling ruins of old house foundations at the edge of villages and in the ancient farmsteads still operating in villages in the countryside. Was the village's grain stored collectively or in the individual farmsteads? How many generations or families resided under the low roof beams of the Bauernhof? For economists, the old farmhouses provided windows into the prehistoric origins of economic value and exchange. For sociologists, the farmhouse's architectural accommodation of family life, work, and community sodality offered a map that led back to the origins of social relations.

Much of the early scholarship into the history of the German farmhouse was of a piece with research into ancient dwellings being undertaken by scholars across Europe. Since the early decades of the nineteenth century, archaeologists, philologists, and architectural historians had been resurrecting the dwelling forms of classical Greece and Rome. The vernacular emerged as a distinct subject of serious study in the last two and a half decades of the century, as scholars parsed the history of folk forms into ever more specific national and regional categories: the northern house, the southern house, the Alpine house, the Saxon house, the Friesian house, the French house, the German house. One of the major impetuses behind this movement to lay scholarly claim to the vernacular heritage was nationalism. Since the writings of Gottfried Herder, the German

philosophical tradition had provided a powerful model for linking national identity and the folk arts. Herder's concept of the *Volksgeist*, a deeply internalized bond of culture and language that united a people across political boundaries, had fueled feelings of romantic nationalism in the early years of the century. One hundred years later, by the 1890s certainly, the belief in a cultural and linguistic basis for national identity also functioned to prove that the historical roots, and by extension the political legitimacy, of the German nation were far more ancient than the mere twenty years of statehood might suggest. Another feature of this late historicist moment, a time of almost hypertrophied historical consciousness and superabundant historical codification, was the rise of history as popular pastime. Historians Celia Applegate and Alon Confino have documented the extent to which German nationalism was defined not in broad, border-to-border strokes but in terms of regional specificity and diversity.³³ Jennifer Jenkins has shown how strongly national identity could be defined in terms of a specific city, and even a single urban district.³⁴ The popular interest in vernacular architecture was at once national and local. The public's knowledge and enthusiasm was borne along by increased tourism to regional historical sites, made possible by the construction of urban and regional railway systems, as well as the mass publication of photographic books and journals, the professionalization and growth of local history museums, the creation of open-air museums that preserved historical villages and farmsteads, and the widespread popularity of the Heimatschutz movement which rallied support for the preservation of traditional architecture and traditional landscapes.

³³ Celia Applegate, *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990); Alon Confino, *The Nation as Local Metaphor: Württemberg, Imperial Germany, and National Memory, 1871-1918* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).

³⁴ Jennifer Jenkins, *Provincial Modernity: Local Culture and Liberal Politics in Fin-de-Siècle Hamburg* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003).

Through the preservation efforts of the Heimatschutz and the popular embrace of local history, the traditional German farmhouse became a symbol of national unity, of the national soul even. That it also became a model for the modern worker's home involved another force, namely the German tradition of corporative political philosophy. This was a body of theory that, broadly observed, defined the state in terms of the collective rights of the *Stände*, the estates or classes, rather than the rights of individuals. Indeed the long history and acceptance of the corporate theory of the nation as a hierarchy of collectivities is one of the reasons the associational notions embodied in the term *Gemeinschaft* could find such resonance in modern Germany. Corporate state theory as articulated in the mid and late nineteenth century saw the social classes in evolutionary perspective. In simple terms, the origins of the *Stände* lay in the property rights of the *Adel* and the *Bauerntum*, the aristocracy and the free farmers. Through the changing nature of property and wealth, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the *Bürgertum*, the bourgeoisie, had emerged – essentially the class of the present, the class that dominated the nineteenth century. Further changes in the nature of property and wealth, propelled by technological progress and industrialization, was stimulating a new, emergent class, the *Arbeitertum*, the working class. Out of the rural feudal and laboring classes would emerge the class of the future. Such evolutionary schemata of class development were by no means exclusive to corporative political thought. Variations on these figures of class descent and emergence were common to a number of social and political theories in the nineteenth century. Karl Marx, Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl, and Thorstein Veblen all offered versions of an evolutionary social narrative that saw the working class emerging as the dominant force of the modern age.

Such theories of class emergence and dominance were relevant to discussions about the farmhouse as a model for modern homes, and in fact they provided the principal rationale for its acceptance as a viably modern architectural form. Because the *Arbeiterstand* was such a recent historical phenomenon, reformers contended, it had not yet developed its own culture. In arguments of varying degrees of direness about the threats of a rootless proletariat, it was held to be imperative that a cohesive, expressive culture appropriate to the expectations and lifeways of the working classes be developed. This was a task of interest not just to reforming architects and planners, but also to socialist workers themselves. The former tended to see the solution in the miniaturization of bourgeois values while the latter saw it in design as political pedagogy. Because the traditional farmhouse was rooted in the historical origins of the workers out of the rural laboring classes, it offered an architectural vessel for instruction in taste and identity. The class history and class values of the workers were *legible* in the farmhouse form. The modern articulation of this argument gave a very theoretical overlay to the age-old forms of workers' cottages and colonies. The availability of the farmhouse solution owed no small debt to English model cottages and to the worker cottages which in Germany dated back to the eighteenth-century reforms of Frederick the Great. The chapter examines in more detail the character of these class debates. It looks at the ways individual architects theorized and designed workers' homes. Finally, it charts the arc of popular acceptance, through publications, exhibitions, and public building projects, of the farmhouse as a model for the simple modern dwelling.

Chapter Four, *Cellular form and collective life*, takes the discussion of ideal community form into the Weimar Republic and beyond. The chapter surveys the theory and design

ramifications of organicist social thought from the late Wilhelmine period through the Weimar Republic, and into the Third Reich, showing that the concept of the "organic" community was more than just a passing metaphor. The term *organisch* was used too frequently and by too diverse a spectrum of reformers, planners, and architects in Germany to let its usage and its various meanings go unremarked. Indeed, the organic society was a key figure of thought in modern architecture. This chapter makes a contribution to the broader historical discussion by focusing on a confluence of political, scientific, and artistic issues particular to the Wilhelmine era.

The chapter investigates how concepts of the organic society borne in corporatist political thought dovetailed into concepts from modern biology to create both the discourse and the architectural and planning propositions about ideal forms of the modern organic community. Biology as such had long been seen as a repository of timeless truths, timeless values, and timeless forms. As the life sciences advanced under the aegis of evolutionary theory, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century especially, biology assumed a leading position within the pantheon of the sciences. It became first among the sciences. Aided by new technologies and new theories, biological research into cellular structure, embryology, and reproduction was transforming understanding of nature and origins of life. Biological metaphors and evolutionary constructs were adopted by many intellectual fields: history, the arts, the social sciences. In some quarters of the social sciences, biologically derived concepts and metaphors were employed as a kind of master discourse for modern life. One of the key nineteenth-century thinkers in this regard was Herbert Spencer, suggesting that biological metaphors and rationales in the social sciences were not exclusive to Germany. What made the German situation so distinctive,

however, was the way in which biological theory melded with the long, native tradition of organicist theories of society and the state. Organicist political theory melded with the corporatist theories of society which underlay much of the social thought and design associated with the resurgence of traditional communities within modernism.³⁵

The attractions of cell science, the basis for the easy transference of ideas and imagery, was certainly based in the fact that cellular metaphors offered a useful means of modeling the essential question of social and political life: the relationship of the part to the whole, the individual to the state. Through the cellular metaphor, the individual could be seen as the single cell within a complex organism. The single cell was lifeless, meaningless, incapable of surviving apart from the organism. At the same time, the organism was but a collection of single cells, operating in unison to produce life. These simple metaphorical constructs fit rather neatly into the concurrent debates about the proper form for modern *Gemeinschaft*. Moreover, biology and cell science offered a wealth of visual material. The simple diagrams of cellular organisms in text books and magazines, and the more elaborately aesthetic illustrations for books by scientists such as Ernst Haeckel and Wilhelm Bölsche exercised a particularly dynamic power that was at once both representative and generative, both symbolic and operative. Cell science imagery offered a pattern book of sorts for modern community design.

In looking at the historical sources for this melding of corporatist social theory and the biological sciences, the chapter examines the content and influence of the 1874 work by sociologist and political economist Albert Schäffle, *Bau und Leben des socialen Körpers*

³⁵ See the discussion of the German penchant for organicist political theory in Martin Greiffenhagen, *Das Dilemma des Konservatismus in Deutschland* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1986), 200-218.

(Formation and Life of the Social Body). As a work which influenced the young Ferdinand Tönnies as he wrote *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, Schäffle's book provides a means of tracing the roots of modern sociology back into the nineteenth century. For the discussion of this chapter, Schäffle's analysis is also significant because it combines historical analysis and biological modeling to create a distinctive organicist theory of modern society. Schäffle provides a crucial link between evolutionary theory, social science, and tradition. He defined tradition, the great body of received everyday knowledge, as a form of symbolic communication and, thereby, as an essential associational mechanism of modern society.

The chapter considers the influence of Ernst Haeckel as a scientist and a social theorist. Haeckel was something of a giant in Wilhelmine culture, a biologist and popularizer of Darwin's theories who influenced the sciences, social sciences, the arts, literature, and religion. In the works of some of his followers, Haeckel's theories of society and the state as organisms shaded neatly into Social Darwinism. But among his students, there were also some such as embryologist Oscar Hertwig who advocated an associational reading of evolutionary theory. Like Peter Kropotkin, Gustav Landauer, Wilhelm Bölsche, and others at the time, Hertwig was an articulate promoter of the idea that cooperation not competition was the driving force of natural evolution. Progress ruled through the associational instinct rather than survival of the fittest. Such a cooperative, associational reading of evolutionary theory cast a gentler light on to the ideas and imagery flowing from biological research, and made those resources, in a sense, *available* to socialist reformers and designers.

Architecturally, the chapter looks at the organicist and biologicistic ideas underlying the garden city theories of Ebenezer Howard and Theodor Fritsch. That analysis leads to a consideration of the plans for small towns and settlements that self-consciously used biologicistic models as a symbolic and operative tool for the creation of a cohesive community form. The focus is on the use of the nucleated, concentric circular form in town planning at the time. While variations on the circular city form were found in ancient Slavic settlements, Renaissance fortresses, and ideal Baroque cities, there was also a compelling visual model in cell science: the blastula, a group of cells which as they multiply begin to create a closed form, the beginnings of the organism. This concentric, circular motif, a hybrid of ancient settlement and technological dynamism was used in the design of the workers' estate Hohe Lache near Dessau, designed by Theodor Overhoff and Edith Schulze in 1919, and in the cooperative moshav of Nahalal, designed by the German-born and -trained architect Richard Kauffmann and built in Palestine in 1922. Other variations on biological imagery and cellular conceptions of community life were employed by Bruno Taut and Walter Gropius in projects for utopian communities in 1919-1920, as well as in later built works in the 1920s. While Overhoff, Kauffmann, Taut, Gropius, and others were employing biological imagery and metaphors at the level of the single building or settlement, there were coeval efforts, such as Central Place Theory, first outlined by geographer Walter Christaller, to extend the cellular conception of community to the region, the nation, and the world. Christaller developed his theory as an ostensibly value-free tool for analyzing and planning regional networks of trade and transportation. The tenets of Central Place Theory were nevertheless absorbed into Third Reich planning efforts, where ideas of the organic community, cellular metaphors, and a

mythic conception of the ideal *Gemeinschaft* were drawn together to become the reigning paradigm of planning.

Objectives of the Study

This study considers the history of architecture, history of planning, history of the social sciences, and above all, the cultural history of the late Wilhelmine period. Each of these fields has its own debates and paradigms, pressing questions and characteristic theoretical bases, and indeed one could trace quite divergent tendencies between scholars' treatments in the United States and in Germany. Working within such a conflux of historiographical currents, this study makes a contribution to two key issues in architectural modernism.

First is to examine more closely how, in discourse and in deed, architecture and planning mold social solidarity. Second is to explore methods of discussing architectural style as an index of political philosophy with degrees of refinement and discrimination that move beyond simple polarities of modernism versus anti-modernism, and corollary antitheses such as urbanism versus anti-urbanism, and progressive versus conservative.

While Germany at the turn of the twentieth century offers a particularly interesting environment for researching theories and practices of community-building, the frame of inquiry could have profitably been settled elsewhere in time and space during the past 150 years. Debates about community and style eerily similar to the Wilhelmine milieu can be traced in histories of the landholders, farmers and aristocrats in mid- nineteenth-century England putting moral philosophy in the service of cottage reform; architects in Weimar Germany waxing poetical and empirical about the *Neue Mensch*, the New Man, and creating the *Siedlungen* at city's edge in which to house him; the architects and

planners rebuilding Europe and the United States in the wake of World War II destruction and urban renewal, invoking a new vitalist catechism of efficiency and dispassion; or even the New Urbanists of the 1990s, wedding vernacular revival and a productivist ethos of leisure. From the concerns about hygiene and morals of the nineteenth century to the civil society, bowling-alone, loss of community arguments of the twenty-first century, what all of these movements have in common is a belief that architectural aesthetics is an operative element of social reform, and a faith that a better environment, a self-consciously planned and constructed environment, will produce a better citizen, a better community, a better nation, a better world.

Chapter One

Sociology Finds Its Subject: Theorizing Modern Community in the Kaiserreich

In trying to understand the interplay of sociological concepts and architectural theory and practice, it is important to place the rise of modern sociology in its principal spatial context: the modern city. Sociology and the diffusion of the sociological mindset were intimately connected to the contemporaneous, unprecedented acceleration of urbanization and industrialization in the late nineteenth century. The emergence of the industrialized metropolis gave modern sociology its subject, its edge, its intellectual distinction. To be concerned about modern life was to be concerned about the city, whether as a force for progress and optimism or as a harbinger of decline and pessimism. Unquestionably, the growth of urban population densities and the appearance of new forms of economic production precipitated crises for health, housing, and labor relations. The conditions of city life also engendered new kinds of consumer behavior, new expressions of class, new ways of fashioning self-identity, new kinds of interpersonal and familial relations, new roles for women, new concepts of knowledge (technical skills, business skills, municipal administration skills), new building types, and new demands for planning of urban space, housing, transportation, and recreation. Social scientists endeavored to fashion the proper frameworks of analysis for the new subjects of the city, and in doing so they reconfigured categorical terms, statistical data, heuristic arguments, and historical methodologies.

Rapid industrial expansion in Germany, as throughout western Europe and the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, brought about dramatic and regionally uneven economic development. With this development came demographic shifts that changed the look of the country and the ways people lived, even the ways

people thought about themselves as Germans. As one-time farmers and handworkers gave up their traditional livelihoods and left their villages and small towns to take jobs in the factories, the movement of people from the countryside and small towns into metropolitan areas meant that cities throughout Germany grew at a furious pace. The statistical facts are striking, and the frequency with which they are recited in urban and social histories cannot diminish the challenge they pose for one's powers of historical empathy. In 1871, the year Germany became a nation, Berlin had some 775,000 inhabitants; in 1914, at the onset of the First World War, there were over 2 million people living in the capital of the German Reich.¹ And Berlin was by no means the only German city doubling and tripling in size in these years. Dresden was transformed from a royal enclave into a leading economic center. Through a climbing birthrate, immigration, and the incorporation of surrounding towns, Dresden grew from 177,040 inhabitants in 1871

¹ Günter Peters, *Kleine Berliner Baugeschichte. Von der Stadtgründung bis zur Hauptstadt* (Berlin: Stapp, 1995), 148. While the pace of expansion in Berlin in the late nineteenth century was notable, the city had been growing steadily since the early years of the nineteenth century, essentially doubling in size every forty years. There were about 200,000 inhabitants in Berlin in 1820, some 415,000 by 1850. A significant measure of this metropolitan expansion involved the migration of inner-city dwellers toward the towns and suburbs immediately surrounding Berlin. Inner-city quarters like Cölln, Dorotheenstadt, and Friedrichstadt actually lost as much as 25 to 36% of their population between 1871 and 1919 – Friedrichswerder, the area lying along the Spree River in the path of new government buildings, lost 77%. Meanwhile towns like Charlottenburg (incorporated into metropolitan Berlin in 1920) which had a population of about 20,000 people in 1871, grew to 331,243 by 1914. Other Berlin suburbs saw similarly marked growth. The western residential areas of Schöneberg and Wilmersdorf had a combined population of about 6,000 inhabitants in 1871. Forty years later they had 283,000. The solidly working-class suburb of Rixdorf to the east grew from 8,000 inhabitants to 237,000 in the same period. See Peters, *Kleine Berliner Baugeschichte*, 145-48. At the conclusion of World War II, Berlin had about 3.5 million inhabitants – almost another doubling in size in twenty years. On the other hand the city's population at the time of Reunification in 1991 was 3.4 million, and in 1998 3.35 million. Since reunification to the present, the capital has been slowly and steadily losing population, while the population of suburban areas in the surrounding state of Brandenburg has been growing. For statistics, see Peters, *Kleine Berliner Baugeschichte*, 145-148, 282; Jürgen Reulecke, *Geschichte der Urbanisierung* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1985), 203, Table 3. For a discussion of the causes and impact of the new urban demographic trends, see Hartmut Häußermann and Andreas Kapphau, *Berlin: von der geteilten zur gespaltenen Stadt? Sozialräumlicher Wandel seit 1990* (Opladen: Leske + Budrich, 2000); and Hartmut Häußermann and Walter Siebel, "Neue Formen der Stadt- und Regionalpolitik," *Archiv für Kommunalwissenschaften* 33, no. 1 (1994): 32-43.

to around 567,000 in 1914.² During the same forty-three year period, between the end of the Franco-Prussian war and the onset of the First World War, Cologne's population expanded five times over, from 129,233 to 640,731. Leipzig, Munich, and Frankfurt expanded at a similar pace. Essen was transformed from a modest manufacturing town of 52,000 inhabitants in 1871 into a sprawling coal and steel center of 325,000 – growth by a factor of six.³ At the time of the Reich's founding, there were eight German cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants. Forty years later, there were forty-nine. By the time the First World War started, every fifth German lived in a big city.⁴

Rapid urbanization engendered a host of social problems. Housing was in short supply, much of what was available was of poor quality, and the health of many urban dwellers was endangered by close quarters and inadequate water and sewage services. The technical and financial challenges of building utility systems and public transportation networks through the older city cores and out into the hinterlands strained municipal budgets.⁵ Nineteenth-century accounts of the city often describe the atmosphere of chaos and noise. A great deal of construction was taking place in the latter decades. In addition

² Wolfgang Zimmer, "Bevölkerungsentwicklung und Sozialstruktur in der Stadt nach 1871," *Dresdner Hefte: Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte* 61 (2000): 18.

³ As a city shaped by industrialization, Essen is in a class by itself. In 1820, when the dust finally settled from the Napoleonic wars, Essen had about 5,000 inhabitants, a handful of whom worked in the fledgling Krupp ironworks. By the 1850s, when Krupp began to expand its operations to meet the demand for rails and cannons, Essen's population had already grown ten times over. See Wilhelm Berdow, *The Krupps: 150 Years of Krupp History 1787-1937, based on documents from the family and works archives*, trans. Fritz Homann (Berlin: Verlag für Sozialpolitik, Wirtschaft und Statistik, 1937). See also Wolfgang Köllmann, "Bevölkerungsgeschichte 1800-1970," in *Handbook der deutschen Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte*, vol. 2, ed. W. Zorn, (Stuttgart, 1976), p. 23; Brian Ladd, *Urban Planning and Civic Order in Germany, 1860-1914* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), 14, Table 1.

⁴ Wolfgang Köllmann, "The Process of Urbanization in Germany at the Height of the Industrialization Period," *Journal of Contemporary History* 4, no. 3 (1969): 61.

⁵ Marianne Rodenstein, *"Mehr Licht, mehr Luft." Gesundheitskonzepte im Städtebau seit 1750* (Frankfurt a.M.: Campus Verlag, 1988); Beate Witzler, *Großstadt und Hygiene. Kommunale Gesundheitspolitik in der Epoche der Urbanisierung* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1995); Clemens Zimmermann, *Von der Wohnungsfrage zur Wohnungspolitik. Die Reformbewegung in Deutschland 1845-1914* (Göttingen: Ruprecht & Vandenhoek, 1991).

to the miles of new avenues being laid out at the periphery (as yet unpopulated by people or houses but subject to rampant property speculation), the streets of the inner city were being excavated to install water and sewage pipes, and to build underground and elevated railways. Over a period of fifty years, the entire subterranean fabric of the modern city was dismantled and reassembled. This was no doubt a mixed blessing. For all the day-to-day disruption, in the end the upheaval did yield better living conditions for many. And the clang and dust of construction provided daily, visible evidence of technological progress – contributing no doubt to a sense of the stimulating urban environment for some and to a feeling that progress had run amok for others.

Fears of imminent moral and political peril may be less amenable to empirical study than mortality statistics, but they had just as powerful influence on how Germans responded to urbanization. There were fears that crowded living quarters bred sexual promiscuity that would undermine the family. There were fears that without some kind of remediation, some kind of intervention, poor living conditions would produce a spiteful working class that could be seduced by the redemptive promise of socialism. There was shock as well about the magnitude of greed that drove land and housing speculation. There was apprehension about the accelerating pace of social change. There was anxiety about the loss of traditional ways of life, and what that loss would mean for the national culture, the national character, the survival of the nation itself.⁶

From the middle years of the nineteenth century, these anxieties, their causes, and the newly evolving structure of life in the city, became the focus of a range of intellectual

⁶ Anthony Sutcliffe, *Towards the Planned City: Germany, Britain, the United States, and France, 1780-1914* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1981).

investigations which have since come to be seen as the formative stages of modern sociology. The development of sociology as an independent academic field is closely bound up with the rise of the modern metropolis. It would, in fact, be no exaggeration to say that the rise of the city created modern sociology.

Thematizing Urban Growth and Change

The transformation of German cities in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has been theorized in terms of structural changes occurring on three levels, *Verstädterung*, *Urbanisierung*, and *Urbanität* – the growth of cities, the process of urbanization, and the development of urbanity or urbanism as a condition of being.⁷ These categories provide a useful means for describing the history of the modern city with increasing degrees of abstraction and theoretical distance. *Verstädterung* refers to the physical and technical markers of the city. The term captures the demographic facts themselves – the conspicuous growth of population as people moved into urban areas in search of work in the industries and businesses taking hold there. It describes the distinctive, conglomerated morphology of the modern metropolis, a settlement of great spatial breadth with a dense core and rapidly spreading margins, tending to swallow up villages and farmland at the periphery. *Verstädterung* also encompasses the functional aspects of the city, and how the concentration of so many people into such a great area demanded new applications of technologies, such as city-wide electricity and gas services, new iterations in governance,

⁷ Use of the terms *Verstädterung*, *Urbanisierung*, and *Urbanität* is derived from the analysis of Jürgen Reulecke in *Geschichte der Urbanisierung in Deutschland*. See also Hartmut Häußermann, ed., *Großstadt: Soziologische Stichworte* (Opladen: Leske + Budrich, 2000); Hartmut Häußermann and Walter Siebel, *Neue Urbanität* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1987); Hartmut Häußermann, “Schlagwort: Urbanität,” *Architekt* (June 1993): 326-329.

such as municipal oversight of housing and utilities, new communications media, and the need for city planning itself.

Although the German word *Verstädterung* is often used interchangeably with *Urbanisierung*, and both are usually translated as the English “urbanization,” it is useful to preserve connotative distinctions. English has no single term that describes the process of becoming a city so well compressed in *Verstädterung*. Although morphologically similar, the term “citified” alludes not to environmental changes but to an alteration in personality and comportment – something akin more to urbanity. “Urbanization” is itself something of a neologism. It was coined in 1888 to describe the formation of the very type of city under discussion here. Urbanization infers a level of complexity and interaction between elements not captured in *Verstädterung*. Even a medieval city could undergo *Verstädterung*; only cities from the nineteenth century onward could be urbanized. Urbanization was a process at once quantitative and qualitative, demographic and cultural, economic and technological, spatial and behavioral. It involved the rise of a more complex class society, as well as the possibility of moving between social strata. It entailed a formalization of relationships between the individual and the entities of control, documentation, and commerce that marked out daily life – in short, the rise of bureaucracy. The proliferation of mass media created new kinds of social relationships, communities bound not by spatial proximity, but by common interests – by political affiliations, what one read, what one wore, the kind of music one listened to.

Urbanization in this period was inextricably connected to the processes and institutions of industrialization. It was, after all, the possibility of work in factories, perhaps steady work, perhaps better paid work, that drew people to the cities from the farms, villages,

and small towns. Rationalized production and mass manufacture spawned a new, more regulated orientation to labor, and a corollary elaboration of leisure as a category of everyday experience, and as a subject of sociological inquiry. The structural changes wrought by industrialization and urbanization defined modernization. It would be more accurate to say that modernization produced urbanization. As historian Elisabeth Pfeil observed, “The rise of the city is both cause and consequence of modernization.”⁸

Urbanität, urbanity, describes a kind of comportment associated with city living:

sophisticated, cultured, and as is inferred by the term “citified,” perhaps also something that is inauthentic and superficially acquired.⁹ In the age of technological innovation, urbanization engendered new kinds of spatial and temporal relationships. Space in this analysis means not only a dimensional realm but also experiential and communicative spheres of action.¹⁰ Conditioned by the anonymity, uncertainty, and fluidity of social relationships, and the dynamic boundaries between the public and private spheres, the everyday experience of living under the conditions of urbanization produced *Urbanität*,

⁸ Elisabeth Pfeil, *Großstadtforschung. Entwicklung und gegenwärtiger Stand* (Hannover: Jänecke, 1972); cited in Reulecke, *Geschichte der Urbanisierung*, 68.

⁹ The concept “Urbanität,” in the critical sense used here was developed by Edgar Salin in 1961 to refer to the character of urban life emerging in the cities of the Enlightenment. See *Erneuerung unserer Städte* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960). Since that time, the concept has been widely used in German urbanism studies, although it has become fashionable to bemoan the imprecision with which it is applied. Salin himself has renounced its critical currency, saying urbanity is a category of historical experience that cannot exist in the era of mass culture. See Edgar Salin, “Von der Urbanität zur ‘Urbanistik’,” *Kyklos* 23 (1970). In a late twentieth-century debate that forms interesting parallels to the arguments about authentic and inauthentic *Gemeinschaft* in the late Kaiserreich, “Urbanität” became the focus of discussion about legitimate and corrupted forms of urban planning. Critics focused on facile usages of the term, particularly in the promotional arenas of urban planning, where merely stating a goal of urbane development seemed sufficient to win praise for foresight, sophistication, and community-building, when in fact what was at issue was the “Inszenierung” or staging of urban life. Against what was seen as a false construction, historians and critics have argued that true urbanity must of necessity develop over time, that it must be the “product of social processes,” that it is variable in different places and times, and that it is not a pure essence, but rather a combination of dynamic, chaotic elements. See Werner Durth, *Die Inszenierung des Alltagswelt* (Braunschweig and Wiesbaden: Vieweg, 1977), 161-171; Häußermann and Siebel, *Neue Urbanität*; Häußermann “Schlagwort: Urbanität;” and Thomas Sieverts, *Zwischenstadt zwischen Ort und Welt. Raum und Zeit, Stadt und Land* (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1997), 32-37.

¹⁰ Konrad Litz, “Theorie einer Raumgeschichte,” *Die Alte Stadt* 9 (1982): 52-76.

urbanity. This is the condition of modern life, "suffused with the sense of the fleeting, the ephemeral, the fragmentary, the contingent,"¹¹ but also the realm of heightened cultural and political engagement, of the public sphere.¹² In the iterations that will be most important to this study, Urbanität in late Wilhelmine Germany was defined by social scientists and cultural observers as the mentalities and conditions of lived experience that fostered new senses of self, and new senses of one's relationship to society. In the parlance of the time, what was taking place was an internalization of the city, as inhabitants adapted to new modes of behavior, thinking, and response.¹³ While Verstädterung and urbanization are largely phenomena of fact and material objects, Urbanität shades into the domains of perception and performance. Urban planning and architecture create the enclosed spaces of streets and plazas, parks and courtyards, which comprise the settings for urban life. Through the intellectual and aesthetic representations of urbanity, urbanization is enfolded into modernism and becomes the subject of art and

¹¹ David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 11.

¹² The defining formulation of the concept of the public sphere presented by Habermas in 1962 has since been extended into many realms of historical examinations of architecture and planning. See Jürgen Habermas, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit* (Darmstadt and Neuwied: Hermann Luchterhand, 1962); and the subsequent critical essays in Craig Calhoun, ed., *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992); as well as the Oskar Negt and Alexander Kluge, *Public Sphere and Experience: Toward an Analysis of the Bourgeois and Proletarian Public Sphere* (1972; Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993). For general discussion of the development of the German cultural sphere, see Christa Bürger, Peter Bürger, and Jochen Schulte-Sasse, eds., *Aufklärung und literarische Öffentlichkeit* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1980); and Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, vol. 1, *Vom Feudalismus des Alten Reiches bis zur defensiven Modernisierung der Reformära, 1700-1815* (Munich: Beck, 1989), 303-331, 520-546; and idem., *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, vol. 3, *Von der "Deutschen Revolution" bis zum Beginn des Ersten Weltkrieges, 1849-1914* (Munich: Beck, 1995).

¹³ For an overview of Wilhelmine and Weimar discourse, see Lothar Müller, "Modernität, Nervosität und Sachlichkeit. Das Berlin der Jahrhundertwende als Hauptstadt der 'neuen Zeit'," in *Mythos Berlin. Zur Wahrnehmungsgeschichte einer industriellen Metropole* (Berlin: Ästhetik und Kommunikation, 1987), 79-92; for a study from the standpoint of the history of everyday life, see Gottfried Korff, "Mentalität und Kommunikation in der Großstadt. Berliner Notizen zur 'inneren' Urbanisierung," in *Großstadt. Aspekte empirischer Kulturforschung*, ed. Theodor Kohlmann and Hermann Bausinger (Berlin: Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, 1985), 343-361.

literature.¹⁴ Through art and literature, the city earns its reputation as the theater of modernity, with scenes of street life, traffic, the factory, tenements, and the amusements of leisure time. Although seemingly cast here as a condition of the middle classes, urbanization also engendered specifically working-class forms of urbanity in these years.¹⁵ The debate about what the nature of that culture was, and concerns about whether the emerging forms and expressions were socially appropriate and politically safe, were central questions for the emerging social sciences.

Sociology in the Late Wilhelmine Era

The development of the field of sociology in Germany from the nineteenth century into the twentieth has conventionally been cast as a saga of four generations. The first generation comprised the founders of the historical school of economics, led by Wilhelm Roscher (1817-1894), Bruno Hildebrand (1812-1886), and Karl Knies (1821-1898). Emerging in the period just before 1848 and dominating the field through the 1870s, they were concerned with the impact of political and cultural forces on economic change.¹⁶ Ultimately they hoped their work, focused on discovering the underlying historical laws that shaped economic development, would support a scientific approach to political

¹⁴ For treatments of the metropolis in art, see Wibke Andresen, *Darstellung des städtischen Lebens in der Malerei des späten 19. Jahrhunderts* (Munich: Tuduv-Verlag, 1987); and Jost Hermand, "Das Bild der 'großen Stadt' im Expressionismus," in *Die Unwirklichkeit der Städte. Großstadtdarstellungen zwischen Moderne und Postmoderne*, ed. Klaus R. Scherpe, (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rohwohlt, 1988), 61-79. For literature, see Sabina Becker, *Urbanität und Moderne. Studien zur Großstadtswahrnehmung in der deutschen Literatur 1900-1930* (St. Ingbert: Röhrig, 1993).

¹⁵ Häußermann and Siebel, *Neue Urbanität*, pp. 239-241.

¹⁶ Ulla G. Schäfer, *Historische Nationalökonomie und Sozialstatistik als Gesellschaftswissenschaften. Forschungen zur Vorgeschichte der theoretischen Soziologie und der empirischen Sozialforschung in Deutschland in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau, 1971); Woodruff D. Smith, *Politics and the Sciences of Culture in Germany, 1840-1920* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 174-179; Jürgen Reulecke, "Die Anfänge der organisierte Sozialreform in Deutschland," in *Weder Kommunismus noch Kapitalismus. Bürgerlich Sozialreform in Deutschland vom Vormärz bis zur Ära Adenauer*, ed. Rüdiger vom Bruch (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1985), 21-59.

governance as well. That orientation toward elaborating historical arguments to explain modern social and political phenomena would become one of the distinguishing features of German sociology. The second generation, led by Gustav Schmoller (1838-1917), Lujo Brentano (1844-1931), Karl Bücher (1847-1930), and Adolf Wagner (1835-1917) – all also historical economists – became more visibly involved in social issues of their day. The instrument of their activism was the Verein für Sozialpolitik, founded in 1872. Under the aegis of the Verein, they sponsored social research with the explicit objective of encouraging the state to ameliorate the social problems and inequities that were the ineluctable fellow-travelers of modernization.¹⁷ The third generation, active in the late Wilhelmine period and the principal sociologists dealt with in this study, comprised the scholars who shaped the practices and theoretical foundations of modern sociology – Ferdinand Tönnies (1855-1936), Georg Simmel (1858-1918), Werner Sombart (1863-1941), and Max Weber (1864-1920).¹⁸ Their principal professional institution was the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie, founded in 1909; their defining idea, the conception of a “value free” social science.¹⁹ Though no strangers to political activism, the members of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie advocated a sociology that was

¹⁷ Irmela Gorges, *Sozialforschung in Deutschland 1872-1914. Gesellschaftliche Einflüsse auf Themen- und Methodenwahl des Vereins für Sozialpolitik* (Frankfurt a.M.: Hain, 1986); Marie-Louis Plessen, *Die Wirksamkeit des Vereins für Sozialpolitik von 1872-1890. Studien in Katheder- und Staatssozialismus* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1975); Dieter Lindenlaub, *Richtungskämpfe im Verein für Sozialpolitik*, vol. 2 (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1967).

¹⁸ In addition to literature on specific individuals and ideas cited in subsequent chapters, important overviews of the history of German sociology in the late Wilhelmine empire include Otthein Rammstedt, *Simmel und die frühe Soziologie: Nähe und Distanz zu Durkheim, Tönnies und Weber* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1988); Wolfgang J. Mommsen, ed., *Max Weber und seine Zeitgenossen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988); Harry Liebersohn, *Fate and Utopia in German Sociology, 1870-1923* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1988); David Frisby, *Fragments of Modernity: Theories of Modernity in the Work of Simmel, Kracauer, and Benjamin* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1986); Dirk Käsler, *Die frühe deutsche Soziologie 1909 bis 1934 und ihre Entstehungsmilieus. Eine wissenschaftlichsoziologische Untersuchung* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1984); and Arthur Mitzman, *Sociology and Estrangement: Three Sociologists of Imperial Germany* (New York: Knopf, 1973).

¹⁹ Paul Honigsheim, “Die Gründung der Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie in ihren geistesgeschichtlichen Zusammenhängen,” *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 11 (1959): 3-10.

in theory at least unswayed by personal political leanings. The policy was an explicit criticism of the ways in which inquiries, and particularly *findings*, of the Verein für Sozialpolitik had conformed to the interests of established powers. The fourth generation, made up of scholars such as Alfred Weber (1868-1958), Franz Oppenheimer, (1864-1943), Leopold von Wiese (1876-1969), and Alfred Vierkandt (1867-1953), were active in the years between the wars and after World War II. While their subjects and methods assumed the lineaments of modern sociology, their commitment to using sociological analysis as a tool for social and political reform retained the force of their forebears.²⁰

In the years under consideration here, the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, sociology was still far from being an established academic field.²¹ There were no sociology appointments in German universities until 1918. Among the founding figures of the modern school, only Max Weber enjoyed sustained academic employment (interrupted by bouts of ill health), although his writings and ideas were by no means dominant in the sociological discussion of the pre-war period, and his early death in Munich in 1920 from pneumonia cut short his life's work. Weber began his career as a lecturer in Roman commercial law at Berlin University, and then intermittently taught political economy at Freiburg and Heidelberg from 1893 to 1903. Although much distracted by the war and the events of the revolution, between 1918 and his death in June

²⁰ Volker Kruse, *Soziologie und "Gegenwartskrise." Die Zeitdiagnosen Franz Oppenheimers und Alfred Webers: Ein Beitrag zur historischen Soziologie der Weimarer Republik* (Wiesbaden: Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag, 1990); Irmela Gorges, *Sozialforschung in der Weimarer Republik, 1918-1933: gesellschaftliche Einflüsse auf Themen- und Methodenwahl des Vereins für Socialpolitik, der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie und des Kölner Forschungsinstituts für Sozialwissenschaften* (Frankfurt a.M.: Hain, 1986); Roland Eckert, *Kultur, Zivilisation und Gesellschaft. Die Geschichtstheories Alfred Webers* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1970); Dieter Haselbach, *Franz Oppenheimer: Soziologie, Geschichtsphilosophie und Politik des "liberalen Sozialismus"* (Opladen: Leske + Budrich, 1985).

²¹ Dirk Käsler, *Die frühe deutsche Soziologie 1909 bis 1934*; Rüdiger vom Bruch, "Bürgerliche Sozialreform im deutschen Kaiserreich," in *Weder Kommunismus noch Kapitalismus*, 61-180.

1920, Weber taught sociology in Vienna and Munich.²² Werner Sombart began his career in 1888 as legal advisor to the Bremen Chamber of Commerce, and then moved in 1890 to an associate professorship in economics and statistics at Breslau. His first teaching job in Berlin was taken in 1906 at a private business school. Sombart was finally appointed to a chair in economics at Berlin University in December 1917.²³ In spite of his seeming marginality to the academic realm, however, Sombart was among the most widely read, most well known sociologist in the late Wilhelmine period. Ferdinand Tönnies, on the other hand, while respected among social science peers, struggled for over twenty years to gain a steady university position. He was named *Privatdozent*, a lecturer to whom students directly paid fees, in the philosophy faculty at the University of Kiel in 1881. He only gained a full chair there, in the department of economics and statistics, in 1913, finally being named professor emeritus in sociology at Kiel in 1921, at the advanced age of sixty-six.²⁴ Georg Simmel likewise did not have a settled university position until late in life. He was *Privatdozent* at the University of Berlin in the department of philosophy for sixteen years before being given the largely honorary title of *Ausserordentlicher Professor*, adjunct lecturer, in 1901. He finally was named to a chair in philosophy in 1914 at the University of Strasbourg, four years before his death.²⁵ There are many reasons for the delays and denials of recognition. Sombart and Tönnies had controversial socialist affiliations. Simmel's distinctive, literary approach to sociology won him a following among students, but fewer fans among the older professors, who also opposed

²² Dirk Käsler, *Einführung in das Studium Max Webers* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1979), 10-25.

²³ Bernhard vom Brocke, "Werner Sombart 1863-1941: Capitalism – Socialism – His Life, Works and Influence," in *Werner Sombart (1863-1941) – Social Scientist*, vol. 1, *His Life and Work*, ed. Jürgen K. Backhaus (Marburg: Metropolis Verlag, 1996), 19-102.

²⁴ Ferdinand Tönnies, "Ferdinand Tönnies," in Raymund Schmidt, *Philosophie der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, vol. III (Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1922), 199-234.

²⁵ David Frisby, *Georg Simmel* (Chichester, Sussex: Ellis Horwood, 1984), 21-44.

his appointment to a chair because he had Jewish ancestors, although Simmel himself was baptized Protestant, had baptized Protestant parents, and was married to a Protestant.²⁶ The lag between scholarly vigor and university recognition was not exclusively an issue for sociology in these years. Other fields, such as anthropology, ethnography, and social geography, likewise emerging from the interstices of history and economics, philosophy and psychology, were also struggling to be recognized in their own right.²⁷

Historical Methods in Sociology

The field of modern sociology emerged in Germany around 1900 at the crux of wide-ranging debates about methodologies. As Volker Kruse has pointed out, the frequency and intensity of debates about social science methods around 1900 were emblematic of a paradigmatic change in the field.²⁸ The debates marked a passage from *historische Nationalökonomie* to *historische Soziologie*, from historical national economy to historical sociology. At the generational level, the changing paradigm manifested itself in the younger generation of Weber, Tönnies, Simmel, and Sombart separating themselves from the dominant Verein für Sozialpolitik to form the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie in 1909. At a deeper level, what was at stake was a search for a new theory of knowledge and appropriate methods for the study of cultural phenomena. Fritz Ringer

²⁶ Liebersohn, *Fate and Utopia in German Sociology*, 152.

²⁷ Anthony Oberschall, *Empirical Social Research in Germany 1848-1914* (Paris: Mouton, 1965), 13.

²⁸ Volker Kruse, "Von der historischen Nationalökonomie zur historischen Soziologie. Ein Paradigmenwechsel in den deutschen Sozialwissenschaften um 1900," *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 19, no. 3 (June 1990), 149-165. Kruse applies Kuhnian terms, while acknowledging the limitations of using Kuhn's arguments, first articulated with regard for the natural and physical sciences, for the social sciences. See also Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970); Gary Gutting, ed., *Paradigms and Revolutions: Appraisals and Applications of Thomas Kuhn's Philosophy of Science* (Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 1980); Werner Simon, *Erkenntnistheorie oder Pragmatik? Das soziologische Verwendungsproblem bei Weber, Popper, Kuhn und Rorty* (Vienna: Passagen, 2000).

defined this paradigmatic change on the eve of the Weimar Republic in other terms. Rather than strictly generational, Ringer saw it as a split between a cultural pessimist "orthodox majority" and realist reforming "modernists." He emphasized that the latter group, in which we would situate the founders of the *Gesellschaft für Soziologie*, "held one definite belief in common. This was that the German intellectual heritage had to be systematically reexamined in the light of modern conditions' socially indefensible accretions that had to be stripped away, so that the vital core of the tradition could be transmitted to a wider audience in an inescapably more democratic age."²⁹

In broadly intellectual terms, the methodological debate in the social sciences around 1900 sought to define analytical methods for historical sociology at the crossroads of the *Naturwissenschaften* (natural sciences) and the *Geisteswissenschaften* (the intellectual sciences, the humanities). While in large part rejecting the application of biological theories and methods to social phenomena as in the Positivism of Auguste Comte, Herbert Spencer, and the leading German advocates for a positivist sociology, Paul von Lilienfeld and Albert Schäffle,³⁰ the developing field of historical sociology looked more to concepts of knowledge and experience developed by philosophers such as Wilhelm Dilthey, Wilhelm Windelband, and Heinrich Rickert. Dilthey in his *Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften* (1883) and related works, endeavored to establish new methodological foundations for the humanities, in the process drawing an ontological distinction between nature and history.³¹ Windelband, in turn, rejected Dilthey's over-

²⁹ Fritz Ringer, *Max Weber: An Intellectual Biography* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 16.

³⁰ Principal treatises on positivist sociology include Paul von Lilienfeld, *Sozialwissenschaft der Zukunft* (1873-1881); and Albert Schäffle, *Bau und Leben des sozialen Körpers* (1875-1878).

³¹ Wilhelm Dilthey, "Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften" (1883), in *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1959), 3-120. See also Kruse, "Von der historischen Nationalökonomie zur

arching dualism. In his *Geschichte und Naturwissenschaft* (1894), he focused rather on the level of methodologies. Windelband distinguished the *Gesetzwissenschaften*, those sciences and field of study that focused on nomothetic forms of knowledge, that is on knowledge dealing with universal and invariant laws, from the *Ereigniswissenschaften*, those fields of study that dealt with idiographic forms of knowledge, that is, particular, concrete, and singular materials and events.³² In furtherance of Windelband's thesis, Heinrich Rickert in *Die Grenzen des naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbild* (1902) focused on the significance of the unique and particular in the cultural sciences, versus the regular and general principles in the natural sciences, concluding that the cultural sciences were not amenable to laws of development.³³

In this brief overview of what were deep and far-reaching explorations of the character of knowledge and research, it is possible to see the social sciences in Germany negotiating the methodological territories between natural science, economics, and most manifestly, and often most problematically, history. As will be apparent from the prevalence of *Entwicklungsgeschichten*, developmental-historical modes of analysis, in works discussed in this study, the separation of the "modernist" generation of sociologists from positivist habits of mind was not as complete as some recent historians might wish. In shaping narratives of the rise of modern sociology, the teleological impulse that makes all histories arrive at the present has tended to privilege Max Weber's rejection of Positivism

historischen Soziologie," 151; and Pietro Rossi, *Vom Historismus zur historischen Sozialwissenschaft* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1987).

³² Wilhelm Windelband, *Geschichte und Naturwissenschaft* (Strasbourg: J.H.E. Heitz, 1904). See also Ringer, *Max Weber*, p. 27.

³³ Heinrich Rickert, *Die Grenzen des naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbild* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1902). Max Weber specifically addressed (and rejected) the application of positivist and developmental-historical methods to social phenomena in "Roscher und Knies und die logischen Probleme der historischen Nationalökonomie" (1903-1906), in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*, 4th ed. (Stuttgart: Mohr, 1973).

(and to elevate Weber as a historical figure generally) over the more equivocal – and it should be noted, for the period of the Wilhelmine era, more representative – relationship that Tönnies had to thinkers like Spencer and Schäffle. Nevertheless, the progenitors of the sociological modern, Sombart, Tönnies, Weber, and Simmel, sought to define a new kinds of historical social theory. They were keen to outline schemes of historical development that led to modernity and to define dominant characteristics and general principle of various historical periods. These characteristics were distilled into theoretical typologies, the heuristic categories of analysis Max Weber termed "ideal types."

Sociology as an Instrument of Social Reform

In addition to the rise of sociology as a distinct and recognized field of study in the academic realm, there was a concurrent professionalization of sociological associations devoted to empirical research, social reform, charitable works, and political advocacy. An overview of some of these organizations provides a useful map for understanding how these organizations served as conduits, bringing the ideas and theories of the social sciences to bear on the social reform efforts undertaken in architecture and planning.

Early empirical studies of the city developed out of a long tradition of statistics in Germany. For a century or more, municipalities, enterprising individuals, and government agencies had been gathering and publishing of numerical data about population, incomes, agricultural production, and trade, activities that accelerated with founding of the Reich under Prussian leadership in 1871. In the universities, statistics was a branch of political economy, and therefore had an important role in the proto-sociological studies born out of that field. The political-economic orientation of founding

professorial members of the Verein für Sozialpolitik ensured that surveys and statistical analysis would be foundations of that organization's work. In 1875 the Verein carried out its first large survey, conducted on behalf of the Reichstag, to assess the impact of factory legislation passed in 1872-73. The Verein's study was the first nation-wide examination of social conditions in newly unified Germany. In the following two decades, the Verein focused largely on surveys of rural problems, including farm-labor, cottage industries, and rural economic systems. There was as great an agrarian crisis in the late Wilhelmine Empire as there was an urban crisis, and both stemmed from similar causes – the shift toward industry in the national economy, the migration of rural workers toward the cities.³⁴ Germany's anti-socialist laws, in effect from 1878 to 1890, suppressed socialist and trade-union activities in the industrialized cities. Controversies about socialism among the membership of the Verein, combined with anti-socialist pressure from the Bismarck administration, put studies of strictly industrial subjects out of bounds for the organization before 1890. The problems of housing in the growing cities provoked less contentious debate. The Verein für Sozialpolitik published two major studies of the workers' housing in the cities. The first, *Die Wohnungsnot der ärmeren Klassen in deutschen Großstädten und Vorschläge zu deren Abhilfe* (the housing needs of the poorer classes and proposals for their remediation), published in 1886, was the first national survey of living conditions of the poorer working classes in Germany.³⁵ The study focused on quantitative topics such as mortality statistics, inhabitants per dwelling, space per inhabitant, and the relationships of the residents, specifically whether the dwelling

³⁴ See Orville Lee, "Cultural Fields, Rural Politics, and the Discourse in the Kaiserreich: Culture in the Construction of an Agrarian Ideology in Wilhelmine Germany, 1871-1914" (Ph.D. diss., University of California Berkeley, 1996).

³⁵ "Die Wohnungsnot der ärmeren Klassen in deutschen Großstädten und Vorschläge zu deren Abhilfe," *Schriften des Vereins für Sozialpolitik* 30-31 (1886).

sheltered a single family or whether there were boarders of any kind. Qualitative questions – access to fresh air and light, the presence of heat, running water, bathing facilities, and sewer connections – formed the basis for most of the Verein's recommendations about improving the lot of inner-city dwellers. In compiling the study, the Verein conducted new research, but it also relied on statistics compiled by the hygiene reform societies which had been founded by doctors and municipal officials in the wake of the 1866 cholera outbreaks. Groups such as the Niederrheinischer Verein für öffentliche Gesundheitspflege, founded in Düsseldorf in 1869, and the Deutscher Verein für öffentliche Gesundheitspflege, founded in 1870 in Frankfurt, gathered information about urban living conditions to support a wide range of advocacy efforts.³⁶

Although less instrumental in the development of sociology as an autonomous discipline, a number of other reform organizations carried out studies of the industrialized urban milieu. Active from 1844 until the eve of the First World War, the Centralverein für das Wohl der arbeitenden Klassen was established by businessmen, industrialists, lawyers, journalists, and government officials, primarily from Berlin and the Rhine-Westfalen region.³⁷ As befits the era of its founding – just after the Silesian weaver strikes, amidst the republican ferment leading up to 1848 – the initial agenda of the Centralverein was motivated both by fears of social unrest and by debates about the role of the state in social problems. At the heart of the group's work was a belief that what was good for business was good for the country, and what was good for the worker was good for

³⁶ Marianne Rodenstein, "Mehr Licht, mehr Luft," 84-96; Juan Rodriguez-Lores, "Stadthygiene und Städtebau: Zur Dialektik von Ordnung und Unordnung in den Auseinandersetzungen des Deutschen Vereins für öffentliche Gesundheitspflege 1868-1901," in *Stadtbaureform 1865-1900*, ed. Juan Rodriguez-Lores and Gerhard Fehl, (Hamburg: Christians, 1985); Ladd, *Urban Planning and Civic Order*, 38-76.

³⁷ Jürgen Reulecke, *Sozialer Frieden durch Soziale Reform. Der Centralverein für das Wohl der arbeitenden Klassen in der Frühindustrialisierung* (Wuppertal: Peter Hammer, 1983).

business. By improving the working and living conditions of industrial laborers, the Centralverein hoped to lessen the attractions of socialism. Their mission was not purely charitable; they sought to foster working class self-sufficiency. Their method was informational and organizational. Contributions to the Centralverein's journal, *Der Arbeiterfreund*, reported on factory and living conditions, as well as innovative reform efforts being undertaken throughout Germany and Europe. A network of local Centralverein committees helped establish cooperative worker savings banks, disability and death insurance, old age pensions, and education initiatives.

Founded in 1890, the Evangelisch-Soziale Kongress comprised church leaders, professors, and government officials. The group's membership in the early years overlapped substantially with that of the Verein für Sozialpolitik.³⁸ While sharing the Verein's position that social policy must be founded in facts and careful analysis, the Evangelisch-Soziale Kongress's studies and policy positions were guided by a larger, over-arching objective: to counteract the secularizing effects of mass industrial society and to re-establish Protestant religious faith as the basis of social and political action. The Evangelisch-Soziale Kongress was one of a number of denominational reform organizations set up in the years following the lifting of the anti-socialist laws. Its Catholic counterpart was the mass-membership Volksverein für das katholische Deutschland.³⁹ In an environment where socialism was equated with atheism, these groups defined a morally and politically safe ground from which to extend the traditional

³⁸ Harry Liebersohn, *Religion and Industrial Society: The Protestant Social Congress in Wilhelmine Germany*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 76, no. 6 (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1986); Gottfried Kretschmar, *Der Evangelisch-Soziale Kongress. Der Deutsche Protestantismus und die soziale Frage* (Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1972).

³⁹ Horstwalter Heitzner, *Der Volksverein für das katholische Deutschland im Kaiserreich 1890-1918* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald Verlag, 1979); Georg Schoelen, ed., *Der Volksvereine für das katholische Deutschland 1890-1933* (Mönchengladbach: Stadtbibliothek, 1974).

charitable work of the churches to include worker self-help and education initiatives, and, in the case of the Evangelisch-Soziale Kongress, to push for state intervention in labor issues.

In 1901 an association organized overtly to lobby for state industrial policy and support of worker welfare was established in Berlin. Chaired by the Prussian trade minister Hans Hermann Freiherr Berlepsch from its founding until 1920, the Gesellschaft für Sozialreform included among its founding ranks many representatives from the Verein für Sozialpolitik, including Gustav Schmoller, Lujo Brentano, Heinrich Herkner, Ferdinand Tönnies, and Werner Sombart.⁴⁰ The Gesellschaft für Sozialreform advocated a middle-of-the-road development for the social-democratic party, the so-called “third way” between rampant communism and unbridled capitalism.⁴¹ In practice, this meant supporting self-help initiatives and lobbying through the press and social agencies to protect legal and political rights and quality of the working class. In 1904 the Gesellschaft für Sozialreform established the Bureau für Sozialpolitik in Berlin, which served as an education, lecture, and publishing center for many of reform groups active in the areas of worker rights and social-democratic politics.⁴²

As housing and property-rights were increasingly placed at the center of the social debates, the number of organizations dedicated to advancing reforms proliferated. The Deutsche Vereine für Armenpflege und Wohltätigkeit, founded in 1882, grew out of

⁴⁰ Ursula Ratz, *Sozialreform und Arbeiterschaft. Die “Gesellschaft für Sozialreform” und die sozialdemokratische Arbeiterbewegung von der Jahrhundertwende bis zum Ausbruch des Ersten Weltkrieges* (Berlin: Colloquium, 1980).

⁴¹ Rolf Neuhaus. “Der dritte Weg: Bürgerliche Sozialreform zwischen Reaktion und Revolution. Die Gesellschaft für Sozialreform 1901-1914,” *Sozialer Fortschritt* 28 (1979): 205-212.

⁴² Ursula Ratz, *Sozialreform und Arbeiterschaft*, pp. 71-76.

discussions on the housing question in the Verein für Sozialpolitik.⁴³ The Berlin-based Verein zur Verbesserung der kleinen Wohnungen began in 1888 as an advocacy organization and soon began to build model tenements. The Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen, dedicated to promoting industry-based worker welfare and housing, was founded in 1891. In addition to reform groups focusing their efforts in specific cities and regions, the housing and planning efforts of the 1890s through the First World War were marked by the rise of cooperative housing finance and construction associations, the Baugenossenschaften.⁴⁴

By the time the Verein für Sozialpolitik published its second major study of housing conditions in 1901, *Neue Untersuchung über die Wohnungsfrage in Deutschland und im Ausland* (New research into the housing question in Germany and abroad) there were literally hundreds of studies and proposals for solving what had become known as the “Wohnungsfrage,” the housing question.⁴⁵ This was the latest iteration in a series of “questions” that had been used to frame social and political concerns and reforming impulses since the consequences of industrialization had first been problematized in the mid nineteenth century. These telescoping concerns – Sozialfrage, Arbeiterfrage, Wohnungsfrage – unfolded in what was understood by many reformers and architects as a progressively more precise definition of the problems at issue. So the general “social

⁴³ For background on the housing reform organizations active in the 1890s, see Nicholas Bullock and James Read, *The Movement for Housing Reform in Germany and France, 1840-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 82, 228-229; and Zimmermann, *Von der Wohnungsfrage zur Wohnungspolitik*, 108-111, 131-154.

⁴⁴ See Klaus Novy, ed., *Genossenschafts-Bewegung. Zur Geschichte und Zukunft der Wohnreform* (Berlin: Transit, 1983); Helmut Faust, *Geschichte der Genossenschaftsbewegung. Ursprung und Aufbruch der Genossenschaften in England, Frankreich und Deutschland so wie ihre weitere Entwicklung im deutschen Sprachraum* (Frankfurt a.M.: Knapp, 1977).

⁴⁵ “Neue Untersuchung über die Wohnungsfrage in Deutschland und im Ausland,” *Schriften des Vereins für Sozialpolitik* 94-97 (1901).

question” of the mid nineteenth century became the class-specific “worker question” of the 1880s. By the 1890s, the declaration “Die Arbeiterfrage ist die Wohnungsfrage” – the worker question is the housing question – suggested both a more exact social and spatial analysis as well as a promising path for practical solutions. The form and rationale for some of those solutions will be discussed more completely in the following chapters dealing with design of dwellings and developments in town planning. In the context of understanding how cities and the social sciences in a sense grew up together; however, it is important to note the class dynamics at issue in these early empirical sociological studies of the urban environment. There was a class of examiners – the academics, businessmen, churchmen, and government officials who comprised the membership of the sociological societies and reform agencies. And there was a subject – the newly evolving industrial working class, an object of study and concern often perceived as so remote from the everyday experience of the reformers as to constitute an anthropological other.⁴⁶ The reformers saw the crowding of urban workers into poor housing as a moral as well as a physical and political threat to society. The moral questions raised by poor housing conditions increased the interest the subject had for such a large portion of the middle class, as evidenced by the plethora of pamphlets and the popularity of lectures on the topic in the latter decades of the nineteenth century.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Such an analogy suggests the relationship of reformers to working class was one of colonization. See Sam Bass Warner, Jr., “The Management of Multiple Urban Images,” in *The Pursuit of Urban History*, ed. Derek Fraser, and Anthony Sutcliffe (London: Arnold, 1983), 388; and Anthony McElligott, “‘Slum’: Encounters with the Urban ‘Other’,” in *The German Urban Experience 1900-1945: Modernity and Crisis* (London: Routledge, 2001), 65.

⁴⁷ Rodenstein, “*Mehr Licht, mehr Luft*,” 121.

Defining Class in the Wilhelmine Era

Conventionally, these efforts to mold the behavior of the working classes through their environment have been presented as a matter of the educated bourgeoisie — the *Bildungsbürgertum* – acculturating the urban working classes to middle-class norms and values.⁴⁸ Among other things, this “disciplining of society” assumed that inculcating fine feelings for home, family, and property would be key to developing a wholesome working class culture.⁴⁹ Beyond the faith in the power of private property to elevate humanity, beyond the concerns for maintaining healthy and productive laborers, beyond the worries about sexual improprieties in the close reaches of working classes housing, the disciplining effort was also a form of training, designed to turn the working classes from the culture that was taking shape of its own accord in the poorer quarters of the cities: working-class culture, proletariat culture. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century proletarianization meant the rise of socialism, the spread of labor unions, and the

⁴⁸ On the bourgeoisie in Germany, see Jonathan Sperber, "Bürger, Bürgertum, Bürgerlichkeit, Bürgerliche Gesellschaft: Studies of the German (Upper) Middle Class and Its Sociocultural World," *The Journal of Modern History* 89 (June 1997): 271-297; Jürgen Kocka and Allen Mitchell, eds., *Bourgeois Society in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Oxford: Berg, 1993); Warren G Breckman, "Disciplining Consumption: The Debate about Luxury in Wilhelmine Germany, 1890-1914," *Journal of Social History* 24, no. 3 (Spring 1991): 485-505; Richard J. Evans and David Blackbourn, eds., *The German Bourgeoisie: Essays on the social history of the German middle class from the late eighteenth to the early twentieth century* (New York: Routledge, 1990); Werner Conze and Jürgen Kocka, eds., *Bildungsbürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1985); Jürgen Kocka, ed., *Bürger und Bürgerlichkeit im 19. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987). On the working classes, see Gerhard A. Ritter and Klaus Tenfelde, *Arbeiter im Deutschen Kaiserreich, 1871 bis 1914* (Bonn: Dietz, 1992); and Jürgen Kocka, *Arbeitsverhältnisse und Arbeiterexistenzen. Grundlagen der Klassenbildung im 19. Jahrhundert* (Bonn: Dietz, 1990). On the development of the middle class managerial classes and white-collar workers, see Jürgen Kocka, *Die Angestellten in der deutschen Geschichte 1850-1980* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981).

⁴⁹ For three approaches to interpreting the design of working-class housing as a strategic element of capitalist business interests, see Juan Rodriguez-Lores, *Sozialer Wohnungsbau in Europa. Die Ursprünge bis 1918: Ideen, Programme, Gesetze* (Basel: Birkhäuser, 1994), pp. 19-24; Renate Kastorff-Viehmann, "Kleinwohnung und Werksiedlung. Zur Erziehung des Arbeiters durch Umweltgestaltung," in *Die Kleinwohnungsfrage. Zu den Ursprüngen des sozialen Wohnungsbaus in Europa*, ed. Juan Rodriguez-Lores and Gerhard Fehl (Hamburg: Christians, 1988), 221-24; and Eduard Führ and Daniel Stemmerich, 'Nach gethaner Arbeit verbelibt im Kreise der Eurigen'. *Bürgerliche Wohnrezepte für Arbeiter zur individuellen und sozialen Formierung im 19. Jahrhundert* (Wuppertal: Peter Hammer, 1985), 18-25.

opening of fissures of conflict and resistance that sought to topple the existing power order. Considering what was known of socialism in theory and practice at that time, it was deemed by many, including most of the reformers discussed above, a dangerous and unproven political order that threatened all known standards, beliefs, and ways of life. "Proletariatization" had an added valence of menace and peril. Used as an appellation for the people (as distinct from the aristocracy) in the French Revolution, since the 1840s in Germany "proletariat" meant the property-less poor, specifically those members of the lower rungs of a working class that spanned from paupers to skilled artisans, and which by no means had a uniform political orientation.⁵⁰ By the latter part of the nineteenth century, the proletariat was specifically understood to be the "industrial proletariat," a class of people inseparable from its ability to serve the manufacturing interests.

Whether technological progress in itself was a good thing, synonymous with historical progress, whether machine work was ennobling, or whether the repetition, uncertain wages and mindlessness of industrial labor turned men into mere cogs in the wheels of capitalism were questions not only for socialist agitators. People at many points along the political spectrum voiced similar concerns. While some reformers set out to integrate the working classes by elevating their cultural tastes and material desires to bourgeois norms – shaping class consciousness through the style of housing, access to art, education, and social advancement – others sought to solve the cultural-economic dynamic along different tracks. How the solution to the problem of proletarianization was expressed depended a great deal on where reformers thought the class had come from, and where

⁵⁰ Jürgen Kocka, *Arbeitsverhältnisse und Arbeiterexistenzen. Grundlagen der Klassenbildung im 19. Jahrhundert* (Bonn: Dietz Nachf., 1990); Wolfgang Kaschuba, *Lebenswelt und Kultur der unterbürgerlichen Schichten im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1990).

they thought it was going. Running counter to our own contemporary interest in class advancement is a notion strikingly present in much of the reform literature of the time, which held that rather than feeding bourgeois cultural tastes to the working classes in homeopathic doses, it was incumbent on the established, educated classes to help the workers to develop their own culture, to take possession of their own interests, to develop their own sense of themselves as a class. These ideas were articulated both in conservative analyses of politics and culture, notably the corporate social theory of W.H. Riehl, as well as in the radical analyses of Karl Marx, with both formulating their hypotheses at about the same time, the middle decades of the nineteenth century.⁵¹ By the end of the nineteenth century, the social and political ideas of Marx and Riehl, the calls for a distinctively working class culture, and growing interest in regional vernaculars and folk revivals converged, with significant ramifications for architecture and community planning.

An emphasis on social reform as a one-way street leading from the bourgeois patriarchy to the impoverished proletariat obscures the complexity of negotiations about class identity actually taking place among those groups. It also overlooks another constellation of class associations relevant to the urbanization and housing debates in this period: the relationship between upper middle-class reformers and the lower middle-class group of shopkeepers and artisans self-identified in this period as the *Mittelstand* and somewhat later in historical analysis as *Kleinbürgertum*.⁵² Blessed with hindsight, post-World War

⁵¹ On Riehl's class theory, see Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl, *Die Bürgerliche Gesellschaft* (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1861), 197-318; Carl Jantke, "Riehls Soziologie des Vierten Standes," *Soziale Welt* (1950/51): 238-254; and Jasper von Altenbockum, *Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl 1823-1897* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1994), 175-187.

⁵² For history of the *Mittelstand* as a class category, see Werner Conze, "Mittelstand," in *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, vol. 4, ed. Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, and Robert Koselleck, (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1978), 49-92; and Karl-Ludwig Ay, "Zur Geschichte des Mittelstandes in Kaiserreich und Republik," *Zeitschrift für*

II analyses have tended to thematize the *Mittelstand* of the late Kaiserreich in developmental strokes, plotting its ultimate evolution into staunch supporters of the Third Reich. As Heinrich-August Winkler's economic studies have shown, small manufacturers, shopkeepers, and hand-workers were indeed as a class disproportionately represented in the ranks of the National Socialist party.⁵³ In tracing the economic and cultural reasons that drove this affiliation, historians have characterized the *Mittelstand* of the late Kaiserreich as a class in a state of decline, in danger of losing economic ground. Threatened on one side by big capital and on the other side by the proletariat, the *Mittelstand* was as disrupted and displaced by the forces of industrialization and urbanization as the working classes.⁵⁴

For observers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, however, the *Mittelstand*, whatever its economic pressures, was a group not in the process of decline but in a state of becoming. In an 1897 lecture before the Evangelisch-Soziale Kongress, Gustav Schmoller described the *Mittelstand* as a growing, characteristically modern manifestation of changing economic conditions.⁵⁵ In a 1909 essay published in Leipzig publisher Quelle and Meyer's popular "Wissenschaft und Bildung" series, the Berlin attorney Johannes Wernicke rejected any definitions of the *Mittelstand* in purely

bayerische Landesgeschichte 37 (1974): 956-62; and David Blackbourn, "The *Mittelstand* in German Society and Politics, 1871-1914," *Social History* 2 (1977): 409-433.

⁵³ Heinrich-August Winkler, *Mittelstand, Demokratie und Nationalsozialismus. Die politische Entwicklung von Handwerk und Kleinhandel in der Weimarer Republik* (Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1972).

⁵⁴ For discussions of the consolidation of *Mittelstand* class identity through shared fears of economic decline, see Hans Mommsen and Winfried Schulze, eds., *Von Elend der Handarbeit. Probleme historischer Unterschichtenforschung* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981); Shulamit Volkov, *The Rise of Popular Anti-modernism in Germany: The Urban Master Artisans, 1873-1896* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978); Robert Gellately, *The Politics of Economic Despair: Shopkeepers and German Politics 1890-1914* (London: Sage, 1974); Annette Leppers-Fögen, *Die deklassierte Klasse. Studien zur Geschichte und Ideologie des Kleinbürgertums* (Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, 1974).

⁵⁵ Gustav Schmoller, *Was verstehen wir unter dem Mittelstande? Hat er im 19. Jahrhundert zu oder abgenommen? Vortrag auf dem 8. Evangelische-Sozialen Kongress in Leipzig am 11. Juni 1897* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897).

economic terms as “anemic and useless.”⁵⁶ Instead, he defined the class in terms of education, comportment, and profession. Because of their “gentleman-like” manners and education, there lay a chasm of difference between the *Mittelstand* and the raw lower working classes, the proletariat. At the same time the *Mittelstand* lacked the property and wealth to be true *Kapitalisten* (a term used interchangeably with *Bürgertum*). Such an analysis follows the standard self-definition of economic class in cultural terms, wherein one is described as belonging by character and educational aspirations, if not true attainments, to the class just above, but fated by economic conditions ever to hover somewhat lower.⁵⁷

Wernicke named an old *Mittelstand*, the traditional self-employed skilled artisans, and a new *Mittelstand*, engaged in technology, business, and manufacturing as higher-level employees and managers – harbingers of Siegfried Kracauer’s *Angestellten* of twenty years later.⁵⁸ From both flanks emerged a *Mittelstand* as concerned as the working classes with consolidating itself as a distinct *Interessengruppe*, an interest group,⁵⁹ with its own rights and role in society.⁶⁰ The *Mittelstand* formed its own social, political, and economic associations. Building upon economic studies of the Middle Ages undertaken

⁵⁶ Johannes Wernicke, *Der Mittelstand und seine wirtschaftliche Lage* (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1909). The Quelle & Meyer pamphlet comprises a popularizing summary of Wernicke’s book, *Kapitalismus und Mittelstandspolitik* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1907). The Wissenschaft und Bildung series, edited by Paul Herre, was designed to provide “instructive and entertaining reading for the lay-person and a suitable means of orientation for the scholar” on topics ranging from contemporary aesthetics to the ancient ice age, from Babylonian culture to plant biology.

⁵⁷ This disparity has been seen as the source of much of the bitterness that drove the *Mittelstand* into the ranks of the Nazis, but then history is often cast as a drama of class resentment. See especially Robert Gellately, *The Politics of Economic Despair*.

⁵⁸ Siegfried Kracauer’s ethnography of *Mittelstand* morals, “Die Angestellten,” was first serialized in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* in 1929. It was subsequently published in book form in 1930 under the title, *Die Angestellten. Aus dem neuesten Deutschland* by Societäts Verlag, Frankfurt a.M. For the publication history, see Inka Mülder-Bach’s introduction to the English edition, *The Salaried Masses: Duty and Distraction in Weimar Germany* (London: Verso, 1998), 3-4.

⁵⁹ By around 1900 the terms “Stand,” “Klasse,” and “Interessengruppe” seem to be used interchangeably.

⁶⁰ Wernicke, *Der Mittelstand*, 5.

earlier in the nineteenth century, scholars in the 1890s began to create narratives of the historical development of the class, showing how the *Mittelstand* arose amidst the guilds and free towns of the Middle Ages. The *Mittelstand* had been responsible for the economic and cultural development of German cities – with culture understood in a specifically nationalist, *völkisch* sense, and cities understood as small, contained, stable population centers.⁶¹ Through modern times, the *Mittelstand* had remained distinctly a class of the cities and towns. Because of its educational and cultural attainments, because of its grasp of technological development, the new *Mittelstand* in particular was moreover, in Wernicke's words, the “bearer and the soul of modern development, of progress, and freedom.”⁶²

The efforts of the *Mittelstand* to identify itself as a distinct class become intertwined with the history of architecture and planning on three levels. First, the new *Mittelstand* in particular was the class which was most interested in and which stood to gain the most from projects such as the *Baugenossenschaften*, *Konsumvereine*, and educational reform. Second, many of the most noteworthy building and planning projects carried out in Germany in the years between 1890 and 1920 were designed not for the poorest of the poor, but for the *Mittelstand*, for middle-class artisans, mechanics, office workers, shopkeepers, and government employees. Third, it is through the developmental histories of the *Mittelstand*, those narratives rooting the class's origin in the ethical and political

⁶¹ Karl Hegel, *Städte und Gilden der germanischen Völker im Mittelalter*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1891); Karl Hegel, *Die Entstehung des deutschen Städtewesens* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1898); Otto Eduard, *Das deutsche Handwerk in seiner kulturgeschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1900); Georg Liebe, *Soziale Studien aus deutscher Vergangenheit* (Berlin: Costenoble, 1901).

⁶² “Der neue *Mittelstand* ist es ja, der durch seine Bildung und die Entwicklung der Technik der Träger und die Seele der moderne Entwicklung, des Fortschritts und der Freiheit geworden ist,” Wernicke, *Der Mittelstand*, 10.

milieu of town guilds in the middle ages, that the medievalizing folk revival so visible in architecture and town design, and evident as well in social science discourse, gains an added dimension of political significance and representational power.

Antiurbanism

While the growing metropolis was a preeminent subject for sociological analysis in the Wilhelmine era, city life was by no means the only topic of concern. There was a concurrent discourse about the country. Sociological treatments of the rural milieu ranged from studies that were as authentically or as inauthentically scientific as anything written about the city. There were sociological studies cast as romantic quasi-analytic idylls of small town life, anthropological laments about rural culture driven into decline and demise by the ineluctable forces of progress, and harsh anti-urbanist polemics in which the farm and village were positioned not just as the primitivized cultural other, but as the very instruments with which an alternative future could be built.

Rural sociology in Germany developed hand-in-hand with studies of urban society, and followed a similar path of development: rooted in historical jurisprudence and historical political economy of the mid nineteenth century, transitioning through historical sociology in the late Wilhelmine era, with numerous statistical studies along the way, and emerging with the contours of the modern field of inquiry in the latter years of the Weimar Republic. Among the foundational works in German rural sociology were writings by Wilhelm Riehl,⁶³ treatises by political economists Karl Knies and Gustav Schmoller, reports issued by the Verein für Sozialpolitik, and indeed, when considered in

⁶³ Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl, *Die Naturgeschichte des Volkes als Grundlage einer deutschen Social-Politik*, 3 vols. (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1851-1855).

this light, even Tönnies' *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*. The scope of early rural sociological studies in Germany included historical and statistical studies of agricultural regions,⁶⁴ investigations that placed rural production within the larger national economic picture,⁶⁵ analyses of farm worker conditions,⁶⁶ studies of declining rural populations,⁶⁷ and analyses of the changing modes of agricultural economics and production.⁶⁸ Within the broad landscape of rural studies, the "village community," a distinctive settlement form and constellation of social relations and values, assumed its own importance. The village had first become a subject of serious study in historical jurisprudential works of the mid-nineteenth century.⁶⁹ By 1900 the sociological basis for studies of village communities was well established.⁷⁰ Propelled by social scientists', and indeed by the

⁶⁴ August Meitzen, *Urkunden schlesische Dörfer. Zur Geschichte der ländliche Verhältnisse und der Flurentheilung insbesondere. Codex Diplomaticus Silesiae* 4 (Breslau: Max, 1863); Georg Hanssen, *Agrarhistorische Abhandlungen*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1880-84).

⁶⁵ Most of the major systematic histories of political economy from the mid-nineteenth century forward addressed the rural situation in broader national and European contexts, including Karl Knies, *Die Politische Oekonomie vom Standpunkte der geschichtlichen Methode* (Braunschweig: C.A. Schwetschke und Sohn, 1853); Otto von Gierke, *Das Deutsche Genossenschaftsrecht*, 3 vols. (Berlin: Weidmann, 1868-1881); Gustav Schmoller, *Grundriß der Allgemeinen Volkswirtschaftslehre*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1900-1904); and Gustav Schmoller, *Die Entwicklung der deutschen Volkswirtschaftslehre im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1908).

⁶⁶ Verein für Sozialpolitik, *Bäuerliche Zustände in Deutschland. Schriften des Vereins für Sozialpolitik*, Vols. 22-24 (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1883); Verein für Sozialpolitik, *Die Verhältnisse der Landarbeiter in Deutschland. Schriften des Vereins für Sozialpolitik*, vols. 53, 54, and 55 (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1892); Max Weber, *Die Lage der Landarbeiter im ostelbischen Deutschland* (1892), in Gesamtausgabe, part. I, vol. 3 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1984).

⁶⁷ Gustav Schmoller, *Zur inneren Kolonisation in Deutschland. Erfahrungen und Vorschläge. Schriften des Vereins für Sozialpolitik* 32 (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1886).

⁶⁸ Fritz Beckmann, "Der Bauer im Zeitalter des Kapitalismus," *Schmollers Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung, Verwaltung und Volkswirtschaft*, n.s., 50, no. 1 (1927): 719-748.

⁶⁹ Georg Ludwig von Maurer, *Einleitung zur Geschichte der Mark- Hof-, Dorf- und Stadtverfassung und der öffentlichen Gewalt* (Munich: Kaiser, 1854); Georg Ludwig von Maurer, *Geschichte der Fronhöfe, der Bauernhöfe und der Hofverfassung in Deutschland*, 4 vols. (Erlangen: Enke, 1862-63); Erwin Nasse, *Über die mittelalterliche Feldgemeinschaft und die Einhegungen des 16. Jahrhunderts in England* (Bonn: Georgi, 1869).

⁷⁰ Although the bounds of rural sociology were demarcated more fully by American scientists in the 1920s, in Weimar a clear sense of the German contribution to the field was also emerging. See the overviews of methods and literature in Leopold von Wiese, ed., *Das Dorf als soziales Gebilde*, vol. 1, *Der Beiträge zur Beziehungslehre*. Kölner Vierteljahrshefte für Soziologie (Munich: Duncker & Humblot, 1928); and Leopold von Wiese, "Siedlungen, I. Ländliche Siedlungen," in *Handwörterbuch der Soziologie*, ed. Alfred Vierkandt (Stuttgart: Enke, 1931). For English-language surveys of the field's early years, see Harlan Paul Douglass, *The Little Town, Especially in its Rural Relationships* (New York: Macmillan, 1921); Pitirim

common person's sense that the styles of farm and small town life that had held sway for decades and even centuries were passing away, the idea and image of the traditional village assumed a more symbolic aspect. The village became antipode to the city.

Antiurbanist sentiment was but one facet of anti- and counter-modernist convictions that unfolded in the decades before the First World War, and indeed in the decades after. To label all critiques of city as conservative, reactionary, or *völkisch* would be incorrect: there were socially progressive tendencies and even radical revolutionary strains of criticism.⁷¹ But antiurbanism was such an important feature of the *völkisch* movement, it is useful to outline some of the bases of that sensibility. There are two sides to the picture: the critique of the city and the glorification of rural and village life.

Within the *völkisch* movement, antiurbanism was tied up with a wide range of issues, including anti-industrialism, anti-Semitism, racism (against Slavs, and others), eugenics, land ownership reform, and tax reform.⁷² The over-arching thematic was a fear of the city

Sorokin and Carle C. Zimmerman, *Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology* (New York: Henry Holt, 1929); Pitirim A. Sorokin, Carle C. Zimmerman, and Charles J. Galpin, eds., *A Systematic Source Book in Rural Sociology*, 3 vols. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1930-32); Walter A. Terpenning, *Village and Open-Country Neighborhoods* (New York: The Century Co., 1931). Of interest on two counts – because it applies the Tönnies' *Gemeinschaft/Gesellschaft* hypothesis so extensively, and because it exemplifies the ways Wilhelmine and Weimar concepts and methodologies were adapted in the post-WWII milieu – is the textbook by Tönnies' American translator, Charles P. Loomis, *Rural Social Systems: A Textbook of Rural Sociology and Anthropology* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1951).

⁷¹ For discussion of antimodernist and antiurbanist thought in the context of what was defined even at the time as the "*Völkische Bewegung*," see Uwe Puschner, *Die völkische Bewegung im wilhelminische Kaiserreich. Sprach – Rasse – Religion* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001); Uwe Puschner, Walter Schmitz, and Justus H. Ulbricht, eds., *Handbuch zur "Völkische Bewegung," 1871-1918* (Munich: Saur, 1996); and Günter Hartung, "Völkische Ideologie," in *Traditionen und Traditionssuche der deutschen Faschismus*, ed. Günter Hartung and Hubert Orłowski (Halle: Wissenschaftliche Beiträge, Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, 1987), 83-100.

⁷² The literature on antiurbanism and reactionary antimodernism in Germany is extensive. For general overviews, see Andrew Lees, *Cities, Sin, and Social Reform in Imperial Germany* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002); Thomas Rohkrämer, *Eine andere Moderne? Zivilisationskritik, Natur und Technik in Deutschland 1880-1933* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1999); Clemens Zimmermann and Jürgen Reulecke, eds., *Die Stadt als Moloch? Das Land als Kraftquell? Wahrnehmungen und Wirkungen der Großstädte um 1900* (Basel: Birkhäuser, 1999); Rolf Peter Sieferle, *Fortschrittsfeinde? Opposition gegen*

as a vortex of decadence and decline. The city's close, over-populated, and unhygienic quarters threatened the integrity and reproductive capacities of the race (that is, the German race). An enormous number of statistical studies, inflamed polemics, and reform treatises dealt with the facts of health, life expectancy, crime, and the tasks of providing housing, education, and medical care for the seemingly unstoppable urban influx of industrial workers.⁷³ For concerned social scientists and reformers, the proliferation of weak specimens of working-class manhood and flawed womanly virtue imperiled the nation physically, economically, and ultimately, militarily. It was envisioned that at some future point Germany would lack the population needed to staff its factories and man its wars.⁷⁴ Furthermore, the physical decline of urban dwellers went hand-in-hand with the

Technik und Industrie von der Romantik bis zur Gegenwart (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1984); Andrew Lees, "Critics of Urban Society in Germany, 1854-1914," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 40, no. 1 (1979): 61-83; Klaus Bergmann, *Agrarromantik und Großstadtfeindschaft* (Meisenheim am Glan: Hain, 1970); Kenneth D. Barkin, *The Controversy over German Industrialization, 1890-1902* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970); Hans-Paul Bahrdt, *Die moderne Großstadt. Soziologische Überlegungen zum Städtebau* (Hamburg: Christian Wegner, 1969); and Herman Lebovics, "'Agrarians' versus 'Industrializers': Social Conservative Resistance to Industrialism and Capitalism in Late Nineteenth Century Germany," *International Review of Social History* 12, no. 1 (1967): 31-65.

For the role of antiurbanist sentiments in the Heimatschutz movement, see Jürgen Reulecke, "Antimodernismus und Zivilisationskritik: Die Heimatbewegung aus historisch-gesellschaftlicher Perspektive," in *Regionaler Fundamentalismus* (1999): 12-21; and Werner Hartung, "Konservative Zivilisationskritik und regionale Identität. Am Beispiel der niedersächsischen Heimatbewegung 1895 bis 1919," *Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission für Niedersachsen und Bremen* 35 (Hannover: Hahn, 1991).

For discussions of antiurbanism in architecture and planning of the time, see Ulrich Linse, "Völkisch-rassische Siedlungen der Lebensreform," in *Handbuch zur "Völkische Bewegung" 1871-1918*, ed. Uwe Puschner, Walter Schmitz, and Justus H. Ulbricht, (Munich: Saur, 1996), 397-410; Gerhard Fehl, *Kleinstadt, Steildach, Volksgemeinschaft. Zum 'reaktionären Modernismus' in Bau und Stadtbaukunst* (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1995); Helmut Böhme, "Städtebau als konservative Gesellschaftskritik," *Die Alte Stadt* 14, no. 1 (1987): 1-27; Dirk Schubert, "Großstadtfeindschaft und Stadtplanung. Neue Anmerkungen zu einer alten Diskussion," *Die Alte Stadt* 13, no. 1 (1986): 22-41.

⁷³ Andrew Lees provides a concise history of the principal protagonists of the biological and demographic arguments, including the dissemination of their ideas into the popular press, see *Cities, Sin, and Social Reform in Imperial Germany*, pp. 28-33. Foundational works of the period included Georg Hansen, *Die drei Bevölkerungstufen. Ein Versuch, die Ursachen für das Blühen und Altern der Völker nachzuweisen* (Munich: Lindauer, 1899); Otto Ammon, *Die Gesellschaftsordnung und ihre natürlichen Grundlagen. Entwurf einer Sozial-Anthropologie zum Gebrauch für alle Gebildete, die sich mit sozialen Fragen befassen* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1895).

⁷⁴ Otto Ammon, *Die natürliche Auslese beim Menschen. Auf Grund der Ergebnisse der anthropologischen Untersuchungen der Wehrpflichtigen in Baden und anderer Materialien* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1893); Karl

menace of moral decadence. Industrial labor itself, with its repetitive, mindless nature, weakened physical and moral character. The preferred leisurely pastimes of the working class – drinking, frivolous (and surely salacious) mass entertainments – pointed the nation down a road to aesthetic perdition that, given the braces of cultural pride that propped up German identity, harkened a collapse no less final than the end of the empire itself.

The fears of physical and moral decline in the cities were not directed at the working classes alone. There were laments about the *Mittelstand* and *Bürgertum* that addressed other pathologies of urban life. Certain kinds of individual mental debility, such as phobias, manias, fragmentation of attention, hypochondria, and paranoia, gathered under the term *Nervosität*, were understood to be conditions distinct to modern city life.⁷⁵ The cycle of malaise spread from the individual across the whole of society, as the mandates of capitalism and urban living conditions weakened family ties, diluted the role of religion and church life, and altogether diminished the bonds of community in favor of new intensely individualistic personality types driven by self-interest and profit.⁷⁶

Ballod, "Die Bedeutung der ländlichen Bevölkerung für die Wehrkraft des Deutschen Reiches," *Archiv des Deutschen Landwirtschaftsrates* 28 (1904).

⁷⁵ Classic early analysis of spiritual and mental illnesses bred by city air include Hermann Schwabe, *Betrachtungen über die Volksseele von Berlin*. Jahrbuch für Volkswirtschaft und Statistik 4 (Berlin, 1870); Willy Hellpach, *Nervosität und Kultur*. vol. 5, Kulturprobleme der Gegenwart, ed. Leo Berg (Berlin: Johannes Råde, 1902); Georg Simmel, "Die Großstadt und Geistesleben," in *Die Großstadt*, ed. Karl Bücher, *Jahrbuch der Gehe-Stiftung*, vol. 9 (Dresden: Zahn & Jaensch, 1903): 185-206; Willy Hellpach, "Sozialpathologie als Wissenschaft," *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 21 (1905): 275-307; and the studies of Hans Ostwald, ed., *Großstadt-Dokumente* (Berlin, 1904-1908). See also Gottfried Korff, "Mentalität und Kommunikation in der Großstadt."

⁷⁶ This was one of the points distilled and highlighted in the popular reception of Ferdinand Tönnies' *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* after the appearance of its second, revised edition in 1912. Other contemporaneous expressions by leading social thinker of the time included Friedrich Naumann, "Großstadt oder Kleinstadt?" *Patria: Jahrbuch der Hilfe* 1903 (Berlin, 1903); Richard Thurnwald, "Stadt und Land im Lebensprozeß der Rasse," *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 1 (1904).

