January 2005

The Culture of Criticism: Adolf Behne and the Development of Modern Architecture in Germany, 1910-1914

Kai K. Gutschow
Carnegie Mellon University, gutschow@andrew.cmu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.cmu.edu/architecture

Part of the Architectural History and Criticism Commons
The Culture of Criticism: Adolf Behne
and the Development of Modern Architecture in Germany, 1910-1914

Kai Konstanty Gutschow

Sponsor: Professor Robin Middleton

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

2005
ABSTRACT

The Culture of Criticism: Adolf Behne and the Development of Modern Architecture in Germany, 1910-1914

Kai Konstanty Gutschow

This dissertation investigates the early career of the German architectural critic Adolf Behne (1885-1948) and the crucial role he played in defining and promoting an early vision of modern architecture. During the particularly vibrant cultural moment in Germany before World War I, Behne became intent on finding artistic and architectural alternatives to what he perceived as the elitism, materialism, and decadence of Wilhelmine society. Influenced by the cultural program of the Socialist party, Behne believed that modern art had to be made accessible to all, and that modern architecture must be grounded in a "social conscience." The theories of Expressionist artists he encountered in Berlin’s Sturm Gallery led Behne to the very different conviction that art must primarily express the inner experience and creative urges of modern man. Combining ideas from Expressionism and Socialism, Behne embraced one of the fundamental paradoxes of modern culture: that art could be simultaneously an ideal, autonomous object of the avant-garde, and also politically and socially engaged to benefit the masses.

Behne found a resolution to this paradox in architecture. His interpretations of Bruno Taut’s early apartment houses and experimental exhibition pavilions as
syntheses of fantasy and functional form-making—an "artistic Sachlichkeit"--inspired the critic to invent the concept of an Expressionist architecture. At the same time, the heated debates promoted by the German Werkbund about the relative merits of art and industry in leading architectural reform, provoked Behne to write trenchant criticism about the nature of contemporary architecture and its place in the social fabric of modern society. Far more than an objective reporter or passive filter of the moment, Behne worked in conjunction with artists, architects, publishers, and a nascent media culture to help bridge the gap between the producers of the new architecture and the ever-expanding consuming public. In this early criticism Behne established the themes that would propel him to become one of the most perspicacious critics of the twentieth century architecture and culture.
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construction site visits, the non-profit housing organizations and propaganda organizations such as the Garden City Association and the Heimatschutzbund that regulated and developed many of the projects Behne reviewed, all extended the web of networks in which his architectural criticism was enmeshed even further. The residents of the houses, the workers in the factory, and the casual sidewalk passer-by added further agendas that Behne incorporated into his criticism. Research into a representative selection of these institutions contained in this study has begun to reveal the extent to which Behne was following or challenging established ideas, and offers a more nuanced analysis of how his criticism helped shape the course of modern architecture.

The radical changes in scope and topic that this dissertation underwent from original conception to final product underscore the difficulties described. The original ambition was to write an in-depth study of architectural criticism in Germany from the founding of the Werkbund in 1907 to the rise of Hitler in 1933. The intent was to reveal the work of critics, theorists, the press, and even individual texts in promoting change and in confronting the problems of modernity, and thereby go beyond the traditional focus on the architect, the client, the available technology or the socio-political context as the primary generators of architecture. Eventually, in an effort to reduce the spectrum of materials, at one point this dissertation focused on three major themes of the day where critics played a particularly important role: reactions to the developing *Großstadt* (metropolis); the changing nature of daily life, especially for women and
workers; and the influence and reaction to the phenomenon of technology and the machine.

In order to focus even more closely on the influence of individual critics and texts, yet still acknowledge the great variety of critical practices that influenced architecture, I began to focus exclusively on two very different critics who both supported the rise of a new modern architecture through their criticism: the professional architect, bureaucrat, and free-lance critic Walter Curt Behrendt, about whom I had written a master’s thesis, and the more avant-garde oriented Adolf Behne, who wrote with equal force about art, architecture, and society. In order to look more closely at the inter-related sides of their criticism, I organized the study into three parts: 1) the "business of criticism," which analyzed in great detail how Behne, Behrendt, and other critics collaborated with architects, publishers, museums, and governments to reach a wide spectrum of audiences with ideologically charged arguments; 2) the "form of criticism," which outlined the multiple venues and media employed by Weimar critics such as Behne and Behrendt in order to reach the broadest possible audience; and 3) the "content of criticism," which outlined the major themes that each critic tackled in order to effect cultural change and forge a new architecture.

When Behrendt and Behne proved too disparate to include in a single study, my focus shifted exclusively to Behne. Although the original intent was to present a survey

---

of Behne’s entire career, the amount of work he produced that had not been properly analyzed, the breadth of topics that Behne covered in his writings, and the large number of important figures and cultural institutions with which he interacted over the course of his career, proved overly voluminous. Compiling a bibliography of his writings and locating all the sources was more time and travel-intensive than anticipated. Finally, an attempt to reveal the origins of his well-known post-war criticism on Sachlichkeit and functionalism, led me to focus on the Behne’s very earliest writings on reform and Expressionism from 1910 to 1914. It is my intention to extend my monographic study of Behne into the Weimar years, at least until 1930, when Behne’s influence reached a climax with his article on the sterility of the Dammerstock housing settlement, and eventually expand to a larger analysis of architectural criticism.

---

3 See Bibliography III for a list of Behne’s writings located so far.

I.
Architectural Criticism, Berlin, and Behne:
Setting the Context

"A critic is supposed to stimulate a dialogue, not be one."
- Robert Cambell, 2005

The Impact of Criticism

A People’s Critic

In August of 2004, New York’s Project for Public Spaces (PPS) issued a call for the public to write letters to The New York Times urging the newspaper to replace the retiring critic Herbert Muschamp with a critic who would shift the focus of architectural criticism from the heroic “project,” to the development of “place” and the building of “communities.” The letter cited a recent Columbia University School of Journalism study lamenting the deteriorated state of architectural criticism in the country. But the Columbia study also insisted that critics still had a power “to make a contribution to

---


6 The Project for Public Spaces (PPS), "Open Letter to the New York Times," (June 24, 2004), n.p.; email to the author from www.archvoices.org, archive of issue from July 2, 2004, for this and the following. See also www.pps.org for a brief history of the first thirty years of activism and critical engagement by PPS, "a nonprofit organization dedicated to creating and sustaining public places that build communities."
improving the quality of cultural expression and public life across America and the
world.”

Even if the implication that an architectural critic writing occasionally in back
sections of a newspaper could change an entire nation’s public life and culture was
somewhat overstated, it did point out the potential power of The New York Times
architecture critic.8

Muschamp, the PPS statement claimed, had championed only a small camp of
"star" architects that created isolated monuments. Although certainly stimulating
public dialogue and promoting a unified vision of architecture—as Clement Greenberg
had admonished all critics to do—PPS maintained that Muschamp’s criticism and the
architects he championed had little true impact on the wider public. A new critic, they
suggested, should focus on the intricate matrix of factors that leads to the development
of "place" and the creation of a people-oriented community. Promoting such an agenda,
they claimed, could help make the city a more livable place. Speculating on the power
and influence of architectural criticism, they maintained that "in many ways this is more
akin to the beginning of a social movement than an architectural movement . . . but its

7 András Szántó, Eric Fredericksen, and Ray Rinaldi, The Architecture Critic: A

8 Many other current and historical examples of the power of critics and the
press to change industry, the profession, and culture could be cited, even when they are
not intentional, especially in today’s "media age." In a recent example, on the editorial
page of the January 2005 Dwell magazine, the editor Allison Arieff claimed to have
been "surprised" when Frances Anderton, host of the radio talk show "Design and
Architecture," commended her for having a "proactive" magazine. "The magazine isn’t
just writing about and showing photographs of the design of houses," she noted, "but is
actually influencing the ways in which they are designed and built"; Arieff, "Small
influence is being felt and reacted to by designers all over the country. There is a trickle-up effect at work here. . . . The world is changing, and we’ve got to wade into the middle of it.” A new people’s critic, they felt, would set the newspaper’s architectural agenda in line with the changing world.

Adolf Behne (1885-1948), the focus of this dissertation, was in many ways the type of people’s critic the PPS was searching for. [Figure 1.1] Although Behne did not emphasize the specific idea of "place" advocated by PPS, he too sought to change architecture by changing the dominant critics of the era. He worked tirelessly to displace an older generation of star critics who had done little more than bow to the entrenched power hierarchies of star artists and architects, who seldom acknowledged "the new," and who never championed it. Behne, by contrast, constantly focused on "das Neue," as well as the needs and ideas of the ordinary person. He sought to lead a group of young architects to create a new vision of modern life and architecture, one based not on established principles, but on a synthesis of the expression of individual creativity and of the entire spectrum of functional and social requirements. Although the campaigns for certain styles and approaches to architecture have changed dramatically since Behne’s time, the PPS request is a reminder that the need to "push the boundaries of what design is and, even more boldly, explore its deepest purpose" through criticism has remained relatively constant.  

---


Modern Architecture and the Media

Using the latest media buzzwords, the architectural historian Franklin Toker speculated recently in his book on Frank Lloyd Wright’s Fallingwater that the "hype" generated by architects in collusion with critics and the media, and the "buzz" created by a receptive public, has elevated individual modern buildings, ideas, and the entire modern movement into the imagination of the public and to an unprecedented extent. In the twentieth century architecture has become inseparable from its heterogeneous representations in many media. The production of architecture has moved increasingly beyond the architect and client to include authors, photographers, and other media people "producing" their own architectural representations and participating in a wider discourse. The entire spectacle of architectural culture has been monitored by a far

11 Frank Toker, Fallingwater Rising: Frank Lloyd Wright, E.J. Kaufmann, and America’s Most Extraordinary House (2004), esp. chaps. 8 and 9, which Toker had given in 2003 as a lecture at the Carnegie Lecture Hall in Pittsburgh.

bigger audience than ever before: the consuming public. Architecture’s users continue to be the people who lived or worked in a building, but in the past century more than ever before also included anyone who saw or read about an image or representation of the building or its related ideas. Over time the media has not only influenced architecture, but representations of modern architecture, including those shaped by critics, increasingly have begun to re-influence the development of the other media such as graphics and advertising, and the development of a modern culture more generally.13

The prominence of theory in recent architectural discourse, the renewed interest in early modernism, post-modern criticism’s fascination with the author as subject, and most importantly the awareness that we are all increasingly living in a "media age," has led to a remarkable surge in research and publishing on modern architecture’s relationship with the media, the publicity industry, and criticism. At the core of much of this new research is the idea that architecture is as much an intellectual construct as a material artifact, as much the result of verbal, representational, and critical practices as


13 Andrew Herscher, for example, has recently discussed the impact that the graphics of several architectural manifestoes from the 1920s had on the advertising and graphics industries in Czechoslovakia; Herscher, "The Media(tion) of Building: Manifesto Architecture in the Czech Avant-garde," Oxford Art Journal 27, no.2 (2004): 193-217.
physical construction. Kenneth Frampton echoes this position when he states in the
introduction to his historical survey of modern architecture, "For me the history of
modern architecture is as much about consciousness and polemical intent as it is about
buildings themselves."\textsuperscript{14}

The inter-relationship of building and ideas goes back at least to ancient Rome
and Vitruvius. Although at first only a critique of the changing architectural values in
his own day, nearly every architect, theoretician, and critic since then has had to enter
into a dialogue with the principles and ideals that Vitruvius laid out in his treatise.\textsuperscript{15}

Mario Carpo’s book \textit{Architecture in the Age of Printing} focuses on the first wave of
commentary and promotion of Vitruvius’ ideas in the Renaissance, analyzing how the
\textit{message} in treatises by Alberti, Serlio, Palladio, and others has had a profound impact on
the development of architecture since then.\textsuperscript{16} But Carpo went further when he argued
that the \textit{medium} by which the printed words of Serlio and others were created had at

\textsuperscript{14} Frampton, \textit{Modern Architecture} (1980), p. 9; also cited in Mary Dean,
"Literature of Architecture," in Encyclopedia of Architecture, Design, Engineering and
Construction vol. 2 (1989), p. 329. Mario Carpo has said in a similar vein that
architecture is either something built, or a body of knowledge that must be recorded

\textsuperscript{15} The literature on the impact of Vitruvius is voluminous. I cite only the
introductions in two recent English translations of Vitruvius: Ingrid Rowland,
fascinating study, \textit{Vitruvius: Writing the Body of Architecture} (2003), examines the
meaning and significance of Vitruvius’ book in his own time, providing the intellectual
context, or what I will call the "culture of criticism" in ancient Rome under Augustus
Caesar.

\textsuperscript{16} Carpo, \textit{Architecture in the Age of Printing}. 
least as profound an influence as their message. In these Renaissance treatises, medium and message, discourse and architecture were each inextricably bound. The vehicle through which the ideas were mediated shaped not only the message but the resulting architecture, on several levels. On one level, words and images about specific historic architectural ideals caused the proliferation of classical ideas. On another level, the medium through which these ideas were proliferated—movable type and printing— influenced not only how the ideas were received, but caused the ideas themselves to be transformed, lending the built work a technical, repetitive edge.

Carpo speculated that the invention of movable type and the printing press in the fifteenth century, and the resulting availability of mass-reproduced architectural images and text by the sixteenth century led to an increased systematization of architecture, especially of the five orders. Architectural design, he hypothesized, began increasingly to rely on the repetition of a few, simple, standardized, pre-designed parts, a design method that he has called "typographic." Carpo claimed that a great deal of architecture after Gutenberg, including modern architecture, had been conceived of in such a systematized manner in part because of the effect of the movable type and the printing press transmitted in criticism such as Behne's. In closing, he conjectured that this typographic approach may only now be ending with the use of

---

digital images and computer-aided architectural design and construction.

Advancing a long line of related studies by twentieth-century historians and theorists such as Walter Benjamin, Juan Pablo Bonta, Hélène Lipstadt, and Stanislaus von Moos, Beatriz Colomina sought to analyze the influence of media on early twentieth century architecture in her book Privacy and Publicity (1994). Colomina began her investigation with the somewhat problematic statement that "modern architecture only becomes modern with its engagement with the media," and quickly moved beyond the idea that the media stimulated change both through its overt message as well as underlying medium. She demonstrated how modern media,

---


including photography, advertising images, and the publishing and publicity industries, had profound effects on how architects such as Loos and Le Corbusier conceptualized their architecture. She argued rather cynically, for example, that Le Corbusier consciously manipulated advertising images to generate much needed publicity for himself and to fashion himself as modern. Rather than see media as a democratic tool to communicate and indoctrinate the masses regarding cultural, and by extension social and political modernization, as will be done in this study on Behne, Colomina investigated media primarily as a means for self-promotion and publicity.

As a result, Colomina argued that one of the defining characteristics of modern architecture was the increasingly privileged role of representations of architecture, often over the actual built work. She suggested that modern architecture increasingly relied on and acted not primarily as a constructed system of physical parts, but as a system of representation consonant with and competing with other forms of mass media. In the early twentieth century, she claims, the site of most innovative architectural production moved progressively from the construction site to the immaterial sites of the mass media and publicity—architectural publications, exhibits, journals, and later photos and film. In the process architecture experienced what she

__________

studies by James Ackerman, Alberto Pérez-Goméz, K. Michael Hays, Hubert Damisch, and Robin Evans.

20 For example Beatriz Colomina, "L’Esprit Nouveau: Architecture and Publicité," in Colomina and Ockman, Architectureproduction, pp. 56-99; later revised in Colomina, Privacy and Publicity.

21 Colomina, Privacy and Publicity, p. 15.
called a loss of "aura." Due to its increased exposure to the media, modern
architecture lost the imposing physical presence as well as the status of "high art" that
had characterized earlier building. Much as Victor Hugo had argued a century earlier,
Colomina argued that the media representation of architecture began to replace the
physical presence of building. Architecture was increasingly created with mass
production in mind, mechanically reproduced, or proliferated as symbol. It moved
from individual creation to communal representation, becoming both a part of mass
culture, and anti-human in its sterility and technical perfection.

Despite some attempt to move away from a focus on the creative genius of
modern designers and the forces of modern industrial society that influenced their built
work, Colomina’s work still privileged the heroic architect and his varied
representational media as the primary force behind the creation of modern architecture.

With her analysis of the transformation of architecture from building to representation,

22 McLeod and Ockman note that the press was also instrumental in creating
aura through its publicity machine, and of releasing counterfeit aura; see McLeod and
Ockman, "Some Comments," p. 224. The most well-known reference to loss of aura is
Benjamin, "The Work of Art," to which Colomina refers often. Although Benjamin does
refer to the loss of aura in the age of technical reproduction, his argument does not refer
to modern architecture, which he claimed lost solidity and opacity, but not necessarily
aura. Behne, who in many ways anticipated Benjamin’s famous argument on the age of
technical reproduction, also discusses aura in Behne, Von Kunst zur Gestaltung (1925);
and in Behne, "Zweck contra Nimbus," Zentralblatt der Bauverwaltung 48, no. 11 (Mar.

23 Although Colomina argues that the press contributed to more communal and
mass culture values in modern architecture, McLeod and Ockman point out the
contradictory nature of arguing simultaneously for a sterile, technological, post-
humanism position, seemingly a prelude to post-modern alienation; see McLeod and
architecture, see also Markus Bernauer, Die Ästhetik der Masse (1990).
however, she did recognize a necessary expansion of the pool of agents and actors that
deserve careful study for how they contributed to the discourse and development of
modern architecture.

Criticism and Architecture

This study too investigates the relationship of architecture and the media, and is
based on the idea that architecture is as much intellectual construct as physical
construction. However, it seeks to go beyond the focusing on the technical apparatus of
the media or the messages it relayed as investigated by Carpo, as well as beyond the
profound changes that occur when architecture becomes primarily representation and
publicity, as investigated by Colomina. Instead, I will focus on the cultural context in
which the media was used as a tool to change architecture. Rather than focus on
printing presses, images, or architects, I will focus on critics and the complex cultural
context in which writers like Behne worked to influence the course of modern
architecture. In the process, I will attempt to explain in greater detail how the
published words of a newspaper critic or journal editor such as Behne can affect not
only the design of a building, but also a broader understanding about architecture and
the cultural landscape of a city and a century.

Critics like Behne played a vital but still underappreciated role in shaping the
development of modern architecture. To be sure there has been a great deal of
publishing recently dealing with the work of architectural writers such as Sigfried
Giedion, Henry-Russell Hitchcock, Nikolaus Pevsner, Reyner Banham, and Manfredo Tafuri. This scholarship builds on previous efforts to publish the work of important critics such as Maria von Renssallear, Alan Temko, James van Trump, its focus has too often remained on the architects and architecture associated with these figures, rather than the actual work of the producing and disseminating effective criticism.

Nonetheless, much work remains to be done to properly understand what differentiates criticism from history, theory, and other journalistic and publishing enterprises.

As we continue to investigate the criticism and transformations in the relationship between the producer, product, and audience of modern architecture, the scope and definition of the entire field will continue to change. Behne worked tirelessly as an activist for larger social movements promoting communally-minded art and architecture. The essays he published in newspapers, journals, and a broad spectrum of Berlin’s nascent media culture, the rhetoric he used, the illustrations he chose, and even the radio technology he embraced early on, all would help influence the architecture of


his era.  During the most productive period of his career from 1912, when he first became associated with Herwarth Walden’s epoch-making Sturm gallery in Berlin, to 1933, when Hitler’s rise to power squelched his tireless promotion of modern art and architecture, Behne published more than 1300 items in over 150 different venues, making him one of the most prolific and active agents for the development of a new, modern architecture.

