

*Journal of the*  
SOCIETY OF  
ARCHITECTURAL  
HISTORIANS



SEPTEMBER 1993

Volume LII

Number 3

a major monument in any history of world civilization in architecture, and we are fortunate that Peter Hutter has given us such a fine account.

ALAN GOWANS

*Images of American Living, Washington, D.C.*

**VITTORIO MAGNAGO LAMPUGNANI** and **ROMANA SCHNEIDER**, editors, *Moderne Architektur in Deutschland 1900 bis 1950, Reform und Tradition*, Stuttgart: Verlag Gerd Hatje, 1992, 344 pp., 422 b. & w. illus., 56 color. DM 58.

The history of twentieth-century German architecture, this book polemically reiterates, has been too much a history of the avant-garde. All thirteen authors in *Reform und Tradition* remind us that modern architecture included not only high-style modernism, but *all* attempts to reform the materialistic discrepancies and stylistic excesses of nineteenth-century culture, as well as *all* efforts to create an architecture that addressed the new technological and social conditions of the day. *Reform und Tradition* accompanied the first of a trilogy of planned exhibitions at the German Architecture Museum that are attempting to present a more inclusive and well-balanced history of modern architecture, and to do no less than "rewrite the history of German twentieth-century architecture" (9).<sup>1</sup>

This particular collection of essays focuses on those architectural reform efforts in Germany that advocated the continuity of tradition as a means of reforming and ameliorating some of the perceived devastation that had been wrought by nineteenth-century industrialization and liberal capitalism. The protagonists of this tradition-bound architecture—including Peter Behrens, Hans Poelzig, Fritz Schumacher, and Paul Schmitthenner, among many—sought to reform architecture by integrating the advances of industry and programs of social reform with a long German craft tradition. The studied elegance and simplicity of their architecture derived from straightforward, timeless, German typologies and from a concern for honesty, function, and structure in architecture. Throughout the first three decades of this century, these architects dominated the German architectural scene, garnering the major projects, teaching and employing the younger modernists, and writing the definitive theoretical works.

Despite the significant role that this progressive use of tradition had in shaping German architecture during the first half of this century, historiographically it has remained in the shadow of high modernism. *Reform und Tradition* begins to rectify this omission. Its authors, part of a small, prolific group, have tackled this neglected half of history intensively for the last decade and have published, almost exclusively in German, important monographs

1. The second exhibition in the planned trilogy at the German Architecture Museum will explore two other fundamentally German aspects of modernism, "Expressionism and *Neue Sachlichkeit*," that, when paired, promise to shed a new light on these already well-known movements. The final exhibition, subtitled "Power and Monument," will study the German development of monumentalism, culminating in the architecture of the Third Reich. Together with the retrospective of the work of Heinrich Tessenow two years ago, these exhibitions are characteristic of the new, more critical approach taken up by Lampugnani, who in 1991 succeeded the museum's founder, Heinrich Klotz, as curator and director.

on influential traditionalist architects such as Theodor Fischer, Heinrich Tessenow, and Paul Schultze-Naumburg. There has also been a general effort to republish hard-to-find primary source material such as the writings of Poelzig and Schmitthenner, but also topical subjects such as the original writings related to the development of the garden city movement or the introduction of skyscrapers into the German architectural scene. Among the very few works in English on tradition-bound modern architecture in Germany are two articles that appeared in a special issue of *Art Journal* edited by Richard Pommer in the Summer of 1983, titled "Revising Modernist History." The first was Christian Otto's article that reinterpreted the architectural program of the Bund Deutscher Heimatschutz, and the second, Pommer's article that untangled the flat roof controversy between traditionalists and avant-garde in Germany.

The major thematic focus of this revisionist work has been the dual nature of German modernity that fostered the integration of apparently conservative and progressive elements. The Heimatschutz Bund, for example, espoused a reformed architecture responsible in equal measure to the environment, modern industry, and the continuity of tradition, while the garden city movement was both a ruralizing, decentralizing force, and a progressive reformer of society and industry. Along similar lines, *Reform und Tradition* reminds us that in many respects such progressive use of tradition in Germany was just as modern as any of the avant-garde innovations. Sorely missing from all of this literature, however, have been more comprehensive overviews of the entire period, including references to larger cultural developments in Germany and Europe. The present volume suffers from similar shortcomings. It covers the eclectic architecture of tradition with fourteen related yet unconnected essays, nine of which deal exclusively with the work of one architect or one building complex, while the rest deal only with a single building type or short-lived building program. The unfamiliar material would have benefitted immensely from a longer introductory essay that outlined a framework for the whole movement.