Against the demonization of the city stood the exaltation of rural life. Tracts by cultural critics and social reformers such as Heinrich Sohnrey, Otto Ammon, and Adolf Bartels, presented the farmer as moral paragon, physical ideal, and hope of the German nation (figure 2).⁷⁷ While such writings were ideologically charged, there were real economic concerns associated with the "flight" of farm workers to the city. Population growth on farms stagnated. The shortage of agricultural laborers and lack of modernization of production and marketing methods made many doubt Germany's ability to feed itself. There were also genuinely felt concerns about the physical and mental health of rural populations, who suffered from isolation, poor medical care, and lack of educational and cultural advantages.⁷⁸

Industrialization, the spread of the margins of the cities into the countryside, and the loss of rural populations gave rise to pressing, practical concerns for the preservation of historical artifacts and natural environments. These efforts, gathered under the banner of the Heimatschutzbewegung, sought to preserve rural life, rural histories, and rural

⁷⁷ Heinrich Sohnrey, *Die Zug vom Lande und die Soziale Revolution* (Leipzig: Werther, 1894); Heinrich Sohnrey, *Die Bedeutung der Landbevölkerung im Staate und unsere besonderen Aufgaben auf dem Lande* (Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1896); Otto Ammon, *Die Bedeutung des Bauernstandes für den Staat und die Gesellschaft* (Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1894); and Adolf Bartels, *Der Bauer in der deutschen Vergangenheit* (Leipzig: Eugen Diederichs, 1900). Of interest also are contributions to the periodical edited by Sohnrey, *Das Land: Zeitschrift für die sozialen und volksthümlichen Angelegenheiten auf dem Lande*, whose purpose was the preservation and resurrection of traditional farm life and values. See Peter Rosegger, "Die Zukunft unseres Bauernstades," *Das Land* 1 (1892-1893); and Heinrich Dade, "Über die Bedeutung des Bauernstandes im modernen Industriestaate und die Maßnahmen zu seiner Erhaltung," *Das Land* 16 (1907-1908).

On Sohnrey, see Bergmann, *Agrarromantik und Großstadtfeindschaft*, 63-85. On Ammon, see Hilkea Lichtsinn, *Otto Ammon und die Sozialanthropologie* (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1987). On Bartels, see Thomas Rösner "Adolf Bartels," in *Handbuch zur "Völkische Bewegung" 1871-1918*, ed. Uwe Puschner, Walter Schmitz, and Justus H. Ulbricht, (Munich: Saur, 1996), 874-894.

The apotheosizing of the farmer continued through the Weimar Republic and into the Third Reich, exemplified by the writings of Richard Walter Darré and Hans F.K. Günther. See Darré, *Das Bauerntum als Lebensquell* (Munich: J.F. Lehmann, 1929); and Günther, *Das Bauerntum als Lebens- und Gemeinschaftsform* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1939).

⁷⁸ Georg Stieger, *Zur Landarbeiterfrage. Beobachtungen und Gedanken aus der Praxis* (Jena: Fischer, 1898); Josef Weigert, *Das Dorf entlang: Ein Buch vom deutschen Bauerntum* (Freiburg: Herder, 1915); and Josef Weigert, *Untergang der Dorfkultur?* 2nd ed. (Munich: Knorr & Hirth, 1930).

landscapes for avowedly nationalistic reasons. There were more personal motivations as well. The quest for *Gemeinschaft* in the idylls of small town life was unquestionably colored by tints of nostalgia for times past. The fact was that in the course of the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century industrial migrations, every second German left his birthplace.⁷⁹ The longing for *Heimat* ran deep.⁸⁰ At the same time, many small towns lost their rural character as manufacturing was forced out of the center of the growing cities towards the villages and open countryside at the periphery.⁸¹ The damage to traditional landscapes, folk arts, and architecture was real and apparent. Amidst all the fears of damage to the commonweal, the specter of the other haunted the cities and the country. Tirades against land speculation were overtly anti-Semitic. Urban dwellers perceived that their cities were being overrun by strangers and poor country people with coarse manners and primitive social ideas. At the same time, many believed that as Germans vacated the countryside to live in cities and work in factories, workers from Polish and Czech lands were settling the farmlands, filling a vacuum, introducing "rassenfremde Elemente," alien racial elements, onto German soil, thereby creating a non-native underclass that threatened to uproot Germans from their land.⁸²

While the arguments of pro-city versus pro-farm and small town suggested a stark polarity of urban and rural space, in fact there was more of a gradual continuum of population density and of domestic and work arrangements. To take Berlin as an

⁷⁹ Wolfgang Köllman, *Bevölkerung in der industriellen Revolution* (Göttingen, 1974), 130, 141.

⁸⁰ See Werner Hartung, "Das Vaterland als Hort vom Heimat. Grundmuster konservativer Identitätsstiftung und Kulturpolitik in Deutschland," in *Antimodernismus und Reform. Zur Geschichte des deutschen Heimatbewegung*, ed. Edeltraut Klueting, (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1991), 112-156.

⁸¹ Jürgen Reulecke, *Geschichte der Urbanisierung*, 70; and Horst Matzerath, "Grundstrukturen städtischer Bevölkerungsentwicklung in Mitteleuropa im 19. Jahrhundert," in *Die Städte Mitteleuropas im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed., Wilhelm Rausch (Linz: Österreichischer Arbeitskreis für Stadtgeschichtsforschung, 1983).

⁸² Linse, "Völkisch-rassische Siedlungen der Lebensreform," 403 fn 44.

example, were one to travel in the year 1900 from the center of the city's densely populated working class districts in Prenzlauerberg to the edges of the city and beyond to the southeast, one would pass by factories and settlements for industrial workers, seeing row houses with vegetable gardens and stables for small animals and open fields separating villages and farms, before coming upon the villa district of Friedrichshagen, overlooking the bucolic Müggelsee, but also just a stone's throw away from the industrialized plant of the Berlin city water works. In the fabric of lived experience, the urban-rural split was never clearly demarcated.

.....

This chapter has provided an overview of the general character of ideas and social issues within which sociology took shape in Germany at the end of the nineteenth century. The chapter considered how the growth of cities and the social changes wrought by rapid urbanization produced a wholly new set of issues, questions, and problems that defined modernity. That sociologists took these problems, these issues, these crises, as their principal subjects, defined sociology as a modern science par excellence. German sociology's roots in historical political economy, however, transformed even modernity into an essentially historical construct. The developmental mode of historical reasoning inherited from political economy provided sociology a methodology that was at once both scientific and cultural. The next chapter considers more closely how four sociological thinkers of the Wilhelmine era utilized this developmental mode of historical reasoning to create powerful theories of the spatial and temporal dialectic that divided village and city, tradition and progress, past and present.

Chapter Two

Past and Present: Through History toward a Sociology of Community¹

For social scientists in Wilhelmine Germany, history was more than just a body of factual knowledge: it was also a method of reasoning, a way of building arguments about the present and making predictions about the future. Against the background of the German historical tradition, with its emphasis on statecraft, politics, and the actions of

¹ The title of this chapter echoes the title of Thomas Carlyle's *Past and Present* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1843). Carlyle's book compares life in England in the twelfth century and in the nineteenth century, much to favor of the former and the detriment of the latter. In its descriptions of the Middle Ages as a halcyon age when the ways of mankind were in harmony with the cosmic order, and in its efforts to awaken a sense of public indignation and impulse toward reform, *Past and Present* resembles the writings of architect A.W.N. Pugin. Although Carlyle articulated his concerns in terms of the facts of economic and political injustice, whereas Pugin lamented the loss of spiritual values, both writers shared an underlying concern for the erosion of moral values in modern life. Both believed that the remedy for the ills of the modern age was religion. For Carlyle, that religion was work, meaningful labor, soulful and committed labor. See A.W.N. Pugin, *Contrasts: or, A Parallel between the noble edifices of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and similar buildings of the present day, showing the present decay of taste* (St. Marie's Grange, England: Printed by the author, 1836), and *True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture* (London: Weale, 1841); and Paul Atterbury, ed., *A.W.N. Pugin, Master of Gothic Revival* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

Carlyle's exaltation of labor earned *Past and Present* a review by Friedrich Engels, who while praising Carlyle's critique of social conditions, also rejected his remedy in religion. It is in this comparative moral calculus of labor-value that *Past and Present* can be seen as a prototypical manifesto of what later would become the political and philosophical foundations of the English arts and crafts movement, and in turn, of the movements in Germany for craft and life reform. See "A Review of Past and Present, by Thomas Carlyle, London, 1843," *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* (1844); and Rob Breton, *Gospels and Grit: Work and Labour in Carlyle, Conrad and Orwell* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005)..

The title page of Carlyle's book carries an epitaph from Schiller's *Prolog zum Wallenstein*, "Ernst ist das Leben," thus omitting the continuation of the phrase, "heiter ist die Kunst" – grave is life, merry is art. Tracing the profound and far-reaching dialogue of ideas between England and Germany in the nineteenth century reveals the German Idealists as an influence on Carlyle, much as Fichte and Schelling had influenced Coleridge. In turn, English ideas, both literary and philosophical, as well as social and aesthetic, were essential inspirations for German aesthetics and reform in many quarters. See Elizabeth M. Vida, *Romantic Affinities: German Authors and Carlyle. A Study in the History of Ideas* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993); W.D. Robson-Scott, *The Literary Background of the Gothic Revival in Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965); and Stefan Muthesius, *Das englische Vorbild. Eine Studie zu den deutschen Reformbewegungen in Architektur, Wohnbau und Kunstgewerbe im späteren 19. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Prestel, 1974).

Carlyle's praise for an idealized Middle Ages, as a time when the labors of life were indistinguishable from the pleasures, stood in contrast to his critique of the alienation and avarice of modern life. The dichotomies described by Carlyle – authenticity against hypocrisy, variety against uniformity, the aristocracy of talent against the depredations of mammon – prefigure Tönnies' later categorical distinctions between *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*. Even more, Carlyle's use of a historical period, the middle ages, as a rhetorical tool for critique of the present and as a means of illuminating social ideals, casts an illuminating light on beliefs and hopes that that underlay historicist analysis in the social sciences of the late nineteenth century..

extraordinary leaders, there were more teleological modes of history charting the course of nations, peoples, and civilizations.² Filtering history through a quasi-biological discourse of origins, rise, and fall, these grand narratives suggested that historical change was as much an act of nature as the product of human action.³ Termed *Entwicklungsgedanken*, evolutionary or developmental thought, with its resultant narratives described as *Entwicklungsgeschichte*, developmental history, this mode of historical reasoning was particularly influential in the social sciences. The tendency toward developmental reasoning in the social sciences produced an understanding of historical change and meaning that operated on three levels. In the most doctrinaire visions of those who employed developmental modes of reasoning, it was assumed that the processes of history followed scientific or science-like rules of change and progression. It followed, therefore, that human society also developed according to laws that could be rationally determined.⁴ As the task of theorizing change became a centerpiece of historical analysis, there was a concomitant tendency to emphasize directionality and intentionality, a tendency to grant history not only a measure of ethical value, but also predictive power. The past showed the way toward the future. Historical sociology tended to view the past as relatively stable and to position the present as

² On German historiography generally, see Georg G. Iggers. *The German Conception of History: The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present* (Middleton, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1968), 4-12, 174-228; and Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 267-280. On the use of history within the cultural sciences, see Woodruff D. Smith, *Politics and the Science of Culture in Germany, 1840-1920* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).

³ For a general overview of these tendencies, see Fritz Wagner, "Biologismus und Historismus im Deutschland des 19. Jahrhunderts," in *Biologismus im 19. Jahrhundert. Vorträge eines Symposiums vom 30. Oktober 1970 in Frankfurt am Main*, ed. Gunter Mann (Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1973), 30-42; and Peter J. Bowler, "Social Metaphors in Evolutionary Biology, 1870-1930: The Wider Dimension of Social Darwinism," in *Biology as Society, Society as Biology: Metaphors*, ed. Sabine Maasen, et al. (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1995), 107-126. For a discussion from the point of view of the early Weimar years, see Albert Fleischmann and Richard Grutzmacher, *Der Entwicklungsgedanke in der gegenwärtigen Natur- und Geisteswissenschaften* (Erlangen: A. Deikert, 1922).

⁴ Smith, *Politics and the Science of Culture*, 27.

wracked with crisis. In the field of sociology, this kind of historical reasoning produced a cultural essentialism that made the past a repository of solutions for the present and the future. As historical analysis uncovered the unique origins and path of development of a people, a community, or a nation, it also defined the core character, the "true nature" of that people, that community, that nation. "True nature" was then endowed with operative values. This kind of anthropological fundamentalism, this desire to go back to basics and to seek the remedy for the future in elementary forms of the past, was one of the defining features of Wilhelmine sociology's modernity.

The scientizing of humanistic studies had its roots in Positivism. While formally developed by French sociologist Auguste Comte and his followers in the mid nineteenth century, the basic premise of Positivism – the belief that the methods of the physical sciences should be the model for all fields of study – found wide though diffused acceptance at the end of the century.⁵ In sociology, the scientizing impulses of the positivist tradition fed into the field's ambitions to be a universal science, or at least to be a science capable of formulating a universally applicable set of laws describing human social behavior. Even those twentieth-century sociologists like Max Weber, who rejected Positivism along with the *entwicklungsgeschichtlich* notion that there were "laws" that governed the development of human institutions, sought to define scientific or at least heuristic categories such as "ideal types" as a way of generalizing human behaviors across a historical continuum.

⁵ Jürgen Blühdorn and Joachim Ritter, eds., *Positivismus im 19. Jahrhundert, Beiträge zu seiner geschichtlichen und systematischen Bedeutung* (Frankfurt a.M.: Klostermann, 1971).

There was a powerfully deterministic aspect to the use of developmental historical method in the social sciences. Because change was a dominant theme of the developmental historical narrative, an intellectual premium was placed on the ability to identify the pervasive yet often hidden mechanisms that altered the course of human affairs.⁶ This was an impetus for sociologists, like Tönnies, Sombart, and Weber, who applied Marx's theories of economic development to other social phenomena. At the same time, the work to identify the fundamental agents and stations of historical change did not always stay on a purely conjectural plane. Secondary academic analyses and popular articulations tended to hypostatize the theoretical constructs. Once loosed from the minds of their creators, Tönnies' catalogue of *Gemeinschaft* social formations or Sombart's medieval town of social equipoise migrated freely beyond ideal types to become part, for better or worse, of the collective wish picture.

The veneration of the past as a model for the present and future was not just a figure of reactionary thought. Even rationalizing, self-consciously modern and systematic discourses could promote idealized views of the past, irrespective of misguided secondary interpretations. Sociology used history to construct ideal-type formations for comparative, analytical, or broadly rhetorical purposes. These ideal types – the family patriarch, the village elder, the poor agricultural laborer, the small-hold farmer, the guild craftsman – could nonetheless take on a life of their own. Ideal types became idealized images, and historical figures stepped beyond the constraints of the heuristic domain to become full-fledged, operative social models. In short, whatever its original intentions,

⁶ Stefan Haas, *Historische Kulturforschung in Deutschland 1880-1930. Geschichtswissenschaft zwischen Synthese und Pluralität* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1994), 376-378.

the historical method of sociology offered up models of what a harmonious community might actually look like. The past was projected forward, and used to imagine an ideal future.

This chapter examines the use of historical methods and subjects in the social sciences with regard for the larger Wilhelmine-era discussion about the proper form of the ideal German community. The section deals with a group of early, manifestly *sociological* studies that dealt with the origin of the modern city from a cultural-developmental point of view: Ferdinand Tönnies' *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, first published in 1887 but not widely read until the second edition in 1912; Werner Sombart's *Der moderne Kapitalismus* from 1902, along with the related essay, "Der Begriff der Stadt und das Wesen der Städtebildung" from 1907; Max Weber's essay known as "Die Stadt, eine soziologische Untersuchung" written around 1911/13 and published posthumously in 1921; and Peter Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* of 1902, published in a German translation by Gustav Landauer in 1904.

These are key works in the history of the sociology of community, laying the theoretical ground for much of the discussion in the following chapters. In later chapters other writers and their ideas will be analyzed in conjunction with specific projects. The discussion here will not look at every aspect of the texts, but rather will explore their presentation of the processes of community formation, with attention to the following points: In laying out a developmental history, how did they define the origins, the fundamental forms, of human community? What events, developments, or structures catalyzed change in community and settlement forms, and in social and economic relations? What were the spatial and aesthetic foundations of these theories? From a

historiographical point of view, it is useful to ask how influential these particular works were at the time they were published. What impact did the writers' ideas have in the social sciences? How did those ideas change as they circulated in other registers of social reform?

Ferdinand Tönnies' *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* (1887/1912):

The Fate of a Book and Its Ideas

Histories sometimes have a way of relegating ideas, books, or people to curiously narrow territories of significance. The necessities of narrative compression and the conventions of scholarly citation ordain that a historian build the back-story for an idea by glossing the histories of others, and by compressing complexities into concise building blocks that can be placed just so to support an argument. But there are cases where an idea, a theory, a word, a writer has been so subject to compressed and repetitious citation that the meaning of his or her work's meaning becomes distorted and its true importance is lost. The reputation of few thinkers from the Wilhelmine era has suffered more from being ill cast in this way than Ferdinand Tönnies, who has too often been described as a progenitor of reactionary or fascist thought, but who was indeed a socialist and a social reformer, although not of a radical bent.⁷ To reduce Tönnies' *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* to a

⁷ A representative example of the treatment of Tönnies in recent histories of the Wilhelmine era is the collection of American essays from 1996, *Imagining Modern German Culture, 1889-1910*. Françoise Forster-Hahn and Kenneth Barkin charge Tönnies with igniting a backlash against modernity. Barkin writes, "The neoromantic wave against modernity toward the end of the century began with the publication in 1887 of *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, one of the classics of sociology by Ferdinand Tönnies." This characterization of Tönnies' book as the ignition point of anti-modernist sentiments is echoed in Forster-Hahn's introduction: "Ferdinand Tönnies, whose publication of *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* in 1887 initiated the movement against modernity, constructed a neoromantic and nostalgic vision of *Gemeinschaft* in the medieval sense, contrasting it to modern urban and capitalist society." Setting aside for the moment the implication in these passages that "modernism" is an entity with delimited boundaries, comprehensible as an unquestionable good, against which a unified field of anti-modernist ideas can be opposed, it is clear that Barkin and Forster-Hahn are using Tönnies more as a place marker for a broader argument, developed

nostalgic lament and an anti-modernist tract is to ignore the true history of the book's reception and to discount the complexity of Tönnies' analysis. A more considered look at Tönnies' book, his ideas, and his sources shows *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* ill-suited for use in any uncomplicated teleology of anti-modernism. The 1890s were indeed a key decade for the rise of the sharp political and intellectual polarities that would go on to shape the twentieth century. Tönnies' *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* was very much a product of that period – but it was not an ignition point nor a generator of anti-modernist ideology. Tönnies' critique of modernization was not a simple reactionary backlash, not a nostalgic lament, not a blueprint for the resurrection of lost times. It was rather an attempt by a deeply rational and coherent thinker to conceive a framework of theoretical analysis that could describe, and comprehend, a world that had perceptibly and radically changed in the course of a single lifetime.

Publication and Reception of *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*

Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft first appeared in 1887, but that date is a bit deceptive, tending to interpretations that overstate the book's influence on social thought among academics and general readers.⁸ The fundamental theory of community and society was

across the many essays in the book, that late Wilhelmine culture was marked by a stark polarization between the forces of modernism and those of anti-modernism. Indeed, Barkin mentions figures such as Adolf Wagner and Max Sering who aggressively campaigned against specific aspects of modernization, such as rapid technological change, growth of the cities, and the decline of agricultural regions, and who represent a better starting point for telling the story of late Wilhelmine anti-modernism, as he has pointed out in his studies, "Adolf Wagner and German Industrialization," *Journal of Modern History* 41, no. 2 (1969), 144-159; and *The Controversy over German Industrialization, 1890-1902* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970). See Françoise Forster-Hahn, "Introduction: Modernity and the Building of Nation," and Kenneth D. Barkin, "The Crisis of Modernity, 1887-1902," in *Imagining Modern German Culture: 1889-1910*, ed. Françoise Forster-Hahn (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1996), 12, 28.

⁸ The sequence of editions is as follows: Ferdinand Tönnies, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft. Abhandlung des Communismus und des Socialismus als empirischer Culturformen* (Berlin: Fuchs's Verlag [R. Reisland], 1887); *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundbegriffe der reinen Soziologie*, 2nd, considerably revised and expanded edition (Berlin: Curtius, 1912); *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundbegriffe der reinen*

first sketched out by Tönnies in a preliminary, unpublished draft in 1880/81, at the same time as he was completing his study of Thomas Hobbes.⁹ When finally published, the book of 1887 was originally addressed to a specialist audience of historians and political scientists. The work garnered a few respectable reviews, but was not noticed outside of professional circles. Only 500 copies of the first edition of 750 were sold; the publisher proposed to destroy the remainder.¹⁰ It was not until the book was reissued in 1912 that it began to attract significant attention. Between 1912 and 1926 there were six more editions, and an eighth edition appeared in 1935.¹¹

Tönnies changed the subtitle of *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* three times over the course of the first three versions, and those changes offer clues to the evolution of his ideas. The 1881 draft of the book was subtitled *Theorem der Cultur-Philosophie*, theory

Soziologie, 3rd revised edition (Berlin: Curtius, 1920); and what subsequently became the definitive text, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundbegriffe der reinen Soziologie*, 8th improved edition (Leipzig: Buske, 1935).

⁹ Tönnies had tried to submit the 1881 draft as his Habilitationsschrift in philosophy at Kiel, but the faculty preferred his “Anmerkungen über die Philosophies des Hobbes.” See Tönnies in Raymund Schmidt, *Philosophie der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, vol. III (Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1922), 212. Tönnies' work on Hobbes included critical editions of *Thomas Hobbes: The Elements of Law Natural and Politic* (London: Simpkin Marshall & Co., 1889), and *Thomas Hobbes: Behemoth or the Long Parliament* (London: Simpkin Marshall & Co., 1889), as well as the study, *Thomas Hobbes. Leben und Lehre* (Stuttgart: Fromann, 1896).

¹⁰ E.G. Jacoby, *Philosophie und Soziologie. Ferdinand Tönnies wissenschaftlichen Weg* (Kiel: Hirt, 1971), 79.

¹¹ The first English translation of portions of *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* appeared in 1940 under the editorship of Charles P. Loomis, as *Fundamental Concepts of Sociology (Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft)* (New York: American Book Company, 1940). That book was republished as *Community and Association* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955). A more complete, but by no means entirely complete translation, again under the editorship of Charles P. Loomis, appeared as *Community and Society* (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1957). Favoring a modern, rationalist, and empirically oriented understanding of sociology's project (and suppressing or altering the socialist and historicist aspects of the book), Loomis' translation served as the basis for English readers' understanding of Tönnies for forty-four years. Loomis was a rural sociologist who had studied in Germany and worked for the U.S. Department of Agriculture before joining the sociology faculty of Michigan State University. In 2001 a new, complete, and historically sensitive translation appeared, drawing on five of the eight editions of the book issued in Tönnies' lifetime. The volume was issued in the series Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought, with the telling title, *Community and Civil Society*, suggesting that Tönnies has assumed a new life as an intellectual forerunner of contemporary civil society and communitarian advocates. *Tönnies: Community and Civil Society*, ed. Jose Harris, trans. Jose Harris and Margaret Hollis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

of cultural philosophy. The first published 1887 edition was subtitled *Abhandlung des Communismus und des Socialismus als empirischer Culturformen*, treatise on communism and socialism as empirical cultural forms. The third edition of 1912 and all subsequent German editions were subtitled *Grundbegriffe der reinen Soziologie*, fundamentals of pure sociology. The shifting emphases in the subtitles were reflected in the different prefaces of the various editions, as well as in additions and changes Tönnies made throughout the text. The subtitles traced Tönnies' changing understanding of the intellectual domain and the reigning paradigms for structuring the arguments. Beginning as a theory of cultural history, the book became a study of fundamental manifestations of associational life, only to end as a coolly scientific analysis of foundational concepts in sociology.

Nor were the transformations entirely on the side of production: the arenas of reception were also altered. The twenty-five years between the first edition of *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* in 1887 and the second in 1912 were witness to significant changes in German political and intellectual life. In the academic realm, by 1912 sociology was well on its way to being an established field. The Verein für Sozialpolitik had been in existence for fifty years. The Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie had been chartered in 1909, with Tönnies among its founders. There were a number of journals oriented toward the professional audience, including the historical school-oriented *Schmollers Jahrbuch*, in publication since 1877, the Verein für Sozialpolitik's ongoing series of monographs and reports published since 1872, Heinrich Braun's weekly *Sozialpolitisches Centralblatt*, published from 1892 forward, and the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie's *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, established in 1909. General

interest journals such as *Der Grenzboten*, *Die Gesellschaft*, *Preußische Jahrbücher*, and *Deutsche Rundschau* regularly included articles with a social scientific slant. The lifting of the decree outlawing socialist parties in 1890 opened the doors for more radical and progressive periodicals, such as *Das Blaubuch*, *Die Zukunft*, *Der Sozialist*, *Die Neue Zeit*, *Die Volksbühne*, *Die Weltbühne*, and *Ethische Kultur*, all of which covered social scientific ideas and literature.

There were also a number of popular series oriented toward the general reader that offered introductory overviews of current topics written by prominent social scientists. Beginning in 1906 the firm of Quelle & Meyer in Leipzig published the series *Wissenschaft und Bildung*, edited by Paul Herre, which included Adolf Weber's *Die Großstadt und ihre sozialen Probleme* (1908), Johann Wernicke's *Der Mittelstand und seine wirtschaftliche Lage* (1909), and Helene Lange's *Die Frauenbewegung in ihren modernen Problemen* (1908). Another popular series, *Die Gesellschaft. Sammlung Sozialpsychologischer Monographien*, edited by Martin Buber and published from 1906 to 1912 by Rütten & Loening in Frankfurt, offered an overview of social trends from a more leftist orientation. The list of contributors reads like a who's who of late Wilhelmine sociologists and social critics, with Werner Sombart discussing the proletariat, Ferdinand Tönnies considering moral customs, Ellen Key writing on the women's movement, Georg Simmel treating the sociology of religion, Gustav Landauer regarding revolution, Karl Scheffler writing about the architectural profession, and Willy Hellpach examining the modern epidemic of neuroses, among others.

Beyond social science circles, Tönnies' contrast of traditional community and modern society found receptive readers among the broader public as well. There was widespread

interest in Lebensreform in the middle classes as well as the radical fringe. Propelled by sentiments that had been brewing for decades, the life-reform movements set the rustic as a remedy against modernity. A new wholeness, a new well-being, a new authenticity was to be found in the ethics of nature and tradition. The popular Lebensreform-oriented periodical, *Der Kunstwart*, had been published since 1887. A movement to preserve the natural environment and historical sites had been active in Germany since the 1880s. From 1904 forward, Heimatschutz and Denkmalschutz organizations were established throughout the Germany. Beyond the many newsletters and popular booklets promoting the movement, the nine volumes of Paul Schultze-Naumburg's *Kulturarbeiten*, published between 1901 and 1917, conveyed a Heimatschutz-influenced critique of architecture, garden design, town planning, and the landscape. Such movements to conserve the folk arts, historical monuments, and vernacular architecture and landscapes against the encroachments of industrial development were taking shape throughout Europe and in the United States at the time. At once conservative and progressive, reactionary and radical, the German preservation movement was occupied with protecting and even resurrecting traditional lifeways, including occasionally archly conservative elements such as patriarchal family and business structures, monarchical government, decentralization of population from the cities, and re-colonization of the countryside. As carrier of an aesthetic philosophy, the Heimatschutz pitted the regional and particular against the cosmopolitan and generic. This was not mere archaism. There is a great deal in Heimatschutz politics and aesthetics that can be seen as distinctly modern, or rather as we would now see it, almost *postmodern*, in the sense that it was already a critique of modernism as a universalizing, rationalizing system of economic production. In the realm

of architecture and design, the use of regional materials and styles of building was deemed functional and practical. Pushed further, there was also a widely held belief that folk forms, because they had been tested and refined over time, could be understood as fundamental, Ur-forms. When plumbed through properly scientific, anthropological and ethnological methods, vernacular and folk forms could be distilled into universal types. These typologies of houses, settlements, furniture and everyday objects were aesthetically and psychologically suited to modern life, but offered a more humanistic, more idiomatic, more German, alternative to the faceless forms of mass production.

Gemeinschaft in History and the Social Sciences Before Tönnies

While Ferdinand Tönnies did not single-handedly confer on the term *Gemeinschaft* its associations with historical tradition and reactionary sentiment, it was not until Tönnies that *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* came to be perceived as sharply polarized concepts. Prior to Tönnies, in fact, the words were considered near synonyms. If *Gemeinschaft* carried any particular valence in the mid and late nineteenth century, it was of a religious community, in the sense of *Gemeinde*. Even after Tönnies, the term *Gemeinschaft* became associated with a strongly anti-modernist point of view only during and after the First World War.¹²

By 1912 and the second edition of *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, there was, however, a well-established intellectual tradition in Germany that elided nationalism, the idealization

¹² Theodor Geiger, "Gemeinschaft," in *Handwörterbuch der Soziologie*, ed. Alfred Vierkandt, (Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1931), 173-180; Friedrich Bülow, "Gemeinschaft," in *Wörterbuch der Soziologie*, ed. Wilhelm Bernsdorf (Stuttgart, Ferdinand Enke, 1969), 336-340; [AUTHOR?] "Gesellschaft, Gemeinschaft," in *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, vol. 2, ed. Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, and Reinhart Koselleck (Stuttgart: Ernst Klett, 1975), 854-859..

of a pre-capitalist medievalism, and the glorification of small towns and rural life. The term *Gemeinschaft*, along with words such as *Heimat*, *Volk*, and *Volksgemeinschaft*, which for a century had hovered along the boundaries of the poetic and the political, was gravitating more perceptibly toward the political. The sentiments attached to terms like Community, Homeland, the People, had been deemed expressive of Germany's sense of nationhood since the end of the eighteenth century. The connotations of the word *Gemeinschaft*, poetical as well as political, philosophical as well as social, were rooted in the German Romantics' reactions to the French Revolution and the predations of the Napoleonic era.

There are two aspects of the term *Gemeinschaft*'s origins in German Romanticism that are particularly important for the cultures of architecture and planning. First is the strongly pastoral connotations that became attached to *Gemeinschaft* – that is, the association of community-feeling with the labors and lifeways of rural and village life. Second, is the conception of authentic *Gemeinschaft* as a form of spiritual and intellectual affinity, deeper than any politically ascribed bond. In contradistinction to natural law or social contract theories of society, the romantic conception of *Gemeinschaft* was seen as a small society of intimates. The Romantics theorized society as an organically developed, historically rooted, socially intimate body, as opposed to an abstract or universal notion of a social collective under control of the state.¹³ As a protest against modern life and French universalism, against the perceived loss of poetry and mechanization of everyday life, against, in Max Weber's words of some one hundred and twenty years later, the *Entzauberung der Welt*, the disenchantment of the world, the

¹³ Karl Gustav Specht, "Gemeinschaft," in *Handwörterbuch der Sozialwissenschaften*, vol. 4, ed. Erwin von Beckerath, et al. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), 329-331.

German Romantics infused the term *Gemeinschaft* with longings for an earlier era, a precapitalist world, a golden age of fellowship. In Novalis' essay of 1799, *Die Christenheit oder Europa*, the ideal community is associated with primitive Christian fellowship, but also with an early version of the German *Sonderweg*:

In other European countries, there is merely a prophetic notion that with the arrival of peace a new and higher religious life will begin to pulsate and soon all other worldly interests will be dispatched. Whereas in Germany one can already ascertain the traces of a new world order. Germany is proceeding on a long but certain path, ahead of other European countries. While other lands are tied up with war, speculation, and factionalism, Germany is moving with sedulity toward the comradeship of a higher cultural epoch. In the course of time, this progress will ensure that Germany prevails over the others.¹⁴

In the writings of the early Romantics, such as *Die neue Christenheit* of Novalis, but also in the writings of Herder and Fichte, the ideal community was connected to a notion of the *Volksgeist*, with its intimations of a cultural particularism unique to the German people. There was also a evident allying of the dream of traditional, historically rooted community forms with the belief that as a nation Germany was endowed with a special mission. Its national soul was formed on a higher plane than mere commercial, economic, or political interests. Germany was a *Kulturnation* united through language, literature, art, and intellectual spirit more than through state or political power.¹⁵ At the time the

¹⁴ “Von den übrigen europäischen Ländern, außer Deutschland, läßt sich nur prophezeien, daß mit dem Frieden eine neues höheres religiöses Leben in ihnen zu pulsieren [beginnen] und bald alles andere weltliche Interesse verschlingen wird. In Deutschland hingegen kann man schon mit voller Gewißheit die Spuren einer neuen Welt aufzeigen. Deutschland geht einen langsamen, aber sichern Gang vor den übrigen europäischen Ländern voraus. Während diese durch Krieg, Spekulation und Parteigeist beschäftigt sind, bildet sich der Deutsche mit allem Fleiß zum Genossen einer höhern Epoche der Kultur, und dieser Fortschritt muß ihm ein großes Übergewicht über die andern in Lauf der Zeit geben.” The essay was not published at the time of its original drafting. Friedrich von Hardenberg (Novalis), *Die Christenheit oder Europa* (Leipzig: Insel Verlag, n.d.), 51. See also Frederick Beiser, ed. and trans., *The Early Political Writings of the German Romantics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 59-79.

¹⁵ For background on the political, philosophical, and philological interests shaping the discussion about nationhood and myth in the Romantic era, see George S. Williamson, *The Longing for Myth in Germany*:

Romantics were writing, the notion of German nationhood was much in contention, and the reality of a unified nation still lay more than seventy years in the future. But from the earliest years of the nineteenth century, writers and political theorists were concentrating into the concept of *Gemeinschaft* layers of potential meanings allied to German nationhood, common spiritual purpose, close-knit intellectually compatible associations, and regionally rooted cultural expressions.¹⁶

In the late Wilhelmine period, the social conceptions of the German Romantics were promulgated primarily by the writers that historian Fritz Stern has called the critics of cultural despair – Paul Lagarde, Julius Langbehn, and Wolfgang Moeller van den Bruck. There was clearly a large and receptive public eager to imbibe the sentiments and politics of romantic nationalism.¹⁷ Paul de Lagarde's unrelenting critique of the rationalizing forces that were destroying the German soul, *Deutsche Schriften*, appeared between 1878 and 1886.¹⁸ Julius Langbehn's *Rembrandt als Erzieher*, a passionate and largely incoherent screed against modernity in any form – professionalism, internationalism, Impressionism, Darwinism, Berlin, fashion, intermarriage with the Slavs – was first

Religion and Aesthetic Culture from Romanticism to Nietzsche (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

¹⁶ Michael Löwy, "Die Romantik zwischen Nationalismus und Kosmopolitismus," in *Nationalismus und Romantik*, ed. Wolfgang Müller-Fun and Franz Schuh, (Vienna: Turia & Kant, 1999), 83-85.

¹⁷ On the origin and reception of romantic nationalist and völkisch ideologies in Germany, see Uwe Puschner, Walter Schmitz, and Justus H. Ulbricht, eds. *Handbuch der "Völkischen Bewegung" 1871-1918* (Munich: K.G. Saur, 1999); and Uwe Puschner, *Die völkische Bewegung im wilhelminische Kaiserreich. Sprach – Rasse – Religion* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001).

¹⁸ Lagarde was well-known among academics in his own time as a philologist and biblical scholar; he became well-known among general readers as a scholar who used his knowledge of ancient languages to fuel anti-Semitic arguments. Today, it is his strident racism that is remembered. Paul de Lagarde, *Deutsche Schriften* (Berlin: Verlag der Freunde, 1994). On Lagarde, see Ina Ulricke Paul, "Paul Anton de Lagarde," in *Handbuch der "Völkischen Bewegung" 1871-1918*, 45-93; Fritz Stern, *The Politics of Cultural Despair: A Study of the Rise of the Germanic Ideology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961); Andreas Urs Sommer, "Zwischen Agitation, Religionsstiftung und 'hoher Politik.' Paul de Lagarde und Friedrich Nietzsche," in *Nietzscheforschung. Ein Jahrbuch* 4 (1998): 169-194; Doris Mendlewitsch, *Volk und Heil. Vordenker des Nationalsozialismus im 19. Jahrhundert* (Rheda-Wiedenbrück: Daedalus, 1988).

issued in 1890, and by 1892 had gone through thirty-nine editions.¹⁹ Nor were Stern's triumvirate of cultural pessimists the only banner carriers for the campaign to stabilize German national values with a nativist's arcadia of rural lifeways, moral probity, and folkloric aesthetics. The four volumes of W.H. Riehl's *Die Naturgeschichte des Volkes als Grundlage einer deutschen Social-Politik* (the natural history of the people as foundation of German social politics), first issued in the 1860s were in their tenth edition by 1899. The five volumes of Gustav Freytag's popular romanticized history, *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit* (images from the German past), originally published between 1859 to 1867, were in their twenty-ninth edition by 1912.²⁰ The popular series of cultural histories, *Monographien zur deutschen Kulturgeschichte* (monographs of German cultural history), edited by Leipzig history professor Georg Steinhausen and published by Eugen Diederichs between 1899 and 1905, offered readers a richly illustrated view of German cultural history, with volumes treating the farmer, handworker, the scholar, the school teacher, the salesman, the soldier, the Jew.²¹ There were also numerous popular illustrated pamphlets and series issued by the publishing

¹⁹ Stern, *The Politics of Cultural Despair*, 109-110, 156-164.

²⁰ Freytag's multi-volume work was, like Riehl's similarly expansive tomes, an ambitious and sustained assertion about the course of development of the true German national character, and an expression of a deeply, personally felt conservative reaction to the failed revolution of 1848. The twenty-ninth edition of Freytag's work in 1912 was published, as was the first in 1859, by Hirzel of Leipzig. The pace of new editions did not diminish in the following decades. From the 1920s through the mid 1940s, there were countless popular editions and publications of selections from the work. The title of a 1926 abridgement, "the evolution of the German soul," gives a sense of the nationalist sentiments that drew his many readers, see Gustav Freytag, *Die Entwicklung der deutschen Volkseele* (Leipzig: Insel-Verlag, 1926). Freytag's work is still in print: the most recent German edition includes an accounting of Freytag's politics and reception of the book. See Gustav Freytag, *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*, ed. Heinrich Pleticha with a foreword by Horst Fuhrmann (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann-Lexikon-Verlag, 1998). On Freytag's place in nineteenth-century German historiography, see Alyssa A. Lonner, *Mediating the Past: Gustav Freytag, Progress, and German Historical Identity, 1848-1871* (Oxford: P. Lang, 2005).

²¹ See Haas, *Historische Kulturforschung in Deutschland 1880-1930*, 196-197; Smith, *Politics and the Science of Culture in Germany*, 186-187.

houses of Teubner, Langwiesche, G.D.W. Callwey and others celebrating the traditional architecture and lifeways of German villages and small towns.

By the second edition of 1912 the German reading public was primed to receive Tönnies' meditations on the ebb of *Gemeinschaft* and the surge of *Gesellschaft* as part of a larger movement calling for the resurrection of romantic tradition as a bulwark against clinical modernity. Whether the intent of Tönnies' argument was properly understood or not, whether his book was even read by those who invoked his name or not, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* became a catch-phrase and a banner for social reaction in ways that Tönnies came to rue. As Helmuth Plessner wrote in a 1955 tribute to Tönnies' hundredth birthday, "It is a tragic irony that the work of such an unromantic thinker as Tönnies, of a thinker so oriented toward the classics of the early Enlightenment, should be made to suffer for or at least contribute to the ideologization of *Gemeinschaft*"²²

Intellectual Foundations and Rhetorical Forms in *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*

As the subtitles of the early editions indicated, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* offered a cultural history of sorts. The book's arguments are emplotted as a developmental narrative, showing how cultural expressions and institutions of human association evolved over time.²³ As a work of the late nineteenth century, Tönnies' historical conception was characteristically influenced by a Hegelian sense of the directionality and

²² "Es wirkt wie eine tragische Ironie, dass ausgerechnet das Werk eines so unromantischen and an der Klassik der Frühaufklärung geschulten Denkers wie Tönnies zu der Ideologisierung der *Gemeinschaft* erhalten oder wenigstens mit beitragen konnte," Helmuth Plessner, "Nachwort zu Ferdinand Tönnies," *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 7, no. 3 (1955): 346-347.

²³ The term "emplotment" is adopted from Hayden White, who in turn was applying to historical narrative the categories developed by Norbert Frye analyses of literature. White, however, does not specify a development history per se. Developmental-history seems closest to his "tragic" mode of history writing, wherein the story offers "gain in consciousness for the spectators of the contest. And this gain is thought to consist in the epiphany of the law governing human existence." See White, *Metahistory*, 9-11.

destiny of history. In addition to sociological theorists such as Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer, Tönnies acknowledged the influence of the massive *Entwicklungsgeschichten*, the developmental histories, of Sir Henry Sumner Maine, Lewis Henry Morgan, J.J. Bachofen, Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, and Otto Gierke. For the most part these were writers whose methodological foundations lay in the history of law, and in anthropological jurisprudence. All employed ethnological speculation and normative historiographical propositions to give narrative shape to the past, and on the basis of their historical findings, they formulated sweeping theories about the future prospects of human culture. On one hand, the developmental historical form defined broad temporal patterns, scenic acts in the great drama of human progress. Morgan mapped the ages of savagery, barbarism, and civilization. Comte described three stages of universal social progress, theological, metaphysical, and scientific.²⁴ Bachofen envisaged a matriarchal age that preceded the present patriarchal era.²⁵ Georg Hansen, Tönnies' colleague from university days at Jena, used the developmental historical form to trace civilization's decline, likewise in three steps.²⁶

A unifying characteristic across these many historians' work was the drive to identify the constants, the fundamental structures that underlay all historical change, such as development of institutions of kinship, ownership, and exchange. The structures at issue were not so much the actual categories of relationships, as they were the ethics of

²⁴ August Comte, *Cours de philosophie positive* (Paris: Bachelier, 1830-42). First English translation, *The Positive Philosophy of August Comte*, freely translated and condensed by Harriet Martineau (London: J. Chapman, 1853).

²⁵ Johan Jakob Bachofen, *Das Mutterrecht: Eine Untersuchung über die Gynaiokratie der alten Welt nach ihrer religiösen und rechtlichen Natur* (1861), ed. Hans-Jürgen Heinrichs (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1975).

²⁶ Georg Hansen, *Die drei Bevölkerungsstufen. Ein Versuch, die Ursachen für das Blühen und Altern der Völker nachzuweisen* (Munich: Lindau, 1899).

obligation and fealty, selfhood and collectivity, territory and possession, which provided the essentially human impetus for the rise of systems of law and government, patterns of land ownership and settlement, and the diverse forms of social solidarity and associational life.

From the perspective of this study dealing with the spatial and aesthetic ramifications of the social sciences, the works of Maine and Morgan are particularly interesting. Maine's *Ancient Law: Its Connection with the Early History of Society, and Its Relation to Modern Ideas* of 1861 traced the transitions of society, from kinship bonds to societies based on property and territorial bonds. In his subsequent books, *Village Communities in the East and West* (1871) and *Lectures on the Early History of Institutions* (1875), Maine continued to apply his methods of comparative anthropological analysis, and drew substantially on his experiences as a colonial administrator and member of the council of the governor general of India. Maine found that he did not have to ground his arguments about the development of cultures from primitivism to progress in purely abstract and hypothetical terms. The "footprints of the past" were evident in the present day, in the form of primitive cultures that had survived unchanged, thereby offering a window into the past of more advanced cultures like that of Europe.²⁷

Morgan's *Ancient Civilization*, first published in the United States in 1877, was translated into German in 1891.²⁸ Extending his earlier studies on the legal and governmental

²⁷ George Stocking explains that Maine's conception of historical survivals was based more on the historical jurisprudence of Karl von Savigny than the anthropology of Edward B. Tylor. Rather than representing evidence of the psychic unity of mankind as with Tylor, for Maine survivals were proof merely of a connection over historical time. See Stocking, *Victorian Anthropology* (New York: The Free Press, 1987), 127-128.

²⁸ The German edition indeed post-dates Tönnies' studies of Morgan's work, but Tönnies read English fluently. Lewis Henry Morgan, *Ancient Society or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from*

institutions of the Iroquois Indians, and the social habits of the American beaver, Morgan explored how over the broad course of history natural forces shaped the rise of ever more complex social formations. While focused on aspects of kinship and the negotiation of collective rule, Morgan was also interested in the physical manifestations of collective life, including the disposition of villages, dwellings, and interior furnishings.²⁹ In a fashion similar to Maine and Morgan, within the native German historical school of sociology, Otto von Gierke's theory of *Genossenschaft*, or social association, traced the historical development of societal forms through an ideal evolutionary scheme of social development, progressing from kinship ties to property relations, from the *Gens* and *Stamm*, through the *Bürgergemeinde*, to the *bürgerliche Rechtsstaat*.³⁰

The Volitional Foundations of Social Life

While following a developmental historical framework, Tönnies also used a psychological and epistemological argument to chart the transition in human societies from *Gemeinschaft* to *Gesellschaft*.³¹ His referent was not the "psychic unity" of anthropologists such as Adolf Bastian, but more the theories of Spencer, Schäffle, and

Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization (Chicago: C.H. Kerr, 1877); *Die Urgesellschaft: Untersuchungen über den Fortschritt des Menschheit aus der Wildheit durch die Barbarei zur Zivilisation*, trans. W. Eichhoff and Karl Kautsky (Stuttgart: Dietz, 1891).

²⁹ Morgan delivered a series of lectures in 1880 at the Archaeological Institute of America in Cambridge, published the next year as *Houses and Houselife of the American Aborigines* (Washington, D.C. Government Printing Office, 1881). Morgan's influence on late nineteenth and early twentieth-century social thought is significant. Marx had done a close study of Morgan's *Ancient Civilization*, the notes of which after Marx's death, Engels gathered together and completed in published form as *Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums, und des Staats. Im Anschluss an Lewis H. Morgan's Forschungen* (Hottingen-Zürich: Dr. d. Schweizer Genossenschafts, 1884). See also Lawrence Kraber, ed., *The Ethnological Notebooks of Karl Marx (Studies of Morgan, Phear, Maine, Lubbock)* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1972).

³⁰ "Gesellschaft, Gemeinschaft," 854; Otto von Gierke, *Das deutsche Genossenschaftsrecht*, 4 vols. (Berlin: Weidemann, 1868-1913).

³¹ René König, "Der Begriff Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft bei Tönnies," *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 7, no. 3 (1955): 351.

even Schopenhauer.³² Tönnies proposed a theory of psychological stimulus-response as the origin and development of social structures.³³ Social formations grew out of essential psychological reactions, out of something like an emotional stimulus reaction, reinforced and fixed in memory. “Human beings form a natural community of thought,” he wrote, “because causality is within us like sense organs.”³⁴ He called this psychological reaction *Bejahung*, or “positive mutual affirmation.”³⁵ The basis for social life was an ethical response, an affirmation of others. This was not a “drive” or an “instinct,” not something operating purely at the level of animal being, but rather a uniquely human psychic and spiritual capacity. Tönnies termed this the *Will*. Influenced by Schopenhauer, Tönnies

³² Tönnies in Raymund Schmidt, *Philosophie der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*. On Bastian's theory of a universal human psyche, see Andrew Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).

³³ The importance of this psychological orientation is especially clear in the preface to the first edition of *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*. Although in later editions of the book, the preface was rewritten and less emphasis was given to psychological theories, the text of the book itself was not substantially changed and psychology remained fundamental to Tönnies' theory of societal origins and development, in *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* and in subsequent writings. In later essays, reflecting back on his early intellectual influences, Tönnies wrote of his early interest in the writings of evolutionarily inclined social theorists such as Herbert Spencer and Albert Schäffle, Ferdinand Tönnies, “Mein Verhältnis zur Soziologie,” *Soziologie von Heute Ein Symposium der Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Soziologie*, ed. Richard Thurnwald (Leipzig: C.F. Hirschfeld, 1931), 103-122; Tönnies mentions especially Albert Schäffle, *Bau und Leben des sozialen Körpers*, 4 vols. (Tübingen: H. Laupp, 1881). Among Tönnies' earliest published writings were reviews of Spencer, Otto Ammon, and other writers whose developmental histories proposed evolutionary “laws” for the progress of society. See “Herbert Spencers soziologisches Werk,” *Philosophisches Monatshefte* 25 (1889): 50-85; “Review of P. Weisengrün, *Die Entwicklungsgesetze der Menschheit*,” *Philosophisches Monatshefte* (1890): 226-227; “Review of Otto Ammon, *Die natürliche Auslese beim Menschen*,” *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie der Sinnesorgane* 6 (1893): 235-245; “Review of von Wimpffen, *Kampf ums Dasein*,” *Deutsche Literarische Zeitung* (1893): 803-804; “Ammons Gesellschaftstheorie,” *Archiv für Soziale Gesetzgebung und Statistik* 19 (1904): 88-111; “Eugenik,” *Schmollers Jahrbuch* 29 (1905): 1089-1106; “Zur naturwissenschaftlichen Gesellschaftslehre,” *Schmollers Jahrbuch* 29 (1905): 27-101, 1283-1322; 30 (1906): 121-145; 31 (1907): 487-552; 33 (1909): 879-894; 35 (1911): 375-396. Tönnies' essay, “Die Anwendung der Deszendenztheorie auf probleme der sozialen Entwicklung was submitted to the 1900 competition sponsored by Alfred Krupp, and chaired by Ernst Haeckel, asking the question “Was lernen wir aus den Prinzipien der Deszendenztheorie in Beziehung auf der innerpolitische Entwicklung und Gesetzgebung der Staaten?” (What can we learn from the principles of evolutionary theory with respect to the development and laws of states?) While Tönnies had a demonstrated interest in evolutionary theory, as an underemployed philosopher he may also have been attracted by the first prize of 10,000 Marks, won by Munich eugenicist Wilhelm Schallmayer. Tönnies' essay was not premiated and was later included in the collection of his writings, *Soziologische Studien und Kritiken*, vol. 1 (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1925), 133-329.

³⁴ Ferdinand Tönnies, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft. Abhandlung des Communismus und des Socialismus als empirischer Culturformen* (first edition, 1887), 15.

³⁵ Ferdinand Tönnies, *Community and Civil Society* (2001), 17.

stated that he comprehended in will “the core and essence of what is human.”³⁶ By rooting his analysis in the deep psychology of volition, “the unifying principle of life,” Tönnies intended to outline a universally applicable theory of human society, and to establish verifiable, scientific laws of historical development.³⁷

Tönnies designated two types of will, *Wesenwille*, natural, essential will, and *Willkür*, replaced by the third edition issued in 1920 by the term *Kürwille*, meaning calculating or rational will.³⁸ Through natural will arose forms of human association that existed for their own sake, without concern for profit or ends, fed by common beliefs and mutual sympathy.³⁹ Natural will was the generator of *Gemeinschaft*. Because natural will expressed itself in progressively greater degrees of volition, that is toward correspondingly more rational, more intellectually willed forms of association, the empirical forms of *Gemeinschaft* existed along a continuum. Tönnies identified three fundamental forms of *Gemeinschaft*: of blood, of place, and of spirit. These three forms corresponded to family, neighborhood, and friendship. The first two configurations, blood/family and locality/ neighborhood were physically manifested in the house and the village. Even when removed from their native environments, however, the *Gemeinschaft*-

³⁶ Ferdinand Tönnies, "Mein Verhältnis zur Soziologie," *Soziologie von heute: Ein Symposium der Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Soziologie*, ed. Richard Thurnwald (Leipzig: C.L. Hirschfeld), 103-122.

³⁷ *Community and Civil Society*, 95.

³⁸ Translation of the terms *Wesenwille* and *Kürwille* as "natural will" and "rational will" here follows usages established in Charles Loomis' first English editions of the 1940s and 1950s, and preserved in the more recent Jose Harris and Margaret Hollis translation of 2001. *Wesen* carries the connotation of the essential and the intrinsic, which are nicely captured by "natural." But "rational" does not do justice to the connotations packed into the prefix *Kür*. Derived from the verb, *küren*, meaning to choose or to elect, *Kürwille* might more correctly, but certainly less elegantly, be translated as "reasoned will" or even "willed will." While "rational" can carry strong connotations of bureaucratized thought, the Latinate root *ratio*, reason, and the substantive form *ratiocination* do indeed convey the distinction Tönnies wished to communicate.

³⁹ For the core of Tönnies' arguments on the nature of will in the formation of human societies, see *Community and Civil Society*, 95-127.

type relationships born within these environs could be sustained by ritual and custom. In Tönnies view, the third form of Gemeinschaft, friendship, was the highest form. This was the fellowship of “cult, fraternity, and religion” made manifest in “churches and monasteries, schools and clubs.”

Kürwille, rational will, produced associations oriented toward achievement of some conscious end. Rational will produced Gesellschaft forms of social life, including contractual and competitive relationships, business associations, and governmental structures. Gesellschaft was shaped by legislation and public opinion. Whereas Gemeinschaft implied psychological solidarity, and an expectation of unlimited accountabilities, Gesellschaft assumed limited social and psychological obligations. Gemeinschaft arose from a complete unity of wills and unquestioned common purpose; Gesellschaft implied a separation of wills, a fragmentation of purpose. “In Gemeinschaft they stay together in spite of everything that separates them; in Gesellschaft they remain separate in spite of everything that unites them.”⁴⁰ Gemeinschaft was romantic and intuitive, Gesellschaft was rational. Gemeinschaft was synonymous with family, village, and small town; Gesellschaft with the city and the state.

Tönnies as Historian

Tönnies had set out to write a meta-history, a narrative that could account for both the synchronic and diachronic phenomena of human society. Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft were presented as purely classificatory terms, ideal types. They were generalizations, abstract concepts which might never exist in pure form in reality but which had the

⁴⁰ *Community and Civil Society*, 52.

character of real social phenomena. As theoretical constructions, the two concepts could be positioned as antithetical premises anchoring the end points of a spectrum of social formations. They constituted a theory-continuum. But they were also positioned temporally as historical entities. There was a continuum, historically and ontologically, between the fundamental forms of *Gemeinschaft* and the still evolving forms of *Gesellschaft*. Tönnies saw in “the entire historical development since the middle ages the gradual setting free of rationalism and its increasing dominance as inherently necessary processes.”⁴¹

Wesenwille and Kürwille, *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*, not only characterized two distinct typologies of human society, they demarcated the two great epochs of human history. *Gemeinschaft* preceded *Gesellschaft*. Historically, *Gemeinschaft* was the dominant form of human association from ancient societies through the middle ages. *Gesellschaft* was the prevailing social force in the modern, capitalist world. This historical relationship of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* was emphasized in the subtitle of Tönnies' second edition, *Abhandlung des Communismus und Socialismus als empirischer Culturformen*, *Treatise on Communism and Socialism as Empirical Cultural Forms*. Tönnies characterized communism as a primitive and fundamental form of exchange, allied with clan and tribal social systems, whereas socialism grew out of more complex forms of social hierarchy and state governance. *Gesellschaft* was synonymous temporally and in terms of economic development with *bürgerlich* *Gesellschaft*, bourgeois society. *Gesellschaft* was rooted in *Gemeinschaft* through the evolution of natural will into rational will, through the developing consciousness of the individual.

⁴¹ Tönnies, "Mein Verhältnis zur Soziologie" (1931), 104.

Over time natural will evolved into rational will. The household economy gave way to the trade economy; the dominance of agriculture gave way to industry. The *Gemeinschaft* of the family, the clan, the village, evolved into the *Gesellschaft* of the money economy and the anonymity of the modern metropolis.

The 1912 edition of *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, with its subtitle *Grundbegriffe der reinen Soziologie*, Fundamental Concepts in Pure Sociology, suggests a more neutral, structural analysis, less impressed by the evolutionary dictates of developmental history than driven towards the ethos of a value-free social science. In the intervening twenty-five years since *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* had first appeared, the field of sociology had evolved, and Tönnies had emerged as a leading voice. He had published his studies on Hobbes. He had helped found the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie, and had been instrumental in distinguishing its mission from that of the politically motivated Verein für Sozialpolitik, by advocating social science practices that were not beholden to state interests. Tönnies wanted as well to distance himself from the simplifications and misunderstandings that had followed on the developmental historical implications of the title and preface of the first edition. In an 1907 lecture before the Gehe-Stiftung in Dresden, Tönnies explained,

The proposition of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* has been repeatedly construed to be a matter of types that can be differentiated in the same way that botanists distinguish trees and grasses or zoologists vertebrates and invertebrates. This interpretation is not my own. I would compare my method much more to that of the chemist than of the natural scientist. It is more a matter of separation and refinement than of differentiation. It is essentially about deconstructing visible social relations down to their

elements, and conceptually representing those elements, irrespective of whether they are ever actually found in their pure form or not.⁴²

Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft comprised a conceptual pair, theoretically and historically connected, but they were not defined as a dialectical synthesis. This avoidance of synthesis was not an oversight on Tönnies' part. Although his interest in the developmental historical aspects of his theory receded with time, he remained committed to his volitional thesis. By basing his theory in a deeply seated psychology of volition, Tönnies constructed an historically aligned ethology, a theory founded on natural and unchanging inclinations would yield an eternally valid set of laws. It was especially important that Gemeinschaft be established as an older, more primitive, more fundamental, and a qualitatively higher form of human social association than Gesellschaft. Tönnies wanted to show that Gemeinschaft was the fundament of human social life, and that it persisted. In the anthropological sense, there were “survivals” of Gemeinschaft in the modern world, in families, villages, small towns, and in the form of associations of closely connected, like-minded people, in the city itself.

From quite early on in the reception of *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, Tönnies' thesis had been criticized as one-sided. It was held, notably by Max Weber and Leopold von Wiese, that he had failed to consider the importance of power and struggle in the

⁴² “Man hat das Theorem [of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft] mehrfach dahin verstanden und ausgelegt, daß es diese Arten unterscheidet, etwa wie Botaniker Bäume und Gräser, der Zoologe Wirbeltiere und Wirbellose unterscheidet. Diese Auslegung ist nicht die meine. Ich vergleiche das hier beschreibenden Verfahren vielmehr dem Verfahren des Chemikers als dem der beschreibenden Naturwissenschaft. Es handelt sich vielmehr um Scheidung als um Unterscheidung. Es gilt die Erscheinung des sozialen Verhältnisses in seine Elemente zu zerlegen und diese Elemente begrifflich darzustellen, unangesehen, ob ihre reine Gestalt in der Wirklichkeit vorkomme oder nicht,” Ferdinand Tönnies, “Das Wesen der Soziologie,” *Vortrag in der Gehe-Stiftung, Neue Zeit- und Streitfragen* 4 (1907), republished in *Soziologische Studien und Kritiken*, vol. 1, 350-368, quote on p. 353.

formation of social structures.⁴³ Yet Tönnies returned to his theory of *Wesenwille* and *Kürwille* numerous times in his writings over several decades, insisting that he had intentionally excluded conflict and negating instincts as a fundamental forms of human sociology.⁴⁴ By emphasizing only positive forms of human interaction, “gegenseitige Bejahung” mutual affirmation, and an inborn, natural inclination toward associational life, Tönnies sought to maintain sociology’s roots in philosophy and history.⁴⁵ He resisted biologically inclined theories that framed human society as a *Kampf ums Dasein*, a struggle for existence

Gemeinschaft as Community Ideal

Tönnies emphasized *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* as ideal types, or normal concepts (*Normalbegriff* is Tönnies’ designation) within a structural-analytical system. Yet in the conceptual pairing of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*, even as ideal types, Tönnies’ preference for *Gemeinschaft* as a higher and better form of social relation was everywhere apparent. “In *Gemeinschaft* we are united from the moment of our birth with our own folk for better or for worse. We go out into *Gesellschaft* as if into a foreign land. A young man is warned about mixing with bad society: but the phrase “bad community” makes no sense.”⁴⁶

⁴³ Max Weber discusses ethical and economic foundations of social life in “Die Stadt, eine soziologische Untersuchung,” written in 1911/13 and first published posthumously in 1921. For Leopold von Wiese’s analysis of Tönnies, see *Allgemeine Soziologie als Lehre von den Beziehungen und Beziehungsbildern der Menschen. Teil 1: Beziehungslehre* (Munich: Duncker & Humblot, 1924); and “Tönnies Einteilung der ,kmSoziologie,” *Kölner Vierteljahreshefte für Soziologie* 5 (1925/26).

⁴⁴ Tönnies, “Mein Verhältnis zur Soziologie,” 139-40.

⁴⁵ “Das Wesen der Soziologie,” 351-352.

⁴⁶ *Community and Society*, 18: In the 1887 edition, the passage reads, “In *Gemeinschaft* mit den Seinen befindet man sich, von der Geburt an, mit allem Wohl und Wehe daran gebunden. Man geht in die *Gesellschaft* wie in die Fremde. Der Jüngling wird gewarnt vor schlechter *Gesellschaft*; aber schlechte *Gemeinschaft* ist dem Sprachsinne zuwider,” 4.

Tönnies preference for village and small town life as an ideal sphere of human activity was a notable feature of his life as well. He preferred the open marshlands of the small town of Husum to the urban bustle of Berlin and Kiel. *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* is strongly shaped by a geographical imperative, by the idea that configurations of place – landscape, architecture, and the habits of everyday life – fostered specific kinds of social structures. *Gemeinschaft* is borne of the rural house and village: “Community life develops in permanent relation to field and dwelling house. It can be explained only in its own terms, for its inner core and thus to some extent its very existence is part of the nature of things.”⁴⁷ *Gesellschaft* was a product of modern capitalist industrial economy: “The big city is the archetype of pure *Gesellschaft*.”⁴⁸ Tönnies was critical of modern cities, in the manner typical of many social reformers of the time: he was critical of property speculation, of poor living and health conditions, of the exploitation of laborers. On the theoretical level of his study, he was critical of the complete instrumentalization of the self and interpersonal relationships, the pressures to conform every aspect of life in the big city to the dictates of economic imperatives. But Tönnies also posited a notion of an ideal city, an historical construct based in classical and medieval precedents, which harbored thriving forms of *Gemeinschaft*. This was the city that grew organically over time, more an aggregation of villages, where craftsmen formed guilds and worshippers built churches. The city in this regard was the crucible of the arts and religion, and the arts and religion were, in turn, the vehicles and substance of enduring *Gemeinschaft* in the city.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ *Community and Society*, 37.

⁴⁸ *Community and Society*, 253.

⁴⁹ *Community and Society*, 48-51.

Tönnies cast *Gemeinschaft* as an idealized version of rural and small town life, of loving families and religious accord, untroubled by poverty, violence, or injustice. This idealization is in large part the source for the criticisms of nostalgia and romanticism that have been leveled at Tönnies over the decades. It was as if, in coming to terms with the world that was altering before his eyes, Tönnies found it necessary to exalt, almost to crystallize, the past, in order to emphasize how dramatically life had changed. Tönnies' defining of modernity through an apparent antithesis, *Gemeinschaft/Gesellschaft*, is characteristic of late nineteenth social theories. Henry Sumner Maine proposed the ideal antithetic categories of "status" and "contract" as a basis for comparative social analysis. Tönnies himself acknowledged Maine's method as an important influence on his formation of the *Gemeinschaft/ Gesellschaft* thesis.⁵⁰ As sociologists and historians grappled with the experience of a world splintering under the pressures of rapid change, they defined the problem through antitheses, as Marx did with feudalism and capitalism, and Durkheim with mechanical and organic society. In each instance, a primitivized past was cast as the antipode of modernity; and modernity, indistinct and still in the process of becoming, was mapped as the antithesis of the past.⁵¹

***Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* as Operative Theory: Tönnies as Social Reformer**

Tönnies theorized that *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* were not only historical categories; they were also conditions of human interaction that were present in the modern world. He perceived that elements of *Gemeinschaft* and elements of *Gesellschaft* were always simultaneously present. Although *Gemeinschaft* was a higher and nobler form of human

⁵⁰ Tönnies in Schmidt, *Selbstdarstellungen*,” 13.

⁵¹ David Frisby, *Fragments of Modernity: Theories of Modernity in the Work of Simmel, Kracauer, and Benjamin* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1986), 13.

relation, *Gesellschaft* was the variable element that transformed culture into civilization. The fundamental nature of *Gemeinschaft* as inborn and native made it capable of existing and persisting in all times and all places in tandem with *Gesellschaft*. In *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* he wrote, "Even as it wanes, the force of *Gemeinschaft* survives within the age of *Gesellschaft*, and remains the reality of social life."⁵² Increasingly, as Tönnies expanded on this idea in his subsequent theoretical writings, he maintained that new forms of *Gemeinschaft* could take shape within *Gesellschaft*. These would be elective associations that arose among people who consciously willed a *Gemeinschaft* within *Gesellschaft*. This could be construed as a third type of will, what Tönnies termed the will to create *Samtschaft*, the social collectivity. For Tönnies, this distinctly modern type of will towards association was most evident in the rise of the working class and in the formation of political parties. Through his writings and his involvement with social reform associations, Tönnies became interested in ways to create or to resurrect *Gemeinschaft* forms of association in the modern world, primarily through the formation of *Gewerksschaften* and *Konsumvereine*, trade unions and cooperative associations.⁵³ He increasingly came to see "a principle of life and health" in the development of *Gesellschaft*, particularly in the evolution of the modern democracy, where the powers of the common will acted as a counterweight to the powers of the state.⁵⁴

⁵² "Die Kraft der *Gemeinschaft* auch innerhalb des gesellschaftlichen Zeitalters, wenn auch abnehmend, sich erhält und die Realität des sozialen Lebens bleibt," *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, 6th edition (1926), 252.

⁵³ On Tönnies' social reform interests, see Arthur Mitzman, "Tönnies and German Society, 1887-1914: From Cultural Pessimism to Celebration of the *Volksgemeinschaft*," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 32 (1971): 507-524. See the bibliography of Tönnies writings, "Schriften von Ferdinand Tönnies aus den Jahren 1875-1935," in *Reine und angewandte Soziologie. Eine Festgabe für Ferdinand Tönnies zu seinem achtzigsten Geburtstag am 26. Juli 1935* (Leipzig: Hans Buske, 1936), 383-403.

⁵⁴ Tönnies, "Das Jubiläum der Städteordnung," *Die Neue Rundschau* (1908), cited in Mitzman, "Tönnies and German Society," 519.

Tönnies contributed articles on social reform to numerous journals, including the *Sozialpolitisches Zentralblatt*, *Schmollers Jahrbuch*, *Die neue Zeit*, *Die Wahrheit*, *Das freie Wort*, *Die Hilfe*, and *Ethische Kultur*, the journal of the German Ethical Culture movement. The Society for Ethical Culture was founded in New York in 1876. In the early years, members promoted the kindergarten movement, settlement houses, and state support for social welfare.⁵⁵ The ethical culture movement spread to Europe first through England in 1890, where it had strong ties to Fabianism. A German branch of the Ethical Society was started in 1892. The Berlin group numbered over 1,000 members.⁵⁶ Tönnies was a member of the German Society's original managing committee and a regular contributor to its weekly publication, *Ethische Kultur*, from the first issue in 1893 until the onset of the First World War. He dealt with topics ranging from education policy to labor relations, from rehabilitation of criminals to housing conditions for workers.⁵⁷

While Tönnies was interested in ways to preserve and even resurrect *Gemeinschaft* within the modern *Gesellschaft*, his reform activity followed the overall agenda of the socialist and workers' movements. His journalistic commentary was often related to his work with sociographic research in crime, suicide, and education. Although interested in more equitable land ownership, he was not active in housing associations, nor was he a member of *Heimatschutz* or Garden City associations, two reform movements which on

⁵⁵ Howard B. Radest, *Toward Common Ground: The Story of the Ethical Societies in the United States* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1969), 307-312.

⁵⁶ Radest, *Toward Common Ground*, 87-88.

⁵⁷ Tönnies' contributions to the journal *Ethische Kultur* included "Die Verhandlungen über Arbeitslosigkeit," *Ethische Kultur* 1 (1893): 715-72; "Universitätsausdehnung in England," *Ethische Kultur* 2 (1894): 283-284, 290-292; "Die sittliche Bestimmung der Frau," *Ethische Kultur* 3 (1895): 26-27; "Die akademische Laufbahn und ihre ökonomische Regelung," *Ethische Kultur* 3 (1895): 119; "Sozialwissenschaft und Universitätsstudium," *Ethische Kultur* 4 (1896): 213-214; "Zum Hamburger Streik," *Ethische Kultur* 4 (1896): 409-411; "Nietzsche und die Humanität," *Ethische Kultur* 5 (1897): 28-30, 36-37; "Hamburger Arbeiterwohnungen," *Ethische Kultur* 5 (1897): 239; "Die Wohnungsnot eine sittliche Not," *Ethische Kultur* 8 (1900): 27-28; "Die Verhütung des Verbrechens," *Ethische Kultur* 9 (1901): 153-155, 162-164; "Belleville," *Ethische Kultur* 10 (1902): 235-236.

the surface at least seem very close to his philosophical interests. There are, however, two documents that offer a view into a more culturally romantic, more spatially defined rendering of Tönnies' ideal *Gemeinschaft*.

During the 1880s, as Tönnies was first working through the arguments and ideas that would become *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, he corresponded with Friedrich Paulsen, a professor of philosophy and pedagogy at the University of Berlin who Tönnies first met in 1875.⁵⁸ Tönnies described for Paulsen his vision of an ideal community of like-minded spirits, a *Gemeinschaft* of scholars, living in harmony apart from the world of political and moral strife.

The second of Tönnies' reform proposals was published in the first issue of *Ethische Kultur* in 1893. "Fünfzehn Thesen über die Erneuerung des Familienlebens," Fifteen Theses for the Renewal of Family Life, focused on marriage and family life as the ethical bases of society.⁵⁹ Tönnies worked along two tracks to create the rationale for his reform proposal. On one hand, he detailed how modern social and economic circumstances, particularly the stressful economic and living conditions in the city, eroded ethical (that is, moral, just, equitable) family life. On the other hand, he proposed that in the new, higher state of future society made possible by the triumph of the ethical culture movement, life-long marriage might become obsolete altogether. While remaining resolved that the whole of the social problem could not be solved until the system of private ownership of dwellings and monopolistic capital was overthrown, Tönnies

⁵⁸ Letters of 28 March 1881 and 26 January 1885, in *Ferdinand Tönnies und Friedrich Paulsen: Briefwechsel, 1876-1908*, ed. Olaf Klose, Eduard Georg Jacoby, and Irma Fischer (Kiel: F. Hirt, 1961).

⁵⁹ Ferdinand Tönnies, "Fünfzehn Thesen über die Erneuerung des Familienlebens," *Ethische Kultur* 1 (1893), pp. 302-304, 310-312.

explained that in the interim, it was necessary to establish the social conditions that would preserve ethical living and lay the ground for the coming new society: “Was wir brauchen ist eine andere Gestaltung,” what we need is a new configuration, he wrote, “one that will make life easier and healthier, create more honest and more meaningful social interactions, and raise the level of understanding between men and women.”⁶⁰

Tönnies’ actual reform plan fell somewhat short of revolutionary: he proposed a network of extended family groups, living communally. Each association (Genossenschaft) would comprise three to five families, related by blood, or by common interests and a desire for more ethical lives, which joined together to share “Haus und Herd,” home and hearth. Living together would promote sociability, economic viability, and the rearing of children among the family members. It would provide a buffer against the isolation and unwholesomeness of big city anomie. In order to create strong bonds and thus ensure the longevity of the family Gemeinschaft, it would be necessary for the family associations to develop cultural rituals that would bind the individual to the group. “Like a kind of religious faith,” he wrote, “you must mobilize your common spirit through regular and extraordinary gatherings, meditations, and artistic events.”⁶¹ In order to sow true and lasting social justice, the individual family associations would join other such groups to form larger communities. These larger communities (Gemeinde) would ideally be composed of family associations from differing economic levels, the upper classes as

⁶⁰ Tönnies, “Fünfzehn Thesen über die Erneuerung des Familienlebens,” p. 310.

⁶¹ “Sie muß ihren gemeinsamen Geist in regelmäßigen und außerordentlichen Zusammenkünften, Betrachtungen, Kunstübungen, nach Art eines religiösen Glaubens, bethätigen,” Tönnies, “Fünfzehn Thesen über die Erneuerung des Familienlebens,” 312.

well as the middle and working classes, so that "through shared labor, a brotherly form of collective life is made possible."⁶²

It would not do to give more credence to these two visions of ideal community than is indeed merited by their relatively minor place in Tönnies' overall work. His political and sociological work in statistical studies, professional associations, and teaching showed a tremendous commitment to advancing the quality of life in the here and now. It is clear, however, that behind the day-to-day involvement with the affairs of modern *Gesellschaft*, he held a vision of a timeless *Gemeinschaft*, "the fraternity or religious congregation... the ultimate and highest expression of the idea of Community."⁶³

Tönnies' ideal community conceptions are similar to other utopian community schemes from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Like the utopian visionaries Robert Owen, Charles Fourier, and Henri Saint-Simon, Tönnies proposed extended, non-traditional family groups, bonded by ritual and collective moral purpose, enjoying the benefits of shared labor and enhanced sociability. Not unlike Novalis' Christian community in *Die Christenheit oder Europa* or Bruno Taut's temple of scholars in *Alpine Architektur*, Tönnies described a brotherhood of intellectuals, what was in essence a medieval monastic brotherhood. It is clear that early on in the drafting of *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, Tönnies was thinking of the historical associations of *Gemeinschaft* with the religious *Gemeinde*. Like the German Romantics, particularly, Tönnies pictured true

⁶² "... eine ethisch Gebildeter wird nicht scheuen, sondern sich freuen, von Zeit zu Zeit auch in familiärer Art mit Gleichgesinnten, die anderen Sphären als er selber angehören, zusammenzukommen, er wird lernen und erfahren, daß die produktive Arbeit einer gesunden Denkungsart förderlich ist, daß unter denen, die sich nicht Herrschaften nennen, ebenso oft ein herrlicher Sinn, wie unter Herrschaften ein knechtischer Sinn blüht, und daß auf Grund gemeinsamer Arbeit eine brüderliche Ordnung des menschlichen Zusammenlebens möglich ist," Tönnies, "Fünfzehn Thesen über die Erneuerung des Familienlebens," 312.

⁶³ Tönnies, *Community and Civil Society*, 36.

community, the enduring *Gemeinschaft* that was both higher and more fundamental than modern *Gesellschaft*, as something that happened outside the purview of the state.

Gemeinschaft was personal, borne by intellectual and moral fortitude, and held together by cultural ritual and artistic tradition.

Theorizing *Gesellschaft* and the Progress of Modernity

While Tönnies' principal interest in *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* and later writings was to analyze the mechanisms and character of modernity, there was indeed a faintly nostalgic quality to his thinking, a feeling that the passage of historical time was a tragedy in which more of value is lost than gained. One senses him trying to gather the threads of tradition as they unravel, of trying to steady faint remnants of *Gemeinschaft* against the storms of historical change. The works of two other leading sociologists of the time, Werner Sombart and Max Weber, Tönnies' peers in the *Gesellschaft für Soziologie*, are perhaps less haunted by regrets for lost time than Tönnies, but they are no less concerned with history as a force of social transformation. Both Sombart and Weber used the method of tracing back social phenomena to their origins in times past as a means of revealing their true nature in the present, and a key to understanding their future development. One significant difference between the work of Tönnies and that of Sombart and Weber was the status given to the city as a historical phenomenon, and as an agent of social change in its own right. In Tönnies' work, the city was remote and abstract: a necessary theater of *gesellschaftlich* social relations. Sombart and Weber, however, saw the city as a central, vital force. Their theories of the origin, essence, and potential future of capitalist society were rooted in investigations of the origin and growth of the city. Both saw the city as an essential arena for the formation of modern social

relations, and both considered economic forces as the principal engine of that formation. In differing ways, both Sombart and Weber placed Marx's idea of economic development as the principal agent in their theories of historical change. Both were interested in the role of changing modes of production, but also in changing patterns of consumption, in networks of distribution, and in the role production and consumption played in the institutionalization of class identities. Both were also interested in the way self- and class-identity were shaped by economic behaviors.

The Marxist basis for their work – and it could be argued, the late nineteenth historicist origins of their intellectual formation – defined progress as the central thematic of their arguments. The social scientific writing of the time was suffused with what was termed *Fortschrittsglauben*, faith in progress. But neither Sombart nor Weber followed any simple positivist track. For them, history was a drama of creative destruction: in order for something to come into being (preeminently capitalism, i.e. *Gesellschaft*), something else (preeminently handwork, master-apprentice relations, small workshops, and cottage industries, i.e. *Gemeinschaft*) would have to fall away. In Tönnies' terms of analysis, one would say Sombart and Weber were above all concerned with *Gesellschaft*, with the rationalizing modernity, its characteristics, its mechanisms, its effects. The idea that there was something like an originating moment for modern social relations, implies that there was a time before modern social relations, a time before *Gesellschaft*, a time when the city and capitalism were not intertwined, a time before the perpetuum mobile of modernization. Sombart was unabashed in calling that age *Gemeinschaft*: he made open and frequent acknowledgement of his intellectual debts to Tönnies. While not without his moments of mourning times past, Weber focused more on the effects, manifest and latent

of modernity. Rather than marking out the stark differential of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*, he traced the gradualist path of capitalism's ascendance.

While treated here in less depth than the consideration given to Tönnies, Sombart's and Weber's analyses are relevant to this study on three counts. First, their approaches to the *Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft* divide show how widespread spatializing modes of analysis and theory formation were in late Wilhelmine sociology. To illustrate briefly: Sombart's sharp division between *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* was reflected in his definition of the urban as the not-rural, whereas Weber's idea of a continuity of social and economic relations posited an urban-rural continuum. Second, their major works related to the role of the city in the rise of modernity further emphasize the degree to which the social sciences of the period reasoned from history. They understood history as progress, driven by the engines of economics. And third, both Sombart and Weber located the origins of the modern age within the economic relations that took shape in the communes of medieval Europe. In doing so they gave added intellectual and scientific force to the romantic mythologies of the Middle Ages as a golden pre-capitalist age of fellow feeling and community cohesion. Sombart and Weber shared this fascination with the Middle Ages as an originating, ideal moment with Tönnies and a number of other social scientists of the time, including Otto von Guericke, Franz Oppenheimer, and Georg Simmel.⁶⁴ The tendency constitutes a kind of "sociological medievalism," which has interesting parallels with other medievalisms of the period – in stylistic aspects of literature, art, and

⁶⁴ See Otto Gerhard Oexle, "Kulturwissenschaftliche Reflexionen über soziale Gruppen in der mittelalterlichen Gesellschaft: Tönnies, Simmel, Durkheim und Max Weber," in *Die Okzidentale Stadt nach Max Weber. Zum Problem der Zugehörigkeit in Antike und Mittelalter*, ed. Christian Meier (Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1994), 115-159; and Klaus Schreiner, "Die mittelalterliche Stadt in Webers Analyse und die Deutung des okzidentalen Rationalismus. Typus, Legitimität, Kulturbedeutung," in *Max Weber, der Historiker*, ed. Jürgen Kocka (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 119-150.

architecture surely, but also in the broader rhetoric of national identity and ideal German community.

Werner Sombart: Gesellschaft as Moloch

From the late 1890s through the 1920s, Werner Sombart was probably the most well-known sociologist in Germany.⁶⁵ Over the course of his career, Sombart's politics passed from socialism to conservative reaction. While Sombart's reputation in modern sociology is now much diminished, and indeed was diminishing in his own lifetime, he remains interesting from a historical perspective because, as Rolf Peter Sieferle put it, his intellectual passages register with "seismological exactness" the mood and themes of the time.⁶⁶

In his early works, written from the late nineteenth century through the early 1920s, Sombart wrote as a socialist under the influence of Marx and Engels, but also as an intellectual sheltered by the moderating influences of the German Social Democratic party and the Ethical Culture movement.⁶⁷ Like Max Weber, Sombart had been a student of the agricultural economist August Meitzen. And like Weber, Sombart wrote his

⁶⁵ Friedrich Lenger, *Werner Sombart, 1863-1941. Eine Biographie* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1994); Jürgen G. Backhaus, ed. *Werner Sombart (1863-1941) – Social Scientist*, vol. 1, *His Life and Work*, vol. 2, *His Theoretical Approach*, vol. 3, *Then and Now* (Marburg: Metropolis-Verlag, 1996). See also Dirk Käsler, *Die frühe deutsche Soziologie 1909 bis 1934 und ihre Entstehungs-Milieus. Eine wissenschaftssoziologische Untersuchung* (Opladen: West Deutscher Verlag, 1984); and Arthur Mitzman, *Sociology and Estrangement: Three Sociologists of Imperial Germany* (New York: Knopf, 1973).

⁶⁶ Rolf Peter Sieferle, *Die Konservative Revolution Fünf biographische Skizzen* (Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, 1995), 74. As evidence of Sombart's preeminence at the time, it is interesting to note that the American sociologist Talcott Parsons did his dissertation at Heidelberg under Karl Jaspers on Sombart as well as Weber, see Talcott Parsons, "Der Kapitalismus bei Sombart und Max Weber" (Capitalism in recent German literature: Sombart and Weber), (Ph.D. diss., Heidelberg, 1929). The German edition is in Talcott Parsons Papers, Harvard University; an English translation can be found in the Staatsbibliothek Berlin.

⁶⁷ Early influences on Sombart's conceptions of social problems also included Lassalle and Emile Zola. See vom Brocke, "Werner Sombart," 26-27.

dissertation on the history of rural economies in Italy.⁶⁸ Through the 1890s and the 1910s, Sombart was deeply interested in the situation of the working class and broader social issues.⁶⁹ In addition to the Ethical Culture Society, he supported the Heimatschutz movement and was on the board of the German Garden City Association. In his commitments to social action as well as theory, Sombart resembles Tönnies (with whom he maintained a life-long friendship). Sombart's politics shifted dramatically in the late 1920s and through the 1930s, but the evidence of Sombart's migration to a Manichean view of economic and social relations was evident much earlier, in his writings of the mid to late 1910s, and it can be argued that the basis of his arguments in a *Gemeinschaft* versus *Gesellschaft* dichotomy established the pattern for an inevitably tragic view of capitalism's progress.

In his early writings about socialism and capitalism, Sombart sought to identify where *Gemeinschaft* might be sheltered or regenerated within modern society. His 1896 book, *Sozialismus und soziale Bewegung im 19. Jahrhundert*, based on a series of lectures at the Swiss Society of Ethical Culture in Zurich, offered an introduction to socialism and Marxist theory.⁷⁰ Rather than a strict interpretation of Marxist doctrine, the book

⁶⁸ Werner Sombart, "Die römische Campagna. Eine sozialökonomische Studie," in *Staats- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Forschungen*, ed. Gustav Schmoller (Leipzig, 1888).

⁶⁹ Sombart was famous in his own day as a reform-minded socialist. His book, *Sozialismus und soziale Bewegung im 19. Jahrhundert. Nebst einem Anhang: Chronik der sozialen Bewegung 1750-1896* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1896) was the principal introduction to Marxism for thousands worldwide at the end of the nineteenth century. His academic career, on the other hand, was made immeasurably more difficult through the 1920s by his early socialist politics. He was unable to obtain a professorial post at Breslau, where he had been a lecturer, or at several other universities in Germany. In 1906 he accepted a post at a Berlin Handelshochschule (business college) where he taught until finally being named to the economics chair at Berlin University, succeeding Adolf Wagner. See the biographical overview in Lenger, *Werner Sombart*.

⁷⁰ Werner Sombart, *Sozialismus und soziale Bewegung im 19. Jahrhundert. Nebst einem Anhang: Chronik der sozialen Bewegung 1750-1896* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1896). Bernhard vom Brocke notes that "In their original form, [the lectures] could hardly have been given on imperial territory." *Werner Sombart*, 29. Fischer's edition presented a edited version of the talks, which were published the next year in their entirety as *Socialismus und soziale Bewegung im 19. Jahrhundert*. Ethisch-socialwissenschaftliche Vortragskurse,

presented an outline for socialism as the instrument of general social and cultural improvement, with attention to the distinctive characteristics, and distinctive paths, of socialism in different countries. Sombart's 1900 book, *Dennoch!*, which also originated in lectures given before worker audiences, identified those institutions within industrial society where *Gemeinschaft* might be regenerated.⁷¹ In subsequent works such as the 1903 *Die deutsche Volkswirtschaft im 19. Jahrhundert*,⁷² and the 1906 *Das Proletariat* (the first volume published in Martin Buber's popular *Die Gesellschaft* series), Sombart showed a continued concern for the plight of the industrial worker.⁷³ At the same time, the books mark the rising wave of lamentation for the loss of *Gemeinschaft* in the wake of capitalist industrial society, and an increasingly visionary attention to the restoration of community. The traditional handworker and artisan were defined as paragons of community. While the spirit and force of capitalism as the principal agent of historical change remained central, the outcomes of the march of historical progress was not salutary:

Capitalism has bestowed upon us mass society; it has robbed our life of its inner peace; it has alienated us from nature; it has taken from us the beliefs of our fathers; it has liquidated everything into a simple math problem and awakened in us an over-estimation of the things of this world; it has brought the great mass of the population into a slave-like relationship of dependence on a small number of businessmen⁷⁴

veranstaltet von den ethischen Gesellschaften in Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz, edited by the Schweizer Gesellschaft für ethische Kultur, vol. 4 (Bern, 1897). The first English-language edition of the book was *Socialism and the Social Movement in the Nineteenth Century, with a chronicle of the social movement, 1750-1896*, trans. by Anson P. Atterbury, with an introduction by John B. Clark (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1898).

⁷¹ Werner Sombart, *Dennoch! Aus Theorie und Geschichte der gewerkschaftlichen Arbeiterbewegung* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1900). See the discussion in Mitzman, *Sociology and Estrangement*, 175-76.

⁷² Werner Sombart, *Die deutsche Volkswirtschaft im 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: G. Bondi, 1903).

⁷³ Werner Sombart, *Das Proletariat: Bilder und Studien* (Frankfurt a.M.: Rütten & Loning, 1906).