Of course, not everything Behne wrote was profound or had a noticeable impact in shaping the discussions and ideas on modern architecture. Many of the pieces were little more than descriptions of art works, summaries of exhibits, or announcements of upcoming events. By helping inform a public and proliferate knowledge about modern art and architecture, however, these writings contributed to the larger cultural modernization effort in Germany. The sheer number of pieces and venues in which he published demonstrates how eager he was to get his ideas circulating among a very broad base of readers, and ultimately how passionate he was about trying to influence artistic developments and creation a new culture through criticism.

This investigation of how Behne both worked within, and profoundly

---


27 The 1500 separate published books, articles, and reviews by Behne in over 170 different periodicals dwarfs figures for other prominent critics such as Paul Westheim and Werner Hegemann, who published around 1000 items, Walter Curt Behrendt, Sigfried Giedion, Heinrich de Fries and Alfred Kuhn who published around 500 pieces each, and by Müller-Wulckow and Gustav Adolf Platz, who wrote about 100 each. Perhaps only the art critic Karl Scheffler published more, though no comprehensive study of his career has yet been attempted.
influenced this culture, demonstrates that the development of modern architecture has been particularly dependent on criticism, the media, and what the cultural theorist Pierre Bourdieu has termed the "intellectual field" surrounding all art. Through his work as a critic, Behne consciously made himself an integral part of the "intellectual field" that determined the rise of Expressionist art and architecture and the ideas of the German Werkbund before World War I, laying the groundwork for his position and great influence on the developments after World War I.

Berlin as Epicenter of Modernity

Nowhere was the interaction of architecture and the media more intense than in early twentieth-century Berlin, where Adolf Behne grew up, developed his career as a critic, and helped shape the development of modern architecture. Between national unification in 1871, and the beginning of World War I in 1914, amidst a burgeoning economy and an often intoxicating national pride, the new German capital transformed itself from a relatively austere Prussian garrison town and provincial capital to a thoroughly modern metropolis, one of the largest cities in the world, and the center of German life.


29 Germany’s overall population rose from 40 million in 1872 to over 67 million in 1913, not including millions of migrant and illegal workers, or the over 3 million
As Germans reflected on and sought to shape the cultural identity of their recently unified country, architecture took on a central role in their deliberations and actions. With its unique position between the public and the private, between art and technology, architecture was perceived as both a cultural artifact and a technical product. An understanding and opinion about architecture was crucial to sorting out divisive contemporary issues such as *Heimat* (fatherland) and national pride, rural town and metropolitan culture, nature and man’s interventions, the traditional German Germans who emigrated overseas in these years. Whereas in 1871 the new Reich only had eight large cities (over 100,000 inhabitants) with 4.8% of the population living in them, by 1910 there were 43, containing 21.3% of the population. Germany’s overall urban population, defined as people living in cities with populations over 2000, went from 36% to 60% of the national total. Although the fastest growth was registered in the industrial West, including the Ruhr Valley, the new national capital of Berlin rapidly assumed a dominant role in economic and industrial spheres, and grew physically and demographically at rates unheard for European capitals. Berlin’s population exploded from 400,000 in 1850, to 932,000 in 1870, to 2 million in 1905, and over 3.8 million inhabitants after 1919, more if distant suburbs are included. These urban, industrial, and demographic explosions are often recounted. See, for example, Volker R. Berghahn, *Imperial Germany* (1994), pp. 43-49; Jürgen Reulecke, *Geschichte der Urbanisierung in Deutschland* (1985); Brian Ladd, *Urban Planning and Civic Order in Germany 1960-1914* (1990), p. 14; and William Harbutt Dawson, *Industrial Germany* (1913). For introductions on the architectural and urban development of Berlin before World War I, see the authoritative compendium of research and primary material in Julius Posener, *Berlin auf dem Wege zu einer neuen Architektur* (1979); Günther Peters, *Kleine Berliner Baugeschichte* (1995); and the impressive set of exhibition catalogues edited by Josef Paul Kleihues: Kleihues, Thorsten Scheer et al., eds., *City of Architecture: Architecture of the City. Berlin 1900-2000* (2000) available in German and in English; Kleihues and Christina Rathgeber, eds., *Berlin - New York. Like and Unlike* (1993); and Kleihues, ed., *750 Jahre Architektur und Städtebau in Berlin* (1987).

applied art for the home and the factory-produced consumer goods for a world market, as well as the appropriate style and meaning for all the various other arts. All of these issues, with architecture at their core, were widely discussed and circulated in newspapers and the publishing culture of the era, including in Behne’s criticism.

Berlin’s explosive growth prompted societal and cultural upheavals—the modernity described and analyzed in the famous 1903 essay "Metropolis and Mental Life" by Georg Simmel, one of Behne’s teachers. The city’s tremendous energy and relative youth led the art critic Karl Scheffler in 1910 to liken to another famous colonial outpost known for its explosive growth, ruthless materialism, and seamy side, but also for innovation, incessant change, and a constant embrace of "the new": Chicago.

"Berlin," Scheffler wrote memorably, "is a city that is forever becoming and never is."\(^{32}\)

Behne was among the millions swept up in Berlin’s explosive growth and dynamic new culture. When he was a year old in 1886, his family moved from Magdeburg to Berlin’s mostly working-class east end, at first near the Frankfurterstraße, then on the Thaerstraße near the great central slaughter house (Centralviehhof).\(^{33}\) [Figure 1.2] Although Behne came from a middle-class family, he

---


\(^{33}\) Adolf Bruno Behne was born on July 13, 1885 in Magdeburg, the second of
grew up "amidst the milieu of worker-housing and allotment gardens" in northeastern
Berlin.\textsuperscript{34} It was here that aspects of his social conscience and his Socialist politics were born. Years later he remembered walking on his way to school past drab, filthy factories, and reflecting on the plight of the worker and their disconnection with modern culture.\textsuperscript{35} In the \textit{Mietskasernen} (rental barracks) surrounding his childhood apartments, he experienced the "unhappy" realities of life in the industrialized

---


\textsuperscript{35} Behne, "Die moderne Fabrik," \textit{Berliner Illustrierte Zeitung} 33, no. 7 (Feb. 17, 1924): 130.
metropolis. His early friendships with street urchins, worker children, and other “uneducated” children, as well as with many Jews, helped establish a lifelong kinship and sympathy for their causes.36 After primary school in the neighborhood, Behne attended the Königstädtilisches Gymnasium (high school) near Alexanderplatz, where he graduated in spring 1905, "with little distinction," as he himself admitted.37

During Behne’s youth, Berlin was in the midst of a fantastic building boom to accommodate the influx of immigrants. It soon became one of the world’s most densely populated cities, a "sea of stone," as the critic Werner Hegemann described it 1930.38 Behne’s father, a successful third generation builder, contributed to this expansion with several speculative apartment buildings that he developed in the family’s


37 Behne, postcard to Walter Dexel (Apr. 12, 1926).

38 The crowding in Berlin was legendary. Whereas in 1871, an average of 57 people lived on one Berlin building lot (compared to 8 per lot in London), by 1900 the average was 77 people per lot; see Peters, Kleine Berliner Baugeschichte, pp.146-147. In 1910, 600,000 people lived in rooms that housed at least five people, and 1.5 million Berliners lived in apartments with only one heated room, usually the kitchen. The demand for land and the price of housing grew unmanageable. In 1872, 53% of all renters had to move on a yearly basis merely to escape skyrocketing rents. The situation soon grew to be all but intolerable, and already at the beginning of the century was the subject of much criticism and reform discourse. See Werner Hegemann, Das Steinerne Berlin (1930), an expansion of essays in vol. 1 of Hegemann, Der Städtebau nach den Ergebnissen der allgemeinen Städtebau-Ausstellung in Berlin (1910), adding a great deal more on pre-19th-century history of Berlin; as well as Johann Friedrich Geist and Klaus Kürvers, Das Berliner Mietshaus, 1862-1945, vol. 2 (1984); and Jürgen Reulecke, ed., Geschichte des Wohnens 1800-1918. Das bürgerliche Zeitalter (1998). On Hegemann see most recently, Christiane Crasemann Collins, Werner Hegemann and the Search for Universal Urbanism (2005).
Adolf Behne’s father, Carl Behne (1851-1922), was born near Magdeburg into a family that owned a large construction company. Carl was trained at a Baugewerkschule, helped in the construction of the Frankfurt opera house, then moved back to Magdeburg (where Behne was born), before moving on to Berlin to build speculative apartment buildings, some of which he kept for himself; see family anecdotes compiled by Karla Behne, in Behne/Wirsig family papers, Rep.200 Acc.3860, Akte #3, item 70.

The growth of Germany’s media industry was explosive. In 1866 Germany had 1000 journals and 1525 newspapers, some 300 of which appeared daily. By 1914 there were 4221 newspapers, but only 700 journals. Of Germany’s 3,689 newspapers in 1919, only 26 had a circulation of over 100,000, while over two thirds had printings of 5,000 or less. Most were purchased through subscription, with 1.9 billion copies delivered by mail in 1910. The best selling periodical was the populist Berliner Illustrierte, founded in 1891, with a circulation of over 1.6 million. The best selling newspaper in Germany was the Berliner Morgenpost, founded in 1903, and already three years later outselling all other newspapers, reaching a peak circulation of 600,000

Along with its new role as the political, manufacturing, financial, cultural, and population hub of modern Germany, Berlin quickly rose into the empire’s media capital. The city’s growth into Germany’s media capital coincided with the rise of a

---

39 Adolf Behne’s father, Carl Behne (1851-1922), was born near Magdeburg into a family that owned a large construction company. Carl was trained at a Baugewerkschule, helped in the construction of the Frankfurt opera house, then moved back to Magdeburg (where Behne was born), before moving on to Berlin to build speculative apartment buildings, some of which he kept for himself; see family anecdotes compiled by Karla Behne, in Behne/Wirsig family papers, Rep.200 Acc.3860, Akte #3, item 70.

40 The growth of Germany’s media industry was explosive. In 1866 Germany had 1000 journals and 1525 newspapers, some 300 of which appeared daily. By 1914 there were 4221 newspapers, but only 700 journals. Of Germany’s 3,689 newspapers in 1919, only 26 had a circulation of over 100,000, while over two thirds had printings of 5,000 or less. Most were purchased through subscription, with 1.9 billion copies delivered by mail in 1910. The best selling periodical was the populist Berliner Illustrierte, founded in 1891, with a circulation of over 1.6 million. The best selling newspaper in Germany was the Berliner Morgenpost, founded in 1903, and already three years later outselling all other newspapers, reaching a peak circulation of 600,000
modern mass media culture worldwide, with the press and eventually radio and film able to reach more people through text and images than ever before. Berlin’s intense media climate was further intensified by the development of a distinct newspaper district, the so-called Zeitzungsquartel, with 75 per cent of all the city’s news, publishing, and printing companies located between the Jerusalemnerstraße and the Markgrafenstraße in the southern Friedrichsstadt.\footnote{Walter E. Keller, \textit{Vom Zeitungsviertel zum Medienquartier} (2003); Peters, \textit{Kleine Berliner Baugeschichte}; and Helmut Engel, \textit{Berlin auf dem Wege zur Moderne} (1997). A good source for the proliferation of journal publishing houses in the area are the annual editions of \textit{Sperlings Zeitschriften-adressbuch}, arranged by subject.} [Figure 1.3] The centralized nature of this district allowed for efficient production of newspapers and other published products, but also for the easy exchange of news and a healthy competitive atmosphere that stimulated both innovation and hype. With a total of 93 mass-circulation newspapers appearing each week on its streets, Berlin had the greatest newspaper density of any city in Europe. Morning commuters had a choice of over 45 daily newspapers published in Berlin alone, alongside two mid-day dailies, fourteen evening editions, as well as newspapers from every other major city in Germany, Europe, and
Heinrich Mann’s novel Berlin, im Schlaraffenland (1900, Berlin, Land of Cockaigne), offers insights into Berlin’s potent mix of modern consumer culture and the press and newspaper publishing world in which Behne became fully entrenched. The novel follows a young, idealistic, artistically-inclined country boy named Andrew after he arrives in the big metropolis of Berlin. Andrew is constantly tested by the trials of modernity and capitalism, but the young man’s dreams come true when he becomes a powerful editor of a large newspaper. In a sober yet creative writing style that Behne admired and later identified as “Expressionist,” Mann explored how Andrew’s character and idealism were eventually ruined by money and the glamorous, overly materialistic lifestyle into which his position at the commercial newspaper embroiled him. The book makes clear the fine line in Wilhelmine Germany between the abyss of capitalist consumer culture, of which the mainstream newspapers and publishing culture were an integral part, and the high ground of being a thoughtful art critic or

---


43 Behne began writing free-lance pieces for newspapers all over Germany in 1913, and after World War I served as art editor for Die Freiheit, the primary newspaper of the leftist USPD (Independent Socialist Party of Germany), from March 1919 to September 1922, and for the communist daily Die Welt am Abend, from September 1924 to February 1932.

44 The novel is based on Mann’s own work at the Fischer Verlag, as editor of the journal Das zwanzigste Jahrhundert (Munich, 1895-1896), as well as Mann’s experiences writing for several newspapers. Heinrich Mann, Berlin Schlaraffenland (1900), translated as Berlin, Land of Cockaigne (1929). See also Jill Lloyd, German Expressionism (1991), p. 130.
editor who sought to advance a more idealized sense of art and culture.\textsuperscript{45}

Berlin as "Word City"

The Berlin in which both Mann’s protagonist Andrew and Adolf Behne came of age was simultaneously a physical place, a burgeoning architectural metropolis, and a spectacle of the modern media. Bismark, who hated big cities and the press, alluded to the potent mix of architecture and the media when he condemned Berlin as nothing but a "city of bricks and newspapers."\textsuperscript{46} The cultural historian Peter Fritzsche recently went even further when he described early twentieth-century Berlin as a "word city," a giant text composed of a panoply of printed words and images that defined the city, guided its inhabitants, and fashioned the nature of the modern metropolitan experience.\textsuperscript{47}

[Figure 1.4] Fritzsche, who drew his evidence from a careful review of a few major turn-of-the-century Berlin newspapers, described a historical moment in which dozens of mass-circulation dailies dominated the psyche and physical surrounds of Berliners, perhaps even more than the age of mass-media that followed in the late 1920s, when other media such as film and radio competed for attention.

Fritzsche analyzed how the myriad of newspapers, like novels, "created" the city in their pages, but did so much more completely, and in an even more modern way, 

\textsuperscript{45} Behne praised Heinrich Mann as an early "Expressionist writer" in Behne, "Kunst und Milieu (I)," \textit{Die Gegenwart} 42.2, no. 38 (Sept. 20, 1913): 599-603.


being more fragmented and simultaneous than were novels. The front pages of newspapers broken into columns of randomly juxtaposed and anonymous stories, interspersed snapshots, and filled with short synopses, were emblematically modern. The effect was multiplied when dozens of newspapers were displayed at the newspaper kiosks alongside the busy streets. [Figure 1.5] The papers served as fleeting, ever-changing guides and dizzying points of orientation for the public. They fostered participation in both a national and international culture. But they also determined a localized, neighborhood spirit, bringing the city, its citizens, and neighborhoods together to share experiences in unprecedented ways.

Although they carried much subjective material, such as Behne’s criticism, the primary business of the newspapers was to inform on the facts rather than to enlighten the mind or provide provocative commentary. They reported the latest news and events, and advertised a myriad of ever-changing goods and services. Most were produced by for-profit business enterprises completely embedded in the heterodox capitalist culture. As a result, they catered to fickle fashions. They mirrored, mediated, amplified, and improvised change and the precarious nature of metropolitan culture. With many papers coming out several times a day, and one newspaper advertising that stories could appear in print on the streets of Berlin eight minutes after happening anywhere in the world, the speed of newspapers was "nearly live."48 Newspapers

played a large part in creating a unified metropolitan culture whose hallmarks were fragmentation and change. Their very essence was modernity, about which Baudelaire had famously remarked: "By modernity I mean the ephemeral, the fugitive, the contingent." 49

In Berlin, as in many big cities, words and the city were inextricably intertwined, the one constantly mediated the other. People relied on an unprecedented number of newspapers, posters, flyers, and a vast number of other printed materials, both words and images, to navigate the city and its architecture. They read Behne’s criticism and other pieces in order to make their changing surroundings understandable. The incessant dynamism, chaotic reality, and material abundance of the metropolis and the life it contained, in turn revised the way people wrote and read. These representational acts spawned new experiences and understandings of the city, and eventually altered behaviors. The "word city" not only documented what happened for contemporary readers as well as for historians, but also each piece of the "word city" was in itself an agent of change, influencing people and defining events. This sense of agency, a crucial feature of even the driest or most descriptive printed-matter from the day, lies at the heart of this research project about Adolf Behne, who contributed prodigiously to the proliferation of words and images in Berlin. 50

---


50 Hayden White’s work in exposing the "figurative" aspect of all historical writing, that by definition all history writing includes the author’s narrative vision, as well as the related discussions about the role of the author in literary criticism have
The "word city" analyzed by Fritzsche extended far beyond the large daily newspapers, and well beyond 1900. If expanded to include the entire press and publishing culture in the decades before World War I, Fritzsche’s ideas lead us to understand that the media played a defining role in the development of a great deal of Berlin’s culture and life, including its architecture. Architecture showed up in the newspapers and other published works in many ways. [Figure 1.6] There were reviews, advertisements, and descriptions of old and new, planned, unfinished, and remodeled buildings. Architecture served as backdrops for photos, news stories, and narrated accounts of all kinds that took place in public and private spaces. It was featured in advertisements and logos for many companies and advertisers. It housed the machines and the sales counters that manufactured and sold the entire range of consumer culture. In combination with the nascent media culture of early twentieth century Berlin of which Behne and his writing were integral parts, architecture became more a more pervasive influence on the culture of the city than ever before.

Berlin as Cultural Capital

By 1910, when Behne began writing as a critic and press correspondent, Berlin was not only the center of the German media, but also ascending to a position at the

---

been influential in my reading of historical material. See, for example, White, "Historicism, History and the Figurative Imagination," in *Tropics of Discourse* (1985), pp. 101-120.

---

Advertisements for most of the big department stores in Berlin, for example, featured graphic stylizations of their large stores; see Figure 1.6.
center of German art and architecture. The traditionally polycentric nature of German culture divided into distinct regional capitals such as Munich, Dresden, Cologne, and Vienna, now focused ever more prominently on Berlin, a cultural upstart suddenly given weight by an influx of artists, critics, and the press. The elite were attracted to, and wealth was increasingly generated in, the exploding metropolis that mingled Prussian respectability with bohemian cosmopolitanism. Although Berlin was home to the Kaiser, the Prussian royal art academies, and their often stifling conservative influence, Berliners also began to consume and produce the lion’s share of new art in Germany, in almost purposeful defiance of authority. The local art public soon became the most open-minded, though also the hardest to please, the most skeptical and critical in all of Germany. Artists of all types increasingly flocked to Berlin hoping to achieve near instant recognition, sponsors, and eventually fame. The first performances of revolutionary plays by Henrik Ibsen, August Strindberg, and Gerhart Hauptmann, and

---

52 Many studies of the era focus on 1910 as a turning point in the history of modern art, architecture and culture in Berlin, the moment of the final turn from historicism to modernism, the halfway point between the earliest signs of industrial modernity of the mid-nineteenth century, and the high modernism of the late 1920s through the post-war era. See, for example, Klaus-Jürgen Sembach, 1910: Halbzeit der Moderne (1992); Françoise Forster-Hahn, Imagining Modern German Culture, 1889-1910 (1996); Eberhard Roters, ed., Berlin 1910-1933 (1982); and Joachim Petsch, Architektur und Gesellschaft (1977). Sembach offers a good overview of the era, but is focused primarily on architecture and design. The inaugural exhibit for the Neue Galerie in New York, Renée Price, ed., New Worlds (2001), offers a recent summary of the developments in the other arts.


the call of Max Reinhard from Vienna to Berlin, had put the city at the forefront of new theater. The most popular theater critics such as Alfred Kerr, Julius Bab, Maximilian Harden, and Sigfried Jacobsohn began to wield extraordinary cultural clout throughout Germany. Behne became a devoted fan of this revolutionary theater culture in high school, and even tried his hand at becoming a theater critic in a regular column for the Sozialistische Monatshefte after 1913.