The essays in *Reform und Tradition* are arranged roughly chronologically, though many of the careers discussed span more than forty years. The first five essays analyze the pre-World War I period, when architects as diverse as Fischer, Poelzig, and Mies van der Rohe were all intent on reforming Wilhelmine architecture by creating a new, more modern architecture in tune with the time and the status of Germany's industrialized mass culture. All looked back to the simplified classicism from around 1800 (see Paul Mebes, *Um 1800*, 2 vols. [Munich, 1908]) for stylistic clues, and more importantly, for the spirit of a rich and rooted craft tradition that still existed then. Tilmann Buddensieg's essay on the integration of art and technology in Behrens' designs for the A.E.G. supplements his previous observations, as well as Stanford Anderson's articles, which have done much to bring the classicism of Behrens and Tessenow into the canon of modern architecture. Two further essays in the catalogue discuss Poelzig and Fischer, both prolific and influential architects who are often remembered only as teachers to, and precursors of, the avant-garde, but who also attempted to create a monumental architecture that incorporated the values and tectonics learned from honest craft traditions.

Perhaps the most insightful of the essays covering pre-war architects is Werner Oechslin's, where he attempts radically to

rethink the design theory of Friedrich Ostendorf and to reinterpret his influential, though unfinished series, *Sechs Bücher vom Bauen*, which appeared in several editions after 1913. Oechslin claims that Ostendorf's refined, Biedermeier style disguised an otherwise completely modern design process that adumbrated the reductionist modernism of the post-war period. According to Ostendorf, "design means, finding the simplest possible form" (*Entwerfen heißt, die einfachste Erscheinungsform zu finden*). Oechslin provocatively aims at bridging the chasm that history has proclaimed between the simple, elegant neoclassicism of ca. 1800, and the ensuing modernist efforts to strip architecture down to its functional essentials.

The remaining essays all grapple with the more familiar Weimar period of German modernism that allowed for a flurry of creativity and experimentation amidst the transition from the conservative Wilhelmine era to National Socialism. As has been described in Pommer and Otto's *Weissenhof 1927 and the Modern Movement in Architecture* (Chicago and London, 1991), it was only during the struggle for Weimar architectural commissions that a formalist polarity between the *Neues Bauen* (New Building) and the traditionalists became radicalized as each side purposefully defined themselves in contrast to the other. After Walter Curt Behrendt's book, *Der Sieg des neuen Baustils* (1927), and the Weissenhofsiedlung that heralded the victory of a non-national, functional architecture in tune with the industrial age using the military metaphor of a triumphant crusade for a new style, the split became an integral part of the histories of modern architecture. The determinist history that resulted and that has remained firmly entrenched in the history books since then, sees modernism as an inevitable development of the industrialization of the free world, and obfuscates the complex interconnections that existed among the many modern architectures present at the time, including those more traditional sides of German modernism.

Many of the architects considered in *Reform und Tradition* have been ignored previously because they have fallen in between the rigid dichotomy of the progressive avant-garde and the blatantly nationalistic traditionalists who later went on to espouse National Socialism. In the catalogue, Hermann Hipp offers an analysis of the work of Fritz Schumacher, city architect of Hamburg from 1909 to 1930, who was in charge of one of the most ambitious social housing programs in the world, all built in a traditional brick, most with pitched roofs, and Jerzy Ilkosz traces Max Berg's designs for simplified, functional, reinforced concrete highrises up to forty stories tall in Wrocław (German Breslau) from 1919–21. Both of these daring projects have been overshadowed by later avant-garde projects, the former by Ernst May's and Bruno Taut's modernist housing settlements in Frankfurt and Berlin, the latter by Mies' skyscraper designs for Berlin of 1921, and the Chicago Tribune Tower competition of 1922.