⁷⁴ "Der Kapitalismus hat uns die Masse beschert, er hat unser Leben der inneren Ruhe beraubt, er hat uns die Natur entfremdet, er hat uns den Glauben unserer Väter genommen, indem er die Welt in ein

Sombart's polemical dichotomy – Gemeinschaft good, Gesellschaft bad – became more vociferous in his later writings of the 1930s, but his crisis of faith in socialism as a optimistic theory of historical progress occurred much earlier.⁷⁵ The inevitability of capitalism, as Weber termed it the "stahlhartes Gehäuse," the iron cage, assumed a tragic guise.⁷⁶

Sombart's early theory of community formation and urban growth was laid out in two works, several chapters in the major socio-economics treatise of his early period, *Der moderne Kapitalismus*, first published in 1902,⁷⁷ and the essay, "Der Begriff der Stadt und das Wesen des Städtebildung" (The concept of the city and the nature of city

Rechenexempel auflöste und eine Überbewertung der Dinge dieser Welt in uns wach rief, er hat die große Masse der Bevölkerung in ein sklavenartiges Verhältnis der Abhängigkeit von einer geringen Anzahl von Unternehmern gebracht," Sombart, *Die deutsche Volkswirtschaft im 19. Jahrhundert*, 509.

⁷⁵Biographers credit the shift rightward in Sombart's political and social outlook, a shift toward a dualistic, aristocratic, anti-materialist, and anti-democratic view, primarily to the crashing disappointment of the First World War, but also even to his shock at capitalism and philistinism run amok in the United States, witnessed during his 1904 trip to the International Congress of Arts and Sciences at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition in St. Louis. As Rolf Peter Sieferle points out, Sombart was not alone in believing that the war marked an apocalyptic solution to the problems wrought by capitalism, and a return of heroic virtues. The "Idee von 1914" was held by many others, including Georg Simmel and Thomas Mann. Within the context of the present study, Sombart's Manichean portrayal of the Germans as the people of soulful Gemeinschaft and the British as the people of money-grubbing, calculating Gesellschaft is of particular interest.

Sombart's use of the Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft thesis in this way marks a key moment in the transubstantiation of Tönnies' theory from systematic-socialist to reactionary-nationalist. One of Sombart's points was that the essential character of the Germans was the belief that, like the soldier sacrificing himself on the battlefield for the greater good of the nation, the individual sublimated himself to the larger dictates of the collective, the Volksgemeinschaft. See Sombart, *Händler und Helden. Patriotische Besinnungen* (Munich and Leipzig: Duncker, 1915). See also Rolf Peter Sieferle, *Die Konservative Revolution*, 74-105; Bernhard vom Brocke, ed. *Moderne Kapitalismus: Materialien zur Kritik und Rezeption* (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1987); and Werner Krause, *Sombarts Weg vom Kathedersozialismus zum Faschismus* (Berlin: Rutten & Loening, 1962).

⁷⁶Max Weber, *Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus* (1904/1905), in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, vol. 1 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1920-21), 203.

⁷⁷Werner Sombart, *Der moderne Kapitalismus*, vol. 1, *Die Genesis des Kapitalismus*, vol. 2, *Die Theorie der kapitalistischen Entwicklung* (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1902). In its second edition of 1916-1919, the book was revised and expanded, with a newly added subtitle and new volume titles, as well, *Der moderne Kapitalismus: Historisch-systematische Darstellung des gesamteuropäischen Wirtschaftslebens von seinen Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, vol. 1, *Einleitung: Die vorkapitalistische Wirtschaft. Die historischen Grundlagen des modernen Kapitalismus*, vol. 2, *Das europäische Wirtschaftsleben im Zeitalter des Frühkapitalismus vornehmlich im 16., 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*, vol. 3, *Das Wirtschaftsleben im Zeitalter des Hochkapitalismus* (Munich and Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1916-1919).

formation) from 1907.⁷⁸ Sombart proposed a theory of the origin and development of the city based on economic relations. He asked, how do settlements first coalesce into cities, how do they grow, and particularly, how and why do they become large cities – Großstädte, metropolises. He argued that economic forces shaped cities and, in turn, that cities were central to the rise of capitalist society.

Rather than enumerating city types – the city as fortress, the city as trading center, the city as ecclesiastical center, the city as industrial center – and letting typological definitions foreclose deeper analysis of generative features, Sombart made *homo economicus* the essence of city formation. Cities were economic entities and man the economic animal, the creature of exchange and acquisition, was the creator of cities. The distinction of Sombart's theory rests on his proposition that it was the network of economic relationships, of the production of surpluses and the provision of services, that developed *between* people that was the true engine of the city's formation. In the words of one of Sombart's biographers, Bernhard vom Brocke, the role of capital in shaping the city is in keeping with Sombart's elevation of capital to a "historical-immanent cause."⁷⁹

Sombart presented a historical systemic analysis that tracked the rise of capitalism and growth of cities from the Middle Ages to the early twentieth century. In defining the forces that shaped the rise of cities and the consequences of urbanization, he drew strongly on Tönnies' categories of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*, evincing a mild emotional preference for the former, and full intellectual engagement for the latter. In simplest terms, the organic societies that existed before the rise of modern economic

⁷⁸ Werner Sombart, "Der Begriff der Stadt und das Wesen der Städtebildung," *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 25, no. 1(1907): 1-9.

⁷⁹ Bernhard vom Brocke, "Werner Sombart 1863-1941," 56.

relations (notably the medieval town and city) were *Gemeinschaft*, the rationalizing and calculating societies (the metropolis) that existed after were *Gesellschaft*. Through his historicized theory, Sombart played out an acute spatialization of the dichotomies of pre-modern and modern capitalism within the topographies of urbanism, and ultimately what became a virulent anti-urbanism.

There are two aspects of Sombart's theorizations of the city that illustrate his conception of how *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* were played out in the historical course of urbanization. Firstly, in establishing the points of origin for urban genesis and growth, he cast a theory of surplus value as a drama of the social and economic interdependence of city-dwellers. Sombart argued that city size and rate of growth were essentially products of surplus value. The size of a city was correlate to the surplus it was able to draw from its dependent regions, in historical terms initially from the surrounding countryside and over time from increasingly more remote regions, through use of the instruments of trade, transportation, and colonization.⁸⁰

With flourishes of psychological insight and literary naturalism, Sombart described the ranks of what he termed city-creators (*Städtebildner*). The real "city" was in effect not produced by architecture or laws or boundaries or allegiances, but by the networks of economic transactions that brought city-dwellers into contact with one another. Although it is fairly evident that Sombart considered these interactions as self-interested and hence as *gesellschaftlich* in type, it is also possible to read these associational networks as manifestations of *Gemeinschaft* within the fabric of everyday urbanism.

⁸⁰ Sombart, "Der Begriff der Stadt und das Wesen der Städtebildung," 6.

As Sombart described it, the original and primary founders of a cities are those who draw their sustenance and wealth directly from the products of the land, both for their own use and for the use others in the city. The primary founders are masters of their own destiny,

a king, who raises the taxes, a landlord who draws interest, a salesman who in his trade with foreigners makes a profit, a handworker or a manufacturer who produces products and sells them abroad, a writer whose writings are sold beyond the gates of the city, a doctor who has clients in the countryside, and even the student whose parents send him money from another region.⁸¹

There is as well a secondary class of city-creators who, rather than gathering sustenance through their own power, participate in the economic enterprises of the primary rank of city shapers. Cast more as reactive subjects in the formation of the city, Sombart calls these secondary creators the *Städtefüller*, the city-fillers,

the shoemaker who makes boots for the king, the singer who sings him songs, the pub-keeper who feeds the landlord, the jeweler from whom salesman buys jewelry for his beloved, the director of the theater where the handworker goes, the barber who shaves the doctor, the good soul who rents the student a room.⁸²

Almost as a cinematic portrait of a city, Sombart then draws out his network of city-builders further to a tertiary level, what today would be called the service economy,

⁸¹ "...ein König, der Steuern erhebt; ein Grundherr, dem gezinst wird; ein Kaufmann, der im Handel mit Fremden Profit macht; ein Handwerker, ein Industrieller; die gewerbliche Erzeugnisse nach auswärts verkaufen; ein Schriftsteller, dessen Schriften draußen vor den Toren gekauft werden; ein Arzt, der Kundschaft im Lande hat; ein Student, dessen Eltern an einem andern Orte wohnen und vom 'Wechsel' seiner Eltern lebt..." "Der Begriff der Stadt und das Wesen der Städtebildung," 7-8.

⁸² "...der Schuster, der dem König die Stiefel macht; der Sänger, der ihm ein Lieder singt; der Wirt, be idem der Grundherr speist; der Juwelier, be idem der Kaufmann seiner Geliebten den Schmuck kauft; der Theaterdirektor, in dessen Theater der Handwerker geht; der Friseur, be idem unser Arzt rasieren läßt; die Phileuse, bei der unser Student sich sein Zimmer mietet," "Der Begriff der Stadt und das Wesen der Städtebildung," 8.

showing how the economic system of monetary exchange binds together the inhabitants of the modern city:

A waiter drinks a glass of beer in a restaurant. The pub-keeper lives off of him, the beer brewer lives off the pub-keeper, the waiter pays with tip money that the doctor gave him, the doctor has an urban clientele, for example the actor, who earns his wages out of the takings of the theater director, these takings come in part from the sale of theater tickets that a professor has purchased; the professor draws his salary from the state: finally the original primary city-creator appears: the state who raises taxes.⁸³

In seeking to define the city qua city, Sombart made a stark distinction between Stadt and Land, city and country, a distinction that on one level was purely descriptive but which nevertheless carried strong qualitative judgments. The city was that which was not-rural: to the city, the country was perceived as "platte Land," figuratively speaking as flat, empty, and banal space.⁸⁴ At this stage, early in the first decade of the century, Sombart did not overtly idealize rural life, just as he did not acutely bemoan the passing of Gemeinschaft as anything more than an inevitable casualty of capitalism's advance. His apotheosis of the small settlements as the crucible of the German nation and of the farmer as the bearer of German virtue would come later, with his 1934 book, *Deutscher Sozialismus*. Similarly, in later writings of the 1930s on the nature of city origin and growth, he made sharper distinctions between the rural and pre-modern as bastions of desirable Gemeinschaft, and the urban, modern, technological, and international as perpetrators of Gesellschaft. In these writings, he expanded his urban-rural dichotomy to

⁸³ "...ein Kellner trinkt in einem Restaurant ein Glass Bier: der Wirt lebt vom ihm, vom Wirt der Bierbrauer; der Kellner bezahlt mit Trinkgeld, das ihm ein Arzt bezahlt hat; der Arzt hat Stadtkundschaft, z.B. bei einem Schauspieler; der Schauspieler erhält seine Gage aus dem Verdienste des Theaterdirektors; dieser stammt (zu diesem kleinen Teile) von den Theaterbilleten, die ein Professor genommen hat; der Professor bezieht sein Gehalt vom Staate: hier erst erscheint der erste originäre Städtebildner: der Steuer erhebende Staat...", "Der Begriff der Stadt und das Wesen der Städtebildung," 8.

⁸⁴ "Der Begriff der Stadt und das Wesen der Städtebildung," 2.

say that to live in the city was to live against nature, to abandon nature for a man-made world, and even to violate nature and the environment. Urbanization, what he termed *Verstädterung*, was the general process of rationalization. It was the inevitable effect of the great drama of historical progress. Sombart increasingly saw that historical process as a tragedy, in which the city figured as the site of the fall from grace and the theater of *Vergeistung*, *Entseelung*, and *Entwurzlung* – of intellectual disenchantment, spiritual dispossession, and uprooting. In an essay of 1931, Sombart laid out a series of oppositional figures that illustrated his conception of *Gesellschaft's* incursions on the terrains of *Gemeinschaft*:

The wall against the hedge and fence. The southern stone house against the Westfalian farmhouse, the French against the English park, architecture against landscape, the Roman centurion settlement against the German walled village, the grid-like borders of the US versus the natural boundaries of the old world, the channeled modern river versus the natural stream flow, the paved, arrow-straight highway versus the winding field path, terrace farming versus the open fields on the natural terrain, the artificially irrigated land versus the land fed by rain, forest against woods, tractors versus the plow.⁸⁵

Like Tönnies, Sombart drafted his vision of an ideal *Gemeinschaft*. In his 1934 *Deutscher Sozialismus*, he offered the blueprint for a total planned state economy that was both supremely bureaucratic and highly decentralized. He envisioned state control of industrial production and distribution, state control of worker relations, state control of

⁸⁵ Die Mauer gegen Zaun und Hecke; das südliche Steinhaus gegen das westfälische Bauernhaus; das französische gegen den englischen Park; Architektur gegen Landschaft; die römische Centuriat-Siedlung gegen das deutsche Gewanddorf; die gradlinige Grenzziehung der Vereinigten Staaten gegen die natürliche der alten Welt; die begradigten Flüsse gegen die natürlichen Flußläufe; die gepflasterte, schnurgrade Chaussee gegen den sich schlängelenden Feldweg; der Terrassenbau gegen die Ackerflur auf dem natürlichen Gelände; das künstliche bewässerte Land gegen das beregnete Land; Forst gegen Wald; Traktoren- und Dampfpflug-Betrieb gegen Werkzeug- und Zugvieh-Betrieb der Landwirtschaft," Werner Sombart, "Städtische Siedlung, Stadt," in *Handwörterbuch der Soziologie*, ed. Alfred Vierkandt (Stuttgart: F. Enke, 1931), 527.

technological advancements (for among other reasons to slow and manage the rate of social change resulting therefrom), and state control of cultural innovations (to legislate against modernism and ensure the continuity of tradition).⁸⁶ In the midst of this fortress of state socialism, Sombart also sketched a vision for the community form that would generate the necessary national values. Even as major industry fell under the sway of state control, the cultures of handworkers and small farmers would be resurrected as mainstays of economic production and moral fortitude. Populations would be dispersed into small towns and new semi-rural communities, where families would be made more self-sufficient, more ethically sound, and more insulated from the vicissitudes of economic change by single-family houses fitted out with gardens, stables for keeping small animals, and attics and cellars for storing goods produced on the homestead. Although Sombart's ideas were not notably anti-urban overall, in this particular instance, his vision mirrors the model of the garden city as it was actually developed in Germany, as a village-scaled alternative, a respite, counterweight and antidote to the urban conglomeration.

Max Weber: The Medieval City as Crucible of Modern Society

Max Weber's essay 'The City, a Sociological Investigation' is a study of economic conditions in the classical and late medieval urban milieu, couched in an account of the historical development of city types.⁸⁷ Although the essay has been rather famously

⁸⁶ Rolf Peter Sieferle describes Sombart's book as typical of a kind of treatise that flourished in the years right after Hitler took power, books written by those who greeted 1933 as a renewal and a breakthrough to a new hierarchy of values, *Die Konservative Revolution*, 99-102.

⁸⁷ Based on comparisons with other studies and on hints in his correspondence, the essay is estimated to have been written sometime between 1911 and 1913. It was not published in Weber's lifetime. After Weber's death in Munich in June 1920 from complications of pneumonia, his widow Marianne Weber found a manuscript in a drawer. She had it published as "Die Stadt. Eine soziologische Untersuchung"

placed as a founding text of urban sociology, in fact it deals in no way with industrialization or the modern *Großstadt*.⁸⁸ It is concerned rather with defining city types, in terms of geographic, economic, and legal characteristics, and with identifying the key economic relationships that define those different types. The essay is a dialogue,

Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik 47, no. 3 (1920/21): 621-772. Shortly thereafter she arranged to have the essay included in the *Grundriß der Sozialökonomik*, although there was no clear indication where Weber himself might have placed the essay, or indeed that he had intended to publish the piece at all. In the *Grundriß*, the essay was included in the section “Typen der Vergemeinschaftung und Vergesellschaftung.” In 1925, the essay was republished under the title “Non-legitimate domination (Typology of cities)” in the 1925 edition of *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, Max Weber, “Die Stadt,” in *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, ed. Marianne Weber (Tübingen: Mohr, 1925): 513-560; *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Die Wirtschaft und die gesellschaftlichen Ordnungen und Mächte*. Nachlaß, Teilband 5: Die Stadt, ed. Wilfried Nippel (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1999); English edition. *Economy and Society*, 3 vols., eds. Günther Roth and Claus Wittlich (New York: Bedminster, 1968). It is difficult to resurrect the original form of the essay, or to assess Weber’s intentions apart from the interpretation of his widow, as the manuscript no longer exists. On the history of the manuscript and various editions, see “Editorischer Bericht, Die Stadt” in *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Die Wirtschaft und die gesellschaftlichen Ordnungen und Mächte*. Nachlaß. *Max Weber Gesamtausgabe*, vol. 22, ed. Horst Baier, et al. (Tübingen: Mohr, 1999), 45-58.

⁸⁸ On the use and abuse of Weber's essay generally, see Wilfried Nippel, “Webers ‘Stadt:’ Entstehung – Struktur der Argumentation – Rezeption,” in *Max Weber und die Stadt im Kulturvergleich*, ed. Hinnerk Bruhns and Wilfried Nippel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 11-38. Weber biographer, Dirk Käsler, termed the essay simply, “One of the important beginnings of urban sociology,” *Max Weber: An Introduction to His Life and Work* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 48. The first chapter of Weber’s essay, dealing with the concept and categories of the city (Begriff und Kategorien der Stadt) was reprinted in Carl Haase’s 1978 collection, *Die Stadt der Mittelalter*, introduced by the assessment that among the sociologists concerned with urban life in the early decades of the century, it was Weber who “stood at the starting point of modern urban research.” See “Einleitung,” in *Die Stadt des Mittelalters*, vol. 1: *Begriff, Entstehung, Ausbreitung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969), xi-xii. In his 1983 history of urbanization in Germany, Hans-Jürgen Teuteberg also placed Weber's work as an essential historical milestone in the study of the industrialization and urbanization, “Historische Aspekte der Urbanisierung: Forschungsstand und Probleme,” in *Urbanisierung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1983), 2-34. A 1986 overview of urban sociology’s history and methodologies described the subject of Weber’s essay as the question of why “in the west a certain type of rationalized industrialization and along with it the industrial metropolis arose,” Hermann Korte, *Stadtsoziologie. Forschungsprobleme und Forschungsergebnisse der 70er Jahre* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1986), 2. While seconding Carl Haase's appraisal of the central importance of Weber’s essay to urban studies, Jürgen Reulecke was more precise as to the ways the piece had shaped the field. In Reulecke’s estimation, because Weber’s essay embedded the development of the city in a broader, deeper reaching, and more global theory of modernization, it put urban sociology and urban history generally in Germany on a path of critical inquiry that surpassed mere empirical documentation and interpretation. Weber connected the development of the city to processes of “economic and technical expansion, structural differentiation, value shifts, spatial and social mobility, and the institutionalization of conflicts,” and thereby pointed urban sociology toward a complex analytical and social tasks. Whatever the potential misinterpretations or missteps between Weber’s authorial intentions and the eighty-year reception history of the piece, Reulecke’s affirmation gives Weber's ideas a more striking and rigorous methodological pedigree within urban history and urban sociology. See Jürgen Reulecke, “Fragestellungen und Methoden der Urbanisierungs-geschichtsforschung in Deutschland,” in *Stadtgeschichtsforschung. Aspekte, Tendenzen, Perspective*, ed. Fritz Mayrhofer (Linz: Donau, 1993), 57-58

a response, and an extension of Sombart's theories of the city's economic development, and a debate with a series of, textually speaking, somewhat invisible foes from the wider realms of history and the social sciences.⁸⁹ Although interesting in their own right, and in large part responsible for the reputation the essay has garnered as a pioneering work of urban sociology, the typologies are not further discussed in the course of the essay, nor do they reappear elsewhere in Weber's later work.

Weber contends that the city as a combination of fortress and market is a worldwide, universal phenomenon, evident in eastern, near eastern, as well as in European cities. The city as an autonomous community, as a corporate body with an independent municipal character and citizens possessing specific privileges within its precincts, is, however, found only in the west. In making this distinction, Weber essentially locates progress in the west. The west invents, in a sense owns, the path toward modernity. That path defines the west. Among the defining features unique to the development of this legally privileged and economically robust class in the western city was the formation of voluntary organizations – in Weber's terminology *Verbrüderung* or fraternalization – which he further defined as the formation of voluntary organizations of more or less equally participating members, in contradistinction to social aggregations based purely in kinship or in hierarchies, such as military organizations. Weber identified two signal moments in which *Verbrüderung* contributed to the formation of the modern city in the middle ages. The first instance was the creation of extra-familial social bonds created by

⁸⁹ Reinmar Schott, "'Die Stadt' und ihre Vorläufer. Zu den Quellen der Stadttypologie Max Webers," *Geschichte und Gegenwart* 15, no. 3 (1996): 141-153; Karl-Ludwig Ay, "Max Weber über die Stadt," in *Stadtgeschichtesforschung. Aspekte, Tendenzen, Perspektiven*, ed. Fritz Mayrhofer (Linz: Donau, 1993), 69-80.

membership in a common church.⁹⁰ The second instance was the formation of common economic, social, and legal purposes within the bounds of the medieval craft guilds.⁹¹

While not specifically interested in tracing the passage from *Gemeinschaft* to *Gesellschaft*, Weber, like Tönnies, sought to identify those associational entities – handcraft guilds, fraternal orders, religious confraternities, market cooperatives – that became the agents of transforming society from pre-capitalism to capitalism.

Weber's efforts to distinguish between eastern and western city types, and his zeroing in on the distinct development of the western city, points to his larger purpose in the essay.

“Die Stadt” is not so much about the history of the city as it is about exploring the question of why, although large settlements formed in many places in the world, an autonomous bourgeoisie arose only in the west. In this regard, the essay fits well with Weber's life-long study of the development of the modern capitalism and the rational state.⁹² Whether investigating agricultural history in Greek and Roman antiquity, the form of early economic contracts in medieval Italian communes, or the relationship between religion and state authority, since his earliest sociological works Weber had been concerned with tracing the historical development of capitalism and with defining the fundamental forms of social life as inscribed in economic relations.⁹³ In works both early and late, he located the ignition point of modern economic culture within associations that arose in European towns and cities of the Middle Ages. His dissertation of 1889, *Zur*

⁹⁰ Max Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, Die Stadt (1999), 119.

⁹¹ Max Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, Die Stadt (1999), 124-125.

⁹² Dirk Käsler, *Max Weber: An Introduction to his Life and Work*, 42-47.

⁹³ Luigi Capograssi Colognesi, “Von den ‘Agrarverhältnissen’ zur ‘Stadt’,” *Max Weber und die Stadt im Kulturvergleich*, 92-106. Among the early writings by Weber on these issues are his *Zur Geschichte der Handelsgesellschaften im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart: Enke, 1889); *Römischen Agrargeschichte* (1891); “Die sozialen Gründe des untergangs der antiken Kultur” (1896); and various versions of the article on “Agrarverhältnisse im Altertum” for the *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften* (1897, 1898, 1908/09).

Geschichte der Handelsgesellschaften im Mittelalter, examined the origin of legal instruments and independent business firms and trade associations in the free cities of Italy. His 1891 Habilitationsschrift, *Die römische Agrargeschichte in ihrer Bedeutung für das Staats- und Privatrechts*, dealt with the origins of capitalism in the agrarian economies of the late Roman Empire and early Middle Ages.⁹⁴

In “Die Stadt,” written some twenty years later, Weber presented an admittedly very selective history of the medieval city. He used only those aspects of the historical record that suited his purposes. Except for the premise of rationalization that lay behind the larger enterprise of his interest in the medieval city, he did not attempt to draw out the lines of historical development beyond those early centuries. He presented no developmental historical narrative. Instead, he portrayed the medieval urban milieu as a very specific constellation of economic factors, conditions, and events. The city of the middle ages became yet another ideal type. History became a conceptual tool.⁹⁵

Kropotkin’s Natural Community

‘The ants and termites have renounced the Hobbesian war, and they are the better for it’

– Peter Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* (1902)

In the 1890s readers of the British monthly *The Nineteenth Century* were treated to a long-running debate about the political and economic implications of scientific knowledge. The subject was Darwin’s theory of evolution, the argument concerned the progress of modern society, and the igniting spark was Thomas Huxley’s essay, “The

⁹⁴ Reprinted in *Max Weber Gesamtausgabe* Part I, vol. 2, ed. J. Deininger (Tübingen: Mohr, 1986).

⁹⁵ Klaus Schreiner, “Die mittelalterliche Stadt in Webers Analyse und die Deutung des okzidentalen Rationalismus. Typus, Legitimität, Kulturbedeutung,” in *Max Weber, der Historiker*, ed. Jürgen Kocka (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986),” 121-125.

Struggle for Existence.”⁹⁶ In this 1888 piece Huxley laid out the classic argument for what would later be called Social Darwinism.⁹⁷ To be alive was to compete, he wrote, and mankind could only achieve its fullest potential by acknowledging and embracing that fact. The fundamental law of nature was the “war of each against all... The strongest, the swiftest, and most cunning lived to fight another day... the weak and stupidest went to the wall.” The rebuttal to Huxley was written by Peter Kropotkin. Living in England after being exiled from France in 1886, Kropotkin was the object of a kind of worship on the part of socialists and reformers who saw him as a combination of “savant and prophet.”⁹⁸ From his cottage in Harrow, Kropotkin's response to Huxley – indeed his response to the character of the age that would argue for capitalism as a force of nature – was a series of seven articles over six years.⁹⁹ Gathered together and published in 1902 as *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*, the essays examined how biological drives and environmental imperatives shaped human social behavior toward cooperative rather than competitive ends.¹⁰⁰ At once a natural history, an anthropological study, a dossier of comparative

⁹⁶ Thomas A. Huxley, “The Struggle for Existence,” *The Nineteenth Century* (February 1888).

⁹⁷ Mike Hawkins, *Social Darwinism in European and American Thought, 1860-1945: Nature as Model and Nature as Threat* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

⁹⁸ Citing historian Ivan Maisky in Martin A. Miller, *Kropotkin* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), 169.

⁹⁹ The articles originally incorporated into the book were published between September 1890 and June 1896, with original article titles reappearing as chapter headings. Subsequent to the publication in 1902, Kropotkin continued to address the subjects of evolution and mutual aid in articles published in what was called post-1900 *The Nineteenth Century And After*. Pursuing the essential lines of analysis established in *Mutual Aid*, those articles (which have not since been republished, but which contributed to the content of his final, uncompleted work, *Ethics: Origins and Development* [1922], trans. from the Russian, by Louis S. Friedland and Joseph R. Piroshnikoff [New York: The Dial Press, 1924]) included “The Ethical Needs of the Present Day,” 54 (August 1904), 207-226; “The Morality of Nature,” 57 (March 1905), 407-426; “The Theory of Evolution and Mutual Aid,” 67 (January 1910), 86-107; “The Direct Action of Environment on Plants,” 68 (July 1910), 58-77; “The Response of Animals to the Environment, part 1,” 68 (November 1910), 856-866; “The Response of Animals to their Environment, part 2,” 68 (December 1910), 1046-1059; “The Inheritance of Acquired Characters: Theoretical Difficulties,” 71 (March 1912), 511-513; “Inherited Variation in Plants,” 74 (October 1914), 816-886; “Inherited Variation in Animals,” 78 (November 1915), 1124-1144; “The Direct Action of the Environment and Evolution,” 85 (January 1919), 70-89.

¹⁰⁰ Peter Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* (London: Heinemann, 1902). There were numerous editions. A revised edition was issued by Heinemann in 1904. Kropotkin wrote a new preface for the 1915

linguistics, as well as a history of law, political structures, agricultural method, morals, and settlement patterns, *Mutual Aid* reveals Kropotkin's broad intellectual interests, wide travel, and extensive reading. The book demonstrated the continuity between natural evolution and human history, and looked to the natural world and the record of the past to find models for ideal collective life in the modern world.

Marshalling the authority of science and historical example as the "expression and the revelation of truth," Kropotkin used Darwinian evolutionary theory to prove that the true character of human society was ethical rather than antagonistic.¹⁰¹ The book was a critique of the survival-of-the-fittest doctrines of Herbert Spencer and Huxley. It was also an indictment of Hobbes' characterization of primitive society as a stage of perpetual war, and a countermand to Rousseau's notion that man though born into a state of natural freedom soon sought the protection of organized state. In Kropotkin's words, there could be no primordial state of innocence, because "man without society has never existed," and indeed society was not something created by man, but was a force, an instinctual drive, of nature itself.¹⁰²

Survival might indeed entail struggle, Kropotkin held, but species succeeded in the long run through cooperation not competition. Ethical behaviors were formed by biological

edition. Kropotkin continued to publish articles about evolution in *The Nineteenth Century* through the end of the First World War. References in the present text refer to a reprint of a 1939 edition of the book, Peter Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*, with an introductory essay by John Hewetson (London: Freedom Press, 1993).

¹⁰¹ On the broader context of radical politics in Europe and Kropotkin's conception of science, see Ruth Kinna, "Kropotkin's Theory of Mutual Aid in Historical Context," *International Review of Social History* 40 (1995): 259-283, quote from Kropotkin on p. 270. Kropotkin's critical approach to Darwinism was influenced by Russian scientists who rejected the Malthusian and individualist aspects of Darwin in favor of evolutionary theory that emphasized group cooperation and environmental factors. See Kinna, "Kropotkin's Theory," 273-275, and Francesco M. Surdo and Michele Acanfora, "Darwin and Russian Evolutionary Biology," in *The Darwinian Heritage*, ed. David Kohn (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 731-749.

¹⁰² *Mutual Aid*, 58.

responses that were deeply rooted in nature. Kropotkin posited close interaction between biological drives and the creation of symbolic and functional forms of culture. He began his study by examining instances of collaboration and social association among the animals – cooperating beetles, colonies of ants, flocks of pelicans scouting for fish, community-minded beavers. With a nod to American jurist and anthropologist Lewis Henry Morgan, Kropotkin detailed a tripartite scheme of mankind's cultural development, periodized as savage, barbarian, and civilized.¹⁰³ Each period was shaped by biological and environmental imperatives, which precipitated the appearance of a distinctive form of associational life. Moreover, Kropotkin theorized strong spatial correlates for each epoch. The characteristic behaviors and interactions of each age produced distinctive associational and settlement forms.¹⁰⁴ The society of the savage, who Kropotkin noted, was neither an “ideal of virtue...nor an ideal of ‘savagery’,” was the age of the tribe.¹⁰⁵ As clans banded together for mutual safety and benefit, they developed systems of common ownership leading to the creation of the first village communities. This was the era of the barbarian. The closely knit world of the barbarian village was the crucible of

¹⁰³ Lewis Henry Morgan's magnum opus, *Ancient Society, Or Researches in the Line of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization* (Chicago: C.H. Kerr, 1877), also exercised a strong influence on Friedrich Tönnies' thematizing of the historical development of human society in *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, and on Frederick Engels in his *Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums und des Staats, im Anschluß an Lewis H. Morgans Forschungen* (Hottingen-Zürich: Schweizerische Genossenschaftsbuchdruckerei, 1884). For Kropotkin's reference to Morgan, see *Mutual Aid*, 107. In regard to Kropotkin's explorations of animal social behavior, it is interesting to note that L.H. Morgan admired the beaver's colony and family life, and considered it a model for human cooperation. See the latter's *The American Beaver and His Works* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1868).

¹⁰⁴ For an analysis of Kropotkin's concept of mutualist evolution as a proto-anarchist theory of the production of social space, see Huston, "Kropotkin and Spatial Social Theory: Unfolding an Anarchist Contribution," in *Anarchist Studies* 5 (1997): 109-130.

¹⁰⁵ *Mutual Aid*, 99.

culture, of art, song, and literature, but also of crime, punishment, authority, monetary exchange, and organized warfare carried out by “brotherhoods of unruly men.”¹⁰⁶

As barbarian settlements grew in size and complexity, and as the villages acquired defensive walls and a degree of independence from reigning feudal lords, there arose that stage of associational life which Kropotkin termed the “most interesting period – the free medieval-city.” Kropotkin located the origins of the modern world, of “civilization,” in the medieval settlement. The first hallmark of the advanced social state was the development of institutions of law and religion. As settlements became more permanent, property was amassed and ancestral lines became more enduring and evident, while at the same time the barbarian clan structure broke down. There arose a need for the arbitration of disputes regarding property and honor. As a result, specific individuals or entire familial lines were charged with “keeping the law of old in its purity,” with preserving tradition and tribal lore in the form of a “mystery.” Thus, the origin of government and religion was also an outgrowth of the instinct toward mutual aid, no matter that it might have later become a source of “authority and oppression.”¹⁰⁷

The medieval town was itself a distinctive mode of associational life, but the settlement structure also brought forth another of Kropotkin’s fundamental institutions of mutual aid: the guild. The relative safety and stability of the medieval settlement led to a growing diversity of occupations, which necessitated a new form of cooperative organization. Within the medieval city, the craft guild functioned as a type of quasi-tribal, village-like unit. It was in the anthropological terminology of the day, a primitive “survival,” albeit

¹⁰⁶ *Mutual Aid*, 130.

¹⁰⁷ *Mutual Aid*, 133.

one “shaped on a new model.”¹⁰⁸ The guild held property in common, whether “cattle, land, buildings, places of worship or stock,” and the members considered one another as brothers or friends though their actual day-to-day relations often assumed the form of commercial transactions.¹⁰⁹

Labor and craft acquired both real and symbolic power as the focus of community life, and as expressions of the unity of individual and polis. With the provision of frequent feast days, short work hours, labor in the medieval community was, moreover, a source of pride and pleasure. When Kropotkin wrote that, “not only many aspirations of our modern radicals were already realized in the middle ages, but much of what is described now as Utopian was accepted then as a matter of fact,” he was speaking of this enchantment of work.¹¹⁰

The architecture of the medieval city was singled out as particularly enduring evidence of what magnificent consequences could flow from placing labor at the center of community life. The era of the independent medieval settlements, Kropotkin wrote, was the time of the “greatest development of human intellect during the Christian era down to the end of the eighteenth century. The very fact that of all arts architecture – a social art above all – had attained the highest development, is significant in itself. To be what it was, it must have originated from an eminently social life.

Medieval architecture attained its grandeur not only because it was a natural development of handicraft; not only because each building, each architectural decoration, had been devised by men who know through the experience of their own hands what artistic effects can be obtained from

¹⁰⁸ *Mutual Aid*, 136.

¹⁰⁹ *Mutual Aid*, 143.

¹¹⁰ *Mutual Aid*, 159.

stone, iron, bronze, or even from simple logs and mortar; not only because each monument was a result of collective experience, accumulated in each “mystery” or craft: it was grand because it was born out of a grand idea. Like Greek art, it sprang out of a conception of brotherhood and unity fostered by the city. It had an audacity which could only be won by audacious struggles and victories; it had that expression of vigour, because vigour permeated all the life of the city...A cathedral or communal house symbolized the grandeur of an organism.¹¹¹

Among the most distinctive attributes of the medieval settlement in Kropotkin’s view was its decentralized nature. He characterized each community as relatively self-sufficient, and discerned a direct connection between that self-sufficiency and political freedoms (he was concerned specifically with the free medieval cities). The population within each town’s walls and on the adjacent farmland areas comprised a self-sustaining system of production and distribution, supply and demand, thus obviating the need for the arbitration or participation of any centralized state authority. But the wheels of history turned and authority did indeed intercede. The medieval communes fell, and the modern state arose. That moment of fall gets to the heart of why the Middle Ages are so important in the overall scope of Kropotkin’s analysis. In a sense, his entire narrative is directed toward identifying the historical moment when authority “crushed tradition.”¹¹² In the final chapters of *Mutual Aid* dealing with the modern era, Kropotkin sketched the outlines of history from the fifteenth through the seventeenth centuries, the years in which the medieval communes were overtaken by the modern nation-state. He was at pains to show that there was nothing natural or instinctive about these developments. It was a matter simply of aggression and greed, misunderstanding and ignorance. The artificial authority of the state intruded into and disrupted the natural evolution of social

¹¹¹ *Mutual Aid*, 170-171.

¹¹² Miller, *Kropotkin*, 185.

traditions and the natural growth of community aggregations. The spirit of brotherhood and cooperation was no longer the driving element of history, and the result was centuries of harsh rule, cruel judgments, fear, narrow morality, and the loss of individual initiative and freedom. “By too much trusting the government, they had ceased to trust themselves.”¹¹³

The natural evolution of society according to the laws of mutual aid stopped in the medieval era. Therefore, he wrote, “It seems hopeless to look for mutual-aid institutions and practices in modern society.” Kropotkin placed a subtle, rhetorical emphasis on the word “seems,” and in fact proceeded to go about identifying modern day instances of “survivals” and examples of efforts to resurrect mutual aid.¹¹⁴ True associational life had found sanctuary and was being preserved in the “rural and industrial populations,” and these were the classes that were struggling to reintroduce the “standing institutions of mutual aid and support.”¹¹⁵ The institution of the guild struggled to find life in the formation of labor unions, the tribal and clan spirit survived in singing clubs and nature leagues and in religious and charitable organizations. Socialism, though it would seem to be founded on the idea of mutual aid, was destined never to fully realize its tenets – it would ever stumble over its constitution as a hierarchical political body. Kropotkin: “[T]he mere fact of belonging to a political body cannot be taken as a manifestation of the mutual-aid tendency. We all know that politics are the field in which the purely egotistic elements of society enter into the most entangled combinations with altruistic

¹¹³ *Mutual Aid*, 179.

¹¹⁴ *Mutual Aid*, 184.

¹¹⁵ *Mutual Aid*, 223.

aspirations.”¹¹⁶ The most enduring and most widespread of the fragmented survivals of mutualism in the modern day was the institution of the village community. In Kropotkin’s estimation, the village showed the most promise as the site capable of regenerating mutual aid and reintroducing it as the driving force in social evolution. Because villages still harbored vestiges of the historically based, mutualist modes of cooperation and common ownership, these small settlements were particularly conducive to promoting mutual aid.¹¹⁷ Kropotkin was not proposing a reactionary development, a reversion to some agrarian golden age. He was looking beyond history, beyond past evolution, toward a future, heretofore unimagined society; he was looking toward a new expression of mutual aid which “would not be the State, nor the medieval city, nor the village community of the barbarians, nor the savage clan, but would proceed from all of them, and yet be superior to them in its wider and more deeply humane conceptions.”¹¹⁸

In *Fields, Factories, Workshops*, published in 1899 but like *Mutual Aid* based on essays which had appeared earlier in *The Nineteenth Century*, Kropotkin expanded on the picture of this future ideal order.¹¹⁹ As the result of a social and political revolution, society would function without an hierarchical authority. Populations would congregate in decentralized, self-sufficient settlements, where guild-like organizations would manage the flow of production and consumption. The new factor in these future communities, the element that made them possible, was technology and, especially, electricity. Kropotkin

¹¹⁶ *Mutual Aid*, 213.

¹¹⁷ *Mutual Aid*, 203.

¹¹⁸ *Mutual Aid*, 179.

¹¹⁹ Peter Kropotkin, *Field, Factories and Workshops* (London: Hutchinson, 1899); edition referenced here is *Landwirtschaft, Industrie und Handwerk oder Die Vereinigung von Industrie und Landwirtschaft, von geistiger und körperlicher Arbeit*, based on the translation of the 1921 German edition by Theodor Plievier (Berlin: Karin Kramer Verlag, 1976).

envisioned a vast network of electrical lines spreading over the land, permitting the decentralization of industrial production, while also allowing smaller-scaled towns and villages to enjoy the advantages of communication and culture historically reserved for larger cities. In the day-to-day life of the communities, there would be no hierarchy of knowledge, occupation, or property. A dramatically reformed educational system would end the “aristocracy of knowledge” and the separation of disciplines. Scientific theory would be integrated into agriculture and industrial production, abstract reasoning would coexist with craft, intellectual work with physical labor.

The roles played by electricity and industrial technology in this ideal community kept Kropotkin’s proposal from becoming merely an archaicized utopia, a return to the roots of a romanticized village community. The emphasis on the reconciliation of perceived opposites – science and art, mind and body, thought and action, industry and agriculture, town and country, technology and nature, freedom and authority – also gave it something of the power of a redemptive vision, one which proved very attractive to the progressive romanticism of the German Lebensreform movement. Kropotkin’s call for a return to the soil, a resurrection of the village armed with the advances of technology, drew followers not just from the ranks of artists and communitarian socialists. His call for the resettlement of urban populations into the countryside was a foundation of the British garden city idea. In Germany, Kropotkin's ideas influenced many reformers, including early German garden city advocate Bernhard Kampffmeyer, writer and socialist activist Gustav Landauer (who also translated several of Kropotkin's works), poet, playwright,

and communist reformer Erich Mühsam, the philosopher Martin Buber, and designers such as Bruno Taut, Leberecht Migge, and Heinrich Tessenow.¹²⁰

A measure of how deeply Kropotkin's vision of a reconciliation of urban and rural spheres left its impress on the field of architecture and planning is shown by the fact that his views were still being discussed in the 1960s and 1970s. In *The City in History*, Lewis Mumford cast Kropotkin in the role of a pioneer, a visionary of modern regional planning. Kropotkin, he wrote, was among the first to recognize how technology would equalize the advantages between urban centers and peripheral communities, and among the first to see the "opportunity for a more responsible and responsive local life, with greater scope for the human agents who were neglected and frustrated by mass organizations."¹²¹

The question as to why the views of a notorious anarchist cum communist revolutionary should have been received so sympathetically by designers and reformers holding such divergent political and social views, is answered in part by the fact that Kropotkin's ideas were received not as a revolutionary ideology, but as theory of political and social reconciliation, a more expansive version of the third way, neither communism nor capitalism. He presented his ideas in such a gently convincing manner that, if the circumstances or political predisposition demanded, they could easily be cast as a theory

¹²⁰ The following list is by no means exhaustive: Bernhard Kampffmeyer, *Die Vermählung von Stadt und Land. Ein Soziales Experiment*. Flugschrift Nr. 2 der Deutsche Gartenstadt Gesellschaft (Berlin, 1903); Gustav Landauer, "Die Siedlung" (1910), republished in *Aufruf zum Sozialismus* (Berlin: Verlag des Sozialistischen Bundes, 1911); Bruno Taut, *Die Auflösung der Städte oder die Erde eine gute Wohnung* (Hagen: Folkwang-Verlag, 1920); Leberecht Migge, *Jedermann Selbstversorger! Eine Lösung der Siedlungsfrage durch neuen Gartenbau* (Jena: Diederichs, 1918); Heinrich Tessenow, *Handwerk und Kleinstadt* (Berlin: Cassirer, 1919); Martin Buber, *Paths in Utopia*, trans. by R.F.C. Hull (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949).

¹²¹ Lewis Mumford, *The City in History* (New York: Harcourt, 1961), 514-515.

of gradualist social change, of evolution not revolution. Kropotkin's ideas also appealed, on both the right and the left, to that not inconsiderable number of thinkers who perceived the big city, the metropolis, as an instrument of either creeping socialism or profligate capitalism. Across the political spectrum, the urban center was considered a barrier to the realization of the ideal polity, whether that polity was projected forward as an agrarian paradise, a patriarchal corporation, or an egalitarian fellowship. Kropotkin offered a reasoned critique of the city that validated the back-to-the-land or back-to-the-village sentiments many people already had.

With Kropotkin's theories and hopes in mind, the riddle of the drawing by Fidus (Hugo Höppener), published and widely distributed in postcard form by the Verlags Lebensreform around 1910, begins to reveal itself (figure 3). In the foreground the edenic, primitive tenders of the soil, in the background a factory smokestack and coursing electrical lines. The picture suggests that in small village communities lay a bright future wrought through by reconciliation of labor and intellect, agriculture and industry, nature and technology.

.....

This chapter has examined key writings on community penned by prominent social scientists in the Wilhelmine era. Although their ideas and motivations were diverse, these thinkers echoed Ferdinand Tönnies in defining continuums, both theoretical and historical, of associational life that ranged from *Gemeinschaft* to *Gesellschaft*, from community to society. They mapped their theoretical continuum onto spatial coordinates of settlement forms that ranged from the village and small town to the metropolis. And in

differing ways, they identified the village and small town as a privileged site for the generation of modern community. Their writings and ideas lent intellectual credence to the plans being put forth by architects, planners, and reformers of the same period, calling for the creation of new villages, new communities, which could act as bulwarks against the ill effects of modernity and as incubators for *Gemeinschaft* within *Gesellschaft*.

The next chapters look more closely at some of the plans and projects of architects and planners, exploring the ways in which the highly theoretical writings of the sociologists were translated into more popular, more concretely historical studies of the relation between associational life and community form. The discussion begins with an examination of the rhetoric of tradition and community that developed around proposals for the ideal worker's home.

Chapter Three

Discovering the Vernacular:

The Farmhouse as Model for the Modern Worker's Home

But only seemingly does the house constrain and define the inhabitant; in truth the house is more like a snail's shell, a dwelling generated by the very act of living.

— August Meitzen, *Das deutsche Haus in seinen volkstümlichen Formen* (1882)¹

One of the striking aspects of German architecture in the late Wilhelmine period is how many of the era's most prominent, most self-consciously progressive architects put housing and community design at the center of their practice. A number of the leading architects and planners of the time – Hermann Muthesius, Richard Riemerschmid, Georg Metzendorf, Paul Schmitthenner, Heinrich Tessenow, Fritz Schumacher, Karl Henrici, and Paul Schultze-Naumburg – designed small houses and also penned essays or books on the theory and practice of designing the small home. While these architects designed houses for the upper and middle classes, the *Bürgertum* and *Mittelstand*, each also endeavored to design ideal homes for the working classes. These houses were not designed with the poorest of the poor in mind. The denizens envisioned by these architects were not paupers, but rather factory workers, agricultural workers, along with trained craftsmen and skilled mechanics. While artistic questions and social concerns in equal measure shaped the architects' fascination with the dwelling as a modern architectural problem across the class spectrum, the task of designing houses for workers brought with it a set of questions that focused more directly on the problem of

¹ "Aber nur scheinbar zwingt und bestimmt dabei das Haus die Bewohner, in Wahrheit wird es, dem Schneckenhaus vergleichbar, aus ihrem lebendigen Wesen erzeugt," August Meitzen, *Das deutsche Haus in seinen volkstümlichen Formen. Behufs Ermittlungen über die geographische und geschichtliche Verbreitung, besprochen auf dem Geographen-Tage zu Berlin am 7.-9. Juli 1881* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1882).

maintaining a cohesive community in the face of industrializing modernity. The artistic became helpmeet to the social, and vernacular building forms – folk architecture, farmhouses, anonymous baroque-era cottages, outbuildings, and wayside structures – gained an elevated artistic value as models for the modern home.

German architectural culture in the latter decades of the nineteenth century and early years of the twentieth acquired a pronounced fluency in the forms and politics of the vernacular. Reform-minded architects came to see the historical folk vernacular as a solution to a distinctly modern design problem: How to shelter the masses of workers migrating from countryside to town or from region to region in search of employment in the industrial centers of Germany. And how not only merely to shelter them, but how to fashion a house form, a settlement form, that would provide those workers with an authentic experience of domestic happiness and community life.

One particular folk form, the farmhouse, became especially charged with social meaning and social function. When modern architects extolled the farmhouse as a model for modern worker's housing, they seemed to have had a set of models in mind, and these models came ready endowed with moral and political meanings. While old and aging farmhouses had long been a feature of the German landscape, and had long been extolled for their picturesque qualities and their intimations of ways of life passing or long past,²

² Two examples from earlier in the nineteenth century would be Justus Möser's paean to the Lower Saxon farmhouse in *Osnabrücker Geschichte* (Berlin: Nicolai, 1780), and *Patriotischen Phantasien* (Berlin: Nicolai, 1775-76); and Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl's ethnographic studies of village life in the Pfalz in *Kulturstudien aus drei Jahrhunderten* (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1859). On Möser, see Renate Stauf, *Justus Möser's Konzept einer deutschen Nationalidentität* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1991); and Peter Schmidt, *Studien über Justus Möser als Historiker: Zur Genesis und Struktur der historischen Methode Justus Möser's* (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1975). On Riehl, see Jasper von Altenbockum, *Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl, 1823-1897: Sozialwissenschaft zwischen Kulturgeschichte und Ethnographie* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1994); and

the vernacular farmhouse was quite literally discovered and defined by late nineteenth-century scholars in the fields of philology, geography, ethnography, and historical political economy. The preconceptions and methodologies of these social scientific fields shaped the reception of the vernacular in the architectural world.

What was distinctive about modern German architects' invocation of folk architecture is the way they understood the rural vernacular, the farmhouse, not just as a romantic stylistic choice, but as an ur-form of dwelling, and further, as a model, at once symbolic and palliative, for modern housing, particularly suited to the aspirations and predilections of the working classes. In formal ways – in terms of the simplicity of the plan, the clarity of the elevation profile – the traditional farmhouse served as a model for the notion of a typology of the modern working-class home. The particular origins, the peculiar nature, of the ethnographic source material on the traditional farmhouse lent to the German conception of architectural typology undercurrents and overtones of social engineering that make the term anything but a neutral term of formal description.

Why was it that around 1890, in architecture and in town planning, the problem of the architectural form of workers' houses, the workers' settlement, became a topic for serious architects? Why were traditional house forms taken up especially by architects concerned with social progress? What changed from the time at mid century when workers' housing had been the resort of polytechnic-trained architects and engineers to the point at the end of the century when it became a serious concern for self-consciously artistic architects? And why did vernacular models figure so prominently into these architects' design

Friedhelm Lövenich, *Verstaatlichte Sittlichkeit: die konservative Konstruktion der Lebenswelt in Wilhelm Heinrich Riehls "Naturgeschichte des Volkes"* (Opladen: Leske und Budrich, 1992).

solutions? The broader context of the arts and crafts movement is certainly important. Concerns about the ways industrialization eroded the moral value in labor and flooded the world with a soulless mass of manufactured goods compelled German designers, like their contemporaries in England, France, Austria, the United States, and elsewhere, to seek a re-enchantment of everyday life through design. The domestic sphere was seen as a crucible for social and political reform. Craft was elevated from the secondary artistic field to the center of modern practices. At the same time, the crafts acquired intellectual consequence through the writings of architect Gottfried Semper and art historian Alois Riegl, whose theories about the evolution of artistic form made handwork and the decorative arts principal bearers of stylistic meaning, thereby lending new importance to what had previously been considered minor arts.

Handcraft and vernacular culture offered two, seemingly paradoxical attractions for the modern designer: the possibility of the universal, and the promise of the particular. The first instance evidences the anthropological, evolutionary turn propelling early modernism. The recovery of deeply historical forms, especially pre-industrial, folk, ur-forms, was part of the back-to-basics ethos of modernism. It was part of the drive toward a kind of rarified simplicity which, like the tonal meditations of the Symbolists and the geometric catechism of the Constructivists, pointed toward the potential emergence of universally comprehensible, universally valid communicative forms. By the end of the nineteenth century, folk vernaculars in craft, art, music, dance, were imbued with the nationalist sentiments first conveyed upon them by the earlier Romantics. Amidst the rationalizing, often universalizing forces of modernity, the folk arts represented for the common citizen an authentic, accessible continuity with the past, a sense of being rooted

in a meaningful tradition, a sense of belonging that was both national and regional in its sympathies. For the designer, the folk vernacular offered a way out of the exhausted vocabulary of historicism, which had for the most part become no more than a lexicon of applied ornament. Folk vernaculars, like organic models from nature that inspired Art nouveau, brought into modern design practices not only a set of façade treatments, but also a rich collection of building and planning typologies. Indeed the models of the vernacular penetrated beyond individual structures to extend to town planning. This point brings the discussion full circle back to the initial question: Why did the problem of the architectural form of workers' houses, the workers' settlement, become such a topic of interest to serious architects? Among the very great attractions must be counted the fact that the design of the workers' settlement gave architects the opportunity to design the whole environment. Mass housing, the design of the estate, the Garden City, the Garden City suburb, or even just the modest urban infill apartment project offered architects a *tabula rasa* for new ideas, a design laboratory of utopian dimensions. The task offered architects the chance to rethink the way housing and community form as a whole could shape life, behaviors, and the connection between aesthetics and political culture.

This chapter explores the question of why the design of workers' houses became such a central concern for modern architects. As part of this discussion, the chapter traces some of the routes of historical and popular explication by which the vernacular became modern, and how historical objects once deemed of little or no importance were elevated in public attention and professional esteem. The first section of the chapter sets the stage by outlining the discussion about workers' housing in the Wilhelmine era, and the long-standing use of vernacular house forms for these structures. The second section outlines

some of the debates about artistic form, and ways in which cultural reformers invoked certain historical styles as panaceas against class conflict. A third section examines the historical scholarship dealing with the discovery, categorization, politicization, and popularization of rural vernacular architecture. The section traces the scholarly studies through which the vernacular became a historical and aesthetic subject, and the ways in which from these earliest moments, the topic of vernacular house forms was infused with social and political associations of class, nation, and German identity. The fourth section examines a gathering of architects and reformers at a 1905 conference in Hagen, sponsored by the Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen (Central Office for Worker Welfare Institutions), which addressed the question of the artistic form of the workers' house. A signal moment in modern home design, the conference featured several architects who would dominate the field of reform housing for the next ten years.³ All saw the German farmhouse as a particularly useful and resonant model for modern housing. These architects also shared the belief that an inhabitant's social class should be legible in the design of his dwelling. For reasons to be seen, the vernacular was therefore considered especially well suited as a representational style for the working classes. The argument presented over the course of the chapter moves from ideas about historicism and building types through arts-and-crafts era theories about architecture as an

³ There was a rich and extensive body of literature on housing and reform that preceded and informed the Hagen conference. Among the major historical and prescriptive sources concerning design of reform workers' housing in Germany were a number of illustrated sources that presented ideal designs as well as critical discussions of need (as distinct from housing tracts that focused on land reform, hygiene, or municipal code, and as distinct from treatises that focused on housing as part of the larger project of city planning). Major illustrated sources included Rudolf Manega, *Die Anlage von Arbeiterwohnungen vom wirtschaftlichen, sanitären und technischen Standpunkte, mit einer Sammlung von Plänen der besten Arbeiterhäuser Englands, Frankreichs und Deutschlands* (Weimar: B.F. Voigt, 1871); Heinrich Albrecht, *Das Arbeiterwohnhaus. Gesammelte Pläne von Arbeiterwohnhäusern und Ratschläge zum Entwerfen von solchen aufgrund praktischer Erfahrungen. Mit Entwerfen von A. Messel.* (Berlin: Robert Oppenheim, 1896); and Karl Weißbach and Walter Mackowsky, eds., *Das Arbeiterwohnhaus* (Berlin: Ernst Wasmuth, 1910). Works on house design written by architects are discussed more fully below.

educational medium to arrive at the foundations of modernist *Typisierung*, the intellectual and practical commitment to creating universal forms for manufactured objects.

Review of the Literature

Since the 1970s the history of German housing has been part of a much larger movement in social history. The very ubiquity and everydayness of housing has made it a useful focal point for looking at the history of industrialization, class and power, social policy, and the formation of individual identities within the family, class, nation, and community. There are aspects of the approach that are common to the practices of social history and the study of housing throughout Europe and North America in the post World War II era, and there are aspects which seem particular to the responsibilities felt by many West German scholars who wanted to write a history of their country which could properly narrate a continuity across the Wilhelmine era, the Weimar Republic, the break with civilization of the Third Reich, and on to the post-World War II development of a social democracy in the West. Hans Ulrich Wehler has described three generations of social historians in West Germany.⁴ The first generation that emerged in the 1960s was led by Werner Conze and Gerhard A. Ritter, among others. They focused on systematic, conceptual histories, shaped by the fields of sociology, political science, and economics. A second generation, the generation of 1945, had as paragons Ralf Dahrendorf, Rainer Lepsius, Thomas Nipperdey, and Wolfgang and Hans Mommsen. The third generation is likewise designated by a watershed year, the generation of 1968. Their approach was

⁴ See Hans Ulrich Wehler, *Historisches Denken am Ende des 20. Jahrhunderts 1945-2000*. Essener Kulturwissenschaften Vorträge 11 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2001); Wehler, *Bibliographie zur neueren deutschen Sozialgeschichte* (Munich: Beck, 1993); and Wehler, *Neue Aspekte der reichsdeutsche Sozialgeschichte 1871-1918* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991).

neo-Marxist – not the “hyperorthodox” Marxism of the East, but a theoretical Marxism by way of the Frankfurt School and the English socialists, Eric Hobsbawm and E.P. Thompson above all. For the 68ers, social history in Germany was very much a history from below, a history of workers, women, shopkeepers, and the clergy, narrated as a political and economic drama acted out on the stage of everyday life. The Wilhelmine era has offered many enticements for the social historian working in Germany from the 1970s to the present: the story of social and economic dislocations attendant to rapid industrialization; the compressed drama of establishing a national identity; the puzzle of the progressive and even model character of Wilhelmine social policy, and not least, the riddle of the continuity of individual and class agency in the transition from monarchy to republic to totalitarian regime. In addition to histories that dealt specifically with German housing reform as an element of the (in the BDR) still evolving *Sozialstaat* – that is, a nation concerned for the common welfare of its citizens,⁵ the subject of housing has been refracted through histories of the rise of the working class⁶, the preeminence of the bourgeoisie,⁷ the development of major industry,⁸ and the history of family structure and

⁵ Dorothea Berger-Thimme, *Wohnungsfrage und Sozialstaat. Untersuchungen zu den Anfängen staatlicher Wohnungspolitik in Deutschland 1873-1918* (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1976); Clemens Zimmermann, *Von der Wohnungsfrage zur Wohnungspolitik. Die Reformbewegung in Deutschland 1845-1914* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991); Jürgen Reulecke, ed., *Die Stadt als Dienstleistungszentrum. Beiträge zur Geschichte der "Sozialstadt" in Deutschland* (St. Katherin: Scripta Mercaturae, 1995).

⁶ Jürgen Reulecke and Wolfhard Weber, eds., *Fabrik, Familie, Feierabend. Beiträge zur Sozialgeschichte des Alltags im Industriezeitalter* (Wuppertal: Peter Hammer, 1978); Hermann Glaser, *Maschinenwelt und Alltagsleben. Industriekultur in Deutschland vom Biedermeier zur Weimarer Republik* (Frankfurt a.M.: Büchergilde Gutenberg, 1981); Hans Jürgen Teuteberg, *Homo Habitans. Zur Sozialgeschichte des ländlichen und städtischen Wohnens in der Neuzeit* (Münster: Coppenrath, 1985); Klaus Tenfelde, ed. *Arbeit und Arbeitserfahrung in der Geschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986). See also Gerhard A. Ritter and Klaus Tenfelde, eds., *Arbeiter im Deutschen Kaiserreich 1871 bis 1914*, vol. 5 *Geschichte der Arbeiter und der Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland seit dem Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Bonn: Dietz, 1992).

⁷ Lutz Niethammer, ed., *Wohnen im Wandel. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alltags in der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft* (Wuppertal: Peter Hammer, 1979); Werner Conze, Jürgen Kocka, Reinhart Koselleck, and M. Rainer Lepsius, eds., *Bildungsbürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert*, 4 vols., (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1985); Joachim Petsch, *Eigenheim und gute Stube. Zur Geschichte des bürgerlichen Wohnens. Städtebau – Architektur – Einrichtungsstile* (Cologne: Dumont, 1989); Jürgen Reulecke, ed., *Geschichte des Wohnens*,

relations.⁹ Another body of historical work dealing with workers' housing arose in planning and architectural schools rather than history departments. These works bear a similar social historical orientation, considering the political and economic structural changes that affected housing policy and design, even when focusing on the works of a specific architect or planner.¹⁰

In his analysis of social history in Germany, Jürgen Kocka described a set of distinctions that shaped the work of many German social historians writing after 1968, distinctions which are especially relevant to this study. In tandem with the affinities for groups out of power and history from below, there was a pronounced focus on culture as a revelator of historical meaning.¹¹ Kocka describes this cultural orientation as manifested in the proliferation of histories of narrowly defined topics, such as gestures, fashions, and the emotions, drafted as portholes into a wider understanding of a historical moment or indeed a longer duration of time. Even when cast over a wider expanse of historical

vol. 3, *Das bürgerliche Zeitalter 1800-1918* (Ludwigsburg: Wüstenrot Stiftung and the Deutsche Eigenheimverein, 1997).

⁸ Hans Pohl, ed., *Sozialgeschichtlicher Probleme in der Zeit der Hochindustrialisierung 1870-1914* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1979); Johann Paul, *Alfred Krupp und die Arbeiterbewegung* (Düsseldorf: Schwan, 1987); Frank Bajohr, *Zwischen Krupp und Kommune. Sozialdemokratie, Arbeiterschaft und Stadtverwaltung in Essen vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (Essen: Klartext, 1988)

⁹ Margret Tränkle, *Wohnkultur und Wohnwesen* (Tübingen: Tübingen Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1972); Heidi Rosenbaum, ed., *Familie und Gesellschaftsstruktur. Materielen zu den sozioökonomischen Bedingungen von Familienformen* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1978); Annemarie Weber, *Immer auf dem Sofa. Das familiäre Glück vom Biedermeier bis heute* (Berlin: Severin & Siedler, 1982). Of interest in the development of this topos is a dissertation by Margarete Freudenthal (who studied with Karl Mannheim, and was married to Norbert Elias), *Gestaltwandel der städtischen, bürgerlichen und proletarischen Hauswirtschaft* (Würzburg: Triltsch, 1934; reprint Frankfurt a.M.: Ullstein, 1986).

¹⁰ See Hartmut Frank and Dirk Schubert, eds., *Lesebuch zur Wohnungsfrage* (Cologne:Pahl-Rugenstein, 1983); Eduard Führ and Daniel Stemmrich, 'Nach gethaner Arbeit verbleibt im Kreise der Eurigen.' *Bürgerliche Wohnrezepte für Arbeiter zur individuellen und sozialen Formierung im 19. Jahrhundert* (Wuppertal: Peter Hammer Verlag, 1985); Juan Rodriguez Lores and Gerhard Fehl, eds., *Die Kleinwohnungsfrage. Zu den Ursprüngen des sozialen Wohnungsbaus in Europa* (Hamburg: Christians, 1988); and Juan Rodriguez-Lores, *Sozialer Wohnungsbau. Die Ursprünge bis 1918: Ideen, Programme, Gesetze* (Basel: Birkhäuser, 1994). Among the few English-language treatments of the subject is Nicholas Bullock and James Read, *The Movement for Housing Reform in Germany and France, 1840-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

¹¹ Jürgen Kocka, *Sozialgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 156-160.

territory – the history of objects, artworks, texts, geographies – the essential materialistic character of these histories reveals a methodological debt to ethnography.

The historical mapping of social and political symptomologies inscribed into, or perhaps better said, emanating from the remnants of the past, both durable and ephemeral, could be seen as a kind of crude inversion of superstructure and base, were it not for the tangled reciprocities of objects and texts, things and commentaries about things – the intertextuality that makes history history, and not merely an ethnography of some temporally distant otherness. The material leavings of modern architecture and planning are a complicated matter: the prescriptive aims of modern design, the varying gradations of utopian intention, the self-consciously deterministic objectives of modern design, so widely and broadly enunciated in manifestoes, magazines, books, and programs, make of modern architectural history a kind of sputtering engine of interpretation, destined to motor back and forth and to and fro across many tracks in order to assess incident against intention. And Germany adds yet another kink in the works: A heroic narrative of architecture is sometimes possible, but not in the Wilhelmine era. The great mass of German social histories dealing with the Wilhelmine era are no longer seemingly compelled to focus, as were the histories written from the 1950s and 1960s, on the era as an incubator of Nazi cultural forms and ideologies. The Wilhelmine period is being spun anew, and historians have been drawing out a much wider range of historical meta-narratives from the thick rope that leads from the late Kaiserreich through the Weimar Republic and up to the Third Reich. Historians can pull on the threads of the Lebensreform movement or the Heimatschutz movement, and describe something more than a presage of dark things to come. There are many factors at play in this

historiographical shift – the passage of time, postmodernism, the emergence of a new conservatism that casts different light on the old – but material among the changes, as Kocka points out, is the younger or at least post-1968 generation's willingness, or better, *ability*, to make warmer address toward the concept of the "Volk," and all the attendant symbolism and discourse that places the common man and woman as makers of culture and strives to show the everyday and the local as generators of a larger, national project.¹²

Housing for the Laboring Classes

The use of rural vernacular styles for housing for the laboring classes has a long history. Throughout the nineteenth century, the semi-rural setting for workers' housing – mining colonies, small textile manufacturing colonies – often meant that the characteristic local building style was adapted to any new construction enterprise. With the rise of major industrial concerns in the second half of the century, however, a more self-conscious and programmatic approach to industrial architecture emerged.¹³ The search for housing forms and stylistic coordinates specific to the working class first took shape in Germany in the 1840s and 1850s, in response to the first waves of industrialization. The *Wohnungsfrage*, the housing question as it was termed, was very much a part of the

¹² Kocka, *Sozialgeschichte*, 159.

¹³ Contemporary sources for the perception of a new, more representative and artistically important industrial architecture include the early issues of *Der Industriebau: Monatsschrift für die künstlerische und technische Förderung aller Gebiete industrieller Bauten, einschliesslich aller Ingenieurbauten, sowie der gesamten Fortschritte der Technik*, published in Leipzig from 1910-1931; and a group of insightful essays by Adolf Behne, "Heutige Industriebauten," *Velhagen & Klasingsmonatshefte* 28 (1913/14): 53-64; "Die Fabrik," *Die Umschau* 18 (1914): 863-866; "Fabrikbau als Reklame," *Das Plakat* 11, no. 6 (1920): 274-276; "Die Deutsche Baukunst seit 1850," *Soziale Bauwirtschaft* (1922). The latter three essays are reprinted in *Adolf Behne: Architekturkritik in der Zeit und über die Zeit hinaus. Texte 1913-1946*, ed. Haila Ochs (Basel: Birkhäuser; 1994). For more recent critical appraisals, see Julius Posener, "Fabrikbau" and "Stahl und Beton" in *Berlin auf dem Wege zu einer neuen Architektur. Das Zeitalter Wilhelms II.* (Munich: Prestel-Verlag, 1979), 387-401, 482-507; Joachim Petsch, "Deutsche Fabrikarchitektur im 19. Jahrhundert," in *Fabrik im Ornament. Ansichten auf Firmenbriefköpfen des 19. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Bernhard Korus (Münster: Landschaftsverband, 1980); Matthew Jeffries, *Politics and Culture in Wilhelmine Germany: The Case of Industrial Architecture* (Oxford: Berg, 1995).

larger Arbeiterfrage, the worker question, which was in turn among the pressing concerns of the larger Sozialfrage, the social question. From the mid nineteenth century forward, reform housing focused on two building typologies that seemed to offer answers to the question of how workers should live – the small house and the urban apartment block, the Mietskaserne. For social reformers of the early and mid nineteenth century, like Victor Aimé Huber and architect C.W. Hoffmann (chief among the founders of the Berlin Gemeinnützigen Baugesellschaft, the first reformer organization which set out to finance privately built housing for the working classes), the question of housing for workers was at the center of a host of other social and political concerns, including morality, hygiene, democratic reform, and land reform.¹⁴ Huber saw home ownership and the single-family house as the unitary solution to these problems, and called for resettlement of urban residents into new towns and settlements in the countryside.¹⁵ Huber, Hoffmann, and other members of the Berlin Gemeinnützigen Baugesellschaft explicitly distanced themselves from the socialist conceptions of Robert Owen, Charles Fourier, and reformers who conceived workers' housing as residence complexes incorporating common washrooms, schoolrooms, childcare for the residents' children, reading rooms, and the like. Instead, they were adamant in their prescriptions for distinct dwelling units that would preserve the traditional boundaries of family kinship, even when part of larger

¹⁴ Victor Aimé Huber, *Die Wohnungsnot der kleinen Leute in den großen Städten* (Leipzig, 1857). On Huber generally, see Michael A. Kanther and Dietmar Petzina, *Victor Aimé Huber (1800-1869). Sozialreformer und Wegbereiter der sozialen Wohnungswirtschaft* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2000); and Karl Munding, ed., *Victor Aimé Hubers Ausgewählte Schriften über Socialreform und Genossenschaftswesen* (1894), with an introduction by Wilhelm Treue and Karl Heinrich Kaufhold (Frankfurt a.M.: Keip, 1990).

¹⁵ Victor Aimé Huber, *Die Selbsthilfe der arbeitenden Klassen durch Wirtschaftsvereine und innere Ansiedlung*, ed. K. Bittel (Esslingen: Langguth, 1916); Victor Aimé Huber, "Was wir wollen," *Concordia. Blätter der Gemeinnützigen Berliner Baugesellschaft* (1849): 1-3.

multi-storied urban apartment blocks.¹⁶ The ideal of the worker-owned house in the mid nineteenth century was just that: an ideal. The cost of building free-standing houses was prohibitive. Even if Huber's group had succeeded in building a substantial number of free-standing cottages, the workers themselves could not have afforded the rents, nor could they have afforded to buy the homes, much less the time and expense of traveling from the city's periphery or surrounding countryside to their places of work in the city. Instead, the Berlin association concentrated on building apartment buildings in the city, erecting some ten ensembles between 1849 and 1871 – in truth, a mere drop in the bucket when measured against the scale of the need.¹⁷ By late 1880s, the crowded living conditions in the urban Mietskaserne had become the principal concern of most social and housing reform associations.¹⁸

There had been a native German tradition of reform cottages dating back to the dwellings Friedrich the Great had built in the 1750s to house silk spinners in Friedrichshagen near Berlin. These buildings, some still standing, offered miniaturized classical detail – cornice overhangs, dentils, rounded masonry arches over the windows and doors, simple pilasters or attached columns – as a kind of architectural shorthand symbolizing the

¹⁶ Renate Kastorff-Viehmann, "Kleinhaus und Mietskaserne" in *Wohnen im Wandel. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alltags in der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*, ed. Lutz Niethammer (Wuppertal: Peter Hammer, 1979), 278, citing C.W. Hoffmann, *Die Wohnungen der Arbeiter und Armen* (1852).

¹⁷ Johann Friedrich Geist and Klaus Kürvers, *Das Berliner Mietshaus 1740-1862* (Munich: Prestel, 1980).

¹⁸ *Die Wohnungsnot der ärmeren Klassen in deutschen Großstädten und Vorschläge zu deren Abhilfe*. Schriften des Vereins für Sozialpolitik 30-33 (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1886-1887); *Die Verbesserung der Wohnungen. Vorberichte und Verhandlungen der Konferenz vom 25. und 26. April 1892 nebst Bericht über die mit derselben verbundene Ausstellung*. Schriften der Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen (Berlin: Carl Heymanns Verlag, 1892); *Neue Untersuchung über die Wohnungsfrage in Deutschland und im Ausland*. Schriften des Vereins für Sozialpolitik 94-97 (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1901); Franz Adler, *Wohnungsverhältnisse und Wohnungspolitik der Stadt Frankfurt a.M. zu Beginn der 20. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt: Schnäpper, 1904).

simple but dignified habitations of skilled labor (figure 4).¹⁹ In the latter half of the nineteenth century, reformers' once utopian and pastoral visions of small, decentralized clusters of cottages had become the standard model of housing for skilled workers constructed as part of a larger manufacturing and mining plants built on the margins of cities, or more frequently in the open countryside. Because worker housing was customarily designed by the same company engineers and builders responsible for the factory plant and mining headworks, there was often a uniformity of design conception across many building types: factories, sheds, portals, offices, and homes. Workers' housing in the latter third of the nineteenth century comprised its own vernacular, a distinctively modern style that was continuous with the industrial vernacular of factories, water towers, and other fixtures of modern life.

The most influential models of reform workers' housing at mid century were built outside of Germany. Model cottages presented in London at the Great Exhibition of 1851 caused a stir across Europe. Saltaire, near Bradford, England, was likewise begun in 1851 by Titus Salt. The settlement would eventually house some 5,000 textile workers. Mülhausen in Alsace was a settlement of 1,200 model cottages founded in 1853 by Johann Heinrich Dollfus for workers in printed cotton fabric mills (figure 5). Such model factory worker colonies became popular destinations for German social reformers and manufacturers looking for the latest ideas to try back home. The four-square house plan from Mülhausen – a distinctive cross-shaped plan with four dwellings on a single floor, each with an exterior entrance – was presented at the Paris world exhibitions of 1855 and

¹⁹ Waldemar Kuhn, *Kleinsiedlungen aus Friderizianischen Zeit* (Stuttgart: Wilhelm Meyer-Ilschen, 1918). Kuhn's research into 18th-century colonies in Prussia and East Prussia had been commissioned by Deutscher Bund Heimatschutz and the Vereinigung für deutsche Siedlung und Wanderung as part of an effort to codify the regional vernacular in advance of a campaign to reconstruct and reconfigure small settlements that had been destroyed in the first months of the First World War.

1867 and quickly became a standard housing type for workers' dwellings throughout Europe.²⁰ The Krupp works' Meisterhäuser, masters' houses on Hügelstrasse in Essen (1861), were brick four-square cottages and rowhouses designed by company architects (figure 6).²¹ Among the most prominent, and the most progressive of German industries developing housing for workers, the Krupp firm apotheosized the vernacular cottage in their company history. The Krupp *Stammhaus*, the 1822 cottage in which the firm's founder Friedrich Krupp had lived, had a position of honor in the company literature and at the center of the massive Krupp works near Essen, where it served as an office amid the massive furnaces and milling works (figure 7).

The Neogothic Style as an Emblem of the Community of Labor

Along with the classicized vernacular, the Gothic Revival emerged as a common style for modern industrial architecture of the Wilhelmine period.²² Used widely for public buildings in England and in Germany, over the course of the nineteenth century the Gothic Revival or Neogothic accumulated connotations that were both regional and nationalistic.²³ The ecclesiastical associations of the style enabled any structure built in the Neogothic idiom to claim some degree of national virtue and cultural dignity for the

²⁰ Johannes Biecker and Walter Buschmann, eds., *Arbeitersiedlungen im 19. Jahrhundert* (Bochum: Studienverlag Dr. N. Borckmeyer, 1985), 36; Walter Kieß, *Urbanismus im Industriezeitalter. Von der klassizistischen Stadt zur Garden City* (Berlin: Ernst & Sohn, 1991), 264-270, 289, 308-316; Führ and Stemmrich, 'Nach gethaner Arbeit verbleibt im Kreise der Eurigen,' 1-98.

²¹ On design of housing and settlements for workers in Germany from the mid nineteenth century on, see Walter Buschmann, "Architektonische und städtebauliche Formen im Arbeitersiedlungsbau des 19. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland," in *Arbeitersiedlungen im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Biecker and Buschmann, 23-66; Führ and Stemmrich, 'Nach gethaner Arbeit verbleibt im Kreise der Eurigen'. See also *Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen der Gußstahlfabrik von Friedr. Krupp zu Essen a.d. Ruhr*, 3 vols. (Essen: Buchdruckerei der Gußstahlfabrik von F. Krupp, 1902)

²² Matthew Jeffries, *Politics and Culture in Wilhelmine Germany*, 31-39; Walter Buschmann, *Zechen und Kokereien im rheinischen Steinkohlbergbau. Die Bau- und Kunstdenkmäler der Rheinland* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1998).

²³ See especially Michael J. Lewis, *The Politics of the German Gothic Revival: August Reichensperger* (New York: Architectural History Foundation, 1993).

activity taking place within, whether it be teaching children, sorting mail, or managing the accounts of a smelting plant.²⁴

The prevalence of Neogothic forms and ornamental motifs in industrial architecture shows the extent to which labor had come to be seen as the moral center of modern life. In the industrializing areas of the Rhine region and Prussia there are numerous examples of Neogothic as a signature style of industrial architecture. In their allusions to the stepped architectural facades of medieval churches and town halls in the Mark-Brandenburg, the factory gates at the Borsig works in Berlin-Tegel (designed 1895-1898 by Friedrich Körte and Konrad Reimer) are an example of how Neogothic industrial architecture could convey a complex, multi-layered symbolism, uniting the moralizing exhortations of the Neogothic with a reinforcement of the worker's fealty to the firm. The adoption of historical sacral style by modern industry gave symbolic assurance that though technological change continued its inexorable march, the company ethos adhered to traditional, even timeless, values of community spirit and common purpose. Above all, the Neogothic idiom in industrial architecture gave architectural expression to the widely held belief that technology itself was a great bearer of cultural progress.²⁵ The waterworks at Berlin Friedrichshagen, designed by Henry Gill and built between 1889-1893, was at the time of its construction the largest and most modern water treatment facility in Europe. The waterworks comprise a Neogothic industrial idyll of engine houses, pumping and filtering works, as well as housing for the managers, engineers, and leading mechanics. Conspicuous at the center of the works is an assembly hall for the

²⁴ E.S. de Beer, "Gothic: Origin and Diffusion of the Term: the Idea of Style in Architecture," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute* 11 (1948): 143-62; Georg Germann, *Neugotik. Geschichte ihrer Architekturtheorie* (Stuttgart: DVA, 1974); Chris Brooks, *The Gothic Revival* (London: Phaidon, 1999).

²⁵ Thomas Rohkrämer, *Eine andere moderne. Zivilisationskritik, Natur und Technik in Deutschland 1880-1933* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1999), 56-71.

workers with a typical medieval Brandenburg stepped gable (figure 8).²⁶ In the Rhine region, Neogothic was the style of choice for companies that desired an up-to-date representative architecture. The mines of the Gelsenkirchener Bergwerks-AG, notably at Zeche Zollern 2 in Dortmund-Bövinghausen (designed 1901 onward by Paul Knobbe [1867-1956]), Bruno Möhring (1863-1929), and Reinhold Krohn (1852-1932), were built in the Neogothic style. Zeche Zollern 2, several buildings of which are today preserved as part of the Westfälisches Industriemuseum, was promoted as the most modern, technologically up-to-date mining installation of the time, with buildings in a Jugendstil-inflected Gothic idiom, with towers, crenellations, pointed arches, figurative reliefs, and carved inscriptions. This kind of romanticized interpretation of medieval architecture became an all-purpose architectural style for public and semi-public buildings associated with modern guilds and handcraft associations, as in the Handwerkervereinshaus in Berlin's Sophienstrasse (figure 9; designed 1904 by Joseph Franckel and Theodor Kampfmeyer), and more broadly for community architecture, as in Ludwig Hoffmann's Märkisches Museum in Berlin (1899-1908), and numerous Rathäuser (city halls) throughout Germany built around 1900, including the Rathäuser in Berlin-Charlottenburg (Heinrich Reinhardt and Georg Süßenguth, 1899-1905) and Berlin-Schmargendorf (Otto Kerwien, 1900-1902).²⁷

²⁶ *Alte Wasserwerke in Berlin*. Berlin-Friedrichshagen: Museum im Wasserwerk, 1995.

²⁷ Northern Renaissance stylistic idioms were also widespread at the time, but were used more frequently for public and semi-public architecture as well as for modern housing associated with the educated professions, engineers, and government administrators – the Bildungsbürgertum and Angestellte. For example, the Haus des Vereins Deutscher Ingenieure in the Berlin Charlottenstrasse, designed 1896-1897 by Reimer and Körte, used Northern Renaissance motifs, as did the apartment buildings and coffee houses designed by Alfred Messel for the middle class and professional class investors of the Berliner Bau- und Wohnungs-Genossenschaft von 1892.

The influence of the Neogothic in workers' housing was evident in some industrial and mining settlements established on the edges of villages and in the open countryside. The approach to the vernacular in these cases was not overtly historical, but was rather vernacular in the truest sense – the legacy of highly localized building traditions and materials, filtered through a romantic, picturesque conception of domestic life. From the middle to the latter decades of the nineteenth century, and indeed well into the twentieth, there were also numerous instances of the romantic vernacular in workers' housing, including fantastically massed and decorated Swiss cottages, and miniaturized versions of bourgeois villas. Among the mid-century pattern books for such domiciles was Georg Ungewitter's *Entwürfe zu Stadt- und Landhäusern* (figure 10; 1856-58). The romantic vernacular of half-timbered facades, balconies, and multi-gabled roofs was also used extensively in workers' housing, as in Kuchen bei Geislingen, built by the Staub firm for its wool weavers in 1858-67. Still resilient and popular at the end of the nineteenth century, this romantic vernacular was used for workers' housing at the Hoechst paint factory near Frankfurt, begun in 1891, and for the Krupp company pensioner settlement at Siedlung Altenhof I in Essen, begun in 1892 (figure 11).

Artistic Form and the Worker's Home

The reigning normative aesthetic for the design of German workers' housing through the latter quarter of the nineteenth century was neither beauty nor artistic expression nor symbolic form, but rather the construction of cost-effective, hygienic shelter. For the great majority of architects and planners trained in polytechnic schools, the dominant artistic conception for the design and planning of mass housing was a strongly functional aesthetic of efficiency. In an essay on the architecture and planning of workers'

settlements in Germany, Walter Buschmann surveyed the aesthetic orientations of some of prominent designers and planners in the Kaiserreich.²⁸ James Hobrecht (1825-1902), principal author of the 1862 plan for extending Berlin, had trained as a land-surveyor and worked sporadically constructing street car lines before becoming accredited as a master builder of water, streets, and railroads, and then finding a position with Berlin city government in 1858.²⁹ Hobrecht held that the artistic ideal in architecture and planning was of necessity sacrificed to private initiative, and concerned himself with the depth of lots and width of streets.³⁰ Similarly, pioneering planners such as Reinhard Baumeister (1814-1886) and Josef Stübben (1845-1936) held that beauty per se was not a matter general responsibility. Advancement of an urban aesthetic was fulfilled through attention to transportation, structural, and health concerns.³¹ In the realm of worker housing, before the 1890s most housing settlements for the railroads, mines, foundries, and other industrial concerns were built by company engineers. A statement from Alfred Krupp captures the general sentiment of the industrial leader: What was needed in workers' housing was "a clear floor plan, the most stringent practicality and functionality, solid construction, and hygienic finishing."³² Artistic concerns did not enter into the equation.

²⁸ Walter Buschmann, "Architektonische und städtebauliche Formen," 42-46.

²⁹ Biographical background from Klaus Strohmeier, *James Hobrecht (1825-1902) und die Modernisierung der Stadt* (Potsdam: Verlag für Berlin-Brandenburg, 2000), 29, 40-42.

³⁰ "...daß der Bebauungsplan auf die Förderung der Schönheit und künstlerischen Disposition verzichten müsse, denn diese seien das Produkt der individuellen Empfindung und der persönlichen und privaten Initiative," cited in Buschmann, "Architektonische und städtebauliche Formen," 42.

³¹ Buschmann, "Architektonische und städtebauliche Formen," 42. Brian Ladd observes that James Hobrecht did have an operative aesthetic model for urban design, and it was the absolutist city, with precedents in Lenné and Schinkel, while Stübben and Baumeister looked to the example of Baron Haussmann and Paris, *Urban Planning and Civic Order in Germany*, 80-84, 111-113.

³² "...klare Disposition, strengste Sachlichkeit und Zweckmäßigkeit, handwerklich solide Ausführung und Hygiene," in Buschmann, "Architektonische und städtebauliche Formen," 45, citing from Richard Klapheck, "Neue Baukunst in den Rheinlanden," *Zeitschrift des Rheinischen Vereins für Denkmalpflege und Heimatschutz* 21 (1928): 41.

The fact that by the 1890s the question of “artistic form” had become central to the debates about workers’ housing is due to two related issues in the larger course of cultural developments in Germany: the Lebensreform movement and the arts and crafts movement, with their shared belief in the idea that everyday life expressed itself through the production of culture, and that everyday life was in turn shaped by its cultural productions. The Lebensreform and arts and crafts movements sought to intercede in the cycle. Rather than letting incidental causality proceed, they consciously endeavored to shape cultural productions to particular social ends. The shift toward a preemptive pedagogical aesthetic did not signal a complete break with the moral inferences of the Gothic and the sentimental shades of the picturesque cottage, for the moral and the sentimental were enfolded into Lebensreform and arts and crafts. In the guise of Jugendstil, the German iteration of Art Nouveau, the new interest in artistic form around 1890 was focused primarily on custom buildings and interiors, luxury goods, private villas, and objects produced in small numbers for a discerning and educated clientele. But the renewed interest in craft brought an emphasis on honesty of form and materials, perceptible evidence of handwork and labor, and regional specificity in design that drew heavily on models from the folk arts. Furthermore, the German Jugendstil and arts and crafts practitioners were distinguished among their European brethren by their conception of design as a comprehensive undertaking, encompassing every point at which the individual intersected with objects and the environment. This totalizing environmental aesthetic was framed on one side by the educational aspirations of the Lebensreform movement and on the other by the philosophy of the Gesamtkunstwerk, the theatrical conception of total sensory immersion. The environment both built and natural was seen

as an arena for aesthetic education, and aesthetic education was seen as an instrument of collective social progress. This was a modernism that called upon the great shades of Germany's native philosophical tradition – Goethe, Schiller, Herder, Wagner – in service of the industrial nation. The marrying of the artistic to the political made social reform intellectually credible: a task for leading minds and no longer just the work of friendly visiting women and ardent churchmen. The proliferation of reform associations that involved political leaders, businessmen, industrialists, and academics – Deutscher Bund Heimatschutz, Garden City Association, municipal building societies, Deutscher Werkbund – provided a social and professional framework that enabled designers to move between the design of villas and the design of workers' housing with their reputations not only intact but perceptibly elevated.³³

The interplay of fine art, decorative arts, and architecture was key to German design in this period. Among the leading architects of the arts and crafts movement in Germany, Peter Behrens, Henry van de Velde, Richard Riemerschmid, and Paul Schultze-Naumburg came to design from painting. Concerns for the aesthetic and for the educational power of the aesthetic were fundamental to their design philosophies and practices.³⁴ Framed by the totalizing environmental pedagogy of Lebensreform, for architects of workers' settlements, this meant controlling the design not just of the individual dwellings, but of the site plan as well. The governing concept was the artistic

³³ As Walter Buschmann has noted, before 1890 the design of workers' housing was not deemed sufficiently architectural to merit professional recognition. The Berlin Architekten-Verein did not allow members to submit designs for workers' housing for consideration in its monthly design competition, "Architektonische und städtebauliche Formen," *Architektonische und städtebauliche Formen*, 45.