Writers and artists moving to Berlin further enhanced the city’s reputation as a seat of innovation. The success of the Berlin Secession and the deliberate attempt by its leader Max Liebermann to recruit experimental artists to Berlin helped counter the conservative force of the Kaiser. Max Pechstein, a leader of the New Secession, had left Dresden for Berlin in 1908, with many of the revolutionary Die Brücke Expressionist painters following by 1911. Alfred Flechtheim opened a branch of his Cologne gallery in Berlin, further helping make Berlin into the center of German avant-garde painting. Experimental poets such as Paul Scheerbart, as well as the Neo-Pathetic Cabaret group of Expressionist poets that formed around Kurt Hiller in 1911 were immigrants to


German literary Expressionism is said to have started in 1911, the year that Jakob van Hoddis [pseud. Of Hans Davidssohn] published his famous poem "Weltende," (End of the World), shortly after his friends formed the Neo-Pathetisch Cabaret, and the founding of the journal Die Aktion; see Paul Raabe, Die Zeitschriften und Sammlungen des Literarischen Expressionismus (1964), p. 1ff.; and Thomas Anz and Michael Stark, eds., Manifeste und Dokumente zur deutschen Literatur 1910-1920 (1982). Gordon sees the Neo-Pathetic Cabaret as related to the style and forms of Expressionist painting, but this is based on formalist criteria rather than intellectual/spiritual geistig criteria that Behne favored. Gordon, Expressionism, p. 91.

German literary Expressionism is said to have started in 1911, the year that Jakob van Hoddis [pseud. Of Hans Davidssohn] published his famous poem "Weltende," (End of the World), shortly after his friends formed the Neo-Pathetisch Cabaret, and the founding of the journal Die Aktion; see Paul Raabe, Die Zeitschriften und Sammlungen des Literarischen Expressionismus (1964), p. 1ff.; and Thomas Anz and Michael Stark, eds., Manifeste und Dokumente zur deutschen Literatur 1910-1920 (1982). Gordon sees the Neo-Pathetic Cabaret as related to the style and forms of Expressionist painting, but this is based on formalist criteria rather than intellectual/spiritual geistig criteria that Behne favored. Gordon, Expressionism, p. 91.

Architects followed suit. Eric Mendelsohn and the brothers Bruno and Max Taut arrived from East Prussia in search of metropolitan culture. Peter Behrens left Düsseldorf for the AEG in Berlin, and in turn young architects like Mies van der Rohe and Le Corbusier flocked to him for architectural training. Hugo Häring came from western Germany. The architectural critics Paul Westheim and Walter Curt Behrendt, two contemporaries of Behne’s, came to Berlin at first to study, but soon decided to make their careers in the capital burgeoning with writing and publishing opportunities. Countless others such as Behne came with the waves of immigrants to the new city.

Behne later recalled that he felt blessed to have grown up in one of the great cultural metropolises of the day. As a teenager he read avidly the popular dime novels published by the Reklam publishing house, as well as translations of naturalist modern authors and playwrights such as Ibsen, Strindberg, Émile Zola, and Leo Tolstoy, whose works were opening in Berlin theaters. He continued enjoying Berlin’s thriving cultural scene as a university student, taking in the theater of Reinhardt and Otto

57 German literary Expressionism is said to have started in 1911, the year that Jakob van Hoddis [pseud. Of Hans Davidssohn] published his famous poem "Weltende," (End of the World), shortly after his friends formed the Neo-Pathetisch Cabaret, and the founding of the journal Die Aktion; see Paul Raabe, Die Zeitschriften und Sammlungen des Literarischen Expressionismus (1964), p. 1ff.; and Thomas Anz and Michael Stark, eds., Manifeste und Dokumente zur deutschen Literatur 1910-1920 (1982). Gordon sees the Neo-Pathetic Cabaret as related to the style and forms of Expressionist painting, but this is based on formalist criteria rather than intellectual/spiritual geistig criteria that Behne favored. Gordon, Expressionism, p. 91.

58 Anon., "Wir stellen vor."
Brahms, Hauptmann’s poetry, Kerr’s criticism in the art magazine Pan, and art shows at the Secession, such as the 1908 retrospective exhibit of Hans von Marées. In his student club "Studentenverbindung Euphoria," Behne had intense discussions about art history, while in the math club MV# he met his future wife Elfriede Schäfer. They married in June 1913.\(^{59}\) Since high school he had subscribed to periodicals such as the Neue Rundschau (New Review), one of Germany’s most important and widely read cultural journals, in which he would publish occasionally throughout his career.\(^{60}\) In 1910 he began publishing his articles in journals such as Friedrich Naumann’s Die Hilfe (Help) and Wilhelm Herzog’s März (March). Behne began writing regular columns in Joseph Bloch’s Sozialistische Monatshefte in 1913, and wrote populist pieces on museums and the old masters in magazines for the working class youth movements such as Arbeiter-Jugend (Worker-Youth) after 1912. His efforts to situate himself within this "intellectual field" and to become one of the most prolific and influential art and architectural critics of his day grew easily out of the cultural context of pre-World War I Berlin.

Once he began writing, Behne quickly infiltrated the network of promoters and


publicists of modern art. A group of very progressive art dealers and gallery owners were instrumental in bringing the new art into the limelight, and with it set the tone for Behne’s writing and helped change the cultural atmosphere of Berlin. The most prominent was Paul Cassirer, who had funded and directed the Berlin Secession since 1899, but also Alfred Flechtheim, who introduced many French painters to local audiences, and later Fritz Gurlitt, J.B. Neumann and Herwarth Walden, for whom Behne wrote some of his most important theoretical pieces. A group of wealthy bankers and industrialists, especially from Berlin’s large liberal Jewish community, increasingly acted as patrons and set record prices as they purchased the new art. In order to get around the conservative tastes of the official curators or the Kaiser’s museum funding, these patrons often donated work to national museums in Berlin, making the revolutionary art accessible to the masses.  

The German press, centered in Berlin, embraced the emerging, dynamic developments in theater, art, and architecture. The reviews of the new art published in Berlin were read throughout the Empire and the world.  

---


62 The biggest Berlin newspapers all published regional editions in other German cities, and even overseas editions. When combined with the efficient German railway system, Berlin newspapers were available throughout the Empire and much of Europe within hours of publication.
from Munich the role as capital of German art and art publishing, attracting even Frank Lloyd Wright to the city that year to publish his grand Wasmuth portfolio. The development of modern architecture in Berlin, and more broadly throughout Germany, was dependent on the modern media culture developing there to promote the discourse of architectural reform and help effect renewal and eventually revolution.

The Architectural "Publishing Culture"

The search for a reformed national culture around 1900 precipitated the proliferation of an ever greater spectrum of printed materials, appearing with ever greater frequency, and referring to an ever broader panoply of cultural conditions. Before World War I an unprecedented array of books, journals, newspapers, posters, photographs and other materials were written, designed, published, and circulated by a vast publicity industry dedicated to architectural design and reform. Stimulated by

---


64 Introductions to this material include Michael Nungesser, "Skizze zur publizistischen Situation der modernen Architektur," in Europäische Moderne. Buch und Graphik aus Berliner Kunstverlagen 1890-1933, ed. Lutz S. Malke (1989), pp. 163-182, as well as Malke’s entire catalogue on the more general world of art publishing; Maria Rennhofer, Kunstzeitschriften der Jahrhundertwende in Deutschland und Österreich 1895-1914 (1997); Roland Jaeger, Neue Werkkunst. Architektenmonographien der zwanziger Jahre (1998), for analysis and a very comprehensive bibliography of the most important books and publications in the German architectural publishing culture from 1918-1933; Andrew Herscher, "Publications and Public Realms: Architectural Periodicals in the Hapsburg Empire and its Successor States," in Shaping the Great City, ed. Eve Blau and Monika Platzer (1999), pp. 237-246; and the series of essays in Werner Oechslin, Moderne Entwerfen (1999), whose vast personal collection of books and this publishing culture forms the basis of his own essays.

German publishers and historians have been surprisingly eager to reprint and
republish many of the influential, obscure books and essays of the architectural publishing culture from the early twentieth century, either separately or in anthologies focused on various themes, personalities, or historical moments. Reprints of whole runs of important journals and publications from the time have begun to correct the focus on professional architects as the only writers and agents of change. Reprinted journals include: ABC, Das Andere, Die Baugilde, bauhaus, Die Form, Frühlcht, G, Das Kunstblatt, Das Neue Berlin, Das Neue Frankfurt, Vesch/Gegenstand/Objet, and Das Werk, as well as a large number of rare Expressionist journals; see below. These reprints, many of which contain essays by Behne, have been motivated in part by the scarcity, demand, and rapidly increasing prices in the used book stores and auction houses of the original resources that were often printed only in very small editions. The reunification of Germany has helped open new archives in the East and also increased interest in the common heritage of East and West before World War II. The old age of the last surviving, immediate family members of the Weimar era architects and critics has motivated the recent selling off of several invaluable private collections to the archives. The recent trends of Minimalism and Neo-Modernism in contemporary architecture and the growing awareness and pervasiveness of the media as a cultural force in the current architectural scene have also helped widen the audience of people interested in the early "media culture" in Germany.

The media representations that have come down to us from Berlin often form the only real connection with the original building or ideas, since the city constantly embraced the new, and so much architectural production was either never built or destroyed soon after being built (for example, Poelzig’s “Large Theater” from 1919). The published materials, in fact, provide much of the "primary source" material for architectural developments of the era, including photographs of the original buildings, and new published commentary by contemporaries who provided a subjective context in which to evaluate the building. With personal papers so often lost to history, this publishing culture provides a nearly inexhaustible supply of evidence, despite being frustratingly dispersed, fragmented, and un-indexed.
Behne and his colleagues published in a remarkably broad spectrum of venues to promote their visions for a new art and architecture. The most well-known sources are the many professional art and architectural journals circulating in Germany, including mainstream, regional, conservative, government published, and more specialized periodicals such as those dealing with housing, engineering structures, or

---

66 A list of the most important mainstream professional journals would include: Deutsche Bauzeitung (1867-1942); Architektonische Rundschau (1885-1915); Moderne Bauformen (1902-1944, 14,000 copies in 1930, the largest circulation in Germany); Neudeutsche Bauzeitung (1904-22); Bauwelt (1910-1945, with 12,00 copies weekly in 1930); Wasmuths Monatshefte (1914-1932); Die Baugilde (1919-41). The best surveys and indexes of the complete spectrum of architectural periodicals in Germany include Rolf Fuhlrott, Deutschsprachige Architektur-Zeitschriften, 1789-1918 (1975); Ludovica Scarpa, ed., "Riviste, manuali di architettura, strumenti del sapere tecnico in Europa, 1910-1930," in Rassegna 3, no. 5 (Jan. 1981): special issue; Annette Ciré and Haila Ochs, Die Zeitschrift als Manifest (1991); Jacques Gubler, ed., "Architecture in Avant-Garde Magazines," Rassegna 4, no. 12 (Dec. 1982): special issue. The published periodical material has also been thoroughly, if not always comprehensively indexed: Stephan Waetzoldt, ed., Bibliographie zur Architektur im 19. Jahrhundert. 8 vols (1977); Peter and Sabine Güttler, Zeitschriften-bibliographie zur Architektur in Berlin von 1919 bis 1945 (1986); and in the annual volumes of Dietrich’s Bibliographie der Deutschen Zeitschriften-Literatur, mit Einschluß von Sammlewerken (1896-1937, reprint 1962), with a comprehensive list of periodicals surveyed.

67 The most important regional professional journals include: Bau-rundschau (Hamburg, 1909-41); Berliner Architekturwelt (Berlin, 1899-1919); Ostdeutsche Bauzeitung (Breslau, 1904-1942) Stein-Holz-Eisen (Frankfurt, 1887-1937); Süddeutsche Bauzeitung (Munich, 1891-1922); and Schweizerische Bauzeitung (Zurich, 1883-present).

68 Conservative professional architectural journals included: Deutsche Bauhütte (1897-1942); Der Profanbau (1905-1922); and Der Baumeister (1902-1944).

69 Official mouthpieces of various German ministries responsible for building include: Zentralblatt der Bauverwaltung (1881-1944); and Zeitschrift für Bauwesen (1851-1931).
emergency dwellings after World War I. A great deal of architectural publishing was also done in related decorative arts and fine arts magazines. Finally there were the many small, specialized avant-garde journals, "little magazines," and broadsheets that often carried the most radical and experimental ideas, particularly in the post-World War I era. Although these venues of creativity and criticism were often short lived and had very small circulation numbers, their reputation among artists, critics, and friends of modern art and architecture, both in Germany and throughout Europe, lent them disproportionate influence.

The close inter-relationship these avant-garde journals had with the artists or architects themselves, and the mythic image of the artist as genius and master of his own destiny, has led many scholars to focus almost exclusively on the writings of architects when investigating the relationship of architecture and the media. Architects

---

70 More specialized professional architectural journals with a wide circulation included: Der Industriebau (1910-1931); Die Volkswohnung /Der Neubau (1919-1930); and Wohnungswirtschaft (1924-2932).

71 Popular decorative arts and interior design magazines included: Dekorative Kunst (1897-1929); Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration (1897-1933); Innen-Dekoration (1900-1944); Das Werk (1914-present); and Die Form (1922, 1925-1934).

72 Fine arts magazines that regularly carried important material on architecture include: Die Kunst (1896-1943); Kunst und Künstler (1902-1933); Der Cicerone (1909-1932); and Das Kunstblatt (1917-1933).

73 The most important German-language (or German published) avant-garde journals that covered architecture include: ABC (1924-1928); Das Andere (1903); bauhaus (1926-31); Frühlicht (1920, 1921-22); G (1923-26); Das Neue Berlin (1929); Das Neue Frankfurt (1926-34); Vesch/Gegenstand/Objet (1922). Although they rarely carried material directly related to architecture, the hundreds of small Expressionist journals that flourished before and after the World War I were crucial to artistic developments; see the 18 thick volumes of Paul Raabe’s Index Expressionismus (1972).
since the turn of the twentieth century increasingly wrote in the form of purposefully provocative manifestoes that they publicized in both avant-garde journals and the general press. But these often cryptic, and usually singular manifestoes offer only partial explanations into the complexities that promote cultural change. Critics, when they are quoted, are cited for the facts they relay, not the opinions or influence they had.

With some exceptions, perhaps, architects were not as adept at expressing themselves in print as were critics and other professional writers. Even the prolific and gifted architect-writer Bruno Taut admitted openly that he expressed himself far better in drawings than in words. Architects’ writings are almost by definition tendentious, with all the perils and power to shape developments that Manfredo Tafuri identified

---

For samples of architect’s manifestoes see Kristiana Hartmann, ed. Trotzdem Modern (1994); Ulrich Conrads, ed., Programs and Manifestes on 20th-Century Architecture (1964, 1989); Ciré and Ochs, Die Zeitschrift als Manifest; and more general art anthologies such as Diether Schmidt, ed., Manifeste Manifeste, 1905-1933 (1965). In recent years there has been increased scholarly research on the reading, writing, publishing, and media work of professional architects all over Europe, including Loos, Le Corbusier, Behrens, Walter Gropius, Ludwig Hilberseimer, Herrmann Muthesius, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Paul Schultze-Naumburg, and Bruno Taut. This trend is hardly new. Writings by important architects have been collected, studied and republished for decades. Even before World War II, for example, the critic and journal editor Paul Westheim was convinced that artists were the best judges of their own intentions and work, leading him to publish anthologies of important essays that affected the development of modern art and architecture; see Paul Westheim, ed., Kulturbekenntnisse. Briefe / Tagebuchblätter / Betrachtungen heutiger Künstler (1925); but also his Paul Westheim and Carl Einstein, eds., Europa Almanach (1925, republished in 1973 and 1984).

with "operative criticism." The nature of the architects' training, profession, and personalities limited their time and abilities to contextualize and criticize their own work and ideas historically and ideologically. As the East German art historian Diether Schmidt has warned, artists are often provocative, but even the most communally minded are rarely what he calls "team players," unable to reflect adequately on how their work fits into the larger artistic, cultural, and social context of their own time.

Some architects, such as Mies van der Rohe, Terragni or Rietveld, intentionally let their buildings speak for them, and as a consequence wrote almost nothing at all. Other such as Erich Mendelsohn, who wrote prolifically and trenchantly about their own work and ideas, were reluctant to expose or share their ideas with the public.

Although architects contributed many of the articles in architectural journals, the overall content and nature of the architectural coverage was usually dictated by the publishing house, including such famous art and architectural publishers as Paul Cassirer, Friedrich Bruckmann, Gustav Kiepenheuer, Ernst Wasmuth, Hermann

---


Reckendorf, and Alexander Koch. For the publishing houses, the art journals were usually part of a much larger business and publishing enterprise, often with a well-defined ideological and artistic positions. Power to control the content was wielded by the journal’s Herausgeber (Editor in Chief) and the Schriftleiter (Managing Editor). They selected the contributors and commissioned specific pieces, and thereby determined the kind of readership and influence the journal could hope for. The architect’s writings were thus subsumed within larger institutions of the media.

In addition to the professional art and architectural press, scholars have increasingly focused on the extensive publishing and publicity efforts of important activist reform and educational institutions of the period such as the German Werkbund, the Heimatschutzbund, the Deutsches Museum für Kunst und Handwerk, the Bauhaus, the Reichsforschungs-gesellschaft (RfG), and the Internationaler Kongress für Neues Bauen (C.I.A.M.). Each of these propaganda organizations disseminated architectural images and ideas to reach a wider audiences and achieve desired reforms. The leaders of these organizations understood from the beginning that change and reform could only be achieved with the aid of the modern media. Recent exhibits and monographs on these institutions and reprints such as the Werkund Yearbooks and Bauhaus book series now allow for a more sophisticated and nuanced understanding of the role these institutions in collaboration with the media played in the development of modern architecture.80

80 On the publicity of the Bauhaus, see, for example, Kerstin Eckstein, "Inszenierung einer Utopie. Zur Selbstdarstellung des Bauhauses in den zwanziger
But the architectural publishing culture before World War I stretched wider than the professional art and architecture journals and a handful of influential cultural institutions that promoted change and reform. A more thorough investigation of effect of critics and the press on architecture must include the much broader range of non-architectural publications, including cultural journals such as Der Kunstwart and Alfred Kerr’s Pan magazine. The monumental efforts by Kraus and others to reprint many of the rare Expressionist journals such as Die Aktion, Der Sturm and Zeit-Echo, as well as surveys of more generalized literary, cultural, and political journals such as Die Welbühne, Das Neue Russland, and Sozialistische Monatshefte, allow us to explore the complete breadth of Germany’s architectural publishing culture. Analyses of important German newspapers such as the Frankfurter Zeitung and the Berliner Morgenpost help explain the context in which architectural reviews by critics such as Behne, Behrendt, Sigfried Kracauer were read. Studies of influential publishing houses such as Mosse, Ullstein, Scherl, and smaller publishers such as Fischer, Piper, Insel, Reclam, and Diederichs provide additional insights. These media outlets reached much larger


82 The largest force in Berlin’s media culture was a group of three giant media
audiences than did the professional press, often on a daily basis, and included reports
and critiques of most of the important events and controversies that gave rise to a
modern architecture. Despite this fact, few of the extant studies of Germany’s
architectural publishing culture have focused attention on the interaction of the more
mainstream media with the professional world of architecture and the influence it had
by addressing a wider, more mass audience.