Three further essays deal with the work of Schmitthenner, whose career spanned the two world wars, and who was arguably the main protagonist of the more traditional modern architecture. Together with Paul Bonatz, architect of the Stuttgart Railroad Station of 1911, Schmitthenner headed the famed Stuttgart School, a counterpart to the Bauhaus and perhaps the premier place to study architecture in Europe in the early 1920s. Karl Kiem's essay looks at Schmitthenner's Staaken garden city, built as worker housing for a state-owned munitions factory near Berlin during the war; Wolfgang Voigt analyzes the sources of

Schmitthenner's very influential book, *Das Deutsche Wohnhaus* (Stuttgart, 1932),<sup>2</sup> and charts his attempt to define a traditional German house type. Lampugnani's essay recalls Schmitthenner's central role in organizing and building the Kochenhofsiedlung in Stuttgart of 1933, meant as a combative, more nationalistic, traditional, and German alternative to the nearby Weissenhofsiedlung, built six years earlier. All the authors attempt to resurrect this figure who, despite a tarnished reputation that resulted from his fervent embrace of National Socialism late in life, was both an important source for, and counterpart to, avant-garde architects.

More interesting and ultimately more provocative than these monographic works are the essays that seek to untangle the intricate social, political, economic, and architectural web in which these heroes found themselves. Noteworthy is Hartmut Frank's essay on German reconstruction efforts in the Ostmark territory in eastern Prussia, destroyed by retreating Russians in 1915. One of the most prolific authors in this revisionist history, Frank analyzes the formative role played in later housing programs and in future architectural thinking by this massive reconstruction, which involved the activity of design review boards, the need to economize on building materials in wartime, and efforts to standardize and create exact building typologies. Reconstruction in East Prussia after 1915, involving such prominent figures of German modernism as Taut, May, Tessenow, and Hans Scharoun, among many, proved to be simultaneously a testing ground for Weimar modernism and for more *Heimat*-oriented design. Frank's argument would only have been strengthened had he stepped out of his narrow time focus to acknowledge the fact that the ideological and architectural colonization of the east had been part of Prussian foreign policy for over two centuries.

*Reform und Tradition* is an attempt to rewrite, or better, reroute, the self-promoting, determinist history of avant-garde modernism. While offering a wealth of interesting new material, however, it seldom treads new methodological ground. The monographic format and generally formalistic analysis of history in many of the essays only continues the method of the dominant historiography of modern architecture. Furthermore, the authors rarely relate the figures under discussion to each other, or more importantly to the larger social, political, and economic spheres. Connections between the primary figures, the dates, and the building campaigns are too often left to the reader to make. Jill Lloyd's intriguing essay on the calls of the era for a return to nature, for example, makes no references to any of the other architects of buildings mentioned. The fact that this rich, tradition-bound, modern architecture reached out to every level of society and was used for vernacular building and monumental public architecture alike makes this material promising for more innovative analysis, perhaps akin to the *Alltagsgeschichte* being written by social historians.

The volume's detailed catalogue of the exhibition, abundant illustrations, including color reproductions of many drawings and

2. The book, the first volume of an unrealized series by Schmitthenner titled *Baugestaltung*, also came out in substantially revised editions in 1940 and 1950. While the first edition was meant to oppose the growing force of the avant-garde, the second combatted the monumental classicism of Nazi architecture, and the third fought the dullness of the post-war international style. Hartmut Frank recently published a reprint of the last edition (Stuttgart, 1984).

watercolors, and index of proper names will serve as effective reference tools for a wider audience. Its usefulness, however, is marred by the lack of a comprehensive bibliography of primary and secondary sources and of uniform, well cross-referenced footnotes, even within the individual essays. Even more problematic is the confusion of vocabularies used to differentiate the architecture of reform and tradition from its avant-garde sister. Lampugnani, for example, couples opposites when he describes this architecture as a "traditionalist, moderate avant-garde" (13). Adjectives like "conservative," "functional," "historical," "appropriate," "nationalist," "simple," and "Sachlich," each of which can be applied to some part of modern architecture, too often confuse rather than clarify the situation. A more appropriate

nomenclature for the architecture investigated in this volume might be "progressive traditionalism."