³⁴ Other architects associated with reform through design in the period – Theodor Fischer, Karl Henrici, Alfred Messel, Hermann Muthesius, Fritz Schumacher Heinrich Tessenow – were trained as architects, and except for Muthesius, who as well as writing widely about all aspects of craft and design also ventured to design clothing and interiors, for the most part restricted their professional activities to architecture and planning.

streetscape. Drawing on the Viennese planner Camillo Sitte's writings about the streetscape as a theater of aesthetic perception, and Raymond Unwin's theories of village design, German designers arranged dwellings in artistic massings along the street and around plazas, staggered the enfilade of facades, staged dramatic shifts in perspective, and framed picturesque vistas – the street beyond viewed through a narrow passage, the settlement church viewed from across a plaza through a central arch – to create a sense of temporal unfolding and harmony between buildings and site.³⁵

The Scholarly Codification of the Regional Vernacular in Germany

Sometime around 1900 there developed in Germany, among professional architects as well as in the circles of environmental and historical preservation, a notable fluency in the languages of vernacular form. Architects began referring to Friesian, Bavarian, Frankisch, and Saxon styles. The founding of the national Heimatschutz movement and the proliferation of provincial associations were both generators and consumers of this new knowledge. Before 1890, one would be hard pressed to find a serious, ethnographically accurate treatment of rural vernacular architecture in the professional design literature. After 1890, they were everywhere. Histories of human dwellings, serving as records of house forms as well as parables about national character and the

³⁵ On Sitte's theories and influence, see his *Der Städtebau nach seinen künstlerischen Grundsätzen*, first published in 1889; George R. Collins and Christiane Crasemann Collins, *Camillo Sitte: The Birth of Modern City Planning* (New York: Rizzoli, 1986); and Michael Mönninger, *Vom Ornament zum Nationalkunstwerk. Zur Kunst- und Architekturtheorie Camillo Sittes* (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1998), 66-70. Raymond Unwin's *Town Planning in Practice* first appeared in 1909 and was translated into German in 1910 as *Grundlagen des Städtebaus* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1994). Kristiana Hartmann describes Unwin's book as one of the earliest and most read books of planning theory at the time, noting that many subsequently influential German planners, including Ernst May, worked in the offices of Unwin and Barry Parker. See "Bruno Taut, der Architekt und Planer von Gartenstädten und Siedlungen," in *Bruno Taut 1880-1938. Architekt zwischen Tradition und Avantgarde*, ed. Winfried Nerdinger et al. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2001), 139. On Unwin generally, see Mervyn Miller, *Raymond Unwin: Garden Cities and Town Planning* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992).

origins of architecture, had been published in Europe since the eighteenth century (even since Vitruvius). Marc-Antoine Laugier's *Essai sur l'architecture* of 1753 theorized a primitive dwelling as the origin of architecture. Gottfried Semper's *Die vier Elemente der Baukunst* and *Der Stil in den technischen und tektonischen Künsten*, published 100 years later, showed how long-lived and durable was the conception of the simple, primitive dwelling as the origin of architectural form.³⁶ Later in the nineteenth century, E.-E. Viollet-le-Duc and Charles Garnier also published studies on the history of human habitation, but their treatment of the European vernacular was speculative and highly idealized, often romantic, and occasionally outright false.³⁷

From about 1890 forward, however, the illustrations of historical vernacular dwellings in Germany became more precise – photographs and measured drawings rather than picturesque sketches. The specificity of terms for room types, and the definitions of regional styles became more exacting, and in many cases more regularized. By 1905 or so the knowledge is widespread. An increasing number of publications began appearing directed to the historical profession, the practicing architect, the preservationist, the

³⁶ Marc-Antoine Laugier, *Essai sur l'architecture* (Paris: Chez Duchesne, 1753); *An essay on architecture* (1753), trans. Wolfgang Hermann (Los Angeles: Hennessey & Ingalls, 1977). Gottfried Semper, *Die vier Elemente der Baukunst. Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Baukunde* (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1851); *The four elements of architecture and other writings*, trans. Harry Francis Mallgrave and Wolfgang Herrmann (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989). Gottfried Semper, *Der Stil in den technischen und tektonischen Künsten, oder praktische aesthetik. Ein Handbuch für Techniker, Künstler und Kunstfreunde* (Frankfurt a. M., Verlag für Kunst und Wissenschaft, 1860; München: Bruckmann's, 1863); *Style in the Technical and Tectonic Arts, or, Practical Aesthetics*, trans. Harry Francis Mallgrave and Michael Robinson (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2004).

³⁷ Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc, *Histoire de l'habitation humaine depuis les temps pré-historiques jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris: Bibliothèque d'éducation et de recreation, 1875); Charles Garnier and A. Ammann, *L'habitation humaine* (Paris: Hachette, 1892). Garnier's survey grew out of a project at the 1889 Paris Exposition, where he had designed pavilions representing the history of human habitation around the world and throughout Europe. The structures were built on the Champs de Mars in the shadow of the Eiffel Tower. Although the pavilions now seem merely picturesque, more a romantic idyll than ethnographic study, at the time they were presented as authoritative. See *L'architecture a l'exposition universelle de 1889: Principales constructions du Champ-de-Mars et de l'esplanade des Invalides* (Paris: Eugene Bigot, 1889); and Frantz Jourdain, *Constructions élevées au Champ de Mars par Ch. Garnier: Pour servir à l'histoire de l'habitation humaine* (Paris: Paris: Librairie centrale des beaux-arts, 1889).

serious amateur, as well as the armchair traveler. While there was a long-standing tradition of local history research into vernacular architecture in Germany, as in England, France, and elsewhere, and the work of amateurs and collectors was important to the preservation of historical remains before the age of state-supported research and preservation.³⁸ The academic thrust for the research and codification of German vernacular architecture, with the traditional German farmhouse as central focus, was rooted in a large body of scholarship in the social sciences dealing with the origin and diffusion of house and settlement forms in German-speaking lands.³⁹ Originating in three relatively distinct academic fields in the 1870s and 1880s – philology, geography, and economic history – by the end of the nineteenth century, the study of vernacular architecture and traditional settlements was a topic of interest in the new fields of Kulturgeschichte, cultural history, and its popularizing variant, Volkskunde, folklore studies. The particular character of the various fields of study left their imprints, shaping the course of the historical studies of house forms, and leaving an impression as well on

³⁸ Susan A. Crane documents the early history of the preservation movement in Germany, from Schinkel's 1815 recommendations to the Prussian government for inventorying historical monuments in territories recently regained from Napoleonic France, through amateur and local collecting associations, to the rise of major state-supported inventories and museum collections, see *Collecting and Historical Consciousness in Early Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000). On the importance of local historical associations for preservation of vernacular architecture and artifacts, see also Celia Applegate, *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990). On the use of amateur and academic scholarship in architectural preservation generally, see Felix Hammer, *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung des Denkmalrechts in Deutschland* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1995).

³⁹ On the historiography of German house research, see Karl Rhamm, "Der heutige Stand der deutschen Hausforschung und das neueste Werk Meitzens," *Globus. Illustrierte Zeitschrift für Länder- und Völkerkunde* 71, no. 11 (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1897): 169-176, 183-188, 206-213; Willi Peßler, "Ein Gang durch die Literatur," in *Das altsächsische Bauernhaus in seiner geographischen Verbreitung* (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1906), 25-46; Kurt Alexander Sommer, *Bauernhof-Bibliographie*. Herausgegeben im Auftrag der Fachgruppe Bauwesen im NS-Bund Deutscher Technik von Gustav Wolf (Leipzig: Karl W. Hiersemann, 1944); Werner Radig, *Frühformen der Hausentwicklung in Deutschland. Die frühgeschichtlichen Wurzeln des deutschen Hauses* (Berlin: Henschelverlag, 1958), 10-27; Karl Baumgarten, *Das deutsche Bauernhaus* (Neumünster: Karl Wachholtz Verlag, 1980); Hans-Jürgen Rach, ed., *Vom Bauen und Wohnen – 20 Jahre Arbeitskreis für Haus- und Siedlungsforschung in der DDR* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1982); Ákos Moravánsky, "Die Entdeckung der Nähen. Das Bauernhaus und die Architekten der frühen Moderne," in *Das entfernte Dorf. Moderne Kunst und ethnischer Artefakt*, ed. Ákos Moravánsky (Vienna: Birkhäuser, 2002), 95-123.

the later reception by working architects. For instance, ethnographically oriented philologists such as the Strasbourg professor Rudolf Henning working in the 1870s and 1880s undertook to do for Germany what the linguistic scholars had done for classical cultures: use architecture as a concrete means of tracing the diffusion of place names, the terms for various features, as well as specific stylistic or construction details.⁴⁰ Henning surveyed regional farmhouse types as historical ancestors of the German farmhouse, working with a set of regional definitions that had already been established in philology and ancient history (he noted styles that included fränkisch-oberdeutsche, sächsische, friesische, anglo-dänische, nordische, ostdeutsche, and arische). Henning's goal was manifestly nationalistic. "It is a matter," he wrote, "of whether prehistoric German tribes already had their own national architecture."⁴¹ Tracing national development through the historical development of words and cultural forms had been pioneered earlier in the century, when Jacob Grimm had collected old terms for the house and its parts for the *Deutsche Grammatik*. Such philological studies sought to identify linguistic and cultural forms that both confirmed and transcended actual political boundaries. In addition to codifying stylistic and construction details characteristic of vernacular houses in specific

⁴⁰Rudolf Henning, *Das Deutsche Haus in seiner historisches Entwicklung. Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der Germanischen Völker* 47 (Strassberg: Karl J. Trübner, 1882); *Die Deutschen Haustypen. Nachträglichen Bemerkungen. Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der Germanischen Völker* 55, no. 22 (Strassberg: Karl J. Trübner, 1886). Henning himself had been influenced by archaeological studies of settlement remains from classical Greece and Rome, notably the work of Heinrich Nissen, who in his studies of Pompeian houses had used the old German farmhouse as an object of comparison, Henning *Deutsche Haus*, VIII, referencing Heinrich Nissen. *Pompejanische Studien zur Städtekunde des Altertums* (Leipzig: Bretkopf und Härtel, 1877). In turn, Henning's philological approach influenced numerous researchers, including Karl Rhamm, *Dorf und Bauernhof in altdeutschem Lande, wie sie waren und wie sie sein werden* (Leipzig: Grunow, 1890); Karl Rhamm, *Ethnographische Beiträge zur germanisch-slavischen Altertumskunde*, Section 2: *Urzeitliche Bauernhöfe in germanische-slavischem Waldgebiet*, Part 1: *Altgermanische Bauernhöfe im Übergange vom Saal zu Fletz und Stube* (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1908); and Rudolf Meringer, *Das deutsche Haus und sein Hausrat* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1906).

⁴¹ "Denn es handelt sich darum, ob die Germanen der Vorzeit bereits eine eigene nationale Architektur gehabt haben," Henning, *Das Deutsche Haus in seiner historisches Entwicklung*, 1.

regions, Henning sought out, studied, and recorded both standard forms and variations in the plans of houses, the utilization of materials, and the customary dispositions and uses of rooms and furnishings (figure 12).

In addition to philology, the field of geography also shaped the character of research into the German vernacular farmhouse. The principle impact of geography was on a sharpening of researchers' awareness of the regional distinctions between, say, a Saxon farmhouse and a Frisian farmhouse. The signal figure in shaping this geographical awareness was Friedrich Ratzel, founder of *Anthropogeographie*, human geography.⁴² *Anthropogeographie* blended cultural geography and natural science to define a close interplay of climate, living organism, and cultural habits.⁴³ While Ratzel's purview was international, he penned a number of works about Germany, including *Deutschland. Einführung in die Heimatkunde*, widely used as a text book at the turn of the century.⁴⁴ In surveying the historical ethnography of German culture, Ratzel melded a localized, regional idea of German culture with an expansive conception of Germany's territorial destiny – we owe to him the concept of *Lebensraum* – which helped cement the idea of Germany as a unified nation proudly composed of culturally and historically distinct regions.⁴⁵ At Leipzig in 1898 Ratzel and historian Karl Lamprecht founded the Institut

⁴² On Ratzel's life and work, see Gerhard H. Müller, *Friedrich Ratzel (1844-1904): Naturwissenschaftler, Geograph, Gelehrter. Neue Studien zu Leben und Werk und sein Konzept der "Allgemeinen Biogeographie"* (Stuttgart: Verlag für Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Technik, 1996); and Günther Buttmann, *Friedrich Ratzel. Leben und Werk eines deutschen Geographen 1844-1904* (Stuttgart: Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1977). On the broader intellectual context of Ratzel's work (and an example of the post-war effort of the geography field to extricate one of their founders from accusations of being a forerunner of Nazi ideology), see Johannes Steinmetzler, *Die Anthropogeographie Friedrich Ratzels und ihre ideengeschichtlichen Wurzeln* (Bonn: Geographischen Institut der Universität Bonn, 1956).

⁴³ Friedrich Ratzel, *Anthropogeographie* (Stuttgart: J. Engelhorn, 1899).

⁴⁴ Friedrich Ratzel, *Deutschland. Einführung in die Heimatkunde* (Leipzig: F.W. Grunow, 1898).

⁴⁵ On Ratzel's role in German geographical thought considered from a more critical and more political point of view (that is, considering his support for colonialism, his racial theories, and his ideas about human psychology and the state as organism), see Gerhard Sandner and Mechtild Rössler, "Geography and Empire

für Deutsche Landes- und Volksgeschichte, the first university institute for regional history, whose purview included studies of settlements, folklore, and vernacular culture.⁴⁶ Ratzel's notion of the "diffusion" of cultural forms over land areas owed something to the methods of philology that traced historical human migration patterns through the evidence of language. At the same time, through the influence of geographer Carl Ritter (1779-1859), whose *Erdkunde* focused on the cultural and historical significance of geography, it is possible to trace a line of intellectual descent from Ratzel right back to Herder, suggesting that feelings for an almost mystical union of land, culture, and state remained strong in German thought over the course of the entire century.⁴⁷

In addition to philology and geography, political economy was the third field shaping the character of historical farmhouse studies in Germany, and the key scholar was Berlin professor August Meitzen (1822-1910). Meitzen had begun his career in government service in Prussia and Silesia, dealing with issues in agriculture and land-management. His first major work, produced while he was still a civil servant, dealt with the history of agricultural production and economic relations in villages in Silesia from the Middle Ages through the eighteenth century.⁴⁸ His focus on using building forms and floor plans of vernacular structures in combination with statistics as documents of economic development was innovative. Meitzen continued to produce statistical and historical

in Germany, 1871-1945," in *Geography and Empire*, ed. Anne Godlewska and Neil Smith (London: Blackwell, 1994), 115-127; and Mark Bassin, "Imperialism and the nation state in Friedrich Ratzel's political geography," *Progress in Human Geography* 11 (1987): 473-495.

⁴⁶ Herbert Helbig, "Fünfzig Jahre Institute für Deutsche Landes- und Volksgeschichte an der Universität Leipzig," *Berichte zur deutschen Landeskunde* 19 (1957): 55-77.

⁴⁷ Buttmann, *Friedrich Ratzel. Leben und Werk eines deutschen Geographen 1844-1904*, 11, 62-64, 103.

⁴⁸ August Meitzen, *Urkunden schlesische Dörfer. Zur Geschichte der ländliche Verhältnisse und der Flurentheilung insbesondere*. Codex Diplomaticus Silesiae 4 (Breslau: Max, 1863). See Meitzen's biography in *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 16, ed. Historische Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1990), 734-735.

studies of Prussian agriculture under state aegis until the end of his life. In 1875 he was named professor of political science at the Berlin University, where he taught until 1904, and advised both Werner Sombart and Max Weber in their doctoral research into agrarian economies of medieval Italy.⁴⁹

Meitzen began publishing studies of the historical-geographic diffusion of house forms in the 1880s. Major works included *Das deutsche Haus in seinen volksthümlichen Formen* of 1882, in which he essayed to define fundamental house forms and to map their geographic diffusion across Europe (figure 13). In the course of this larger, transnational effort, Meitzen took note of the specifics of plan, construction details, patterns of interior usage, and the disposition of furnishings in farmhouses (figure 14). His studies of the vernacular house and community form culminated in 1895 in the massive three-volume *Wanderungen, Anbau, und Agrarrecht der Völker Europas nördlich der Alpen*.⁵⁰

(Migrations, cultivation, and agrarian law of the European people north of the Alps).

Meitzen surveyed the contemporaneous landscape of Europe for evidence of historical survivals, remnants of the ur-forms and historical forms of settlement and domestic economy that had survived into the nineteenth century. His approach to the root forms of social life in ancient agricultural settlements was essentially that of an anthropologist and geographer. Climate, he maintained, was the original determiner of cultural forms and dwelling type; over time dwelling forms evolved in tandem with the evolving complexities of agricultural technologies, trade, and migration. The tents of desert

⁴⁹ Max Weber, *Römischen Agrargeschichte* (1891), in *Gesamtausgabe*, part 1, vol. 2; *Die Lage der Landarbeiter im ostelbischen Deutschland* (1892), in *Gesamtausgabe*, part I, vol., 3, section 2 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1984).

⁵⁰ August Meitzen, *Das deutsche Haus in seinen volksthümlichen Formen* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1882); August Meitzen, *Wanderungen, Anbau, und Agrarrecht der Völker Europas nördlich der Alpen. Siedelung und Agrarwesen der Westgermanen und Ostgermanen, der Kelten, Römer, Finnen und Slawen*, 3 vols.(Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz, 1895).

nomads and the remains of prehistoric cave dwellers in northern Europe showed adaptations to very different climatic conditions, which in turn gave shape to very different cultures. Meitzen did not postulate an ideal origin for architecture in the primitive hut, but traced numerous forms of accommodation and adaptation to regional environments (figure 15). He saw rural and village dwellings as the foundational work of human existence, both a record and shaper of family relations, public life, economic life, and ultimately, the nation. Meitzen's accumulation of documentary evidence can be seen as a historical record of the same forms of family, village, and small town *Gemeinschaft* that Tönnies traced in his seminal sociological study written during the same period of the 1880s. At a presentation at the annual geographers conference in Berlin 1882, Meitzen gave a preview of his work-in-progress, and summarized the significance of his research for social reform and architecture in the present day,

Houses are a speaking testament to the fundamental character of a people's existence. Large or small dimensions, good or bad materials, solid or less enduring workmanship, secure or insufficient protection against the onslaught of the weather, and not least the construction, the apportionment of space, whether the living and working spaces are well-arranged or narrow and inappropriate, whether care is shown for the cohabitation of wife, children, and domestic servants, and likewise for the disposition of livestock and home economies – the possibility of cleanliness and healthy, refreshing impressions distinguish houses and their inhabitants alike. The classes of people are divided accordingly. Just as the standard house plan takes shape around each class, in both the good and bad sense, so must its effects, in so far as the house's singular nature can be generalized and made to prevail, become favorable or unfavorable for the overall living conditions of the nation. But only seemingly does the house constrain and define the inhabitant; in truth the house is more like a snail's shell, a dwelling generated by the very act of living. The house is the embodiment of the spirit of the people. As in myths

and sagas, in the house's primordial lineaments, we see the desiderata and creative claims of the national soul.⁵¹

To carry out their studies, scholars like Rudolf Henning and August Meitzen hiked the countryside of Germany, taking their own measurements, making their own sketches. Philologist Rudolf Henning's wife, Adele, hiked alongside him and drew the illustrations for his books.⁵² August Meitzen and the cultural historian Karl Lamprecht made research forays together into the countryside of the Eiffel and the Ardennes. This was primary research. There was little or no prior authoritative documentation.⁵³ The material these scholars collected remains invaluable as historical documentation. Over the decades that these early studies of rural vernacular architecture were being carried through, the object of interest was quite literally disappearing, as urbanization effaced the villages at the edges of metropolitan areas and emigration driven by the attractions of industrial work in the cities depleted outlying rural villages of their populations.

The work of scholarly research, of writing history, became bound up with the work of preserving history, and with the work of creating a national identity for a Germany that

⁵¹ " Die Häuser geben ein sprechendes Zeugnisse der Hauptgrundlagen der Volksexistenz. Grössere oder kleinere Ausdehnung, gutes oder schlechtes Material, feste oder wenig dauerhafte Beschaffenheit, sicherer oder unzureichender Schutz gegen die Einflüsse der Witterung, und nicht weniger die Einrichtung, die Raumvertheilung, der gute Zusammenhang oder die Enge und Unzweckmässigkeit der Wohnungs- und Arbeitsräume, die Rücksicht auf das Zusammenleben mit Frau und Kind und Gesinde, ebenso die Beziehungen an Vieh und Wirtschaft, Erleichterung jeder Hantierung, Möglichkeit der Sauberkeit und gesunder efrischender Eindrücke unterscheiden die Häuser wie ihre Bewohner. Die Klassen des Volkes trennen sich danach. Wie für jede Klasse im guten oder schlimmen Sinne der übliche Plan des Hauses gestaltet ust, so müssen seine Wirkungen, je nachdem sein eigenthümliches Wesen sich verallgemeinert und er der vorherrschende bleibt, in Sitte und Wohlsein und in den gesammten Lebensverhältnissen der Nation günstige oder ungünstige werden. Aber nur scheinbar zwingt und bestimmt dabei das Haus die Bewohner, in Wahrheit wird es, dem Schneckenhaus vergleichbar, aus ihrem lebendigen Wesen erzeugt. Das Haus ist die Verkörperung des Volksgeistes. Wir ahnen in seinen ursprünglichen Zügen, wie in Mythe und Sage, Bedürfnisse und schöpferische Anforderungen des nationalen Gemüthes," August Meitzen, *Das deutsche Haus in seinen volksthümlichen Formen. Behufs Ermittlungen über die geographische und geschichtliche Verbreitung, besprochen auf dem Geographen-Tage zu Berlin am 7.-9. Juli 1881* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1882), 1-2

⁵² Henning, *Das deutsche Haus*, IX.

⁵³ Roger Chickering, *Karl Lamprecht: A German Academic Life 1856-1915* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1993), 84.

had existed as a nation for only a short period – in the 1880s when Henning, Ratzel, and Meitzen were writing their major works, for less than ten years. These scholarly studies were part of a larger political project to fashion the historical consciousness of nationhood from the disparate regions, states, and principalities that made up German-speaking lands. By the end of the nineteenth century, with Germany united as a nation, the push to establish the historical roots of a national identity had not diminished, but had become institutionalized in the universities and professional scientific organizations, particularly through the creation of departments, institutes, associations, and professional journals dedicated to the fields of cultural history,⁵⁴ folklore studies, and ethnography.⁵⁵

The research and collections of amateur historians and local antiquarians became the founding impetus for German history museums, among them, the Germanisches

⁵⁴ The work of Karl Lamprecht and colleagues such as geographer Friedrich Ratzel at Leipzig was decisive in the elevation of German folk culture as a legitimate, and popular, subject of study, and in the seeding of cross-disciplinary studies in geography and cultural history, the particular domain of farmhouse research, as below with Lamprecht and Ratzel's student, Willi Pessler. See Chickering, *Karl Lamprecht*,

⁵⁵ Even Rudolf Virchow (1821-1902) weighed in on the farmhouse form with several essays between 1887 and 1891 in the *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, the journal of the Berlin Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte. The interest was not fleeting: in 1888 Virchow helped found the Museum für deutsche Volkstrachten und Erzeugnisse des Hausgewerbe in Berlin, which later became the Deutsches Museum für Volkskunde. See Ulrich Jahn, "Das neubegründete Museum für deutsche Volkstrachten und Erzeugnisse des Hausgewerbes zu Berlin," *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft* 19 (1889): 334-343; Ulrich Steinmann, "Die Entwicklung des Museums für Volkskunde von 1889 bis 1964," *75 Jahre Museum für Volkskunde zu Berlin* (Berlin: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, 1964), 7-47. While in the early nineteenth century, German anthropology under such figures as Adolf Bastien had drawn a distinction between *Naturvölker* and *Kulturvölker*, with anthropology dedicated properly to the study of the first and history to the second, by the later nineteenth century the increase in what Andrew Zimmerman describes as the historicization of the objects of anthropology led to a reconfiguration of the field's focus on the actual histories of people rather than the inscription of some universal and timeless set of laws of human development. The significance of this shift for the study of artifacts such as folk handcrafts and the remains of age-old vernacular buildings was that the separation between nature and culture became less firm. In a sense history now extended indefinitely into prehistory, and the *Entwicklungsgeschichte*, developmental history, of the German people, and the German nation, could be traced back to time immemorial. See Andrew Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 201-214. On the rise of folklore studies as an academic field, and the popularization of the field's work through public museums, see Wolfgang Brückner, "Das Museumswesen und die Entwicklung der Volkskunde als Wissenschaft um die Jahre 1902/1904," in *Das kunst- und kulturgeschichtliche Museum im 19. Jahrhundert. Vorträge des Symposiums im Germanischen Nationalmuseum, Nürnberg*, ed. Bernward Deneke and Rainer Kahsnitz (Munich: Prestel Verlag, 1977), 133-142. On the establishment of ethnographic museums in Germany, see Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Antihumanism*, 172-216; and H. Glenn Penny, *Objects of Culture: Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002).

Nationalmuseum in Nuremberg, founded in 1852, and the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, founded in 1885 (with W.H. Riehl as its first director), as well as numerous state and city history museums.⁵⁶ The burgeoning interest in vernacular house forms and rural settlements, as subject of historical study and objects in need of preservation spurred the founding of *Heimattmuseen*, homeland museums, in Germany around the turn of the century. The popular interest in farmhouses and disappearing practices of rural life also led to the creation of a new kind of museum in this period, the *Freilichtmuseum*, open-air museum, in which collections of historical houses or recreations of historical villages educated the public about local history.⁵⁷

The career of historian Otto Lauffer (1874-1949) exemplified the cross-pollination between academic scholarship and popular history. In 1908 Lauffer was appointed first director of the Museum für Hamburger Geschichte, and in 1919 was named to the first German chair in Volkskunde, folklore studies, at Hamburg University. In that same year, Lauffer published *Das Deutsche Haus im Dorf und Stadt*, a book for general readers that popularized the archaeological, philological, and geographical studies of vernacular house form pioneered by Henning, Meitzner, and others.⁵⁸ Hoping to advance the cause

⁵⁶ See Berward Deneke, "Die Museen und die Entwicklung der Kulturgeschichte," and Gerd Spies, "Die kunst- und kulturgeschichtlichen Lokal- und Regionalmuseen," in *Das kunst- und kulturgeschichtliche Museum im 19. Jahrhundert*, 59-76, 118-132.

⁵⁷ The first European open-air museum was established in 1891 in Skansen near Stockholm, as a branch of the Nordiska Museet, itself the first folk history museum founded in Stockholm in 1873. The first German open-air museum was a farmhouse exhibit, founded as a private initiative in 1899, the Freilichtmuseum Ostenfelder Bauernhaus. Between 1907 and the First World War, numerous other farmhouse museums were established throughout Germany. See Ingrid Edeler, *Zur Typologie des kulturhistorischen Museums, Freilichtmuseen und kulturhistorische Räume* (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1988).

⁵⁸ Otto Lauffer, *Das deutsche Haus in Dorf und Stadt* (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1919). While this chapter focuses on historical studies of the German farmhouse as a model for the modern home, Lauffer's book touches on an equally important current in house research at the time: histories of the development of the city house, which similarly informed modern architects looking for historically rooted models for modern apartment life, albeit resulting in invocations of medieval- and baroque-era influences on facades and

of historic preservation, Lauffer illustrated his book with photographs of still extant farmhouses (figure 16). He used etymological examples to demonstrate the origins of the essential elements of the German house, in rural as well as small town and urban milieus. Lauffer used the German saying "Haus und Herd" (home and hearth) to demonstrate how the traditional farmhouse was built from the heating source, the fireplace, out.⁵⁹ In the course of tracing this etymological convergence, Lauffer demonstrated that the *Stube*, the main living space of the farmhouse, was also evidence of the fireplace as the origin of the dwelling. He traced "Stube" through "stieben," to heat with steam, back through historical terms for baked clay vessels that also sprouted tangents to etymologies for the *Kachelofen*, the tiled oven.⁶⁰ The belief in the fireplace as the generative origin of the dwelling was a mainstay of historical architectural theory as well, of great importance in the writings of Karl Bötticher and Gottfried Semper, and cited by modern architects like Georg Metzendorf and Frank Lloyd Wright as decisive in their design methodology.

The career of Friedrich Ratzel's student Willi (Wilhelm) Pessler (1880-1962) illustrates another route for the popularization of farmhouse studies through the educational work of new kinds of local history museums, until it was finally subsumed into the nationalist and racial purity projects of the Third Reich. Pessler published his dissertation, *Das altsächsische Bauernhaus in seiner geographischen Verbreitung* (The old Saxon farmhouse in its geographic extension), in 1906, two years after Ratzel's death.⁶¹ The

streetscapes then on the inner disposition of rooms. In any case, histories of the city house likewise had their origin in mid nineteenth-century studies colored by patriotism both national and municipal.

⁵⁹ Lauffer, *Das deutsche Haus in Dorf und Stadt*, 9-10.

⁶⁰ Lauffer, *Das deutsche Haus in Dorf und Stadt*, 12-14.

⁶¹ The work was completed at Königsberg under geographer Friedrich Gustav Hahn (1852-1917), and dedicated to Halle geographer Alfred Kirchhoff (1838-1907). Pessler's extensive research travel through Europe was financed by a fellowship the Zentralkommission für deutsche Landes- und Volksforschung, a

book opens with a quote from the Marburg geographer Theobald Fischer, which telegraphs the nationalist intents of Pessler's approach:

To deepen the knowledge of one's own people and fatherland, and thereby to nourish the roots of the love for one's people and fatherland is the most important task of the geographer.⁶²

Pessler's study is evidence of the importance attached to establishing the paths and boundaries of the cultural diffusion as a means of clarifying the historical development of cultural forms, and as a means of defining the "natural" borders of nations. Like Henning and Meitzen, Pessler was interested in the way linguistic analysis of names for features of construction and everyday use infused the vernacular house form with deeper cultural meanings (figure 17). Like Lauffer, Pessler was concerned with the endangered state of Germany's vernacular architectural heritage (figure 18). He was also interested in the preservation of the Bauerntum, the farming classes, as a way of sustaining or even resurrecting nativist German lifeways and moral values. In addition to documenting the architectural structures of farmhouses themselves, he made extensive photographs of farming families at work and leisure (figure 19). Pessler's studies of vernacular farmhouse architecture bridge late nineteenth-century geographical studies of the farmhouse as artifacts of German economic and cultural history, and twentieth-century popularizations of the farmhouse as a symbol of German nationalism. As director of the Vaterländisches Museum in Hannover, a local history museum established in 1903, Pessler was an advocate for museums as centers of public education about national

grant made at the behest of Ratzel. Willi Pessler, *Das altsächsische Bauernhaus in seiner geographischen Verbreitung* (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1906).

⁶² "Die Kenntnis des eigenen Volkes und Vaterlandes zu vertiefen und damit den Wurzeln der Liebe zum eigenen Volke und Vaterlande neue Nahrung zuzuführen ist der wichtigste Aufgaben des Geographen." Theobald Fischer in Pessler, *Das altsächsische Bauernhaus*, 1.

history. He was also a prolific publisher of popular books about farmhouses and local culture.⁶³ The undertones of patriotism that were present in his work became increasingly strident in the 1930s, as his long-held ideas found a wider audience in the cultural milieu of the Third Reich. Pessler reprised his doctoral study thirty years later, under the aegis of the Vaterländisches Museum, as *Das niedersächsische Bauernhaus, ein Denkmal germanischer Kultur* (The lower Saxon farmhouse, a monument of Germanic culture),⁶⁴ and in the late 1930s worked on massive studies of *Stammeskunde*, histories of the German *Stamm*, or tribe – racial histories of the German people.⁶⁵

The need to document and preserve vernacular architectural forms against the onslaught of modernity became a popular cause in Germany.⁶⁶ The first German Heimatschutz association was formed in 1904. Dedicated to local history, nature study, and early forays into what we today know as environmental education, Heimatschutz organizations joined with the equally recently established Denkmalpflege (monument preservation) groups, and made the preservation of rural villages and landscapes their foremost objectives.⁶⁷

⁶³ Wilhelm Pessler, *Das Heimat-Museum im deutschen Sprachgebiet als Spiegel deutscher Kultur* (Munich: Lehmann, 1927).

⁶⁴ Wilhelm Peßler, *Das niedersächsische Bauernhaus, ein Denkmal germanischer Kultur*. Veröffentlichungen des Vaterländischen Museums der Hauptstadt Hannover 7 (Hannover, 1936).

⁶⁵ Wilhelm Peßler, *Handbuch der deutschen Stammeskunde* (Potsdam: Athenaion, 1942).

⁶⁶ For an overview of the interests in folk art and the vernacular in Europe at the turn of the twentieth century, see the essays in *Das entfernte Dorf. Moderne Kunst und ethnischer Artefakt*, ed. Ákos Moravánszky (Vienna: Böhlau, 2002).

⁶⁷ The Heimatschutz movement was a convergence, and a seed bed, of several different strands of German cultural development at the end of the nineteenth century: idealization of the folks arts, preservation of the folk arts, preservation of national monuments, preservation of natural landscapes, regional pride, national chauvinism, nature romanticism. For overviews of the diverse historical resonances of the term "Heimat" in German culture, see Jost Hermand, ed. *Heimat, Nation, Fatherland: The German Sense of Belonging* (New York: Peter Lang, 1996); Andrea Bastian, *Der Heimat-Begriff. Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung in verschiedenen Funktionsbereichen der deutschen Sprache* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1995); and Elisabeth Moosmann, ed., *Heimat: Sehnsucht nach Identität* (Berlin: Ästhetik & Kommunikation, 1980). For general histories of the Heimatschutz movement, see Edeltraud Klüeting, ed., *Antimodernismus und Reform. Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Heimatbewegung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1991); Christian F. Otto, "Modern Environment and Historical Continuity: The Heimatschutz Discourse in Germany" *Art Journal* (Summer 1983): 148-157; Helmut Fischer, *Hundert*

Regional vernacular houses were regularly featured in the regional Heimatschutz journals.⁶⁸ Articles related the histories of specific buildings and regional styles, and documented the technical details of traditional construction (figures 20 and 21). The Heimatschutz journals also served to educate popular taste in the vernacular, with articles that proposed Heimatstil solutions for modern appurtenances like powerlines and transformers (figure 22), and essays on good and bad forms of the vernacular (figures 23 and 24). From 1903 to 1906, the Verband Deutscher Architekten- und Ingenieurvereine (the Union of German Architect and Engineer Associations) published more

Jahre für den Naturschutz. Heimat und regionale Identität: Die Geschichte eines Programms (Bonn: Bund Heimat und Umwelt, 2004); Deutscher Heimatbund, ed., *Für Heimat und Umwelt. Achtzig Jahre Deutscher Heimatbund 1904-1984* (Bonn: BHU, 1984); Deutscher Heimatbund, ed., *Fünfundsiebzig Jahre Deutscher Heimatbund* (Siegburg: Deutscher Heimatbund, 1979); Walter Schoenichen, *Naturschutz, Heimatschutz: Ihre Begründung durch Ernst Rudorff, Hugo Conwentz und ihre Vorläufer* (Stuttgart: Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1954). For English-language histories of local pride as a constituent of German nationalism and historical preservation, see Celia Applegate, "Localism and the German Bourgeoisie: The 'Heimat' Movement in the Rhenisch Palatinate before 1914," in *The German Bourgeoisie*, ed. David Blackbourn and Richard J. Evans (New York: Routledge, 1990), 224-254; and Celia Applegate, *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990). For discussions of the Heimatschutz movement as an environmental movement, see Thomas M. Lekan, *Imagining the Nation in Nature: Landscape Preservation and German Identity, 1885-1945* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004); William H. Rollins, *A Greener Vision of Home: Cultural Politics and Environmental Reform in the German Heimatschutz Movement, 1904-1918* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997); John Alexander Williams, "The Chords of the German Soul are Tuned to Nature: The Movement to Preserve the Natural Heimat from the Kaiserreich to the Third Reich," *Central European History* 29, no. 3 (1996): 339-384; Raymond Dominick, *The Environmental Movement in German: Prophets and Pioneers, 1871-1971* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991); and Jost Hermand, *Grüne Utopien in Deutschland: Zur Geschichte des ökologischen Bewusstseins* (Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, 1991).

⁶⁸ In addition to the national *Heimatschutz* journal, established in 1904, periodicals were published by many regional and city Heimatschutz organizations, including Baden (*Mein Heimatland. Badische Blätter für Volkskunde, ländliche Wohlfahrtspflege, Heimat- und Denkmalschutz*, 1913-1942); Bavaria (*Volkskunst und Volkskunde: Monatsschrift des Bayerischen Vereins für Volkskunst und Volkskunde in München*, 1903-1911; *Bayerischer Heimatschutz. Monatsschrift des bayerischen Landesvereines für Heimatschutz – Verein für Volkskunst und Volkskunde*, 1912-1936); Brandenburg (*Heimatschutz in Brandenburg*, 1909-1920); Hesse (*Mittelingen des Vereins für Naturdenkmal- und Heimatschutz in Kurhessen*, 1912-1914); Mecklenburg (*Zeitschrift für Heimatbundes Mecklenburg*, 1906-1941); Lower Saxony (Jahresbericht des Heimatbundes Niedersachsen, 1903-1937; *Zeitschrift des Vereins Heimatbund Niedersachsen*, 1905 through mid 1940s under various titles); the Pfalz (*Pfälzische Heimatkunde. Illustrierte Monatsschrift zur Förderung von Nature- und Landeskunde in der Rheinpfalz*, 1904-1920); Rheinland (*Mitteilungen des Rheinischen Vereins für Denkmalpflege und Heimatschutz*, 1907-1918;); Saxony (Mitteilungen des Landesvereins Sächsischer Heimatschutz e.V.: Naturschutz, Heimatgeschichte, Denkmalpflege und Volkskunde, 1912-1940); Schleswig-Holstein (*Schleswig-Holsteinische Natur- und Vogelschutzblätter*, 1912-1914); and Württemberg (Mitteilungen des Bundes für Heimatschutz Württemberg und Hohenzollern, 1909-1924).

architecturally polished pendants to Meitzen's studies, notably the massive volume, *Das Bauernhaus im Deutschen Reiche und in seinen Grenzgebieten* (The farmhouse in the German Reich and its border areas), and similar books on the rural vernacular architecture of Switzerland and of Austro-Hungary.⁶⁹ Produced in a large atlas format, with detailed floor plans, elevations, sections, and construction details, the volumes were at once prestige objects, instruments of romantic nationalism, documents to guide historical preservation, and model books for the vernacular revival (figures 25 and 26). These volumes would have served as a ready source for modern German architects interested in regional style.

The Vernaculat Turn: The Artistic Form of the Worker's Home

That German architects at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century found inspiration in folkloric vernaculars is in keeping with a larger interest in handcraft and folk arts in the arts and crafts movement at the time. As an international efflorescence at the end of the nineteenth century, arts and crafts represented many things – a mode of production that asserted the dignity of hand labor against the soullessness of the machine, a symbolic language for the regional particularism of romantic nationalism, a means of expressing class distinction through conspicuous aesthetic consumption, a promise of social renewal through design, a path offering a way out of the perceived exhaustion of historicist styles. These were just some of the meanings concentrated into representations of folk, or vernacular architecture.

⁶⁹ *Das Bauernhaus in der Schweiz* (Zurich: Schweizerischer Ingenieur und Architekten-Verein, 1903); *Das Bauernhaus im Deutschen Reich und in seinen Grenzgebieten* (Dresden: Kuthmann, 1906); *Das Bauernhaus in Österreich-Ungarn* (Vienna: Österreichischer Ingenieur- und Architektenverein, 1905-1906).

In our own time, the concept of the “vernacular” in architecture is resists concise definition. Even in late Wilhelmine Germany, and certainly by the time of the outbreak of the First World War, the conception of folk architecture as a representative expression of quotidian culture, and especially of quotidian rural culture, was already established. But it was precisely in the period from the 1880s to around 1914 that vernacular folk forms came into its own as a topic of interest and discussion in architecture, and as a subject of popular interest. Coupled with the popular enthusiasm for the folk arts, vernacular architecture, primarily in the guise of old farmhouses and rural cottages, came to be seen as something closely tied to native German character.

There are two distinctive characteristics to the German architects’ invocation of rural vernaculars in modern architecture: First is the way the rural vernacular, the farmhouse, came to be interpreted as a kind of ur-form of dwelling, and as a model for modern housing particularly suited to the tastes and aspirations of the working classes. Second is the way the architects looked to social scientific authority, to findings from the fields of ethnography and geography, as justification for the progressive reform potential, the modernity, of the farmhouse forms.

The gathering in June 1905 of a group of architects and planners in the west German industrial town of Hagen for a conference on “The Artistic Form of the Worker’s House” provides an interesting and fruitful point of entry into the discussions of the time.⁷⁰ The conference was convened under the aegis of the Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen, the Central Office for Workers’ Welfare, a quasi-governmental

⁷⁰ *Die künstlerische Gestaltung des Arbeiter-Wohnhauses. 14. Konferenz der Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen am 5. und 6. Juni 1905 in Hagen i. W.* (Berlin: Carl Heymanns Verlag, 1906).

agency founded in Berlin in 1891. Leaders of the Centralstelle were members of the upper middle classes – government ministers, educators, and social reformers – who wanted to steer a moderately socialist middle course between rampant communism and untrammled capitalism.⁷¹ The conference was chaired by Karl Ernst Osthaus, and held at the Folkwang Museum.⁷² Over the course of the conference, an ancillary exhibition of designs for workers' housing, including photographs, drawings, and models, was presented in the galleries of the Folkwang Museum. Preceded by a show of work by Ferdinand Hödler and followed by one of Vincent van Gogh, the exhibition of new ideas about housing would have been received as part of the museum's larger effort to instruct the public in the ways of modernism.

Among those delivering lectures, Hermann Muthesius, Paul Schultze-Naumburg, Karl Henrici, and Richard Riemerschmid were already leading figures in modern art and design. Until he opened his own architectural practice in 1904, Muthesius had been

⁷¹ See Rüdiger vom Bruch, "Bürgerliche Sozialreform im deutschen Kaiserreich," in *Weder Kommunismus noch Kapitalismus. Bürgerliche Sozialreform in Deutschland vom Vormärz zur Ära Adenauer*, ed. Rüdiger vom Bruch (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1985), 61-180.

⁷² Heir to an industrial fortune, in 1898 Osthaus had set out to found a natural history museum for the betterment of the working people in the heavily industrial city of Hagen – in the belief that science was the driving force of modernity and progress. Under the influence of Henry van de Velde, among others, Osthaus developed a new philosophy of social evolution that involved spurring progress through education in the arts rather than science. In 1902 he established the Museum Folkwang, dedicated to the presentation of modern art. The original neo-Renaissance museum building designed by Carl Gerard in 1898 was reconfigured in a flowing Jugendstil style by Henry van de Velde in 1902, and the walls were hung with works by post-Impressionists such as Cézanne, van Gogh, Gauguin, Manet, and Matisse, as well as Secessionists and Symbolists such as Leibl, Trübner, Thoma, Böcklin, and Hödler, sculptors such as Minne and Meunier, and incipient Expressionists like Christian Rohlf, Emil Nolde, Ernst Barlach, the Brücke. Osthaus also played a pivotal role in the founding of the Deutscher Werkbund in 1907, providing financial as well as intellectual support. Following Osthaus' death in 1921, director of the Essen city art museum, Ernst Gosebruch, acquired the Folkwang collections and merged them with Essen's historical holdings. In 1929 the combined collection opened in a distinctive installation that juxtaposed modern works with medieval sculptures, East Asian works, and primitive carvings and ritual objects. In Gosebruch's words, the installation was fitting because Osthaus sought "to find the modern in every epoch of art." See Ernst Gosebruch, "Zur Neuordnung des Museums Folkwang in Essen," *Kunstblatt* 13 (1929): 52. On Osthaus and his conception of the Folkwang Museum generally, see the essays in *Der westdeutsche Impuls 1900-1914. Kunst und Umweltgestaltung im Industriegebiet. Die Folkwang-Idee des Karl Ernst Osthaus* (Hagen: Karl Ernst Osthaus Museum, 1984); and Herta Hesse-Frielinghaus, ed., *Karl Ernst Osthaus. Leben und Werk* (Recklinghausen: Bongers, 1971).

cultural attaché and advisor on arts and craft educational reform for the Prussian Ministry of Commerce. He had been steadily publishing articles and books on English and German design since the early 1890s. Schultze-Naumburg was a regular contributor to the popular cultural journal, *Kunstwart*, and had already published the first three volumes of his *Kulturarbeiten* series to great popular acclaim. Just the year before the conference, Schultze-Naumburg had been elected chair of the newly founded Deutscher Bund Heimatschutz. Henrici, born in 1842 and therefore some 20 years older than the others, was city planner in Aachen. Richard Riemerschmid, who in 1897 had founded the Munich Vereinigten Werkstätten für Kunst im Handwerk, had earned national renown for his prize winning interior and furniture at the 1900 World Exposition in Paris. He was among the leaders of the German Garden City Association, founded in 1902. None of the speakers had yet actually designed a home for workers, much less an entire housing estate – that work would follow in the years after the conference. Osthaus, Muthesius, Riemerschmid, and Schultze-Naumburg would also be leaders in founding the Deutscher Werkbund in 1907.

Karl Ernst Osthaus gave the opening address, an excursus on the evolution of cultures that brought all of architectural history and theory to bear on potential of the worker's home as a tool of education and an instrument of progress. In his estimation, the art form of the age, the true style of modernism, would emerge from the masses of the industrial workers.⁷³ Art history had neglected the house, in favor of monumental architecture, Osthaus maintained. In fact, architectural history had in a sense created monumental architecture through its continuous and many-faceted contributions to historicism. Art

⁷³ Karl Ernst Osthaus, "Der Wert des Hauses," *Die künstlerische Gestaltung des Arbeiter-Wohnhauses*, 1-6.

history's and architecture's disregard for the humble necessity of everyday shelter had opened up a chasm separating art and life. Echoing the ethnographic schema of architectural theorists such as Gottfried Semper, Osthaus declared, "It is one of the deepest realizations of the age's cultural history that all the great monuments of architecture that make men proud have grown up out of the ground of an authentic domestic culture."⁷⁴ The domestic meant two things to Osthaus: the importance of the simple house form, and the importance of tradition. But rather than sounding reactionary or nostalgic, Osthaus' invocation of tradition was specifically modern: the proof of modernist functionalism was in adaptations slowly shaped over the ages. The vernacular house was evidence of men confronting the forces of nature, and over many generations devising solutions to problems of site, materials, structure, and plan that perfectly suited specific modes of living.⁷⁵

Osthaus sounded two key themes explored in other contributions to the conference: the idea that the vernacular was the functionalist model par excellence, and the idea that there was a close connection between taste, beauty, class, and national political harmony. The strategy for national progress, he maintained, was the education of taste, and more specifically the education of taste keyed to class station in life. In this regard, a characteristically modernist harangue against superfluous ornament took on an added level of social and political critique. The tendency to over-ornamentation in German

⁷⁴ "Es ist eine der tiefsten und für unsere Zeit wichtigsten Erkenntnisse der Kulturgeschichte, daß alle großen Denkmäler der Baukunst, die den Stolz der Menschheit ausmachen, auf dem Boden einer echten häuslichen Kultur erwachsen sind," Osthaus, "Der Wert des Hauses," 2.

⁷⁵ "Wir erkennen also in den Typen des Hauses, wie sie uns die verschiedenen Kulturepochen überliefert haben, nicht das Werke menschlicher Laune und Willkür, sondern die sozusagen exakte Lösung von Problemen, die aus den Bedürfnissen der menschen unter bestimmten äußeren Bedingungen sich ergaben. Ihr Dasein ist das äußere Zeichen, daß ein Volk seinen Zuständen gewachsen war, seine Lebensumstände begriffen und bewältigt hat," Osthaus, "Der Wert des Hauses," 3.

culture was not simply a matter of bad taste, Osthaus held, it was a sign of people striving to appear as higher than their actual class. Germans were culturally backward.⁷⁶

Nothing characterizes the cultural level of a people better than what it considers beautiful. It is yet not so long ago that we advanced from admiring the simple to admiring the flamboyant. Everyone strives towards the opulent and the bedecked, whether it be a woman's hat, a garden trellis or a house façade.⁷⁷

Osthaus invoked Goethe and Schiller and the philosophical tradition wherein beauty was understood as a spiritual force, and a driver of fundamental ethical judgment.⁷⁸ With the loss of local connection and the loss of the proper fit between social class and aesthetic expression, German culture had gone astray. The problem of the house was not just a worker question: it was a cultural question, and a question of some moment for the German nation.⁷⁹ The forces of industrialization had moved too quickly. A mere century was not a long enough time to overcome the loss of connection to place and landscape, and to overcome the leveling effects of modernity. "Our culture has gone off the tracks," Osthaus said, "The ethical and aesthetic sides of life have suffered in corresponding measure as the economic and political sides have expanded. The visible sign of this is the German house."⁸⁰

⁷⁶ Osthaus, "Der Wert des Hauses," 4.

⁷⁷ "Nichts kennzeichnet besser das Kulturniveau eines Volkes als was es für schön hält. Es ist noch nicht lang her, da hätte man den, der das Einfache dem Überladenen vorgezogen hätte, bei uns groß angesehen. Jeder strebt zum Üppigen, Aufgezierten, ob es sich um einen Damenhut, ein Gartengitter oder eine Hausfassade handelte," Osthaus, "Der Wert des Hauses," 3.

⁷⁸ Osthaus, "Der Wert des Hauses," 3.

⁷⁹ "Ist die Bewegung auch keineswegs eine Arbeiterfrage sondern eine Kulturfrage des ganzen deutschen Volkes," Osthaus, "Der Wert des Hauses," 6.

⁸⁰ "Unsere Kultur ist aus ihrem Geleise gehoben. Die ungeheurer sich drängenden Entdeckungen und Erfindungen der letzten Jahrzehnte, die Dampfkraft und der auf ihr beruhende Weltverkehr, die gesteigerte Möglichkeit, fremde Städte und Länder zu sehen, die Kulturgeschichte, die aus ihren Füllhörnern tausend Ideen und Formen schüttet, die Erleichterungen der Materialbeschaffung – alles das hat unser Leben unendlich bereichert, aber auch unendlich verwirrt. Ein Jahrhundert hat nicht ausgereicht, um das neue Wissen und Können mit unserem Leben in Harmonie zu stehen. Seine ethische und ästhetische Seite hat in

In his evolutionary scheme of cultural development and aesthetic judgment, Osthaus wrought a causal linkage between beauty, political harmony, national destiny, and the home. The solution at the center of the problematic of modernity was the farmhouse. As a model for the workers' house, the farmhouse was both a prescription and a crucible. A prescription for what ailed German society, and a crucible for breeding the German culture of the future. The farmhouse was the most typical expression of the nation's character and soul. The great beauty of the German farmhouse was its pure functionality: it was an anonymous form that had evolved over years to ideally serve the function of sheltering productive laborers. While in the course of industrialization, workers had grown away from the soil and had left their homes and their Heimat, their homelands, both physically and spiritually, the farmhouse offered a key for re-establishing the rootedness of the workers and of offering them a means for becoming truly German. Although the course of historical progress could not be turned back – it was not possible literally to return the workers to the farms – it was possible to re-root the laboring classes in their true and native culture by giving them simple houses, derived from farmhouse models, to live in.

Muthesius and the Art of Designing the Worker's Home

Hermann Muthesius' address, "Die Entwicklung des künstlerischen Gedankens im Hausbau" (the development of the artistic idea in home design), cast further light on the issues of class and architectural expression raised by Osthaus. Muthesius saw the design of the workers' house as an extension of the great cultural task of the modern age: the

denselben Masse gelitten wie seine wirtschaftliche und politische sich expandierte. Das sichtbare Zeichen dessen ist das heutige deutsche Haus," Osthaus, "Der Wert des Hauses," 5-6.

need to forge a cultural identity for the great and growing middle classes, the Bürgertum, the bourgeoisie. This was a theme of Muthesius' major work, *Das englische Haus*, published in 1904-05, and a persistent subject in much of his cultural criticism of the time.⁸¹ The bourgeoisie might have its characteristic taste, but whether it was *adequate* taste, whether it was *authentic* taste, or whether it was just an aping of aristocratic manners, that was the question.⁸²

The spread of *Parvenütum*, pretension, upstart taste, class surrogacy, was the heart of the problem.

The bourgeoisie is happy to live amidst an environment of aristocratic frippery and pretentious surrogates. The surrogate in actual and metaphorical significance seems to characterize our cultural situation just as it characterizes our architectural situation. Cacophony wafts through our cultural expressions. There can be no artistic unity under the current careless conditions. Only harmonic conditions produce beauty.⁸³

Muthesius was concerned that class – he used the corporative term *Stand* – be properly expressed and fully legible in architecture. He was especially critical of what he saw as a growing tendency toward theatricality in bourgeois representation, with increasing

⁸¹ Hermann Muthesius, *Das englische Haus: Entwicklung, Bedingungen, Anlage, Aufbau, Einrichtung und Innenraum*, 3 vols. (Berlin: Wasmuth, 1904-1905). See also articles penned around the same time as the Hagen conference which focus more specifically on the architectural and artistic expression of class in Germany with less resort to the English model as the source of solutions, including "Alte Volkstradition und modernes Parvenütum in unserer Baukunst," *Deutsche Monatsschrift für das gesamte Leben der Gegenwart* 1 (1902): 219-224; "Die moderne Umbildung unserer ästhetischen Anschauungen," *Deutsche Monatsschrift für das gesamte Leben der Gegenwart* 1 (1902): 686-702; "Unsere Kunstzustände als Ausdruck unserer Kultur," *Der Kunstwart* 28, no. 23 (1904): 464-473.

⁸² For an overview of Muthesius' thought and writings on class and design, see Fedor Roth, *Hermann Muthesius und die Idee der harmonischen Kultur. Kultur als Einheit des künstlerischen Stils in allen Lebensäußerungen eines Volkes* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 2001), 75-94, 143-155.

⁸³ "Der Bürger gefällt sich in der Umgebung eines aristokratischen Flitterkrums und lebt zwischen prätenziösen Surrogaten. Die Surrogate in wirklicher und übertragener Bedeutung scheinen unsere Kulturlage zu charakterisieren wie sie unsere architektonische Lage charakterisieren. Ein mißklang weht durch unsere Kulturäußerungen. Bei der Zerfahrenheit der allgemeinen Zustände können aber die künstlerischen nicht einheitlich sein. Nur harmonische Zustände erzeugen Schönheit," Muthesius, "Die Entwicklung des künstlerischen Gedankens im Hausbau," 8.

emphasis on individualism and novelty. Over the course of the nineteenth century, house design had drifted ever more towards the archaeological and artificial, so much so that, as he put it, “Instead of houses, we build mere objects of style.”⁸⁴ An excess of ornament and emphasis on ostentatious presentation was not appropriate to the Bürgertum, and most definitely not appropriate to workers. What was needed was a harmonious and unified expression of art, craft, and architecture that suited a “settled class sensibility.”⁸⁵

The home was a mold of class character and moral strength, and the crucial task of modern design was to fashion the entire crucible: not just the façade and applied ornament, but the disposition of rooms and the proper relation of furnishings and interior décor as well.⁸⁶ Architecture was the great educator of the tastes of the masses, and the question of the pedagogical power of traditional form was the main issue in the design of modern small homes. In his 1918 book, *Kleinhaus und Kleinsiedlung*, Muthesius recapped the essential message of his Hagen lecture:

Architecture is the great educator of the people's artistic taste, and all efforts to improve the feeling for good form are scattered to the winds as long as we tolerate the occupation of our land by ugly buildings. The structural connection to indigenous models, the nurturing of native methods of construction, the development of a uniform style that will once again express the sensibility of our time – these are burning issues today for the question of new settlement forms.⁸⁷

⁸⁴ "Statt Häuser baut man Stilobjekte," Muthesius, "Die Entwicklung des künstlerischen Gedankens im Hausbau," 8.

⁸⁵ Roth, *Hermann Muthesius und die Idee der harmonischen Kultur*, 134.

⁸⁶ See also Muthesius's essays in *Kunstgewerbe und Architektur* (Jena: Eugen Diederichs, 1907).

⁸⁷ "Die Baukunst ist die größte Geschmackserzieherin des Volkes, und alle Bestrebungen auf Hebung des Sinnes für gute Form verpuffen im Nebel, solange wir dulden, daß unser Land weiter mit häßlichen Bauwerken besetzt wird. Die bauliche Anknüpfung an die alteingessenen guten Vorbilder, die Pflege der heimatlichen Bauweise, die Entwicklung einer einheitlichen Bauform, die wieder ein Ausdruck des Empfindens unserer Zeit wird, das sind heute Fragen, die gerade auch bei der neuen Siedlungsart brennenden werden," Muthesius, *Kleinhaus und Kleinsiedlung* (Munich: F. Bruckmann, 1918), 5.

Muthesius' critique of historicism and ornament, and his prescription for a more modest architecture as a crucible of a strong class identity, were rooted in theories of culture and history characteristic of the late Wilhelmine era, and indeed of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century altogether. While Muthesius was perhaps the most articulate among the Hagen presenters in arguing the case, similar ideas underlay the position of the other speakers. Because these theoretical foundations touch so directly on why so many informed and influential architects saw the vernacular as a fulcrum for regenerating and preserving community, they are worth looking at more closely.

The first of the epochal theories guiding Muthesius and the other Hagen architects was the idea that the genius of a nation arose from below, from the realms of everyday life and naïve inspiration. This idea of the generative spirit of the people, the *Volksgeist*, was first articulated in the Romantic nationalism of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. In the industrializing world of the late nineteenth century, the concept remained bound up with an affection for the folk arts, but also found new life in the belief that the lowly domestic sphere was a shaper of class *Habitus* and national character. The praise for naïveté and the folk arts against educated taste and high art could have an archly nationalistic, even anti-intellectual and anti-modern character, most flamboyantly in the writings of Julius Langbehn and his Rembrandt-Deutsch followers. It could also be coupled with a highly intellectualized, Nietzschean belief in the unity of art and life, and in the artist as the agent of national enlightenment, as demonstrated in the architecture and discourse of Peter Behrens and Joseph Maria Olbrich at the 1901 *Ein Dokumente*

deutscher Kunst exhibition at Darmstadt.⁸⁸ But there was a more practical pedigree for the embrace of the everyday, one which looked to the household, the craftsman's workshop, or the machinist's floor, as fonts of functional and practical form. Modern form was to be found, as Adolf Loos put it, in the "objects of everyday that are so much in the style of the age that we perceive them as style-less."⁸⁹ For Muthesius, too, the question of nurturing good and suitable architectural form began with the applied arts.⁹⁰ His praise for the naïve effortlessness of everyday design was joined by his belief that unity of artistic expression, in an age and in a nation, was an indication of cultural health. Accordingly, disunity was a kind of pathology, a symptom of degeneracy and, at least, a moral weakness.

That Muthesius could be so decisive in his belief that national genius and a new and great cultural age could be jump-started with a simple spark from the decorative arts was no doubt because he felt he had the full force of art historical judgment behind him. The writings of Gottfried Semper and Alois Riegl had provided ample fuel for the argument

⁸⁸ See the comprehensive documentation in *Darmstadt: Ein Dokument deutscher Kunst 1901-1976*. On Behrens's interest in Nietzsche, see Tilmann Buddensieg, "Die Wohnhaus als Kultbau. Zum Darmstadter Haus von Behrens," in *Peter Behrens und Nürnberg. Geschmackswandel in Deutschland. Historismus, Jugendstil und die Anfänge der Industrieform*, ed. Peter-Klaus Schuster (Munich: Prestel, 1980), 37-47. On Nietzsche's influence on the arts in Wilhelmine Germany generally, see Steven E. Aschheim, *The Nietzsche Legacy in Germany, 1890-1990* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990).

⁸⁹ "Nur die Erzeugnisse dieser Gewerbe repräsentieren den Stil unserer Zeit. Sie sind so sehr im Stile unserer Zeit, daß wir sie – und das ist das einzige Kriterium – gar nicht als stilvoll empfinden. Sie sind mit unserem Denken und Empfinden verwachsen. Unsere Wagen, unsere Gläser, unsere optischen Instrumente, unsere Schirme und Stöcke, unsere Koffer und Sattlerwaren," Adolf Loos, *Sämtliche Schriften in zwei Bänden*, ed. Franz Glück, vol. 1 (Vienna: Herold, 1962), 268, 393, cited in Roth, *Hermann Muthesius und die Idee der harmonischen Kultur*, 150.

⁹⁰ "Die Pflege und Entwicklung eines echteren tektonischen Empfindens findet vorläufig noch an einer andern, man möchte sagen, an einer Nebenstelle statt, nämlich beim neuen Kunstgewerbe," Muthesius, "Die Entwicklung des künstlerischen Gedankens im Hausbau," 13.

that the characteristic style of an age was born within the small, everyday arts of handcraft and ornament.⁹¹

The second historical idea shaping Muthesius' statements about the educative powers of design drew on contemporaneous theories about how classes developed and differentiated themselves. The overarching precept was that there was an evolutionary schema to class development, and that historical epochs were characterized by the emergence and dominance of certain classes, keyed to the development of modes of production and economic exchange. For instance, the middle ages were marked by the creation of great agricultural estates and the aristocracy, the nineteenth century by the rise of trade and manufacture and the bourgeoisie, and the modern age by mass industrial production and the working class. This developmental cadence could have been derived from readings of Karl Marx, but a more appropriate influence for the decidedly unsocialist architects at Hagen would have been Marx's contemporary, the ethnographer, journalist, and museum director, Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl. Riehl's *Die Naturgeschichte des Volkes als Grundlage einer deutschen Sozialpolitik* (The natural history of the people as a foundation for German social politics), originally published in the 1850s, was in its tenth edition at the time of the Hagen conference. It was considered an authoritative, albeit staunchly conservative source for analyzing modern social relations. Riehl developed an evolutionary history of society that linked corporative theories of class to representative culture. His argument assumed that there was a natural evolution to class development.

⁹¹ Gottfried Semper, *Der Stil in den technischen und tektonischen Künsten; oder, Praktische Aesthetik: Ein Handbuch für Techniker, Künstler und Kunstfreunde*, 2 vols. (Frankfurt a.M.: Verlag für Kunst und Wissenschaft, 1860; Munich: F. Bruckmann, 1863); trans., Harry Francis Mallgrave and Michael Robinson, *Style in the technical and Tectonic Arts; or, Practical Aesthetics* (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2004); Alois Riehl, *Stilfragen: Grundlegungen zu einer Geschichte der Ornamentik* (Berlin: G. Siemens, 1893).

As the aristocracy had arisen in time immemorial from the farmers of the land, so had the bourgeoisie arisen from the aristocracy in the past two centuries. In the modern industrial era, a fourth class was emerging: the *Arbeiterstand*, the Working Class. Although in some ways related to the age-old *Bauernstand*, the Farming Class, the working class was something new and distinctive, something still not completely formed.⁹² The worker hardly had an identity separate from his function in the chain of industrial production. This was the essence of Riehl's analysis of the place of the worker in the unfolding of history, and similar notions were expressed in Muthesius' articulation as well. Muthesius described the worker and his class as being mired in collectivity, unable to express the idea of the individual outside of the giant organism of industry. In Germany (compared to England, where Muthesius had spent many years as a cultural emissary) the bourgeoisie was itself still so new it had hardly started to find its own expressive culture. The working class was still farther behind in their development – it was a class still in diapers.⁹³ The social and aesthetic disharmonies that had arisen in the industrial age were due in part to the failure of the classes to find the proper expression of their character. The bourgeois classes in Germany must persevere in the development of a meaningful and important cultural embodiment for their own class. They must work to foster, prod, encourage, and create a representative aesthetic identity for the working classes.

⁹² In conservative estate theory, land was considered the original source of wealth and status. The Bauernstand was, therefore, essentially the *Ur-Stand*, predating even the nobility, which itself had originated in the early farming classes.

⁹³ "Nun hat sich die Schichtung der neuen Stände aber noch keineswegs endgültig geklärt. Vor allem haben die neuen Stände, obzwar sie sich als Waffe bereits deutlich abheben, noch keine eigenen Kulturäußerungen aufzuweisen. In Deutschland im besonderen ist die Lage so, daß selbst das Bürgertum noch halb um seine Kultur kämpft. Der heutige deutsche Bürger steht noch durchaus in einer Zwitterstellung zwischen einer neu entstehenden, noch nicht ausgereiften Bürgerkultur und einer Talmi-aristokratenkultur, nach der es ihn immer noch hinzieht. Der Arbeiter aber hat noch nirgends auf der Welt seine eigenen Kulturäußerungen, der ganze Stand liegt vom Standpunkte der kulturellen Leistung noch in den Windeln," Muthesius, "Die Entwicklung des künstlerischen Gedankens im Hausbau," 9.

Just what form the representative culture of the working classes might take was still open to debate. In the task of giving the worker, the *vierte Stand* (the fourth estate or class), his house, Muthesius looked first, as he had in his endeavor to shape a culture for the bourgeoisie, to the English model.⁹⁴ The English had already learned, Muthesius said, that artistry in architecture need cost no more than pure functionality. Architects like William Morris and Norman Shaw had developed a clear and simple style for middle class houses. Their model? The farmhouse. The first full expression of this model had been in the villa colony at Bedford Park near London. And “von dem kleinen Bürgerhause bis zu dem Arbeiterhaus ist nur ein Schritt," it is only a step from the small middle class house to the worker's house. The model worker's dwelling was first realized at Port Sunlight near Liverpool some two decades earlier, followed by the factory colony at Bourneville. It was coming to fruition in the garden cities then under construction.⁹⁵

Muthesius' rationale for the farmhouse as model for the modern workers' house was based on two aesthetic foundations. First, he held that the farmhouse was authentic culture, not false “art.” The traditional farmhouse was a true expression of the simplicity of the German sensibility and the naïve, pure feeling of the Volk.⁹⁶ Second, because the farmhouse had been developed and refined over a long period of time, it had an inherent functionality that make it a good model for modern housing.⁹⁷ This was to some degree a matter of familiarity: “Wir schätzen und lieben das, was wir kennen," we value and love

⁹⁴ Muthesius, "Die Entwicklung des künstlerischen Gedankens im Hausbau," 9-10.

⁹⁵ Muthesius, "Die Entwicklung des künstlerischen Gedankens im Hausbau," 10-12.

⁹⁶ "In unsrer vorläufig noch verwirrten und ungeklärten Kulturlage liefert das Vorbild des Bauernhauses aber ein sichere Geleite, das uns wenigstens vor groben Ausschreitungen bewahrt. Dieses Vorbild muß heute jedenfalls höchst willkommen sein, indem an ihm der einfache deutsche Sinn und die unbeeinflusste naive Volksempfindung klar niedergelegt sind," Muthesius, "Die Entwicklung des künstlerischen Gedankens im Hausbau," 14.

⁹⁷ Muthesius, "Die Entwicklung des künstlerischen Gedankens im Hausbau," 15.

what we know, he intoned at a public lecture in 1908.⁹⁸ But it was also an expression of a respect for tradition that transcended any division between tradition and modernity. What tradition represented in the modern age was "der Sinn auf das Natürliche, Träuliche und Wohnliche," a feeling for the natural, the trusted, the customary.⁹⁹

Tradition means oral transmission. It means something that is living and not the introduction of dead forms of expression. A tradition can be upheld only by the further transmission of living artistic forms, that is, by the development and improvement of what is common today.¹⁰⁰

Traditional forms, folk forms, were expressive of a deep, collective identity. Tradition was what carried simplicity beyond mere functionality and made it artistic, gave it cultural power and the force to shape an inchoate society into a harmonic community.¹⁰¹ Moreover, the movement toward small double houses and single-family houses in rural and semi-rural settlements, as opposed to Mietskasernen and crowded city living, was a big step forward. The small house in this guise was progressive and modern, not nostalgic, retrogressive, or reactionary. Such houses were more salutary, hygienically but also socially. They offered not the fleeting anonymity of the crowded big city dwelling, but the easy and long-lasting social relations of the small town.¹⁰²

As in his theoretical writings, so in his architecture, Muthesius was preoccupied with developing a modern style of home for the German bourgeoisie. The majority of his building projects were villas and bourgeois houses, and his presentation at the 1905

⁹⁸ Muthesius, *Die Einheit der Architektur: Betrachtungen über Baukunst, Ingenieurbau und Kunstgewerbe. Vorträge, gehalten am 13. Februar 1908 im Verein für Kunst in Berlin* (Berlin: Karl Curtius, 1908), 29

⁹⁹ Muthesius, *Die Einheit der Architektur*, 50.

¹⁰⁰ "Tradition heißt mündliche Überlieferung, bedeutet also etwas Lebendiges und kann sich auch in der Kunst nicht auf die versuchte Einführung erstorbener Ausdrucksformen beziehen. Eine Tradition kann nur in der Weitergabe bestehender Kunstweisen erblickt werden, also in der Durchbildung und Ausbildung des heute Üblichen," Muthesius, *Die Einheit der Architektur*, 55-56.

¹⁰¹ Muthesius, "Die Entwicklung des künstlerischen Gedankens im Hausbau," 15.

¹⁰² Muthesius, *Kleinhaus und Kleinsiedlung*, 3.

Hagen conference preceded any actual designs for small houses. Subsequently, Muthesius designed row houses for the Garden City Hellerau (1910) and for a settlement near Duisburg (1910). In both instances, he conceived the small house essentially as a miniaturization of the villa form (figure 27). His design of small houses for the Preussische Siedlung, built 1912-1914 in Altglienecke near Berlin (figure 28), for the Garden City suburbs of Leipzig-Lößnig and Leipzig-Marienbrunn (1918), and his design of a model house for workers in a vernacular baroque idiom for the exhibition *Sparsame Bauweise* in Berlin in 1919 (figure 29), presented dwelling types that in their simple plans and elevations were more directly addressed to the means and lifeways of the working classes.¹⁰³

Muthesius's 1918 book, *Kleinhaus und Kleinsiedlung*, represented his most complete treatment of the design of simple houses. The book was written out of concern for the widespread housing shortages in Germany at the end of the First World War, a subject that had concerned Muthesius as early as 1915, when he published *Wie baue ich mein Haus?*¹⁰⁴ *Kleinhaus und Kleinsiedlung* showed how deeply Muthesius' thinking about accommodating class habitus in domestic architecture had been shaped by models of vernacular architecture. Among the ideas that migrated from philological and ethnographic research into the studios of reform-minded architects like Muthesius was the designation of the typical, traditional farmhouse *Stube*, or what was sometimes called the *Wohnstube* or *Wohnküche* – a single, all-purpose living, eating, and cooking room – into a standard feature of the worker's home. The all-purpose *Wohnstube* was considered a room type particularly suited to the communal, family-loving lifeways of the working

¹⁰³ Hermann Muthesius *1861-1927* (Berlin: Akademie der Künste, 1978), 125-135.

¹⁰⁴ Muthesius, *Wie baue ich mein Haus?* (Munich: F. Bruckmann, 1915, second edition 1917).

classes. In *Kleinhaus and Siedlung*, the Wohnstube was a principal organizing feature in the planning of workers' housing. Muthesius presented numerous variations on floor plans for the simple home, whether freestanding, duplexes, or rowhouses (figure 30). He also illustrated the interior arrangements of the home, attending especially to the layout and furnishings of the Wohnküche (figure 31).

Muthesius held that there was a need for elites to discover and draw out the particular *volkscharacterlichen* aspects, the common and popular qualities of the lower classes.¹⁰⁵ The Wohnstube offered an instrument of sorts for bringing forward the pride and moral probity of the age-old classes of agricultural laborers into the malleable and uncertain cultural consciousness of the industrial workers. Another such instrument was the cohesive style of traditional vernacular architecture, both the farmhouse but also the ensembles of small rural villages. The line of peaked gables in modern workers' housing designed by Krupp architect Robert Schmohl at the Dahlhauser Heide settlement (1911) echoed the profile of housetops along the streets of old villages in Lower Silesia or Pommern (figures 32-34), appealing simultaneously to the modernist inclinations for rhythm and clear order, while also promoting a taste for feelings of hominess and historicity. But the implication was that the transposition of architectural form from the traditional realm into a new milieu would also practice a reforming, even anthropogenetic influence upon the inhabitants within. Village virtues would take root in the industrial workers' community. In the minds of industrialists building garden cities for their workers, and the leagues of government officials, churchmen leaders, and civic leaders fronting the cooperative building associations and organizations like the the Central

¹⁰⁵ Roth, *Hermann Muthesius und die Idee der harmonischen Kultur*, 75-85.

Office for Workers' Welfare, foremost among these virtues was contentment:

Contentment with social status, contentment with income, contentment with the lot in life. The precise mechanism for inculcating virtue was the vernacular style, the appreciation of which would infuse the hearts of workers with a sense of rootedness and a feeling of community belonging. Just as Muthesius sought to define and propagate an authentically bürgerlich style for the educated middle classes, not merely a hand-me-down from the aristocracy, so was he sensitive to the fact that the espousal of the farmhouse vernacular as an all-purpose solution to working class housing was really a matter of noblesse oblige in action, with the bourgeoisie playing the role of the patriarch to the supplicant worker. He also recognized that the admiration of Bauernkunst was primarily a fact of bourgeois classes, not the workers, and the elevation of the farmhouse as a model for workers' housing meant that one class pressed its tastes on another.¹⁰⁶

Paul Schultze-Naumburg: Tradition and Sachlichkeit

If the thrust of some portion of the argument in this chapter, and in this work as a whole, is that there was no simple or direct connection between the championing of traditional architecture in the late Kaiserreich and the elevation of Heimatstil to an officially sanctioned style in the Third Reich, the career of Paul Schultze-Naumburg serves as a major exception. His work and ideas reinforce every conception and preconception about the link between traditionalism and reactionary politics. He first became prominent as a spokesperson for the arts and crafts reform and the Heimatschutz; he later became notorious as a cultural leader in the Nazi party. There was no sea change in his political attitude or artistic positions, but merely a steady and certain unfolding of ideology.

¹⁰⁶ Muthesius, "Die Entwicklung des künstlerischen Gedankens im Hausbau," 15.

At the time of Hagen conference in 1905, Schultze-Naumburg had, like Muthesius, not yet actually built any housing for the working classes. He had designed the initial stages of his own home, and completed a handful of large houses, estates really, for the upper classes.¹⁰⁷ Although between about 1904 and the early 1930s, Schultze-Naumburg did a steady business in home design for the well-to-do, his forays into the design of workers' housing and small homes were few: a double house in Zawisc in Upper Silesia in 1908, and a 1910 plan for the Garden City Rechenberge near Bad Kösen in Thuringia. The latter was meant to be home to Schultze-Naumburg's Saalecker Werkstätten, much as Hellerau was home to the Deutsche Werkstätten.

The force of Schultze-Naumburg's authority in matters architectural around 1905 arose not from his built achievements but rather from his activities as a journalist and advocate for design reform. After a brief career as a painter and drawing instructor, Schultze-Naumburg had found his professional niche as a journalist and designer.¹⁰⁸ Over the course of his career, he penned over thirty books. Between the early 1890s and the end of World War II, he wrote hundreds of articles for journals and newspapers. Beginning in

¹⁰⁷ After the model of Richard Riemerschmid's Vereinigten Werkstätten in Munich, in 1904 Schultze-Naumburg established the Saalecker Werkstätten, which eventually encompassed three areas: architecture, landscape and garden design, and interior design. By 1910 the workshop numbered seventy artists, designers, and craftsmen. In addition to the workshops and studios at Schultze-Naumburg's home in Saaleck, the Werkstätten had branches and showrooms in Berlin, Cologne, and Essen. After the First World War, with economic hardships and changing fashions, the fortunes of Schultze-Naumburg's firm declined, but the Saalecker Werkstätten remained in operation up until 1930. See Norbert Borrmann, *Paul Schultze-Naumburg 1869-1949. Maler, Publizist, Architekt. Vom Kulturreformer der Jahrhundertwende zum Kulturpolitiker im Dritten Reich* (Essen: Richard Bach, 1989), 104-106. The living quarters and workshops are still standing at Saaleck, see Hubertus Adam, "Wolken ziehen drüber hin. Paul Schultze-Naumburg und die Saalecker Werkstätten," *Archithese* 29, no. 2 (1999), 46-51.

¹⁰⁸ Schultze-Naumburg was chair of the Deutscher Bund Heimatschutz, from its founding in 1904 up until 1913, and went on to hold similarly responsible and representative positions in organizations focused on preserving traditional culture and advancing German national culture through the late 1920s, 1930s, and on through the Third Reich. He was a founding member of the conservative architect's association, Der Block, in 1928, and was appointed director of the Weimar Kunsthochschule in 1930 (during which year he also joined the Nazi party), and leader of the Kampfbund deutscher Architekten und Ingenieure in 1931. Borrmann, 183-185. See also Barbara Miller Lane, *Architecture and Politics in Germany 1918-1945* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985), 147-167.

1894, he first established his reputation as a cultural critic through regular contributions to *Der Kunstwart*. He also wrote articles for numerous other journals, such as *Die Kunst für Alle*, *Dekorative Kunst*, and *Hohe Warte*, which like *Kunstwart* were focused on Lebensreform and arts and crafts design.

At the time of the Hagen conference, Schultze-Naumburg had won a wide audience with the first three books of his *Kulturarbeiten* series, which would eventually number nine volumes issued between 1901 and 1917 (there were later, revised editions). Volume one, *Hausbau*, was published in 1901, followed by *Gärten* in 1902/04 and *Dörfer und Kolonien* in 1904. Written for the general, educated public and available at the time for about three marks per book, the *Kulturarbeiten* volumes were among of the most widely read art publications in the early decades of the twentieth century. The books, which had originated in essays published in *Der Kunstwart*, were richly illustrated with photographs. Most of the pictures were taken by Schultze-Naumburg himself, and a great majority of the shots depicted the architectural examples of the middle German landscape in the Saale river valley, where Schultze-Naumburg had been born, and where in 1901 he had returned to build his own house and studio.¹⁰⁹ Schultze-Naumburg famously and to great effect used a comparative method in the *Kulturarbeiten* volumes, showing photographs of good and bad examples of architecture, design, and landscapes on facing pages throughout the books (figure 35).

If Schultze-Naumburg's built works were still few in 1905, his theory of architecture was already well formed. It comprised a mix of ideas about site and massing derived from his

¹⁰⁹ Examples of English architecture in the books came from Muthesius' collection, and other illustrations were purchased from the art reproduction trade. The entire photo archive was lost in the aftermath of World War II, Borrmann, *Paul Schultze-Naumburg*, 25.

background as a landscape painter, and ideas about the legibility of class and purpose in a building's form, derived from relatively unsystematic but deeply felt beliefs about nationalism, race, and the corporate society. At Hagen, Schultze-Naumburg laid out his own version of W.H. Riehl's theory of the historical classlessness, the as-yet unformed character of the working class, a condition that for Schultze-Naumburg was manifested above all in the placelessness of the modern worker: "Der Arbeiter wohnt heute noch nicht in seiner Heimat," the worker does not yet live in his native land.¹¹⁰ The worker was essentially nomadic moving from job to job, owning little, owing little to any community or circle of associates beyond his family. The "facelessness" of the working classes was reflected in the cell-like architecture of modern workers' settlements: flat roofs, repetitious facades, grid-like street plans. For Schultze-Naumburg, who rued the haphazard effects of industrialization, the fact that modern workers' housing settlements were so soulless compared to the traditional village was further evidence of the decline of civilization in the modern era.¹¹¹

Like Riehl, and to some extent also Muthesius, Schultze-Naumburg held that it was the responsibility of the educated bourgeoisie, the *Bürgertum*, to help the worker find his living space, his home. Rather than resorting to radical solutions, it was better to build upon proven forms in the effort to reconnect the worker with the traditions of the Heimat. Heimat in the modern sense for Schultze-Naumburg was something different than the medievalizing strains of the Vaterland and Aldeutsch styles (fatherland, old German).

Being modern meant good use of materials and simplicity of form – stylistic references

¹¹⁰ Paul Schultze-Naumburg, "Das Bauernhaus in seiner vorbildlichen Bedeutung für den Arbeiterwohnhausbau," in *Die künstlerische Gestaltung des Arbeiter-Wohnhauses. 14. Konferenz der Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrteinrichtungen am 5. und 6. Juni 1905 in Hagen i. W.* (Berlin: Carl Heymanns Verlag, 1906), 30.

¹¹¹ Schultze-Naumburg, "Das Bauernhaus," 29.

that signaled the classicizing tendencies of German Biedermeier revival architecture.¹¹² For Schultze-Naumburg, the ideal combination was a blending of the scale and historicity of farmhouse-inspired dwellings, with a simplified, “modernized” form language derived from the German Biedermeier period.¹¹³ The classical foundation supported the modern translation of the old regional styles into architectural forms that could endure against changing fashions and put an end to the hunt through historicist styles that had made such a hash of late nineteenth-century architecture. What the German farmhouse offered to modernity was a form that had developed over centuries, a form that expressed the dignity and inherent intelligence of the handworker against the arrogance and decadence of the educated architect. Schultze-Naumburg referred to this quality as “Sachlichkeit,” an overall impression of a building that was well placed on its site, properly respectful of historical and regional idioms, well built with solid handwork and traditional materials and construction methods, and with a form that clearly expressed the building’s purpose. The term Sachlichkeit is more often associated with Hermann Muthesius and the modernist movement toward simplicity and functionality of form in machine manufacture. Schultze-Naumburg’s understanding of Sachlichkeit partook of the drive toward simplicity and clarity, but it had an added ideological charge. In his articulation, Sachlichkeit also connoted a soundness, a fitting-together of form and purpose that had been proven over the course of time. The ideological charge came into play as historical development was elevated as a rationale unto itself, howsoever tautological. If a form was right because it had developed and proven its serviceability over a long period of

¹¹² Schultze-Naumburg, “Das Bauernhaus,” 32-33.

¹¹³ The use of German baroque and Biedermeier styles as models for the modern, already wide spread by 1905, was further popularized by Paul Mebes, *Um 1800. Architektur und Handwerk im letzten Jahrhundert ihrer traditioneller Entwicklung* (Munich: F.W. Bruckmann, 1908).

time, then forms that had developed over time were right. "Right" meant optimized functionality, but it also meant social stability.¹¹⁴

The time-proven, time-tested qualities of traditional architecture guaranteed simplicity of form, guaranteed that the form fitted the purpose. And not least, traditional forms guaranteed the readability, the legibility of a building, but only if the proper traditional forms were selected, and only if they were used in the proper manner,

[O]ur idea of architecture has lost its solid footing...our proletariat houses look like palaces, our palaces like Swiss chalets, our farm houses like penitentiaries, our penitentiaries like churches, and our churches like train stations.¹¹⁵

Schultze-Naumburg saw the farmhouse as a model for the workers' house. The farmhouse form, in its simplicity, its adaptability, its tradition-bound character, and in its legibility as a dwelling for people who work with their hands offered a medium for binding the traditionless class of the future with the past.¹¹⁶ The historical continuity was self-evident: the Nordic farmhouse was the seed form of the workers' house, the farmhouse was the "little brother" of the modern German house.¹¹⁷ Using the farmhouse as a model for the modern worker's home was not a matter of playing a game of noblesse

¹¹⁴ Schultze-Naumburg, "Das Bauernhaus," 33-34; Borrmann, *Paul Schultze-Naumburg*, 143-144. For a discussion of Schultze-Naumburg's position in the debates about functionality and Sachlichkeit in the 1920s, see Rosemarie Haag Bletter, "Introduction," in *Adolf Behne: The Modern Functional Building*, trans. Michael Robinson (Santa Monica: The Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1996), 1-83.

¹¹⁵ "Traditionen werden seit Jahrzehnten aufgesucht und weitergesponnen. Wenn es bis heute noch nichts oder wenig gefruchtet hat, ja, wenn wir den Hauptschaden daher datieren, so hat das nicht allein den Grund, daß man die alten Formen so miserabel schlecht und unverstanden wiederholte, sondern auch vor allem Dingen den, daß man falsche, für den Fall nicht passende Traditionen wählte. Ja, das wurde der Hauptgrund dafür, daß unser Architekturbild jede feste Fügung verlor, daß unsere Proletarierhäuser wie Paläste, die Paläste wie Schweizerhäuser, die Bauernhäuser wie Zuchthäuser, die Zuchthäuser wie Kirchen und die Kirchen wie Bahnhöfe aussehen," Schultze-Naumburg, "Das Bauernhaus," 35.

¹¹⁶ "Hier wäre ein äußerliches Mittel gefunden, den "traditionslosen Stand der Zukunft mit der Vergangenheit zu verknüpfen," Schultze-Naumburg, "Das Bauernhaus," 40-41.

¹¹⁷ Paul Schultze-Naumburg, *Kulturarbeiten*, Bd. 3: *Dörfer und Kolonien* (Munich: Callwey, 1908), 17-19.

oblige with quaint styles – the industrial patron building little Swiss cottages for the workers – it was a matter of cultivating the natural growth of a harmonic landscape and a harmonic nation.¹¹⁸

Schultze-Naumburg's theories of tradition and class were essentially anthropological, and his point of view shows just how conservative a modern worldview derived from an anthropological interpretation of history could be in the Kaiserreich. He inferred that while industrialization and rationalization proceeded to transform the world, the activities of everyday life in the home had changed little over the previous hundred years. Eating, drinking, sleeping, socializing with friends, simply enjoying being with others (*geselliges Empfangen* and *wohliges Zusammensitzen*) were the same in the early twentieth century as they had been in the early nineteenth century.¹¹⁹ His belief that class must be clearly legible in architectural form was similarly rooted in anthropology, most particularly in the developmental histories of culture and race promulgated by sociologist Franz Müller-Lyer.¹²⁰ Müller-Lyer's comprehensive *Die Entwicklungstufen der Menschheit* (The development steps of mankind) described history as a battle of cultures vanquished and cultures triumphant.¹²¹ Published in seven volumes between 1908 and 1924, and

¹¹⁸ Schultze-Naumburg, "Das Bauernhaus," 47.

¹¹⁹ Schultze-Naumburg, "Wer hat Recht?" *Der Uhu* 2/7 (1926), 40, cited in Borrmann, *Paul Schultze-Naumburg*, 142-143.