Architectural Critics and the "Culture of Criticism"

Many of the individuals, organizations, and institutions with which Behne
interacted had in common a dissatisfaction with what they perceived to be an
increasingly decadent consumerism and materialism in Wilhelmine Berlin before World
War I. They wrote critiques, proposed reforms, searched for alternatives, challenged
authority, and sought revolution on many different levels. At the conservative extreme,
writers such as Paul de Lagarde, Julius Langbehn, and Moeller van den Bruck attacked
the progress of modernity and expressed deep dissatisfaction with the condition of

---

empires at the center of the so-called "Gross-Presse": the Ullstein, Mosse and Scherl
conglomerates. Each published many daily and weekly newspapers, a broad range of
periodical journals and magazines (popular and professional, humorous and
philosophical, artistic and technical), as well as books and other printed matter in vast
numbers. Their output was supplemented by a host of smaller and more specialized
publishers from Berlin, the traditional center of German book publishing in Leipzig, as
well as cities from all over Germany, Europe and the world. Berlin, as capital of the
German Reich, had an appetite for a vast array of printed material, living up to its labels
as "Zeitungsstadt" and "Medienstadt". See Mendelsohn, Zeitungsstadt Berlin;
Schottenloher and Binkowski, Flugblatt und Zeitung, pp. 89-96; and Bohrmann,
"Anmerkungen zur Mediengeschichte."
Stern investigates the writings of Paul de Lagarde, Julius Langbehn and Moeller van den Bruck, all deeply dissatisfied with the condition of modern German culture and the German spirit. They enumerated the discontents of Germany’s industrial civilization and warned against an ongoing loss of values and a cultural crisis. Hoping to become prophets of a national rebirth, they propounded all manner of reform, ruthless and idealistic, nationalistic and utopian, that Stern argues facilitated the rise of National Socialism; see Fritz Stern, The Politics of Cultural Despair (1961).

Their nostalgia for traditions and a more perfect past, and hopeless attitude about the present, spawned what Fritz Stern has labeled a "culture of despair." They were reacting to what had been wrought in large part by the primary conservative force in Germany, the Kaiser and his loyal entourage of army officers, academy professors, and other establishment figures.

Unlike the promoters of a "culture of despair," this camp promoted an often paradoxical mix of tradition and modernity. Emblematic were the German world’s fair pavilions in Chicago (1893) and Paris (1900), where a neo-Renaissance or medieval half-timber facade stood in front of airy, steel-an-glass halls selling high-tech Krupp armaments or tea-kettles from the AEG.

Responding to many of the same ills of modern industrialized civilization, more centrist critics such as Eugen Diederichs and Friedrich Naumann and several of the founding members of the German Werkbund spawned a very broad movement of "reform culture" that encompassed nearly every aspect of life, from lifestyles to the German home and landscape, to political reform and industrial policy. Although progressive in comparison to the advocates of tradition mentioned above, these critics encompassed a wide spectrum and rich mix of political and social ideas. Many were

---

83 Stern investigates the writings of Paul de Lagarde, Julius Langbehn and Moeller van den Bruck, all deeply dissatisfied with the condition of modern German culture and the German spirit. They enumerated the discontents of Germany’s industrial civilization and warned against an ongoing loss of values and a cultural crisis. Hoping to become prophets of a national rebirth, they propounded all manner of reform, ruthless and idealistic, nationalistic and utopian, that Stern argues facilitated the rise of National Socialism; see Fritz Stern, The Politics of Cultural Despair (1961).
progressive on matters of technology, modern design, and laissez faire capitalism, but simultaneously strong social conservatives that sought to restore "order" in all aspects of German life.

The left also featured a broad spectrum of ideas. Socialists sought political and economic change to benefit the working class, but as will be explored below, often had very conservative ideas about culture and art. On the far left, a bohemian "café culture" developed in Berlin and other large cities in which artists, literary figures, and all manner of intellectuals retreated to an avant-garde artistic position as a means of compensating for their lack of political power. Their political stances varied from anarchists to "Activists," Socialist and more centrist positions.

All three of these branches of cultural criticism used publishing, the press, and the modern media with great effectiveness to get out their message and convince others of their cause. Together, the reformers, the institutions through which they worked, and the media through which they communicated created what I am calling a "culture of criticism."84 Art and architectural issues formed only a small part of the larger

---

84 Joan Ockman describes a "culture of criticism" within architecture for the post-World War II era, but uses the term much more narrowly, confined for the most part to the professional architectural press or the writings of professional architects. In an effort to distinguish the post-World War II period from the pre-war era, she also postulates that the pre-war architectural culture was dominated by architects and their manifestoes, and thus did not feature as pervasive and complex a culture of criticism as the post-World War II era. While this may be true for the United States, England, and Italy, this dissertation is an attempt to demonstrate that this was decidedly not the case in pre-war Germany, where a thriving media produced a mature culture of criticism to rival that of any other period or place. See Ockman, ed., Architecture Culture 1943-1968: a Documentary Anthology (1993), p. 20.
culture of criticism in Berlin. Nonetheless, I maintain that Behne’s reviews of art, essays of architecture, and theoretical statements on the avant-garde that are the primary source material for this study and so much architectural history of the period, can only be fully understood within the much wider context of the culture of criticism in which they were produced. The culture of criticism encompassed not only what Bourdieu has called the "intellectual field" that surrounds all art and helps define cultural developments, but also a more mundane system of communication, production and exchange that was the modern media. His views on art and architecture were profoundly affected by the network of institutions around him, his writings transmitting and translating for his readers general cultural ideas as well as specific messages about art and architecture.

An investigation of the "culture of criticism" and how it influenced architecture in early twentieth-century Berlin shows the way in which writers such as Behne and the press more generally inserted themselves between producers of the new architecture and the consuming public. They related architecture to larger developments in art, politics, and society. They dictated the tone, format and very often the message of architectural change, and with it implicated larger cultural and even political reforms. Far more than objective reporters or passive filters of the moment, critics such as Behne, Behrendt, Platz and Giedion, working in conjunction with architects, publishers, and the larger culture of criticism opened up the discursive space for a modern architecture and culture in Germany. Modern architecture in Germany, I contend, was shaped as
much by words and images as by actual buildings; the representations by non-practitioners such Behne at least as determinant as the structures and manifestoes of the architects.

Behne as Premier Critic of Modern Architecture

The Existing Research

Few architectural critics from the early twentieth century have been comprehensively researched or written about, but the existing literature and historical evidence confirms that no critic was more productive, provocative, or influential in determining the course of modern architecture in Germany before World War II than Adolf Behne. His writing, the many artists and architects he wrote about and promoted, and the institutions through which he operated, confirm Behne’s influence beyond the confines of traditional art criticism. His vast and provocative work places him squarely as a leading architectural voice within Berlin’s culture of criticism.

In order to fully appreciate Behne’s role in motivating architectural change, a wide array of sources related to his day-to-day work is required. Because the work of critics and the press has with few exceptions been seen as secondary compared to the work of architects, the personal papers of most critics are widely dispersed or lost to history.\textsuperscript{85} Except for several relatively small collections of personal papers consisting

\textsuperscript{85} Countless letters to archives and discussions with scholars here and abroad in the early years of research proved over and over the relative dearth of archives and personal papers related to architectural critics as well as publishing houses in Weimar Germany. Giedion’s papers in Zurich are a stark exception. Many records of the critics’
mostly of reprints or copies of his published articles, there is no comprehensive repository of Behne’s personal papers, as there is for critics and historians such as Sigfried Giedion or Nicholas Pevsner, or many of the heroic architects they interacted with.\(^{86}\) However, nearly every archival collection of material related to practicing architects or important cultural institutions of the period contains letters to or from Behne.\(^{87}\) If the architect or institutions employed newspaper clipping services, as most did in early twentieth-century Germany, there are nearly always articles by Behne. Finally, scholarship in a few archives directly related to the publishing industry have started to provide invaluable insights into the complex business and mechanics of architectural publishing in Weimar Germany, though none seems to contain material

---

\(^{86}\) There are several small collections of Behne papers, mostly clippings or copies of articles, but also limited correspondence to or from Behne. The most important archival collection are in order of quantity and significance: 1) the Sammlung Behne/Scharfe at the Bauhaus-Archiv, as well as several pieces of correspondence Behne had with some of the other figures collected by the Bauhaus-Archiv such as Gropius; 2) the Sammlung Behne in Herwarth Walden’s Sturm-Archiv in the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin; 3) a series of letters from Behne to various people collected in the Sammlung Baukunst of the Akademie der Künste, Berlin; 4) a series of letters by Behne to various people in archives of the Berlinische Gallerie in Berlin; 5) a large cache of letters to Behne’s close friend Walter Dexel, a painter, in the archives of the Getty Research Center in Los Angeles.

\(^{87}\) See Bibliography II below for a list of archival collections consulted, including many of Behne’s architect colleagues. A surprisingly large number contain at least a letter or note from Behne.
related to Behne’s work as a critic.

The incisiveness and importance of Behne’s writings have long been recognized and continue to be relevant in both art and architectural history. His publications and ideas are frequently cited in studies of German Expressionist art, European Constructivism, the art of "New Objectivity" (*Neue Sachlichkeit*) or Post-Expressionism, working-class and communist art, and the group of artists labeled "Degenerate" during the Third Reich. Behne’s achievements as an architectural critic have been increasingly recognized since his most important book, *Der moderne Zweckbau* (1926) was first republished in 1964 by Ulrich Conrads. The still relevant, insightful analysis of the various functionalist positions circulating in the Behne’s book has been excerpted countless times, republished, translated into Italian, and even recently into English. Behne’s essay "Kunst, Handwerk, Technik," (Art, Craft and Technology, 1922) which appeared in the celebrated cultural review *Die neue Rundschau*, was translated in *Oppositions* (1980), as well as in the English version of Francesco Dal Co’s book *Figures*

---

88 The discovery of records related to the publishing of the important art periodical *Das Kunstblatt* in the archives of a successor company of the original publisher Gustav Kiepenheuer Verlag have led to a recent monograph of Paul Westheim’s work as an art critic; see Lutz Windhöfel, *Paul Westheim und Das Kunstblatt* (1995). In a similar manner, the discovery of archival material related to the publication of Walter Müller-Wulckow’s very popular "Blaue Bücher" in the company archives of the Karl Langewiesche Verlag led to another reprint edition of the books, and to a companion volume of historical analyses of the influence of the book, the career of Müller-Wulckow, and detailed evidence on the photography and photographic editing process that took place in the process of publishing the book in several editions; see Walter Müller-Wulckow, *Architektur 1900-1929 in Deutschland*, ed. Heinz-C. Köster (1999). These books had already been reprinted once, with a forward by Reyner Banham: Müller-Wulckow, *Architektur der Zwanziger Jahre in Deutschland*, intro. Reyner Banham (1972).
of Architecture and Thought. Eight of Behne’s other books and many of his most important essays have been republished or translated. New scholarship, including research developed for a symposium on Behne in Berlin in 1995, has begun to shed light on specific phases, influences, or themes in Behne’s work. Nonetheless, major gaps in


90 In the last decade, alone, twenty seven of his essays have been reprinted or substantial parts republished, his most famous book has been translated into English and Spanish, and been republished for a third time, while five other books have also been republished, either as facsimile reprints, or as part of a larger anthology. Further editions of Behne’s Der moderne Zweckbau (1926), already republished once in 1964, include Behne, 1923, La Construcción functional moderna (1994); Behne, Modern Functional Building (1996); and Behne, Der moderne Zweckbau (1998). Recent facsimile reprints include Behne, intro., Max Taut: Bauten und Pläne (1996); and Behne, intro., Berlin in Bildern (1998). The volume Behne, Schriften zur Kunst (1998), edited by Cornelia Briel, includes Behne’s Die Wiederkehr der Kunst (1919); Behne, Von Kunst zur Gestaltung (1925); and Behne, Entartete Kunst (1946). An anthology of Behne’s writings Behne, Architekturkritik in der Zeit und über der Zeit hinaus. Texte 1913-1946, ed. Haila Ochs (1994), contains thirty seven of Behne’s most important essays on architecture as well as his book Zur Neuen Kunst (1915, 1917); while the anthology Hartmann, Trotzdem Modern, contains fourteen of Behne’s essays and excerpts from three books. See also Bibliography I.

Behne’s Criticism Before World War I

This dissertation investigates the early career of Adolf Behne and the crucial role he played in defining and promoting the development of modern architecture before World War I. During this particularly vibrant cultural moment in Germany, Behne became one of the most perceptive and influential critics of his day, intent on finding alternatives to the elitism, materialism, and decadence of Wilhelmine society. In the course of his intense engagement with Socialism, Expressionism, and the German Werkbund, Behne slowly established a critical position about what modern architecture should be: a synthesis of fantasy and functionality. Although his attitudes about art, architecture, politics, and culture would continue to evolve over the course of his career, the foundations laid between 1910 and 1914 would in time establish him as one of the most perspicacious architecture critics of the twentieth century. By placing Behne’s work in a larger critical and artistic context, this study shows how Behne served as link between the producers of the new architecture and an ever-expanding consuming public by making use of the nascent modern media of the day.

Chapter 2, "Reform and Socialism: Behne’s Start as a Cultural Critic," investigates Behne’s training and earliest attempts to enter the dialogue of reform and cultural change in Germany. After several semesters of architecture school, Behne moved on to study art history at the University of Berlin, where he wrote a dissertation on medieval Tuscan architectural ornament that was completed in 1912. As early as 1910, he had begun publishing short reviews of art books and exhibits of Impressionist and Secessionist art in journals such as Friedrich Naumann’s Die Hilfe and others related to the cultural reform movement that had led to the formation of the German Werkbund several years earlier. The early reviews from 1910 to 1912 were for the most part unremarkable, but in them he young critic began to establish his positions on modern art, and also on the nature of architectural criticism and its relationship to both the artists and the general public.

Although Behne had hopes of entering academia after school, his increasingly Socialist politics and engagement with avant-garde art made that untenable. In 1912 he began teaching art appreciation courses in the public adult education schools (Volkshochschulen) of Berlin and began publishing in a variety of journals related to the cultural program of the Socialist party, including Arbeiter-Jugend (Worker-Youth) and Socialistische Monatshefte (Socialist Monthly). His texts for the Socialist press were primarily art appreciation pieces for working class youth in which he worked to convince his readers of the inspirational power of beautiful art, both for personal enrichment, and as a unique means of creating community among men. In the course
of this writing, his ideas moved ever farther from the more mainline cultural reform movement.

Chapter 3, "Encountering the Avant-Garde: Behne, Sturm, and Expressionist Culture," explores Behne’s turn to Expressionist art, especially the artists exhibiting in Herwarth Walden’s Sturm Gallery. The Sturm gallery and the related Der Sturm journal were the center of avant-garde art in Germany before World War I, a powerful force for promoting and disseminating a new vision of art that Behne quickly absorbed on his way to becoming one of Expressionism’s primary theoretical voices. He defined Expressionism as attitude that departed from the materialistic, observable world of Impressionism, and instead communicated a more communal and spiritual sense about human experience. Under this banner, Behne sought to unify all of Europe’s disparate avant-garde movements, including Italian Futurism and French Cubism.

Behne’s most important contribution to the discourse of modern art and architecture before the War was not the theoretical definition of a new art, but rather the expansion of an Idealist vision of what constituted Expressionist thought to other cultural and intellectual fields. Inspired by the theoretical biologist Jacob von Uexküll and others, Behne developed ideas he had taken from Kandinsky and Worringer, and proposed that fields as diverse as biology, art history, and literature could all be labeled "Expressionist." Seeking to overcome the materialism of the Impressionist mindset, he avoided discussions of formal style or materially-based criteria, in favor of more Idealist visions of form and spirit.
Chapter 4, "Inventing an Expressionist Architecture: Behne and Bruno Taut," investigates how Behne translated ideas he had explored in Expressionist art to define a new architecture. Upon meeting the younger Bruno Taut at the end of 1912, Behne invented the term "Expressionist Architecture" to define the unique mix of artistic fantasy and objective functionality, a mix which he had discerned in Taut’s almost unknown early architectural designs. Behne and Taut soon became fast friends, and by May of 1913 Behne was fully engaged in promoting and shaping Taut’s architecture and ideas.

Increasingly they began to collaborate on a new vision of architecture, realized most forcefully in the Glashaus (Glass Pavilion) for the 1914 Werkbund exhibition at Cologne. Although the Glashaus has long been interpreted as a collaborative product of Taut and the novelist Scheerbart, in this chapter I argue that the architect, novelist, and critic were equal partners using different tools to ply their trade and express architectural ideas. The poet Scheerbart acted as theorist. The architect Taut struggled to find physical, architectural forms corresponding to their shared vision for the future and engaged several artists to create pieces of the building. Through his criticism, Behne lent meaning and speculated on the architectural implications of the collaborative work. When architecture is understood not only as the physical artifact, but also as the meanings implicit in the design, the process that created it, as well as the ideas and discourse that results, then all three figures must be credited as architectural collaborators. Each of them—the architect, the visionary, and the critic—deserves equal
Chapter 5, "Cultural Socialism: Defining a Socialist Architecture," investigates the process by which Behne began to define what he called a "sociological approach" to architecture. Behne’s desire to unify art and life—a central tenet of both Expressionist art and the German Werkbund—gave rise to one of the fundamental paradoxes, indeed contradictions, in Behne’s criticism and the visions he promoted. On the one hand, Behne promoted a new art that he felt transcended the mundane, materialist society of Wilhelmine Germany, one that aspired to express the spirituality, artistry, and inner needs of an artist in the modern world. On the other hand, Behne also wrote passionately about the need to make art accessible to more people, to bring good art and an appreciation of beauty to the masses, which he considered a pre-requisite for the establishment of true modern art and architecture. In Behne’s criticism, art was to be simultaneously high and low, personal and popular, autonomous and socially relevant. At the heart of this apparent contradiction in Behne’s art criticism lay his political and social convictions, a position I call "cultural socialism": a belief in the principles of Socialism that focused on empowering the people, without engaging in bureaucratic party politics, which too often diffused or blocked the connection of the people to modern art.

Beginning in 1913, Behne increasingly turned to architecture as a means of resolving the perceived paradox of avant-garde autonomy and socialist functionalism in modern art. In Taut’s early apartment buildings and designs for the Falkenberg
Garden City, Behne identified a unique blend of simple functionality that expressed the basic needs of the common man, and a fantastic sense of artistry by the architect that could inspire and elevate the human spirit. Such an architecture, Behne theorized, had the potential to shape people and by extension, culture directly. In this way, art became a kind of politics that would eventually help lead man to a new society.

Chapter 6, "Balancing Rationality and Fantasy: Behne’s Critique of Industrial Architecture," continues the investigation of Behne’s attempt to forge a "socialist" or sociologically appropriate architecture for the common man, but focuses on Behne’s critical reaction to the ideas of the German Werkbund and its program of reforming industrial architecture. Beginning in 1913, Behne began to define industrial architecture as one of the primary means of renewing modern culture. He distinguished several contemporary approaches to the type, of which only the "Rationalist," was deemed appropriate. Exemplified by the factories of Hans Poelzig and exhibition pavilions of Bruno Taut, rationalist architecture for Behne synthesized a clear functional objectivity, or \textit{Sachlichkeit}, with an "inner necessity" and human approachability that raised the buildings from mere mechanisms to the level of organic artworks.

The theoretical speculations on industrial architecture he wrote set the stage for a major set of critical essays on the architecture of the Werkbund exhibition in Cologne during the summer of 1914, particularly in reviews of Taut’s Glashaus in comparison to Gropius’ model factory. Although Behne did not actually participate in the famous Werkbund debates that summer, his essays reveal a viewpoint very close to that of the
socialist artist Henry van de Velde, and vehemently opposed to the establishment view promoted by Muthesius. Behne advocated above all else that it should be artists, not businessmen, who lead the Werkbund out of the quagmire represented by the exhibit.