Despite *Reform und Tradition's* attempt to rewrite history, the definitive story of this progressive traditionalism has yet to be written. There is much room for future scholarship, particularly for more comprehensive, book-length writings that address the whole diversity and incredible richness of German architectural thought between 1900 and 1950 in new methodological formats. Such work will ultimately force us to rethink the development of all of modern architecture not only in Germany, but throughout the world.

KAI K. GUTSCHOW  
[University of California, Berkeley]

## AMERICAN URBANISM

**JOEL GARREAU**, *Edge City: Life on the New Frontier*, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1991, xi + 546 pp., 10 maps. \$22.50.

**JAMES GILBERT**, *Perfect Cities: Chicago's Utopias of 1893*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991, xiv + 279 pp., illus., maps. \$27.50.

"If, as has happened to the Egyptians, Ninevites, Etruscans, Pelasgians, Aztecs, and Central American races, our buildings alone should be left, by some cataclysm of nations, to tell of our existence, what would they directly express of us? Absolutely nothing!" So complained the art critic, James Jackson Jarves, in 1864 in *The Art Idea*, before the skyscraper, tract house, Winnebago, and mall became common American fixtures. Were he to come back now and see American architecture having firmly taken root, what would he make of it?

Joel Garreau, senior writer for the *Washington Post*, discovers that our architecture and land use reveals much about us. And while the mid-nineteenth-century critics were perplexed by the American habit of dressing up their modern buildings, Garreau is accepting. He has given a name to the new territory of mirror-glassed, wraparound band-windowed, endlessly replicated office blocks, cathedral-sized-atrium shopping malls, and surrounding subdivisions that has recently begun to ring our cities. This place outside the old downtown, beyond the suburbs, at the confluence, not of rivers, oceans, or railroad lines, but of interstate highways and ring roads, he calls Edge City. In this gelatinous mix of land speculation, tax abatements, and middle-class flight, Garreau sees something permanent.

The people who are now settling the edge are different from those who populated the first giant wave of flight out of the downtowns and into the suburbs after World War II. The suburbanites' frame of reference remained the one square mile at the heart of the traditional city where they commuted to work during the week and returned for entertainment or high culture at the symphony, opera, or ballet on the special weekend. This first generation of exurbanites, with their baby-boom gang of children, lived ten to forty miles out of the downtown but continued

to look back. If they lived in Great Neck, they called themselves New Yorkers; in Evanston they were Chicagoans. If already out on the edge, they tended not to acknowledge it, claiming all the sophistication of their downtown friends with none of the hassles of parking, crime, and deteriorating schools. Their identities continued to be shaped by association, no matter how perfunctory, with the old city. This, argues Garreau, is no longer the case.

Edge urbanites live in a region defined by the decaying hulk at its core. The city that gives a regional name to the cluster of edge cities along its swath of interstates is merely a brand name to distinguish among generics. A fixed triad of office park, mall, and subdivision is the formula whether it is in Washington, Boston, or Atlanta. All space without place. Five million square feet of office space and a 500,000-square-foot mall within a fifteen-minute drive of 250,000 people is all you need to get started.

Back in the distance, the old downtown provides some glow of ambient difference where none in fact exists, less a real place with a particular history than a part of a collective downtown. Old downtown has become a source for authentic, one-of-a-kind images that can be copied and transported to the edge. One is as likely to find the Liberty Bell in an Arizona mall as in one outside Philadelphia.

Garreau's edge urbanites have little in common with the earlier generation that was born and raised in cities or found themselves, later in life, fleeing rural poverty or the Main Street provincialism of small American towns. The American city traditionally provided two essential things. It offered the promise of a better living while its size and disorder provided anonymity—a good place to reinvent oneself. Its skyscraper architecture—vertical, white-collar factories—reinforced the idea that the modern American city was dedicated to one ideal, the production of capital. But the very density created by this intensification of land use, where the average tall building of the 1880s was fifteen stories and became, a century later, sixty, produced a remarkable culture at the margins. Spaces vacated by upscaling businesses became artists' lofts and studios for writers. Edge cities, in contrast, are purely economic phenomena. There is nothing at their margins.

In fact, it is precisely a horror of life at the margins, which includes drugs and gangs as surely as it does the irreducible urban