¹²⁰ Schultze-Naumburg knew and admired the writings of Müller-Lyer. See his review, "Das Werk Müller-Lyers," *Die Umschau* (Frankfurt a.M.) 27, no. 31, 33, 34 (1923): 481-483, 513-516, 532-536.

¹²¹ Franz Müller-Lyer (1857-1916) trained as a medical doctor and worked in psychiatric clinics in Strasbourg and across Europe. His name is associated with the perceptual illusions that he developed in the course of his research (notably the Müller-Lyer Illusion in which two lines of the same length appear to be different sizes). The illusions were designed to assess levels of mental development and acuity, and Müller-Lyer considered his sociological studies as a product of the same sort of empirical research techniques. Walter Gropius' ideas about the role of the individual and collective as building blocks of modernity (as a step beyond the traditional conceptions of the family), were influenced by Müller-Lyer. See Walter Gropius, "Die soziologischen Grundlagen der Minimalwohnung für städtische Industriebevölkerung," in *International Kongresse für Neues Bauen Zürich*, ed. *Die Wohnung für das Existenzminimum* (Frankfurt: Englert und Schlosser, 1930), 13-23

preceded and accompanied by numerous related articles in periodicals for both general readers and specialists, *Die Entwicklungstufen des Menschheit* offered a Social Darwinist history of culture.¹²² Müller-Lyer's approach was distinctive. He placed the essential motor of cultural progress not in the struggle of individuals against individuals, but in the conflicts of social group against social group, each maintaining their cohesiveness due to human instincts of communication, play, and social comity. The strongest weapon that the group had in its struggle for existence was organization.¹²³

What this has to do with Schultze-Naumburg and his theories of architecture is this: Schultze-Naumburg believed that clarity of form and legibility of class affiliation were necessary expressions, and necessary instruments, of an organized, well-functioning, harmonic society. He advocated for architectural legibility over the course of his entire career. The critique of “workers’ houses that look like palaces, palaces that look like Swiss chalets” from the Hagen lecture in 1905 evolved into his prescriptive “types” of the 1917 book, *Der Bau des Wohnhauses*. His use of simplified, geometrical forms as the basis for modern house design was, like his use of the concept “Sachlichkeit,” an example of how what seem to be modernist orthodoxies were indeed in the years before the Weimar Republic used to support theories of society and design that were quite politically diverse. In *Der Bau des Wohnhauses*, Schultze-Naumburg enumerated and analyzed a full spectrum of specific domestic building types, developing a schedule of

¹²² Franz Müller Lyer, *Die Entwicklungstufen des Menschheit Eine sytematische Soziologie in Überblicken und Einzeldarstellungen*, vol. 1, *Der Sinn des Lebens und Wissenschaft*, vol. 2, *Phasen der Kultur und Richtungslinien des Fortschritts*, vols. 3 and 4, *Der Familie, Der Staat*, vol. 5, *Der Staat*, vol. 6, *Die Geschichte des menschlichen Verstandes*, vol. 7, *Die Entwicklung der Moral des Rechtes* (Munich: A. Lehmanns, 1908-1924).

¹²³ Franz Müller Lyer, *Die Entwicklungstufen des Menschheit*, 346-347.

massings, floor plans, and façade elevations, as a means of affecting the legibility of class in architectural expression and architectural form (figure 36).

Just as single individuals are integrated into professions, estates, or classes and so become representatives of larger groups, so do houses on closer observation become separated into defined classes and under-classes that comprise fixed types.¹²⁴

Schultze-Naumburg's understanding of the role of design and architecture in shaping society was on one hand acutely and warmly aware of the way people actually lived in buildings – witness his invocations of *geselliges Empfangen* and *wohliges Zusammensitzen*. On the other hand, he adhered to rigid conceptions of proper class comportment and German character. Although not always foremost in his works on architecture, his social program for design was propelled by beliefs in racial destiny and degeneration. The arguments about class and the image of class and keeping each class within its proper sphere that arose in his lecture for the Hagen conference and his volumes on *Der Bau des Wohnhauses*, developed into full-bore racist theories of German culture in his works of the 1920s, such as *Kunst und Rasse* (Art and race) of 1928 and *Das Gesicht des deutschen Hauses* (The face of the German house) of 1929. In the latter book, Schultze-Naumburg offered a physiological theory of house form and community design, in which he pitted the beautiful native German face of townscape and village against the face of all that was *häßlich*, ugly, the product of speculative development, lack of planning, unbridled individualism, and the loss of a sense of rootedness in community (figure 37). As Schultze-Naumburg's renown and authority grew, his

¹²⁴ "Aber genau so wie die einzelnen Individuen sich zu Berufen, Ständen oder Steuerklassen zusammenschließen und Repräsentanten größerer Gruppen werden, genau so werden die Wohnhäuser bei näherer Betrachtung sich in bestimmte Klassen und Unterklassen zerlegen lassen, die für sich feste Typen bilden," Schultze-Naumburg, *Der Bau des Wohnhauses*, vol. 1 (Munich: Callwey, 1917), 103.

pronouncements about house types and *ständische Gesellschaftgliederung* (corporative social structure) in the architectural and art press were echoed with more vociferously racialist pronouncements about Germany's Nordic heritage and cultural destiny in articles written for cultural journals of the Third Reich, such as *Die Umschau*, the *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie*, and *Volk und Rasse*.

Richard Riemerschmid: Designing for the Corporative Society

In his presentation at Hagen, "Grundriß und Aussehen, Innenausbau und Einrichtung des Arbeiterwohnhauses" (Floorplan and appearance, interiors and furnishings of the worker's house), architect, designer, and planner Richard Riemerschmid reiterated the conference themes of the educational significance of the workers' house.¹²⁵ Properly considered, he stated, the simple house itself could become a tool for social reform, helping inculcate a sense of rootedness and community belonging in the worker. Although less beholden to nationalist paeans than Schultze-Naumburg, Riemerschmid still held traditional styles and their intimations of allegiance to region and fatherland in high esteem. One did not "search" for artistic form; the right form was there; the right form grew out of the circumstances. New forms grew out of the old: the vernacular tradition was a repository of important verities for modern architects. The well-designed dwelling should have the air of inevitability,

When it is prudently and thoughtfully made, the result is a dwelling that outside and in has the same qualities we would want to find in its inhabitants: honest and decent, simple and frugal and proud of it, quietly self-confident, serene and true. If some early evening one should come upon such a group in a lane, standing close together, not

¹²⁵ Richard Riemerschmid, "Grundriß und Aussehen, Innenausbau und Einrichtung des Arbeiterwohnhauses," *Die künstlerische Gestaltung des Arbeiter-Wohnhauses*, 48-58.

in a row, not overly fancy nor placed for show, but rather informal, without one or the other putting himself forward, in shirtsleeves perhaps with the pipe between the teeth, in relaxed conversation, one would think: yes, they suit one another, these houses and these men.¹²⁶

Like Muthesius with his admonitions about architecture as the crucible of class identity and comportment, like Schultze-Naumburg with his program of dwelling typologies keyed to class hierarchies, Riemerschmid also saw design as an instrument for fostering social and political stability.

In 1907 Karl-Ernst Osthaus arranged a commission for Riemerschmid to design a colony of workers' housing for the Elbers textile firm on the Walddorfstrasse in the Wasserlosen Tal near Hagen (figures 38 and 39).¹²⁷ Using concepts about building diversity within unity by using an intentionally limited range of house types, floorplans, and exterior and interior fixtures, Riemerschmid created a plan for eighty-four dwellings, a community house, kindergarten, and central market plaza with fountain. As befitted Riemerschmid's conception of the simple life of the working classes, the houses were picturesque, and even rustic, lacking, for instance, indoor toilets. Only eleven of the stone dwellings were built, and Riemerschmid was soon occupied with applying his ideas about unity and diversity and the varied use of repeatable elements in the design of the Garden City Hellerau near Dresden.

¹²⁶ "Wenn so alles bedacht und gemacht ist, dann müßte das Ergebnis sein, daß die Wohnstätten außen wie innen dieselben Eigenschaften zeigen, die wir auch an den Bewohnern finden möchten: ehrlich und anständig, schlicht genügsam und dazu stolz und ruhig selbstbewußt, heiter und treu. Wenn man an einem Feierabend in einer solchen Gasse eine Schar gemütlich beieinander stehen sieht, nicht in Reih und Glied, nicht aufgeputzt, nicht irgendwie zur Schau sich stellend, sondern ohne strenge Ordnung, aber auch ohne daß sich Einer belästigend vordrängte, in Hemdärmeln vielleicht und die Pfeife zwischen den Zähnen, in behaglichem Gespräche, dann sollte man sich denken müssen: ja, die passen zu einander, die Häuser und die Menschen," Riemerschmid, "Grundriß und Aussehen," 58.

¹²⁷ "Arbeiter-Wohnungen für die Hagener Textilindustrie Hagen, Walddorfstrasse, 1907," in *Richard Riemerschmid Vom Jugendstil zum Werkbund. Werke und Dokumente*, ed. Winfried Nerdinger (Munich: Prestel Verlag, 1982), 397-399, 416.

Another instance of Riemerschmid's ideas about developing designs tailored to the social habits and expectations as well as the economic capacities of a range of classes was evident in his 1906 *Maschinenmöbel* furnishings series for the Dresdener Werkstätten für Handwerkskunst.¹²⁸ Riemerschmid designed a range of furniture that could be produced through interchangeable, machined elements that were assembled and finished by hand. Overall economies of labor and materials would lead to lower costs and wider distribution. The *Maschinenmöbelprogramm* was focused on fulfilling the long-standing dream of the arts and crafts movement to produce well-designed, quality household goods for the mass public. Through innovations in design, production, and marketing, the Dresden workshops sought to overcome the discrepancies between social vision and market share that had dogged the arts and crafts movement since its inception. By machining the interchangeable parts – chair backs, table legs, cabinet doors – in different kinds and grades of wood, and by applying different kinds and grades of hardware, finishes, and decorative ornament, furnishings could be produced for a range of consumer tastes and budgets. The further innovation of the Dresden workshops was then to market these furnishings to specific classes. Riemerschmid's *Maschinenmöbelprogramm* was introduced to the public at the *Dritte Kunstgewerbe-Ausstellung* in Dresden in 1906. The furnishing ensembles were intended to appeal to the budgets, tastes, and typical dwelling arrangements of three classes.¹²⁹ They took into account the typical, or rather ideal, layout of abodes for each class. Workers did their living and socializing in homes of two or perhaps three rooms. The Dresdener Werkstätten appropriately offered furnishings for

¹²⁸ Sonja Günther, "Richard Riemerschmid und die Dresdener Werkstätten für Handwerkskunst," in *Richard Reimerschmid. Vom Jugendstil zum Werkbund*, 34-38; and Sonja Günther, *Interieurs um 1900. Bernhard Pankok, Bruno Paul und Richard Riemerschmid als Mitarbeiter der Vereinigten Werkstätten für Kunst im Handwerk* (Munich: W. Fink, 1971).

¹²⁹ *Richard Reimerschmid. Vom Jugendstil zum Werkbund*, 194-227.

the all-purpose Stube or Wohnküche. The Mittelstand possessed homes with more expansive living areas, and the Werkstätten program responded accordingly. For the rambling homes of the Bürgertum, the Werkstätten offered a full complement of rooms, including suites for the children's bedrooms. The Arbeiterwohnung furnishings, called Einrichtung I in the Dresdener Werkstätten handbook, comprised a kitchen, living room, and bedroom (Küche, Wohnstube, Schlafstube), and were made from simple painted fir, with iron fittings and hinges (figure 40). Einrichtung II, tailored to the Mittelstand, included a combined living-dining room, a bedroom, and kitchen, produced in mahogany and larch with bronze or wrought iron hardware. Einrichtung III, targeted toward the upper levels of the Mittelstand and those among the bourgeoisie not able to afford custom furnishings and interiors (which also continued to be designed and produced by the Dresden workshops), consisted of a dining room and men's den in oak, a living room in mahogany, and a bedroom in larch, as well as a reception hall and girl's bedroom.

Karl Henrici: Environment as Maker of Social Identity

As befitted his decades of experience as a city planner, Karl Henrici approached the question of the worker's house at Hagen more in terms of settlement form than the design of individual dwellings.¹³⁰ Even from this broader viewpoint, the themes emphasized by the other speakers at Hagen came through in his presentation: the belief that the living environment shaped human behavior, the belief that design was an instrument that could be wielded toward desired social ends, and specifically to inculcate a peaceable class identity among industrial workers. These beliefs were not just crude environmental

¹³⁰ Karl Henrici, "Arbeiterkolonien," *Die künstlerische Gestaltung des Arbeiter-Wohnhauses*, 59-66. On Henrici's life and work, see Gerhard Curdes and Renate Oemichen, *Künstlerischer Städtebau um die Jahrhundertwende. Der Beitrag von Karl Henrici* (Cologne: Deutscher Gemeindeverlag, 1981).

determinism, but rather evidence of more deeply held philosophical principles, above all the conviction that symbolic forms were not merely decorative but that they acted upon human judgment in fundamental ways. The symbolic form of the dwelling comprised its roof profile, its floor plan, the articulation of fenestration across the façade, the massing of rows of housing along the street.

While Henrici was the elder among the architects at the Hagen conference, his comments seem the most modern of them all. He went further than any other speaker in articulating outright the political convictions underlying the conference's themes of social harmony and painterly townscapes. Henrici pointed out what a thoroughly new conception the idea of a "worker community" actually was. It was a settlement intentionally designed to segregate a class. From a design standpoint, the new settlement type presented three challenges: how to express unity and harmony without creating mind-deadening repetition, how to create the proper register of visual beauty, and how to use design to forestall potential socialist organizing in the worker enclaves. On one hand, it was important not to build colonies that looked like military encampments, with one row of houses after another. Such a settlement would foster class identity, though of a grim and undesirable kind. At the same time, it was "dangerous" to design workers' houses that looked like villas: too much design, too much ornament, too fine a use of materials, raised unattainable expectations.¹³¹ It was important to create tastes appropriate to the working class, representative of the virtues of hard work, simple tastes, and modest prospects.¹³²

¹³¹ Henrici, "Arbeiterkolonien," 64.

¹³² Henrici, "Arbeiterkolonien," 60-62.

Henrici was more active as a planner than as an architect, and his design of worker housing was limited. In 1905 he designed the plan for a workers' colony in Knurów in Upper Silesia (figure 41), and in 1912 entered into a competition for a Garden City suburb, Spiegelberge zu Halberstadt. Neither project was built.

Conceptions of the Vernacular and Workers' Housing Beyond Hagen

Heinrich Tessenow: Vernacular Simplicity and Modern Architecture

While the presentations at the 1905 Hagen conference offer a focused look at architects' ideas about the use of vernacular forms as models for modern housing, the small house was of interest to numerous designers of the time, as evidenced by the many books about the small house written by architects, critics, and reformers in the early decades of the twentieth century.

In his *Der Wohnhausbau* of 1909, Heinrich Tessenow was more concerned with the practical aspects of the small home than with design as a propaedeutic instrument for class identity.¹³³ He focused on the “Einfach - Niedrig - Praktische,” the simple, the lowly, the practical, that is, on the work of designing for specific purposes and uses rather than over-arching theories of form.¹³⁴ Tessenow saw that the question of the small home was part of the larger task for modern architecture, the need to design dwellings that fitted the lifeways of the residents, while also conforming domestic architecture to the demands of new modes of transportation, new manufacturing processes, new conceptions

¹³³ Heinrich Tessenow, *Der Wohnhausbau* (Munich: Callwey, 1909, rev. eds. 1914 and 1927). On Tessenow's life and work, see Marco de Michelis, *Heinrich Tessenow, 1876-1950* (Milan: Electa, 1991); Gerda W. Wangerin and Gerhard Weiss, *Heinrich Tessenow: Baumeister, 1876-1950. Leben, Lehre, Werk* (Essen: Bacht, 1976).

¹³⁴ “Über Arbeiter- und Kleinbürger-Wohnungen,” in Heinrich Tessenow, *Geschriebenes Gedanken eines Baumeisters*, ed. Otto Kindt (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1982), 21.

of space and property. While Tessenow continued to write about these ideas in his later books, *Hausbau und dergleichen* (house-building and such) and *Handwerk und Kleinstadt* (handwork and the small town), he began to move away from purely practical questions toward more philosophical and purely aesthetic issues.¹³⁵ In the aftermath of the First World War, Tessenow felt that architecture and architects were left to pick up the pieces of cultural and economic disruption, weighing what from the past should be taken forward, and what of the future was of most pressing significance. Like Schultze-Naumburg and Riemerschmid, Tessenow praised architecture of the traditional craftsman and builder, and distrusted architecture that was too intellectual. The artisan, the *Handwerker*, assumed a position of moral and symbolic importance in Tessenow's writings comparable to the *Bauern* in the writings of W.H. Riehl, R. Walter Darré, and Paul Schultze-Naumburg. The craftsman was the paragon of ethical judgment and practical skill. Independent, rational, but with the fine feeling of an artist, the craftsman ensured that in modern society labor maintained its moral power. As the master of his small workshop, the craftsman acted as the center and the guide for his circle of workers and apprentices. At one level, Tessenow was concerned about mass production driving out a finer sense of aesthetic appreciation for simplicity. His more pressing concern was that evidence of handwork in architecture expressed a social ethic. "Das geordnete oder gesunde Kleinhandwerkliche ist immer eine Frucht des stark Gesellschaftlichen," he wrote. Orderly or sound craftsmanship is always the fruit of a strong sense of the social. The forces of modernity were splitting the community apart, as shown by the fragmentation and multiplicity of styles, and the pressure towards newness and novelty

¹³⁵ Tessenow, *Hausbau und dergleichen* (Berlin: Cassirer, 1916); Tessenow, *Handwerk und Kleinstadt* (Berlin: Cassirer, 1919).

driven by modern industrialization. Tradition, as borne by traditional craft and handwork, had the power to hold community together.¹³⁶ One of the signal characteristics of tradition was its tendency toward sameness and repetition rather than novelty. "Die Starken und Reichen wiederholen nicht gern; die Wiederholung ist das Mittel der Einfachen," the strong and the rich aren't easily given to repetition; repetition is the province of the simple.¹³⁷ Tessenow maintained that during historical periods, such as the Middle Ages, in which there had been a strong handworker tradition, there had also been strong repetition of form.¹³⁸ He counseled a return to the basic generators of simple and beautiful form: symmetry, clarity, and plainness (figure 42). The desired effect was demonstrated in his own designs for Garden City communities at Hellerau (1910; figure 43), for the Gartenstadtgenossenschaft Hohensalza in Posen (1911; figure 44), and for the war veteran's housing settlement at Rähnitz near Dresden (1919; figures 45 and 46). In *Handwerk und Kleinstadt* (1919), Tessenow would draw out the moral figure of the craftsman as an ideal character type comparable to the ideal community type of the Kleinstadt, the small town, as an urgent panacea to the splintering and destructive forces wrought by the First World War.

Georg Metzendorf: Vernacular as Typology

Under the tutelage of Robert Schmohl in the Krupp firm's architectural office in Essen, architect and Garden City planner Georg Metzendorf had become well-versed in the practice of developing picturesque effects across a large settlement using a limited

¹³⁶ Tessenow, *Hausbau und dergleichen*, 17-18.

¹³⁷ Tessenow, *Hausbau und dergleichen*, 30.

¹³⁸ Tessenow, *Hausbau und dergleichen*, 31-32.

number of house plan and façade types (figure 47).¹³⁹ While working with Schmohl on the Krupp's Garden City settlement Margarethenhöhe, built near Essen starting in 1908, Metzendorf developed what he saw as an all-purpose house type. In elevation, his ideal two-story house was modeled on examples of baroque farmhouses and village homes. Metzendorf built his first model worker's house for the Hessische Landesausstellung für freie und angewandte Kunst 1908 (figure 48). It was commissioned by the Ernst-Ludwig-Verein and constructed as part of a colony of six model homes on the Mathildenhöhe, in an area just behind Joseph Maria Olbrich's main exhibition building constructed for the Darmstadt exposition of 1901.¹⁴⁰

As Metzendorf explained later in his *Kleinwohnungsbauten und Siedlungen* (small house construction and settlements) of 1920, in designing this house type, he had worked with both vernacular and modernist conceptions of class-specific typologies.¹⁴¹ In plan, Metzendorf prided himself on designing to accommodate the lifeways of the working classes. While he included modern appurtenances such as a central coal oven and a built-in bath, he also adopted features from vernacular cottages. In the traditional farmhouse of northwestern Germany, cooking and living were combined in a single, main room, referred to by Metzendorf and his contemporaries as the *Wohnküche*, the all-purpose kitchen and living room. This room with a fireplace and oven was the traditional gathering place for the working class family. While in urban dwellings the kitchen and

¹³⁹On Metzendorf, see Rainier Metzendorf, *Georg Metzendorf, 1874-1934. Siedlung und Bauten* (Darmstadt: Hessische Historische Kommission und Historische Kommission für Hessen, 1994).

¹⁴⁰ Metzendorf's model home, along with several other model dwellings, was dismantled after the 1908 exhibition. The design by Metzendorf and those by architects Wienkoop, Mahr, and Markwort, were constructed anew by a nearby dairy. The house type won a Grand Prize at the 1910 World Exposition in Brussels. See Johannes Cramer and Niels Gutschow, *Bauausstellungen. Eine Architekturgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1984), 28, 94-100.

¹⁴¹ Georg Metzendorf, *Kleinwohnungsbauten und Siedlungen* (Darmstadt: A. Koch, 1920).

living room were eventually divided into two spaces, the *Küche* and the *Gute Stube*,¹⁴² in the working class dwellings of small town and country, and most determinedly in the dwellings being designed for workers by modern architects, the space remained unified, often with a small workspace, the *Spülküche*, a wash kitchen or utility room, off to one side.¹⁴³

Fritz Schumacher: Type and Mass Production

Hamburg architect and planner Fritz Schumacher, in his *Die Kleinwohnung* of 1919, was less concerned with pessimistic assessments of artistic form as an index of cultural decline, than with the practical issues of solving the housing question.¹⁴⁴ He approached the issues of housing shortages and the relative advantages of multi-storied rental apartments versus single-family houses from the viewpoint of a city planner. While he retained the fundamental beliefs that guided reforming architects of the time – that the issue of housing was not merely an architectural problem but also a social question, and that there was no stronger tool than the design of the home for inculcating desired social cultures – Schumacher saw the housing question as writ larger than mere cultural identity.¹⁴⁵ His method of approach followed a more sociological line of inquiry: the housing question was a question of how a society organizes itself.¹⁴⁶ Accordingly, he did

¹⁴² See Adelheid von Saldern, “Im hause, zu Hause. Wohnen im Spannungsfeld von Gegebenheiten und Aneignungen,” in *Geschichte des Wohnens*, vol. 3, 1800-1918, *Das bürgerliche Zeitalter*, ed. Jürgen Reulecke (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1997), 211-214

¹⁴³ Georg Metzendorf, *Kleinwohnungsbauten und Siedlungen*; Rainier Metzendorf, *Georg Metzendorf*, 40-41.

¹⁴⁴ Fritz Schumacher, *Die Kleinwohnung. Studien zur Wohnungsfrage* (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1916; 2nd ed. 1919). On Schumacher generally, see *Fritz Schumacher. Reformkultur und Moderne*, ed. Hartmut Frank (Stuttgart: Gerd Hatje, 1994).

¹⁴⁵ “...daß es hier nicht um architektonische Fragen, sondern um soziale Fragen schlechthin handelt...Es gibt keinen stärkeren Erzieher zu sozialer Kultur und zu sozialer Unkultur, als die Wohnung des Menschen ,“ Schumacher, *Die Kleinwohnung*, 3.

¹⁴⁶ Schumacher, *Die Kleinwohnung*, 63-64.

not focus on individual structures, but on the city as an organism containing the entirety of the *Gemeinschaft* within its bounds.¹⁴⁷

Writing at the end of the First World War, Schumacher had a good ten years of critical distance on the enthusiasms for farmhouse-inspired single-family houses and the artistic townscapes of the Garden City movement. He saw that however admirable they might be in principle, in view of the dire shortages of housing, especially after the First World War, Garden Cities could be but a small part of the solution. He also saw that, however admirable the value of home ownership for strengthening family life and *bürgerlich* values, the actual character of industrial labor made the ideal of single-family home ownership impractical. The worker was often compelled to change jobs, and it was even to his advantage to pursue work in new locations.¹⁴⁸ In looking at Garden Cities and industrial colonies, Schumacher was above all critical of the architectural emphasis on artistic questions before the more practical issues.¹⁴⁹ The tendency toward painterly effects at settlements like Metzendorf's Margarethenhöhe and parts of Riemerschmid's Hellerau risked being interpreted as mere decoration. In fact, Schumacher saw Hellerau as an object lesson in the rise and decline of the idea of the artistic worker's home:

The appearance today of Hellerau gives a highly interesting cross-section through this development [of the artistic design of the worker's home]: It began with Riemerschmid's picturesque images, followed by the clear, recurring motives that articulated the streets of Muthesius, finally coming to the complete plainness of Tessenow, where the architectural effect was created merely through the piercings of the façade, while anything that might enliven the silhouette was eschewed.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁷ Schumacher, *Die Kleinwohnung*, 19.

¹⁴⁸ Schumacher, *Die Kleinwohnung*, 31-32.

¹⁴⁹ Schumacher, *Die Kleinwohnung*, 54-55.

¹⁵⁰ "Die heutige Erscheinung von Hellerau gibt einen höchst interessanten Querschnitt durch diese Entwicklung: man begann mit Riemerschmids malerischen Gebilden, dann folgten klare, durch

For Schumacher the essential question of the time was not about painterly effects but about the question of type.

It is not mainly a question here of the degree of architectural asceticism, but rather of something much more fundamental. The drive toward a conscious unity of architectural effect mirrors the growing knowledge that settlements rely on the purposeful development and exploitation of typical forms. It is essential in this regard to deactivate the misunderstood appetite for artistic individualism and to consciously seek its effects in the return of the type.¹⁵¹

Whereas Muthesius and Schultze-Naumburg approached the question of type in housing as a question of basic house forms, keyed to socioeconomic class, and Riemerschmid developed basic, repeatable house types for Hellerau, each element of which was nonetheless handcrafted, Schumacher saw the advantage of the type in the mass production of building elements like windows and doors which could be combined in numerous ways to produce the effect of diversity within overall unity.¹⁵²

Paul Schmitthenner: Type and Community Identity

Among the housing works singled out for praise by Schumacher was Paul Schmitthenner's Staaken colony near Berlin, built between 1913 and 1917 for armament laborers (figure 49). In his architecture and in the many books and essays written over the course of his long career, Schmitthenner played a leading role in transforming the

wiederkehrende einfach Motive gegliederte Straßen, wie die von Muthesius und endlich kam man zu der völligen Motivlosigkeit eines Tessenow, bei dem nur noch Wand und Loch durch ihre Verhältnisse wirken, während jede Umrißbelebung verschmährt wird," Schumacher, *Die Kleinwohnung*, 91.

¹⁵¹"Aber nicht die Frage nach dem Grad der architektonischen Askese ist hierbei die Hauptsache, es handelt sich vielmehr um etwas weit Wesentlicheres. Der Zug nach der bewußten Einheitlichkeit der architektonischen Wirkung spiegelt nur die immer deutlicher werdende Erkenntnis, daß solche Siedelungen auf das zielbewußte Herausbilden und Ausnützen typischer Gestaltungen angewiesen sind. Es gilt, auf diesem Gebiete den mißverstandenen Trieb nach künstlerischem Individualismus auszuschalten und seine Kraft bewußt zu suchen im Wirken durch die Wiederkehr des Typus," Schumacher, *Die Kleinwohnung*, 91.

¹⁵² Schumacher, *Die Kleinwohnung*, 92.

historical vernacular into the model for the modern house type.¹⁵³ Schmitthenner's 1919 essay, "Die Deutsche Volkswohnung: Einführung in die Siedlungsfrage" (The German people's home: Introduction to the settlement question), laid out the close connection between unified architectural form and a unified community identity:

When seen from the outside in, a settlement should clearly represent the idea of the collective, of a solidly united ethos. No house should outclass the others. Each is a cell in the organism and supports the larger form. The strength of the expression must lie in consonance, the dominating rhythm of the masses.¹⁵⁴

The idea that political equality should be an expression, and an outcome, of architectural form was shaped by Schmitthenner's association with the Arbeitsrat für Kunst, the cultural workers council founded in 1919 in the wake of the Weimar Revolution.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵³ Wolfgang Voigt and Hartmut Frank, eds., *Paul Schmitthenner 1884-1972* (Tübingen: Ernst Wasmuth, 2003).

¹⁵⁴ "Eine Siedlung soll von außen her sehen deutlich die Idee der Genossenschaft, die solidarische Gesinnung, zeigen. Kein Haus soll das andere übertreffen, jedes ist Zelle im Organismus und trägt mit zur großen Form. Der starke Ausdruck muss im Gleichklang liegen, in beherrschten Rhythmus der Massen," Paul Schmitthenner, "Die Deutsche Volkswohnung: Einführung in der Siedlungsfrage," *Daimler-Werkzeitung* 1, no. 15-18 (1919/1920), 280. Schmitthenner's essay appeared in the in-house publication of Daimler in Stuttgart. At the time, Schmitthenner was designing a workers' colony for the Daimler factory in Sindelfingen, see "Volkswohnung und fabriziertes Fachwerk: Paul Schmitthenner und die rationalisierung im Wohnungsbau," in *Paul Schmitthenner 1884-1972*, 15, 240 fn 46.

¹⁵⁵ Schmitthenner was one of ten founding architects in the Arbeitsrat für Kunst. While most histories of the Arbeitsrat tend to emphasize the radical and Expressionist roots of the group as a bridge to the Bauhaus and other modernist experiments of the Weimar Republic, the architectural representation in fact included many designers who would continue to ply a more traditional route in design through the 1920s and 1930s. In addition to Schmitthenner, architect members of the Arbeitsrat included Otto Bartning, Walter Curt Behrendt, Martin Elsässer, Walter Gropius, Paul Mebes, Hans Poelzig, Bruno Taut, Max Taut, and Heinrich Tessenow. Among the principles and demands of the Arbeitrat's program published in March 1919 (which included Bruno Taut's Program for Architecture which had been written and circulated in late 1918 in the *Mitteilungen des deutschen Werkbundes* 4 [1918], 14-15) were a unity of art and the people, the call for state support of *Volkswohnungen*, new housing for the people, and the establishment of *Volkshäuser*, centers for community cultural life – ideals which were held by artists and architects across the political spectrum. Schmitthenner was an early contributor to a periodical started by Arbeitsrat members which substantially set out to achieve these goals albeit in practices oriented toward maintaining continuities with historical tradition. *Die Volkswohnung. Zeitschrift für Wohnungsbau und Siedlungswesen* was published between 1919 and 1923 with Walter Curt Behrendt as editor, and the names of Otto Bartning, Hans Bernoulli, Otto Glass, Felix Grüneisen, Gerhard Jobst, and Paul Mebes appearing alongside Schmitthenner's on the masthead. On the involvement of Schmitthenner in the Arbeitsrat für Kunst and Volkswohnung circle, see Wolfgang Voigt, "Volkswohnung und fabriziertes Fachwerk: Paul Schmitthenner und die rationalisierung im Wohnungsbau," in *Paul Schmitthenner 1884-1972*, 15-18. On

Amidst the revolutionary fervor, Schmitthenner was emphatic in his support of the farmhouse as a model for the modern house, and by extension, of the farmer as a model, ethically speaking, for modern man:

We want to fundamentally renounce the cities and to rediscover the peasant that more or less still resides deeply in every German. We don't however want to build farmhouses, but rather houses that we actually need.¹⁵⁶

The connection between the simplicity of the vernacular farmhouse as a model home, and the development of modern housing types that could be produced en masse and inexpensively for the workers and middle classes, or be customized for the bourgeoisie, remained an interest of Schmitthenner throughout his career as an architect and as a writer.¹⁵⁷ He was a regular contributor to *Die Volkswohnung*, a periodical published from 1919 to 1923 that served as the mouthpiece for the traditionally oriented architects in the early years of the Weimar Republic. In his built works as well, Schmitthenner maintained an interest in sustaining the connections between traditional architecture and modern needs and building techniques. Over time, he grew more stridently opposed to the constructivist and internationalist influences taking hold in German architecture. In the experimental estate at Kochofen near Stuttgart – initiated in part as a traditionalist response to the spare, geometricized architecture of the Weissenhofsiedlung build in the late 1920s – he endeavored to develop a means of adapting traditional farmhouse

Taut's contributions to the architecture program of the Arbeitsrat, see Rosemarie Haag Bletter, "Bruno Taut and Paul Scheerbart: Some Aspects of German Expressionist Architecture" (Ph.D, diss., Columbia University, 1973); and Iain Boyd Whyte, *Bruno Taut and the Architecture of Activism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 95-109, 232-233

¹⁵⁶ "Wir wollen den Städte gründlich verleugnen und das Bauerntum herausholen, das in jedem Deutschen mehr oder weniger tief noch steckt. . . Wir wollen aber deshalb beliebe keine Bauernhäuser bauen, sondern Häuser, wie wir sie eben brauchen," Schmitthenner, "Die Deutsche Volkswohnung," 280.

¹⁵⁷ Wolfgang Voigt, "Vom Ur-Haus zum Typ. Paul Schmitthenners 'deutsches Wohnhaus' und seine Vorbilder," in *Moderne Architektur in Deutschland 1900 bis 1950. Reform und Tradition*, ed. Vittorio Magnano Lampugnani and Romana Schneider (Stuttgart: Gerd Hatje) 245-265.

construction methods, namely the Fachwerk (half-timbered) technique of frame and fill, to enable builders of moderate scale to construct inexpensive mass housing.¹⁵⁸ The guiding principle was not anti-modernist: Schmitthenner believed that working from traditional forms using both old and new materials and methods of construction would over time lead to the evolution of new forms, a further iteration of the evolution-not-revolution philosophy of progressive reformers.

In his *Das deutsche Wohnhaus* of 1932 and *Die Baukunst im neuen Reich* of 1934,¹⁵⁹ without substantially shifting his point of view or approach to design, Schmitthenner aligned himself more and more with German nationalists. By the mid 1930s, Schmitthenner's architecture and writing were well in keeping with the cultural program of National Socialism. Making the connection between the elemental vernacular and the modern concept of type remained a constant of his work, from the time of the Weimar Republic, through the Third Reich, and into the postwar period. The posthumous publication of *Gebaute Form*,¹⁶⁰ a collection of typological studies, confirmed that the simple house form had been a career-long fixation for Schmitthenner (figure 50). The basis of the studies, originally made between 1943 and 1949, was a simple house with a

¹⁵⁸ Under the aegis of the Reichsforschungsgesellschaft für Wissenschaftlichkeit in Bauwesen (RFG – the same entity that financed Weissenhof), Schmitthenner in 1927-28 developed a settlement plan using his "Fafa" method of wood construction, a combination of balloon-frame wood construction and concrete (for which he applied for a patent in 1931). His plans for an experimental estate in 1928 were not realized, but in 1933 Schmitthenner took over as artistic director of the Ausstellungssiedlung Deutsches Holz am Kochenhof, a housing exhibition on the same site sponsored by the wood construction industry. See Stefanie Plarre, *Die Kochenhofsiedlung. Das Gegenmodell zur Weißenhofsiedlung. Paul Schmitthenners Siedlungsprojekt in Stuttgart von 1927 bis 1933* (Stuttgart: Hohenheim, 2001). On the Weissenhofsiedlung, its development, and its controversies, see Richard Pommer and Christian F. Otto, *Weissenhof 1927 and the Modern Movement in Architecture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); and Julius Posener, "Weissenhof und danach," *Baumeister* 78, no. 6 (June 1981): 596-607.

¹⁵⁹ Paul Schmitthenner, *Das deutsche Wohnhaus* (Stuttgart: Konrad Witter Verlag, 1932); *Die Baukunst im neuen Reich* (Munich: Callwey, 1934). See Christian Weller, "Paul Schmitthenners Buch *Das deutsche Wohnhaus*: Zur Rezeption eines umstrittenen Textes," in Paul Schmitthenner 1884-1972, 47-66.

¹⁶⁰ *Gebaute Form: Variationen über ein Thema*, ed. Elisabeth Schmitthenner (Leinfelden-Echterdingen: Alexander Koch, 1984).

three-bay façade and a pyramidal or hipped roof. Encapsulating Schmitthenner's conception of ideal house typology, the model was based to some degree on the baroque model of Goethe's garden house in Weimar. In the 1932 *Das Deutsche Wohnhaus*, Schmitthenner had contrasted Goethe's garden house as a paragon of good design against the "Wohnmaschine betitelten Avantgardebau," the avant-garde architecture of the machines for living, of Hans Scharoun's Weissenhof estate house.

Schmitthenner used this basic, vernacular baroque-inspired house form in his earliest projects, notably the houses of the Garden City Carlowitz near Breslau of 1912. He used it again for the model houses at the Kochenhofsiedlung of 1927. He continued to adapt the form in his work through the 1950s. As Wolfgang Voigt has pointed out, invoking the model of Goethe's garden house imbued the modern homes with the resonances of Goethe's morphological theories. Much as Goethe's *Urpflanze*, a mythical original plant form, carried within itself the potential to generate all other plant forms, so did this simple baroque vernacular house, this *Urhaus*, have the power to become the generative form out of which architects could extract all iterations of the modern German house.¹⁶¹

The Vernacular as Model for Modern Housing

The diffusion of the rural vernacular, as a model for modern dwellings, and as a parallel track, neither exactly historical, nor exactly contemporary, but rather "traditional," that is belonging to a timeless realm of community, was played out in several spheres, including the Garden City movement, world expositions and housing fairs, in works of the Deutscher Werkbund, and in projects of cultural preservation organizations such as the

¹⁶¹ Wolfgang Voigt, "Vom Ur-Haus zum Typ. Paul Schmitthenners 'deutsches Wohnhaus' und seine Vorbilder," 245-246.

Dürerbund, and the Deutscher Bund Heimatschutz and its regional affiliates. While vernacular house typologies have been discussed here as a discrete problem of the form of individual dwellings, in the minds of contemporary architects and reformers, the question of the dwelling was frequently bound up with the question of the settlement form as a whole. The search for historical models and modern typologies based in time-proven, vernacular forms was the focus there as well.

The Vernacular and War Housing

The pressure to build low-cost single-family houses, nationalist sentiments, and the romanticization of semi-rural life converged during the First World War to create what in retrospect can be seen as a high point in the development of the vernacular farmhouse as a model for modern housing (figure 51). There had been dramatic housing shortages before the war, and by the first year of the conflict, the need had risen to emergency proportions. The program developed to address the need, the *Kriegerheimstätten* (veteran's homesteads) movement, set out to build single-family houses for returning soldiers.¹⁶² The economic exigencies of wartime made simple designs and inexpensive building materials and methods imperative. The architects called upon to supply designs for the *Kriegerheimstätten* housing included Heinrich Tessenow, Karl Henrici, and other founders of the Heimatschutz and German Garden City movements. For many of these designers, the model of the vernacular-inspired small house was an accepted model for progressive, socially responsive design. Indeed, the *Kriegerheimstätten*gesetz passed on

¹⁶² Heinrich Erman, "Die Grundzüge für ein Kriegerheimstättengesetz," *Soziale Zeitfragen: Beiträge zu den Kämpfen der Gegenwart* 64 (Berlin, 1916); Carl Johannes Fuchs, *Die Wohnungsfrage vor und nach dem Kriege: Aufsätze und Vorträge zur Wohnungsfrage* (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1917); Carl Johannes Fuchs, *Die Wohnungs- und Siedlungsfrage nach dem Krieg* (Stuttgart: Meyer-Ilschen, 1918); Heinrich Erman, "Volkssiedlung: Besprechung der Gesetzentwürfe zum Preussischen Städtebaugesetz und zum Reichsboden-Reformgesetz," *Soziale Zeitfragen* 82/83 (Berlin 1925).

21 November 1915 (the law that stipulated construction of housing for war veterans) echoed the principles of Bodenreform, Heimatschutz, and Garden City advocates:

§ 11. The veteran's homesteads must be adequate to ensure the healthy physical and moral regeneration of the people, to strengthen the military strength of the nation, and to increase the productive yield of the native soil.

§ 12. The houses must be constructed as low-rise buildings, and every dwelling must have a contiguous garden and its own particular entrance.¹⁶³

The push to offer returning soldiers and war invalids the opportunity to have a small house in the countryside was motivated by patriotic sentiment, but also by the sense of national self-preservation. The economic difficulties and ensuing social unrest of soldiers returning from the Franco-Prussian conflict was still a living memory in Germany.¹⁶⁴

The rebuilding of East Prussia from around 1915 forward (beginning in earnest in 1917) marked a high point of the vernacular Heimatstil as official state architecture before the Third Reich.¹⁶⁵ Following the destruction of villages and cities in East Prussia by Russian troops in the first weeks of the First World War, the German government moved quickly to aid inhabitants of the region and to begin rebuilding, in large part because of the

¹⁶³ "§ 11. Die Kriegerheimstätten müssen geeignet sein, einen körperlich und sittlich gesunden Volksnachwuchs zu sichern, die Wehrkraft des Volkes zu erhöhen und die Erträgnisse des heimischen Bodens zu steigern. § 12. Die Häuser müssen in Flachbau errichtet sein und jede Wohnung muß einen damit zusammenhängenden Garten und einen besonderen Hauseingang haben," cited in Kristiana Hartmann, *Deutsche Gartenstadtbewegung. Kulturpolitik und Gesellschaftsreform* (Munich: Heinz Moos, 1976), 43, 140 fn 225.

¹⁶⁴ Adolf Damaschke, "Die Kriegerheimstätten Bewegung in C.J. Fuchs, *Die Wohnungs- und Siedlungsfrage nach dem Krieg*, 392-393. See also Jörn Janssen, "Sozialismus, Sozialpolitik und Wohnungsnot," in *Kapitalistischer Städtebau*, eds. Hans G. Helms, Jörn Janssen, and Lucius Burckhardt (Neuwied: Luchterhand, 1970), 73-83.

¹⁶⁵ Harmut Frank, "Heimatschutz und typologisches Entwerfen. Modernisierung und Tradition beim Wiederaufbau von Ostpreußen 1915-1927," in *Moderne Architektur in Deutschland 1900 bis 1950. Reform und Tradition*, ed. Vittorio Magnano Lampugnani and Romana Schneider (Stuttgart: Gerd Hatje) 105-131. A similar inclination toward nativist sentiments and regional vernaculars drove the rebuilding efforts after the First World War in France. See Jean-Claude Vigato, *L'Architecture régionaliste, France 1890-1950* (Paris: Editions Norma, 1994).

importance of the agricultural production of the region, critical to a Germany otherwise cut off from trade by the conflict. In September 1914 an aid commission was established and in October 1914 some 400 million Marks were set aside for rebuilding.¹⁶⁶ The project of reconstruction became a particular interest of architects associated with reform movements such as the Heimatschutz, Garden City Association, and the Werkbund. For many, the reconstruction of East Prussia seemed to offer a tabula rasa for their dreams of building a new Heimat.¹⁶⁷ A number of German architects contributed to the effort, including Hugo Wagner, Gustav Wolf, Hans Scharoun, Hugo Häring, and Fritz Schopohl, although the tendency in the design of housing was toward set types rather than endlessly creative experiments.

In the absence of research documenting the traditional East Prussian regional style to guide the modern rebuilding effort, the Deutscher Bund Heimatschutz and the Vereinigung für deutsche Siedlung und Wanderung commissioned a study of the vernacular traditions at the start of the reconstruction period. The model vernacular, illustrated in Waldemar Kuhn's 1918 *Kleinsiedlungen aus Friderizianischer Zeit* (Small settlements from the age of Frederick) was not an Ur-alt farmhouse, but the model colonist houses constructed in the eighteenth century by Frederick the Great (figure 52).¹⁶⁸ The Deutscher Bund Heimatschutz also commissioned Berlin architect Georg Steinmetz to research and develop typologies based in historical models. Steinmetz's first volume of the three-volume *Grundlagen für das Bauen in Stadt und Land mit besonderer Rücksicht auf den Wiederaufbau in Ostpreußen* (Foundations for urban and rural

¹⁶⁶ Erich Göttgen, *Der Wiederaufbau Ostpreußens. Eine kulturelle, verwaltungstechnische und baukünstlerische Leistung* (Königsberg: Gräfe und Unzwer, 1928).

¹⁶⁷ Frank, "Heimatschutz und typologisches Entwerfen," 119.

¹⁶⁸ Waldemar Kuhn, *Kleinsiedlungen aus Friderizianischer Zeit* (Stuttgart: Wilhelm Meyer-Ilschen, 1918).

architecture with particular consideration for the reconstruction in East Prussia) was published in 1918. It exemplified the importance accorded to vernacular forms during the war. Later volumes of the *Grundlagen*, published in 1922 and 1928, were more in tune with Weimar-era debates about cost, mass production, and standardization of building components than with the concerns about traditional types that shaped the initial First World War reconstruction effort.¹⁶⁹

Vernacular Models in Housing Exhibitions

Exhibitions of model housing, in the form of photographs, drawings, and models, were frequently included in national pavilions at the world expositions. But full-scale model houses and even recreations of small model villages were likewise mainstays of the major international fairs. The presence of model housing at world expositions was established in London in 1851, when Prince Albert sponsored the Society for Improving the Condition of the Labouring Classes had built in Hyde Park after the designs of Henry Roberts, a two-story model city house for four worker families, constructed of polychromed masonry in a vaguely Tudoresque style.¹⁷⁰ The model of the historical village, as architectural history lesson and entertainment zone, was well established by the time Ulrich Jahn, a co-founder of the Museum für Volkskunde in Berlin, built a picturesque German village at the 1893 World Columbia Exposition in Chicago.

¹⁶⁹ Georg Steinmetz, *Grundlagen für das Bauen in Stadt und Land mit besonderer Rücksicht auf den Wiederaufbau in Ostpreußen*, 3 vols. (Munich: Callwey, 1918-1928); Frank, "Heimatschutz und typologisches Entwerfen," 124.

¹⁷⁰ An accompanying brochure with plans and suggestions for interior furnishings was published in 1851 and translated into German in 1852 with a second edition appearing in 1862. The houses were demounted and re-erected at the entrance of Kensington Park just southwest of the Vauxhall Bridge. See Henry Roberts, *The Model Houses for Families, Built in Connexion with the Great Exhibition of 1851* by Command of Prince Albert (London, 1851); Eduard Führ and Daniel Stemmerich, 'Nach gethaner Arbeit verbleibt im Kreise der Eurigen.' *Bürgerliche Wohnrezepte für Arbeiter zur individuellen und sozialen Formierung im 19. Jahrhundert* (Wuppertal: Peter Hammer, 1985), 88-89.

In Germany the presentation of model housing for workers was a mainstay of major expositions and of fairs focused specifically on housing and city planning. Model houses at expositions in the first years of the twentieth century, such as the *Deutsche Bauausstellung* at Dresden in 1900¹⁷¹ and the *Rheinisch-Westfälische Industrie-, Gewerbe- und Kunst-Ausstellung* at Düsseldorf in 1902, followed the romantic conception of the workers' cottage as a miniaturization of the bourgeois villa (figure 53 and 54).¹⁷² By 1906 and the *Bayerische Jubiläums-Landesausstellung* in Nuremberg, the vernacular farmhouse had become the reigning paradigm, a trend that continued with the 1908 Stuttgart Bauausstellung, where a model house for the workers' settlement at Gmindersdorf, after the design of Theodor Fischer, was built on the grounds of the exposition, and with the 1908 *Hessische Landesausstellung für freie und angewandte Kunst*, at which Georg Metzendorf's worker's house, discussed above, was one of a group of six model homes on the Mathildenhöhe in Darmstadt.¹⁷³ The Verband Sächsischer Industrieller, in conjunction with the Sächsischer Heimatschutz, sponsored the design and construction of a colony of model workers' houses at the *Internationale Hygiene-Ausstellung* in Dresden in 1911, including a two-story block for six families as well as single-family houses constructed of simple wood (figure 55 and 56).¹⁷⁴ The 1913 *Internationale Baufachausstellung* in Leipzig, in addition to the recreation in miniature of Leipzig's baroque-era Altstadt, entitled *Leipzig um 1800*. The Gartenvorstadt Leipzig-Marienbrunn was built a short distance from the exposition grounds, with a masterplan by

¹⁷¹ *Deutsche Bauzeitung* 34 (1900), 385.

¹⁷² Anton Schnabel, "Arbeiterwohnungen auf der Industrie- und Gewerbeausstellung in Düsseldorf 1902," *Österreichische Wochenschrift für den öffentlichen Baudienst* 9 (1903), 60-65.

¹⁷³ Johannes Cramer and Niels Gutschow, *Bauausstellungen*, 37-39.

¹⁷⁴ Karl Schmidt, "Kleinwohnungsbauten des Verbandes Sächsischer Industrieller auf der Internationalen Hygiene-Ausstellung in Dresden 1911," *Architektonische Rundschau* 11, 12 (1911), V.

Hans Strobel and individual house designs – also conspicuously tending toward the vernacular baroque – by numerous architects, including Herman Muthesius.¹⁷⁵

The construction of model houses in the Neue Niederrheinische Dorf at the 1914 *Deutsche Werkbund Ausstellung* in Cologne represented the high point of the use of traditional vernacular forms as models for modern workers' housing before the First World War (figure 57).¹⁷⁶ Tucked behind Walter Gropius' more well-known office building at the farthest, northern-most reaches of the exposition area on the west bank of the Rhine River, the village was sponsored by the Rheinischer Verein für Denkmalpflege und Heimatschutz, an organization founded in 1906.¹⁷⁷ The village featured designs by leading architects from the Rhine region, who were otherwise not represented among architects of the main exposition buildings. Georg Metzendorf had architectural oversight of the project and was responsible for several of the individual buildings. Thirteen other architectural offices contributed. Drawing very selectively and somewhat romantically on stylistic characteristics from the rural and small town architecture of the lower Rhine region, the architecture resembled the workers' housing and Garden City settlements Metzendorf had been designing for the Krupp company in Essen, and his small house

¹⁷⁵ Internationale Bauausstellung. *Offizieller Katalog der Internationalen Bauausstellung mit Sonderausstellungen, Leipzig Mai bis Oktober 1913* (Leipzig: C.F. Müller, 1913); Hans Strobel, "Die Gartenvorstadt Leipzig-Marienbrunn," *Der Städtebau* 9 (1912): 55-58.

¹⁷⁶ In expositions during the Weimar Republic, such as the Werkbund exposition at Weissenhof in Stuttgart in 1927, the wooden construction and gabled roofs of the traditional farmhouse were replaced by the smooth stuccoed finish and flat roofs of modernism. The high visibility of the Weissenhof exposition set a new standard for housing at fairs, followed by modernist housing exhibitions at Brunn in 1928, Breslau in 1929, Berlin in 1931, and Vienna in 1932. The ascendancy of the new style catalyzed opposition among architects who continued to espouse national traditions and conventional evidence of handwork in architecture, among them Paul Schultze-Naumburg, Paul Schmitthenner, and German Bestelmeyer, all founding members of the Block, an association of conservative architects.

¹⁷⁷ Wolfram Hagspiel, "Das 'Neue Niederrheinische Dorf'," in *Der westdeutsche Impuls 1900-1914. Kunst und Umweltgestaltung im Industriegebiet. Die Deutsche Werkbund-Ausstellung Cöln 1914*, ed. Wulf Herzogenrath, Dirk Teubner, and Angelika Thiekötter (Cologne: Kölnischer Kunstverein, 1984), 186-191; Wulf Herzogenrath, ed., *Frühe Kölner Kunstausstellungen* (Cologne: Wienand, 1981), 271-285; and Richard Klapheck, *Neue Baukunst in den Rheinlanden. Eine Übersicht unserer Baulichen Entwicklung seit der Jahrhundertwende* (Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1928), 96-103.

design for the Ernst-Ludwig-Verein at Mathildenhöhe in 1908. The village buildings were constructed of brick with Dutch-gabled end walls. A village church and small market plaza with a fountain in the center were framed by the village pub, a youth center, and a model three-family row house, used over the course of the exposition to house an exhibition about the Rhineland Heimatschutz's preservation work. The three model workers' houses were designed by Metzendorf, and the Cologne architects Camillo Friedrich and Otto Müller-Jena.

The marriage between the farmhouse and the modern home met a mixed fate at the Versuchssiedlung (experimental estate) Am Fischtal in Berlin-Zehlendorf, a project to create model housing for the middle classes presented as part of the exhibition *Bauen und Wohnen* in 1928.¹⁷⁸ Occurring some ten years after the high point of the Heimatstil movement, the pitched roofs and farmhouse-like facades of the Am Fischtal estate could legitimately be termed a revival, although many at the time saw it more as a reaction. The Am Fischtal settlement was built near the Onkel-Toms-Hütte Siedlung, an estate begun two years earlier that would eventually house 15,000 inhabitants. Designed by Bruno Taut in collaboration with Hugo Häring and Otto Rudolf Salvisberg, Onkel-Toms-Hütte represented the leading edge of modern housing, with flat roofs, geometrically defined profiles, and staggered enfilades of long apartment Zeilenbau. The Onkel-Toms-Hütte estate had been financed by the Gehag (Gemeinnützige Heimstätten-, Spar-, und Bau-Aktiengesellschaft, a municipal housing construction and management agency founded in

¹⁷⁸ Johannes Cramer and Niels Gutschow, *Bauausstellungen*, 132; Annemarie Jaeggi, "Waldsiedlung Zehlendorf 'Onkel-Toms-Hütte'," in *Siedlungen der zwanziger Jahre – heute. Vier Berliner Großsiedlungen 1924-1984*, ed. Norbert Huse (Berlin: Bauhaus-Archiv, 1985), 137-158.

1924), which also sponsored the exhibition houses at Am Fischtal.¹⁷⁹ Critics at the time interpreted the conservatism of the Am Fischtal architecture as a direct reaction against the modernist form of the Werkbund housing exhibition at Weissenhof in Stuttgart, which had opened the year before.¹⁸⁰ The stark differences between Weissenhof and Am Fischtal set off a running debate in the architectural press in 1928 about the architectural, historical, moral, and political merits of flat roofs versus pitched roofs.¹⁸¹

Architect Heinrich Tessenow, who had been commissioned by the Gehag to do the master site plan for Am Fischtal, reported that the stipulation for pitched roofs had in fact come from the Gehag itself.¹⁸² The housing agency also outlined a number of other stipulations as part of a building program that emphasized affordable housing for the middle classes. The model homes and apartment dwellings were arrayed along the length of the street, Am Fischtal, resembling in their disposition the plan of a traditional *Strassendorf* (as distinct from the long apartment blocks in the neighboring Taut Siedlung; figure 58). With their stucco finishes and roofs pitched at consistent 45-degree angles, Am Fischtal had a unified appearance across the house designs of the seventeen participating architects.¹⁸³ The settlement included some 120 dwellings in single family houses, row houses, and apartment rows. Although the exterior facades of the dwellings followed the typology of the simple worker's home, the interior disposition of rooms,

¹⁷⁹ In 1998, the GEHAG was privatized. Ownership was divided among a holding company, banks, and the city of Berlin. See the melding of history and publicity for the new undertaking offered in the catalogue for an exhibition at the Beratungszentrum der Investitionsbank Berlin, *Wohnen in Berlin. 100 Jahre Wohnungsbau in Berlin* (Berlin: Edition StadtBauKunst, 1999).

¹⁸⁰ Hans Joseph Zechlin, "Fünfzehn Architekten und der unbekannte Bürger. Zur Gagfah-Siedlung in Fischtalgrund," *Wasmuths Monatshefte für Baukunst* 12 (1928): 211-242.

¹⁸¹ Julius Posener, "Weissenhof und danach," *Baumeister* 78, no. 6(1981): 596-607; Richard Pommer, "The Flat Roof: A Modernist Controversy in Germany," *Art Journal* (Summer 1983): 158-169.

¹⁸² Johannes Cramer and Niels Gutschow, *Bauausstellungen*, 132.

¹⁸³ The seventeen architects included Hans Gerlach, Ernst Grabben, Wilhelm Jost, Fritz Keller, Alexander Klein, Arnold Knoblauch, Paul Mebes and Paul Emmerich, Hans Poelzig, Erich Richter, Emil Rüster, Paul Schmitthenner, Fritz Schopohl, Georg Steinmetz, Heinrich Tessenow, Karl Weißhaupt, and Gustav Wolf.

with provisions for maid's quarters, music rooms, sunrooms, or simply multiple rooms for a single resident, as in Arnold Knoblauch's "House for a Working Woman," exceeded the financial and social expectations of the middle classes at the time (figures 59 and 60).

Within a few years, the debates about roof profiles and housing typologies in Germany would shed their attachment to tradition, to the rural vernacular, and begin to take on the more rigorous functional dimensions conventionally associated with German modernism. The traditional would be left behind for a broader, more synthetic idea of architectural *Sachlichkeit* and *Typisierung*. The commitment to simplicity cultivated in the romantic wilderlands of the German farmhouse, and the experience with using simple materials and standard construction elements for emergency wartime housing would eventually lead to 1920s experiments with *Existenzminimum* dwellings among the committed formalists, and stripped-down, ridged-roof or hipped-roof mass housing among the committed traditionalists. The concerns about the evolution of class consciousness and class representation, about design as a tool of social education, and about the mission of the architect as a social engineer would remain. At the same time, the enthusiasm for the vernacular as a source of new forms became calcified into stylistic orthodoxies by more conservative architects and planners of the 1930s and 1940s, both within National Socialist circles and without. Vernacular architecture and villages became patterns, tools, that were at once symbolic and operative (figure 61).

.....

Even in the rhetoric of the traditionally inspired worker's house, there have been hints of the idea that the individual house was just a unit in the larger organism of the community.

Paul Schmitthenner described the house as the single cell. Fritz Schumacher conceived of the city as a *Gemeinschaft* organism. The next chapter looks more closely at the ways biological forms and cellular concepts served as metaphors and models for designers making the modern community.

Chapter Four

Cellular Form and Collective Life: The Concept of the Organic Community in the Social Sciences and City Planning

The previous chapters have explored diverse connections between the social sciences and the built environment in the late Wilhelmine era. Statistical analyses and empirical studies provided a factual basis for social reform. Developmental cultural histories offered up narratives in which the past, present, and future became scenes in an epochal drama of national destiny. Ethnographic and archaeological investigations provided modern designers a pattern book for modern shelter, with shifting valences of nationalist fervor, historical authenticity, and romantic sentiment. This chapter considers another field of late Wilhelmine discourse about the proper form of the ideal community: the ways in which biological ideas and imagery were joined to social scientific rationales and social reform design. It traces the transition from sociological studies of community based in developmental historical arguments to studies that addressed life as an organic totality, whereby the currents of romantic evolutionism and Social Darwinism transformed biology into a de facto social science. The long-standing metaphorical potential of the concept of the "organic community" appeared to be a genuine possibility as vitalistic tendencies in biology were taken up by historians, social reformers, planners, and designers. Science in this iteration was less a method or body of knowledge than a symbolic discourse and an ideology of progress. Rather than science, it was "scientistic;" rather than biological, it was "biologistic." It was a mode of cultural reasoning that encompassed the life sciences, social politics, history, and the arts. This phenomenon by

which biology exercised a formal and ideological influence on design and social theory has been termed “Biologismus” in German and “biocentrism” in English.¹

This chapter looks at the use of organic metaphors and models in sociological thought, and traces some of the applications of those ideas in city planning in Germany in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. To understand how a world view shaped by evolutionary theory and cell biology found analytic and metaphorical expression in the built environment, the study considers illustrations from scientific literature and city plans, primarily of a utopian nature, from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Such plans, whether full city plans or building floor plans, are simultaneously expressions and generators of ideological propositions about family relationships, class, and political and economic power. The visual artifacts that document this conjunction of biological theory and social reform are of two kinds: the stylized illustrations of cellular organisms from the late Wilhelmine era, and the contemporaneous, and equally stylized, plans for ideal cities and settlements. The city conceptions – two-dimensional site plans and bird’s-eye views – are abstracted, highly codified projections. Compressed into the lines depicting transportation networks, the placement of public buildings, residential zoning, even the boundaries between town and country, are assumptions about class hierarchies, about the function of labor, the purpose of leisure, the character of neighborly association, and the relationships between individuals and higher political powers.²

¹ On biological metaphors generally, see Gunter Mann, ed., *Biologismus im 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1973); Sabine Maasen, Everett Mendelsohn, and Peter Weingart, eds., *Biology as Society, Society as Biology: Metaphors* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1995). An early version of this chapter was presented at a session on “Biocentrism and Modernism,” chaired by Isabel Wünsche and Oliver Botar at the conference of the College Art Association in New York in 2003.

² See Mechthild Schumpp, *Stadtbau – Utopien und Gesellschaft. Der Bedeutungswandel utopischer Stadtmodelle unter sozialen Aspekten* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1972); and Dirk Schubert, “Stadtplanung als

Although there are some compelling instances of visual alliteration among these cell diagrams and the city plans, the migration of cellular imagery into planning was not merely ornamental. Architects and planners used cellular forms to signal modernity, dynamism, an affinity with scientific progress. This occurred at the level of visual metaphor, but there was also a programmatic, anthropogenetic aspect. Cellular theory offered a way of modeling the ideal community. Cellular theory offered a complete cosmology, a unified world view connecting the smallest elements of living matter to the broadest swath of social and political action. Just as cell science was concerned with understanding and articulating the relationship of the individual unit, the single cell, to the totality of the complex organism, so the application of cellular concepts in the social sphere was concerned with the relation of the individual to the group, and more programmatically, with suggesting an ideal construct of community in which the individual would be reconciled to the demands of the group, the collective.

Society as Second Nature: Theorizing Organicism in Modernity

The idea that society is like an organism goes back to antiquity. It is among the most durable and most protean of political metaphors.³ Although the circumstances and intentions compelling invocation of the term “organic society” have changed over the centuries, there are certain core themes and articulations present at the outset which bear notice so as to better understand what was distinctive in their later applications. The

Ideologie. Eine theoriegeschichtliche-ideologiekritische Untersuchung der Stadt, des Städtebaus und Wohnungsbaus in Deutschland von ca. 1850 bis heute" (Ph.D. diss., Freie Universität Berlin, 1981).

³ Francis William Coker, *Organismic Theories of the State* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1910); Gerhard Dohrn-van Rossum, “Politischen Körper, Organismus, Organisation. Zur Geschichte natürlicher Metaphorik und Begrifflichkeit in der politischen Sprache” (Ph.D. diss., Bielefeld, 1977); Gerhard Dohrn-van Rossum and Ernst-Wolfgang Böckenforde, “Organ, Organismus, Organisation, politische Körper,” in *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexicon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache*, vol. 4, ed. ed. Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, and Reinhart Koselleck (Stuttgart: Klett, 1978), 519-622.

underlying conception of political life as an outgrowth of nature was present in Aristotle's *Politics*, with his catenation of a natural order progressing from family to village to state. During the late medieval and Renaissance period, the projection of a world unfolding according to natural law became a fundamental premise of political theory, and in the realm of philosophy, an encompassing cosmology.

In her 1994 study, *Organicism in Nineteenth-Century Architecture*, Caroline van Eck outlined three types of organicism evident in that century's design.⁴ First was "tectonic organicism, in which nature served as a model for constructional procedures," which she related to the work of Schinkel, among others; then, "religious organicism, where nature is the art of God," expressed vividly by Ruskin, via Dean and Woodward's Oxford University Museum of 1860. Thirdly, van Eck outlined a "scientific organicism...based on developments in comparative anatomy...and distinguished by use of biological concepts such as 'type'," which she related to nineteenth-century architect-theorists such as Viollet-le-Duc and Gottfried Semper.⁵

The study of settlement forms in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century points to a fourth kind of organicism in play in modernism, an organicism that transcends the bounds of the single building, the single structure, to take on the totality of the built environment. In equal part environmental determinism and triumph of evolutionary thought, this organicism asserted cellular theory as the model for social representation,

⁴ Caroline van Eck, *Organicism in Nineteenth-Century Architecture. An Inquiry into Its Theoretical and Philosophical Background* (Amsterdam: Architectura & Natura Press, 1994).

⁵ Among recent studies of the relationship between biology and architectural form, Günther Feuerstein's *Biomorphic Architecture: Human and Animal Forms in Architecture* (Stuttgart: Axel Menges, 2002) considers biomorphism as a formal, analogical and rather mystical tendency that is manifested in structure not in social program. Similarly, while George Hersey, *The Monumental Impulse: Architecture's Biological Roots* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999) is more attentive to the details of scientific discovery and natural form, biological incident in architecture is presented as ahistorical likeness.

social structure, and social function. The visual representations of cellular forms in architectural ornament served as symbolic schemata signaling modernity, dynamism, an affinity with scientific progress – for instance, in the Jugendstil architectural designs of August Endell, where the model of the single-celled organism, the flagellate algae, served as a model. But there was also a socially normative, programmatic aspect to the use of cell forms. Cell biology offered a way of modeling the ideal community. What is at issue here is something different from the practice of applying sociological or environmental research to design problems. The metaphorical possibilities of cellular biology offered a complete cosmology.

The following discussion posits, first, that the relationship between individual and collective is at the heart of every application of vitalistic cellular thought in the realm of architecture and planning. Second, contrary to tendencies to ally biologicistic thinking with reactionary, racist, and völkisch thought, the analysis suggests that it is not possible to ascribe a specific political affiliation to this intellectual formation, or at least not possible in the Wilhelmine period.⁶ By the period of the late Weimar Republic and certainly in the years of the Third Reich, the discourses of the organic community were increasingly allied with radically nationalistic and racist ambitions. But in this earlier period, the concern with the relationship of the individual to the group, and the desire to find a formal expression of reconciliation, the desire to create a social environment that would dictate the behaviors of reconciliation, was present across the political spectrum.

⁶ On the general character of racism and eugenical thinking in Germany before the First World War, see the overview by Rolf Peter Sieferle, "Rassismus, Rassenhygiene, Menschenzuchtideale," in *Handbuch zur "Völkische Bewegung" 1871-1918*, ed. Uwe Puschner, Walter Schmitz, and Justus H. Ulbricht (Munich: K.G. Sauer, 1999), 436-448; and the in-depth history and discussion in Peter Weingart, Jürgen Kroll, and Kurt Bayertz, *Rasse, Blut und Gene. Geschichte der Eugenik und Rassenhygiene in Deutschland* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1988).

The historical treatment of the relationship between the biological sciences and the social realm in the late nineteenth century has tended to be labeled as Positivism or Social Darwinism, and to be consigned to the dustbins of bad science. While the eugenical and racist conceptions of völkisch advocates and anti-Semites are certainly prominent facets of biologistic social thought in Germany from the 1890s through World War II, it is also true that the diffusion of evolutionary propositions into the realms of academic thought and popular opinion was so widespread and so diverse that it is difficult to find any social, aesthetic, or historical discourse that is not imbued with some degree of biological overlay or analogy. There were numerous progressively liberal social reformers working in late Wilhelmine Germany whose efforts were compelled by scientific findings and evolutionary theory, and through whose efforts cellular models and metaphors made their way into architecture, planning, and community reform practices.

Organicist Political and Social Philosophies

If the casting of social concepts in the language of biologistic analogies and evolutionary metaphors found such a ready audience in Germany, it was in part because the essential ideas underlying their proposals were in keeping with philosophies which had long been a part of the country's intellectual landscape. From the earliest iteration of a distinctively German political philosophy, in the writings of Samuel Pufendorf and others writing in the late seventeenth century, society was conceived not as a collective of monadic individuals, but as a collective moral body. The nation was a "supra-organism" in which individuals acted as members of their *Stand*, their estate or class. Pufendorf's notion of the nation as an organic *Gemeinschaft* became a foundational conception in German political thought. Through the refinements of later eighteenth and early nineteenth-

century thinkers such as Justus Möser and J.G. Herder, the ideal of the organic society became associated with the Teutonic and folkloric features that expressed German national identity through the late nineteenth century.⁷

The qualifier “organic,” howsoever loosely invoked, cast a ray of positive, idealist meaning on anything it touched. The idea of society as an organism taking form over a long period, shaped by the climate, landscape, and mores of a particular region and people carried with it the added imprimatur of historical authority. It also carried forward deeply moral connotations. In the guise of corporatist political theory – the conception of society as a hierarchy of relatively stable socio-economic estates or *Stände* – the exaltation of the organic community persevered well into the time when industrialization and urbanization had irrevocably eroded the old power orders. The supreme evidence of this longevity is the sustained attention accorded to the corporatist visions of writer Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl, whose multi-volume treatise *Die Naturgeschichte des Volkes als Grundlage einer deutschen Sozial-Politik* was first published in the 1850s and was still being reissued and avidly read and cited into the 1920s and beyond.⁸ It was as a synthesizer, popularizer, and polemicist that Riehl carried forward the conception of the organic society as an ideal, timeless form of political association. While “organic” refers here to a corporatist society whose political relationships are derived from long historical development, any overtones of the association of the organic with the soil are entirely

⁷ On the development of a distinctive national political philosophy in Germany, see Leonard Krieger, *The German Idea of Freedom: History of a Political Tradition, from the Reformation to 1871* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957); Hans Medick, *Naturzustand und Naturgeschichte der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft. Die Ursprung der bürgerlichen Sozialtheorie als Geschichtsphilosophie und Sozialwissenschaft bei Samuel Pufendorf, John Locke und Adam Smith* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973); and James J. Sheehan, *German Liberalism in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978).

⁸ On the editions of Riehl’s works, see Andrea Zinnecker, *Romantik, Rock und Kamisol. Volkskunde auf dem Weg ins Dritte Reich - die Riehl-Rezeption* (Münster: Waxmann, 1996), 343-349.

apposite to Riehl's thoughts on the subject. Like his forebear Justus Möser, Riehl considered the farming estate, the *Bauernstand*, as the foundation of the German nation and the principal carrier of the country's political virtue, economic sustainability, and moral fortitude. Through this idolization of the farmer, the organicist/corporatist political conception fueled the association of rural life, manual labor, moral character, and high national purpose. This constellation of virtues – as much a part of the American national myth or the French as it is of the German, and clearly the product of a larger historical moment rather than any singularly national quirk – was an ideology of the right as well as the left in late Wilhelmine Germany. It remains now to be investigated how the corporatist philosophy and the exaltation of the rural became elided with scientific conceptions of the “organism.”

Theorizing Society as an Organism: The Historical Sociological Model

One of the characteristic forms of scholarly communication in the last half of the nineteenth century was the treatise that sought to synthesize political philosophy, scientific thought, and social history into a great dramatic narration of the historical progress of human society. The type of developmental history referred to here, *Entwicklungsgeschichte* in the German terminology, had its origins in legal and economic history.⁹ Though now little read or forgotten, these great systematic histories still have value for understanding the intellectual influences of modern thinkers whose writings may have escaped the shelves of off-site library storage to flourish in citations and paperback editions. The very stuff that makes these works so impenetrable to

⁹ Georg G. Iggers. *The German Conception of History: The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present* (Middleton, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1968), 131-133.

contemporary reason – their density, their remoteness, their long-windedness – can provide insights into the set of mind of the social thinker and the social reformer of the late Wilhelmine period.¹⁰

Albert Schäffle (1831-1903) was a professor of political economy at Tübingen and Vienna, a journalist, and a politician at the regional and national levels. In his multi-volume work of 1874, *Bau und Leben des socialen Körpers*, Schäffle presented a developmental history of human society that used the terms of biological science to define cultural entities.¹¹ Intellectually and politically, Schäffle's conception of social development was shaped by the failed revolution of 1848 and the rise of Prussia as a political and military force in Europe. Republican in affinities from an early age, by the mid 1870s Schäffle was openly professing his sympathy for socialism.¹² In *Bau und Leben des socialen Körpers*, Schäffle explored what he termed the “characteristic mechanisms of the social body.” He understood the outermost envelope of that social body to be the nation. He presented a sophisticated historical sociology based on a functional analysis of the individual organism extended into the social organism. Beginning with a step-by-step biological and historical narrative that traced the development of civilization from animals through primitive man to the modern world, Schäffle arrived at a description of modern society as cells (individuals) and organs (associational entities) connected by tissues and networks of associational institutions and traditions and through symbolic communication. Organs were the associational entities of

¹⁰ For an overview and discussion of other writers not specifically related to the organic society discussion here, but applying evolutionary schema to the study of history and culture, see Albert Kelly, *The Descent of Darwin: The Popularization of Darwinism in Germany, 1860-1914* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981), 103-105.

¹¹ Albert G. F. Schäffle, *Bau und Leben des socialen Körpers*, 2 vols. (Tübingen: Laupp, 1874).

¹² See Albert Schäffle, *Aus meinen Leben*, 2 vols. (Berlin: E. Hofmann, 1905); and *Die Quintessenz der Socialismus* (Gotha: Perthes, 1875; 25th edition Gotha: Perthes, 1920).

life – cities, villages, transportation. The musculature corresponded to martial force of the state. The nervous system was analogous to communication and culture: humans were connected principally by ideas. Schäffle enumerated eight kinds of social tissue or *Binde-Gewebe*: origin, region, interests, opinions, religious faith, the associational instinct, and historical tradition (including language). In his histological analysis of the social body, Schäffle proposed a physio-psychological basis for the *Volksgeist*. National culture was an inter-cellular substance that activated a form of hidden consciousness in the cells of the body, and drew individuals together into the national community. Schäffle's theory can be classified as a progressive articulation of organicist social theory on two counts: in his determination of where the engine of the associational will resided, and in his characterization of the function of goods or capital. He placed the social will in the individual, in the individual cell, the individual consciousness. He placed goods in the connective tissue, and oriented his discussion toward the necessity of seeing economic relations as part of a collective social project.

Bau und Leben des socialen Körpers cast the course of social development as an evolutionary cadence, in which the progress of civilization, if properly channeled would eventually lead to the triumph of socialism. The political and social philosophy presented in the book exemplify the socialist's application of the organicist metaphor. Schäffle's conception of social evolution and his analysis of the associational instinct as grounded in symbolic culture were of great interest to Émile Durkheim.¹³ In defining communities as

¹³ Durkheim reviewed the first volume of *Bau und Leben des socialen Körpers* in the *Revue philosophique* 19 (1885): 84-101. On Durkheim's early interest in the ideas of Schäffle, see Lewis A. Coser, *Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in Historical and Social Context* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977), 145-148. Both Schäffle and Durkheim were admirers of the social evolutionary ideas of Alfred Espinas, a professor and teacher of Durkheim's at Bourdeaux. Espinas' *Des Sociétés animales* (1877), which sought to find the roots of human social forms in animal behavior was also influential for

entities that could transcend geographic proximity and reside in or operate through communicative forms such as literature, religion, and political affinities, Schäffle's ideas also prefigure the later work of Robert Park and the Chicago school of urban sociologists.¹⁴

Schäffle's *Bau und Leben des socialen Körpers* was also read by the young Ferdinand Tönnies as he crafted his own developmental history of human society, what would in 1887 become *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*. Although in the end, Tönnies was critical of sociological analyses that rested too strongly on natural science models and metaphors, there are many aspects of Schäffle's ideas that resonate in Tönnies' writings, including the essentially progressive, mutual aid, socialist-oriented character of the evolutionary schema, the positioning of the family as an elementary foundation of human society, the positing of a physiologically based drive, or will, towards association, and the elaboration of a deeply placed, historically developed basis of morals, ethics, and law. Schäffle's division between "organic" society and "civil" society, a difference developed along a historical continuum, foreshadowed the relationship that Tönnies would later draw between *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*.¹⁵

Kropotkin's theorization of mutual aid. Alfred Victor Espinas, *Des Sociétés animales* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1877); German translation, *Die Thierischen Gesellschaften. Eine vergleichend-psychologische Untersuchung* (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1879). For Kropotkin's appraisal, see *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* (1902; London: Freedom Press, 1993), 25.

¹⁴ Park had done his doctorate at the University of Heidelberg with Wilhelm Windelband (1848-1915), and was very much interested in the relationship of nature and human society and in using studies of animal and plant communities as conceptual models for analyzing human social forms and behaviors. See Robert E. Park, *Masse und Publikum. Eine methodische und soziologische Untersuchung* (Bern: Lack & Grunau, 1904); and Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, "The Urban Community as a Spatial Pattern and a Moral Order," in E.W. Burgess, ed., *The Urban Community* (New York: Greenwood, 1926).

¹⁵ See Ferdinand Tönnies, "Mein Verhältnis zur Soziologie," *Soziologie von Heute. Ein Symposium der Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Soziologie*, ed. Richard Thurnwald (Leipzig: C.F. Hirschfeld, 1931), 103-122.

Theorizing Society as an Organism: Ernst Haeckel and the Monists

Born in 1834 and active intellectually and politically up until the eve of his death in 1919, Ernst Haeckel held the chair in zoology and comparative anatomy at Jena from 1862 forward.¹⁶ As a zoologist, Haeckel did important, ground-breaking research into marine life physiology and organism growth and development. It was as a teacher, as an advocate of Darwin's evolutionary theories, and as a prolific writer and lecturer in the field of popular science, that Haeckel made his mark on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Today in the United States, Haeckel is perhaps best known as originator of the biogenetic postulate, "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny."¹⁷ Haeckel's theory held that the biological development of the individual embryo re-enacted the evolutionary development of the lower animal orders. His work on the development of embryos and early stages of cell division and specialization in complex organisms yielded explanatory drawings and diagrams that made the heretofore hidden character of the origins of life readily comprehensible to understanding without obscuring the sense of beauty and mystery that compelled scientific research (figure 62).

Haeckel's most decisive influence in the social realm of late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Germany came through the philosophy of "Monism," a belief in the oneness of all life and matter in a unified cosmos, and a form of secularized religion by which the postulates of evolutionary Darwinism were applied to all aspects of human life.

A measure of the reach and success of Haeckel's project can be gauged by the fact that

¹⁶ Wilhelm Bölsche, *Ernst Haeckel. Ein Lebensbild* (Dresden: Reissner, 1900); Erna Aescht, et al., *Welträtsel und Lebenswunder. Ernst Haeckel: Werk, Wirkung und Folgen* (Linz: Oberösterreich Landesmuseum, 1998).

¹⁷ Ernst Haeckel, *Anthropogenie oder Entwicklungsgeschichte des Menschen. Gemeinverständliche wissenschaftliche Vorträge der die Grundzüge der menschlichen Keimes- und Stammes-Geschichte* (1874; Leipzig: Wilhelm, Engelmann, 1877).

the most substantial of his treatises on Monism, *Die Welträtsel* (The riddles of the universe) of 1899 sold over 100,000 copies in the first year of its publication, and over 300,000 before the First World War.¹⁸ In 1906 Haeckel's followers and admirers organized the Monist League, an association of scientists, doctors, writers, social reformers, and government officials, which became one of the most pervasive conduits for the application of biological theory in the social sphere. Within a few years, the Monist League had over 6,000 members. Through a monthly journal, *Der Monismus*, and numerous auxiliary publications and pamphlet series, Monism developed into a widespread intellectual and social movement.¹⁹ Anti-clerical, mystical, and with a tendency toward the ecstatic celebration of progress and scientific advancement, Monism was nationalistic, often chauvinistic, and frequently imperialistic. The Monistic ethos held that evolutionary theory should be the basis for solving social problems, devising educational policy, and conducting political life. Haeckel conceived of all matter as infused with life force and the will-to-form. The crystalline structures in rocks no less than the cells of diatomaceous creatures and single-celled algae, as well as complex multi-cellular organisms, shared fundamental drives toward survival and procreation. In projecting his analysis of cellular behavior on to human society, Haeckel held that biological imperatives for survival dictated that the individual was pre-eminently responsible to the community, to the collective organism.²⁰ The cellular individual came

¹⁸ Ernst Haeckel, *Die Welträtsel. Gemeinverständliche Studien über Monistische Philosophie* (1899; Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner, 1905); on circulation statistics, see Alfred Kelly, *The Descent of Darwin*, 25

¹⁹ Paul Ziche, ed., *Monismus um 1900. Wissenschaftskultur und Weltanschauung. Ernst-Haeckelhaus-Studien*, vol. 4 (Berlin: Verlag für Wissenschaft und Bildung, 2001); and Daniel Gasman, *The Scientific Origins of National Socialism: Social Darwinism in Ernst Haeckel and the German Monist League* (New York: American Elsevier, 1971).

²⁰ These ideas were developed most fully with regard to the social organism in the 1899 *Die Welträtsel*, but were part of Haeckel's scientific work and social philosophy much earlier, albeit as illustrative examples and metaphorical concepts, see Ernst Haeckel, *Ueber Arbeitsteilung in Natur- und Menschenleben*.

into being, the cell existed, only for the survival and advancement of the whole organism. The division of labor in society, as in the organism, was essential. The health, success, and longevity of the organism – that is, of society, the community, the nation – depended on every constituent cell operating at its utmost capacity. Laboring toward the larger organism's survival was the foundation of individual happiness and the operational ethos of human society. Haeckel's Monism, with its overtones of universal consciousness, rose to meet the yearning for a sense of home and belonging in the modern soul that had been set adrift in the anomie of *Gesellschaft*. The use of organic metaphor here telegraphed the possibility of a greater authenticity, a return to a kind of *Gemeinschaft*. It dovetailed with the era's popular notions of the *Volksgeist* and what was seen as a typically, even uniquely German orientation toward the social collective.

Should this gloss of Haeckel's ideas suggest that Haeckel was a harsh and unfeeling, Spencerian intellect, should it seem to be reinforcing received opinions that Haeckel's place in history is framed on one side as propagator of Social Darwinism and on the other as progenitor of National Socialism, it is necessary to correct the perception by bringing to the fore two other measures of his influence in the early twentieth century: his creation of compelling aesthetic models of nature which influenced artists and designers who were seeking forms that could express a feeling of progressive, future-oriented modernity, and the implications of his spirit-infused cellular universe for progressive social theories based in a cooperative rather than competitive ethos.

Vortrag, gehalten im Saale des Berliner Handwerker-Vereins am 17. Dezember 1868. Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge, herausgegeben von Rudolf Virchow und Fr. v. Holtzendorff, vol. 4, no. 73-96 (Berlin: C.G. Lüderitz, 1869).

Haeckel himself was an artist of considerable talent. He painted detailed, often fanciful landscapes on his travels. Even his laboratory drawings and field research sketches have a quality that far surpasses the customary notebook illustrations of scientists. Haeckel prepared the working drawings for the illustrations of his popular lithographic portfolios, *Kunstformen der Natur*, originally published between 1899 and 1904. The richly colored illustrations of single-celled organisms and cellular colonies exercised a powerful fascination on turn-of-the-century artists and designers.²¹ While the illustrations of *Kunstformen der Natur* are scientific and realistic in the sense that they more or less accurately portray the organisms named, the overwhelming impressions conveyed by the volumes is aesthetic and philosophical. Haeckel used color and symmetry to unify the composition of each plate – color and symmetry that might bear only a passing resemblance to the appearance of the organisms in nature. The emphasis on geometric symmetry to establish the underlying structure of the cellular organisms and to create a sense of reason, order, and intentionality in the natural forms created a visual corollary for the Monist conception of the spirit-infused universe of cellular organisms motivated by a primal need to bond with their own kind (figure 63). The symmetrically ordered cellular forms became a pattern of sorts, a visual model that went beyond metaphor or analogy to offer a prescription for social institutions.²²

²¹ Christophe Kockerbeck, *Ernst Haeckels Kunstformen der Natur und ihr Einfluss auf die deutsche bildende Kunst der Jahrhundertwende* (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1986); Erika Krause, “L’Influence de Ernst Haeckel sur l’art nouveau,” in *L’Âme du corps. Arts et sciences 1793-1993*, ed. Jean Clair (Paris: Grand Palais, 1993), 342-350; Erna Aescht et al., *Welträtsel und Lebenswunde. Ernst Haeckel: Werk, Wirkung und Folgen* (Linz: Oberösterreich Landesmuseum, 1998); and George Hersey, *The Monumental Impulse: Architecture’s Biological Roots* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999).

²² The slender volume of Haeckel’s later years, *Kristallseelen*, extended the arguments of spiritual matter beyond the kingdoms of plants and animals and into the realm of seemingly inanimate minerals. See *Kristallseelen. Studien über das anorganische Leben* (Leipzig: Alfred Kröner, 1917). Haeckel argued that rocks, too, were infused with a will to form. His overt reliance on analogies of form and his obscure and lyrical analysis of the purity of crystalline structures recall the rapturous crystalline metaphors of poet Paul

Oscar Hertwig and the Theory of the Zellenstaat

Against the survival of the fittest doctrine of the Social Darwinists can be set a competing social philosophy derived from late nineteenth-century evolutionary concepts, the doctrine of mutual aid. Among the followers of Haeckel, one biologist broke away from the prescriptions of Social Darwinism and offered a scholarly analysis of the social body along mutual aid lines: Oscar Hertwig. As a student of Haeckel, Hertwig did important research into embryology and the mechanisms and structures of fertilization and reproduction (figure 64). In a series of publications from 1899 to his death in 1922, Hertwig offered one of the most complete philosophies of the relationship of cellular biology to political life of the period.²³ Hertwig was by no means as popular as Haeckel. His writings were directed toward academic and professional readers rather than popular audiences. Hertwig extended the social and political metaphors latent in the notion of the *Zellenstaat*, the cell state, a concept in wide use among biologists at the turn of the century.²⁴ The theory of the cell state held that an organism was like a polity in that it was composed of individual cells organized in a coordinated, functional hierarchy; and conversely, that the nation-state was like an organism, an aggregation of individual cell units. It followed that the organism would outlive the single constituent cell, just as the

Scheerbart, who moved in the Monist circles of literary figures and social reformers in Berlin and its southeasterly suburb, Friedrichshagen, where Wilhelm Bölsche, one of Haeckel's most important followers and publicists was based. Scheerbart was also a friend of architect Bruno Taut, who invoked crystalline cellular forms in his utopian community plans of 1919-1920.