He passionately defended Taut’s Glashaus as the most artistically inspired pavilion, complete with all the newest materials of concrete and glass, but here used so much more objectively and according to the true principles of glass than the “block-like” glass of Gropius’ factory.

A brief epilogue investigates how the themes that Behne deployed in his criticism of the Werkbund exhibition buildings crystalized during the years of World War I and beyond, most importantly his famous book Der moderne Zweckbau (1926, The Modern Functional Building). It stresses that the intellectual groundwork for Behne’s rise to becoming one of the most respected and influential critics of art and architecture of Weimar Germany began before the war, in a very different artistic and political milieu.
II.
Reform and Socialism:
Behne’s Start as a Cultural Critic

"I am a Socialist from the depths of my soul; with my entire being. But not a practical Socialist!"
– Franz Marc, 1915

Behne and Germany’s Cultural Reform Movement

Behne’s earliest work as a freelance critic after 1910 immediately engaged him in two distinct branches of the larger effort to reform art, design, and culture in modern Germany. The first was the cultural reform movement centered around figures such as Friedrich Naumann, Eugen Diederichs, and others who had helped found the German Werkbund in 1907. The second was Germany’s Socialist party’s attempt to create a working-class culture. While enmeshed in these larger struggles for cultural reform, Behne also entered ongoing debates outlining the principles of modern art for the first time.

Behne began his studies with a pragmatic architecture education, and began his career as a critic writing for Naumann’s Die Hilfe and related journals. But as he began

to teach at several public adult-education schools (*Volkshochschulen*), he published ever more in Socialist newspapers and journals. He also became increasing involved with the experimental art of Berlin’s Expressionist avant-garde. He was a fan of early avant-garde theater, literature, and art. The newest art in Berlin seemed to confirm his teacher Heinrich Wölfflin’s ideas that all true art strove to be autonomous and ideal, rather than merely a representation or means of communicating.

As a young man still working to establish his position in the complex political climate of Wilhelmine Berlin that pitted conservative museum officials against radical gallery owners, for example, he was reluctant to link art and to specific political positions. Instead, Behne began to define an approach for his criticism that I call "cultural socialism," a form of Socialism concerned more with the individual fellow man and the sense of belonging to a common humanity, than with party politics and organized Socialism. With the rise of Behne’s increasing belief in cultural socialism he began abandon the more bourgeois art reform movements and to stake out a new critical position on modern art and architecture to which he would cling for the rest of his life--he sought to find a modern art and architecture which was based on the spiritual (though not religious) and functional needs of the individual modern man.

This chapter will investigate how Behne’s criticism and ideas on modern art moved gradually from the reform movement over to socialism, and how he began to define for himself the role of an art critic within the development of modern culture.
Architectural Training

Adolf Behne’s career opens in the fall of 1905 with four semesters of rather traditional architectural studies at the royal Berlin Polytechnic (Königliche Technische Hochschule) in the western suburb of Charlottenburg. By attending the elite university rather than a more vocationally oriented Baugewerkschule (building trade school) such as the one his father had attended in order to become a contractor, the nineteen-year-old Behne showed his thirst for academia and the world of high culture. The polytechnic was the most prestigious of many options in Germany’s exceptionally competitive and pluralistic architectural education system, as well as a prerequisite to any Prussian civil service career in architecture. Fellow students studying architecture in Charlottenburg during these years included Walter Gropius and the future architectural critics Walter Curt Behrendt, Gustav Adolf Platz, and Heinrich De Fries. However, besides Gropius, it produced few of the important future designers of Weimar Germany.

The Berlin Polytechnic had emerged with the merger of Schinkel’s Bauakademie (Building Academy) and the Gewerbeakademie (Applied Arts Academy) over the course of several years around 1880. It featured a traditional educational system that

\[ \text{2 For biographical sources, see chapter 1.} \]

\[ \text{3 Rosemarie Haag Bletter highlights four distinct degree programs for studying architecture in Germany at the beginning of the twentieth century: 1) the architecture departments in the art academies; 2) the elite polytechnics, including the conservative Berlin and the liberal Munich and Stuttgart institutions, which required graduation from the Gymnasium; 3) the apprenticeship system; 4) the Bauschule (building school) or Baugewerkschule (building trade school), which combined academic and apprenticeship training; Bletter, "Introduction," in Behne, Modern Functional Building (1996), pp. 15ff.} \]
emphasized memorization and rigorous day-long examinations. Gropius reported to
his mother that he was taking seventeen courses per semester, which kept him in class
literally all day. Behne later recalled taking courses in construction, stereotomy,


descriptive geometry, physics and chemistry; he also remembered vividly drawing
acanthus leaves and intricate shade and shadow exercises. As is still common in

German architectural education, and as was more common for students attending a

vocational Baugwerkschuleschule, Behne also participated in various practical building

internships, working on the construction sites of the Hohenzollern-Lyceum in

Schöneberg and of a locomotive shed in Grunewald. Here he likely drew on the


4 On architectural education in Wilhelmine Germany, see Erich Kontor,
"Architekten Ausbildung," in Eckehard Mai, Hans Pohl et al., Kunstpolitik und
Kunstförderung im Kaiserreich, Kunst im Wandel der Sozial- und
Wirtschaftsgeschichte (1982). On the origins of the Berlin Polytechnic in particular see
most recently Erich Kontor, "Königliche Bau-Akademie zu Berlin, die Institution," in

5 Gropius attended the Munich Polytechnic for a semester in summer 1903, and
the Berlin Polytechnic from fall 1905 to spring 1907 (Behne started in the fall of 1905).
Reginald Isaacs characterized the Berlin curriculum as time-consuming, pedantic and
boring; see Isaacs, Walter Gropius. Der Mensch und sein Werk (1983), pp. 66-68, 76-77;

6 Postcard with autobiographical synopsis, Behne to Walter Dexel, (Apr. 12,
1926), Dexel Papers, Archives for the History of Art, Getty Center for the History of Art

7 Postcard Behne to Dexel, April 12, 1926. Although he was little more than a
construction hand, Behne certainly influenced the design of many buildings through his
criticism, and, as shall be discussed, may even have had a direct hand in the design of a
few buildings by architects he championed. Sauer’s Allgemeines Künstler Lexikon vol.
8 (1994), p. 305, lists without a source that Behne participated in the design of the
waiting room of the Barmen train station (1912/13) and the Düsseldorf train station
(1932/36).
practical experience he had gained through his father’s work as a developer and builder of speculative apartment buildings in the working-class districts of eastern Berlin.

Although the polytechnic was one of the leading architectural schools in Germany, its conservative faculty included none of the more famous “father figures” of modern architecture such as Fritz Schumacher at Dresden, Theodor Fischer at Stuttgart (and after 1909 at Munich), Hans Poelzig at Breslau, Peter Behrens at the Kunstgewerbeschule (Applied Arts School) in Düsseldorf, or Hermann Billing at Karlsruhe. Nor did the faculty at the Berlin Polytechnic did not include any of the leading architects practicing in Berlin, such as Alfred Messel, Ludwig Hoffmann, Paul Wallot, Ernst von Ihne, Bruno Möhring, Cremer and Wolfenstein, or Bruno Schmitz. Instead, Behne took classes with the historian Richard Borrmann, the urbanist Joseph Brix, the Renaissance specialist Heinrich Strack who taught composition, Hugo Koch who taught construction, and the drawing instructors Günther-Naumburg and Julius Jacob.

University Art History

Behne and Gropius were soon deeply disappointed and bored by the pedantic and pragmatic education they were receiving. Both left their architectural school training in the spring of 1907. The more well-to-do Gropius began with an extended

---

8 Behne regularly cited the "father figures" Otto Wagner (in Vienna), Hendrik Petrus Berlage (in Amsterdam), and Alfred Messel (in Berlin), and occasionally referred to Auguste Perret and Louis Sullivan.
study trip to Spain and later gained practical experience working in Behrens’ architecture office. Behne moved to what he hoped would be a more intellectually expansive course of study in art history at the Friedrich-Wilhelm-Universität in central Berlin.⁹ In this prestigious department, Behne was inspired by the art historians Heinrich Wölfflin and Karl Frey, lectures by the sociologist Georg Simmel, the social philosopher Alois Riehl and the social historian Kurt Breysig.¹⁰ Fellow students at the university in these years included the future art historian Paul Frankl, and the future art critics Paul Westheim and Carl Einstein, who influenced the profession of modern art criticism and publishing.

Behne’s formal university training had a profound effect on his future career as a critic. His professors opened his eyes to the broadest possible range of scholarship and art: typologically, chronologically, geographically, and stylistically. He became equally interested in the complete spectrum of the fine and applied arts from all periods and from all over the world. In some of his earliest published essays he wrote for several Socialist youth magazines, for example, he drew casually from his studies of the entire range of human cultural production, alternating between famous works of art in

⁹ Gropius toured Spain from September 1907 - spring 1908, when he began working for Peter Behrens; see Isaacs, Walter Gropius (1991), pp. 78, 90.

¹⁰ Behne, "Lebenslauf," n.p. Behne also lists studies with the Assyria specialist Friedrich Delitzsch (1850-1922), the ancient Greek and Roman specialists Paul Herrmann (1859-1935) and Reinhard Kékulé von Stradonitz (1839-1911), Baroque specialist Werner Weisbach (1873-1953), art theoreticians Oskar Wulff (1864-1946) and Max Dessoir (1867-1947), and the young modernist Hans Hildebrandt (1878-1957), who would become an influential professor at Stuttgart and later would translate Le Corbusier’s books into German.
the public National Gallery, more ordinary applied arts recorded in obscure research
volumes, and even examples of popular material culture from the streets of Berlin. As
a self-proclaimed "people’s critic," Behne wrote for a wide array of audiences, including
workers, professionals, as well as the educated, intellectual elite. He adjusted his
writing style, the nature of his arguments, and even the content to accommodate his
targeted audiences, but the underlying goal of his work remained relatively constant: to
make the transformative power and beauty of all art appreciated by all, and to create a
new, modern art, and a new, more socialist society.

Following the example of his teacher Wölfflin, but also indicative of his own
populist stance, Behne increasingly focused on architecture, a more public form of art
than the paintings which were typically located in exclusive museums or galleries.
Gradually he made a transition from considering architecture as a pragmatic, technical
discipline to studying it as an art form that emphasized creativity, intuition, emotion,
and the human spirit. Although over the course of his career he would write more on
art than on architecture, he wrote his dissertation on architecture, and always came
back to architecture as the fundamental vehicle through which to understand broader
creative and cultural values. In his 1911 article "Peter Behrens and Tuscan

---

11 Wölfflin reinforced the intellectual connections of art history and architecture
in 1908 when he commissioned Peter Behrens to give drawing lessons to his art history
students at the University of Berlin so they might develop a more experiential approach
to understand form and space. Although Behne was studying at the university then,
there is no evidence he attended Behrens’ classes; see Tilmann Buddensieg, ed.,
Industriekultur: Peter Behrens und die AEG, 1907-1914 (1979), pp. 117, D292; translated
as Industriekultur: Peter Behrens and the AEG (1984), pp. 231, 499. Unless otherwise
noted, all references are to the original German edition.
Architecture of the 12th-Century” that developed out of his dissertation research, for example, he analyzed how two new exhibition pavilions by Behrens borrowed the overall forms and even some decorative motifs of Tuscan Gothic architecture, but also embodied a personal expression of architecture that was thoroughly modern.\(^\text{12}\)

In the course of his university studies Behne became familiar with the leading art historical debates of the day. He became involved in defining what is the nature of art its role in modern society. He read widely and historical ideas began to frame his views on contemporary art and architecture. Above all, he was caught up in heated debates about the autonomy of art. On the one hand, art could be interpreted as a product of a zeitgeist and the geographic, social, and cultural milieu in which it was made. This view was represented by the so-called "social historians of art," perhaps most famously in Behne’s day, by the French art historian Hippolyte Taine.\(^\text{13}\) In this view art was inevitably a product of its socio-cultural milieu, and thus a tool for social action; it could reflect reality as well as promote ideologies.

On the other hand, through his studies with Wölfflin, Behne also began to understand that art could be interpreted as an autonomous artifact within modern


society, one understood through formal analysis and intuition about the underlying "idea." This Neo-Kantian position had its origins in philosophical Idealism such as that professed by Kant and Arthur Schopenhauer, who insisted that the Idea was the central element in the creation of all great art. According to this anti-materialist stance, all pre-defined principles, rules, and other external material factors lead only to poor imitations, not great art. Art, they insisted, is about Idea.

This latter position found particular resonance in the culture wars of Wilhelmine Germany. As Frederic Schwartz has summarized in his discussions about the intellectual and philosophical arguments that were waged in the name of creating "Culture" in the face of bourgeois materialism in pre-war Germany, "Idealism" was a way that "bourgeois thinkers characterized their desire to break through the forms of technological Civilization to a transcendent Culture." In this view, art provided a

---


means to escape from the materialism of the day. In the wake of revolutionary activities after World War I, when Behne frequently wrote for a more consciously Socialist and anti-bourgeois audiences, he would interpret the very concept of "Idealism" as bourgeois, claiming that any attempt to separate art and real life was anti-Socialist and conservative.16

These opposing views of art led Behne to confront one of the most fundamental paradoxes of modernity: modern art could be simultaneously an autonomous object of the avant-garde and also politically and socially engaged for the masses.17 Behne’s early engagement with Germany’s cultural reform movement, his increasingly Socialist leanings, and his avid interests in contemporary culture provided a variety of potential answers. As Behne encountered the work of sociologists such as Simmel and Max


16 See Behne, "Sozialismus und Expressionismus," Die Freie Welt 3, no. 23 (June 9, 1921): 179-180; also republished in an unknown socialist journal, a copy of which exists in the Behne papers at the Bauhaus-Archiv.

17 Bushart discusses this opposition in reference to the postcard from Apr. 12, 1926 reference above that Behne wrote to his close friend Walter Dexel, in which he sketches out a brief autobiography, listing important dates. He titles his chronology, and thereby his life "Lenin der Kunstgeschichte" (The Lenin of Art History). Bushart too sees this as one of the most fundamental oppositions, though she at times focuses on the contradictions it elicited in Behne’s work, rather that the synthesis it inspired. Bushart claims that in the end Behne evaded the paradox by believing that art was neither autonomous, nor popular, but rather a larger metaphysical category, alongside politics and religion one of the primary sociological forces that structured human life and existence; see Bushart, "Kunst-Theoretikus," p. 11.
Weber, philosophers such as Alois Riehl and Friedrich Nietzsche, and economic and cultural theorists such as Werner Sombart, Friedrich Naumann, and Theodor Heuß, and later cultural theorists such as Walter Benjamin, Sigfried Kracauer and Ernst Bloch, he continued to expand and refine his initial positions on the proper role of art in society.  

Behne’s Dissertation

Inspired by the lectures of the Renaissance art historian Karl Frey, in 1910 Behne began his dissertation on the foreign influences on polychrome incrustations in the medieval churches of Pisa, Lucca, and Florence during the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries. His study built on the works of nineteenth-century German-speaking theorists such as Carl Bötticher, Gottfried Semper, Conrad Fiedler and Alois Riegl, but also of English writers such as John Ruskin and Owen Jones, all of whom studied ornamental traditions in order to arrive at a new understanding of the role of the applied arts in the development of architecture. Not straying far from the ideas of his professors, Behne’s dissertation was a conventional art historical investigation of style and formal influences, with no inklings of the modern art and architecture that would shortly capture his professional attention. In the course of his research, Behne

---

18 David Frisby, "Social Theory, the Metropolis, and Expressionism," in Timothy O. Benson, ed., Expressionist Utopias. Paradise, Metropolis, Architectural Fantasy (1994), pp. 88-111. See also Markus Bernauer, Die Ästhetik der Masse (1990);

19 See, for example, Deborah Schafter, The Order of Ornament, the Structure of Style. Theoretical Foundations of Modern Art and Architecture (2003).

20 Adolf Behne, "Der Inkrustationsstil in Toscana." Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Berlin (1912).
traveled to Tuscany in the fall of 1910, closely studying the cathedral complexes in Pisa and Florence. On his travels to and from Italy he later recalled visiting important landmarks, museums, and art collections in Frankfurt, Darmstadt, Strasbourg, Heidelberg, Colmar, Freiburg, Basel, and Munich. Behne submitted the dissertation that resulted, "Der Inkrustationsstil in Toscana," to the medievalist Professor Adolf Goldschmidt, and the young classical archaeologist Richard Delbrück. He defended it cum laude in July of 1912. [Figure 2.1]

In his dissertation Behne attributed the polychrome incrustation of Pisa to influences from Armenia and Syria-Mesopotamia. His thesis confirmed the controversial theories of the art historian Josef Strzygowski, and refuted the more common notion that the Tuscan style derived from Arab or Byzantine sources. Despite the role of foreign influences, however, Behne claimed that the overall system

---

21 Behne, "Inkrustation." The dissertation was published in 1912 by Emil Ebering. Paul Zucker’s review in Monatshefte für Kunstwissenschaft 13.2 (Oct. 1920): 327-328, implied it was also republished after World War I by the "Zirkel Verlag," which also published Bruno Taut’s magazine Frühlicht as well as other books on architecture. On the progressive Zirkel Verlag see Jaeger, Neue Werkkunst, p. 145. A further review of Behne’s dissertation was by F. Schillmann, in Mitteilungen aus der historischen Literatur N.F. 4 (1916): 78-79.


22 Later in his career, Behne would label Wölfflin as old fashioned compared to Strzygowski (1862-1941); Behne, "Kunstchronik," Die Welt am Abend 8, no. 76 (Mar. 31, 1930): B.2.
of Pisan incrustation was a new invention. In contrast to the better known mosaics in Florence, Pisa’s mosaics were "organic" in their comprehensiveness, they were tectonic and haptic, and all the pieces were subordinated to a higher idea. Unlike the Pisan incrustation, the Florentine mosaics lacked plasticity, serving merely as ornamental surface cladding (*Verkleidungsprinzip*), and were therefore Byzantine in inspiration. The value of Behne’s work, the young historian Paul Zucker later commented, was to show the complexity and inter-twined nature of multiple influences, conclusions that could only come through objective research not beholden to any particular theory or implication.²³

Although Behne is best known for his criticism and writing on modern art and architecture, he would continue to undertake traditional art historical investigations throughout his career. In tandem with his criticism, Behne wrote many general historical pieces that served as primers on "art appreciation" for lay audiences, including youth groups and Socialist working-class organizations. Art history also allowed him to engage in less controversial work than the radical criticism and commentary on modern art and architecture for which he became known. When Behne’s writing began to be censored by the Nazis, for example, Behne turned almost entirely to writing general art historical works. His popular *Die Stile Europas*, a layman’s guide to architectural styles, and *In Stein und Erz*, a survey of historical German sculpture, for example, were written for a working-class book-of-the-month

²³ Zucker review in *Monatshefte*. 
Earliest Articles: Reviews for Reform

In the spring of 1910, even before he finished his dissertation, Behne began publishing short reviews of art books and exhibits in popular magazines, literary reviews, and newspapers, and was soon able to support himself and his young family as a freelance writer. For the first two and a half years he wrote exclusively for two journals. *Die Hilfe* (Help), was the official publication of Friedrich Naumann’s progressive Christian-Social reform movement. The upstart, populist journal *Wissenschaftliche Rundschau* (Scientific Magazine), sought to bring the latest research and discoveries from all branches of knowledge to a wider, lay audience. Although


25 The only articles he wrote for other journals were the article on Behrens mentioned above and Behne, "Zwei Ausstellungen," *Der Sturm* 3, no. 107 (Apr. 1912): 19-20, an exhibition that launched Behne on a more progressive and avant-garde path. Friedrich Naumann founded *Die Hilfe* in 1894 as organ for his political movement; see Heinz-Diedrich Fischer, ed., *Deutsche Zeitschriften des 17. bis 20. Jahrhunderts* (1973); and Fritz Schlawe, *Literarische Zeitschriften 1910-1933* (1973). The journal had a circulation of 12,500 in 1912. The bi-monthly journal *Wissenschaftliche Rundschau*, to which Behne contributed 11 articles, beginning with vol. 1, no. 6 in Dec. 1910, was first published in Oct. 1911 by the Theodor Thomas Verlag in Leipzig. It was one of the many new journals founded in the late Wilhelmine era to capitalize on and promote the explosion of knowledge and the increased interest in all manner of science and "Wissenschaften" in this age of materialism. Its first subtitle was "Journal for the general continuing education of teachers," and changed to "Bi-monthly journal for advancements in all knowledge areas" by vol. 3. In 1913 the magazine was folded into
not affiliated with Naumann directly, the educational mission of the second journal was part of the larger cultural reform effort in Germany of which Naumann was a leading force.