²³ Paul Julian Weindling, *Darwinism and Social Darwinism in Imperial Germany: The Contribution of the Cell Biologist Oscar Hertwig (1849-1922)* (Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer, 1991).

²⁴ Hertwig offered an early articulation of the cell-state idea as it pertained to the human organism in "Der Mensch als Zellenstaat und die Gesetze des Zellenlebens," as a lecture at the Verein für Volkshygiene in Berlin, *Blätter für Volksgesundheitspflege* 4 (1904): 1-5, 17-22; and extended these ideas into a full-fledged theory of social and political life in his *Der Staat als Organismus Gedanken zur Entwicklung der Menschheit* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1922). See also Paul Weindling, "Theories of the Cell State in Imperial Germany," in Charles Webster, ed., *Biology, Medicine and Society 1840-1940* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 99-155.

nation would outlive the individual. The survival of the organism, of the state, was the highest mandate of biological evolution. This sounds a lot like mechanistic, Social Darwinist philosophy. But Hertwig created his theory as a direct critique of Social Darwinism. Like Kropotkin, Landauer, and others, Hertwig held that the cooperative instinct was the driving force of evolutionary progress. Over the course of history, human society had evolved into a *Gemeinschaft* with moral laws, emotional bonds, and social institutions that sustained cooperation and mitigated the baser instinctual drives (although it is interesting to note that even the proto-theorist of Social Darwinism, Herbert Spencer, believed that human society had only attained its present levels of complexity because of its capacity for cooperation).²⁵ Societies could not surrender to the raw forces of nature, but needed rather to do whatever was possible to foster cooperative instincts and strengthen the social bonds. And, in a stroke that seems to translate Hegel's World Spirit to the biological sphere, Hertwig contended that the nation state was the culmination of evolutionary forces moving through history, ineluctably higher, ever higher, pointing toward ethical socialism as the ultimate stage of evolutionary progress. The modern nation-cell-state was a complex organism, functioning through a exalted level of division of labor and interdependence of classes. Intellectuals functioned like the higher nervous system, with ganglion clusters of university professors as driving *Überzellen*. Because every individual, every cell, had its function in the organism of the state, Hertwig was opposed to eugenical programs designed to weed out the proletariat. He favored everything that might improve the overall conditions of the *Gemeinschaft*-organism, and particularly of the large number of undifferentiated cells, the workers. Like many another

²⁵ Oscar Hertwig, *Das Werden der Organismen. Zur Widerlegung von Darwins Zufällstheorie durch das Gesetz in der Entwicklung* (1916; 3rd ed, Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1922).

reformer in the late Wilhelmine period, Hertwig called for improved worker healthcare, education, and opportunities for constructive leisure in the form of museums, libraries, and community associations.

Wilhelm Bölsche: Between Wilhelmine Science and Cultural Reform

The lakeside village of Friedrichshagen, southeast of Berlin, was a great center of poetical mysticism and social reform in turn of the century Berlin. The crossroads and meeting point for many of the era's literary figures and reformers, including Gustav Landauer, Martin Buber, Gerhard Hauptmann, Erich Mühsam, Fritz Mauthner, and Richard Dehmel, Friedrichshagen becomes quite literally the hub in time and space that enables lines of acquaintance and influence to be drawn between such diverse intellectual and political strands as the revival of interest in German Romanticism, the German Garden City Movement, anarchism, Monism, and nativist tendencies of Lebensreform.²⁶

From the 1880s to 1918, the novelist and critic Wilhelm Bölsche was a resident of Friedrichshagen.²⁷ One of the most popular and influential science writers of the pre-World War I period, Bölsche was biographer of Haeckel and Darwin, and an avid popularizer of monistic ideas. Through his Friedrichshagen connections, Bölsche was an important link between the realm of biological thought and the world of architecture and planning in Wilhelmine Germany. Bölsche's neighbors and confrères at Friedrichshagen

²⁶ See Rolf Kauffeldt and Gertrude Cepl-Kaufmann, eds., *Berlin-Friedrichshagen. Literaturhauptstadt um die Jahrhundertwende. Der Friedrichshagener Dichterkreis* (Munich: Boer, 1994); and Herbert Scherer, *Bürgerlich-oppositionelle Literaten und sozialdemokratische Arbeiterbewegung nach 1890. Die Friedrichshagener und ihr Einfluß auf die sozialdemokratische Kulturpolitik* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1981).

²⁷ On Bölsche's life and work, see Wolfram Hamacher, *Wissenschaft, Literatur und Sinnfindung im 19. Jahrhundert. Studien zum Wilhelm Bölsche* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1993); Rolf Lang, *Wilhelm Bölsche und Friedrichshagen: Auf dem "Mußweg der Liebhaberei"* (Frankfurt a. d. Oder: Kleist-Gedenk- und Forschungsstätte, 1992); and Rudolf Magnus, *Wilhelm Bölsche. Ein biographisch-kritischer Beitrag zur modernen Weltanschauung* (Berlin: Elwin Staude, 1909).

included Bernhard and Hans Kampffmeyer and Heinrich and Julius Hart, founders of the German Garden City movement, as well as, for a while, the social anarchist, Gustav Landauer, who introduced the writings and ideas of Peter Kropotkin to Germany via translation and commentaries. In keeping with the character of the Friedrichshagen milieu, Bölsche's work is shot through with the nature-oriented Lebensreform ideals of turn-of-the-century Germany. A romantic, poetical sensibility of self- and social-improvement, Lebensreform stressed man's place in nature, man's oneness with nature. Bölsche's works, *Vom Bazillus zum Affenmenschen: Naturwissenschaftlichen Plaudereien* (From bacteria to apemen: Natural science chats) and *Auf dem Menschenstern* (On the human star), popularized the ideas of Haeckel and helped shape the common-sense reception of evolutionary theory and biological concepts as allegorical models for human moral behavior.²⁸ His *Liebesleben in der Natur* (Love life in nature) of 1898, described the many varieties of erotic attraction in the natural world, contending that even bacteria had a love life of sorts, shaped by desire and elective affinities. In his concentration on the erotic instincts compelling procreation, Bölsche offered an influential version of Monism and a popular articulation of the mutual aid doctrine. Bölsche's contention that love really did make the world go round was based on the mutual aid idea that cooperation, not competition, was the operative instinct shaping evolutionary progress. Bölsche adopted the Haeckel-Monist conception that every living cell was imbued with spiritual force and will. But in following a mutual aid-oriented line of thought, Bölsche endowed those cells with a drive for the need with communion with

²⁸ Wilhelm Bölsche, *Vom Bazillus zum Affenmenschen: Naturwissenschaftliche Plaudereien* (Jena: Diederichs, 1900; *Auf dem Menschenstern* (Dresden: C. Reißner, 1909). Bölsche published a popular biography of Haeckel that went through numerous editions, see *Ernst Haeckel: Ein Lebensbild* (Leipzig: Seemann, 1900). Bölsche's ongoing interest drawing morals from animal behavior developed into a more direct political parable in his *Der Termitenstaat: Schilderung eines geheimnisvollen Volkes* (Stuttgart: Franckh, 1931).

others – a will toward Gemeinschaft. Such a deeply based, biologically founded ethos of cooperation as a foundation of human society had great attractions for socialist architects, planners, and reformers.

Tracing the Connections between Politics and Biologistic Thought

In the end, Schäffle's or Haeckel's or Bölsche's or Hertwig's intricate theories about the social organism sound very much like the program of many another progressive reformer at the turn of the century. The range of political sympathies among the scientist-social theorists calls to mind the famous passage in a letter from Marx to Engels, in which the former remarked that it was curious that Darwin seemed to have found the entire workings of bourgeois society within the animal kingdom.²⁹ Scientists acting as social theorists looking for the One Great Truth in the Mirror of Nature were liable to find their own political affinities reflected there, depending on how one characterized the interaction of the individual cell units. A scientist like Hertwig, who believed that organisms and societies advanced through cooperation, was inclined to believe that a republic or socialist state was the best of all worlds. A scientist like Haeckel, who saw hierarchical powers at work in the organism and state, was inclined to find his political beliefs confirmed in nature: The division of power in the cell paralleled the division of power in society, class society was itself a product of evolutionary development, hereditary monarchy and a fixed aristocracy were facts of nature.

²⁹ "It is noteworthy how Darwin rediscovers his entire English society among the animals and plants, with its division of labor, competition, the opening up of new markets, inventions, and the Malthusian struggle for existence... It is reminiscent of Hegel's Phenomenology, in which bourgeois society is portrayed as the animal kingdom. In Darwin, the animal kingdom becomes bourgeois society." (18 June 1862), *Karl Marx-Friedrich Engels. Historisch-kritische Gesamtausgabe*, vol 3, part 2, 77-78.

Invocation of the ideal of the organic society tended to reinforce the idea that existing hierarchies were natural, and even inevitable, what Richard Peet has called social philosophy as legitimation theory.³⁰ The background evolutionary schema, however, allowed room to reason that present-day political and economic arrangements could develop further, thus leaving plenty of room for the possibility of socialism as a higher form of human social progress. For some, that was the stuff of a happy future. For partisans of monarchy and the status quo, however, the portent of socialism was a threat, proof enough indeed of the deep truth of evolutionary theory, but proof rather that evolution could lead to degeneration as well as progress. In either instance, conservative or socialist, partisan of stability and incremental development, or partisan of dramatic political change, Darwinism was in play. On both sides of the political divide, the Darwinist fundament expressed itself in the realms of planning and architecture as a belief that environment was a factor in evolution. To shape the future in accord with one's theory of social evolution, it was necessary to engineer the proper environment.³¹

³⁰ Richard Peet, "The Social Origins of Environmental Determinism," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 75, no. 3 (1985), 309-333.

³¹ There were a number of other biologically based theories of community circulating in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which are not under discussion here because, while they were influential in their own ways and arguably more influential in certain more conservatively oriented political circles than some of the theories discussed here, they were not founded on cellular science. The journalist and physical anthropologist Otto Ammon (1842-1916) employed Darwinian ideas to argue against Socialism as in any sense a "natural" social evolution, and presenting the idea that equality and economic leveling would lead to physical and social degeneration. Ammon's ideas were based in a strongly Christian ethic of charitable social welfare. He rejected the Spencerian survival of the fittest ethos that would deny medical or economic interventions to mediate the natural fates of the disadvantaged or disabled. But he also outlined a rigid framework of class identities that assigned responsibility for the advancement of civilization to the aristocracy, while farmers sustained the physical and moral vitality of the German race. Ammon's social theories are developed in his *Der Darwinismus gegen die Sozialdemokratie. Anthropologische Plaudieren* (Hamburg: Verlagsanstalt und Druckerei AG, 1891); *Die Bedeutung des Bauernstandes für den Staat und die Gesellschaft* (Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1894; 2nd ed. 1906); and *Die Gesellschaftsordnung und ihre natürlichen Grundlagen. Entwurf einer Sozial-Anthropologie zum Gebrauch für Gebildeten, die sich mit sozialen Fragen befassen* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1895), which had a second edition in 1896 and a third in 1900 and which was translated into French in 1900 as well. On Ammon generally, see Hilke Lichtsinn, *Otto Ammon und die Sozialanthropologie* (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter

Biologistic Thinking and Settlement Forms in Germany

Biologistic theories of social and political life found their ways into the fields of architecture and planning in this period of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century

Lang, 1987); on Ammon in the broader context of German anthropology, see Benoit Massin, "From Virchow to Fischer: Physical Anthropology and 'Modern Race Theories' in Wilhelmine Germany," in *Volkgeist as Method and Ethic: Essays on Boasian Ethnography and the German Anthropological Tradition*, ed. George W. Stocking, Jr. (Madison: University Wisconsin Press), 93-94, 132-33.

Ernst Haeckel's colleague in scientific research and Monism, the Swiss entomologist August Forel (1848-1931), also penned an influential body of social theory about the essentially cooperative character of human society and its destiny in socialism and globally scaled mutual aid association. Forel's specialty was the social insects, and more specifically ants, whose complex, well-coordinated societies Forel saw as a potential model for humankind, following a tradition in observations of the social insects that went back to classical times. Active in many social and political reforms of the era, Forel supported the temperance movement, the Ethical Culture Society, regulation of prostitution, women's rights, sterilization of criminals, the retarded, and insane, and the diverse pacifist movements related to calls for the establishment of a League of Nations. Forel began to draw comparisons between ant colony behaviors and human society from his earliest publications, see his "Expériences et observations de mœurs," in *Les Fourmis de la Suisse. Ouvrage couronné par la Société Helvétique des Sciences Naturelles*, vol. 26 (Zurich: Zürcher und Furrer, 1874), 242-449. This comparative approach culminated in the multi-volume opus of his later career, particularly in the fifth and final book, *Mœurs spécialisées. Epilogue: Les Fourmis, les Termites et l'Homme of his Le Monde social des fourmis, compare à celui de l'homme* (Geneva: Librairie Kundig, 1921-1923). Forel's League of Nations proposal is presented in *Les Etats-Unis de la Terre. Un programme praticable d'entente pacifique universelle et stable entre les peuples* (Lausanne: E. Peytrequin, 1914), an earlier articulation of which had been published in June 1914 in the Hamburg-based *Der allgemeine Beobachter*, and which was translated into German as *Die Vereinigten Staaten der Erde* (Lausanne: Bund für Organisierung menschlichen Fortschritts, 1914-1915). On Forel's relationship to Haeckel and Monism, see Heiko Weber, "Der Monismus als Theorie einer einheitlichen Weltanschauung am Beispiel der Positionen von Ernst Haeckel und August Forel," in *Monismus um 1900*, ed. Paul Ziche. On Forel's work and life generally, see Rolf Meier, *August Forel, 1848-1931. Arzt, Naturforscher, Sozialreformer* (Bern: Universität Bern, 1986). On the long tradition of drawing moral and social lessons from observations of hymenoptera, see Juan Antonio Ramírez, *The Beehive Metaphor: From Gaudí to Corbusier* (London: Reaktion Books, 2000).

Finally, not discussed at length here, again because while the impact on planning was considerable, the ideas were not closely based on cellular conceptions of society, are the forces of reforming thought which today are gathered under the heading of Social Darwinism. Of interest particularly because of their use of biologically based developmental histories of human society are the ten winning essays of a competition sponsored in 1900 by the industrialist Alfred Krupp, and chosen by a committee of which Ernst Haeckel was a leading member, published in the series *Natur und Staat. Beiträge zur naturwissenschaftlichen Gesellschaftslehre*. The original call for entries is included in Heinrich Ernst Ziegler, *Einleitung zu dem Sammelwerke Natur und Staat* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1903). The premiated entries include developmental historical approaches such as vol. 5, Curt Michaelis, *Prinzipien der natürlichen und sozialen Entwicklungslehre des Menschen. Anthropologisch-ethnologische Studien* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1904); and vol. 8, Alfred Methner, *Organismen und Staaten. Eine Untersuchung über die biologische Grundlagen des Gesellschaftslebens und Kulturlebens* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1906).

On Social Darwinism generally, see Peter Dickens, *Social Darwinism: Linking Evolutionary Thought to Social Theory* (Buckingham, England: Open University Press, 2000); Mike Hawkins, *Social Darwinism in European and American Thought, 1860-1945: Nature as Model and Nature as Threat* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Alfred Kelly, *The Descent of Darwin: The Popularization of Darwinism in Germany, 1860-1914* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981); and Hans-Joachim Koch, *Der Sozialdarwinismus. Seine Genese und sein Einfluß auf das imperialistische Denken* (Munich: Beck, 1973).

on four levels. First, there were a number of non-professional social reformers who proposed new conceptions for ideal town plans inspired by the new spirit and authority of biological science. The garden city proposals of German social reformer and journalist Theodor Fritsch and the English social reformer Ebenezer Howard, published 1896 and 1898 respectively, were reactions to the accumulating and irrefutable evidence correlating sanitation and mortality in Europe's burgeoning industrial metropolises. Both proposed a resettlement of populations into middle-sized towns in the countryside. Both based their conception of community form and purpose on evolutionary theories, more Lamarckian than Darwinian, but in any case strongly adhering to a belief that the built environment could shape social behavior and over time alter the course of human development.

The second level includes planners who embraced the discrete, decentralized small-town settlement paradigm established by the Garden City movement in Germany, and who also embraced the period's reigning conceptions about environment, social behavior, and historical development, but who developed a planning typology that grafted the traditional layout of the agricultural village on to a self-conscious invocation of cellular imagery and scientific theories of the workers' community as a self-sustaining organism. Two examples of this planning typology are discussed below: the workers' settlement of Hohe Lache near Dessau, designed by Theodor Overhoff and Edith Schulze in 1919, and the cooperative moshav of Nahalal, designed by the German-born and trained architect Richard Kauffmann and built in Palestine in 1922.

The third level at which biologicistic ideas influenced modern settlement form includes those instances of early high modernist planning, developed as purely utopian ideas, and

in that form meant to bring visual expression to the most optimistic, forward-looking conception of community life, these include the utopian settlement conceptions of 1919-1920 of Bruno Taut and Walter Gropius. These settlement proposals were tied to conceptions of social theory that crystallized in sharpest relief the issues that are inherent in any theory of political life but which find such ready resonance in the idea of the society as organism – the relationship of the one to the many, the part to the whole, the salutary development and preservation of the whole in perpetuity – and which so acutely pointed to the hopes and conflicts at issue as Germans sought to envision a new society at the dawn of the Weimar Republic. Strongly socialist and egalitarian in origin, overtly cellular in visual expression, Taut's and Gropius' utopian plans offered a vision of modern community in which for the first time the cellular idea was made operational and visually legible.

The fourth level of penetration of cellular imagery and social theory into the realms of architecture and planning takes this study beyond the temporal confines of the late Wilhelmine period and shows the biologicistic idea in full ascendance during the territorial expansion of the Third Reich. From the 1930s forward, the cellular conception of community developed at two scales. It was subtly present in the analysis of regional growth patterns called Central Place Theory, developed by geographer Walter Christaller in the 1930s and employed as a planning tool in the Third Reich by the Commissioner of Settlements, architect Gottfried Feder, particularly in the planning of regions in annexed areas to the east, in Poland, Sudetenland, and Silesia, which were perceived as *tabula rasa* for the planning of rational networks of new towns. Another cellular conception of community developed on the macrocosmic level, as the late Wilhelmine rhetoric of the

village as organism was absorbed into National Socialist theories of the urban neighborhood as a distinctly cellular social unit within the larger urban organism, and even further into the development of larger conceptions of regional systems comprising nodes and networks of communities, transportation, and communications.

Biology and the Garden City

Discussions of social progress and traditionalist or picturesque styles in the early garden cities have tended to overshadow analysis of the biological conceptions that propelled the movement as a whole.³² The biology at issue in the theoretical and practical formation of the early garden city was based as much in the evolutionary ideas of Galton and Spencer as of Darwin. This is to say it tended toward Social Darwinism, a diffuse conception that does not map cleanly on to the political spectrum.³³

The garden city, along with its corollary forms the garden suburb, the garden industrial settlement, was arguably the most influential model to emerge in this period for town planning as a means of social and cultural reform new town at the time. The call for the orderly resettlement of urban populations into new economically and culturally self-sufficient, small-town scaled settlements in the countryside was perceived by many as a distinctively new, distinctively modern solution to the problem of the proper form of the modern community. There are at hand three features of the garden city conception

³² An exception to this is the essay by Wolfgang Voigt, originally presented at a colloquium in Delft in 1986, "Die Gartenstadt als eugenisches Utopia," and published in *Im Grünen wohnen – im Blauen planen. Ein Lesebuch zur Gartenstadt mit Beiträgen und Zeitdokumenten*, ed. Franziska Bollerey, Gerhard Fehl, and Kristiana Hartmann (Hamburg: Christians, 1990), 301-314. The essay was translated as Wolfgang Voigt, "The Garden City as Eugenic Utopia," in *Planning Perspectives* 4 (1989): 295-312.

³³ For an overview of the scientification of social thought in Germany, see Peter Weingart, "Biology as Social Theory: The Bifurcation of Social Biology and Sociology in Germany, circa 1900," in *Modernist Impulses in the Human Sciences, 1970-1930*, ed. Dorothy Ross (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 255-271.

characteristic to its time of origin and first public reception. First, the garden city responded to specific conditions of capital in the late nineteenth century, notably land speculation and industrialization, with all the attendant complications of rapid urban growth, poor housing stock, and unwholesome, congested living conditions. Second, it promoted a conception of nature, of the natural landscape, as a necessary theater for the realization of self through physical action and ethical reflection. And third, it mapped science on to the social realm, furthering a larger, generational awareness of the environment as a factor in social behavior and social control. The belief in the improvability, the perfectibility, of the social body draws on eugenical concepts of inheritance and evolution that were omnipresent at the time. The corollary to faith in progress was the fear of degeneration – decline of morality, of class boundaries, of the nation. Historians of German planning have tracked the parallels and intersections between garden city ideas and eugenics from the early 20th century through the Third Reich.³⁴

The following discussion looks at two, nearly contemporaneous visions for the garden city, that of the German journalist, Theodor Fritsch, who published his treatise, *Die Stadt der Zukunft*, in 1896, and that of the English court reporter and part-time inventor Ebenezer Howard who published *To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* in 1898.³⁵

Howard is today widely lauded as a great humanist. One hundred years after its

³⁴ See especially Wolfgang Voigt, "The Garden City as Eugenic Utopia;" Peter Propping and Heinz Schott, eds., *Wissenschaft auf Abwegen. Biologismus – Rassenhygiene – Eugenik* (Bonn: Bouvier, 1992); and Paul Weindling, *Health, Race, and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism, 1870-1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

³⁵ Theodor Fritsch, *Die Stadt der Zukunft* (Leipzig: Verlag von Theodor Fritsch, 1896); Ebenezer Howard, *To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* (London: Swann Sonnenschein, 1898); and *Garden Cities of To-Morrow, being the Second Edition of To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* (London: Swann Sonnenschein, 1902).

appearance, his book remains in print, and writers and planners interested in livable community form continue to mine its pages for inspiration. Fritsch is forgotten to all but a handful of historical specialists.³⁶ The joining of their planning conceptions under a single umbrella, the garden city, is a bit misleading. There were similarities in conception, and in their points of origin. Both Howard and Fritsch were social reformers untrained in the fields of architecture and planning. Both were responding to what they

³⁶ There has been a persistent and understated national competition as to who could rightfully lay first claim to the invention of the garden city: Germany with Theodor Fritsch, or England with Ebenezer Howard. The idea that the garden city was “invented” is a conceit that runs through the histories of the movement. Lewis Mumford in his introductory essay to the 1946 edition of Ebenezer Howard’s *Garden Cities of To-morrow* lumps together the garden city and the airplane as the great inventions of the twentieth century, see “The Garden City Idea and Modern Planning,” in *Ebenezer Howard: Garden Cities of To-morrow*, ed. F.J. Osborn (London: Faber and Faber, 1946), 29. Howard himself considered the garden city an instrument of modernization on a par with the typewriter and the railroad. Howard’s confidence in claiming innovation was based in what he knew to be a novel method of financing the new towns: the formation of share-holder corporations whereby any appreciation in land-value would redound to the benefit of the community rather than migrating into private wealth.

The debate about precedence for inventing the garden city, such as it is, was more of a concern for German advocates in the early years of the movement and is, from the perspective of historical analysis, moot, because Fritsch’s 1896 publication was not widely circulated or reviewed. Hans Kampffmeyer, in his early accounts of the history of the Garden City movement, perceptively noted, “Wie wir sahen, ist die Gartenstadtbewegung die natürliche Reaktion gegen die Mißstände in der städtischen Entwicklung, die der wirtschaftliche Aufschwung des vergangenen Jahrhunderts mit sich brachte. Es wird uns deshalb nicht wundernehmen, wenn die gleichen Leiden in verschiedenen Menschen nahezu gleichzeitig den Gedanken an das gleiche Heilmittel entstehen ließen” (As we saw, the Garden City movement is a natural reaction against the failing state of urban development created by the economic conditions of the past century. It will be no wonder then if the same suffering in different people should nearly simultaneously give rise to ideas about exactly the same antidote), Hans Kampffmeyer, *Die Gartenstadtbewegung* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1909). If Kampffmeyer sets out one tendency in the histories, that of Gustav Simons (1861-1914) offers the other. Simons follows the sentiments expressed by Fritsch himself in his second edition of *Die Stadt der Zukunft*, conspicuously now subtitled *Gartenstadt*. Fritsch claims precedence and notes, “Es scheint beinahe eine unvermeidliche Notwendigkeit zu sein, dass deutsche Ideen erst den Umweg über das Ausland nehmen müssen, ehe sie in ihrer Heimat auf Beachtung zählen können,” *Die Stadt der Zukunft: Gartenstadt* (Leipzig: Hammer Verlag, 1912). A proponent of vegetarianism, inventor of “Simonsbrot,” a whole-grain bread that promised psychological as well as physiological benefits, and leader of the utopian agricultural settlement Eden bei Oranienburg north of Berlin, Simons offered a more partisan and chauvinistic reading of the history, naming both Fritsch and Howard “spiritual fathers of the Garden City Movement.” Simons considered the lack of enthusiasm that originally attended Fritsch’s idea as proof that no man is a prophet in his own land, and lambasted the Germans for believing that a good idea was not a good idea unless it was a foreign idea. Gustav Simons, *Die Deutsche Gartenstadt. Ihr Wesen und ihre heutigen Typen* (Wittenberg: Ziemsen Verlag, 1912), 3-5. On Simons and Eden, see Judith Baumgartner, *Ernährungsreform. Antwort auf Industrialisierung und Ernährungswandel. Ernährungsreform als Teil der Lebensreformbewegung am Beispiel der Siedlung und des Unternehmens Eden seit 1893* (Frankfurt a.M.: Lang, 1992). For a brief history of Eden and the text of the original prospectus for settlers, which persisted as a colony into the 1930s, see Ulrich Linse, ed., *Zurück O Mensch zur Mutter Erde. Landkommunen in Deutschland 1890-1933* (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1983), 37-61.

perceived as a social crisis – the concentration of populations in the cities was precipitating the decline of health, morals, and happiness. Both were interested in the larger question of the vitality of the people as the basis for a capable and strong nation. They were interested in improving the physical and cultural stock of the nation – they were interested in eugenics, in steady, mindful, and guided incremental change. Neither garden city idea was conceived as a crucible for revolution. They were interested in change that promoted political stability. Both Howard and Fritsch saw the solution to social problems in the dispersal of urban populations into medium-sized new towns in open landscapes. There were also typological similarities in their planning solutions. Both Howard and Fritsch devised circular planning conceptions that concentrated public areas as a central nucleus within the town plan and then arranged other functions, such as residential areas, manufacturing, and transportation, in concentric, highly zoned areas radiating out from the core. There were significant differences as well, in their conceptions of class relations, property ownership, and the proper ends of social reform. Nevertheless, the joining of Howard and Fritsch, and especially, the resurrection of Fritsch, who has had little to no influence on the actual forms and practices of town planning, reveals underlying intentions of biologicistic planning models developed in the late nineteenth century.

Theodor Fritsch and the City of the Future

A native of Saxony, Theodor Fritsch (1852-1933) was trained as an engineer and machinist.³⁷ In 1879 he opened a business to promote new kinds of mill machinery, and

³⁷ On Fritsch's publishing career, see Justus H. Ulbricht, "Das völkischen Verlagswesen im deutschen Kaiserreich," in *Handbuch zur "Völkischen Bewegung" 1871-1918*, ed. Uwe Puschner, Walter Schmitz, and

in 1880 began publishing the *Kleine Mühlen-Journal*, a periodical that served both as a newsletter for small milling firms and as a platform for Fritsch's anti-Semitic, anti-tax, and anti-land speculation polemics. In 1882 Fritsch moved to Leipzig, where he established an eponymous publishing firm. The miller's journal was renamed *Deutscher Müller*. In the mid 1880s, Fritsch also began issuing a steady stream of anti-Semitic pamphlets, the *Antisemitische Correspondenz*, culminating in the 1887 publication of his *Antisemiten-Katechismus*.³⁸ In 1902 he began publishing the newspaper, *Der Hammer*, subtitled at various stages *Blätter für deutschen Sinn* (Pages for German consciousness) and *Parteilose Zeitschrift für nationales Leben* (Independent newspaper for national life). In 1912 Fritsch founded the anti-Semitic Reichshammerbund, which was affiliated with the völkisch Germanen-Orden society and the Thule-Gesellschaft. From 1914 onward he was a member of the Mittelstandspartei.³⁹

While accusations of anti-modernism and *Großstadfeindlichkeit* are often, and often unfairly, cast on any writer from the late Wilhelmine era who was critical of the avarice of capitalism and the ill effects of industrialization, the labels are applied to Fritsch with

Justus H. Ulbricht (Munich: K.G. Saur, 1999), 285-287. For treatment of Fritsch's political beliefs and activities, see Klaus Bergmann, *Agrarromantik und Großstadtfeindschaft* (Meisenheim am Glan: Hain, 1970), 143-150; Uwe Lohalm, *Völkischen Radikalismus. Die Geschichte des Deutschvölkischen Schutz- und Trutz-Bundes 1919-1923* (Hamburg: Leibniz-Verlag, 1970); and Reginald H. Phelps, "Theodor Fritsch und der Antisemitismus," *Deutsche Rundschau* 87 (1961): 442-449. For a consideration of his ideas and work by his contemporaries, see *Festschrift zum fünfundzwanzigjährigen Bestehen des Hammers* (Leipzig: Hammer-Verlag, 1926). For general biographical information on Fritsch, see Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften/Historische Kommission, *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 5 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1961).

³⁸ Theodor Fritsch, *Antisemiten-Katechismus: Eine Zusammenstellung des wichtigsten Materials zum Verständnis der Judenfrage* (Leipzig: Theodor Fritsch 1887), reissued as *Handbuch der Judenfrage: Eine Zusammenstellung des wichtigsten Materials zur Beurteilung des jüdischen Volkes*, 26th edition (Hamburg: Hanseatische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1907). *Handbuch der Judenfrage* became something of a bible of anti-Semitism for the Nazis and even served as a school textbook. The forty-ninth edition of the book appeared in 1943.

³⁹ See Dirk Schubert, "Theodor Fritsch und die völkische Version der Gartenstadt," *Stadtbauwelt* 73/*Bauwelt* 12 (1982): 65-70/463-468; translated as "Theodor Fritsch and the German (*völkische*) version of the Garden City: the Garden City invented two years before Ebenezer Howard," *Planning Perspectives* 19 (2004): 3-35.

every justification. Fritsch promulgated a starkly anti-Semitic, anti-capitalist, anti-speculative, pro-Aryan, pro-German nationalist social and economic philosophy. An arch nationalist, Fritsch considered the Großstadt, the metropolis, un-German. He called for a return to the soil, farm labor, and small town life. Fritsch's arguments about the moral rectitude of physical labor on the land were reminiscent of the conservative anthropologist Otto Ammon's arguments in the 1894 *Die Bedeutung des Bauernstandes für den Staat und die Gesellschaft* (they were, coincidentally, also similar to the ideas put forward by Peter Kropotkin in *Fields, Farms, and Factories* of 1899). Fritsch did not imagine that big cities could or should disappear: they were too necessary to the larger economic interests of a powerful state, to the development of higher culture, and to the need for an impressive center for political activity.

Fritsch's principal statements about the form and shape of ideal settlements were articulated in programmatic book of 1896, *Die Stadt der Zukunft*, *The City of the Future* (figure 65), and numerous short articles published in the journal *Hammer*.⁴⁰ As ideal plans go, Fritsch's *Stadt der Zukunft* was as competent and informed a proposal as many others of the period, though his direct sources and influences are not known. He did not discuss historical models in the text of the book, although from context it is apparent that he had studied the form of Baroque cities. Fritsch had a strong grasp of the principles of zoning which in 1896, even in the nascent profession of planning, were by no means firm.⁴¹ He was well informed about the goals of the Genossenschaft (cooperative

⁴⁰ *Die Stadt der Zukunft* (Leipzig: Verlag von Theodor Fritsch, 1896); 2nd ed. with a new foreword and afterword by the author, and retitled, *Die Stadt der Zukunft: Gartenstadt* (Leipzig: Hammer Verlag, 1912). The first edition of the book was issued with Fritsch's pamphlet, *Die neue Gemeinde*.

⁴¹ Schubert suggests that Fritsch may have relied on works by Baumeister and Stübgen, Schubert, "Theodor Fritsch und die völkische Version der Gartenstadt," 66.

association) movement, and from 1904 forward followed the progress of the German Garden City Movement.

Fritsch laid out his ideal city of the future in the form of a half circle, reminiscent of the plans for Chaux and Karlsruhe. He foresaw that as the town grew it would form a full circle; his time frame for town development was 150 to 200 years (figures 66 and 67).

The town would grow in a spiral formation, with new sections always added to the outer perimeter while the older, inner city was preserved. Over time, the spiraling path of city growth would offer an educational object lesson in the historical development of architecture, “The entire construction proceeding organically, one might say, according to the law of crystallization.”⁴²

Using a series of concentric rings, Fritsch divided his plan into seven zones (figure 68).

At the center of the town stood the “eternal core” of the organic community, a public plaza surrounded by monumental public buildings (figure 69).⁴³ Zone two was devoted to the most luxurious villas, the homes of the aristocracy and the very upper economic echelons. Zone three was populated by solidly bourgeois homes; zone four by the homes and businesses of the *Mittelstand*. Zone five was apportioned for workers’ housing and the small workshops of their employment. The rough and heavy work of the town was restricted to the outer zones: factories and warehouses in zone six, truck farms and gardens in zone seven. The concentric rings gave order to Fritsch’s community: separation of functions, separation of classes. The zoning also made class differences legible in the built fabric of the community itself. Fritsch specified the segregation of the

⁴² “Die ganze Bebauung schreitet organisch, man möchte sagen, nach dem Gesetz der Krystallisation, in einer Richtung fort,” *Die Stadt der Zukunft* (1896), 13, 17.

⁴³ *Die Stadt der Zukunft* (1896), 13.

Stände, and the separation of cultural and civic, residential, and manufacturing functions. He located wealth – monumental public buildings and villas of the rich – at the center, and dispersed the workers and factories around the periphery. The layout of Fritsch's reformed community reflected his impassioned espousal of the corporative system of economic relations, inflected by emerging conceptions of the social and economic importance of the *Mittelstand*, the middle classes of small shopkeepers and craftsmen.

Fritsch was equally attentive to class differences, and class needs, in his inventive solutions for transportation in the city of the future. He sketched out a plan to develop the main arteries from periphery to city center as two-level streets, with orderly middle-class traffic on the surface, and the coming and goings of deliveries and workingmen hidden in tunnels below the surface (figure 70).⁴⁴ While it is true that the upper classes would be thereby spared too intimate an experience of the workers' ways, Fritsch was clear that the great advantages of separating traffic would mainly accrue to the workers and businessmen, who could move themselves and their goods more easily from warehouses and manufactories on the periphery into the town center. The use of subterranean transportation corridors for heavy goods would also have an additional advantage: surface streets could be smaller and fewer, thereby freeing up area for parks and green areas.⁴⁵ Fritsch reserved an area on the town periphery for a city forest, and sketched plans for playgrounds and greenspace and play areas in the common courts at the center of housing blocks (figure 71). The concentric rings of the town plan were intercut by a series of parks that penetrated in wedge-shaped forms from the rural areas of the town periphery through the working class residential zone and into the third, *Mittelstand*

⁴⁴ *Die Stadt der Zukunft* (1896), 20.

⁴⁵ *Die Stadt der Zukunft* (1896), 21.

districts (figure 72). The scheme, and the rationale, look forward to the city-penetrating “green belts” developed by Robert Schmidt for his 1911/1912 regional plan for Düsseldorf and the surrounding Ruhr industrial areas, and included in the plan developed by architect Bruno Möhring, economist Rudolf Eberstadt, and transportation engineer Richard Petersen for their third-prize winning entry in the greater Berlin planning competition of 1910 (figures 73 and 74).⁴⁶ By the 1920s, the idea of the countryside and nature intruding toward the city core via parkways and park systems had become an orthodoxy of modern planning, as illustrated in Paul Wolf’s 1926 treatise (figure 75).⁴⁷ The flower-shaped form of the town infiltrated by greenbelt was a functional morphology of the modern industrial city, and an emblem of community as a living, growing, pulsating, vital organism.

Fritsch’s conception has perhaps less in common with the idea of the garden city as a small town with a carefully calibrated balance of residential, light-industry, business, civic, and natural areas, than with another great urban conception of the 1890s, the American City Beautiful. In his attention to zoning and transportation, class segregation

⁴⁶ On Schmidt’s regional plans for a park system and greenbelts, see Robert Schmidt, *Denkschrift betreffend Grundsätze zur Aufstellung eines General-Siedlungsplanes für den Regierungsbezirk Düsseldorf* (Essen: Fredebeul & Koenen, 1912); on Schmidt, see Kommunalverband Ruhrgebiet und der Internationalen Bauausstellung Emscherpark, ed., *Robert-Schmidt-Preis 1993. Dokumentation* (Essen: Kommunal Verband Ruhrgebiet, 1994); and Ursula von Petz, “Robert Schmidt und die Grünflächen-Politik im Ruhrgebiet (1900-1930),” in *Die grüne Stadt. Siedlungen, Parks, Wälder, Grünflächen 1860-1960 im Ruhrgebiet*, ed. Renate Kastorff-Viehmann (Essen: Klartext, 1998), 25-48. On the plan by Möhring et al., see *Wettbewerb Gross-Berlin 1910. Die preisgekrönten Entwürfe mit Erläuterungsberichten* (Berlin: Wasmuth, 1911); and Wolfgang Sonne, “Ideen für Großstadt: Der Wettbewerb Groß-Berlin 1910,” in *Stadt der Architektur/ Architektur der Stadt. Berlin 1900-2000*, ed. Thorsten Scheer, Josef Paul Kleihues, and Paul Kahlfeldt (Berlin: Nicolai, 2000), 67-77.

⁴⁷ See Paul Wolf, *Wohnung und Siedlung* (Berlin: Ernst Wasmuth, 1926). The emphasis in Wolf’s 1926 book on the city in the context of the surrounding region, and on the relationship of the urban fabric to open space, industrial zones, transportation networks, and agricultural areas, is in marked contrast to his earlier planning treatise from 1919, *Städtebau. Das Formprobleme der Stadt in Vergangenheit und Zukunft* (Leipzig: Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1919), where the center of attention was focused on urban plazas and streetscapes. The span of seven years between the two marks the rapid professionalization of German planning in the Weimar period.

and orderly business operations, representative civic buildings and the underlying imperial urban morphology, Fritsch's *Stadt der Zukunft* resembles Daniel Burnham and Edward Bennett's proposal for Chicago of 1909, and presages the Chicagoans' analyses of cities as organisms shaped by circulation systems.⁴⁸

The concern about land speculation was widespread in the late nineteenth century, in the United States as well as Europe. Fritsch's criticism of land speculation was a part of his general condemnation of financial speculation in every form – stocks, interest, real estate – and was closely entwined with his advocacy of land reform and eugenics.⁴⁹ In Fritsch's vision of the ideal future society, the issue of land reform was inseparable from anti-Semitic dreams of a pure German race, a connection that motivated a significant contingent of land reformers, although certainly not all. On one side of the spectrum were liberal humanists like the Jewish socialist reformer Franz Oppenheimer. On the other were theorists like the anthropologist Heinrich Driesmans, of whose book *Menschenreform als Bodenreform* (Human Reform as Land Reform), the critic Paul Kampffmeyer remarked, “the piece turns the harmless consumer's cooperative into a race-purifying eugenics institute.”⁵⁰ Similarly, Fritsch's city of the future spun the

⁴⁸ On the City Beautiful, see William H. Wilson, *The City Beautiful Movement* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989); Mario Manieri-Elia, "Toward an 'Imperial City': Daniel H. Burnham and the City Beautiful Movement," in *The American City: From the Civil War to the New Deal*, ed. Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co, Mario Manieri-Elia, and Manfredo Tafuri. Translated by Barbara Luigia La Penta (London: Granada, 1980), 1-142.

⁴⁹ See his earlier publications, *Anti-Semiten-Katechismus: eine Zusammenstellung des wichtigsten Materials zum Verständniß der Judenfrage* (Leipzig: Fritsch, 1887), and *Zwei Grundübel: Bodenwüchser und Börse* (Leipzig: Theodor Fritsch, 1894).

⁵⁰ “Die Schrift macht aus dem harmlosen Konsumverein ein rassenveredelndes Züchtungsinstitut,” Paul Kampffmeyer, review from the *Sozialistische Monatshefte* cited, interestingly, as part of the self-promotion in *Menschenreform und Bodensreform Unter Zugrundelegung der Veredelungslehre Francis Galton (Galton contra Malthus) auf Grund eines Vortrags über „Anthropologie und Bodenreform“ gehalten im volkswirtschaftlichen Seminar des Deutschen Bundes für Bodenreform*, 3rd revised edition (1904; Leipzig: Felix Diedrich, 1911). In the book Driesmans describes an ideal community, “Roda,” as a “biogenetic oasis in the desert of thoughtless sexual unions and mixing of bloodlines” (p. 56). Driesmans' major work, the

strands of land reform, associational life, and orderly social reform into a conception for a community that would serve as a “Pflanzenschule deutschen Lebens,” a brood-house, a nursery, for regenerating German life. Although *Die Stadt der Zukunft* had no direct expression of Fritsch’s anti-Jewish mania, the line used later to close every edition of his newspaper *Der Hammer* – “Es gibt keine Gesundung der Völker vor Austreibung der Juden,” there is no recovery of the nation without the expulsion of the Jews – is implicit throughout. Fritsch’s purified German community would breed a new spirit, a new sense of social order of a life bound to the soil.⁵¹ The plan would shape a new community that operated as a “wohlgegliederten Organismus,” a well-coordinated organism.

Fritsch's friend and fellow writer, the chemist and biologist Willibald Hentschel, envisioned a new form of semi-rural settlement that would serve as the crucible for the renewal of the German people.⁵² A student in biology under Ernst Haeckel, Hentschel's concepts of a racial utopia were detailed in two books published by Fritsch's Hammer-Verlag. Hentschel's novel, *Varuna*, was a lengthy, trite parable set in an ideal community dedicated to creating the German race of the future.⁵³ A second book, *Mittgart*, was more directly polemical and programmatic in laying out a rationale and detailing the requisite

three-volume *Kulturgeschichte der Rasseninstinkte* (Leipzig: Naumann, Diederich, 1889-1901), and *Rasse und Milieu* (Berlin: Vita-Deutscher-Verlag, 1909), set out to corral history, the cultural sciences, and the entire diffuse Lebensreform movement toward the goals of breeding a stronger German nation.

⁵¹ *Die neue Gemeinde*, 9.

⁵² On Hentschel, see Peter Emil Becker, *Zur Geschichte der Rassenhygiene. Wege ins Dritte Reich* (Stuttgart: Thieme, 1988), 219-276; Dieter Löwenberg, "Willibald Hentschel (1858-1947). Seine Pläne zur Menschenzüchtung, sein Biologismus und Antisemitismus" (Ph.D. diss., Mainz, 1979); and Günter Wackitz, "Willibald Hentschel, Bruno Tanzmann und der Bund der Artamen," in *Traditionen und Traditionssuche des deutschen Faschismus*, ed. Hubert Orłowski and Günter Hartung (Poznan: Adam Mickiewicz University, 1992), 49-61.

⁵³ Willibald Hentschel, *Varuna. Eine Welt- und Geschichtsbetrachtung vom Standpunkt des Ariers*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Theodor Fritsch, 1901); 2nd edition 1907 with a new subtitle, *Das Gesetz des aufsteigenden und sinkenden Lebens in der Geschichte*.

operations of such ideal settlements.⁵⁴ Hentschel's utopian communities were single-mindedly dedicated to one end: the propagation of the future generations of a perfect German race. To counteract the effects of the Großstadt where industrial development, crowding, and the decline of cultural standards had forced the intermingling of classes and races (e.g. middle-class and bourgeois Germans forced to live and work in proximity to workers, Slavs, and Jews), Hentschel proposed a healthy semi-rural setting, with daily labor, high moral standards, and residency restricted to those with the right physical characteristics, notably good family lines, light-skin, and the finely shaped features of dolichocephalic heads. The residents of Mittgart would commit themselves to breeding a class of Aryan overlords and reserves of strong German workers. Marriage in Mittgart was reduced to a polygamous or at best a serial monogamous breeding pact, with the men charged with impregnating as many wives as possible. Mittgart was to be a farm devoted "not to the production of beef, potatoes, grain, butter, and cheese, but to men, to new men."⁵⁵ In Mittgart,

marriages are arranged by the elders of the community. To symbolize their married state, the women bind their hair up. The Mittgart marriage, founded on devotion and faith, lasts only so long until the woman finds herself in blessed circumstances. After this time, she leaves her mate, in order to dedicate herself with necessary consideration entirely to the education and care of her child. Once weaned, the children of Mittgart are kept a goodly distance from the dustiness of the schoolroom. The young girls grow up in the households of their mothers. The young boys are reared together in Spartan simplicity. They romp and play the whole day over in paddocks, are taught to thrust and parry by elders, and are raised

⁵⁴ Willibald Hentschel, *Mittgart. Ein Weg zur Erneuerung der germanischen Rasse* (Leipzig: Hammer-Verlag, 1904). In 1906 Hentschel co-founded the Mittgart-Bund, dedicated to advancing racial breeding for purity of the race.

⁵⁵ "...nicht der Produktion von Rindern, Kartoffeln, Getreide, Butter, und Käse, sondern von Menschen, von neuen Menschen," Willibald Hentschel, *Vom aufsteigenden Leben. Ziele der Rassen-Hygiene* (Leipzig: Fritz Eckardt Verlag, 1910), 121, cited in Ulrich Linse, "Völkische-rassische Siedlungen der Lebensreform," in *Handbuch zur "Völkische Bewegung" 1871-1918*, 402.

toward true and spirited dispositions. In the open air, they are taught the ancient songs of the heroes, which trains their memories and gives them a feeling for rhythm. They return in the evenings tired and hungry to the households of their mothers.⁵⁶

Hentschel's hope was to found as many as 300 Mittgart settlements in Germany, which would at full production produce 100,000 new German souls. In 1904 Fritsch and Hentschel were among the founders of the Deutsche Erneuerungs-Gemeinde, an organization devoted to anti-Semitic agitation in furtherance of land reform.⁵⁷ As a practical effort to realize the vision of a settlement for propagation of a purer, stronger German race, in 1908 Fritsch and a group of colleagues and relatives founded the Siedlungs-Gesellschaft Heimland, for which Fritsch served as chair. A year later the association purchased an old farm and began to build its own ideal community, Heimland.⁵⁸ Fritsch's son out of wedlock, Walther Kramer, became business director of the project. Inspired by the success of the fruit-growing colony Eden near Oranienburg, Heimland was to be the first of many rural settlements that would counteract the ill effects of urban living and cosmopolitan culture to breed a new Aryan race for Germany's future.

⁵⁶ "Die Mittgartehe wird vor dem rat der Ältesten geschlossen. Zum Zeichen ihrer Verheiratung binden die Frauen ihren Haarschmuck empor. Die auf Treu und Glauben gegründete Mittgartehe währt solange, bis die Frau sich in gesegneten Umständen befindet. Nach dieser Zeit verliert sie den Gatten, um sich in gebotener Rücksichtnahme gänzlich der Ausbildung und Pflege ihres Kindes zu widmen.... Von den entwöhnten Mittgartkindern wird grundsätzlich aller Schulstaub ferngehalten. Die Mädchen wachsen im Haushalt ihrer Mütter, die Knaben in spartanischer Einfachheit zu Hundertschaften vereint empor. Sie tummeln sich tagsüber in der Pferdekoppel, spielen und werden von den Alten in Hieb und Stoß, in Wahrhaftigkeit und mutiger Gesinnung erzogen. Ihr im Freien geübter Unterricht erstreckt sich auf Heldengesänge, in denen sie Gedächtnis und rhythmisches Gefühl üben. Sie kehren am Abend müde und hungrig in den mütterlichen Haushalt zurück," Hentschel, *Varuna*.

⁵⁷ *Vom neuen Glauben: Bekenntnis der deutschen Erneuerungs-Gemeinde* (Leipzig: Hammer-Verlag, 1914).

⁵⁸ This discussion of Heimland draws extensively on the research of Dr. Christoph Knüppel, who has collected and published documents about Heimland in *Dokumente zur Geschichte der völkischen Siedlung Heimland bei Rheinsberg*. Catalogue to an exhibition of historical documents at the Galerie Altes Heizhaus, Hotel Kapellensee, Luhme-Heimland, 11 May – 22 September 2002 (Herford: The author, 2002).

The settlement site comprised some 450 Morgen (about 270 acres) in the countryside near Rheinsberg, northwest of Berlin. Heimland was laid out in two concentric rings. At the core of the settlement stood the buildings of an old, extant farmstead arranged around a central court, with the gable of the barn painted with a large swastika. These residences and outbuildings were to be home to the unmarried men and women who would work the fields and tend the livestock. Around this central area, the Siedlungs-Gesellschaft plotted fifty parcels of farmland for future settlers, envisioned as farm families, pensioners, artists, and writers. Between 1910 and 1914, eleven houses were built on the parcels, designed by the architect Jorg Brücke (1880-1967), who was himself a resident of the community. Up until the time of the First World War, Heimland had about 10 to 15 "farmers" in residence on the common lands. In truth, most of the permanent residents and home owners were fairly well-to-do retirees and artists who sought refuge and respite from the city.⁵⁹ The real labor at Heimland was done by young people who lived in the settlement for short periods of time, attracted by the life-reform spirit and nationalist aura of the project. Erich Matthes, publisher of Jugendbewegung books and periodicals, lived at Heimland for six months in 1910. Heinrich van der Smissen, former teacher at the Landerziehungsheim Haubinda, temperance advocate, and partisan of the racist-eugenics organization Mittgart, resided at Heimland from 1911 forward.⁶⁰ It was rather more difficult to find young women eager to take on the work of race building while existing on a meager diet of whole-grain bread, vegetables, and no beer. Advertisements placed in *Der Hammer* entreated participation of "Ladies and young women whose bodies and minds have not suffered unduly from education, and who feel themselves strong enough

⁵⁹ Linse, "Völkische-rassische Siedlungen der Lebensreform," 402.

⁶⁰ Becker, *Zur Geschichte der Rassenhygiene*, 238.

to participate in our effort to regenerate the human race,” while also promising the candidates “chivalrous protection against life’s dangers.”⁶¹

Heimland did not prosper as either an agricultural settlement or as a eugenics experiment. The community had limited access to agricultural skill, suffered from chronically low farm productivity, was hampered in its search for resources and manpower by the outbreak of the First World War, and was not experimental or adventurous enough to attract a strong stream of paying guests from the cities. The Siedlungs-Gesellschaft Heimland finally disbanded in 1926.⁶²

Ebenezer Howard and a Schematic Typology of Biologic Community

The biologic, scientific underpinnings of Ebenezer Howard’s garden city conception did not move forward on the kind of heated enthusiasm for strengthening and purifying the races that propelled Fritsch and his contemporaries.⁶³ Howard presented an

⁶¹ The full advertisement reads “Frauen und Mädchen die nicht durch Verbildung körperlich und seelisch gelitten haben, sich stark genug fühlen, an unserem Werke, das Menschengeschlechte zu regenerieren, sich zu beteiligen und vernunftvolle, gesundmachende praktische Arbeit zu tun, finden Aufnahme in der Siedlung Heimland. In Heimland ist die Frau nicht ein untergeordnetes Wesen, sondern von allen geschätzt und geehrt, nicht "gleichberechtigt" sondern bevorechtigt und vor den härtesten Gefahren des Lebens ritterlich behütet.“

⁶² Linse, "Völkische-rassische Siedlungen der Lebensreform," 405.

⁶³ Howard first published his garden city idea in 1898. A subsequent revised edition of the treatise in 1902 provided a more far-reaching theoretical rationale and contextual information. See *To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* (London: Swann Sonnenschein, 1898); and *Garden Cities of To-Morrow, being the Second Edition of To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* (London: Swann Sonnenschein, 1902). A 1946 edition of the book, with an introduction by Lewis Mumford, found a wide readership among planners and architects in the post-World War II era of reconstruction, suburbanization, new towns, and urban renewal. See *Garden Cities of To-Morrow*, ed. with a preface by F.J. Osborn (London: Faber and Faber, 1946). A facsimile edition of the 1898 publication, published in celebration of the centenary of the first garden city at Letchworth, England, provides an invaluable, page-by-page running commentary on the text, with background on Howard's life, biographical sketches of people mentioned, references to literary and extra-textual sources, and information about contemporaneous events in politics, economics, and urbanism. See E. Howard, *To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform*. Original edition with commentary by Peter Hall, Dennis Hardy, and Colin Ward (London: Routledge, 2003). On Howard's life, see Robert Beevers, *The Garden City Utopia: A Critical Biography of Ebenezer Howard* (London: Macmillan, 1988); and Robert Fishman, *Urban Utopias in the Twentieth Century: Ebenezer Howard, Frank Lloyd Wright and Le Corbusier* (New York: Basic Books, 1977). On Howard's influence on the field

evolutionarily inspired, historical and scientific rationale, specific to the progress of industrialization and urbanization in the late nineteenth century. The thrust of the argument was critical of the congested and unhealthy state of the cities, without becoming outright anti-urban. Howard understood that cities offered opportunities for social intercourse and remunerative work that far surpassed the offerings of rural areas and villages. He also saw large urban centers as essential for cultural and financial activities undertaken at an international scale. In his analysis, cities exercised a magnetic attraction that drew people through the promise of entertainment and social engagements. As a result, the countryside was becoming depopulated, shorn of labor power and deprived of public vigor. If there was a eugenical subtext to Howard's reasoning, it was subtle and assumed rather than explicit, borne on the metaphor of a geographic and demographic union, the marriage of town and country. "Town and country must be married," Howard wrote, "and out of this joyous union will spring a new hope, a new life, a new civilization."⁶⁴ Rather than setting out to steer human destiny through rationalization, Howard placed greater store in the serendipitous power of human will guided by Divine Wisdom.

Like Fritsch, Howard saw his new town as a laboratory, a test garden, for the cultivation of a new society and the revitalization of community life. The reform of land ownership and the curtailment of land speculation was essential to this vision. By reforming land ownership – taking the appreciating value of land out of the hands of speculators and the landed aristocracy, and putting it into common ownership – Howard hoped that the

of town planning, see Peter Hall and Colin Ward, *Sociable Cities: The Legacy of Ebenezer Howard* (Chichester: Wiley, 1998); and Stanley Buder, *Visionaries and Planners: The Garden City Movement and Modern Community* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).

⁶⁴ Howard, *Garden Cities of To-Morrow* (1946), 48.

garden cities would reform the very foundations of wealth. The economic stranglehold of inherited wealth would be counteracted by the rise of natural merit. The declining moral and physical fiber of the aristocracy would give way, naturally, to the robust productivity of the craftsman classes.

Howard's Garden City became a leading paradigm for progressive reform planning in Germany in the decade before the First World War. He conceived it as a form of scientific resettlement. Howard called for the dispersal of metropolitan populations across a landscape punctuated by economically self-sufficient, mid-sized cities, connected by railroads and canals. He developed his garden city idea with the models and lessons of the English colonies fully in view.⁶⁵ In the colored lithographs illustrating his book – the original sketches were drawn and lettered by Howard himself – the Garden City was laid out as a series of concentric circles demarcating avenues and community functions (figure 76). The nucleus of the Garden City community, the core of Howard's diagram, is a synthesis of nature and art, exemplified by a city park and cultural edifices. Museum, library, concert hall, theater, museum, town hall, and hospital are institutions that belong to the common organism (figure 77). The residential quarters are arrayed around this civic center – blocks undifferentiated by class, for the Garden City was conceived as a paradise for the middle classes. The segregating inclinations are expressed in the protoplasmic regions beyond the boundaries of the town proper, in the greenbelts and agricultural zones that lay between the satellite communities (figures 78 and 79). In these regions were convalescent homes, asylums for the deaf and blind, orphanages, homes for inebriates, and farms for epileptics. Everyone was allotted his place in the grand scheme

⁶⁵ Howard, *Garden Cities of To-Morrow* (1946), "Chapter Ten: A Unique Combination of Proposals," 118-127.

of the garden city community, although some were ordained to live at a remove from the centers of reproduction.

Although created as conceptual illustrations, not exact site plans, the circular configuration of Howard's diagrams link them to a long tradition in utopian architectural thought. The conception of an enclosed city as a complete organism unto itself, embodying a social order as well as a political cosmology is evident in some of the earliest designs for ideal cities from the late Middle Ages forward. The radiant circular plan was used in plans for absolutist cities of the Renaissance and Baroque eras. Among the earlier utopian community conceptions acknowledged as influences on his plans, Howard credited James Silk Buckingham's ideal city, *Victoria*, published in 1849, which was laid out as a series of concentric quadrilaterals telescoping into a central town square (figure 80).⁶⁶ He also credited G.J. Ouseley's 1884 plan for a Heptapolis, a system of seven circular cities that would regenerate a more authentic, primitivist Christian community (figure 81).⁶⁷ Howard was aware of a range of earlier ideal city conceptions and mapped his plan for the wholesome modern environment onto pre-existing typologies of city form (figure 82). Howard linked the concentric typology drawn from historical models to a new typology of the organic, hierarchically disposed, modern community.

⁶⁶ James S. Buckingham, *National Evils and Practical Remedies, with the Plan of a Model Town* (London: Jackson Son and Co., 1849).

⁶⁷ Gideon Jasper Ouseley, *Paligenesia: or, the Earth's New Birth* (Glasgow: Hay Nisbet & Co., 1884). See especially the commentary by Peter Hall, Dennis Hardy, and Colin Ward in the 2003 facsimile edition of E. Howard, *To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform*.

Cellular Typologies in Planning Practice: Hohe Lache

In the early twentieth century the formal typology of the circular, self-contained settlement continued to be used in both utopian proposals and built settlements. There was a heightened self-consciousness about the symbolic and functional aspects of the form, and a growing sense of the capacity of the circular settlement form both to express a conception of the ideal modern community, and to help foster or enforce behaviors in everyday life that would make that ideal of modern community possible. The circular plan offered a framework that simultaneously telegraphed historical sensibility and biologicistic modernity.

In the field of planning, the circular and semi-circular cellular schemata translated into a settlement typology in which residential units were arranged around an open commons, which served as both the symbolic expression as well as the active forum of community life. Resembling the cellular gastrulae illustrated by Ernst Haeckel, the typology also recalled the primitive form of the *Runddorf*, the round village (figures 83 and 84).

Identified in the 1880s through field research in the countryside of Germany by the agricultural economist August Meitzen, this ancient settlement form brought with it a soundly nationalist, soundly nativist pedigree. It was, moreover, a settlement form particularly associated with the Slavic reaches of prehistoric Europe, including the central eastern regions of Brandenburg, Saxony, and Anhalt.⁶⁸ For a settlement like the workers' community Hohe Lache near Dessau, located in Anhalt, the modernist conception of the

⁶⁸ See August Meitzen, *Wanderungen, Anbau, und Agrarrecht der Völker Europas nördlich der Alpen. Siedlung und Agrarwesen der Westgermanen und Ostgermanen, der Kelten, Römer, Finnen und Slawen*, 3 vols. (Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz, 1895); Robert Mielke, *Das deutsche Dorf* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1907); Robert Mielke, *Siedlungskunde des deutschen Volkes und ihre Beziehung zu Menschen und Landschaft* (Munich: J.H. Lehmanns, 1927); and Werner Radig, *Die Siedlungstypen in Deutschland und ihre frühgeschichtlichen Wurzeln* (Berlin: Henschelverlag, 1955).

town center as a nucleus, at once Stadtkrone (city crown or center) and social condenser, was grafted onto the morphology of the traditional agricultural village (figure 85).⁶⁹ The financial and legal impetuses that gave shape to Hohe Lache were similar to other garden-city inspired housing efforts of the period. With the pressures of industrialization and population growth, the city of Dessau sought area to expand. The city had become a member of the Deutsche Gartenstadtgesellschaft in 1905, and a Dessau Gartenstadtverein began in 1916 to attract small investors. The imprimatur of the Prussian Housing Law of 1918, calling on towns and cities to develop adequate housing for people of “moderate means” (*minderbemittelte*), provided an added impetus.⁷⁰ In November 1918 a member of the ducal Anhalt family deeded a plot of open land to the west of the city center to Dessau for purposes of building much-needed housing. In that same year a group of investors and reformers, some affiliated with the Gartenstadtverein, and most certainly sympathetic to the garden city idea, established the Gemeinnützige Siedlungsgesellschaft für Dessau Stadt und Land. The Gesellschaft initiated the planning and building activities for Hohe Lache, and was joined through the first half of the 1920s by several other contracting and building agencies, including the city of Dessau, consumer associations, industries such as the Dessauer Waggonbaufabrik which financed housing in the settlement for their skilled workers and managers, and a

⁶⁹ Lying just a few blocks west of the Bauhaus, the settlement is still largely intact. It received protective landmark status in 1993. On Hohe Lache, see Theodor Overhoff, *Die Siedlung Hohe Lache bei Dessau* (1921; Dessau: Arbeitskreis Siedlungen im Verein industrieller Gartenreich, e.V., 1994); Torsten Blume, *Die Siedlung "Hohe Lache" Dessau* (Dessau: Stiftung Bauhaus Dessau, 1994); Harald Kegler, "Gartenstadt 'Hohe Lache' in Dessau," in *Villa and Eigenheim. Suburbaner Städtebau in Deutschland*, ed. Tilman Harlander, et al. (Ludwigsburg and Munich: Wüstenrot Stiftung and Deutsch-Verlags-Anstalt, 2001), 209-217.

⁷⁰ See "Wohnungsgesetz vom 28. März 1918: Artikel 6. Wohnungsaufsicht," in *Sozialer Wohnungsbau in Europa. Die Ursprünge bis 1918: Ideen, Programme, Gesetze*, ed. Juan Rodriguez-Lores (Basel: Birkhäuser, 1994), 170-171.

collective of skilled craftsmen and laborers who designed and built their own houses in the project in their off hours.

Garden city goals inspired the designers of the master plan, and the architects for the first stage of the settlement, Theodor Overhoff (1880-?) director of the Dessau building office, and his assistant, the trained engineer, Edith Schulze.⁷¹ Other architects included Kurt Elster and Friedrich Wiesel. Hohe Lache's most striking planning design element was a central plaza, the *Achteck*, the octagon, enclosed by row houses, with rear gardens radiating outwards to abut the garden allotments of houses situated on the periphery streets. To ensure stable density and community cohesion, as well as to preserve the small town, bucolic character of the settlement in perpetuity, the housing association included clauses in its by-laws and purchase contracts which prevented undue profit-taking on the appreciation of the value of the land, and prohibited housing construction on the garden allotments.⁷²

The prominence of large garden allotments at Hohe Lache offered a vision of the joining of agriculture and industry in the modern community. Hohe Lache advanced a social program of the marrying nature and culture, labor and leisure, town and country. But the agricultural elements were also a necessity. Many of the workers coming from the

⁷¹ Theodor Overhoff was Magistratsbaurat and the leading figure in town planning in Dessau through the 1920s, the years when the Bauhaus moved to the city and when a number of the school's fledgling architectural and planning efforts were carried out in the area. In 1912 Overhoff designed the garden city of Kolonie Askania, adjacent to Hohe Lache, and subsequently became leader of the Siedlungsgesellschaft Dessau Stadt und Land G.m.b.H. and chairman of the Bund Bildender Künstler Dessau. With the incorporation of the villages Törten, Ziebigk, and Kleinkühnau into the city of Dessau in 1924, Overhoff was charged with the master plan for city expansion, one element of which was Walter Gropius' design of the Dessau-Törten settlement, built in three stages from 1926 to 1928. Like Hohe Lache, the plan for Dessau-Törten included sizable garden allotments so the residents could grow their own food and keep small livestock. On Overhoff, see Blume, "Die Siedlung Hohe Lache Dessau," 13; and Günter Ziegler, *Anhaltische Baumeister – Baumeister in Anhalt-Dessau* (Dessau: Kulturamt und Amt für Denkmalpflege, 1992).

⁷² Kegler, "Gartenstadt 'Hohe Lache' in Dessau," 211.

countryside to work in city factories were accustomed to raising their own food, and since the early days of workers' housing, contractors and architects had seen the provision of garden plots and small animal stalls as part of the settlement program. In the case of the Krupp settlement programs, the gardens and animal pens were even considered tools for the gradual assimilation of agricultural workers into urban-industrial lifeways.⁷³ More importantly, and more immediately, as Germany emerged from war and revolution, people grew their own food to survive.

The perception of the garden settlement as an experimental stage for uniting agriculture and industry persisted through the 1920s. In 1925 Leberecht Migge designed ten model gardens on Am Hasenwinkel in Hohe Lache, as proving grounds for his theories of *Daseinsbewältigung*, existence management. Migge conceived of the houses and adjoining gardens as sites of production not just consumption. Among their special features, the model gardens included compost silos, gray-water filter systems, and brick espalier walls to hold the sun's heat and increase the production of fruit trees.⁷⁴ Even Walter Gropius, when a few years later he designed the spare modernist housing for Dessau-Törten 1926-28, provided sizable garden allotments and small animal stalls.

In his introduction to the first significant publication about Hohe Lache, the mayor of Dessau Fritz Hesse in 1921 framed the traditional character of the settlement's design as

⁷³ Richard Ehrenberg and Hugo Racine, *Krupp'sche Arbeiter-Familien. Entwicklung und Entwicklungsfaktoren von drei Generationen deutscher Arbeiter*, *Archiv für Exakte Wirtschaftsforschung (Thünen-Archiv)* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1912).

⁷⁴ Leberecht Migge, "Moderne Siedlungsgärten," *Anhaltische Siedlerzeitung. Organ des Anhaltischen Siedler-Verbandes* 3, no. 11 (1926); "Die Siedlung Hohe Lache bei Dessau," *Siedlungswirtschaft. Mitteilungen der Siedler-Schule Worpswede* 3, no. 1-2 (1 February 1926).

a matter of necessity. “We Germans have become a poor people,” he wrote.⁷⁵ In fitting with the times, the plan for the settlement and its houses needed to be modest, economical, and purposeful. Ostentation and ornament were superfluous, even irrelevant, at a time when the means to build were so constrained.

The showpiece Achteck, the octagonal central plaza, of Hohe Lache became the signature of the settlement: the symbol of the vision for a community that organically integrated nature and industry (figure 86). The Achteck was, however, not a true town center. It lacked the magnetic attractions of commerce, trade, and culture – the functions that clustered along other streets of the settlement. The central plaza was just parkland surrounded by two-story high row houses. It was put into service as a vegetable patch during the First World War. Nonetheless, the plaza provided a powerful graphic symbol of Hohe Lache as a cohesive community, a power that was most apparent in aerial views, a fact proudly noted through the 1920s by the settlement’s designers, and a need neatly serviced by fly-overs of Junker airplanes manufactured in factories at Dessau (figure 87). From the ground, Hohe Lache exuded the ambiance of a small town idyll, suspended between baroque prosperity and bourgeois decorum. From the air it became the symbol of the power of modern planning to generate new communities.

Cellular Form as Utopian Blueprint: Kauffmann's Nahalal

In settlements like the moshav of Nahalal, a farming cooperative community, designed in 1921 by Richard Kauffmann (1887-1958), there was a conscious grafting of a modernist, cellular-derived model onto the traditional village morphology (figure 88). Kauffmann

⁷⁵ “Wir sind ein armes Volk geworden,” Fritz Hesse [Bürgermeister of Dessau], “Die Entstehung der Siedlung,” in Overhoff, *Die Siedlung Hohe Lache bei Dessau*, 4.

had studied at the Technische Hochschule with Theodor Fischer and had worked with Georg Metzendorf on the design of the Krupp-financed garden city Margarethenhöhe near Essen.⁷⁶ Kauffmann's design for Nahalal became the model for many workers' settlements in Eretz Israel. Arranged in concentric circles, Nahalal's public and civic buildings are clustered in the center, the nucleus of the community, surrounded by a ring of houses. Modest, functional, similarly sized, without ostentation, expressing neither the possession of wealth nor aspirations to surpass class, the architecture of the settlement sublimated individual pursuits to the service of the higher functioning organism, the community. From this inner hub, the settlers' gardens and fields radiate outward. As with Hohe Lache, the signature views of Nahalal are from the air, where its geometric plan and radiant growth patterns read both as energy pulsating from a community center, and as community magnetically drawn toward the center, the very symbol of the agricultural settlement as a rational and legible force of modernity.⁷⁷

Cellular Form as Symbol of Organic Solidarity: Bruno Taut's Britzsiedlung

The Hufeisensiedlung at Berlin-Britz, designed by Bruno Taut and Martin Wagner with landscape and garden design by Leberecht Migge, was built in stages between 1925 and 1933. The estate offers an even more striking example of planning form with illusions to

⁷⁶ On Kauffmann and his work in Israel, see Ines Sonder, *Gartenstädte für Erez Israel. Zionistische Stadtplanungsvisionen von Theodor Herzl bis Richard Kauffmann* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2005); Anna Minta, *Israel bauen. Architektur, Städtebau und Denkmalpolitik nach der Staatsgründung 1948* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 2004); and Myra Wahrhaftig, *Sie legten den Grundstein. Leben und Wirken deutschsprachigen jüdischen Architekten in Palästina 1918-1948* (Tübingen: Wasmuth, 1996).

⁷⁷ On Nahalal in the context of the settlement of British Palestine/Eretz Israel, see Jeannine Fiedler, *Social Utopias of the Twenties: Bauhaus, Kibbutz, and the Dream of the New Man*, trans. Miriam Neumann and William H. Boyle (Dessau and Tel Aviv: Bauhaus Dessau Foundation and Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, 1995), 87-88, 108-119; and Arie Sharon, *Kibbutz + Bauhaus: An Architect's Way in a New Land* (Stuttgart: Karl Krämer, 1976).

biological models, as well as historical settlement forms.⁷⁸ In a plan for the housing estate from 1925/26, Taut punctuated the staggered processions of row houses with four polygonal interjections (figure 89), areas of gardens and sports fields set amid the housing, and a pentagonal park fronted onto an arc-shaped school at the edge of the estate (this was unbuilt as such in the final plan). The arrangement of staggered row houses recalls the traditional form of the *Angerdorf*. The trapezoidal green lined with row houses recalls the plan of a Baroque settlement in nearby Müggelheim bei Kopenick (figure 90). The largest of these interjections, and the centerpiece, the signature, indeed, the namesake, of the 1,000-unit settlement was a horseshoe shaped, three-story high apartment block. These apartments, all built on the same floor plan, are single-loaded with inner, balconied facades overlooking a park and garden area which slopes downward to a small pond, one of two bodies of water originally on the building site. That Taut chose to bend the modern apartment row around the pond was certainly an accommodation of program to site.⁷⁹ The use of the half arc building form as symbol and condenser of community life had its historical sources, such as the primitive *Runddorf*, a settlement typology that was well known to Taut (figure 91). The half arc also recalled the medieval town center, the crescent at Bath, and Theodor Fischer's plan for the workers' colony of Gmindersdorf. It was a planning form that Taut had been experimenting with since the earliest years of his professional career. But the horseshoe-shaped plan was also a brilliant intuition into the graphic signature of the modern site plan and the symbolic power of biologicistic form. The necklace of dwelling units recalls

⁷⁸ On the estate generally, see Annemarie Jaeggi, "Hufeisensiedlung Britz," in *Siedlungen der zwanziger Jahre – heute. Vier Berliner Großsiedlungen 1924-1984*, ed. Norbert Huse (Berlin: Bauhaus-Archiv, 1985), 111-136.

⁷⁹ Kurt Junghanns, *Bruno Taut, 1880-1938. Architektur und sozialer Gedanke*, 3rd rev. ed. (Leipzig: E.A. Seemanns, 1998), 70-73.

the close packed cells of Haeckel's gastrular diagram. In plan, the arc of the Hufeisen apartment block seems to be held closed under vitalistic tension, suspended in the matrix of streets that make up the estate.⁸⁰

The horseshoe-shaped building at the Hufeisen estate is most legible from an aerial perspective (figure 92). Taut, the city planning office under its director Martin Wagner appointed in 1926, and the project developers, the Gemeinnützige Heimstätten Aktiengesellschaft (Gehag), established in 1924, were certainly mindful of aerial photography as a distinctively modern way of presenting architecture. The sheer size of the construction site and the building project demanded aerial views to track building progress. But the use of the drama of aerial perspective at Berlin-Britz showed that Taut and his circle were aware that there was a public for modern architecture. It showed that they were aware of the need to *create* a public for modern architecture. Photography promoted the estate to potential residents as well as to professional architects, municipal power-brokers, and investors. The horseshoe-shaped housing ring established an immediate, popular signature for the new settlement. Some eighty years later, the distinctive horseshoe-shaped Britz estate continued to serve as logo for the Gehag.

The tensile arc of the Hufeisen apartment building, which presents such a strong graphic conception in plan, unfolds quite differently in the space and time of the ground level. There is a durational aspect to the design, a product of the immense scale of the main building, and the difficulty of reading the structure as a whole from any single vantage point. It is necessary to move through and around the building to understand it. This

⁸⁰ For further on the context of circular schemata in planning, see Franziska Bollerey and Kristiana Hartmann, "Bruno Taut, Vom phantastischen Ästheteten zum ästhetischen Sozial(ideal)isten," in *Bruno Taut 1880-1938* (Berlin: Akademie der Künste, 1980), 15-94.

tension between symbolic modernity and lived modernity seems to define Taut's conception of the modern organic community. The Hufeisen is a spacious sweep of an apartment block, a monumental building whose inner façade punctuated with deep inset balconies overlooking the inner gardens. The prospect suggests that lives are lived within at a modest but very comfortable scale (figures 93 and 94). The streets of the surrounding estate meet the outer curved expanse of the horseshoe as if it were a city wall. Structural and applied detail bring the outer wall's otherwise daunting expanse and towering height into proportion with the neighboring row houses. The white sash bars of the small-paned windows and vertical course of red brick syncopate the soft grey textured stucco of the outer wall, demarcating apartment entrances and through-passages to the inner court (figure 95). That same red brick runs horizontally just above the third story of grey stucco. The fourth story above is painted a dark cobalt blue and shadowed by the overhang of a deep, thin-edged cornice, the effect of which is to further diminish the scale of the apartment block, which rises a full two stories above the neighboring row houses. Taut also used color and articulated facades to create a sense of individuality and neighborhood intimacy along the narrow ways of the 10,000-unit estate. Entrances, staircases, and fenestration were marked with strong, contrasting colors. He broke the lines of the buildings, setting some rows farther back from the street, and setting others at a slightly askew angle.⁸¹

In the design for the Britz estate, as for many his housing projects from the late 1910s and through the 1920s, Taut used the idea of the *Stadtkrone*, the city crown, as a focus of community life and symbol of the inhabitants shared identity. He also used the settlement

⁸¹ On Taut's use of color in architecture, see Rosemarie Haag Bletter, "Expressionism and the New Objectivity," *Art Journal* 43 (Summer 1983): 108-120.

townscape itself as a condenser for community life. The streets and passages comprised a living, ever-unfolding theater in which impressions, sensibilities, convictions were formed as residents pass through in the course of everyday life.⁸² The open space in the enclosure of the horseshoe, the void of the gastrular cellular formation, so to speak, contained park land and a pond, the heart of the Britz community. The clustering of living units around the nucleic center created a dynamic schematic of community form: symbolic in plan, generative of community identity, and associational life in everyday practice.

Taut had used the arced building form before as a signature element in community designs. Inspired perhaps by the example of his early employer and mentor, Theodor Fischer, who had used the sweeping arc to make the retirement home the signature building for the workers' settlement Gmindersdorf (1905-1915), Taut used variations of the half-circle form in his 1912 competition entry for Rüdeshheimer Platz in Berlin-Wilmersdorf; the 1913 project for a bachelors' home at the Garden City Falkenberg, the 1918-1921 bachelors' residence at Siedlung Lindenhof in Berlin; and the 1922 design for a cemetery at Magdeburg (figures 96 and 97). But the foundations of Taut's organic architectural forms and his organicist philosophy of community life were found in his books of 1919-1920, notably *Alpine Architektur* and *Die Auflösung der Städte*, in which Taut fashioned a utopia based on an infinitely expandable network of worker communities.⁸³ In aerial perspective, Taut's ideal landscapes of clustered homes, gardens,

⁸² Bruno Taut, "Neue und alte Form im Bebauungsplan," *Wohnungswirtschaft* 3, no. 24 (1926): 198-199.

⁸³ Bruno Taut, *Alpine Architektur* (Hagen: Folkwang, 1919); and *Die Auflösung der Städte* (Hagen: Folkwang, 1920).

and workshops resemble flowers or cellular diatomaceous forms, reminiscent of Haeckel's illustrations of algae colonies and radiolarian (figures 98 and 994).

The natural symbolism in play, the organicism shaping Taut's philosophy of architectural form and planning for community life was at once crystalline and vegetative. He sought to give architectonic expression to his understanding of an organic society that moved beyond the class- and estate-bound vision of the corporate state to embody a socialist society. The strong graphic conception of the central Hufeisen at Berlin-Britz – the tensile vitality of its form, the play of color and pattern in the neighboring row houses – produced the experience of a building as a form of life in itself, something rooted in a place, something that embodied personality, something that grew over time.⁸⁴ Taut's philosophy of the organic society as a thriving, growing entity, and the utopian, even occult, resonances of his interests in color and crystalline forms, owed much to the vitalistic currents of Expressionism and his friendship with the poet Paul Scheerbart.⁸⁵ The melding of organic and inorganic had its echoes in the scientific world, as well. In his book of 1917, *Kristallseelen*, Ernst Haeckel had rhapsodized over the generative power of simple crystals, maintaining that all life, all creation, even the realm of the mineral world, was animated by a life force and a will toward form and beauty.⁸⁶

⁸⁴ Regine Prange, "Die Hufeisensiedlung in Spiegel des Glashauses." in *Kristallisationen, Splitterungen. Bruno Tauts Glashaus*, ed. Angelika Thiekötter, et al. (Basel: Birkhäuser, 1993), 135-136. Prange discusses the crystalline metaphor in German aesthetic theory, and surveys Taut's thinking and writing on the subject in *Die Kristalline als Kunstsymbol: Bruno Taut und Paul Klee. Zur Reflexion des Abstrakten in Kunst und Kunsttheorie der Moderne* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1991).

⁸⁵ Rosemarie Haag Bletter provides a broader historical examination of the crystal metaphor in architecture in "The Interpretation of the Glass Dream – Expressionist Architecture and the History of the Crystal Metaphor," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 40 (1981): 20-43.

⁸⁶ Ernst Haeckel, *Kristallseelen. Studien über das anorganische Leben* (Leipzig: Alfred Kröner, 1917).

For Taut, architecture, with its generative, crystalline capacities, was the supreme mold of human sensibility, the source of life, the central living trunk from which all cultural life arose.⁸⁷ The art of architecture, the task of planning, was to drive functionality in the service of social and spiritual happiness, to make manifest for all to see the cosmic power of architecture.⁸⁸ By the mid 1920s, with his utopian writings behind him and his day-to-day life absorbed in the work of designing and building some 10,000 apartment dwellings in and around Berlin – what he referred to as his “seven fat years” – Taut’s blending of cosmic mission, organic under-currents, and architectonic form was above all directed toward putting housing in the service of a better future.⁸⁹

Der neue Mensch: Biologicistic Projects of the 1920s

Another interpretation of the gastrulated community form – single residential cells dispersed around a central commons area – is illustrated in architect Walter Gropius’s 1919 plans for the *Wohnberge*, a series of long, hill-like, self-contained residential structures, triangular in section and composed of thousands of individual dwelling units and all necessary services, linked by massive transportation corridors (figures 100 and 101).⁹⁰ Part of the same wave of Weimar revolutionary creativity that gave rise to Taut’s expressionist studies of crystalline palaces and flower-like site plans, Gropius’ *Wohnberge* represented the utopian, visionary edge of what would precipitate down into the more pragmatic program of massive housing estates in Weimar Germany of the 1920s

⁸⁷ Bruno Taut, “Ein Architekturprogramm,” from *Flugschriften des Arbeitrates für Kunst Berlin* (1918), in *Arbeitsrat für Kunst Berlin 1918-1921* (Berlin: Akademie der Künste, 1980), 85-86.

⁸⁸ Bruno Taut, *Die Stadtkrone* (Jena: Diederichs, 1919), 54-55.

⁸⁹ Taut cited in Nike Bätzner, “Der Siedlungsbau der 20er Jahre. Laboratorium sozialer Ideen und formaler Experimente,” in *Stadt der Architektur/Architektur der Stadt. Berlin 1900-2000*, ed. Thorsten Scheer, Josef Paul Kleihues, Paul Kahlfeldt (Berlin: Nicolai, 2000), 151.

⁹⁰ Reginald R. Isaacs, *Walter Gropius. Der Mensch und sein Werk*, vol. 1 (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1983), 198-201.

– the Zeilenbau, the culmination of several strands of architectural thinking about housing type, scientific planning, sociological and spatial studies of the fundamental coordinates of shelter in the modern age. The Wohnberge presented a utopian, admittedly futuristic expression of Gropius' theory of the organic socialist community. Gropius sketched out a small group of apartment types for the Wohnberge, dwellings capable of accommodating shifting personal relationships over the course of a lifetime. Rather than positing the family as the basic social group, Gropius designed for the individual as an autonomous social unit. Communities were aggregate organisms, made up of hundreds, thousands of cellular monads. Modern architecture abetted the relationship of the part to the whole, of the individual to the community, and, especially, of the individual to other singular souls. The multi-unit dwelling was a machine for collective life. The New Man and the New Woman would live out their lives of in absolute equality – equality of space, equality of opportunity, equality of labor.

The vision to remake the environment as an organic whole, to see architecture's task not just as a periodic interjection into the landscape, but rather as a remaking of the landscape itself became the *raison d'être* of modern planning. The goal was to envision the envelope that would generate and contain a new set of behaviors. The questions of the money, power, resources, and economic relations needed to sustain the enormity of the vision were less articulated than assumed: the vision would only be possible through a radical break with the present day, a radical introduction of socialism. Gropius' Wohnberge project, Taut's Hufeisen estate, and the utopian *capricci* of *Alpine Architektur* and *Die Auflösung der Städte*, and even Ebenezer Howard's vision for a network of "Slumless, Smokeless Cities" are part of a passage in the history of modern planning. These

proposals, along with other planning projects of the 1920s, like Ludwig Hilberseimer's Hochhausstadt of 1924 and Le Corbusier's Voisin Plan and Contemporary City of 1925, established the intellectual foundations that made scientific approaches and massive environmental intervention a centerpiece of ambitious professional practice in the decades after World War II.⁹¹

In 1976 Reyner Banham memorialized these massive post-World War II interventions as megastructures, describing them as “the dinosaurs of the modern movement,” freaks of nature, peculiarly adapted to an intensely heated, super-saturated climate, now all but extinct.⁹² But Banham was at pains to categorize varieties of the still-evolving species even as he intoned the elegy. Drawing on definitions from Fumihiko Maki's 1964 Metabolist tract, *Investigations in Collective Form*,⁹³ Banham described the classical megastructure as a “mass-human scale form,” involving “the repetition and agglomeration of seemingly standardized folk-building elements into settlements of conspicuously clear plan or striking silhouette.”⁹⁴ This post-war vision of the modern community suggests something of a hybrid of the accretive *Gemütlichkeit* of an Italian hill town and an infinitely extensible fabric of cellular living units. The tension between the acquiescence to the needs of everyday life and the assertion of a will towards total control over living echoes the vexed rationalization that wended through the architecture and planning projects – the realized and realizable as well as the fantastic and utopian – of Taut and Gropius. That tension, that hybridization, may in fact be one of the legacies of the early modern architects in the post-World War II period. Indeed, Banham claims

⁹¹ Ludwig Hilberseimer, *Großstadtarchitektur* (Stuttgart: Julius Hoffmann, 1927); Le Corbusier, *Urbanisme* (1925; trans. *The City of To-morrow and Its Planning* (New York: Payson & Clarke, 1929).

⁹² Reyner Banham, *Megastructure: Urban Futures of the Recent Past* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1976).

⁹³ Fumihiko Maki, *Investigations in Collective Form* (St. Louis: Washington University, 1964).

⁹⁴ Banham, *Megastructure*, 8-9.

Gropius' Wohnberge, along with Le Corbusier's 1931 *Projet A* for Algiers, as progenitors of the modern megastructure.⁹⁵

The megastructural conceptions of the 1920s and 1930s are the products of catastrophe and pressing need. In the wake of war and in the face of extraordinary want, architects developed a practical, functional approach to community form. It is not that concerns for human needs, for beauty, for the pleasures of everyday life were evacuated from the architectural process. The model of community as organism remained, but the model of nature became more mechanistic. In the most scientific articulations, society began to be conceived as a system of relationships analogous to biological processes. Architectural design became a process of defining problems, parameters, and solving them spatially. The model of architecture as a theater for the unfolding of daily life remains; but the theater was stripped of reference, ornament, and myth, in order to leave the stage free for lives that were more authentic, more immediate, more productive, and less burdened by the shadows of history and received morality.

The State as Cellular Organism: Planning for Total Gemeinschaft

In Germany in the early twentieth century, the biological concepts and metaphors that propelled so many visions of the organic community partook of a Social Darwinism that was current in modernist thought throughout the west, in Great Britain, the United States, France, Italy, Russia, and beyond – wherever the writings of Spencer and Darwin, Haeckel and Bölsche were read. In Germany, however, the modernist theses of Social

⁹⁵ Taut did not figure into Banham's megastructural thesis, although in *Theory and Design in the First Machine Age*, he credited Taut's bequest to modernism more on the side of literature than built form, praising *Die Stadtkrone* (1919) and *Modern Architecture* (1929), and contending that Taut's architecture had gone down hill after the glass pavilion at the 1914 Werkbund exposition. Reyner Banham, *Theory and Design in the First Machine Age* (1960; Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992), 81, 265, 308.