The journals for which Behne first wrote and the cultural reform efforts to which they were connected held ideological appeal for the young critic. The early texts published in *Die Hilfe* and *Wissenschaftliche Rundschau* must be interpreted as part of the larger reform and public education effort promulgated by Naumann and others. The critic and his publishers sought to make art accessible and understood by a larger public. In hindsight, both were inherently conservative periodicals that advocated a top-down reform program for modern Germany that Behne eventually spurned as his interest turned increasingly to modern art and Socialism.

Naumann, a neo-liberal politician with strong social views, had worked tirelessly on many fronts to combine bourgeois and Socialist aspirations for creating a stronger Germany through reform and public education. He was the founder of the short-lived National Social party, through which he sought to establish an intermediate position between Germany’s increasingly powerful Social Democratic Party (SPD), and the more conservative right-wing parties associated with the Kaiser, the army, and the more popular *Die Umschau*, published by the Frankfurt publisher Bechhold, with the subtitle *Illustrated Weekly on Advancements in the Sciences and Technology*, to which Behne contributed 7 articles from 1913 to 1915 and in 1932.

---

aristocracy. A staunch nationalist, Naumann became a leading advocate of improving the status, joy, and qualitative output of the German worker. He pushed to revitalize German culture by exploiting the modern technology and industrial capitalism that had made Germany an economic and military force in a globalizing marketplace. In 1907 Nauman played a central role in founding the Werkbund. His belief in the social and political significance of aesthetic questions led him to promote the invention of new design ideas in order to represent German modernity. He sought more respect for the creative power of individual personalities and ultimately and ambitiously the German State. His journal Die Hilfe in which Behne published his first articles, was full of essays by academics, professionals, and politicians seeking to "help" educate and indoctrinate a less sophisticated public about the path to a reformed culture.

Behne also wrote for the neo-conservative publisher Eugen Diederichs, another important reformer and Werkbund founder. Diederichs was a spokesman for the quasi-mystical reform movement to which he gave the name "New Romanticism." In the face of the chaos of German modernization as well as the decadence of the Kaiser’s taste, they advocated looking to the past, especially the order of the bourgeois Biedermeier period, for clues on how to develop a more coherent society and culture. Although he advocated social and cultural reforms similar to those professed by

---

27 On Diederichs (1867-1930) and his publishing company, see the book catalogue Die Kulturbewegung Deutschlands im Jahre 1913 (1913); as well as Gary D. Stark, Entrepreneurs of Ideology: Neo-Conservative Publishers in Germany, 1890-1933 (1981), chapter 3, pp. 58-110; Campbell, German Werkbund, pp. 21; and George L. Mosse, Crisis of German Ideology (1964), pp. 52-63.
Naumann, he remained unconvinced that genuine reform could be politically mandated or implemented. Rather he dedicated himself to education and public indoctrination, promoting his more conservative ideology through publishing to a wide range of audiences.

Behne did not find opportunities to publish with Diederichs until 1913, but he went out of his way to praise the press and its books for their commitment to reform and education of a broad public, particularly on matters of the arts and culture.\(^{28}\) Diederichs himself had modeled many of his ideas on the conservative art and culture critic Ferdinand Avenarius, founder of the popular Der Kunstwart (Warden of the Arts) magazine, and of the Dürerbund, a populist national reform association to which Behne may have had ties.\(^{29}\) Similar to Avenarius and Naumann, Diederichs espoused an intriguing blend of nationalism, bourgeois conservatism, and reform-minded cultural policies. Seeking to counter the perceived materialism and cultural degeneration of Germany, they tended as easily towards a conservative "cultural despair" as to progressive reform.\(^{30}\) Each saw art and a harmonious culture as a key to national


\(^{29}\) Although this author has uncovered no evidence Behne belonged to the generally conservative Dürerbund, Bernd Lindner has suggested that Behne became a member of the Werkbund in 1913 through his affiliations with the Dürerbund; Lindner, "Mut machen zu Phantasie und Sachlichkeit," Bildende Kunst 33, no. 7 (1985): 292. In 1917 Behne published a guide to the Berlin suburb of Oranienburg as part of the Flugschriften of the Dürerbund.

\(^{30}\) The literature on German "cultural despair" is vast. See most importantly
renewal and strength. Only by returning to the values and aesthetics of a more harmonious past could Germany establish herself as a power among the nations of the world.

Generally short and unremarkable, Behne’s early book and exhibit reviews in the reform-oriented journals are key to understanding his earliest positions on modern art, as well as his critical direction. Often published in small print in the back pages of the journals and easy for contemporaries and historians alike to overlook, their inclusion was an argument for the cultural currency of fine art within this reform movement.31 Through education, Behne and his publishers sought to raise the awareness of their readers of a common cultural heritage, and simultaneously to reform the cultural institutions and publications that were not appropriately or effectively contributing to this campaign.

Behne’s very first article in Die Hilfe, on the landscape painter Otto Reininger, was the beginning of a series of sympathetic reviews that he wrote on established Impressionist painters from the Berlin Secession such as Lovis Corinth, Max Klinger,


31 Of the 161 publications found so far that Behne wrote before 1915, only 71 were included in the extensive bibliography compiled by Haila Ochs in Behne, Architekturkritik in der Zeit und über der Zeit hinaus. Texte 1913-1946, ed. Haila Ochs (1994); and even Bushart’s very complete bibliography missed 35 early essays, including many of the reviews in the Wissenschaftliche Rundschau discussed below; see the notes on Bushart’s unpublished bibliography in the bibliography at the end of this dissertation.
Max Slevogt, Ludwig von Hofmann, and Max Liebermann. These salon artists were popular with collectors and museums, and well-known to the general public from fawning press coverage. The paintings, however, fit into Naumann’s reform program by promoting a naturalist, more accessible school of painting in opposition to the Kaiser’s formal, academic and historicist taste. Behne’s descriptive texts were not yet pieces of criticism. Taking cues from his teacher Wölfflin, as well as the Impressionist techniques and subjects themselves, Behne highlighted especially the formal, painterly aspects of the art works without tackling their cultural implications. Through this purely formal approach he began to identify increasingly with ever younger, more modern and abstract artists, including artists associated with Expressionism whom he would soon champion.

In addition to the reviews of individual artists and exhibitions, Behne write reviews of the published media through which art reached the public: museum catalogues, art books, art journals, and reproductions of art. Like Wölfflin, Behne felt contemporary museum catalogues were often useless compilations of material facts, meant more for the curator than for the lay public. Both art historians insisted that catalogues should instead guide viewers through collections and encourage individual exploration, excitement, and a true understanding of the exhibited art, rather than just

---

the accumulation of facts. Wölfflin had called for catalogues with better descriptive material to guide the viewers' eyes towards greater understanding, while Behne in articles such as "The Museum Catalogue: Principles of a Popular Form" and "An Educational Museum" from 1910 urged curators to devise a catalogue format that would still highlight the best art works, but would avoid the tunnel vision that focused only on masterpieces and ignored lesser or peripheral works of art.³³ According to Behne, such catalogues allowed the individual viewer to determine their own path through the collection and foster their own personal appreciation and understanding of each piece.

Behne's book reviews of art books contained similar critiques. He was reassured by the fact that fewer dilettantes were writing about art, but felt that too much of the recent literature on art focused only on easily understood material such as the history, context, and subject matter of the art piece. These factual elements, once revealed, were easily and objectively understood by all. Such art history seemed to be a mere ordering of art works or biographies of artists, containing scholarship that was primarily "factual,

³³ Heinrich Wölfflin, "Über Galeriekataloge," Kunst und Künstler 6, no. 2 (Nov. 1907): 51-54; and Behne, "Der Museumskatalog. Prinzipien einer populären Abfassung," Die Hilfe 16, no. 17 (May 1, 1910): 272-274; expanded in Behne, "Ein erzieherisches Museum," Die Hilfe 16, no. 52 (Dec. 31, 1910): 835-836; and Adolf Bruno [pseud. of Adolf Behne], "Einführung in den Museumskatalog," Wissenschaftliche Rundschau 1, no. 18 (June 15, 1911): 416-419. As with most critics, Behne frequently published similar ideas and even reused entire passages or occasionally entire articles, in other venues. Although subsequent articles often included greatly revised ideas, more often than not the changes were subtle, the republishing done primarily to get the ideas to broader audiences, and to bring in more money, as Behne lived off of his free-lance writing.
Behne claimed that historians such as Taine, who focused primarily on the surrounding "cultural milieu" and the iconography of art, failed to tackle the true inner values of art. Essays on art in most popular journals, he continued, merely described what could be seen or how it deviated from nature, usually in florid prose, with overly sentimental judgements. He complained that the style and content was meant more to sell papers than to understand the art.

Behne considered most books on art and art history, including the standard surveys by Anton Springer and Wilhelm Lübke, inadequate and inappropriate for the average reader. The texts transmitted little true understanding or feelings to the layman. Behne suggested instead books such as Salomon Reinach’s Allgemeine Kunstgeschichte, Julius Meier-Graefe’s books introducing German audiences to the art of Cézanne and Van Gogh (whose art Behne called the path to the future), and even

34 Wölfflin too had complained of the lackluster state of art history, see his "Über kunsthistorische Verbildung," Neue Rundschau 2 (1909): 275; and the closely related Adolf Bruno, [pseud. of Adolf Behne], "Populäre Kunstwissenschaft," Wissenschaftliche Rundschau 1, no. 11 (Mar. 1, 1911): 248.

35 Behne alluded to Taine’s theory as early as his article "Populäre Kunstwissenschaft," and reviewed Taine’s book in Behne, "Kunstwissenschaftliche Neuerscheinungen," (Oct. 1, 1912). Behne also included Wilhelm Hausenstein’s "sozialästhetisch" approach as an example of an "Impressionist" art history focused on cultural milieu rather than the essence of art.

Paul Schultze-Naumburg’s *Kulturarbeiten*, which despite being a bit doctrinaire, he considered "educational and didactic," and therefore useful for Naumann’s reform program.37

In articles such as "Popular Art Books," and "Domestic Art Collections: Helpful Hints" from early 1912, Behne insisted that all genuine understanding of art required intense visual investigation. Although he urged his readers to inspect the original art works, he also called for better reproductions of art to overcome the inconvenience and expense that prohibited a broader public from visiting museums.38 Photography and graphic reproductions of art in journals, books, and individual prints had been a much discussed area of concern for German critics since before the turn-of-the-century, when technical reproduction processes, especially photographs of art works, began to make mass reproduction of art more affordable and widespread.39 He praised the museum catalogue of Berlin’s National Gallery for providing small photographic reproductions


of all paintings so that a viewer might orient him or herself more readily. The photographs made vague verbal descriptions unnecessary, and allowed curators in their written sections to focus on guiding the viewer’s eye to the most important elements.

Behne noted that the technical process of publishing photos had made great advances, but that reproductions differed from the original as much as photos of people differed from their personality. He lamented that much valuable detail about the process of artistic creation, including layers of paint and individual brushstrokes, was lost in most reproductions. Changing the scale, proportions, and framing of the original paintings were too often changed drastically merely to suit publishing formats, often making the art unrecognizable. Such differences between original and reproduction also made viewers lazy, Behne surmized. Original paintings were no longer studied and analyzed in depth. Instead, art museum visitors merely "matched" what they saw to reproductions they knew.

Behne also noted in the 1912 articles that as reproduction quality and quantity had increased, the quality of the accompanying art historical texts had gradually diminished. Authors and publishers realized that many art books were selling primarily because of illustrations, not for their texts. In this period of the proliferating media, which Behne called the "age of reproduction" in 1917, images and reproductions were replacing originals and true understanding. Instead of buying a book with two

---

40 In 1917 Behne published an essay on art in the "age of reproduction," in the short-lived Expressionist journal Marsyas, in which he repeated many of these same
hundred illustrations and poor texts, Behne suggested to his readers that they use their money to buy a few big, well-made reproductions and study them intensely, or better yet, spend more time in museums examining the originals.41

As a "people's critic," an intermediary between art and the public, Behne was as much concerned with the original art as with reproductions, museum catalogues, art books, and magazines that allowed art to be disseminated more widely. Through these publications, art became part of the wider public discourse and had the possibility of effecting change in other areas such as politics, education, or the urban context. The conditions under which art was viewed, the quality of art reproductions, and the effectiveness of various media to transmit authentic images were vital parts of the effort to educate people and reform German culture and society at large.

The Nature of Criticism: Seeking the Scholar-Critic

arguments he had made in articles from 1910-1912; Behne, "Das reproduktive Zeitalter," Marsyas no. 2 (Nov./Dec. 1917): 219-226. Arnd Bohm has argued that Behne’s 1917 essay was the unacknowledged source of Walter Benjamin’s much more famous essay "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," in Illuminations, ed. Hannah Arendt (1968, orig. 1936); see Bohm, "Artful Reproduction: Benjamin’s Appropriation of Adolf Behne’s ‘Das reproduktive Zeitalter’ in the Kunstwerk Essay," The Germanic Review 68, no. 4 (1993): 146-155. Although Bohm offers a convincing case for crediting Behne, as the previous note indicates, these ideas were already circulating widely in the late nineteenth century. See Lewis, Art for All?, on the discussion about reproductions in the nineteenth century; and Fritzsche, Reading Berlin 1900 (1996), on the proliferating media and its effects on culture around 1900.

41 Behne, "Populäre Kunstbücher." There were many companies that produced reproductions of art works. In the early 1920s, Behne himself would be responsible for publishing a series of reproductions with the Photographische Gesellschaft in Berlin from; see Behne, ed., Der Sieg der Farbe. Die entscheidende Zeit unserer Malerei in 40 Farbenlichtdrucken (1920-1925).
Through these early reviews from 1910 to 1912, Behne developed his personal conception about what constituted the essence of art and what constituted good criticism. In a complex, non-linear evolution, Behne moved from more objective reporting of facts, to more subjective interpretations and empathetic translations of the art to his audience. His essays struggled with what goals a critic should have, what qualities a good critic needed to have, and what relationship a critic was to maintain with the artist as well as with the public that viewed art or read about it in the press. In his struggle to define the nature of art criticism Behne delved into a minefield of conflicting ideas that had been discussed widely by artists, critics, and the press since the beginnings of modern art. Beth Irwin Lewis, in her recent analysis of Germany’s art scene in the last decades of the nineteenth century, dealt extensively with the heated debate about the nature of criticism just before Behne began his career in 1910. With evidence taken primarily from art journals of the period, Lewis described the growing split between the public and the dangerously inter-dependent artists and critics. Journals from 1870 to 1910 reveal how the art-viewing public went from being heralded as democratic patrons of national art, to being demonized by critics and artists as an irresponsible, alienated "rabble" that did not understand what it was to be an artist or the true essence of art.

At the turn-of-the-century, there was great debate among critics about who was responsible for this rift that affected not only the art market, but also the nation’s pride.

---

and cultural reputation. Was it the artists, who were creating ever more modern and unfamiliar art? Were artists painting only for an elite—either the conservative academics or the liberal patrons who purchased the newest artistic experiments—and unwilling to respond to the artistic desires of the public? Or was it the public, who in the eyes of critics and artists, were too uneducated, uncultured, unartistic, stubborn, or conservative to accept anything new? Or was it the critics? Were critics too defensive of the artists? Were they too beholden to a specific art-buying clientele? Were they merely intent on creating controversy and selling newspapers? Lewis describes how conservative nineteenth-century writers such as Friedrich Pecht, Adolf Rosenberg, and Ludwig Pietsch categorically refused to sanction or embrace anything new, intent on defending the academy, its "star" artists, and the status quo. As Lewis explains, younger, more progressive critics such as Meier-Graefe, and Schultze-Naumburg, whose work Behne lauded, worked tirelessly to explain the new art to the people in a more comprehensible way. Despite the best efforts of these and other critics, however, modern art remained strange to the general public, out of reach emotionally and culturally foreign. It would be up to Behne’s generation to close this divide.

In the introduction to his analysis of the effect of criticism on the work of Kandinsky and Klee, Mark Roskill analyzes how the gap between artists and the public was gradually closed in the years before World War I, just as Behne was beginning his career as a critic.\footnote{Mark Roskill, "On the Role of Criticism in the Development of Modern Art," Klee, Kandinsky and the Thought of their Time (1992), pp.1-27.} Roskill documents the changing nature of art criticism as it moved
from being a primarily descriptive reporting of facts during the late nineteenth century, to becoming ever more evaluative and opinionated in the twentieth century. This change, Roskill argues, had been motivated by the need to justify modern art’s worthiness of being included in the salons after the emergence of a consolidated avant-garde in the 1880s. Roskill shows how critics moved progressively further away from merely enumerating or explicating what the artist had done, to "highlighting," "mediating," and "evaluating" the art work. Critics increasingly sought to explain the artist’s intentions and values, such as an interest in new formal techniques such as wild color or representational styles such as primitivism. In addition, critics increasingly offered opinions on the place of specific artworks within larger social and cultural contexts, as well as relationships to artistic "language." In his well-known biography of Van Gogh, for example, Meier-Graefe took account of the social context in which the French artist worked, and in the process made the evaluation relative to this context.

As a result, art moved from being defined primarily as a physical object of culture that could only be objectively described according to academic and elite formal values, to

44 Roskill, Klee, Kandinsky, pp. 1-5.

being the product of a particular milieu and the personal context of the artist, which made the artists more approachable to the public.

In Germany this trend of highlighting the subjective creativity and invisible forces shaping art was continued both by the formal analysis of Heinrich Wölfflin and the psychologically-based criticism of Wilhelm Worringer, both of whom had a profound impact on Behne at the start of his career.\(^{46}\) By avoiding discussion of the subject matter and focusing instead on form, Wölfflin highlighted the artistic processes and the artistic decisions that went into the artwork. According to Roskill, a "psychological mode of criticism" by writers such as Worringer, interpreted art works according to broad cultural impulses that expressed themselves in the form of psychological or spiritual forces. They stressed that creativity derived from inner personality and temperament, not any outward or objective standards.\(^{47}\)

Kandinsky, an artist influenced by these Wölfflin and Worringer, summarized the trends in criticism when he professed that the ideal critic is one who would "try to feel the inner effect of this or that form, and then communicate to the public in an expressive way the totality of his experience."\(^{48}\) As will be discussed in the next chapter, this liberating push to focus on subjective interpretation of the art by critics and

\(^{46}\) On Wölfflin’s impact on Behne see above; on Worringer’s impact see chapter 3.

\(^{47}\) Roskill, Klee, Kandinsky, p. 13.

art writers would have a tremendous impact both on the development of artistic
Expressionism, and on the public’s embrace of the new art. Behne’s early career would
in large part be played out in the context of these changes in the nature of art criticism.

In articles such as "About the Art Writer" from 1913, Behne insisted that writing
on art was particularly tricky, even unique. Through publications such as
Wissenschaftliche Rundschau, specialized knowledge from all fields was becoming
increasingly accessible to an ever wider audience. But art criticism required more than
a clear explanation of facts. According to Behne, it required an emotional engagement
(\textit{empfinden}) with the art work, which was much more difficult to achieve.

In Behne’s eyes few writers had the qualifications necessary to act as good
critics. In his article "The Artist as Art Critic," he claimed that until recently artists
themselves--usually second-rate ones--had been the primary art critics of their day.
Behne felt this led to wholly biased evaluations of limited scope, completely
inappropriate for an overall appreciation of art. A good critic, Behne insisted, should
aspire to be unbiased, broadly educated, and trained to be able to evaluate a broad
range of art. He speculated the like the general public, even rigorously trained art
historians tended to be biased in favor of older, more conventional art. They resisted

\footnote{Behne, "Kunstliteratur," \textit{Die Hilfe 18}, no. 30 (July 25, 1912): 477; Behne, "Vom
Kunstschriftsteller," \textit{Kunstgewerbeblatt} N.F. 24, no. 8 (May 1913): 154.}

\footnote{Behne, "Der Künstler als Kunstkritiker," \textit{Hamburger Schifffarts-Zeitung}, no.
202 (Aug. 29, 1913): 13; Behne, "Fortschritte in der Kunstkritik," \textit{Kunstgewerbeblatt} 24,
no. 3 (Dec. 1912): 46. On the changing nature of art criticism and the constant battle in
the nineteenth century between artists and their critics claims for authority, see B.I.
Lewis, \textit{Art for All}; also Mark Roskill, \textit{Klee, Kandinsky, and the Thought of their Time}
(1992).}
the new and more challenging contemporary art, and were thus unqualified to serve as critics.\footnote{51}

Reflecting back on this period later in his career, Behne claimed that in the vibrant art market of Wilhelmine Berlin, when people still visited galleries and bought art in vast quantities, critics served primarily as taste-makers for the constituent readers of their particular newspaper.\footnote{52} Readers sought to get the critics’ opinions after each art opening in order to have the "correct" opinion for discussion in entrenched social circles. The public demanded extensive coverage, and knew where to find it: unter dem strich (under the line), the colloquial though literal location in most traditional German newspapers for the feuilleton section.\footnote{53} Much like the rest of the newspaper, the reporting by art critics was meant to transmit the latest "news" on particular shows, paintings, or artists, with an emphasis on speedy reporting so the discerning public could be "in the know." But in this scenario critics were not the leaders that Behne wanted them to be. They did not play a significant role in discovering or selecting the successful artists—that was done by gallery owners and juries of the various art


\footnote{53} Behne, "Über Kunstkritik," Sozialistische Monatshefte. The feuilleton is the cultural section of German newspapers, even today. It is akin, perhaps, to our "Arts and Leisure" section, though it covers a broader range of culture, criticism, and observation. The feuilleton can be readily found either in its own section, or "under the line," literally placed under a heavy horizontal line in the newspaper, usually on the bottom of the second or third page of each edition of the daily newspapers.
organizations which hosted the exhibits.

The *feuilletonists*, or journalists who wrote on all aspects of culture in Germany’s newspapers but had little technical training in art history, were the source of great contempt in the early reform movement, as well as in avant-garde Expressionist circles. In assessing the state of Germany’s applied arts in 1907, for example, Hermann Muthesius, criticized generalist journalists for promoting poor taste and poor quality in art and the applied arts. He called for more critics who were trained in or were professionally knowledgeable about architecture to replace the droves of amateur critics who too often knew little about the field. Muthesius urged that educated critics work specifically in the mass circulation media, not only in professional journals, so as to have the maximum possible impact on the public and thereby help to reform culture.

In his 1912 article "Advancements in Art Criticism," Behne called somewhat self-servingly for "a new type of critic . . . the artistically educated scholar-critic." These scholar-critics, he argued, were to possess not only an understanding and feeling for true art, but also the ability to relay it to others effectively. They should be without biases against new or old art. They need not be formally trained in art history, he admitted, though in order to understand the artistic problem with which each artist is engaged, they needed to have seen and experienced the broadest possible range of art

---


55 "Wenn also die Jugend nicht im Dunkeln bleiben, nicht das Schicksal der meisten Erneurer teilen soll, die auf einer anderen Welt schufen, so muß ein anderer Typus des Kritikers in die Bresche springen: der kunstwissenschaftlich gebildete Kritiker"; Behne, "Fortschritte in der Kunstkritik," (1912), p. 50.
and have a comprehensive overview of art’s development. The scholar-critics should be able to make connections between even the most distant problems, ideas, and solutions in art works. Appropriate subjects for these professional critics, Behne argued, would be the "presentation of the process of artistic creation of an artwork, its significant elements, explanation of the artistic achievement, mention of the inner growth of the artist, and expressing why an artists’ mature works exceeded his early work."56

For Behne, the focus of good criticism was to be less on deciphering the iconography and more on exploring the psychic expressions of the artwork. Above all, he declared, the good critic must have a "feel for quality" (Qualitätsgefühl)—though he admitted this was a rare talent. Critics needed both to act in concert with the artist as translators, intermediaries, and illuminators of the artists’ creativity and intentions, and to communicate the experience effectively to the public.57 The role, indeed the responsibility of any person writing or publishing about art, was to reveal and relay the quality of the artistry that could be felt in the presence of the original work.

Following the prevailing trends towards more subjective criticism described by Lewis and Roskill, Behne began to emphasize "feeling" as the primary attributes of a


good critic. Much as the mere words of an Ibsen play or the mere notes of Beethoven’s “Eroica” alone did not constitute the essence of their artistry, Behne insisted in his 1911 essay "Popular Art History" that the essence of art lay beyond the intellect, in the realm of feeling and cosmic understanding. These feelings, he insisted, were not the individual and mostly arbitrary "associations" that all the arts inevitably bring up, different in each person. Rather they were a vague but objective "artistry" (das Künstlerische) that every person, if properly trained, could observe in a true work of art. Subjectivity was not a substitute for education, but rather an outgrowth of it. Yet unlike "taste," it was not something accessible only to those with the requisite experience and social class. Although objective and universal, such an understanding of art was at its root irrational and intuitive, part of a larger trend in turn-of-the-century conception of art and culture celebrated in the writings of Nietzsche and Bergson, whom Behne quoted often.

Behne struggled to find a comfortable position. In a 1914 article "Goethe and Nietzsche on Popular Knowledge," published in the minor literary journal Die Lese in Stuttgart, Behne picked up on Muthesius’ earlier criticism of feuilleton writers. Citing the words of Nietzsche, who had great contempt for the common masses, Behne argued that professional art critics and theorists were better qualified than lay ones to judge and write about art for the public, even if their tone and their training limited their

---

58 Behne, "Populäre Kunstwissenschaft," (Mar. 1911), p. 247, on this and the following.
ability to communicate with the people on their own level. A few years later, Behne pulled back from this elitist defense of the expert when he made distinctions between the critic, the aesthete, and the historian. An expert historian, Behne now maintained, sought facts (Kenntnisse); an aesthete revealed underlying principles (Erkenntnisse); while a good critic issued judgements (Bekenntnisse), which was the hardest of all.

Behne was especially cautious about the role of overly professional writers in the technical field of architecture. Architects such as Muthesius often insisted that only "experts" such as trained engineers and schooled architects write about architecture. But Behne argued ever more fervently that such narrow-minded "experts" (Fachmänner) too often expressed the attitude that architecture was primarily about material technique and stylistic consistency. They emphasized facts that could be learned, rather than the inner, spiritual dimensions through which Behne defined genuine art. In articles such as "The Call for Experts," Behne argued that these professionals too easily rejected any sort of metaphysical conception of art, and discounted the role of empathy and individual creativity in understanding art movements and in defining public taste.

---


61 Behne, "Der Schrei nach dem Fachmann," Die Weissen Blätter 2, no. 7 (July 1915): 935-937. Behne's arguments against the Fachmann would become one of the primary theoretical principles of the Arbeitsrat für Kunst after World War I. Seeking to
The underlying themes in these early articles would set the stage for Behne’s post-war career and mission in the art world: to publicize and highlight good art, to provide better art scholarship and writings enabling viewers to form their own opinions and personal understanding of art, and to make good art more accessible to a broader range of the lay public. From the beginning of his career, Behne turned his role as an art critic into a personal mission. He saw himself as a critic working in the service of the public, especially the working class, with which he empathized. Bringing good art to a wide populace, especially those who had so little access to art, was both his career and social cause. Although he always had strong opinions on what was good or bad, and he certainly promoted specific artists with great fervor throughout his career, Behne tried to avoid becoming a long-term apologist or propagandist for a particular artist of movement. Over the course of his career, as his values and assessment of social conditions changed, his allegiances to artists and architects would escape the strictures of government ministries, state run museums, and even established gallery owners, the Arbeitsrat had no entry requirements, encouraged non-conventional and utopian forms of expression, and solicited "unknown" and non-artists such as workers and children to submit work for exhibitions and publications. On the Arbeitsrat see Regine Prange, "Architekturphantasie ohne Architektur? Der Arbeitsrat für Kunst und seine Ausstellungen," in Joseph Paul Kleihues and Thorsten Scheer et al., eds., Stadt der Architektur der Stadt, Berlin 1900-2000 (2000), pp. 93-103; the utopian correspondence of Bruno Taut and "Crystal Chain" colleagues in Iain Boyd Whyte and Romana Scheiner, eds., Die Briefe der Gläsernen Kette (1986); translated as The Crystal Chain Letters: Architectural Fantasies by Bruno Taut and his Circle (1985); Joan Ockman, "Reinventing Jefim Golyscheff: Lives of a Minor Modernist," Assemblage, no. 11 (1990): 70-106; and Joan Weinstein, The End of Expressionism (1990).

Socialism and Professional Aspirations

Hopes for Academia

Despite Behne’s successful start as a freelance critic, it may not have been his first career choice. When Behne completed his dissertation in 1912, he sent a copy to Wilhelm von Bode, the influential, newly appointed head of the Berlin museums. He was, presumably, looking to start a stable career in the museum world. But positions in museums, government agencies, or universities were notoriously difficult to obtain in Germany. Despite the innovative research and writing that made German scholars world famous in many fields, the academic community was known for its conservative social and political ways, including underlying anti-Socialist and anti-Semitic sentiments. Although Behne’s actual party affiliations, especially those before 1919, are unclear, his growing ties to the Socialist party and an increasing fascination with

---

63 Behne, letter to Wilhelm von Bode (Sept. 28, 1912), #265, Nachlaß Bode, Zentralarchiv, Nationalgalerie Berlin; also excerpted in Bushart, "Kunst-Theoreticus," p. 69n11. Later in his career, Behne became extremely critical of Bode and his lack of interest for adding modern art to the museum collections. See, for example, Behne, "Von Bode," Die Weltbühne 22.1, no. 3 (Jan. 19, 1926): 116-117.

contemporary cultural developments may have hampered his chances for gaining an academic position or of being employed in the aristocratic, conservative Wilhelmine civil service.\footnote{One anecdote is revealing: when the Kaiser read a sympathetic review of a Socialist party rally in Hamburg by the academic Leo Arens, Wilhelm immediately had the critic fired, ending his telegram: "I do not tolerate Socialists among my officials, not even amongst the teachers of our youth at the Royal College"; cited in Mattenklott, "Universität und gelehrtes Leben," p. 155.}

But the antagonism of the establishment and Socialists could go both ways. The prominent Socialist art critic and card-carrying SPD member Wilhelm Hausenstein, for example, deliberately rejected a prestigious academic career in the state’s historical commission in favor of a positions in Munich \textit{Volkshochschulen} in 1907. Trained in philosophy, history and economics, and only briefly art history, Hausenstein taught courses in history, the classic texts of Socialism, and eventually art for ten years at both Munich’s municipal \textit{Volkshochschule} and in the "Vorwärts" worker education association run jointly by trade unions and the Socialist party. He realized early on that being a staunch Socialist was incompatible with being a German academic before World War I, and turned down his a government post with the explanation: "I am, after all, a Socialist, and if I read Prussian history as Eisner did, my position in the long term is untenable. . . . I have come to recognize what is in me and what will be expressed, and I see no other means of existence other than a writer or journalist."\footnote{Wilhelm Hausenstein, letter to Theodor Heuß (May 15, 1907), reprinted in Hellmut H. Rennert, ed., \textit{Wilhelm Hausenstein, Ausgewählte Briefe 1904-1907} (1999); also in Walter Migge, ed., \textit{Wilhelm Hausenstein. Wege eines Europäers} (1967), p. 41; and cited in Bushart, "Kunst-Theoretikus," p. 14. See also Wilhelm Hausenstein, "Arbeiter-Bildungsbewegung," under the rubric "Geistige Bewegung" in \textit{Sozialistische}
German civil service, it seems, did not mix.

If academia seemed stuffy and closed, the publishing industry, in its zealous desire to report on the vibrant cultural life of Berlin, was open to all able critics. But Behne’s move from his university studies to the milieu of the popular press and its ideological implications did not come without some reservations. In many of his earliest articles Behne chose to write using the pseudonym "Adolf Bruno" (his first and middle names). Perhaps he was evincing a simple lack of confidence in his first writings. Or, more likely, in his quest to seek an official government position, he was seeking to disassociate himself from overly popular or Socialist journals.

Modern Art and Politics in Wilhelmine Germany


Some have even claimed that the proliferation of newspapers and the press meant that they would take anyone who could write, and let the public decide who should be retained.

See, for example, Adolf Bruno [pseud. of Adolf Behne], "Populäre Kunstwissenschaft," Wissenschaftliche Rundschau 1, no. 11 (Mar. 1, 1911): 247-250. Based on the bibliography assembled so far for Behne, there is no regular pattern as to when Behne used the pseudonym "Adolf Bruno." He definitely used it for his first four articles in Wissenschaftliche Rundschau (Dec. 1910 - June 1911); for fifteen of his first seventeen articles in the Socialist youth magazine Arbeiter-Jugend (June 1912 - Jan. 1915); for the one article he is known to have written before World War I in the Socialist daily Vorwärts (July 1913); for the fourth of sixteen articles he wrote for the popular illustrated journal Zeit im Bild (Feb. 1914); and possibly four more short notes signed only "A.Br." He ended the practice, however in 1918, at the end of World War I, when he fully embraced both the avant-garde and the ideology of Socialism without reservation.
Art and politics were particularly enmeshed in German society at the beginning of the twentieth century. Germany’s so-called *Sonderweg* (unique path) to democracy had led its middle class to turn to culture and the arts rather than politics as the primary means of expressing their ideas and challenging the nobility’s hold on power.\(^6^9\) The clash between bourgeois art and aristocratic politics was provoked from many sides by politicians, artists, and the press. From the very highest levels of government, particularly in Prussia and Berlin, art was part of state policy and a vision for the new German nation.

As Behne noted in his 1913 essay "The Kaiser and Art," published in a special issue of Diederichs’ *Die Tat* celebrating the 25\(^{th}\) anniversary of Kaiser Wilhelm’s rule, the Kaiser himself had dreamed of leading Germany into a great flowering of the arts and with it to international acclaim.\(^7^0\) But according to Behne, the crown had failed miserably to advance the arts. Behne railed against Wilhelm’s oppressive artistic policy, his complete incompetence to judge and lead artists, and the negative influence

\(^{6^9}\) Germany’s path to modernity has been described as a "*Sonderweg," in large part as a means of explaining how unique aspects of Germany’s modern culture eventually led to the rise of National Socialism, with politics and democracy a large part of these studies. The prefix *Sonder* (special) was also part of the artistic debates around Expressionism before World War I, for example Kurt Gerstenberg, *Deutsche Sondergotik: eine Untersuchung über das Wesen der deutschen Baukunst im späten Mittelalter* (1913), which sought to define special characteristic of the Gothic as German.

the emperor had on the entire German art world. By labeling all modern artists "gutter-artists" (*Rinnsteinkünstler*), Behne felt that Wilhelm had alienated himself, and with it much of German culture, from "true art."\(^{71}\) The Kaiser praised, commissioned, and promoted a decadent and academic vision of art and architecture, hindering almost all currents of modern art and reform. Behne felt the Kaiser’s embrace of monumental art served primarily as propaganda for his regime, drawing art into debates about nationalism and politics. The preservation of teutonic castles and the government-sponsored exhibitions at world’s fairs, Behne argued, distorted the word "German" and "national" to mean only "dynastic" or "loyal" to Kaiser. Such royal policies, he felt, led to a national mistrust of all that was foreign or unfamiliar, actions fundamentally at odds with the nature of artistic development.

For Behne, too much of the art that was created and collected in Germany was determined by the conservative institutions loyal to the Kaiser. The art museum directors he installed at the National Gallery and museums all over Germany, the art academies he sponsored, the artists upon whom he had bestowed stipends, and the art commissioned by the crown, all promoted only a dry academic art. Both Behne’s critique of the establishment and his support for modern, international, and alternative artists must be considered political gestures, part of the reform-movement’s. effort to counter the Kaiser’s decadence.

\(^{71}\) The Kaiser’s retorts against *Rinnstein-Künstler* were uttered, among other places, at the ceremonial opening of the ensemble of traditional sculpture along the Siegesallee in Berlin in 1901; excerpts in Dieter Bartmann, "Berlin offiziell - Kunst und Kunstpolitik unter Wilhelm II," in Asmus, *Berlin um 1900*, pp. 199-200.
Artists and critics from both ends of the political spectrum scorned the repressive and decadent artistic culture under the Kaiser. Those not included in the crown’s patronage system—including Behne—demanded that support be extended to a greater range of artists. At the same time, they expected complete artistic freedom and even support in their search for alternatives. The first successful rebellion against the Kaiser’s control of the German art world was the Berlin Secession of 1898, which started a wave of further secessions, regroupings, and new artistic camps. Each took its own stance against official Wilhelmine culture. As a result the German art world, particularly in Berlin, became increasingly divided, confrontational, and political, about both domestic and international art.

As has been mentioned, Behne was cautious about overtly introducing politics into his art criticism before World War I and the November 1918 political revolution. He advocated revolution, but more in spirit, art, and culture, than in politics. Nonetheless, his political beliefs can be gleaned in part from his word choice and the similarity of his views to overtly political agents. In a 1913 review on "Populist Art," for example, he maintained that critics and the State’s "art politics" (Kunstpolitik), had a responsibility to address the public’s desire for a more familiar art by working to promote and enrich the so-called "intimate" and "sentimental" art that was so popular among the common people. Art that found a more direct connection to the people, he

72 See Paret, Berlin Secession.

argued somewhat jingoistically himself, was less likely to be found in antique or Italian
art, than in Dutch and Germanic art, or in modern art.

Behne claimed that modern art was more "democratic" than art had been in
previous generations, granting more artistic freedom to the artist, and open to a far
greater spectrum of society. No longer was art proscribed by guild rules, by a dominant
academic style, or by the whims of a few elite patrons such as the church or princes.
Behne credited modern capitalist culture and the free market system that prevailed in
the galleries--some of the same institutions that he also criticized for the pervading
materialism in Wilhelmine culture--for allowing modern artists freedom in the content
and form of their art, and in determining the role the artist played in society. The fact
that art could now represent and cater to the elites and to the working-class through
inexpensive prints or reproductions, for example, created a huge reservoir of
possibilities for modern art that Behne hoped would lead soon to great new art.
Expressionism in particular, he was convinced, was an art with which the people could
connect, an art with a social if not Socialist conscience. Impressionism, on the other
hand, he considered "bourgeois," "undemocratic," and even "imperialist" because of its
focus on materiality and imitation rather than spirit and abstraction.  