Darwinism were enfolded into a particular set of political beliefs, at once imbued with long-standing historical power and at the same time charged with a vehemence and urgency specific to the country's particular political and economic circumstances. The political legacies of natural law and the corporate polity, romantic ideas of the Volk and the Volksgeist, when bolstered by biological theories of race yielded a new, specifically modern conception of the organic community as totalitarian state, the National Socialist's *Volksgemeinschaft*.⁹⁶

Organicist Aspects of Central Place Theory

In the branch of geography known as Central Place Theory, first outlined by the German geographer Walter Christaller in the 1930s, cellular models and analogies moved beyond the bounds of the utopian to become mainstreamed into the analysis, planning, and control of population movement, trade, and transportation.⁹⁷ Christaller did not formulate his thesis of central places as an explicitly biologicistic vision, but rather sought a value-free analysis of the positioning of population centers across wide territories. It is Central Place Theory's claims as an integrated spatial and social totality, and the uses that were

⁹⁶ The classic critical discussions of the political and cultural formation of the *Volksgemeinschaft* are found in Fritz Stern, *The Politics of Cultural Despair: A Study in the Rise of the Germanic Ideology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961); and George L. Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1964). For more recent discussions see Jeffrey Herf, *Reactionary Modernism: Technology, Culture, and Politics in Weimar and the Third Reich* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984). More recent studies of the scientization of architecture and planning in service of the Third Reich include Dieter Münk, *Die Organisation des Raumes im Nationalsozialismus. Eine soziologische Untersuchung ideologisch fundierter Leitbilder in Architektur, Städtebau und Raumplanung des Dritten Reiches* (Bonn: Pahl-Rugenstein, 1993); see also the essays in Klaus R. Kunzmann, ed., *20 Jahre Raumplanung. Eine Disziplin institutionalisiert sich. Dortmunder Beiträge zur Raumplanung 50* (Dortmund: IRPUD/Institut für Raumplanung, 1990).

⁹⁷ On Walter Christaller, see Ruth Hottes, "Walter Christaller – Ein Überblick über sein Leben und Werk," in *Geographisches Taschenbuch*, ed. E. Ehlers and E. Meynen (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1981); and Mechtild Rössler, "Applied Geography and Area Research in Nazi Society: Central Place Theory and Planning, 1933 to 1945," *Environment and Planning* 7 (1989): 419-31. On Central Place Theory generally, see Edwin von Böventer, "Walter Christaller's Central Places and Peripheral Areas: The Central Place Theory in Retrospect," *Journal of Regional Science* 9 (1969): 117-124.

made of the theory by geographers and planners more vociferous in their call for an organic society that make it of interest here.

Christaller's first publication on the subject was his Erlangen university dissertation published in 1933, *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland*.⁹⁸ As Christaller explained in his foreword to the book, "The following work was originally conceived as a study in nation economy and political science. The leading viewpoints were therefore directed toward discovering the theoretical economic basis for the rational administration of the state and for the simplified annexation of the German empire."⁹⁹ Christaller's Central Place Theory was not concerned with individuals, or with community values as such, but rather with analyzing, accurately describing, and planning for the dispersal of populations, goods, and resources. In his investigation of the underlying scientific laws governing socio-economic behavior, Christaller's method seems to look back to the national economists of the nineteenth century, to Schmoller, Gierke, Schäffle, and others who sought to inscribe a developmental history that would adequately explain the modern world and, indeed, suggest a pattern for future actions. In Christaller's search for a modern calculus of living space, for a true science of settlement-geography, he drew a line between his project and the social sciences of the nineteenth century. Economic laws, he wrote, were completely different from natural laws.¹⁰⁰ The logic was one of mathematics not of associational passions. Christaller's intellectual sources were diverse,

⁹⁸ Walter Christaller, *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland, Eine ökonomisch-geographische Untersuchung über die Gesetzmäßigkeit der Verbreitung der Siedlungen mit städtischen Funktionen* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1933).

⁹⁹ "Die vorliegende Arbeit war ursprünglich als eine nationalökonomisch-staatswissenschaftliche gedacht; der leitende Gesichtspunkt wäre dabei der gewesen, die ökonomisch-theoretischen Unterlagen für einen rationalen Verwaltungsaufbau des Staates und eine das Staatsleben vereinfachende Neugliederung des Deutschen Reiches aufzusuchen." Christaller, *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland*, n.p.

¹⁰⁰ Christaller, *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland*, 15.

but two stand out particularly in the context of modern community planning. He drew significantly from the economically based spatial analyses of industry of Alfred Weber and the theories of the spatial manifestations of different economic systems developed by Franz Oppenheimer.¹⁰¹

Christaller sought to understand why populations are dispersed and clustered as they are, why people live in large or small towns, or in rural isolation, why there are regions with numerous large cities and other regions without a single large urban center. One might seek the answers to these questions in a narrative of historical development coupled with the accidents of geographic location: stories of Roman encampments and royal fortresses, of fortunate harbors and advantageous river crossings. But Christaller was not concerned with history or lifeways or the day-to-day business within towns and cities. He quite consciously named his subject the central “place” (Ort), rather than the city or the settlement.¹⁰² On the face of it, Central Place Theory offered a neutral, ahistorical, non-literary approach to settlements. Christaller defined and mapped a network of towns and cities ranked according to size, and correlated them to a hierarchical structure of regional economies. Geographic space in Christaller’s graphic representations was an undifferentiated tabula rasa on to which were plotted nucleic centers that might be, but were by no means required to be, co-terminus with the boundaries of a city or a community.¹⁰³ Population densities appeared as significant events, as concentrations or foci temporarily anchored in the economic protoplasm of the region or the nation state.

¹⁰¹ Alfred Weber, *Über den Standort der Industrien*, part 1, *Reine Theorie des Standorts* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1909) and Franz Oppenheimer, *System der Soziologie*, vol. 1, *Der soziale Prozess* (Jena: Fischer, 1923)

¹⁰² Christaller, *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland*, 24.

¹⁰³ Christaller, *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland*, 25.

The case for biological resonances within Christaller's work should not be pressed too far, as he did not frame his theory in that way. The connection within the work itself is made on two scores: the strikingly cellular images that he used to illustrate his theory (figures 102 and 103), and the thorough co-option of his theory by the pre-eminently biologistic ideology of community in the Third Reich. For all of Christaller's avoidance of an explicitly organic articulation of Central Place Theory, its underlying rationalities were essentially owed to the same mechanistic model of nature that compelled many other theories of biologistic modernism. Christaller may have set out to shape a disinterested, value-free science, but the applications of his ideas by Nazi planners in the 1930s and 1940s show just how operative Central Place Theory could be.

The instrument, so to speak, for Central Place Theory's influence on Third Reich planning policy was the Reichsstelle für Raumordnung, established in 1935 and charged with oversight and execution of new laws and regulations such as the Wohnsiedlungsgesetz of 1933, the Siedlungsordnungsgesetz of 1934, and the Reichsnaturgesetz of 1935. After publication of his thesis, Christaller was affiliated with a special research division of the Reichsstelle, the Reichsarbeitsgemeinschaft für Raumforschung und Raumordnung, a network of university-based research efforts founded in 1936 and directed by SS-Oberführer Konrad Meyer-Hetling until 1939. In the period from 1936 to 1939, Christaller was more directly involved with the subsidiary group, the Arbeitskreis Zentrale Orte (Study Group on Central Places). In 1939 Meyer was appointed director of the Institute for Agriculture and Politics under the Stabshauptamt für Planung und Boden. In 1940 Christaller joined Meyer in Berlin and conducted research for Meyer's Institute and for the Stabshauptamt für Planung und

Boden. Christaller helped draft the Generalplan Ost, which used Central Place Theory to chart the current location of settlements, trade, and transportation routes in recently annexed territories of Poland and Czechoslovakia, and to plan for future settlement expansions and the construction of new towns.¹⁰⁴

The exigencies of wartime planning in Germany had created a greater need for regional planning, as was the case throughout Europe and in the United States. But in Germany, particularly, the newly conquered and annexed regions of Poland, Silesia, and the Sudetenland, were perceived as a vast tabula rasa. The Generalplan Ost was the master plan for the expanded German Reich: a program of deportations, forced emigration, the destruction of existing towns and farms and the creation of new settlements whose size and placement would be determined in large part by the methods of Central Place Theory. Central Place Theory was used in the Third Reich to analyze transportation patterns, to determine where new settlements should be built, where existing settlements should be razed, and where concentration camps should be located.¹⁰⁵

Re-ordering the Topography of German community: Gottfried Feder's Science of the Volksgemeinschaft

Geography, like sociology, in the years of the Wilhelmine empire and Weimar Republic had been governed to a large extent by a dialectic paradigm that plotted a sharp division

¹⁰⁴ Walter Christaller was originally a member of the Social Democratic party. He signed on to the Nazi party in 1940. After the war he was a member of the Communist party from 1945 to 1959, when he rejoined the Social Democrats. Konrad Meyer stood trial at Nuremberg in 1946 for his SS and Generalplan Ost activities. He was convicted and served two years imprisonment. In 1956 Meyer was appointed to a teaching position in Gartenbau und Landeskultur at Hannover. See Mechtild Rössler, "Die Institutionalisierung einer neuen Wissenschaft im Nationalsozialismus. Raumforschung und Raumordnung 1935-1945," *Geographische Zeitschrift* (1987): 164-177.

¹⁰⁵ On the role of architects and planners in reshaping cities and villages after the annexation of Poland and Silesia, see Niels Gutschow, *Ordnungswahn. Architekten planen im "eingedeutschten Oste," 1939-1945* (Basel: Birkhäuser, 2001).

between urban space and rural space, and between the city as a settlement type and the village as a settlement type. Christaller introduced a set of new contentions into the field of settlement studies that marked what could be seen as a transition away from a strict sociological dyad *Gemeinschaft/Gesellschaft*, aligned with ideal, albeit antipodal, settlement types such as rural/urban or village/city, toward a conception of the settlement landscape as continuous space.¹⁰⁶ From the 1930s onward, modern planners, whether they articulated their ideas in the environs of CIAM conferences, regional planning offices, or German *Raumforschung* circles, drafted large-area plans in which the ostensible boundaries of urban population centers were seamlessly fused with the surrounding settlements and countryside. In Germany of the 1930s, this continuous planning rubric was termed the *Stadtlandschaft* (townscape), and carried within it the ideological impetus of the organic society. In professional practice, this meant that geographers and planners were charged with conceptualizing and controlling the totality of space. Now the nation was the organism, and the task at hand was to make every part, every cell, every organ, every region, every commune, every individual, operate to advance the survival of the whole.¹⁰⁷

Gottfried Feder (1883-1941) was among the propagandists and party officials of the Third Reich, through whose writings and agitation the articles of Central Place Theory were integrated into modern planning practice. Feder's early career melded professional training as a building engineer with agitational activities for economic reform. Engaged

¹⁰⁶ While in the late nineteenth century and first two decades of the twentieth, the tendency was towards theorizing the urban and the rural as opposing spheres of activity, in the post-WWII era, the division of *Gemeinschaft* versus *Gesellschaft* was tempered by spatial analyses that correlated life ways and settlement forms along a rural-urban continuum. See Giovanni Mottura, "Considerazioni sulla genesi e sulla crisi del concetto di 'Rural-Urban Continuum'," *Quaderni di sociologia* 16, no. 2 (1967): 123-143.

¹⁰⁷ Gutschow, *Ordnungswahn*, 121, 173-181.

as a propagandist, pamphleteer, and activist through the 1920s and 1930s, Feder held a number of organizational posts that tracked closely along the left wing of the rising National Socialist Workers Party, until he left the party leadership and went into a premature retirement in November 1934 (timing that suggested a connection to the Night of the Long Knives) as a professor of architecture at the Technische Hochschule Berlin-Charlottenburg.

A structural engineer by training and profession, Feder's financial frustrations and failures transformed him into a vehement critic of capitalism. He was a member of militantly nationalist and anti-Semitic groups like the Thule-Gesellschaft and the Hammerbund, founded by Theodor Fritsch. In 1919 Feder established his own organization, the Kampfbund zur Brechung der Zinsknechtschaft (Action league to crush tax servitude). Through the 1920s and early 1930s, he wrote essays and books railing against Jews, financial speculation, capitalism, and the immorality of interest. Feder was a founding member of the Deutsche Arbeiter Partei (German Worker Party), which became the Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei (NSDAP, National Socialist Workers Party) in 1920. When the NSDAP was re-established in 1925 (after its abolition in the wake of the 1923 Putsch attempt), Feder was awarded membership card number eleven.

Feder's transition from economics into planning was borne along by his training as an engineer as well as by his agitation for property reform. In the 1920 platform he helped draft for the National Socialists, amid the edicts for a Deutsche Blutgemeinschaft and abolition of war profiteering and private incomes, Feder proposed common property ownership and resettlement of populations in the countryside to boost agricultural

production and relieve urban crowding. In 1931 Feder was a founding member (along with engineer Franz Lawaczeck and architect Paul Schultze-Naumburg) of the NSDAP-affiliated Kampfbund Deutscher Architekten und Ingenieure, and in 1934 he was appointed Reichskommissar für das Siedlungswesen (Reich Commissioner for Study of Settlements), a position he held for only a few months before being shuttled off to Charlottenburg to teach city planning.¹⁰⁸

As part of his general activities in the field of planning and economics, Feder had been a member of Konrad Meyer's and Walter Christaller's Central Place Theory study group. The basic propositions of Central Place Theory, its organicist undertones, and its powerful graphic representations were incorporated into Feder's 1939 city planning treatise, *Die neue Stadt* (The New City). *Die neue Stadt*, a comprehensive treatise on modern planning.¹⁰⁹

Feder proposed a new science of city planning that would grow out of the social structures of German life itself. Empirical research would yield planning guidelines and models for an ideal, organic, functioning community – with first preference for the small town of about 20,000 inhabitants, where every variable was controlled and held in balance, from the number of schools, shops, and manufactories, to the number of families, single people, workers, and even priests. In Feder's vision for the ideal small town, the circular, walled, and cell-like medieval city of Nördlingen was proposed as an

¹⁰⁸ See Werner Durth, *Deutsche Architekten. Biographische Verflechtungen 1900-1970* (Munich: Deutsche Taschenbuch Verlag, 1992), 120-121.

¹⁰⁹ Gottfried Feder, *Die neue Stadt* (Berlin: J. Springer, 1939). In the post-war period Feder's principles were cleansed of their overt Nazi appurtenances and propagated as models for a new generation of planners who were driven, as Feder was, to reconcile the rational and the romantic tendencies within modernity.; and Dirk Schubert, "Gottfried Feder und sein Beitrag zur Stadtplanungstheorie. Technokratische Richtwertplanung oder nationalsozialistische Stadtplanungsideologie?" *Die Alte Stadt* 13, no. 3 (1986): 192.

archetype for the ideal modern community (figures 104 and 105). His embrace of the organic, cellular view of community operated at both the level of platitude, through appeals to sentiment referencing an idealized medieval past of moral certainty and social unity, and as a technocratic imperative, by which actual medieval models were absorbed into a scientizing rhetoric of modernity. The "problem" of the city was solved by creating dispersed networks of new, hygienic, and stylistically unified small towns. Into a rhetoric that married the biological bases for city sanitary renewal to a more metaphoric biologism, Feder injected a völkisch ethos. Feder's theory of planning for the organic community echoed earlier cellular community paradigms, but was fueled by an explicit political agenda. The individual members of society are like cells, some higher, some lower, he wrote, but all part of the community organism. The design of the new Third Reich towns must, therefore, guarantee that "each cell of the organism would live for the good of the others." The individual would be sublimated to the needs of the greater community, the greater organism, the state.¹¹⁰ In addition to outlining the theory and practice of new town design in the Third Reich, Feder's treatise on *Die Neue Stadt* addressed the question of regional planning, mapping the ideal geography for the newly annexed districts of the Eastern zones (figure 106). From the great regional clusters of smoothly functioning cellular communities would be created the great organism of the state, the Reich.

Planning policy in the Third Reich found an analogue of cellular form in the framework of the *Gau*, the regional administrative unit that was the center of the all-encompassing administrative bureaucracy designed to ensure that every municipality, every

¹¹⁰ Feder, *Die neue Stadt*, 19.

neighborhood, every settlement was brought into line with the commands of the central Nazi government.¹¹¹ As the cell was to the organism, so the individual and the greater community unit would be to the greater state. While Feder's version of the organic Volksgemeinschaft owed as much to the inheritance of Herder, the Wandervögel, and the Heimatbewegung, he along with other German planners also utilized the cellular form as a more rationalized pattern of community planning, particularly with regard to city expansion. The concept of *Siedlungszellen*, settlement cells, offered a means for remaking and expanding the urban fabric as a controlled, regulated cellular community. In *Die neue Stadt*, Feder described the organization of the Siedlungszellen: "This urban organism is made up of a series of cells, which group themselves into cellular formations within various sub-nuclei around a central point in the city."¹¹²

The concept of the Siedlungszelle was taken up in 1940 by Hamburg architect and city planner Konstanty Gutschow in his work "Die Ortsgruppe als Siedlungszelle" (the local branch as settlement cell), and became the basis for a 1944 competition to design a city addition in Hamburg.¹¹³ Gutschow's urban neighborhood plan correlated urban form so closely to the block and cell system of the National Socialist government that it seems almost like a schematic diagram of the latter. The foundation of Gutschow's plan was population units based in a mixture of building types and economic classes, which were then amalgamated into settlement cells of about 8,000 people each. Each cell would have

¹¹¹ On planning in the Third Reich, see Christian Otto, "City-Planning Theory in National Socialist Germany," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 24 (March 1965): 70-74.

¹¹² "Dieser Stadtorganismus wird sich zusammensetzen aus einer ganz Reihe von Zellen, die sich dann zu Zellverbänden innerhalb verschiedener Unterkerne um die Stadtmittelpunkt gruppieren." Feder, *Die neue Stadt*, 19.

¹¹³ See Elke Pahl-Weber, "Die Ortsgruppe als Siedlungszelle. Ein Vorschlag zur Methodik der großstädtischen Stadterweiterung von 1940," in *Planen und Bauen in Europa 1930-1945*, ed. Harmut Frank (Hamburg: Hans Christians Verlag, 1985), 282-298.

a complement of shops, cultural buildings, and, at the center of the community as *Stadtkrone*, a grouping of community buildings and the local Nazi party headquarters. The September 1944 competition brought forth a number of different plans through which the cellular idea was expressed in gridded streets, and in a proposal by the partnership of Helmut Hentrich and Hans Heuser, which synthesized the medievalized settlement form championed by Feder in *Die neue Stadt* with the biologized model of the cellular organism (figure 107).

The German planning typology of the *Siedlungszelle* of the 1930s and 1940s was comparable to the American “neighborhood unit” concept, developed in the 1920s and implemented as a planning concept from the 1930s forward. The American neighborhood unit concept grew out of a movement to regenerate community life during the First World War. Clarence Perry, who drafted the precepts of the neighborhood unit idea, had worked his way toward regional planning as a social worker and activist for municipal playgrounds and community centers.¹¹⁴ Perry’s neighborhood unit concept predated the work of Feder and Gutschow by some twenty years, and indeed the German planners knew of the American idea when they proposed their own scheme for dividing urban centers into manageable areas. By the 1940s the neighborhood unit concept was enmeshed with the German concept of the *Volksgemeinschaft*, the ideal of a seamless fabric of belief, action, and control extending from the highest levels of the state into the realms of everyday life.¹¹⁵ The cell model and the neighborhood unit model both offered manageable, convincing models for modern planning that spoke to the rationalization

¹¹⁴ See Clarence Arthur Perry, “The Neighborhood Unit,” in *Neighborhood and Community Planning*, vol. 7 (New York: Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs, 1929).

¹¹⁵ Ernst Lehmann, *Volksgemeinschaft aus Nachbarschaften. Eine Volkskunde des deutschen Nachbarschaftswesens* (Prague: Noebe, 1944); Helmut Klages, *Der Nachbarschaftsgedanke und die nachbarschaftliche Wirklichkeit in der Großstadt* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1968).

concerns of the commissioning state or municipal entities on one hand, and the day-to-day needs of the users – the residents – on the other. Both offered approaches for scaling the potential vastness of the big city to everyday human needs. Both offered ways to embed ideological principles of culture, political participation, and social consensus into the built environment.

Conclusion: Wohin Gemeinschaft?

In 1919, the year of manifestoes, the revolutionary councils in Germany issued proclamations that seemed to draw a line between the past and the future, between tradition and modernity. The Arbeitsrat für Kunst in Berlin published a program of six demands that positioned a common, democratic artistic culture as the generator of a new collective life.¹ "Art and people must form a unity... Art shall no longer be the enjoyment of the few but the life and happiness of the masses," the council decreed, and proposed the democratization of museums, schools, housing, and city planning. Echoing Bruno Taut's *Architektur-Programme* of the previous year, the Arbeitsrat conceived the future of culture as borne along on a new wave of architectural ideas and practices.² The path would be cleared by the destruction of old monuments and buildings. Housing would provide the most important locus for democratizing society, through the establishment of new estates that would serve as perpetual laboratories of architectural experimentation.

While Taut's and the Arbeitrat für Kunst's declarations envision a tabula rasa, other manifestoes of the early Weimar Republic acknowledged, if not a narrative of historical progress, then a moral fable of history as eternal return. In his program for the founding of the Staatliches Bauhaus, Walter Gropius (who was also a signatory to the Arbeitsrat für Kunst manifesto), sought to gather together all the arts under the sheltering cloak of architecture as the supreme art that enfolds all others. Gropius conceived of the new design education as a return to craft, understood as the historical crafts of woodworking,

¹ "1919. 'Work Council for Art.' Under the wing of a great architecture," in *Programs and Manifestoes on 20th-Century Architecture*, ed. Ulrich Conrads (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1970), 44-45.

² "1918. Bruno Taut: A Programme for Architecture," in *Programs and Manifestoes onf 20th-Century Architecture*, ed. Conrads, 41-43.

weaving, painted glass, and metals, through which fledgling artists and designers would rediscover the physicality of materials, the fundamentals of fabrication, and the proper feeling for form. Though Gropius' brief was indeed only to draft the rationale and curriculum for a new art school, his conception summoned visions of an entirely new society. The Bauhaus would be an incubation chamber. The labors of artists and craftsmen working side by side in the school's studios were seeds of a new future. Gropius' model for art and craft unified under architecture was the Bauhütte, the guild of craftsmen who built the medieval cathedral. What was graphically represented in the Bauhaus program by Lyonel Feininger's woodcut of a crystalline cathedral bedecked with stars and radiating beams of light, was verbalized by Gropius in the pamphlet printed in conjunction with the 1919 Exhibition for Unknown Architects. Architecture was the instrument, he wrote, for realizing "the rebirth of that spiritual unity which ascended to the miracle of the Gothic cathedrals."³ Even while looking toward the future, Gropius conjured a Golden Age of the medieval past, a time when society was ostensibly bound together into a *Gemeinschaft* of shared labor.

The medievalizing yearnings of the early Bauhaus and its Expressionist milieu are interesting for a study concerned with the relationships of historical tradition and modernity, but it is this figure of labor as the generator and bond of community that is most important here. The idea that work might persevere in binding a community together as other, more ancient forces like family, village, church, and monarchy faded away, was a favorite tenet of sociologists Durkheim, Tönnies, and Sombart. It underlay Bruno Taut's utopian vision of handworker communities in *Die Auflösung der Stadt*, and

³ "1919. Walter Gropius: Programme of the Staatliches Bauhaus in Weimar," in *Programs and Manifestoes on 20th-Century Architecture*, ed. Conrads, 49-53.

it compelled Peter Kropotkin's dream of a classless society in which everyman was a thinker, everyman a maker.

In the waning years of the nineteenth century, Tönnies drew upon anthropological models to propose that community arose from deep within human nature. There was a will towards collective life, a social instinct. The connective tissue of social relations was originally rooted in blood relation and proximity – in the family, the clan, and the village. As *Gemeinschaft* passed into *Gesellschaft*, the morality of the farm, village, and small town gave way to the manners of the city. The bonds of kinship gave way to social relationships based in rational transactions, such as trade and monetary exchange. Tönnies held out the possibility of *Gemeinschaft* forms of social life surviving into the modern era. Brotherhoods of scholars and religious believers, cooperatives of the *Genossenschaft* movement – such intentional communities were the islands of *Gemeinschaft* within *Gesellschaft*.

Tönnies' colleague in the *Gesellschaft für Soziologie*, Werner Sombart, inferred that some of the very agents driving the formation of *Gesellschaft*, such as industrialization and the rise of the working class, might also be producing new forms of *Gemeinschaft*. At an earlier point in his career, he believed the labor unions were such an entity – new communities that were gathering up the scattered strands of sodality remaining from the ancient craftsmen's guilds. But Sombart was less interested in identifying vestiges of the past than in giving a name to the forces shaping modernity. The main focus of his work was the economic basis of society. His Marxist-inspired analyses considered not just the forces of labor and production, but also the vectors of taste and consumption. Such subjects made the city the central milieu of sociological study, for Sombart, as for other

sociologists and social critics writing from the turn of the century and into the 1920s and 1930s.

As *Gemeinschaft* evolved into *Gesellschaft*, what happened to community in modernity? What was the fate of the forces of history and tradition by which *Gemeinschaft* was framed? If, as Ferdinand Tönnies believed, there were forms and pockets of *Gemeinschaft* life even within *Gesellschaft*, where did they reside in the cities and settlements of modern Germany? Sociologists and architects of the late Wilhelmine period presented one case for *Gemeinschaft*: it was generated in the home, in the small community, in the enfolding of the actions of the one into the interests of the many. As *Gesellschaft* became ascendant, and as the city replaced the village and small town as the principal home and source of identity for Germany's citizens, what did architects and planners consider the basic unit of community? What did they see as the compelling forces keeping community life bound together? What kind of architecture did they believe would set the stage for this new, more modern unfolding of collective life?

The Village in the City

There were many Wilhelmine- and Weimar-era architectural projects that sought to foster *Gemeinschaft* within *Gesellschaft*. In addition to small-scale utopian experiments like Theodor Frisch's *Heimland*, the Garden City settlements for craft and industrial workers, Garden City-inspired suburbs designed for the middle classes, and suburban estates like Taut and Wagner's *Hufeisensiedlung*, the 1910s and 1920s saw a number of plans realized for urban housing estates and apartment blocks that sought to recreate the image of the traditional village or small town – and to invoke some semblance of village-scale

comity – in the middle of the city. In Berlin as in other cities of the Reich and Republic, many ambitious projects were supported by the *Baugenossenschaften*, the building associations. Philosophically, these groups were part of a larger associational movement, espoused by social scientists and reformers such as Heinrich Albrecht, Adolf Damaschke, and Franz Oppenheimer, and directed toward mitigating economic hardships and inequalities. Frequently financed by interested reformers, and occasionally by labor unions, the *Baugenossenschaften* supported diverse building efforts in the 1910s and 1920s.⁴

One of these building associations, the Berliner Bau- und Wohnungsgenossenschaft von 1892, commissioned a number of housing blocks in Berlin from architect Alfred Messel.⁵ Reform-minded building projects such as the apartments in Sickingen Strasse (1893-95), Proskauer Strasse (1897-98), and Stargarder Strasse (1899-1900) provided not just residences but also garden courts, play areas, common rooms, libraries, and festivals organized by the residents (figure 108). Messel conceived of his apartment buildings as a communities unto themselves. While often quite large, his buildings blended into the urban street fabric, but were neither anonymous nor ostentatious. Messel articulated the

⁴ Klaus Novy describes four different kinds of building associations forming in the Wilhelmine era: 1) those dedicated to promoting individual home ownership; 2) those promoting benefits and self-help measures for company employees or state employees; 3) paternal and Christian organizations that linked social reforms to the improvement of morals through communal life; and 4) radical and separatist reformers who sought to remake the basis of social life, exemplified by utopian communities such as the garden colony Eden near Berlin, see Klaus Novy and Barbara von Neumann-Cosel, eds. *Zwischen Tradition und Innovation. 100 Jahre Bau- und Wohnungsgenossenschaft von 1892* (Berlin: Edition Hentrich, 1992), 47-48. On the building reform associations in Berlin, see Klaus Novy and Barbara von Neumann-Cosel, eds., *Wohnreform in Berlin – Ein Arbeitsprogramm wird vorgestellt* (Berlin: Edition Hentrich, 1991).

⁵ On Messel, see the introductory essays by Robert Habel, Fritz Neumeyer, and Dieter Hoffmann-Axthelm in *Alfred Messel-Seminar. Wohnen und Arbeiten in der Innenstadt Sanierungsgebiet Kollwitzplatz, Berlin-Prenzlauer Berg. Oktober 1999-Mai 2000*, ed. STERN Gesellschaft der behutsamen Stadterneuerung (Berlin: Berliner Bau- und Wohnungsgenossenschaft von 1892, 2000). On the building association, which continues to support construction of innovative reform housing to the present day, while also managing its numerous historical properties, see Novy and von Neumann-Cosel, eds. *Zwischen Tradition und Innovation*.

facades through restrained use of Northern Renaissance and vernacular motifs such as rusticated foundations, steeply pitched roofs, gables, balconies, loggia, and corner towers. At the Stargarder site, the symbol of the Berliner Bau- und Wohnungsgenossenschaft von 1892 – the beehive, emblem of felicitous collective life – was emblazoned above the building's doorways (figure 109).

On its founding in 1902, the Protestant-based Vaterländischer Bauverein zu Berlin pieced together a strip of property that ran through the center of one of Berlin's large blocks in the working class district of Wedding.⁶ Following the typical mode of building in central Berlin at the time – a comparatively narrow street façade behind which ran an enfilade of apartment structures linked by open courtyards, the *Hinterhöfe* – one D. Schwartzkopff, a pastor on the board of the association, designed a project to house over one thousand people. Among the striking feature of Schwartzkopff's design was a series of six courts rendered in various period styles to illustrate the progress of Berlin from "*Fischerdorf zur Kaiserstadt*," from fishing village to imperial city. The parade of architectural history included courtyard facades and sidewalls rendered as Romanesque, medieval Brandenburg, old Nuremberg, northern Renaissance, Baroque, and modern (figure 110). In addition to three- and four-room dwellings for families, the housing association provided extensive amenities and social activities for the inhabitants, including an assembly room, washing facilities, monthly association meetings, child care, an association library, a choral society, and seasonal presentations of song and theater. To preserve the character of family life, association rules forbade subletting or taking in boarders, and instead set aside a wing of the complex as single-room residences for

⁶ *Der Vaterländische Bauverein zu Berlin, eingetragene Genossenschaft mit beschränkter Haftpflicht. Im Auftrage des Vereinsvorstandes herausgeben von Schwartzkopff, Pf.*, 2nd. ed. (Berlin: Selbstverlag, 1906).

unmarried and widowed women, along with a hospice for single men, renting rooms by the night, week, and month.

In addition to the lessons of history displayed in the courtyards of the Wedding settlement, carved panels beneath the windows on the Strelitzer Strasse entrance, lost in World War II bombings, admonished the inhabitants *Gott mit uns! Bete und Arbeit! Einigkeit macht stark!* God be with us! Pray and work! Unity makes us strong! (figure 111).

Through a program of subsidized housing and social betterment efforts, the Vaterländischer Bauverein's Protestant leaders hoped to raise urban dwellers to a higher level of ethical, hygienic, and cultural behavior. As the association's program put it, "*Es gilt einen neuen Mittelstand zu schaffen!*" It is necessary to create a new middle class! The raw material for this manufacture was to be found among the residents amassing in the old tenements of Berlin, particularly among the ranks of skilled blue-collar workers and the lower earning strata of administrative employees – those members of the Mittelstand straddling the class divide or perhaps even clinging to the bottom ranks of middle class respectability. The association's housing offered the possibility of raising the status of one's family and oneself; it also held out the hope of at least not losing ground in the competitive tussle of urban life. With all the instabilities of social meaning and self-identity in the metropolis, these new kinds of social-reform housing implied that the fluidity of urban society also provided a frame for new kinds of status and respectability. The prospects of getting ahead and of improving one's lot were after all among the most powerful attractions for moving to the city.

Like the architects gathered at Hagen in 1906, debating the merits of the farmhouse as a model for the worker's home, Alfred Messel and the members of the Berliner Bau- und Wohnungsgenossenschaft von 1892, and Schwartzkopff and his compatriots in the Vaterländischer Bauverein, held high ideals of architecture as an instrument of moral instruction. Much as the Hagen architects saw themselves engaged in making working class identity legible in the buildings and streets of the laborers' settlements, so Messel, Schwartzkopff, and many others involved in the design and construction of reform apartments, sought to create an architectural representation adequate to the developing class identity of the Mittelstand.

The architectural programs of Messel's designs for the Berliner Bau- und Wohnungsgenossenschaft von 1892 and Schwartzkopff's design for the Vaterländischer Bauverein's Wedding project suggest a inventory of virtues for the emerging Mittelstand, an inventory which was perhaps dictated by the projects' patrons, but which also reflected that class's own evolving self-image. The assembly halls and lending libraries showed a commitment to useful leisure and the conviviality of well-mannered social life. The pedagogy of historicized façade ornament telegraphed love of country and a sense of rootedness and place. Messel's beehive and the admonitory phrases on the Strelitzer Strasse façade proclaimed to the passing public that respectability and sedulity dwelt therein. At a time when Lebensreform ideas reached into all corners of society, the affiliation of apartment buildings with the social reform movement was in itself a sign of the residents' modernity, self-cultivation, and ambitions. Indeed, the housing association projects stood out dramatically against the extant fabric of the inner city. Before the First World War, the projects were "*Inseln im Meer des steinernen Berlin*," islands in the sea

of stone Berlin.⁷ The distinctive feature of Berlin's urban fabric in the northern and eastern reaches of the city was the endless blocks of the *Mietskaserne*, the rental barracks built by developers who maximized profits by packing as many people as possible into the space allotted. The small two- and three-room apartments were crowded with family members and boarders brought in to help cover costs. The rental barracks housed not only the poorest of the poor and the most recently arriving laborers coming into the city from the small towns and countryside, but also sizable numbers of hard-working families who had recourse to no better dwelling.⁸

As the housing reform associations grew, they reached beyond the tight spatial constraints of the inner city toward projects in outlying areas and on the urban periphery. Sparingly in the decade before the First World War, and aggressively in the decade after, the building associations expanded beyond plans for single apartment-block projects to begin constructing entirely new neighborhoods to serve the emerging middle classes of office workers, government administrators, and small business owners. Even as the architectural styles changed, there was consistency across the diverse programs and intentions of these larger housing projects of the late Wilhelmine and early Weimar periods. "Wholesome urbanity" is perhaps the most succinct description of those intentions. Through careful disposition of the apartment plans, unified treatment of the

⁷ Klaus Novy, "Wohnreform in Berlin – Eine Entwicklungsskizze," in *Wohnreform in Berlin – Ein Arbeitsprogramm wird vorgestellt*, ed. Novy and von Neumann-Cosel, 28. The reference is to Werner Hegemann, *Das steinerne Berlin, Geschichte der größten Mietskasernenstadt der Welt* (1930; Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1988).

⁸ The most notorious of the Berlin *Mietskaserne*, Meyers Hof, lay in the Acker Strasse in Wedding, just a short distance away from the Vaterländischer Bauverein's project. Meyers Hof penetrated seven buildings and six courts deep. In their study of day-to-day life in Meyers Hof, Jonas Geist and Klaus Kürvers show that while the poor hygiene and narrow quarters of the tenement made life difficult, the buildings nevertheless sheltered close, long-lived communities. See Johann Friedrich Geist and Klaus Kürvers, *Das Berliner Mietshaus, 1862-1945* (Munich: Prestel, 1984).

massing and facades, artful allusions to history and tradition in the ornament, and extensive provision of public garden areas, the settlements established a new typology for urban housing estates. Equally distinct from the dense inner city Mietskasernen and the suburban Zeilenbau settlements, the typology offered many variations on the village-in-the-city idea.

A number of major developments were undertaken along the expanding southwest edges of Berlin, bridging the urban center with the villa and park districts of the Grönewald and Dahlem. As Helmut Geisert has noted, the numerous projects built specifically to house the burgeoning middle classes in southwest Berlin between 1890 through the Weimar era gave that area of the city an architectural character that differed greatly from the working-class quarters of the east and the north.⁹ The attention to air and light in the individual apartments, the platting of graceful streets and landscaped squares, and the assurance of convenient access to public transportation signaled a new level of integration of home, public space, and metropolitan life.

Among the earliest of the large urban developments undertaken in the southwest areas by the socially progressive building associations was Lindenhof, a settlement of some 200 residences built between 1918 and 1921 under the direction of Martin Wagner, the chief of buildings for the city of Schöneberg (incorporated into greater Berlin in 1920).¹⁰ Sited around a lake, Lindenhof included ample public and private garden areas designed by

⁹ Helmut Geisert, "Reformmodelle für das städtische Wohnen," in *Stadt der Architektur/Architektur der Stadt. Berlin 1900-2000*, ed. Thorsten Scheer, Josef Paul Kleihues, and Paul Kahlfeldt (Berlin: Nicolai, 2000), 43.

¹⁰ Wagner became Baurat, building director, of greater Berlin in 1924.

Leberecht Migge. There were also accommodations for unmarried men, designed by Bruno Taut but no longer standing (figure 112).¹¹

Another Schöneberg project, Ceciliengärten, was originally conceived in 1912 by Paul Wolf under commission from the Gemeinnützige Heimstättengesellschaft, and completed between 1924 and 1926 by Heinrich Lassen. The apartment blocks are arranged around a large central plaza graced with flowerbeds and two sculptures, *Der Morgen* (Morning) and *Der Abend* (Evening; both 1926) by Georg Kolbe. The rowhouse stylings of Ceciliengärten present a subtle Expressionist massing of the streetfront facades. There is also Expressionist detailing punctuated by animal and plant motifs at the entrance portals, window eaves, and cornices. The simple classicism of Kolbe's sculptures is repeated in figurative reliefs above the entrance doors of the inner court (figures 113 and 114).

In addition to the social reform building associations, there were a number of investment-oriented groups, which also undertook design and construction of major village-in-the-city settlements in the late Wilhelmine and early Weimar period. These *Terraingesellschaften*, land associations, purchased large tracts of land at the boundaries of Berlin's expansion. They then either themselves arranged to build housing and shops as well as streets and plazas, or merely drafted a master plan for building plots and transportation, and resold parcels to other developers who would do the actual construction. The *Berlinische Boden Gesellschaft*, founded in 1890, was such an

¹¹ Two-thirds of the Lindenhof settlement was destroyed by World War II bombing. See Maria Berning et al., *Berliner Wohnquartiere. Ein Führer durch 80 Siedlungen in Ost und West* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1994), 116-119. The residents of Lindenhof assembled their own history of day-to-day life in the settlement, see Berliner Geschichtswerkstatt, ed., *"Das war'ne ganz geschlossene Gesellschaft hier." Der Lindenhof: Eine Genossenschaftssiedlung in der Großstadt* (Berlin: Berliner Geschichtswerkstatt, 1997).

organization.¹² Dedicated to promoting home ownership among the established Mittelstand, the Berlinische Boden Gesellschaft created site plans and design guidelines (often promoted through competitions and prizes), and contracted with other developers to construct the buildings. The Gesellschaft oversaw the development of entire city neighborhoods, including the Bayerisches Viertel (Bavarian Quarter) in Berlin-Schöneberg, begun in 1898. With the streets planned by the city of Schöneberg and general design standards for individual buildings and plazas specified by the Gesellschaft, the project took shape over ten years, eventually comprising some 500 buildings and numerous plazas, including competitions for the designs of the Viktoria-Luise-Platz and the Bayerischer-Platz. The Bayerisches Viertel had a unified look and feel, described as the "Nürnberger Stil," the style of old Nuremberg, with half-timbered gables, corner towers, and deep loggias. Envisioned as a tasteful neighborhood for middle and upper-middle class residents, the neighborhood formed "a tiny idyll amidst the metropolitan bustle."¹³

In a similar manner, and toward similar social and aesthetic ends, the Berlinische Boden Gesellschaft and an affiliated agency, the Terraingesellschaft Berlin Südwestern, founded in 1895, developed the neighborhood of Rüdeshheimer Platz, an ensemble of five-story terrace apartments built between 1910 and 1914 in the town of Wilmersdorf, after a master plan by architect Paul Jatzow, and individual buildings by other architects, inspired by the English Tudor manor house. The visual unity of the development was

¹² *40 Jahre Berlinische Boden-Gesellschaft. Ein Bild der Groß-Berlin Wohnungsversorgung und der Tätigkeit der Gesellschaft vor, während und nach der Kriegszeit* (Berlin: Berlinische Boden-Gesellschaft, 1930).

¹³ "Die Straße ist um Nürnberger Stil errichtet und bildet auf ihre Weise auch heute noch ein kleines Idyll im Mittelpunkt des großstädtischen Getriebes," *40 Jahre Berlinische Boden-Gesellschaft*, 12.

reinforced by a large, central public garden with sculptural fountain, designed by Emil Cauer, Jr. (figures 115 and 116).¹⁴

In practice, whether or not the projects actually originated in cooperative or land reform philosophies, these village-inspired housing schemes came to represent a certain style of dwelling and milieu, a certain brand of distinctly Wilhelmine urbanity. The right blend of historical reference and modern accoutrement on the façade signaled the educational and social status of the dwellers within. The right disposition of pathways and walks, public squares and private courts, signaled a reconciliation of urban necessity and natural beauty. The right balance of cornice lines and bays, of small shops at the ground floor and medievalizing style at the roof, showed that even within the chaos, the competition, and the calculation of the modern metropolis, there were new social graces to be discovered within Gesellschaft.

Die Stadt ist auch eine Gemeinschaft – The City is also a Community

The work of Sombart's and Tönnies' contemporary, sociologist Georg Simmel, was fully focused on the city of the late Wilhelmine period as the principal theater of modern life. Rather than looking back to a seemingly more orderly age, against which the present moment would always be found wanting, Simmel was interested in Gesellschaft as such, in the urbanity of the Großstadt, and in new forms of human interaction and expression taking shape within the precincts of the metropolis. Simmel's *Philosophie des Geldes* (philosophy of money) of 1900 opened up a subject and methodology of sociological

¹⁴ Berning et al., *Berliner Wohnquartier*, 97-100; *40 Jahre Berlinische Boden-Gesellschaft*, 26-32.

analysis that he continued to explore for the next decade and a half.¹⁵ For Simmel, it was not enough to say that modern social interactions were governed by rational choice, by calculation and self-interest. It was not enough simply to accept that the universalizing character of monetary exchange under capitalism seemed to produce a leveling of values in modern society. Simmel sought to map the psychic operations by which subject, object, and society were bound together into a constellation of reciprocal, perpetual meaning-making by the activities of economic exchange. He examined the way monetary culture reconfigured both the most fleeting and the most durable phenomena of everyday life – from modes of dress and manners among strangers on the street to the relations between the sexes and the fashioning of class-identity. Capitalism exerted pressure of metamorphic proportion on the traditional categories of philosophical meaning-making. Conceptions of beauty, Kantian categories of judgment, and the cultivation of the inner self gave way to a new dynamic. The ubiquity of monetary exchange produced a new equivalence of values, and, moreover, an equivalence that was constantly changing. The signal effect in modern life was the production of distance, the emergence of an ever-

¹⁵ Georg Simmel, *Philosophie des Geldes* (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1900); *The Philosophy of Money*, 2nd enlarged edition, ed. David Frisby, trans. Tom Bottemore and David Frisby (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1990). See also Gianfranco Poggi, *Money and the Modern Mind: Georg Simmel's Philosophy of Money* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993). While Simmel's "Die Grosstädte und das Geistesleben" (The Metropolis and Mental Life) is often considered emblematic of his ideas about the urban milieu, and indeed, a guide to the mentalité of modern urbanism, the essay is essentially an extract from *Philosophy of Money*. Delivered as a 1903 lecture before the Dresden Gehe-Stiftung, and included in a collection of essays dealing with the city, published in association with a city planning exhibition, Simmel's discussion of urban "nervosity" appeared alongside works by geographer Friedrich Ratzel, economist Karl Bücher, historian Dietrich Schäfer, and many others – none of them as positive as was Simmel about the social changes being wrought by the closeness and distractions of urban life. See Karl Bücher, ed., *Die Großstadt. Jahrbuch der Gehe-Stiftung zu Dresden 9* (Dresden: Zahn & Jaensch, 1903). See also Ilja Srubar, "Zur Formierung des soziologischen Blickes durch die Großstadtswahrnehmung," in *Die Großstadt als "Text,"* ed. Michael Smuda (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1992), 37-52; and Lothar Müller, "Die Großstadt als Ort der Moderne. Über Georg Simmel," in *Die Unwirklichkeit der Städte. Großstadtdarstellungen zwischen Moderne und Postmoderne*, ed. Klaus R. Scherpe (Reinbeck bei Hamburg: Rohwohlt, 1988), 14-36.

shifting gap of uncertain meaning between the subject and the object, the self and the world.

Simmel's interests in mass culture, the sociology of knowledge, emerging forms of aesthetic meaning, and the idea of the city as the primary arena of modernity were influential for later writers such as Siegfried Kracauer and Walter Benjamin.¹⁶ More importantly, Kracauer and Benjamin took up Simmel's method of excavating beneath the surface of cultural phenomena as a means of uncovering the deeper psychological vectors at work in modernity. The signal quality of Simmel's sociological project, a quality shared by Kracauer and Benjamin, and one that differentiates their writings from those of Tönnies and Sombart, was the absence of a sense of over-weaning regret for the world passing away. Simmel, Kracauer, and Benjamin were not unaware that ways of life that had held sway for centuries were disappearing. The tenor of rhetoric in Benjamin's work especially belongs to the tragic voice. But they saw also that the anonymity, competition, and instability of the metropolis sheltered emancipatory potential. The city offered opportunities for individual self-realization that were not tenable in the tradition-bound milieux of village and small town. The city brought forth new possibilities for the future, not least the option to be free of the past.

¹⁶ On Kracauer's interest in Simmel, see the excerpt from the former's unpublished book, "Georg Simmel," in *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays*, trans., ed. and with an intro. by Thomas Y. Levin (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995), 225-257. See also Henrik Reeh, "The Resubjectivization of Modern Urban Culture," in *Ornaments of the Metropolis: Siegfried Kracauer and Modern Urban Culture* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2004), 19-36. While the influence of Simmel on Benjamin is diffused throughout the latter's work, Benjamin specifically wove extracts and commentaries on *Philosophie des Geldes* into his study of the Paris shopping arcades, see *The Arcades Project*, trans. Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin, prepared on the basis of the German volume edited by Rolf Tiedemann (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999). See also Susan Buck-Morss, *The Dialectics of Seeing: Walter Benjamin and the Arcades Project* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989); and Graeme Gilloch, *Myth and Metropolis: Walter Benjamin and the City* (Cambridge, Eng.: Blackwell, 1996).

The Lament for Lost Community

The inquiry into the architecture of *Gesellschaft* opens up a discussion of building types and sociological theories that goes far beyond the boundaries of the present study to examine how the environment was designed to accommodate new forms of mass culture, mass entertainment, mass communication, mass transportation, consumer culture, and constructed leisure.¹⁷ The planning discussion itself moves beyond the design of discrete buildings and settlements to consider the total environment, and the forty-plus year reign of the CIAM model of the functional city.¹⁸

There are elements of this study that can be traced forward. Designing for *Gemeinschaft-within-Gesellschaft* is an especially persistent figure in modernism – from the community center movement in the United States to the *Kulturhäuser* in the DDR, from the neighborhood unit to the cluster, from Le Corbusier's "street" in the *Unité d'Habitation* to the construction of pedestrian promenades in rehabilitated downtown districts. Each of these efforts is borne along by its own theory about the nature of society and human interaction, assigning the position of generator of core community values to cultural endeavor, geographic proximity, and economic consumption. Just as persistent a figure from early modernism to the present day is the use of design in the service of the resurrection of a lost *Gemeinschaft*. Although on first glance rather distant from one another on the spectrum of social goals, the architecture of the communal experiments of the 1960s and 1970s and more recent projects carried out under the rubric of New

¹⁷ See, for example, the examinations of the architecture of entertainment and consumerism in Weimar Germany in Kathleen James-Chakraborty, *German Architecture for a Mass Audience* (London: Routledge, 2000); and Janet Ward, *Weimar Surfaces: Urban Visual Culture in 1920s Germany* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001)

¹⁸ See Eric Mumford, *The CIAM Discourse on Urbanism, 1928-1960* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2000).

Urbanism share an interest in regenerating *Gemeinschaft*. Both used vernacular forms, the invocation of ostensibly more authentic ways of life, and the valorization of the family, clan, or neighborhood to demarcate the boundary between community and other. The discourse surrounding such projects, in registers at once hortatory, therapeutic, utopian, communitarian, and millenarian, echoes the rhetoric of *Wilhelmine Lebensreform*, suggesting that understanding the role of tradition, as source of forms, as source of social rationales, and as sphere of psychic projection, is an ongoing project of investigation.

Bibliography

- Adam, Hubertus. "Wolken ziehen drüber hin. Paul Schultze-Naumberg und die Saalecker Werkstätten." *Archithese* 29, no. 2 (March-April 1999): 46-51.
- Adler, Franz. *Wohnungsverhältnisse und Wohnungspolitik der Stadt Frankfurt a.M. zu Beginn der 20. Jahrhunderts*. Frankfurt: Schnäpper, 1904.
- Adler, Ignac. *Das organizistische Gesellschaftsbegriff. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Herbert Spencers, Paul von Lilienfelds und Albert Schäffles*. Bern: E. Sieber, 1925.
- Aescht, Erna, et al. *Welträtsel und Lebenswunder. Ernst Haeckel: Werk, Wirkung und Folgen*. Linz: Oberösterreich Landesmuseum, 1998.
- Akademie der Künste. *Hermann Muthesius 1861-1927*. Berlin: Akademie der Künste, 1978.
- Albrecht, Heinrich. *Das Arbeiterwohnhaus. Gesammelte Pläne von Arbeiterwohnhäusern und Ratschläge zum Entwerfen von solchen aufgrund praktischer Erfahrungen. Mit Entwerfen von A. Messel*. Berlin: Robert Oppenheim, 1896.
- Altenbockum, Jasper von. *Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl, 1823-1897. Sozialwissenschaft zwischen Kulturgeschichte und Ethnographie*. Cologne and Weimar: Böhlau Verlag, 1994.
- Ammon, Otto. *Die natürliche Auslese beim Menschen. Auf Grund der Ergebnisse der anthropologischen Untersuchungen der Wehrpflichtigen in Baden und anderer Materialien*. Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1893.
- _____. *Die Bedeutung des Bauernstandes für den Staat und die Gesellschaft*. Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1894.
- _____. *Die Gesellschaftsordnung und ihre natürlichen Grundlagen. Entwurf einer Sozial-Anthropologie zum Gebrauch für alle Gebildete, die sich mit sozialen Fragen befassen*. Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1895.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso, 1991.
- Anderson, Stanford. *Peter Behrens and an Architecture for the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000.
- Andresen, Wibke. *Darstellung des städtischen Lebens in der Malerei des späten 19. Jahrhunderts*. Munich: Tuduv-Verlag, 1987.

- Applegate, Celia. *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- _____. "Localism and the German Bourgeoisie: The 'Heimat' Movement in the Rhenish Palatinate before 1914." In *The German Bourgeoisie*, ed. David Blackbourn and Richard J. Evans, 224-254. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Aschheim, Steven E. *The Nietzsche Legacy in Germany, 1890-1990*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Atterbury, Paul ed. *A.W.N. Pugin, Master of Gothic Revival*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Ay, Karl-Ludwig. "Zur Geschichte des Mittelstandes in Kaiserreich und Republik." *Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte* 37 (1974): 956-62.
- _____. "Max Weber über die Stadt." In *Stadtgeschichtsforschung. Aspekte, Tendenzen, Perspektiven*, ed. Fritz Mayrhofer, 69-80. Linz: Donau, 1993.
- Bachofen, Johan Jakob. *Das Mutterrecht: Eine Untersuchung über die Gynäkokratie der alten Welt nach ihrer religiösen und rechtlichen Natur* (1861). Edited by Hans-Jürgen Heinrichs. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1975.
- Backhaus, Jürgen G., ed. *Werner Sombart (1863-1941) – Social Scientist*. Vol. 1: *His Life and Work*; Vol. 2: *His Theoretical Approach*; Vol. 3: *Then and Now*. Marburg: Metropolis Verlag, 1996.
- Bahrdt, Hans-Paul. *Die moderne Großstadt. Soziologische Überlegungen zum Städtebau*. Hamburg: Christian Wegner, 1969.
- Bajohr, Frank. *Zwischen Krupp und Kommune. Sozialdemokratie, Arbeiterschaft und Stadtverwaltung in Essen vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg*. Essen: Klartext Verlag, 1988.
- Banham, Reyner. *Megastructure: Urban Futures of the Recent Past*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1976.
- _____. *Theory and Design in the First Machine Age* (1960). Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.
- Barkin, Kenneth D. *The Controversy over German Industrialization, 1890-1902*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Barlösius, Eva. *Naturgemäße Lebensführung. Zur Geschichte der Lebensreform um die Jahrhundertwende*. Frankfurt a.M.: Campus, 1997.

- Bartels, Adolf. *Der Bauer in der deutschen Vergangenheit*. Leipzig: Eugen Diederichs, 1900.
- Bassin, Mark. "Imperialism and the Nation State in Friedrich Ratzel's Political Geography." *Progress in Human Geography* 11 (1987): 473-495.
- Bastian, Andrea. *Der Heimat-Begriff. Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung in verschiedenen Funktionsbereichen der deutschen Sprache*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1995.
- Bätzner, Nike. "Der Siedlungsbau der 20er Jahre. Laboratorium sozialer Ideen und formaler Experimente," in *Stadt der Architektur/Architektur der Stadt. Berlin 1900-2000*, ed. Thorsten Scheer, Josef Paul Kleihues, and Paul Kahlfeldt, 149-159. Berlin: Nicolai, 2000.
- Baumgarten, Karl. *Das deutsche Bauernhaus*. Neumünster: Karl Wachholtz Verlag, 1980.
- Baumgartner, Judith. *Ernährungsreform – Antwort auf Industrialisierung und Ernährungswandel. Ernährungsreform als Teil der Lebensreformbewegung am Beispiel der Siedlung und des Unternehmens Eden seit 1893*. Frankfurt a.M.: Lang, 1992.
- Becker, Peter Emil. *Zur Geschichte der Rassenhygiene. Wege ins Dritte Reich*. Stuttgart: Thieme, 1988.
- Becker, Sabina. *Urbanität und Moderne. Studien zur Großstadt Wahrnehmung in der deutschen Literatur 1900-1930*. St. Ingbert: Röhrig, 1993.
- Beckmann, Fritz. "Der Bauer im Zeitalter des Kapitalismus." *Schmollers Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung, Verwaltung und Volkswirtschaft* N.S. 50, no. 1 (1927): 719-748.
- Beevers, Robert. *The Garden City Utopia: A Critical Biography of Ebenezer Howard*. London: Macmillan, 1988.
- Behne, Adolf. "Heutige Industriebauten." *Velhagen & Klasings Monatshefte* 28 (1913/14): 53-64.
- Beiser, Frederick, ed. and trans. *The Early Political Writings of the German Romantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Benjamin, Walter. *The Arcades Project*. Trans. Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin, prepared on the basis of the German volume edited by Rolf Tiedemann. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.

- Berdow, Wilhelm. *The Krupps: 150 Years of Krupp History 1787-1937, based on documents from the family and works archives*. Trans. Fritz Homann. Berlin: Verlag für Sozialpolitik, Wirtschaft und Statistik, 1937.
- Berger-Thimme, Dorothea. *Wohnungsfrage und Sozialstaat. Untersuchungen zu den Anfängen staatlicher Wohnungspolitik in Deutschland 1873-1918*. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1976.
- Bergmann, Klaus. *Agrarromantik und Großstadt Feindschaft*. Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1970.
- Berliner Geschichtswerkstatt, ed. *"Das war'ne ganz geschlossene Gesellschaft hier." Der Lindenhof: Eine Genossenschaftssiedlung in der Großstadt*. Berlin: Berliner Geschichtswerkstatt, 1997.
- Berning, Maria et al. *Berliner Wohnquartiere. Ein Führer durch 80 Siedlungen in Ost und West*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1994.
- Biecker, Johannes, and Walter Buschmann, eds. *Arbeitersiedlungen im 19. Jahrhundert*. Bochum: Studienverlag Dr. N. Borckmeyer, 1985.
- Blackbourn, David. "The Mittelstand in German Society and Politics, 1871-1914." *Social History* 2 (1977): 409-433.
- Blackbourn, David, and Geoff Eley. *The Peculiarities of German History: Bourgeois Society and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Germany*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Bletter, Rosemarie Haag. "Bruno Taut and Paul Scheerbart: Some Aspects of German Expressionist Architecture." Ph.D, diss., Columbia University, 1973.
- _____. "The Interpretation of the Glass Dream – Expressionist Architecture and the History of the Crystal Metaphor." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 40 (March 1981): 20-43.
- _____. "Expressionism and the New Objectivity." *Art Journal* 43 (Summer 1983): 108-120.
- _____. "Introduction." In *Adolf Behne: The Modern Functional Building*. Trans. Michael Robinson, 1-83. Santa Monica: The Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1996.
- Blühdorn, Jürgen, and Joachim Ritter, eds. *Positivismus im 19. Jahrhundert. Beiträge zu seiner geschichtlichen und systematischen Bedeutung*. Frankfurt a.M.: Klostermann, 1971.

- Blume, Torsten. *Die Siedlung "Hohe Lache," Dessau*. Dessau: Stiftung Bauhaus Dessau, 1994.
- Böhme, Helmut. "Städtebau als konservative Gesellschaftskritik." *Die Alte Stadt* 14, no. 1 (1987): 1-27.
- Bollerey, Franziska. *Architekturkonzeptionen der utopischen Sozialisten. Alternative Planung und Architektur für den gesellschaftlichen Prozeß*. Berlin: Ernst & Sohn, 1991.
- Bollerey, Franziska, Gerhard Fehl, and Kristiana Hartmann, eds. *Im Grünen Wohnen – im Blauen Planen. Ein Lesebuch zur Gartenstadt*. Hamburg: Christians, 1990.
- Bollerey, Franziska, and Kristiana Hartmann. "Bruno Taut. Vom phantastischen Ästheten zum ästhetischen Sozial(ideal)isten." In *Bruno Taut 1880-1938*, 15-94. Berlin: Akademie der Künste, 1980.
- Bölsche, Wilhelm. *Ernst Haeckel. Ein Lebensbild*. **Dresden: Reissner**, 1900.
- _____. *Vom Bazillus zum Affenmenschen: Naturwissenschaftliche Plaudereien*. Jena: Diederichs, 1900.
- _____. *Auf dem Menschenstern*. Dresden: C. Reissner, 1909.
- _____. *Der Termitenstaat: Schilderung eines geheimnisvollen Volkes*. Stuttgart: Franckh, 1931.
- Borrmann, Norbert. *Paul Schultze-Naumburg 1869-1949. Maler, Publizist, Architekt. Vom Kulturreformer der Jahrhundertwende zum Kulturpolitiker im Dritten Reich*. Essen: Richard Bach, 1989.
- Böventer, Edwin von. "Walter Christaller's Central Places and Peripheral Areas: The Central Place Theory in Retrospect." *Journal of Regional Science* 9 (1969): 117-124.
- Bowler, Peter J. *Evolution: The History of an Idea*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- _____. "Social Metaphors in Evolutionary Biology, 1870-1930: The Wider Dimension of Social Darwinism." In *Biology as Society, Society as Biology: Metaphors*, eds. Sabine Maasen et al., 107-126. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1995.
- Brander, Sylvia. *Wohnungspolitik als Sozialpolitik. Theoretische Konzepte und praktische Ansätze in Deutschland bis zum erster Weltkrieg*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1984.

- Breckman, Warren G. "Disciplining Consumption: The Debate about Luxury in Wilhelmine Germany, 1890-1914." *Journal of Social History* 24, no. 3 (Spring 1991): 485-505.
- Brenke, Else. "Schriften von Ferdinand Tönnies aus den Jahren 1875-1935." In *Reine und angewandte Soziologie. Eine Festgabe für Ferdinand Tönnies zu seinem achzigsten Geburtstag am 26. Juli 1935*, 383-403. Leipzig: Hans Buske Verlag, 1936.
- Breton, Rob. *Gospels and Grit: Work and Labour in Carlyle, Conrad and Orwell*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- Brocke, Bernhard vom, ed. *Moderne Kapitalismus: Materialien zur Kritik und Rezeption*. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1987.
- Brooks, Chris. *The Gothic Revival*. London: Phaidon, 1999.
- Bruch, Rüdiger vom, ed. *Bürgerliche Sozialreform in Deutschland vom Vormärz bis zur Ära Adenauer*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1985.
- Bruch, Rüdiger vom, Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, and Gangolf Hübinger, eds. *Kultur und Kulturwissenschaften um 1900*. Vol. 1, *Krise der Moderne und Glaube an die Wissenschaft*. Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1989.
- Bruch, Rüdiger vom, Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, and Gangolf Hübinger, eds. *Kultur und Kulturwissenschaften um 1900*. Vol. 2, *Idealismus und Postivismus*. Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1997.
- Brückner, Wolfgang. "Das Museumswesen und die Entwicklung der Volkskunde als Wissenschaft um die Jahre 1902/1904." In *Das kunst- und kulturgeschichtliche Museum im 19. Jahrhundert. Vorträge des Symposiums im Germanischen Nationalmuseum Nürnberg*, ed. Bernward Deneke and Rainer Kahsnitz, 133-142. Munich: Prestel Verlag, 1977.
- Bruhns, Hinnerk, and Wilfried Nippel, eds. *Max Weber und die Stadt im Kulturvergleich*. Göttingen: Vandenhock & Ruprecht, 2000.
- Buber, Martin. *Paths in Utopia*. Translated by R.F.C. Hull. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949.
- Bücher, Karl. *Die Großstadt. Jahrbuch der Gehe-Stiftung zu Dresden*, vol. 9. Dresden: Zahn & Jaensch, 1903.
- Buckingham, James S. *National Evils and Practical Remedies, with the Plan of a Model Town*. London: Jackson Son and Co., 1849.

- Buck-Morss, Susan. *The Dialectics of Seeing: Walter Benjamin and the Arcades Project*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989.
- Buddensieg, Tilmann. "Die Wohnhaus als Kultbau. Zum Darmstadter Haus von Behrens." In *Peter Behrens und Nürnberg. Geschmackswandel in Deutschland. Historismus, Jugendstil und die Anfänge der Industrieform*, ed. Peter-Klaus Schuster, 37-47. Munich: Prestel, 1980.
- Buder, Stanley. *Visionaries and Planners: The Garden City Movement and Modern Community*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Bullock, Nicholas, and James Read. *The Movement for Housing Reform in Germany and France, 1840-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Bülow, Friedrich. "Gemeinschaft." In *Wörterbuch der Soziologie*, ed. Wilhelm Bernsdorf, 336-340. Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1969.
- Bürger, Christa, Peter Bürger, and Jochen Schulte-Sasse, eds. *Aufklärung und literarische Öffentlichkeit*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1980.
- Burgess, Ernest W., ed. *The Urban Community*. New York: Greenwood, 1926.
- Buschmann, Walter. *Zechen und Kokereien im rheinischen Steinkohlbergbau. Die Bau- und Kunstdenkmäler der Rheinland*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1998.
- _____. "Architektonische und städtebauliche Formen im Arbeitersiedlungsbau des 19. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland." In *Arbeitersiedlungen im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Johannes Biecker and Walter Buschmann, 23-66. Bochum: Studienverlag Dr. N. Borckmeyer, 1985.
- Buttmann, Günther. *Friedrich Ratzel. Leben und Werk eines deutschen Geographen 1844-1904*. Stuttgart: Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1977.
- Calhoun, Craig, ed. *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.
- Carlyle, Thomas. *Past and Present*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1843.
- Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen. *Die Verbesserung der Wohnungen. Vorberichte und Verhandlungen der Konferenz vom 25. und 26. April 1892 nebst Bericht über die mit derselben verbundene Ausstellung. Schriften der Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen*. Berlin: Carl Heymanns Verlag, 1892.
- _____. *Die künstlerische Gestaltung des Arbeiter-Wohnhauses. 14. Konferenz der Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen am 5. und 6. Juni 1905 in Hagen i. W.* Berlin: Carl Heymanns Verlag, 1906.

- Chickering, Roger. *Karl Lamprecht: A German Academic Life 1856-1915*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1993.
- Christaller, Walter. *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland. Eine ökonomisch-geographische Untersuchung über die Gesetzmäßigkeit der Verbreitung der Siedlungen mit städtischen Funktionen*. Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1933.
- Coker, Francis William. *Orgasmic Theories of the State*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1910.
- Collins, George R., and Christiane Crasemann Collins. *Camillo Sitte: The Birth of Modern City Planning*. New York: Rizzoli, 1986.
- Colognesi, Luigi Capograssi. "Von den 'Agrarverhältnissen' zur 'Stadt'." In *Max Weber und die Stadt im Kulturvergleich*, ed. Hinnerk Bruhns and Wilfried Nippel, 92-106. Göttingen: Vandenhock & Ruprecht, 2000.
- Comte, August. *Cours de philosophie positive*. Paris: Bachelier, 1830-42.
- Confino, Alon. *The Nation as Local Metaphor: Württemberg, Imperial Germany, and National Memory, 1871-1918*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Conrads, Ulrich, ed. *Programs and Manifestoes on 20th-Century Architecture*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1970.
- Conze, Werner. "Mittelstand." In *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, eds. Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, and Robert Koselleck, Vol. 4, 49-92. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1978.
- Conze, Werner, Jürgen Kocka, Reinhart Koselleck, and M. Rainer Lepsius, eds. *Bildungsbürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert*, 4 vols. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1985.
- Coser, Lewis A. *Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in Historical and Social Context*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.
- Cramer, Johannes, and Niels Gutschow. *Bauausstellungen. Eine Architekturgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1984.
- Crane, Susan A. *Collecting and Historical Consciousness in Early Nineteenth-Century Germany*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000.
- Curdes, Gerhard, and Renate Oemichen. *Künstlerischer Städtebau um die Jahrhundertwende. Der Beitrag von Karl Henrici*. Cologne: Deutscher Gemeindeverlag, 1981.

- Dade, Heinrich. "Über die Bedeutung des Bauernstandes im modernen Industriestaate und die Maßnahmen zu seiner Erhaltung." *Das Land* 16 (1907-1908).
- Dal Co, Francesco. *Figures of Architecture and Thought: German Architecture Culture, 1880-1920*. New York: Rizzoli, 1990.
- Darré, Richard Walter. *Das Bauerntum als Lebensquell*. Munich: J.F. Lehmann, 1929.
- de Beer, E.S. "Gothic: Origin and Diffusion of the Term: the Idea of Style in Architecture." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute* 11 (1948):143-62.
- de Lagarde, Paul. *Deutsche Schriften*. Berlin: Verlag der Freunde, 1994.
- de Michelis, Marco. *Heinrich Tessenow, 1876-1950*. Milan: Electa, 1991.
- Deneke, Berward. "Die Museen und die Entwicklung der Kulturgeschichte." In *Vorträge des Symposiums im Germanischen Nationalmuseum Nürnberg*, ed. Bernward Deneke and Rainer Kahsnitz, 118-132. Munich: Prestel Verlag, 1977.
- Deutsche Erneuerungs-Gemeinde. *Vom neuen Glauben: Bekenntnis der deutschen Erneuerungs-Gemeinde*. Leipzig: Hammer-Verlag, 1914.
- Deutscher Heimatbund, ed. *Fünfundsiebzig Jahre Deutscher Heimatbund*. Siegburg: Deutscher Heimatbund, 1979.
- _____. *Für Heimat und Umwelt. Achtzig Jahre Deutscher Heimatbund 1904-1984*. Bonn: BHU, 1984.
- Deutscher Ingenieur und Architekten-Verein. *Das Bauernhaus im Deutschen Reich und in seinen Grenzgebieten*. Dresden: Kuthmann, 1906.
- Dickers, Peter. *Social Darwinism: Linking Evolutionary Thought to Social Theory*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press, 2000.
- Dilthey, Wilhelm. "Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften" (1883). *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. 1, 3-120. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1959.
- Dohrn-van Rossum, Gerhard. "Politischen Körper, Organismus, Organisation. Zur Geschichte natürlicher Metaphorik und Begrifflichkeit in der politischen Sprache." Ph.D. diss., Bielefeld, 1977.
- Dohrn-van Rossum, Gerhard, and Ernst-Wolfgang Böckenforde. "Organ, Organismus, Organisation, politische Körper." In *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexicon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache*, ed. Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, and Robert Koselleck, Vol. 4, 519-622. Stuttgart: E. Klett, 1978.

Ein Dokument deutscher Kunst: Darmstadt, 1901-1976, 5 vols. Darmstadt: E. Roether, 1976.

Dominick, Raymond. *The Environmental Movement in German: Prophets and Pioneers, 1871-1971*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.

Douglass, Harlan Paul. *The Little Town, Especially in its Rural Relationships*. New York: Macmillan, 1921.

Driesmans, Heinrich. *Kulturgeschichte der Rasseninstinkte*. Leipzig: Naumann; Diedrich, 1889-1901.

_____. *Rasse und Milieu*. Berlin: Vita-Deutscher-Verlag, 1909.

_____. *Menschenreform und Bodensreform Unter Zugrundelegung der Veredelungslehre Francis Galton (Galton contra Malthus) auf Grund eines Vortrags über "Anthropologie und Bodenreform" gehalten im volkswirtschaftlichen Seminar des Deutschen Bundes für Bodenreform (1904)*. Third revised edition. Leipzig: Felix Diedrich, 1911.

Durkheim, Émile. "Review of *Bau und Leben des sozialen Körpers* by Albert Schäffle," *Revue philosophique* 19 (1885): 84-101.

Durth, Werner. *Die Inszenierung des Alltagswelt*. Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1977.

_____. *Deutsche Architekten. Biographische Verflechtungen 1900-1970*. Munich: Deutsche Taschenbuch Verlag, 1992.

Eckert, Roland. *Kultur, Zivilisation und Gesellschaft. Die Geschichtstheories Alfred Webers*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1970.

Edeler, Ingrid. *Zur Typologie des Kulturhistorischen Museums, Freilichtmuseen und kulturhistorische Räume*. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1988.

Eduard, Otto. *Das deutsche Handwerk in seiner kulturgeschichtlichen Entwicklung*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1900.

Ehrenberg, Richard, and Hugo Racine. *Krupp'sche Arbeiter-Familien. Entwicklung und Entwicklungs-Faktoren von drei Generationen deutscher Arbeiter*. Archiv für Exakte Wirtschaftsforschung (Thünen-Archiv). Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1912.

Empathy, Form, and Space: Problems in German Aesthetics, 1873-1893. Introduction and translation by Henry Francis Mallgrave and Eleftherios Ikononou. Santa Monica, CA: Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1994.

- Engels, Friedrich. *Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums, und des Staats. Im Anschluss an Lewis H. Morgan's Forschungen*. Hottingen-Zürich: Schweizer Genossenschafts, 1884.
- Erman, Heinrich. "Die Grundzüge für ein Kriegerheimstättengesetz." *Soziale Zeitfragen*: 64 (1916).
- _____. "Volkssiedlung: Besprechung der Gesetzentwürfe zum Preussischen Städtebaugesetz und zum Reichsboden-Reformgesetz." *Soziale Zeitfragen* 82/83 (1925).
- Espinas, Alfred Victor. *Des Sociétés animales*. Paris: F. Alcan, 1877.
- _____. *Die Thierischen Gesellschaften. Eine vergleichend-psychologische Untersuchung*. Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1879.
- Evans, Richard J., and David Blackbourn, eds. *The German Bourgeoisie: Essays on the Social History of the German Middle Class from the Late Eighteenth to the Early Twentieth Century*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Faust, Helmut. *Geschichte der Genossenschaftsbewegung. Ursprung und Aufbruch der Genossenschaften in England, Frankreich und Deutschland so wie ihre weitere Entwicklung im deutschen Sprachraum*. Frankfurt a.M.: Knapp, 1977.
- Feder, Gottfried. *Die neue Stadt*. Berlin: J. Springer, 1939.
- Fehl, Gerhard. *Kleinstadt, Steildach, Volksgemeinschaft. Zum "reaktionären Modernismus" in Bau- und Stadtbaukunst*. Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1995.
- Fehl, Gerhard, and Juan Rodriguez-Lores. *Stadterweiterungen, 1800-1875*. Hamburg: Hans Christians, 1983.
- Feuerstein, Günther. *Biomorphic Architecture: Human and Animal Forms in Architecture*. Stuttgart: Axel Menges, 2002.
- Fiedler, Jeannine. *Social Utopias of the Twenties: Bauhaus, Kibbutz, and the Dream of the New Man*. Translated by Miriam Neumann and William H. Boyle. Dessau and Tel Aviv: Bauhaus Dessau Foundation and Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, 1995.
- Fischer, Helmut. *Hundert Jahre für den Naturschutz. Heimat und regionale Identität: Die Geschichte eines Programms*. Bonn: Bund Heimat und Umwelt, 2004.
- Fishman, Robert. *Urban Utopias in the Twentieth Century: Ebenezer Howard, Frank Lloyd Wright and Le Corbusier*. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Fleischmann, Albert, and Richard Grutzmacher. *Der Entwicklungsgedanke in der gegenwärtigen Natur- und Geisteswissenschaften*. Erlangen: A. Deikert, 1922.

Forel, August. "Expériences et observations de mœurs." *Les Fourmis de la Suisse. Ouvrage couronné par la Société Helvétique des Sciences Naturelles*, Vol. 26, 242-449. Zurich: Zürcher und Furrer, 1874.

_____. *Mœurs spécialisées. Epilogue: Les Fourmis, les Termites et l'Homme of his Le Monde social des fourmis, compare à celui de l'homme*. Geneva: Librairie Kundig, 1921-1923.

_____. *Les Etats-Unis de la Terre. Un programme praticable d'entente pacifique universelle et stable entre les peuples*. Lausanne: E. Peytrequin, 1914.

Forster-Hahn, Françoise, ed. *Imagining Modern German Culture: 1889-1910*. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1996.

40 Jahre Berlinische Boden-Gesellschaft. Ein Bild der Groß-Berlin Wohnungsversorgung und der Tätigkeit der Gesellschaft vor, während und nach der Kriegszeit, Berlin: Berlinische Boden-Gesellschaft, 1930.

Frank, Hartmut. "Heimatschutz und typologisches Entwerfen. Modernisierung und Tradition beim Wiederaufbau von Ostpreußen 1915-1927" In *Moderne Architektur in Deutschland 1900 bis 1950. Reform und Tradition*, ed. Vittorio Magnano Lampugnani and Romana Schneider, 105-131. Stuttgart: Gerd Hatje, 1992.

Frank, Hartmut, ed. *Fritz Schumacher. Reformkultur und Moderne*. Stuttgart: Gerd Hatje, 1994.

Frank, Hartmut, and Dirk Schubert, eds. *Lesebuch zur Wohnungsfrage*. Cologne: Pahl-Rugenstein, 1983.

Frecot, Janos, Johann Friedrich Geist, and Diethart Kerbs. *Fidus 1868-1948. Zur ästhetischen Praxis bürgerlicher Fluchtbewegungen*. Munich: Rogner & Bernhard, 1972.

Freudenthal, Margarete. *Gestaltwandel der städtischen, bürgerlichen und proletarischen Hauswirtschaft* (1934). Frankfurt a.M.: Ullstein, 1986.

Freytag, Gustav. *Die Entwicklung der deutschen Volkseele*. Leipzig: Insel-Verlag, 1926.

_____. *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*, edited by Heinrich Pleticha with a foreword by Horst Fuhrmann. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann-Lexikon-Verlag, 1998

Frisby, David. *Georg Simmel*. Chichester, Sussex: Ellis Horwood, 1984.

- _____. *Fragments of Modernity: Theories of Modernity in the Work of Simmel, Kracauer, and Benjamin*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1986.
- Fritsch, Theodor. *Antisemiten-Katechismus: Eine Zusammenstellung des wichtigsten Materials zum Verständnis der Judenfrage*. Leipzig: Theodor Fritsch 1887.
- _____. *Zwei Grundübel: Bodenwüchser und Börse*. Leipzig: Theodor Fritsch, 1894.
- _____. *Die Stadt der Zukunft*. Leipzig: Verlag von Theodor Fritsch, 1896.
- _____. *Handbuch der Judenfrage: Eine Zusammenstellung des wichtigsten Materials zur Beurteilung des jüdischen Volkes*, 26th edition. Hamburg: Hanseatische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1907.
- _____. *Die Stadt der Zukunft: Gartenstadt*. With a new foreword and afterword by the author. Leipzig: Hammer Verlag, 1912.
- Fuchs, Carl Johannes. *Die Wohnungsfrage vor und nach dem Kriege: Aufsätze und Vorträge zur Wohnungsfrage*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1917.
- _____. *Die Wohnungs- und Siedlungsfrage nach dem Krieg*. Stuttgart: Meyer-Ilschen, 1918.
- Führ, Eduard, and Daniel Stemmerich. 'Nach gethener Arbeit verbelibt im Kreise der Eurigen'. *Bürgerliche Wohnrezepte für Arbeiter zur individuellen und sozialen Formierung im 19. Jahrhundert*. Wuppertal: Peter Hammer Verlag, 1985.
- Garnier, Charles. *L'architecture a l'exposition universelle de 1889: Principales constructions du Champ-de-Mars et de l'esplanade des Invalides*. Paris: Eugene Bigot, 1889.
- Garnier, Charles, and A. Ammann. *L'habitation humaine*. Paris: Hachette, 1892.
- Gasman, Daniel. *The Scientific Origins of National Socialism: Social Darwinism in Ernst Haeckel and the German Monist League*. New York: American Elsevier, 1971.
- Geiger, Theodor. "Gemeinschaft." In *Handwörterbuch der Soziologie*, ed. Alfred Vierkandt, 173-180. Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1931.
- Geist, Johann, and Klaus Kürvers. *Das Berliner Mietshaus*, Vol. 1. 1740-1862, Vol. 2. 1862-1945, Vol. 3. 1945-1989. Munich: Prestel, 1980-1989.
- Gellately, Robert. *The Politics of Economic Despair: Shopkeepers and German Politics 1890-1914*. London: Sage, 1974.

- Germann, Georg. *Neugotik. Geschichte ihrer Architekturtheorie*. Stuttgart: DVA, 1974.
- "Gespräch mit Vittorio Magnago Lampugnani and Winfried Nerdinger." *Baumeister* 8 (1994): 46-48.
- Gierke, Otto von. *Das Deutsche Genossenschaftsrecht*, 4 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1868-1913.
- Gilloch, Graeme. *Myth and Metropolis: Walter Benjamin and the City*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1996.
- Glaser, Hermann. *Maschinenwelt und Alltagsleben. Industriekultur in Deutschland vom Biedermeier zur Weimarer Republik*. Frankfurt a.M.: Büchergilde Gutenberg, 1981.
- Gorges, Irmela. *Sozialforschung in Deutschland 1872-1914. Gesellschaftliche Einflüsse auf Themen- und Methodenwahl des Vereins für Sozialpolitik*. Frankfurt a.M.: Hain, 1986.
- _____. *Sozialforschung in der Weimarer Republik, 1918-1933: gesellschaftliche Einflüsse auf Themen- und Methodenwahl des Vereins für Socialpolitik, der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie und des Kölner Forschungsinstituts für Sozialwissenschaften*. Frankfurt a.M.: Hain, 1986.
- Gosebruch, Ernst. "Zur Neuordnung des Museums Folkwang in Essen." *Kunstblatt* 13 (1929), p. 52.
- Göttgen, Erich. *Der Wiederaufbau Ostpreußens. Eine kulturelle, verwaltungstechnische und baukünstlerische Leistung*. Königsberg: Gräfe und Unzwer, 1928.
- Greiffenhagen, Martin. *Das Dilemma des Konservatismus in Deutschland*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1986.
- Günther, Hans F.K. *Das Bauerntum als Lebens- und Gemeinschaftsform*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1939.
- Günther, Sonja. *Interieurs um 1900. Bernhard Pankok, Bruno Paul und Richard Riemerschmid als Mitarbeiter der Vereinigten Werkstätten für Kunst im Handwerk*. Munich: W. Fink, 1971.
- Gutschow, Niels. *Ordnungswahn. Architekten planen im "eingedeutschten Osten" 1939-1945*. Basel: Birkhäuser, 2001.
- Gutting, Gary, ed. *Paradigms and Revolutions: Appraisals and Applications of Thomas Kuhn's Philosophy of Science*. Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 1980.

- Haas, Stefan. *Historische Kulturforschung in Deutschland 1880-1930*. Cologne: Böhlau, 1994.
- Haase, Carl, ed. *Die Stadt des Mittelalters*, Vol. 1: *Begriff, Entstehung, Ausbreitung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit*. Darmstadt: Hermann Luchterhand, 1962.
- Haeckel, Ernst. *Ueber Arbeitstheilung in Natur- und Menschenleben. Vortrag, gehalten im Saale des Berliner Handwerker-Vereins am 17. Dezember 1868*. Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge, herausgegeben von Rudolf Virchow und Fr. v. Holtzendorff, Vol. 4, no. 73-96. Berlin: C.G. Lüderitz, 1869.
- _____. *Anthropogenie oder Entwicklungsgeschichte des Menschen. Gemeinverständliche wissenschaftliche Vorträge der die Grundzüge der menschlichen Keimes- und Stammes-Geschichte*. Leipzig: Wilhelm, Engelmann, 1877.
- _____. *Die Welträtsel. Gemeinverständliche Studien über Monistische Philosophie* (1899). Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner, 1905.
- _____. *Kristallseelen. Studien über das anorganische Leben*. Leipzig: Alfred Kröner, 1917.
- Hagspiel, Wolfram. "Das 'Neue Niederrheinische Dorf'." In *Der westdeutsche Impuls 1900-1914. Kunst und Umweltgestaltung im Industriegebiet. Die Deutsche Werkbund-Ausstellung Cöln 1914*, ed. Wulf Herzogenrath, Dirk Teubner, and Angelika Thiekötter, 186-191. Cologne: Kölnischer Kunstverein, 1984.
- Hall, Peter, and Colin Ward. *Sociable Cities: The Legacy of Ebenezer Howard*. Chichester: Wiley, 1998.
- Hamacher, Wolfram. *Wissenschaft, Literatur und Sinnfindung im 19. Jahrhundert. Studien zum Wilhelm Bölsche*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1993.
- Hamman, Richard, and Jost Hermand. *Stilkunst um 1900. Epochen deutscher Kultur von 1870 bis zur Gegenwart*, Vol. 4. Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1977.
- Hammer, Felix. *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung des Denkmalrechts in Deutschland*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1995.
- Hammer Verlag. *Festschrift zum fünfundzwanzigjährigen Bestehen des Hammers*. Leipzig: Hammer-Verlag, 1926.

Hansen, Georg. *Agrarhistorische Abhandlungen*, 2 vols. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1880-84.

_____. *Die drei Bevölkerungsstufen. Ein Versuch, die Ursachen für das Blühen und Altern der Völker nachzuweisen*. Munich: Lindauer, 1989.

Hardenberg, Friedrich von (Novalis). *Die Christenheit oder Europa*. Leipzig: Insel Verlag, n.d.

Hart, Julius, and Heinrich Hart, eds. *Die neue Gemeinschaft*. Leipzig: Eugen Diederichs: 1901-1902.

Hartmann, Kristiana. *Deutsche Gartenstadtbewegung. Kulturpolitik und Gesellschaftsreform*. Munich: Heinz Moos Verlag, 1976.

_____. "Bruno Taut, der Architekt und Planer von Gartenstädten und Siedlungen." In *Bruno Taut 1880-1938. Architekt zwischen Tradition und Avantgarde*, ed. Winfried Nerdinger et al. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2001.

Hartung, Günter. "Völkische Ideologie." In *Traditionen und Traditionssuche der deutschen Faschismus*, vol. 3, eds. Günter Hartung and Hubert Orłowski, 83-100. Halle: Wissenschaftliche Beiträge, Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, 1987.

Hartung, Werner. *Konservative Zivilisationskritik und regionale Identität. Am Beispiel der niedersächsischen Heimatbewegung 1895 bis 1919*. Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission für Niedersachsen und Bremen 35. Hannover: Hahn, 1991.

Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.

Haselbach, Dieter. *Franz Oppenheimer. Soziologie, Geschichtsphilosophie und Politik des "liberalen Sozialismus"*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich, 1985.

Häußermann, Hartmut. "Schlagwort: Urbanität." *Architekt* (June 1993): 326-329.

Häußermann, Hartmut, ed. *Großstadt: Soziologische Stichworte*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich, 2000.

Häußermann, Hartmut, and Andreas Kapphan. *Berlin: von der geteilten zur gespaltenen Stadt? Sozialräumlicher Wandel seit 1990*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich, 2000.

Häußermann, Hartmut, and Walter Siebel. *Neue Urbanität*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1987.

- _____. "Neue Formen der Stadt- und Regionalpolitik." *Archiv für Kommunalwissenschaften* 33, no. 1 (1994): 32-43.
- Hawkins, Mike. *Social Darwinism in European and American Thought, 1860-1945: Nature as Model and Nature as Threat*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Hegel, Karl. *Städte und Gilden der germanischen Völker im Mittelalter*, 2 vols. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1891.
- _____. *Die Entstehung des deutschen Städtewesens*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1898.
- Hegemann, Werner. *Das steinerne Berlin, Geschichte der größten Mietskasernenstadt der Welt* (1930). Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1988.
- Heilbron, Johann, Lars Magnusson, and Björn Wittrock, eds. *The Rise of the Social Sciences and the Formation of Modernity*. *Sociology of the Sciences Yearbook*, vol. 20. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1998.
- Heinßen, Johannes. *Historismus und Kulturkritik. Studien zur deutschen Geschichtskultur im späten 19. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.
- Heitzner, Horstwalter. *Der Volksverein für das katholische Deutschland im Kaiserreich 1890-1918*. Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald Verlag, 1979.
- Helbig, Herbert. "Fünfzig Jahre Institute für Deutsche Landes- und Volksgeschichte an der Universität Leipzig," *Berichte zur deutschen Landeskunde* 19 (1957): 55-77.
- Hellpach, Willy. *Nervosität und Kultur*. *Kulturprobleme der Gegenwart* 5, ed. Leo Berg. Berlin: Johannes Råde, 1902.
- _____. "Sozialpathologie als Wissenschaft." *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 21 (1905): 275-307.
- Henning, Rudolf. *Das Deutsche Haus in seiner historischen Entwicklung. Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der Germanischen Völker* 47. Strassberg: Karl J. Trübner, 1882.
- _____. *Die Deutschen Haustypen. Nachträglichen Bermerkungen. Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der Germanischen Völker* 55, no. 2. Strassberg: Karl J. Trübner, 1886.
- Henrici, Karl. "Arbeiterkolonien." In *Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen. Die künstlerische Gestaltung des Arbeiter-Wohnhauses. 14. Konferenz der*

Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrteinrichtungen am 5. und 6. Juni 1905 in Hagen i. W., 59-66. Berlin: Carl Heymanns Verlag, 1906.

Hentschel, Willibald. *Varuna. Eine Welt- und Geschichtsbetrachtung vom Standpunkt des Ariers*, 2 vols. Leipzig: Theodor Fritsch, 1901.

_____. *Mittgart. Ein Weg zur Erneuerung der germanischen Rasse*. Leipzig: Hammer-Verlag, 1904.

_____. *Varuna. Eine Welt- und Geschichtsbetrachtung vom Standpunkt des Ariers. Das Gesetz des aufsteigenden und sinkenden Lebens in der Geschichte*, 2nd edition. Leipzig: Theodor Fritsch, 1907.

Herf, Jeffrey. *Reactionary Modernism: Technology, Culture, and Politics in Weimar and the Third Reich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Herman, Jost. "Das Bild der 'großen Stadt' im Expressionismus." In *Die Unwirklichkeit der Städte. Großstadtdarstellungen zwischen Moderne und Postmoderne*, ed., Klaus R. Scherpe, 61-79. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rohwohlt, 1988.

_____. *Grüne Utopien in Deutschland: Zur Geschichte des ökologischen Bewusstseins*. Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1991.

Herman, Jost, ed. *Heimat, Nation, Fatherland: The German Sense of Belonging*. New York: Peter Lang, 1996.

Hersey, George. *The Monumental Impulse: Architecture's Biological Roots*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999.

Hertwig, Oscar. "Der Mensch als Zellenstaat und die Gesetze des Zellenlebens," *Blätter für Volksgesundheitspflege* 4 (1904): 1-5, 17-22.

_____. *Der Staat als Organismus Gedanken zur Entwicklung der Menschheit*. Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1922.

_____. *Das Werden der Organismen. Zur Widerlegung von Darwins Zufällstheorie durch das Gesetz in der Entwicklung* (1916). Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1922.

Herzogenrath, Wulf, ed. *Frühe Kölner Kunstausstellungen*. Cologne: Wienand, 1981.

Hesse-Frielinghaus, Herta, ed. *Karl Ernst Osthaus. Leben und Werk*. Recklinghausen: Bongers, 1971.

Hilberseimer, Ludwig. *Großstadtarchitektur*. Stuttgart: Julius Hoffmann, 1927.

- Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terrence Ranger, eds. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Honigsheim, Paul. "Die Gründung der Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie in ihren geistesgeschichtlichen Zusammenhängen." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 11 (1959): 3-10.
- Hottes, Ruth. "Walter Christaller – Ein Überblick über sein Leben und Werk." In *Geographisches Taschenbuch*, ed. E. Ehlers and E. Meynen. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1981.
- Howard, Ebenezer. *To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform*. London: Swann Sonnenschein. 1898.
- _____. *Garden Cities of To-Morrow, being the Second Edition of To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform*. London: Swann Sonnenschein, 1902.
- _____. *Garden Cities of To-morrow*. Edited by. F.J. Osborn with an introduction by Lewis Mumford. London: Faber and Faber, 1946.
- _____. *To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform*. Original edition with commentary by Peter Hall, Dennis Hardy, and Colin Ward. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Huber, Victor Aimé. "Was wir wollen." *Concordia. Blätter der Gemeinnützigen Berliner Baugesellschaft* (1849): 1-3.
- _____. *Die Wohnungsnot der kleinen Leute in den großen Städten*. Leipzig, 1857.
- _____. *Die Selbsthilfe der arbeitenden Klassen durch Wirtschaftsvereine und innere Ansiedlung*. Edited by K. Bittel. Esslingen: Langguth, 1916.
- Iggers, Georg G. *The German Conception of History: The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1968.
- Internationale Baufachausstellung. *Offizieller Katalog der Internationalen Baufachausstellung mit Sonderausstellungen*, Leipzig Mai bis Oktober 1913. Leipzig:C.F. Müller, 1913.
- Isaacs, Reginald R. *Walter Gropius. Der Mensch und sein Werk*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1983.
- Jacoby, E.G. *Philosophie und Soziologie. Ferdinand Tönnies wissenschaftlichen Weg*. Kiel: Hirt, 1971.

- Jaeger, Friedrich, and Jörn Rüsen. *Geschichte des Historismus*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1992.
- Jaeggi, Annemarie. "Hufeisensiedlung Britz." In *Siedlungen der zwanziger Jahre – heute. Vier Berliner Großsiedlungen 1924-1984*, ed. Norbert Huse, 111-136. Berlin: Bauhaus-Archiv, 1985.
- _____. "Waldsiedlung Zehlendorf 'Onkel-Toms-Hütte'." In *Siedlungen der zwanziger Jahre – heute. Vier Berliner Großsiedlungen 1924-1984*, ed. Norbert Huse, 137-158. Berlin: Bauhaus-Archiv, 1985.
- Jahn, Ulrich. "Das neubegründete Museum für deutsche Volkstrachten und Erzeugnisse des Hausgewerbes zu Berlin." *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft* 19 (1889): 334-343.
- James, Harold. *A German Identity: 1770 to the Present*. London: Phoenix Press, 1991.
- James-Chakraborty, Kathleen. *German Architecture for a Mass Audience*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Janssen, Jörn. "Sozialismus, Sozialpolitik und Wohnungsnot." In *Kapitalistischer Städtebau*, ed. Hans G. Helms, Jörn Janssen, and Lucius Burckhardt, 73-83. Neuwied: Luchterhand, 1970.
- Jantke, Carl. "Riehls Soziologie des Vierten Standes." *Soziale Welt* (1950/51): 238-254.
- Jarzombek, Mark. "The Kunstgewerbe, the Werkbund, and the Aesthetics of Culture in the Wilhelmine Period." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 53, no. 1 (1994): 7-19.
- Jeffries, Matthew. *Politics and Culture in Wilhelmine Germany: The Case of Industrial Architecture*. Oxford: Berg, 1995.
- Jenkins, Jennifer. *Provincial Modernity: Local Culture and Liberal Politics in Fin-de-Siècle Hamburg*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.
- Jourdain, Frantz. *Constructions élevées au Champ de Mars par Ch. Garnier: Pour servir à l'histoire de l'habitation humaine*. Paris: Paris: Librairie centrale des beaux-arts, 1889.
- Juckel, Lothar. *Stadtbildprägende Arbeitersiedlungen. Erhalt und Erneuerung denkmalwerter Arbeitersiedlungen im Rhein-Ruhr-Gebiet*. Dortmund: Institut für Landes- und Stadtentwicklungsforschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, 1992.
- Junghanns, Kurt. *Bruno Taut, 1880-1938. Architektur und sozialer Gedanke*, 3rd rev. ed. Leipzig: E.A. Seemanns, 1998.

- Kampffmeyer, Bernhard. *Die Vermählung von Stadt und Land. Ein Soziales Experiment.* Flugschrift Nr. 2 der Deutsche Gartenstadt Gesellschaft. Berlin, 1903.
- Kampffmeyer, Hans. *Die Gartenstadtbewegung.* Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1909.
- Kanther, Michael A., and Dietmar Petzina. *Victor Aimé Huber (1800-1869). Sozialreformer und Wegbereiter der sozialen Wohnungswirtschaft.* Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2000.
- Karl Ernst Osthaus Museum. *Der westdeutsche Impuls 1900-1914. Kunst und Umweltgestaltung im Industriegebiet. Die Folkwang-Idee des Karl Ernst Osthaus.* Hagen: Karl Ernst Osthaus Museum, 1984.
- Käsler, Dirk. *Einführung in das Studium Max Webers.* Munich: C.H. Beck, 1979.
- _____. *Die frühe deutsche Soziologie 1909 bis 1934 und ihre Entstehungsmilieus. Eine wissenschaftlichsoziologische Untersuchung.* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1984.
- _____. *Max Weber: An Introduction to His Life and Work.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Kaschuba, Wolfgang. *Lebenswelt und Kultur der unterbürgerlichen Schichten im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert.* Munich: Oldenbourg, 1990.
- Kastorff-Viehmann, Renate. "Kleinhaus und Mietskaserne." In *Wohnen im Wandel. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alltags in der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*, ed. Lutz Niethammer. Wuppertal: Peter Hammer Verlag, 1979.
- _____. "Kleinwohnung und Werkssiedlung. Zur Erziehung des Arbeiters durch Umweltgestaltung." In *Die Kleinwohnungsfrage. Zu den Ursprüngen des sozialen Wohnungsbaus in Europa*, eds., Juan Rodriguez-Lores and Gerhard Fehl, 221-24. Hamburg: Christians, 1988.
- Kauffeldt, Rolf and Gertrude Cepl-Kaufmann. *Berlin Friedrichshagen. Literaturhauptstadt um die Jahrhundertwende. Der Friedrichshagener Dichterkreis.* Munich: Klaus Boer, 1994.
- Kegler, Harald. "Gartenstadt 'Hohe Lache' in Dessau." In *Villa and Eigenheim. Suburbaner Städtebau in Deutschland*, ed. Tilman Harlander et al, 209-217. Ludwigsburg and Munich: Wüstenrot Stiftung and Deutsch-Verlags-Anstalt, 2001.
- Kerbs, Diethard, and Jürgen Reulecke, eds. *Handbuch der deutschen Reformbewegungen 1880-1933.* Wuppertal: Peter Hammer Verlag, 1998.

- Kieß, Walter. *Urbanismus im Industriezeitalter. Von der klassizistischen Stadt zur Garden City*. Berlin: Ernst & Sohn, 1991.
- Kinna, Ruth. "Kropotkin's Theory of Mutual Aid in Historical Context." *International Review of Social History* 40 (1995): 259-283.
- Klages, Helmut. *Der Nachbarschaftsgedanke und die nachbarschaftliche Wirklichkeit in der Großstadt*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1968.
- Klapheck, Richard. *Neue Baukunst in den Rheinlanden. Eine Übersicht unserer Baulichen Entwicklung seit der Jahrhundertwende*. Düsseldorf: L. Schwann, 1928.
- Kleihues, Josef Paul, ed. *750 Jahre Architektur und Städtebau in Berlin. Die Internationale Bauausstellung im Kontext der Baugeschichte Berlins*. Stuttgart: Gert Hatje, 1987.
- Klose, Olaf, Eduard Georg Jacoby, and Irma Fischer, eds. *Ferdinand Tönnies und Friedrich Paulsen: Briefwechsel, 1876-1908*. Kiel: F. Hirt, 1961.
- Klueting, Edeltraut, ed. *Antimodernismus und Reform. Zur Geschichte des deutschen Heimatbewegung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1991.
- Knies, Karl. *Die Politische Oekonomie vom Standpunkte der geschichtlichen Methode*. Braunschweig: C.A. Schwetschke und Sohn, 1853.
- Knüppel, Christoph, ed. *Dokumente zur Geschichte der völkischen Siedlung Heimland bei Rheinsberg*. Catalogue to an exhibition of historical documents at the Galerie Altes Heizhaus, Hotel Kapellensee, Luhme-Heimland, 11 May – 22 September 2002. Herford: The author, 2002.
- Koch, Hans-Joachim. *Der Sozialdarwinismus. Seine Genese und sein Einfluß auf das imperialistische Denken*. Munich: Beck, 1973.
- Kocka, Jürgen. *Die Angestellten in der deutschen Geschichte 1850-1980*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.
- _____. *Sozialgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.
- _____. *Arbeitsverhältnisse und Arbeiterexistenzen. Grundlagen der Klassenbildung im 19. Jahrhundert*. Bonn: Dietz, 1990.
- Kocka, Jürgen, ed. *Max Weber, der Historiker*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

- Kocka, Jürgen, ed. *Bürger und Bürgerlichkeit im 19. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.
- Kocka, Jürgen, and Allen Mitchell, eds. *Bourgeois Society in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Oxford: Berg, 1993.
- Kockerbeck, Christophe. *Ernst Haeckels "Kunstformen der Natur" und ihre Einfluss auf die deutsche bildende Kunst der Jahrhundertwende*. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1986.
- Köllmann, Wolfgang. "The Process of Urbanization in Germany at the Height of the Industrialization Period." *Journal of Contemporary History* 4, no. 3 (1969).
- Kommunalverband Ruhrgebiet und der Internationalen Bauausstellung Emscherpark, ed. *Robert-Schmidt-Preis 1993. Dokumentation*. Essen: Kommunal Verband Ruhrgebiet, 1994.
- König, René. "Der Begriff Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft bei Tönnies." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 7, no. 3 (1955): 348-420.
- Korff, Gottfried. "Mentalität und Kommunikation in der Großstadt. Berliner Notizen zur 'innere' Urbanisierung." In *Großstadt. Aspekte empirischer Kulturforschung*, ed. Theodor Kohlmann and Hermann Bausinger, 343-361. Berlin: Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, 1985.
- Korte, Hermann. *Stadtsoziologie. Forschungsprobleme und Forschungsergebnisse der 70er Jahre*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1986.
- Koshar, Rudy. *Germany's Transient Pasts: Preservation and National Memory in the Twentieth Century*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998.
- Krabbe, Wolfgang R. *Gesellschaftsveränderung durch Lebensreform. Strukturmerkmale einer sozialreformerischen Bewegung im Deutschland der Industrialisierungsperiode*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.
- Kraber, Lawrence, ed. *The Ethnological Notebooks of Karl Marx (Studies of Morgan, Phear, Maine, Lubbock)*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1972.
- Kracauer Siegfried. *Die Angestellten. Aus dem neuesten Deutschland*. Frankfurt a.M.: Societäts Verlag, 1930.
- _____. *The Salaried Masses: Duty and Distraction in Weimar Germany*. Translated by Quintin Hoare. London: Verso, 1998.

- _____. *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays*. Trans., ed. and with an intro. by Thomas Y. Levin. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Krause, Erika. "L'Influence de Ernst Haeckel sur l'art nouveau." In *L'Âme du corps. Arts et sciences 1793-1993*, ed. Jean Clair, 342-350. Paris: Grand Palais, 1993.
- Krause, Werner. *Sombarts Weg vom Kathedersozialismus zum Faschismus*. Berlin: Rutten & Loening, 1962.
- Kretschmar, Gottfried. *Der Evangelisch-Soziale Kongress. Der Deutsche Protestantismus und die soziale Frage*. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1972.
- Krieger, Leonard. *The German Idea of Freedom: History of a Political Tradition, from the Reformation to 1871*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Kropotkin, Peter. *Field, Factories and Workshops*. London: Hutchinson, 1899.
- _____. *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*. London: Heinemann, 1902.
- _____. *Landwirtschaft, Industrie und Handwerk oder Die Vereinigung von Industrie und Landwirtschaft, von geistiger und körperlicher Arbeit*. Translated by Theodor Plievier. Berlin: Karin Kramer Verlag, 1976.
- _____. *Ethics: Origins and Development* (1922). Translated by Louis S. Friedland and Joseph R. Piroshnikoff. New York: The Dial Press, 1924.
- _____. *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*. With an introductory essay by John Hewetson. London: Freedom Press, 1993.
- Kruse, Volker. "Von der historischen Nationalökonomie zur historischen Soziologie. Ein Paradigmenwechsel in den deutschen Sozialwissenschaften um 1900." *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 19 (1990): 149-165.
- _____. *Soziologie und "Gegenwartskrise." Die Zeitdiagnosen Franz Oppenheimers und Alfred Webers: Ein Beitrag zur historischen Soziologie der Weimarer Republik*. Wiesbaden: Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag, 1990.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Kuhn, Waldemar. *Kleinsiedlungen aus Friderizianischen Zeit*. Stuttgart: Wilhelm Meyer-Ilschen, 1918.
- Kunzmann, Klaus R. ed. *20 Jahre Raumplanung. Eine Disziplin institutionalisiert sich. Dortmunder Beiträge zur Raumplanung 50*. Dortmund: IRPUD/Institut für Raumplanung, 1990.

- Ladd, Brian. *Urban Planning and Civic Order in Germany, 1860-1914*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Lampugnani, Vittorio Magnago, and Romana Schneider, eds. *Moderne Architektur in Deutschland 1900 – 1950. Reform und Tradition*. Stuttgart: Hatje, 1992.
- Landauer, Gustav. "Die Siedlung" (1910). In *Aufruf zum Sozialismus*. Berlin: Verlag des Sozialistischen Bundes, 1911.
- Lane, Barbara Miller. *Architecture and Politics in Germany, 1918-1945*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Lang, Rolf. *Wilhelm Bölsche und Friedrichshagen. Auf dem "Mußweg der Liebhaberei"*. Frankfurt a. d. Oder: Kleist-Gedenk- und Forschungsstätte, 1992.
- Lauffer, Otto. *Das deutsche Haus in Dorf und Stadt*. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1919.
- Laugier, Marc-Antoine. *An essay on architecture* (1753). Translated by Wolfgang Hermann. Los Angeles: Hennessey & Ingalls, 1977.
- Lebovics, Herman. "'Agrarians' versus 'Industrializers': Social Conservative Resistance to Industrialism and Capitalism in Late Nineteenth Century Germany." *International Review of Social History* 12. no. 1 (1967): 31-65.
- Le Corbusier. *The City of To-morrow and Its Planning*. New York: Payson & Clarke, 1929.
- Lee, Orville. "Cultural fields, rural politics, and the discourse in the Kaiserreich: Culture in the construction of an agrarian ideology in Wilhelmine Germany, 1871-1914." Ph.D. diss., University of California Berkeley, 1996.
- Lees, Andrew. "Critics of Urban Society in Germany, 1854-1914." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 40, no. 1 (Jan-March 1979): 61-83.
- _____. *Cities, Sin, and Social Reform in Imperial Germany*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002.
- LeFèvre, Wolfgang. "Darwin, Marx und der garantierte Fortschritt – Materialismus und Entwicklungsdenken im 19. Jahrhundert." In *Materialismus und Spiritualismus. Philosophie und Wissenschaft nach 1848*, eds. Andreas Arndt and Walter Jaeschke, 167-187. Hamburg: Meiner, 2000.
- Lehmann, Ernst. *Volksgemeinschaft aus Nachbarschaften. Eine Volkskunde des deutschen Nachbarschaftwesens*. Prague: Noebe, 1944.

- Lekan, Thomas M. *Imagining the Nation in Nature: Landscape Preservation and German Identity, 1885-1945*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Lenger, Friedrich. *Werner Sombart, 1863-1941: Eine Biographie*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1994.
- Leppers-Fögen, Annette. *Die deklassierte Klasse. Studien zur Geschichte und Ideologie des Kleinbürgertums*. Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1974.
- Lewis, Michael J. *The Politics of the German Gothic Revival: August Reichensperger*. New York: The Architectural History Foundation, 1993.
- Liebe, Georg. *Soziale Studien aus deutscher Vergangenheit*. Berlin: Costenoble, 1901.
- Liebersohn, Harry. *Religion and Industrial Society: The Protestant Social Congress in Wilhelmine Germany*. Philadelphia: Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 76, Part 6, 1986.
- _____. *Fate and Utopia in German Sociology, 1870-1923*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1988.
- Lichtsinn, Hilkea. *Otto Ammon und die Sozialanthropologie*. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1987.
- Lindenlaub, Dieter. *Richtungskämpfe im Verein für Sozialpolitik*, vol. 2. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1967.
- Linse, Ulrich. *Zurück O Mensch zur Mutter Erde. Landkommunen in Deutschland, 1890-1933*. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1983.
- _____. "Völkische-rassische Siedlungen der Lebensreform." In *Handbuch zur "Völkische Bewegung" 1871-1918*, ed. Uwe Puschner, Walter Schmitz, and Justus H. Ulbricht, 397-410. Munich: Saur, 1996.
- Litz, Konrad. "Theorie einer Raumgeschichte." *Die Alte Stadt* 9 (1982): 52-76.
- Lohalm, Uwe. *Völkischen Radikalismus. Die Geschichte des Deutschvölkischen Schutz- und Trutz-Bundes 1919-1923*. Hamburg: Leibniz-Verlag, 1970.
- Lonner, Alyssa A. *Mediating the Past: Gustav Freytag, Progress, and German Historical Identity, 1848-1871*. Oxford: P. Lang, 2005.
- Loomis, Charles P. *Rural Social Systems: A Textbook of Rural Sociology and Anthropology*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1951.

- Lövenich, Friedhelm. *Verstaatlichte Sittlichkeit: Die konservative Konstruktion der Lebenswelt in Wilhelm Heinrich Riehls "Naturgeschichte des Volkes."* Opladen : Leske und Budrich, 1992.
- Löwenberg, Dieter. "Willibald Hentschel (1858-1947). Seine Pläne zur Menschenzüchtung, sein Biologismus und Antisemitismus," Ph.D. Diss., Mainz, 1979.
- Löwy, Michael. "Die Romantik zwischen Nationalismus und Kosmopolitismus." In *Nationalismus und Romantik*, eds. Wolfgang Müller-Fun and Franz Schuh, 74-87. Vienna: Turia & Kant, 1999.
- Lunn, Eugene. *Prophet of Community: The Romantic Socialism of Gustav Landauer.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.
- Maasen, Sabine, Everett Mendelsohn, and Peter Weingart, eds. *Biology as Society, Society as Biology: Metaphors.* Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1995.
- Maciuka, John V. *Before the Bauhaus: Architecture, Politics and the German State, 1890-1920.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Magnus, Rudolf. *Wilhelm Bölsche. Ein biographisch-kritischer Beitrag zur modernen Weltanschauung.* Berlin: Elwin Staude, 1909.
- Maki, Fumihiko. *Investigations in Collective Form.* St. Louis: Washington University, 1964.
- Manega, Rudolf. *Die Anlage von Arbeiterwohnungen vom wirtschaftliche, sanitären und technischen Standpunkte, mit einer Sammlung von Plänen der besten Arbeiterhäuser Englands, Frankreichs und Deutschlands.* Weimar: B.F. Voigt, 1871.
- Manieri-Elia, Mario. "Toward an 'Imperial City': Daniel H. Burnham and the City Beautiful Movement." In *The American City: From the Civil War to the New Deal*, ed. Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co, Mario Manieri-Elia, and Manfredo Tafuri, 1-142. Translated by Barbara Luigia La Penta. London: Granada, 1980.
- Mann, Gunter ed. *Biologismus im 19. Jahrhundert.* Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1973.
- Massin, Benoit. "From Virchow to Fischer: Physical Anthropology and 'Modern Race Theories' in Wilhelmine Germany." In *Volksgeist as Method and Ethic: Essays on Boasian Ethnography and the German Anthropological Tradition*, ed. George Stocking, 79-154. Madison: University Wisconsin Press.
- Matzerath, Horst. "Grundstrukturen städtischer Bevölkerungsentwicklung in Mitteleuropa im 19. Jahrhundert." In *Die Städte Mitteleuropas im 19.*

- Jahrhundert*, ed. Wilhelm Rausch. Linz: Österreichischer Arbeitskreis für Stadtgeschichtsforschung, 1983.
- Maurer, Georg Ludwig von. *Einleitung zur Geschichte der Mark- Hof-, Dorf- und Stadtverfassung und der öffentlichen Gewalt*. Munich: Kaiser, 1854.
- _____. *Geschichte der Fronhöfe, der Bauernhöfe und der Hofverfassung in Deutschland*, 4 vols. Erlangen: Enke, 1862-63.
- McElligott, Anthony. *The German Urban Experience 1900-1945: Modernity and Crisis*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Mebes, Paul. *Um 1800. Architektur und Handwerk im letzten Jahrhundert ihrer traditioneller Entwicklung*, 2 vols. Munich: F.W. Bruckmann, 1908.
- Medick, Hans. *Naturzustand und Naturgeschichte der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft. Die Ursprung der bürgerlichen Sozialtheorie als Geschichtsphilosophie und Sozialwissenschaft bei Samuel Pufendorf, John Locke und Adam Smith*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.
- Meier, Rolf. *August Forel, 1848-1931. Arzt, Naturforscher, Sozialreformer*. Bern: Universität Bern, 1986.
- Meitzen, August. *Urkunden schlesische Dörfer. Zur Geschichte der ländliche Verhältnisse und der Flurentheilung insbesondere*. Codex Diplomaticus Silesiae 4. Breslau: Max, 1863.
- _____. *Das deutsche Haus in seinen volksthümlichen Formen. Ermittlungen über die geographische und geschichtliche Verbreitung, besprochen auf dem Geographen-Tage zu Berlin am 7.-9. Juli 1881*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1882.
- _____. *Wanderungen, Anbau, und Agrarrecht der Völker Europas nördlich der Alpen. Siedelung und Agrarwesen der Westgermanen und Ostgermanen, der Kelten, Römer, Finnen und Slawen*, 3 vols. Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz, 1895.
- Mendlewitsch, Doris. *Volk und Heil. Vordenker des Nationalsozialismus im 19. Jahrhundert*. Rheda-Wiedenbrück: Daedalus, 1988.
- Meringer, Rudolf. *Das deutsche Haus und sein Hausrat*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1906.
- Methner, Alfred. *Organismen und Staaten. Eine Untersuchung über die biologische Grundlagen des Gesellschaftslebens und Kulturlebens. Natur und Staat. Beiträge zur naturwissenschaftlichen Gesellschaftslehre*, Vol. 8. Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1906.
- Metzendorf, Georg. *Kleinwohnungsbauten und Siedlungen*. Darmstadt: A. Koch, 1920.

- Metzendorf, Rainier. *Georg Metzendorf, 1874-1934. Siedlung und Bauten*. Darmstadt: Hessische Historische Kommission und Historische Kommission für Hessen, 1994.
- Michaelis, Curt. *Prinzipien der natürlichen und sozialen Entwicklungslehre des Menschen. Anthropologisch-ethnologische Studien. Natur und Staat. Beiträge zur naturwissenschaftlichen Gesellschaftslehre*, Vol. 5. Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1904.
- Mielke, Robert. *Das deutsche Dorf*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1907.
- _____. *Siedlungskunde des deutschen Volkes und ihre Beziehung zu Menschen und Landschaft*. Munich: J.H. Lehmanns, 1927.
- Migge, Leberecht. *Jedermann Selbstversorger! Eine Lösung der Siedlungsfrage durch neuen Gartenbau*. Jena: Diederichs, 1918.
- _____. "Moderne Siedlungsgärten." *Anhaltische Siedlerzeitung. Organ des Anhaltischen Siedler-Verbandes* 3, no. 11 (1926).
- _____. "Die Siedlung Hohe Lache bei Dessau." *Siedlungswirtschaft. Mitteilungen der Siedler-Schule Worpswede* 3, no. 1-2 (1 February 1926).
- Miller, Martin A. *Kropotkin*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Miller, Mervyn. *Raymond Unwin: Garden Cities and Town Planning*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992.
- Minta, Anna. *Israel bauen. Architektur, Städtebau und Denkmalpolitik nach der Staatsgründung 1948*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 2004.
- Mislin, Miron ed. *Julius Posener: Laßt mich doch, Kinder, hier komme ich wahrscheinlich nie wieder her! In memoriam Julius Posener*. Berlin: Jovis, 1997.
- Mitzman, Arthur. *Sociology and Estrangement: Three Sociologists of Imperial Germany*. New York: Knopf, 1973.
- _____. "Tönnies and German Society, 1887-1914: From Cultural Pessimism to Celebration of the *Volksgemeinschaft*." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 32 (October-December 1971): 507-524.
- Mommsen, Hans, and Winfried Schulze, eds. *Von Elend der Handarbeit. Probleme historischer Unterschichtenforschung*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981.
- Mommsen, Wolfgang J., ed. *Max Weber und seine Zeitgenossen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988.

- Mönninger, Michael. *Vom Ornament zum Nationalkunstwerk. Zur Kunst- und Architekturtheorie Camillo Sittes*. Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1998.
- Moosmann, Elisabeth, ed. *Heimat: Sehnsucht nach Identität*. Berlin: Ästhetik & Kommunikation, 1980.
- Moravánsky, Ákos, ed. *Das entfernte Dorf. Moderne Kunst und ethnischer Artefakt*. Vienna: Birkhäuser, 2002.
- Morgan, Lewis Henry. *The American Beaver and His Works*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1868.
- _____. *Ancient Society or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization*. Chicago: C.H. Kerr, 1877.
- _____. *Die Urgesellschaft: Untersuchungen über den Fortschritt der Menschheit aus der Wildheit durch die Barbarei zur Zivilisation*, Translated by W. Eichhoff and Karl Kautsky. Stuttgart: Dietz, 1891.
- _____. *Houses and Houselife of the American Aborigines*. Washington, D.C. Government Printing Office, 1881.
- Möser, Justus. *Patriotischen Phantasien*. Berlin: Nicolai, 1775-76.
- _____. *Osnabrücksche Geschichte*. Berlin: Nicolai, 1780.
- Mosse, George L. *The Crisis of German Ideology: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1964.
- Mottura, Giovanni. "Considerazioni sulla genesi e sulla crisi del concetto di 'Rural-Urban Continuum'." *Quaderni di sociologia* 16, no. 2 (April-June 1967): 123-143.
- Müller, Gerhard H. *Friedrich Ratzel (1844-1904): Naturwissenschaftler, Geograph, Gelehrter*. Stuttgart: Verlag der Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Technik, 1996.
- Müller, Lothar. "Modernität, Nervosität und Sachlichkeit. Das Berlin der Jahrhundertwende als Hauptstadt der 'neuen Zeit'." In *Mythos Berlin. Zur Wahrnehmungsgeschichte einer industriellen Metropole*, 79-92. Berlin: Ästhetik und Kommunikation, 1987.
- _____. "Die Großstadt als Ort der Moderne. Über Georg Simmel." In *Die Unwirklichkeit der Städte. Großstadtdarstellungen zwischen Moderne und Postmoderne*, ed. Klaus R. Scherpe, 14-36. Reinbeck bei Hamburg: Rohwohlt, 1988.

- Müller Lyer, Franz. *Die Entwicklungstufen des Menschheit: Eine sytematische Soziologie in Überblicken und Einzeldarstellungen*. Vol. 1, *Der Sinn des Lebens und Wissenschaft*; Vol. 2, *Phasen der Kultur und Richtungslinien des Fortschritts*; Vol. 3 and 4, *Der Familie, Der Staat*; Vol. 5, *Der Staat*; Vol. 6, *Die Geschichte des menschlichen Verstandes*; Vol. 7, *Die Entwicklung der Moral des Rechtes*. Munich: A. Lehmanns, 1908-1924.
- Mumford, Eric. *The CIAM Discourse on Urbanism, 1928-1960*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2000.
- Mumford, Lewis. *The City in History*. New York: Harcourt, 1961.
- Munding, Karl, ed. *Victor Aimé Hubers Ausgewählte Schriften über Socialreform und Genossenschaftswesen* (1894). With an introduction by Wilhelm Treue and Karl Heinrich Kaufhold. Frankfurt a.M.: Keip, 1990.
- Münk, Dieter. *Die Organisation des Raumes im Nationalsozialismus. Eine soziologische Untersuchung ideologisch fundierter Leitbilder in Architektur, Städtebau und Raumplanung des Dritten Reiches*. Bonn: Pahl-Rugenstein, 1993.
- Museum im Wasserwerk. *Alte Wasserwerke in Berlin*. Berlin-Friedrichshagen: Museum im Wasserwerk, 1995.
- Muthesius, Hermann. "Alte Volkstradition und modernes Parvenutum in unserer Baukunst." *Deutsche Monatsschrift für das gesamte Leben der Gegenwart* 1 (1902): 219-224.
- _____. "Die moderne Umbildung unserer ästhetischen Anschauungen." *Deutsche Monatsschrift für das gesamte Leben der Gegenwart* 1 (1902): 686-702.
- _____. "Unsere Kunstzustände als Ausdruck unserer Kultur." *Der Kunstwart* 28, no. 23 (1904): 464-473.
- _____. *Das englische Haus: Entwicklung, Bedingungen, Anlage, Aufbau, Einrichtung und Innenraum*, Vols. 1-3. Berlin: Wasmuth, 1904-1905.
- _____. "Die Entwicklung des künstlerischen Gedankens im Hausbau." In *Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrtseinrichtunge. Die künstlerische Gestaltung des Arbeiter-Wohnhauses. 14. Konferenz der Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrteinrichtungen am 5. und 6. Juni 1905 in Hagen i. W.*, 7-15. Berlin: Carl Heymanns Verlag, 1906.
- _____. *Kunstgewerbe und Architektur*. Jena: Eugen Diederichs, 1907.

- _____. *Die Einheit der Architektur: Betrachtungen über Baukunst, Ingenieurbau und Kunstgewerbe. Vorträge, gehalten am 13. Februar 1908 im Verein für Kunst in Berlin.* Berlin: Karl Curtius, 1908.
- _____. *Wie baue ich mein Haus?* Munich: F. Bruckmann, 1915.
- _____. *Kleinhaus und Kleinsiedlung.* Munich: F. Bruckmann, 1918.
- Muthesius, Stefan. *Das englische Vorbild. Eine Studie zu den deutschen Reformbewegungen in Architektur, Wohnbau und Kunstgewerbe im späteren 19. Jahrhundert.* Munich: Prestel, 1974.
- Nasse, Erwin. *Über die mittelalterliche Feldgemeinschaft und die Einhegungen des 16. Jahrhunderts in England.* Bonn: Georgi, 1869.
- Naumann, Friedrich. "Großstadt oder Kleinstadt?" *Patria: Jahrbuch der Hilfe* (1903).
- Negt, Oskar, and Alexander Kluge. *Public Sphere and Experience: Toward an Analysis of the Bourgeois and Proletarian Public Sphere.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.
- Nerdinger, Winfried. *Theodor Fischer: Architekt und Städtebauer 1862 – 1938.* Berlin: Ernst, 1988.
- Nerdinger, Winfried, ed. *Richard Riemerschmid. Vom Jugendstil zum Werkbund. Werke und Dokumente.* Munich: Prestel, 1982.
- Nerdinger, Winfried, Kristiana Hartmann, Matthias Shirren, and Manfred Speidel, eds. *Bruno Taut, 1880-1938. Architekt zwischen Tradition und Avantgarde.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2001.
- Neuhaus, Rolf. "Der dritte Weg: Bürgerliche Sozialreform zwischen Reaktion und Revolution. Die Gesellschaft für Sozialreform 1901-1914." *Sozialer Fortschritt* 28 (1979): 205-212.
- Niethammer, Lutz ed. *Wohnen im Wandel. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alltags in der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft.* Wuppertal: Peter Hammer Verlag, 1979.
- Novy, Klaus ed. *Genossenschafts-Bewegung. Zur Geschichte und Zukunft der Wohnreform.* Berlin: Transit, 1983.
- Novy, Klaus, and Barbara von Neumann-Cosel, eds. *Wohnreform in Berlin – Ein Arbeitsprogramm wird vorgestellt.* Berlin: Edition Hentrich, 1991.
- _____. *Zwischen Tradition und Innovation. 100 Jahre Bau- und Wohnungsgenossenschaft von 1892.* Berlin: Edition Hentrich, 1992.

- Oberschall, Anthony. *Empirical Social Research in Germany 1848-1914*. Paris: Mouton, 1965.
- Ochs, Haila, ed. *Adolf Behne: Architekturkritik in der Zeit und über die Zeit hinaus. Texte 1913-1946*. Basel: Birkhäuser; 1994.
- Oexle, Otto Gerhard. *Geschichtswissenschaft im Zeichen des Historismus: Studien zur Problemgeschichte der Moderne*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- _____. "Kulturwissenschaftliche Reflexionen über soziale Gruppen in der mittelalterlichen Gesellschaft: Tönnies, Simmel, Durkheim und Max Weber." In *Die Okzidentale Stadt nach Max Weber. Zum Problem der Zugehörigkeit in Antike und Mittelalter*, ed. Christian Meier, 115-159. Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1994.
- Oppenheimer, Franz. *System der Soziologie*. Vol. 1, *Der soziale Prozess*. Jena: Fischer, 1923.
- Österreichischer Ingenieur- und Architektenverein. *Das Bauernhaus in Österreich-Ungarn*. Vienna: Österreichischer Ingenieur- und Architektenverein, 1905-1906.
- Osthaus, Karl Ernst. "Der Wert des Hauses." In *Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen. Die künstlerische Gestaltung des Arbeiter-Wohnhauses. 14. Konferenz der Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen am 5. und 6. Juni 1905 in Hagen i. W.*, 1-6. Berlin: Carl Heymanns Verlag, 1906.
- Otto, Christian. "City-Planning Theory in National Socialist Germany." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 24 (March 1965): 70-74.
- _____. "Modern Environment and Historical Continuity: The Heimatschutz Discourse in Germany," *Art Journal* 43, no. 2 (Summer 1982): 148-157.
- Otto, Walter. *Schäffle's Lehre vom Sozialismus*. Bochum: Stumpf, 1923.
- Ouseley, Gideon Jasper. *Paligenesia: or, the Earth's New Birth*. Glasgow: Hay Nisbet & Co., 1884.
- Overhoff, Theodor. *Die Siedlung Hohe Lache bei Dessau* (1921). Dessau: Arbeitskreis Siedlungen im Verein industrieller Gartenreich, e.V., 1994.
- Pahl-Weber, Elke. "Die Ortsgruppe als Siedlungszelle. Ein Vorschlag zur Methodik der großstädtischen Stadterweiterung von 1940." In *Planen und Bauen in Europa 1930-1945* ed. Harmut Frank, 282-298. Hamburg: Hans Christians Verlag, 1985.

- Pankau, Johannes G. *Wege zurück. Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte restaurativen Denkens im Kaiserreich. Eine Untersuchung kulturkritischer und deutschkundlicher Ideologiebildung*. Frankfurt a.M.: P. Lang, 1983.
- Park, Robert E. *Masse und Publikum. Eine methodische und soziologische Untersuchung*. Bern: Lack & Grunau, 1904.
- Paul, Ina Ulricke. "Paul Anton de Lagarde." In *Handbuch der "Völkischen Bewegung" 1871-1918*, ed. Uwe Puschner, Walter Schmitz, and Justus H. Ulbricht, 45-93. Munich: Saur, 1996.
- Paul, Johann. *Alfred Krupp und die Arbeiterbewegung*. Düsseldorf: Schwan, 1987.
- Peet, Richard. "The Social Origins of Environmental Determinism." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 75, no. 3 (1985): 309-333.
- Penny, H. Glenn. *Objects of Culture: Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.
- Perry, Clarence Arthur. "The Neighborhood Unit." In *Neighborhood and Community Planning*, Vol. 7. New York: Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs, 1929.
- Pessler, Wilhelm (Willi). *Das altsächsische Bauernhaus in seiner geographischen Verbreitung*. Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1906.
- _____. *Das Heimat-Museum im deutschen Sprachgebiet als Spiegel deutscher Kultur*. Munich: Lehmann, 1927.
- _____. *Das niedersächsische Bauernhaus, ein Denkmal germanischer Kultur*. Hannover: Veröffentlichungen des Vaterländischen Museums der Hauptstadt Hannover, 1936.
- _____. *Handbuch der deutschen Stammeskunde*. Potsdam: Athenaion, 1942.
- Peters, Günter. *Kleine Berliner Baugeschichte. Von der Stadtgründung bis zur Hauptstadt*. Berlin: Stapp, 1995.
- Petsch, Joachim. *Eigenheim und gute Stube. Zur Geschichte des bürgerlichen Wohnens. Städtebau – Architektur – Einrichtungsstile*. Cologne: Dumont, 1989.
- Petz, Ursula von. "Robert Schmidt und die Grünflächen-Politik im Ruhrgebiet (1900-1930)." In *Die grüne Stadt. Siedlungen, Parks, Wälder, Grünflächen 1860-1960 im Ruhrgebiet*, ed. Renate Kastorff-Viehmänn, 35-48. Essen: Klartext, 1998.

- Pfeil, Elisabeth. *Großstadtforschung. Entwicklung und gegenwärtiger Stand*. Hannover: Jänecke, 1972.
- Phelps, Reginald H. "Theodor Fritsch und der Antisemitismus." *Deutsche Rundschau* 87 (1961): 442-449.
- Plarre, Stefanie. *Die Kochenhofsiedlung. Das Gegenmodell zur Weißenhofsiedlung. Paul Schmitthenners Siedlungsprojekt in Stuttgart von 1927 bis 1933*. Stuttgart: Hohenheim, 2001.
- Plessen, Marie-Louis. *Die Wirksamkeit des Vereins für Sozialpolitik von 1872-1890. Studien in Katheder- und Staatssozialismus*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1975.
- Plessner, Helmuth. "Nachwort zu Ferdinand Tönnies." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 7, no. 3 (1955): 346-347.
- Poggi, Gianfranco. *Money and the Modern Mind: Georg Simmel's Philosophy of Money*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Pohl, Hans ed. *Sozialgeschichtlicher Probleme in der Zeit der Hochindustrialisierung 1870-1914*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1979.
- Pommer, Richard. "The Flat Roof: A Modernist Controversy in Germany." *Art Journal* (Summer 1983): 158-169.
- Pommer, Richard and Christian F. Otto. *Weissenhof 1927 and the Modern Movement in Architecture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Posener, Julius. *Berlin: Auf dem Wege zu einer neuen Architektur*. Munich: Prestel Verlag, 1970.
- _____. *Aufsätze und Vorträge 1931-1980*. Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1981.
- _____. *Fast so alt wie das Jahrhundert*. Berlin: Siedler, 1990.
- _____. "Weissenhof und danach." *Baumeister* 78, no. 6 (June 1981): 596-607.
- Prange, Regine. *Die Kristalline als Kunstsymbol: Bruno Taut und Paul Klee. Zur Reflexion des Abstrakten in Kunst und Kunsttheorie der Moderne*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1991.
- _____. "Die Hufeisensiedlung in Spiegel des Glashauses." In *Kristallisationen, Splitterungen. Bruno Tauts Glashaus*, ed. Angelika Thiekötter, et al., 134-138. Basel: Birkhäuser, 1993.

- Projektgruppe Eisenheim, Fachhochschule Bielefeld, *Rettet Eisenheim. Gegen die Zerstörung der ältesten Arbeitersiedlung des Ruhrgebietes*, 2nd ed. Berlin: Verlag für das Studium der Arbeiterbewegung, 1973.
- Propping, Peter, and Heinz Schott, eds. *Wissenschaft auf Abwegen. Biologismus – Rassenhygiene – Eugenik*. Bonn and Berlin: Bouvier, 1992.
- Pugin, A.W.N. *Contrasts: or, A Parallel between the noble edifices of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and similar buildings of the present day, showing the present decay of taste*. St. Marie's Grange, England: The author, 1836.
- _____. *True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture*. London: Weale, 1841.
- Puschner, Uwe. *Die völkische Bewegung im wilhelminische Kaiserreich. Sprach – Rasse – Religion*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001.
- Puschner, Uwe, Walter Schmitz, and Justus H. Ulbricht, eds. *Handbuch zur "Völkische Bewegung," 1871-1918*. Munich: Saur, 1996.
- Rach, Hans-Jürgen, ed. *Vom Bauen und Wohnen – 20 Jahre Arbeitskreis für Haus- und Siedlungsforschung in der DDR*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1982.
- Radest, Howard B. *Toward Common Ground: The Story of the Ethical Societies in the United States*. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1969.
- Radig, Werner. *Die Siedlungstypen in Deutschland und ihre frühgeschichtlichen Wurzeln*. Berlin: Henschelverlag, 1955.
- _____. *Frühformen der Hausentwicklung in Deutschland. Die frühgeschichtlichen Wurzeln des deutschen Hauses*. Berlin: Henschelverlag, 1958.
- Ramírez, Juan Antonio. *The Beehive Metaphor: From Gaudí to Corbusier*. London: Reaktion Books, 2000.
- Rammstedt, Otthein. *Simmel und die frühe Soziologie: Nähe und Distanz zu Durkheim, Tönnies und Weber*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1988.
- Ranke, Leopold von. *Geschichten der romanischen und germanischen Völker von 1494 bis 1514* (1824). *Sämtliche Werke*, Vols. 33/34. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1874.
- Ratz, Ursula. *Sozialreform und Arbeiterschaft. Die "Gesellschaft für Sozialreform" und die sozialdemokratische Arbeiterbewegung von der Jahrhundertwende bis zum Ausbruch des Ersten Weltkrieges*. Berlin: Colloquium, 1980.

Ratzel, Friedrich. *Deutschland. Einführung in die Heimatkunde*. Leipzig: F.W. Grunow, 1898.

_____. *Anthropogeographie*. Stuttgart: J. Engelhorn, 1899.

Reeh, Henrik. *Ornaments of the Metropolis: Siegfried Kracauer and Modern Urban Culture*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2004.

Repp, Kevin. *Reformers, Critics, and the Paths of German Modernity: Anti-politics and the Search for Alternatives*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Reulecke, Jürgen. *Sozialer Frieden durch Soziale Reform. Der Centralverein für das Wohl der arbeitenden Klassen in der Frühindustrialisierung*. Wuppertal: Peter Hammer, 1983.

_____. *Geschichte der Urbanisierung*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1985.

_____. "Fragestellungen und Methoden der Urbanisierungs-geschichtsforschung in Deutschland." In *Stadtgeschichtsforschung. Aspekte, Tendenzen, Perspective*, ed. Fritz Mayrhofer. Linz: Donau, 1993.

_____. "Antimodernismus und Zivilisationskritik: Die Heimatbewegung aus historisch-gesellschaftlicher Perspektive." *Regionaler Fundamentalismus* (1999): 12-21.

Reulecke, Jürgen, ed. *Die Stadt als Dienstleistungszentrum. Beiträge zur Geschichte der "Sozialstadt" in Deutschland*. St. Katherin: Scripta Mercaturae, 1995.

_____. *Geschichte des Wohnens. Vol. 3, Das bürgerliche Zeitalter 1800-1918*. Ludwigsburg: Wüstenrot Stiftung and the Deutsche Eigenheimverein, 1997.

Reulecke, Jürgen and Wolfhard Weber, eds. *Fabrik, Familie, Feierabend. Beiträge zur Sozialgeschichte des Alltags im Industriezeitalter*. Wuppertal: Peter Hammer Verlag, 1978.

Rhamm, Karl. *Dorf und Bauernhof in altdeutschem Lande, wie sie waren und wie sie sein werden*. Leipzig: Grunow, 1890.

_____. *Ethnographische Beiträge zur germanisch-slavisches Alterumskunde*, Section 2: *Urzeitliche Bauernhöfe in germanische-slavisches Waldgebiet*, Part 1: *Altgermanische Bauernhöfe im Übergange vom Saal zu Fletz und Stube*. Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1908.

_____. "Der heutige Stand der deutschen Hausforschung und das neueste Werk Meitzens." *Globus. Illustrierte Zeitschrift für Länder- und Völkerkunde* 71, no. 11 (1897): 169-176, 183-188, 206-213.

- Rickert, Heinrich. *Die Grenzen des naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbild*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1902.
- Riedel, Manfred. "Die dialektische Begründung der Notwendigkeit des Fortschritts in Hegels Geschichtsphilosophie." *Hegel –Jahrbuch* (1968-69): 89-106.
- Riegl, Alois. *Stilfragen: Grundlegungen zu einer Geschichte der Ornamentik*. Berlin: G. Siemens, 1893.
- Riehl, Wilhelm Heinrich. *Die Naturgeschichte des Volkes als Grundlage einer deutschen Social-Politik*. Vol. 1 *Land und Leute*, Vol. 2 *Die bürgerliche Gesellschaft*, Vol. 3 *Die Familie*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1851-1855.
- _____. *Kulturstudien aus drei Jahrhunderten*. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1859.
- Riemerschmid, Richard. "Grundriß und Aussehen, Innenausbau und Einrichtung des Arbeiterwohnhauses." In *Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen. Die künstlerische Gestaltung des Arbeiter-Wohnhauses. 14. Konferenz der Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen am 5. und 6. Juni 1905 in Hagen i. W.*, 48-58. Berlin: Carl Heymanns Verlag, 1906.
- Ringer, Fritz K. *The Decline of the German Mandarins: the German Academic Community, 1890-1933*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- _____. *Max Weber: An Intellectual Biography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Ritter, Gerhard A., and Klaus Tenfelde. *Arbeiter im Deutschen Kaiserreich, 1871 bis 1914*. Vol. 5, *Geschichte der Arbeiter und der Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland seit dem Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts*. Bonn: J.H.W. Dietz nachf., 1992.
- Ritter, Joachim. "Fortschritt." In *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, vol. 2. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972: 1032—1059.
- Robson-Scott, W.D. *The Literary Background of the Gothic Revival in Germany*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Rodenstein, Marianne. "Mehr Licht, mehr Luft." *Gesundheitskonzepte im Städtebau seit 1750*. Frankfurt a.M.: Campus Verlag, 1988.
- Rodriguez-Lores, Juan. *Sozialer Wohnungsbau in Europa. Die Ursprünge bis 1918: Ideen, Programme, Gesetze*. Basel: Birkhäuser, 1994.

- Rodriguez-Lores, Juan, and Gerhard Fehl, eds. *Stadtbaureform 1865-1900. Von Licht, Luft und Unordnung in der Stadt der Gründerzeit*. Hamburg: Hans Christians, 1985.
- _____. *Die Kleinwohnungsfrage. Zu den Ursprüngen des sozialen Wohnungsbaus in Europa*. Hamburg: Christians, 1988.
- Rohrkramer, Thomas. *Eine andere Moderne? Zivilisationskritik, Natur und Technik in Deutschland 1880-1933*. Paderborn: Schönigh, 1999.
- Rollins, William H. *A Greener Vision of Home: Cultural Politics and Environmental Reform in the German Heimatschutz Movement, 1904-1918*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997.
- Rosenbaum, Heidi. ed. *Familie und Gesellschaftsstruktur. Materielen zu den sozioökonomischen Bedingungen von Familienformen*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp. 1978.
- Rössler, Mechthild. "Die Institutionalisierung einer neuen Wissenschaft im Nationalsozialismus. Raumforschung und Raumordnung 1935-1945" *Geographische Zeitschrift* (1987): 164-177.
- _____. "Applied Geography and Area Research in Nazi Society: Central Place Theory and Planning, 1933 to 1945." *Environment and Planning* 7 (1989): 419-31.
- Roth, Fedor. *Hermann Muthesius und die Idee der harmonischen Kultur. Kultur als Einheit des künstlerischen Stils in allen Lebensäußerungen eines Volkes*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 2001.
- Saldern, Adelheid von. "Im hause, zu Hause. Wohnen im Spannungsfeld von Gegebenheiten und Aneignungen." In *Geschichte des Wohnens*. Vol. 3, 1800-1918, *Das bürgerliche Zeitalter*, ed. Jürgen Reulecke, 145-332. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1997.
- Salin, Edgar. *Erneuerung unserer Städte*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960.
- _____. "Von der Urbanität zur 'Urbanistik'." *Kyklos* 23 (1970).
- Sandner, Gerhard, and Mechthild Rössler. "Geography and Empire in Germany, 1871-1945." In *Geography and Empire*, ed. Anne Godlewska and Neil Smith, 115-129. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.
- Scaff, Lawrence A. "Geschichte und Historismus in der deutschen Tradition des politischen und ökonomischen Denkens," in *Historismus am Ende des 20.*

Jahrhunderts. Eine internationale Diskussion, ed. Gunter Scholz, 127-145. Berlin: Akademie, 1997.

Schäfer, Ulla G. *Historische Nationalökonomie und Sozialstatistik als Gesellschaftswissenschaften. Forschungen zur Vorgeschichte der theoretischen Soziologie und der empirischen Sozialforschung in Deutschland in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau, 1971.

Schäffle, Albert E.F. *Bau und Leben des socialen Körpers: Encyclopädischer Entwurf einer realen Anatomie, Physiologie und Psychologie der menschlichen Gesellschaft mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Volkswirtschaft als socialen Stoffwechsel*, 4 vols. Tübingen: Laupp, 1875-1878.

_____. *Aus meinen Leben*, 2 vols. Berlin: E. Hofmann, 1905.

_____. *Die Quintessenz der Socialismus* (1875). Gotha: Perthes, 1920.

Scheer, Thorsten, Josef Paul Kleihues, and Paul Kahlfeldt, ed. *Stadt der Architektur/Architektur der Stadt. Berlin 1900-2000*. Berlin: Nicolai, 2000.

Scheffler, Karl. *Der Architekt*. Frankfurt a.M: Rütten & Loening, 1907.

Scherer, Herbert. *Bürgerlich-oppositionelle Literaten und sozialdemokratische Arbeiterbewegung nach 1890. Die Friedrichshagener und ihr Einfluß auf die sozialdemokratische Kulturpolitik*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1981.

Schmidt, Karl. "Kleinwohnungsbauten des Verbandes Sächsischer Industrieller auf der Internationalen Hygiene-Ausstellung in Dresden 1911." *Architektonische Rundschau* 11 (1911): V.

Schmidt, Peter. *Studien über Justus Möser als Historiker: Zur Genesis und Struktur der historischen Methode Justus Möasers*. Göttingen: Kümmerle, 1975.

Schmidt, Robert. *Denkschrift betreffend Grundsätze zur Aufstellung eines General-Siedlungsplanes für den Regierungsbezirk Düsseldorf*. Essen: Fredebeul & Koenen, 1912.

Schmitthenner, Paul. "Die Deutsche Volkswohnung: Einführung in der Siedlungsfrage." *Daimler-Werkzeitung* 1, no. 15-18 (1919/1920): 245-282.

_____. *Das deutsche Wohnhaus*. Stuttgart: Konrad Witter Verlag, 1932.

_____. *Die Baukunst im neuen Reich*. Munich: Georg D.W. Callwey, 1934.

_____. *Gebaute Form: Variationen über ein Thema*, ed. Elisabeth Schmitthenner. Leinfelden-Echterdingen: Alexander Koch, 1984.

- Schmoller, Gustav. *Zur inneren Kolonisation in Deutschland. Erfahrungen und Vorschläge*. Schriften des Vereins für Socialpolitik 32. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1886.
- _____. *Was verstehen wir unter dem Mittelstande? Hat er im 19. Jahrhundert zu oder abgenommen? Vortrag auf dem 8. Evangelische-Sozialen Kongress in Leipzig am 11. Juni 1897*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897.
- _____. *Grundriß der Allgemeinen Volkswirtschaftslehre*, 2 vols. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1900-1904.
- _____. *Die Entwicklung der deutschen Volkswirtschaftslehre im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1908.
- Schnabel, Anton. "Arbeiterwohnungen auf der Industrie- und Gewerbeausstellung in Düsseldorf 1902." *Österreichische Wochenschrift für den öffentlichen Baudienst* 9 (1903): 60-65.
- Schoelen, Georg ed. *Der Volksvereine für das katholische Deutschland 1890-1933*. Mönchengladbach: Stadtbibliothek, 1974.
- Schoenichen, Walter. *Naturschutz, Heimatschutz: Ihre Begründung durch Ernst Rudorff, Hugo Conwentz und ihre Vorläufer*. Stuttgart: Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1954.
- Scholz, Gunter, ed. *Historismus am Ende des 20. Jahrhunderts. Eine internationale Diskussion*. Berlin: Akademie, 1997.
- Schott, Reinmar. "'Die Stadt' und ihre Vorläufer. Zu den Quellen der Stadtypologie Max Webers." *Geschichte und Gegenwart* 15, no. 3 (August 1996): 141-153.
- Schreiner, Klaus. "Die mittelalterliche Stadt in Webers Analyse und die Deutung des okzidentalischen Rationalismus. Typus, Legitimität, Kulturbedeutung." In *Max Weber, der Historiker*, ed. Jürgen Kocka, 119-150. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.
- Schubert, Dirk. "Stadtplanung als Ideologie. Eine theoriegeschichtliche-ideologiekritische Untersuchung der Stadt, des Städtebaus und Wohnungsbaus in Deutschland von ca. 1850 bis heute." Ph.D. diss., Freie Universität Berlin, 1981.
- _____. "Theodor Fritsch und die völkische Version der Gartenstadt." *Stadtbauwelt* 73/*Bauwelt* 12 (1982): 65-70/463-468.
- _____. "Großstadtfeindschaft und Stadtplanung. Neue Anmerkungen zu einer alten Diskussion." *Die Alte Stadt* 13, no. 1 (1986): 22-4.

- _____. "Gottfried Feder und sein Betrag zur Stadtplanungstheorie. Technokratische Richtwertplanung oder nationalsozialistische Stadtplanungsideologie?" *Die Alte Stadt* 13, no. 3 (1986): 192-211.
- _____. "Theodor Fritsch and the German (*völkische*) Version of the Garden City: The Garden City Invented Two Years Before Ebenezer Howard." *Planning Perspectives* 19, no. 1 (January 2004): 3-35.
- Schultze-Naumburg, Paul. *Kulturarbeiten*, 9 vols. Munich: Georg D.W. Callwey, 1902-1917.
- _____. "Das Bauernhaus in seiner vorbildlichen Bedeutung für den Arbeiterwohnhausbau." In *Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen. Die künstlerische Gestaltung des Arbeiter-Wohnhauses. 14. Konferenz der Centralstelle für Arbeiter-Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen am 5. und 6. Juni 1905 in Hagen i. W.*, 29-47. Berlin: Carl Heymanns Verlag, 1906.
- _____. *Der Bau des Wohnhauses*, Vol. 1. Munich: Callwey, 1917.
- _____. "Das Werk Müller-Lyers." *Die Umschau* (Frankfurt a.M.) 27, no. 31, 33, 34 (1923): 481-483, 513-516, 532-536.
- _____. "Wer hat Recht?" *Der Uhu* 2/7 (1926).
- Schumacher, Fritz. *Die Kleinwohnung. Studien zur Wohnungsfrage*. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1916.
- Schumpp, Mechthild. *Stadtbau – Utopien und Gesellschaft. Der Bedeutungswandel utopischer Stadtmodelle unter socialem Aspekte*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1972.
- Schwabe, Hermann. *Betrachtungen über die Volksseele von Berlin*. Jahrbuch für Volkswirtschaft und Statistik 4. Berlin, 1870.
- Schwartz, Frederic J. *The Werkbund: Design Theory and Mass Culture before the First World War*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Schwartzkopff, D., ed. *Der Vaterländische Bauverein zu Berlin, eingetragene Genossenschaft mit beschränkter Haftpflicht. Im Auftrage des Vereinsvorstandes herausgeben von Schwartzkopff, Pf.*, 2nd. ed. Berlin: Selbstverlag, 1906.
- Schwarzer, Mitchell. *German Architectural Theory and the Search for Modern Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Schweizerischer Ingenieur und Architekten-Verein. *Das Bauernhaus in der Schweiz*. Zurich: Schweizerischer Ingenieur und Architekten-Verein, 1903.

- Semper, Gottfried. *The Four Elements of Architecture and Other Writings*. Translated by Harry Francis Mallgrave and Wolfgang Herrmann. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- _____. *Style in the Technical and Tectonic Arts, or, Practical Aesthetics* (1860-1863). Translated by Harry Francis Mallgrave and Michael Robinson. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2004.
- Sharon, Arieh. *Kibbutz + Bauhaus: An Architect's Way in a New Land*. Stuttgart and Massada, Israel: Karl Krämer Verlag, 1976.
- Sheehan, James J. *German Liberalism in the Nineteenth Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- Sieferle, Rolf Peter. *Fortschrittsfeinde? Opposition gegen Technik und Industrie von der Romantik bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1984.
- _____. *Die Konservative Revolution Fünf biographische Skizzen*. Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1995.
- Sieverts, Thomas. *Zwischenstadt zwischen Ort und Welt. Raum und Zeit, Stadt und Land*. Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1997.
- Simmel, Georg. "Die Großstadt und Geistesleben." In *Die Großstadt. Jahrbuch der Gehe-Stiftung*, vol. 9, ed. Karl Bücher, 185-206. Dresden: Zahn & Jaensch, 1903.
- _____. *Philosophie des Geldes*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1900.
- _____. *The Philosophy of Money*, 2nd enlarged edition, ed. David Frisby, trans. Tom Bottemore and David Frisby. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1990.
- Simons, Gustav. *Die Deutsche Gartenstadt. Ihr Wesen und ihre heutigen Typen*. Wittenberg: Ziemsen Verlag, 1912.
- Sitte, Camillo. *Der Staedtebau nach seinen künstlerischen Grundsätzen* (1889). Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1983.
- Smith, Anthony D. *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001.
- Smith, Woodruff D. *Politics and the Sciences of Culture in Germany, 1840-1920*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Sohnrey, Heinrich. *Die Zug vom Lande und die Soziale Revolution*. Leipzig: Werther, 1894.

- _____. *Die Bedeutung der Landbevölkerung im Staate und unsere besonderen Aufgaben auf dem Lande*. Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1896.
- Sombart, Werner. *Sozialismus und soziale Bewegung im 19. Jahrhundert*. Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1896.
- _____. *Socialism and the Social Movement in the Nineteenth Century, with a chronicle of the social movement, 1750-1896*. Translated by Anson P. Atterbury, with an introduction by John B. Clark. New York and London: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1898.
- _____. *Dennoch! Aus Theorie und Geschichte der gewerkschaftlichen Arbeiterbewegung*. Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1900.
- _____. *Der moderne Kapitalismus*, Vol. 1: *Die Genesis des Kapitalismus*; Vol. 2: *Die Theorie der kapitalistischen Entwicklung*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1902.
- _____. *Die deutsche Volkswirtschaft im 19. Jahrhundert*. Berlin: G. Bondi, 1903.
- _____. *Das Proletariat: Bilder und Studien*. Frankfurt a.M.: Rütten & Loning, 1906.
- _____. "Der Begriff der Stadt und das Wesen der Städtebildung." *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 25, no. 1 (1907): 1-9.
- _____. *Händler und Helden. Patriotische Besinnungen*. Munich and Leipzig: Duncker, 1915.
- _____. *Der moderne Kapitalismus: Historisch-systematische Darstellung des gesamteuropäischen Wirtschaftslebens von seinen Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. Vol. 1: *Einleitung. Die vorkapitalistische Wirtschaft. Die historischen Grundlagen des modernen Kapitalismus*; Vol. 2. *Das europäische Wirtschaftsleben im Zeitalter des Frühkapitalismus vornehmlich im 16., 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*; Vol. 3. *Das Wirtschaftsleben im Zeitalter des Hochkapitalismus*. Munich and Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1916-1919.
- _____. "Städtische Siedlung, Stadt." In *Handwörterbuch der Soziologie*, ed. Alfred Vierkandt. Stuttgart: F. Enke, 1931.
- Sommer, Andreas Urs. "Zwischen Agitation, Religionsstiftung und 'hoher Politik.' 'Paul de Lagarde und Friedrich Nietzsche.'" *Nietzscheforschung. Ein Jahrbuch* 4 (1998): 169-194.
- Sommer, Kurt Alexander. *Bauernhof-Bibliographie*. Herausgeben im Auftrag der Fachgruppe Bauwesen im NS-Bund Deutscher Technik von Gustav Wolf. Leipzig: Karl W. Hiersemann, 1944.

- Sonder, Ines. *Gartenstädte für Erez Israel. Zionistische Stadtplanungsvisionen von Theodor Herzl bis Richard Kauffmann*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2005.
- Sonne, Wolfgang. "Ideen für Großstadt: Der Wettbewerb Groß-Berlin 1910." In *Stadt der Architektur/Architektur der Stadt. Berlin 1900-2000*, ed. Thorsten Scheer, Josef Paul Kleihues, and Paul Kahlfeldt, 67-77. Berlin: Nicolai, 2000.
- Sorokin, Pitirim, and Carle C. Zimmerman. *Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology*. New York: Henry Holt, 1929.
- Sorokin, Pitirim A., Carle C. Zimmerman, and Charles J. Galpin, eds. *A Systematic Source Book in Rural Sociology*, 3 vols. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1930-32.
- Specht, Karl Gustav. "Gemeinschaft," in *Handwörterbuch der Sozialwissenschaften*, Vol. 4, eds. Erwin von Beckerath, et al. 329-331. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.
- Sperber, Jonathan. "Bürger, Bürgertum, Bürgerlichkeit, Bürgerliche Gesellschaft: Studies of the German (Upper) Middle Class and Its Sociocultural World." *The Journal of Modern History* 89 (June 1997): 271-297.
- Spies, Gerd. "Die kunst- und kulturgeschichtlichen Lokal- und Regionalmuseen." In *Vorträge des Symposiums im Germanischen Nationalmuseum Nürnberg*, ed. Bernward Deneke and Rainer Kahsnitz, 59-76. Munich: Prestel Verlag, 1977.
- Srubar, Ilja. "Zur Formierung des soziologischen Blickes durch die Großstadtswahrnehmung." In *Die Großstadt als "Text,"* ed. Michael Smuda. 37-52. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1992.
- Stauf, Renate. *Justus Möser's Konzept einer deutschen Nationalidentität*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1991.
- Steinmann, Ulrich. "Die Entwicklung des Museums für Volkskunde von 1889 bis 1964," *75 Jahre Museum für Volkskunde zu Berlin*, 7-47. Berlin: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, 1964.
- Steinmetz, Georg. *Grundlagen für das Bauen in Stadt und Land mit besonderer Rücksicht auf den Wiederaufbau in Ostpreußen*, vols. 1-3. Munich: Callwey, 1918-1928.
- Steinmetz, George. *Regulating the Social: The Welfare State and Local Politics in Imperial Germany*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.

- Steinmetzler, Johannes. *Die Anthropogeographie Friedrich Ratzels und ihre ideengeschichtlichen Wurzeln*. Bonn: Geographischen Institut der Universität Bonn, 1956.
- Stern, Fritz. *The Politics of Cultural Despair: A Study in the Rise of the Germanic Ideology*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961.
- STERN Gesellschaft der behutsamen Stadterneuerung, ed. *Alfred Messel-Seminar. Wohnen und Arbeiten in der Innenstadt Sanierungsgebiet Kollwitzplatz, Berlin-Prenzlauer Berg. Oktober 1999-Mai 2000*. Berlin: Berliner Bau- und Wohnungsgenossenschaft von 1892, 2000.
- Stieger, Georg. *Zur Landarbeiterfrage. Beobachtungen und Gedanken aus der Praxis*. Jena: Fischer, 1898.
- Stocking, George. *Victorian Anthropology*. New York: The Free Press, 1987.
- Strobel, Hans. "Die Gartenvorstadt Leipzig-Marienbrunn." *Der Städtebau* 9 (1912): 55-58.
- Strohmeyer, Klaus. *James Hobrecht (1825-1902) und die Modernisierung der Stadt*. Potsdam: Verlag für Berlin-Brandenburg, 2000.
- Surdo Francesco M., and Michele Acanfora. "Darwin and Russian Evolutionary Biology." In *The Darwinian Heritage*, ed. David Kohn, 731-749. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.
- Sutcliffe, Anthony. *Towards the Planned City: Germany, Britain, the United States and France, 1780-1914*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1981.
- Taut, Bruno. *Alpine Architektur*. Hagen: Folkwang-Verlag, 1919.
- _____. *Die Stadtkrone*. Jena: Diederichs, 1919.
- _____. *Die Auflösung der Städte oder die Erde eine gute Wohnung*. Hagen: Folkwang-Verlag, 1920.
- _____. "Ein Architekturprogramm" (1918). In *Arbeitsrat für Kunst Berlin 1918-1921*, 85-86. Berlin: Akademie der Künste, 1980.
- _____. "Neue und alte Form im Bebauungsplan." *Wohnungswirtschaft* 3, no. 24 (1926): 198-199.
- Tenfelde, Klaus ed. *Arbeit und Arbeitserfahrung in der Geschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

Terpenning, Walter A. *Village and Open-Country Neighborhoods*. New York and London: The Century Co., 1931.

Tessenow, Heinrich. *Der Wohnhausbau*. Munich: G.D.W. Callwey, 1909.

_____. *Hausbau und dergleichen*. Berlin: Cassirer, 1916.

_____. *Handwerk und Kleinstadt*. Berlin: Cassirer, 1919.

_____. *Geschriebenes Gedanken eines Baumeisters*, ed. Otto Kindt. Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1982.

Teuteberg, Hans-Jürgen. *Urbanisierung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. Cologne: Böhlau, 1983.

_____. *Homo Habitans. Zur Sozialgeschichte des ländlichen und städtischen Wohnens in der Neuzeit*. Münster: F. Copenrath, 1985.

Thurnwald, Richard. "Stadt und Land im Lebensprozeß der Rasse." *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 1 (1904).

Tönnies, Ferdinand. *Thomas Hobbes: Behemoth or the Long Parliament*. London: Simpkin Marshall & Co., 1889.

_____. *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft. Abhandlung des Communismus und des Socialismus als empirischer Culturformen*. Berlin: Fuchs's Verlag (R. Reiland), 1887.

_____. "Herbert Spencers soziologisches Werk." *Philosophisches Monatshefte* 25 (1889): 50-85.

_____. *Thomas Hobbes: The Elements of Law Natural and Politic*. London: Simpkin Marshall & Co., 1889.

_____. "Review of P. Weisengrün, "Die Entwicklungsgesetze der Menschheit." *Philosophisches Monatshefte* (1890): 226-227.

_____. "Review of Otto Ammon, "Die natürliche Auslese beim Menschen." *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie der Sinnesorgane* 6 (1893): 235-245.

_____. "Review of von Wimpffen, "Kampf ums Dasein." *Deutsche Literarische Zeitung* (1893): 803-804.

_____. "Fünfzehn Thesen über die Erneuerung des Familienlebens." *Ethische Kultur* 1 (1893): 302-304, 310-312.

- _____. "Die Verhandlungen über Arbeitslosigkeit." *Ethische Kultur* 1 (1893): 715-72.
- _____. "Universitätsausdehnung in England." *Ethische Kultur* 2 (1894): 283-284, 290-292.
- _____. "Die sittliche Bestimmung der Frau." *Ethische Kultur* 3 (1895): 26-27.
- _____. "Die akademische Laufbahn und ihre ökonomische Regelung." *Ethische Kultur* 3 (1895): 119.
- _____. "Sozialwissenschaftlern und Universitätsstudium." *Ethische Kultur* 4 (1896): 213-214.
- _____. "Zum Hamburger Streik." *Ethische Kultur* 4 (1896): 409-411.
- _____. "Nietzsche und die Humanität." *Ethische Kultur* 5 (1897): 28-30, 36-37.
- _____. "Hamburger Arbeiterwohnungen." *Ethische Kultur* 5 (1897): 239.
- _____. "Die Wohnungsnot eine sittliche Not." *Ethische Kultur* 8 (1900): 27-28.
- _____. "Die Verhütung des Verbrechens." *Ethische Kultur* 9 (1901): 153-155, 162-164.
- _____. "Belleville." *Ethische Kultur* 10 (1902): 235-236.
- _____. *Thomas Hobbes. Leben und Lehre*. Stuttgart: Fromann, 1896.
- _____. "Die Anwendung der Dezendenztheorie auf probleme der sozialen Entwicklung" (1900). In *Soziologische Studien und Kritiken*, Vol. 1, 133-329. Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1925.
- _____. "Ammons Gesellschaftstheorie." *Archiv für Soziale Gesetzgebung und Statistik* 19 (1904): 88-111.
- _____. "Eugenik," *Schmollers Jahrbuch* 29 (1905): 1089-1106.
- _____. "Zur naturwissenschaftlichen Gesellschaftslehre." *Schmollers Jahrbuch* 29 (1905), pp. 27-101, 1283-1322; 30 (1906), pp. 121-145; 31 (1907), pp. 487-552; 33 (1909), pp. 879-894; 35 (1911), pp. 375-396.
- _____. "Das Wesen der Soziologie." *Soziologische Studien und Kritiken*, Vol. 1, 350-368. Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1925.

_____. *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundbegriffe der reinen Soziologie*, 2nd, revised and expanded edition. Berlin: Curtius, 1912.

_____. *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundbegriffe der reinen Soziologie*, 3rd, revised edition. Berlin: Curtius, 1920.

_____. *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundbegriffe der reinen Soziologie*, 8th improved edition. Leipzig: Buske, 1935.

_____. "Ferdinand Tönnies." In *Philosophie der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, Vol. III, ed. Raymund Schmidt, 199-234. Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1922.

_____. *Einführung in die Soziologie*. Stuttgart: Enke, 1931.

_____. "Mein Verhältnis zur Soziologie." In *Soziologie von Heute. Ein Symposium der Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Soziologie*, ed. Richard Thurnwald, 103-122. Leipzig: C.F. Hirschfeld, 1931.

_____. *Fundamental Concepts of Sociology (Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft)*. Translated by Charles P. Loomis. New York: American Book Company, 1940.

_____. *Community and Association*. Translated by Charles P. Loomis. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955.

_____. *Community and Society*. Translated and edited by Charles P. Loomis. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1957.

_____. *Tönnies: Community and Civil Society*. Edited by Jose Harris and translated by Jose Harris and Margaret Hollis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Tränkle, Margret. *Wohnkultur und Wohnwesen*. Tübingen: Tübingen Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1972.

Troeltsch, Ernst. *Aufsätze zur Geistesgeschichte und Religionssoziologie. Gesammelte Schriften 4*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1925.

_____. "Die Krisis des Historismus." *Die Neue Rundschau* 1 (1922): 572-590

Unwin, Raymond. *Town Planning in Practice* (1909). New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1994.

van Eck, Caroline. *Organicism in Nineteenth-Century Architecture. An Inquiry into Its Theoretical and Philosophical Background*. Amsterdam: Architectura & Natura Press, 1994.

- Verein für Sozialpolitik. *Bäuerliche Zustände in Deutschland*. Schriften des Vereins für Sozialpolitik 22-24. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1883.
- _____. *Die Wohnungsnot der ärmeren Klassen in deutschen Großstädten und Vorschläge zu deren Abhilfe*. Schriften des Vereins für Sozialpolitik 30-33. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1886-87.
- _____. *Die Verhältnisse der Landarbeiter in Deutschland*. Schriften des Vereins für Sozialpolitik 53-55. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1892.
- _____. *Neue Untersuchung über die Wohnungsfrage in Deutschland und im Ausland*. Schriften des Vereins für Sozialpolitik 94-97. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1901.
- Vida, Elizabeth M. *Romantic Affinities: German Authors and Carlyle. A Study in the History of Ideas*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.
- Vigato, Jean-Claude. *L'Architecture régionaliste, France 1890-1950*. Paris: Editions Norma, 1994.
- Viollet-le-Duc, Eugène-Emmanuel. *Histoire de l'habitation humaine depuis les temps pré-historiques jusqu'à nos jours*. Paris: Bibliothèque d'éducation et de recreation, 1875.
- Voigt, Wolfgang. "The Garden City as Eugenic Utopia," *Planning Perspectives* 4 (1989): 295-312.
- _____. "Die Gartenstadt als eugenisches Utopia." In *Im Grünen wohnen – im Blauen planen. Ein Lesebuch zur Gartenstadt mit Beiträgen und Zeitdokumenten*, ed. Franziska Bollerey, Gerhard Fehl, and Kristiana Hartmann, 301-314. Hamburg: Christians, 1990.
- _____. "Vom Ur-Haus zum Typ. Paul Schmitthenners 'deutsches Wohnhaus' und seine Vorbilder." In *Moderne Architektur in Deutschland 1900 bis 1950. Reform und Tradition*, ed. Vittorio Magnano Lampugnani and Romana Schneider, 245-265. Stuttgart: Gerd Hatje, 1992.
- Voigt, Wolfgang, and Hartmut Frank, eds. *Paul Schmitthenner 1884-1972*. Tübingen and Berlin: Ernst Wasmuth, 2003.
- Volkov, Shulamit. *The Rise of Popular Anti-modernism in Germany: The Urban Master Artisans, 1873-1896*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978.
- Wackitz, Günter. "Willibald Hentschel, Bruno Tanzmann und der Bund der Artamen," in *Traditionen und Traditionssuche des deutschen Faschismus*, ed. Hubert Orłowski and Günter Hartung, 49-6. Poznan: Adam Mickiewicz University, 1992.

- Wagner, Fritz. "Biologismus und Historismus im Deutschland des 19. Jahrhunderts." In *Biologismus im 19. Jahrhundert. Vorträge eines Symposiums vom 30. Oktober 1970 in Frankfurt am Main*, ed. Gunter Mann, 30-42. Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1973.
- Wagner, Peter. "'An Entirely New Object of Consciousness, of Volition, of Thought:' The Coming into Being and (Almost) Passing Away of 'Society' as a Scientific Object." In *Biographies of Scientific Objects*, ed. Lorraine Daston, 132-157. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Wahrhaftig, Myra. *Sie legten den Grundstein. Leben und Wirken deutschsprachigen jüdischen Architekten in Palastina 1918-1948*. Tübingen: Wasmuth, 1996.
- Wangerin, Gerda W., and Gerhard Weiss. *Heinrich Tessenow: Baumeister, 1876-1950. Leben, Lehre, Werk*. Essen: Bacht, 1976.
- Ward, Janet. *Weimar Surfaces: Urban Visual Culture in 1920s Germany*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- Watson, Stephen H. *Tradition(s): Refiguring Community and Virtue in Classical German Thought*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.
- Weber, Alfred. *Über den Standort der Industrien*. Part 1, *Reine Theorie des Standorts*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1909.
- Weber, Annemarie. *Immer auf dem Sofa. Das familiäre Glück vom Biedermeier bis heute*. Berlin: Severin und Siedler, 1982.
- Weber, Heiko. "Der Monismus als Theorie einer einheitlichen Weltanschauung am Beispiel der Positionen von Ernst Haeckel und August Forel." In *Monismus um 1900. Wissenschaftskultur und Weltanschauung*, ed. Paul Ziche. Berlin: Verlag für Wissenschaft und Bildung, 2001.
- Weber, Max. "Die römische Agrargeschichte in ihre Bedeutung für das Staats- und Privatrechts" (1891). *Gesamtausgabe* Vol. 1, Part 2, ed. J. Deininger. Tübingen: C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1986.
- _____. "Die Lage der Landarbeiter im ostelbischen Deutschland" (1892). *Gesamtausgabe*, Abt. I, Band 3, 2, Tübingen: Mohr, 1984.
- _____. "Roscher und Knies und die logischen Probleme der historischen Nationalökonomie" (1903-1906). *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*, 4th ed. Stuttgart: Mohr, 1973.

- _____. "Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus" (1904/1905). *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, Vol. 1. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1920-21.
- _____. "Die Stadt. Eine soziologische Untersuchung." *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 47, no. 3(1920/21): 621-772.
- _____. "Die Stadt." In *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, ed. Marianne Weber, 513-560. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1925.
- _____. *Economy and Society*, 3 vols., ed. Günther Roth and Claus Wittlich. New York: Bedminster, 1968.
- _____. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Die Wirtschaft und die gesellschaftlichen Ordnungen und Mächte. Nachlaß. Max Weber Gesamtausgabe*, Vol. 22, ed. Horst Baier et al. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1999.
- Wehler, Hans-Ulrich. *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, vol. 1: *vom Feudalismus des Alten Reiches bis zur defensiven Modernisierung der Reformära, 1700-1815*. Munich: Beck, 1989.
- _____. *Neue Aspekte der reichsdeutsche Sozialgeschichte 1871-1918*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- _____. *Bibliographie zur neueren deutschen Sozialgeschichte*. Munich: Beck, 1993.
- _____. *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, vol. 3: *von der "Deutschen Revolution" bis zum Beginn des Ersten Weltkrieges, 1849-1914*. Munich: Beck, 1995.
- _____. *Historisches Denken am Ende des 20. Jahrhunderts 1945-2000*. Essener Kulturwissenschaften Vorträge 11. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2001.
- Weigert, Josef. *Das Dorf entlang: Ein Buch vom deutschen Bauerntum*. Freiburg: Herder, 1915.
- _____. *Untergang der Dorfkultur?* 2nd ed. Munich: Knorr & Hirth, 1930.
- Weindling, Paul Julian. *Health, Race, and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism, 1870-1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- _____. *Darwinism and Social Darwinism in Imperial Germany: The Contribution of the Cell Biologist Oscar Hertwig (1849-1922)*. Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer, 1991.
- _____. "Theories of the Cell State in Imperial Germany." In *Biology, Medicine and Society 1840-1940*, ed. Charles Webster, 99-155. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

- Weingart, Peter. "Biology as Social Theory: The Bifurcation of Social Biology and Sociology in Germany, circa 1900." In *Modernist Impulses in the Human Sciences, 1970-1930*, ed. Dorothy Ross, 255-271. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.
- Weingart, Peter, Jürgen Kroll, and Kurt Bayertz. *Rasse, Blut und Gene. Geschichte der Eugenik und Rassenhygiene in Deutschland*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1988.
- Weißbach, Karl, and Walter Mackowsky, ed. *Das Arbeiterwohnhaus*. Berlin: Ernst Wasmuth, 1910.
- Wernicke, Johannes. *Kapitalismus und Mittelstandspolitik*. Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1907.
- _____. *Der Mittelstand und seine wirtschaftliche Lage*. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1909.
- Wettbewerb Gross-Berlin 1910. Die preisgekrönten Entwürfe mit Erläuterungsberichten*. Berlin: Wasmuth, 1911.
- White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.
- Whyte, Iain Boyd. *Bruno Taut and the Architecture of Activism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Wiese Leopold von. *Allgemeine Soziologie als Lehre von den Beziehungen und Beziehungsgebilden der Menschen. Teil 1: Beziehungslehre*. Munich: Duncker & Humblot, 1924.
- _____. "Siedlungen, I. Ländliche Siedlungen." In *Handwörterbuch der Soziologie*, ed. Alfred Vierkandt. Stuttgart: Enke, 1931.
- Wiese, Leopold von, ed. *Das Dorf als soziales Gebilde, H. 1: Der Beiträge zur Beziehungslehre. Kölner Vierteljahrshefte für Soziologie*. Munich: Duncker & Humblot, 1928.
- Williams, John Alexander. "The Chords of the German Soul are Tuned to Nature: The Movement to Preserve the Natural Heimat from the Kaiserreich to the Third Reich." *Central European History* 29, no. 3 (1996): 339-384.
- Williamson, George S. *The Longing for Myth in Germany: Religion and Aesthetic Culture from Romanticism to Nietzsche*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

- Wilson, William H. *The City Beautiful Movement*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- Windelband, Wilhelm. *Geschichte und Naturwissenschaft*. Strasbourg: J.H.E. Heitz, 1904.
- Winkler, Heinrich-August. *Mittelstand, Demokratie und Nationalsozialismus. Die politische Entwicklung von Handwerk und Kleinhandel in der Weimarer Republik*. Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1972.
- Wittkau, Annette. *Historismus. Zur Geschichte des Begriffs und des Problems*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.
- Witzler, Beate. *Großstadt und Hygiene. Kommunale Gesundheitspolitik in der Epoche der Urbanisierung*. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1995.
- Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen der Gußstahlfabrik von Friedr. Krupp zu Essen a.d. Ruhr*, 3 vols. Essen: Buchdruckerei der Gußstahlfabrik von F. Krupp, 1902.
- Wohnen in Berlin. 100 Jahre Wohnungsbau in Berlin*. Berlin: Edition StadtBauKunst, 1999.
- Wolf, Paul. *Städtebau. Das Formprobleme der Stadt in Vergangenheit und Zukunft*. Leipzig: Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1919.
- _____. *Wohnung und Siedlung*. Berlin: Ernst Wasmuth, 1926.
- Zechlin, Hans Joseph. "Fünfzehn Architekten und der unbekannte Bürger. Zur Gagfah-Siedlung in Fischtalgrund." *Wasmuths Monatshefte für Baukunst* 12 (1928): 211-242.
- Ziche, Paul ed. *Monismus um 1900. Wissenschaftskultur und Weltanschauung*. Ernst-Haeckelhaus-Studien 4. Berlin: Verlag für Wissenschaft und Bildung, 2001.
- Ziegler, Günter. *Anhaltische Baumeister – Baumeister in Anhalt-Dessau*. Dessau: Kulturamt und Amt für Denkmalpflege, 1992.
- Ziegler, Heinrich Ernst. *Einleitung zu dem Sammelwerke Natur und Staat. Natur und Staat. Beiträge zur naturwissenschaftlichen Gesellschaftslehre*, Vol. 1. Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1903.
- Zimmer, Wolfgang. "Bevölkerungsentwicklung und Sozialstruktur in der Stadt nach 1871." *Dresdner Hefte: Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte* 61 (2000):
- Zimmerman, Andrew. *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

- Zimmermann, Clemens. *Von der Wohnungsfrage zur Wohnungspolitik. Die Reformbewegung in Deutschland, 1845-1914*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- Zimmermann, Clemens, and Jürgen Reulecke, eds. *Die Stadt als Moloch? Das Land als Kraftquell? Wahrnehmungen und Wirkungen der Großstädte um 1900*. Basel: Birkhäuser, 1999.
- Zinnecker, Andrea. *Romantik, Rock und Kamisol. Volkskunde auf dem Weg ins Dritte Reich - die Riehl-Rezeption*. Münster: Waxmann, 1996.