Behne’s "Cultural Socialism"

---

74 See, for example, Behne, "Impressionismus und Expressionismus," Der
Zeitgeist, insert to Berliner Tageblatt 42, no. 39 (Sept. 29, 1913): 1; repeated in Behne,
Scholars as well as Behne’s daughter have consistently labeled Behne “Socialist,” a "majority Socialist," and a "leftist Socialist," implying specific political affiliations that have been difficult to document. Based on his associations with various artistic and political groups, others have stated more directly that he was actually a member of the SPD, while others have speculated that after 1917, he belonged to the USPD, since he was art editor for the USPD’s primary newspaper, Die Freiheit from March 1919 to September 1922. Still others have pointed to his editorship at the Communist daily Die Welt am Abend from September 1924 to February 1932, as well as his memberships and activities in the revolutionary Arbeitsrat für Kunst (Working Council for Art), the Gesellschaft der Freunde des neuen Rußlands, (Society of Friends of the New Russia), the Bund für Proletarische Kultur (Association for Proletarian Culture), the German PEN Club, and the Schutzverband Deutscher Schriftsteller (Club for the Protection of German Writers) as evidence of even more radically left-leaning and Communist


political convictions.\textsuperscript{77}

Behne’s relationship with Socialism and politics more generally has been the source of much misunderstanding. His exact party affiliations will probably never be known. But in documents recently uncovered by the author that Behne himself submitted to the Nazi Reichsschriftumskammer (Writer’s Ministry) in 1933 and 1938, Behne claimed to have had "no previous political affiliations," except for "a few months in 1919-20," when he admitted belonging to the leftist USPD.\textsuperscript{78} These documents were no doubt filled-out under some duress and may have intentionally under-represented his party affiliation for fear of reprisals. But the fact that Behne, whose rights as a freelance modern art critic had slowly been taken away by the Nazis, mentioned only a brief membership with the USPD, is significant. Although Behne published for the Socialist press and held great sympathy for the Socialist cause, he portrayed himself as not overtly politically active in party politics. When he did join a party--the USPD--it was a short-lived, left-leaning splinter group, not the main-line Socialist party.

The issue of political affiliations is especially significant in a country as politically turbulent and often troublesome as Germany. Since modern unification in 1871, political affiliation in Germany has always been taken seriously, with one's reputation and fate often closely connected to that of a party. Actual party affiliation--

\textsuperscript{77} On Behne’s memberships see biographical dictionaries such as \textit{Lexikon der Kunst}, vol. 1 (1987) p. 462; and \textit{Who was Who among English and European Authors 1931-1949}, vol.1 (1949), p. 121.

\textsuperscript{78} See Behne file in the Bundesarchiv, Berlin, Reichskulturkammer BA-RK (BDC)2101/0700/12, copies kindly provided by S. Langner.
whether one was a "card-carrying member" of a party--carried real implications for life and career, not to mention subsequent moral judgements. While distinctions between left, center, and right, and extremes within that spectrum may suffice in other countries, Germany’s fractured political landscape made the need for precision especially important. As many historians have speculated, it was to a large extent the fractions within Germany’s gigantic Socialist party that caused many of the rifts and political stalemates in Weimar Germany, and ultimately allowed the rise of the Nazi party.

Behne’s criticism was profoundly determined by the complex history of Socialism in Germany: Bismark’s "Socialist Laws" (Sozialistengestze), the rise of the German SPD into the world’s largest Socialist political organization, the SPD’s decision to support Germany’s entry in World War I through a "Castle Peace" (Burgfrieden) with the Kaiser, the defection of the Independent Socialists (USPD) and the Communist Party (KPD) from the main party in 1917, the failed Socialist revolution in November 1918, the revolts by right-wing troops in the early years of Weimar Germany, and of course the rise of Hitler and the Nazi party after the perceived "failure" of socialism to solve Germany’s problems. Although Behne died in 1948, before the establishment of the German Democratic Republic (GDR), his close and self-defined affiliations to Socialism made him a favorite son of often ideologically motivated Socialist East German historians. They, along with West German historians since the 1970s interested in understanding the political underpinnings of modern art in Germany, played a large part in beginning to uncover Behne’s key role in the rise of modern art and architecture
in Germany.\textsuperscript{79}

The attempt to clarify Behne’s political ideology and affiliations must be put in the context of the many famous German architects and historians who went to great lengths to deny or hide any connections to politics in their private or professional lives.\textsuperscript{80} Behne’s writings offer clear and incontrovertible connections of modern art and politics. As a person committed to the pure expression of art and its dissemination to a broad populace, Behne did not seek to participate in day-to-day politics and in the large bureaucratic machines that were the essence of most political parties. Nonetheless, his

\textsuperscript{79} Behne’s most ambitious (though unpublished) biographer and bibliographer to date was the late Jürgen Scharfe of the University of Halle in the GDR. Scharfe worked for years editing in fastidious detail an anthology of commrade Behne’s writings for the Socialist VEB Verlag. His personal research notes are included with the Behne papers in the Bauhaus-Archiv. On the history of this collection see Appendix 1. Publishers in the GDR reprinted several of Behne’s articles as late as 1987 (for example Behne, “Otto Nagel,” Die Weltbühne 82, no. 42, no. 23 (June 9, 1987): 727-728), and Behne featured prominently in several important East German exhibition catalogues such as Christine and Christian Suckow, eds., Revolution und Realismus Revolutionäre Kunst in Deutschland 1917 bis 1933 (1972); and Roland März and Anita Kühnel, eds., Expressionisten. Die Avantgarde in Deutschland 1905-1920 (1986), as well as articles commemorating Behne’s 100th birthday (for example Bernd Lindner, "Mut machen"). Behne’s hometown of Magdeburg in the former GDR has even named a street after him: "Behneweg." Early West German works featuring Behne include: Ulrich Conrads, Fantastische Architektur (1960); Frecot, "Bibliographische Berichte"; Wend Fischer, ed., Zwischen Kunst und Industrie (1975); and Freya Mühlhaupt and Karin Wilhelm, eds., Wem gehört die Welt? (1977).

\textsuperscript{80} Both Gropius and Mies van der Rohe, for example, repeatedly denied that their architecture was at all related to politics and over the course of their careers went to great lengths to create this illusion, though scholarship since their deaths has increasingly revealed the political convictions and connections they maintained. See, for example, Richard Pommer, "Mies van der Rohe and the Political Ideology of the Modern Movement," in Mies van der Rohe, Critical Essays, ed. Franz Schulze (1989), pp. 97-134; Richard Pommer and Christian Otto, Weissenhof 1927 (1991); or Winfried Nerdinger, ed., Bauhaus Moderne im Nationalsozialismus (1993).
affiliations with many Socialist and Communist publications over the course of his career, his interest in social aspects and the internationalism of modern art and architecture, and his fervent support of many anti-establishment artists, especially those who dealt with the reality of working-class life in Berlin, have correctly placed him in the center of studies regarding political aspects of modern German art. Behne himself claimed that he was released by the Nazis from his teaching duties at the continuing education college Humboldt-Hochschule, "because of my political convictions."[81]

But his position within Socialism was far from clear, certainly not mainstream, a condition which often left him vulnerable to criticism. In a letter to the family friend Grete Dexel, he complained bitterly about being rejected from many newspapers and journals: "I am sick of the German press! For the Socialists I am not bourgeois enough, for the bourgeoisie I am too proletarian, for the Communists I am too bourgeois."[82] He wrote this letter in 1925, but the same sentiments must have applied before World War I as well. Behne’s views on art and society led him to a position that I will call a spiritual or "cultural socialism," a socialism focused on the development of individuals and their

---


[82] "Mir hängt die deutsche Presse zum Hals raus! Den Sozialdemokraten bin ich nicht bürgerlich genug, den bürgerlichen zu proletarisch, den Kommunisten zu bürgerlich"; letter Behne to Grete Dexel (Nov. 25, 1925), in Dexel Papers, Getty Research Institute, Santa Monica, partially republished in Walter Vitt, ed., Hommage à Dexel (1980), p. 97, emphasis in original. Behne wrote this because he was frustrated by many rejection letters from publishers, who he said failed to understand his articles, which seemed to the publishers "zu sachlich oder fachlich oder ernst oder streng oder schwer oder sonst was" (too objective or factual or serious or extreme or difficult or something). He then also blamed his own political stance for the many rejections.
cultural enlightenment. This emphasis on non material issues often clashed with the ideology and policies of the party bureaucracy. A detailed and more nuanced exploration of Behne’s involvement with Socialism reveals a great deal about his particular vision of modern art, as well as the role that he played in forging a modern art and architecture in Germany.

Although Socialist cultural institutions, including that of adult education, the press, artistic policies, and early reforms of worker housing have been studied, the specific influences these institutions had on the development of modern art and architecture have not been adequately investigated. The role that critics played in transmitting ideas and initiating connections is rarely discussed. Behne’s influential criticism, rather than being isolated within the art world, ran parallel to and drew from the reform sensibility promoted by the many arms of the Socialist party apparatus. Behne acted as a translator between these cultural institutions. By addressing a variety of audiences, including the general public and workers, Behne’s own ideas began to change. As will be shown, his conception of modern art was in part determined by the varied non-art related Socialist institutions in which he worked.

Germany’s inequitable three-tier voting structure kept the SPD from exercising political power in proportion to their voting strength until after World War I. But official Socialist party had a powerful influence on nearly every aspect of German society and culture. After being partially banned by Bismark’s "Socialist Laws," the SPD made huge strides in organizing and representing the interests of the working class in
the decades around the turn-of-the-century. In 1912, just as Behne was finishing his studies and encountering the artistic avant-garde, the SPD garnered a record 34.8% of the vote and claimed 110 seats in the Reichstag, more than double the 43 seats of 1907. Its membership drew heavily from the lowest working-classes—who voted in overwhelming numbers for the SPD—but also increasingly from a segment of the middle class that sought change. Before the war, SPD membership spanned from hard-line Marxists seeking a proletarian revolution, to the mainstream "right-opportunists," Socialists who were willing to engage with the ruling party and undertake evolutionary reform rather than revolution. The tensions within this broad spectrum of ideologies was palpable, and often a hindrance to the progress of the party as a whole.

With expanding public interest, party membership and affiliated union organization, if not political power, the party worked to create a distinct Socialist sub-culture. It turned its attention and resources to issues such as equality in the voting

---

83 Fearing the "extremely dangerous efforts" of Socialists, Bismarck banned most Socialist party activities and gatherings from 1878 to 1890 with the Sozialistengesetze, which allowed the police to dissolve all Socialist clubs, to require registration for all Socialist propagandists and writers, and to censor or ban all Socialist newspapers and publications.

84 In 1917, in the middle of World War I, internal tensions caused the SPD to split, the German Communist Party (KPD) and the Independent Socialist (USPD) seceding from the main-line Socialists, unable to support the SPD's Burgfrieden with the Kaiser and general unwillingness to take firm oppositional stances. It was at this point that Behne and many artists associated with the avant-garde and the Arbeitsrat für Kunst (Working Council for Art) joined the USPD. See Weinstein, The End of Expressionism, esp. chapter 2; Richard Sheppard, "Artists, Intellectuals and the USPD 1917-1922," Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch im Auftrag der Görres-Gesellschaft N.F. 32 (1991): 175-216; and David W. Morgan, The Socialist Left and the German Revolution. A History of the German Independent Social Democratic Party, 1917-1922 (1975).
system, social insurance, the eight-hour work day, and lifestyle-reform. To some extent Behne had begun absorbing aspects of Socialist cultural policy in his earliest youth while living among the factories and working-classes in Eastern Berlin. He could hardly have been unaware of, or untouched by, the advances of the SPD and its program for a Socialist sub-culture. Behne was increasingly, and in different manifestations, Socialist.

_Volkshochschule_ as Socialist Sub-culture

Throughout his career Behne sought to expand public interest in art. He wanted to educate the masses about his particular views on an appropriate modern art, and at times worked to contribute officially to the development of a Socialist artistic sub-culture. Teaching as a docent at several adult-education schools (_Volkshochschulen_) in Berlin was one of Behne’s earliest and enduring cultural missions.

85 On the creation of a Socialist or proletarian sub-culture, see Vernon Lidtke, _The Alternative Culture: Socialist Labor in Imperial Germany_ (1985); Willi L. Guttsman, _Workers’ Culture in Weimar Germany_ (1990), chapter 1; Frank Trommler, "The Origins of Mass Culture," _New German Critique_ no. 29 (Spring - Summer, 1983): 57-70; Will van der Will and Rob Burns, _Arbeiterkulturbewegung in der Weimarer Republik_ (1982), chapter I; and Christoph Engels, _Auf der suche nach einer ‘deutschen’ Kunst_ (1997), pp. 42-43.

86 Definitive records on Behne’s teaching at the various _Volkshochschulen_ are scarce. The CV he filled out to teach at Berlin’s Hochschule der Künste in 1945 indicated he had been teaching since finishing his studies; see Behne "Lebenslauf." The earliest evidence we have of his employment is his article "Der Künstler als Kunstkritiker," _Hamburger Schiffarts-Zeitung_, no. 202 (Aug. 29, 1913): 13, which he signed "Dr. Adolf Behne, Dozent an der Freien Hochschule Berlin." His own stationary included the title "Dozent an der Freien Hochschule Berlin" in the header at least as early as July 1914; cf letter Behne to Gropius (July 7, 1914) Gropius papers, #123 (= Arbeitsrat für Kunst) = GN 10/197, Bauhaus-Archiv. These all point to an earlier
emerged in the nineteenth century as a way to "wake and expand the spiritual and intellectual forces already latent in the people," as one course catalogue proclaimed.  

These schools were meant to supplement Germany’s elite humanist educational system by providing courses for those not admitted to the university, and as a means for adults to explore topics outside of their formal professions. Both the private and municipally funded schools were open to all audiences, including the working-class; early on they emphasized "continuing" education, "scientific thinking" and vocational training not available at the university, rather than remedial or populist courses.

After the lifting of the *Sozialistengesetze* at the end of the century, however, these

---

87 *Volkshochschule Groß-Berlin, Arbeitsplan*, n.p. The earliest continuing education in Berlin was provided in the People’s Libraries (*Volksbüchereien*). *Volkshochschulen* began after the founding of the Reich, with the establishment of the "Gesellschaft für die Verbreitung von Volksbildung" in 1871, and the bourgeois "Humboldt-Akademie" in 1878, the oldest and biggest true *Volkshochschule* in Germany. *Volkshochschulen* that also catered to working-class students began to appear after the lifting of the *Sozialistengesetze* and included the science-oriented "Urania" after 1889, and the "Lessing-Hochschule" and "Arbeiterbildungsschule" after 1891. The "Freie Hochschule" was founded in 1902 by Max Apel, Bruno Wille, and Wilhelm Bölsche. For information on the *Volkshochschulen* in Berlin see Konrad Hirsch, "Die Humboldt-Hochschule, Freie Volkshochschule Groß-Berlin und die Volkshochschulfrage" (Diss. 1927); Dietrich Urbach, *Die Volkshochschule Groß-Berlin 1920 bis 1933* (1971), pp. 10-17; C. Reckenfelder-Bäumer, "'Wissen ist Macht - Macht ist Wissen'," in *Berlin um 1900*, pp. 405-416. For a complete course listings, locations of classes, and short statements about the purpose and philosophy behind the schools, see publication series such as *Volkshochschule Groß-Berlin, Arbeitsplan*, *Mitteilungen der Volkshochschule Groß-Berlin*, *Humboldt-Blätter*, course catalogues, and newsletters in the SBPK as well as announcements in the Socialist newspapers such as *Vorwärts* or *Freiheit* (after World War I).
schools opened their doors increasingly to working-class students, though most remained politically neutral. Behne began teaching in 1912 at the Freie Hochschule Berlin, which merged with the more prestigious Humboldt-Akademie during World War I to become the Humboldt-Hochschule. In the aftermath of the war these schools were subsumed under the Volkshochschule Groß-Berlin, an association founded by the Socialist municipal government of Berlin, several large trade unions, as well as the university and the technical university. The *Volkshochschule Groß-Berlin* was "the first in Germany to offer popular education (*Volksbildung*) based on a cooperation of the working classes and academics."\(^{88}\) It was created to accommodate a burgeoning interest in continuing education, especially among workers, and to decentralize the *Volkshochschulen* into smaller, local, more easily accessible schools that nonetheless featured similar curricula.

Teaching provided Behne with opportunities to bring fine art directly to the public, at first primarily to middle-class students, but increasingly also to the leftist working-class. The Volkshochschule Groß-Berlin drew its teaching staff from a broad spectrum of unaffiliated academics, private businessmen, and university professors. But, as the example of Hausenstein mentioned above makes clear, teaching in these

---

\(^{88}\) "Aufruf!," *Mitteilungen der Volkshochschule Groß-Berlin* 3, no. 1 (Nov. 1922): 1; and "Was will die Volkshochschule Groß-Berlin?," Volkshochschule Groß-Berlin: *Arbeitsplan* (Jan.-Mar. 1920), p. 3. At the 1902 opening of the Freie Hochschule, Bruno Wille, a founder of both the Freie Hochschule and the German Garden City Association, declared it a "college that is free, that is independent of the State, a counterpoint to the outdated, medieval character" of the universities; cited in Reckenfelder-Bäumer, "Wissen ist Macht," p. 413.
more populist, private and municipally funded Volkshochschulen was interpreted as something of an ideological statement. This was especially true before World War I, when positions in the more prestigious state-financed art and university system were rarely opened to self-avowed Socialists or other minorities.

Behne taught one to three art courses several nights a week each quarter for over twenty years at various Volkshochschulen in Berlin, taking time off when health or writing demanded. Classes were held in rented school rooms, worker clubs, or eating establishments throughout Berlin. The atmosphere was reportedly quite informal, with classes often accompanied by food and drink. Behne’s courses “Tours through the Kaiser Friedrich Museum” or “Italian Painting, guided tours” were held in museum galleries to bring students directly to the art. In addition to offering a chance to air some of his ideas on art in public, the teaching represented a reliable income to supplement his erratic pay as a freelance critic. The Volkshochschule also provided Behne with opportunities to interact with faculty colleagues such as economist Werner Sombart and philosopher Alfred Vierkandt, both frequently cited in Behne’s writings. Fellow art historians at Berlin’s Volkshochschule, who taught very similar courses in

89 Lidtke, Alternative Culture, pp. 175-176.

90 Volkshochschule students paid for classes by purchasing individual class tickets at various points throughout Berlin. Although we do not know how much Behne was paid, O.K. Werckmeister has noted that one reason that Paul Klee taught at the Bauhaus was to insure a steady income in the turbulent economic times, though a full-time master was paid much more than a local Volkshochschule instructor. Unlike the volatile art market, or the work of the free-lance critic, salaries at the Bauhaus were indexed to inflation; see Werckmeister, Making of Paul Klee’s Career, pp. 242-243.
different locations, included Max Deri and Ernst Cohn-Wiener, both Jews who had studied with Wölfflin and Goldschmidt just before Behne.  

In line with one of the six program points of the *Volkshochschule* to "deepen interest in the fine arts (poetry, visual art, music) through intellectual discourse," Behne’s courses in art history stressed general art appreciation.  Since Behne left no papers related to his teaching, the specific content of his courses remains unknown. Course catalogues indicate that he taught a range of topics such as "Antique Art," "Representation in European Art," and "Introduction to Viewing Art," as well as more cutting edge topics such as "The New Art: Futurism, Expressionism, Cubism and Dadaism," "The New Art as an Expression of Our Times," "Art and Politics," or "Industrial and Commercial Buildings."

Behne’s Publishing in Socialist Journals  

In conjunction with early *Volkshochschule* teaching, after 1912 Behne began publishing ever more extensively in a wide range of explicitly Socialist-oriented venues, including *Sozialistische Monatshefte* (Socialist Monthly) and *Arbeiter-Jugend* (Worker Jugend).  

---  

91 On Max Deri and Ernst Cohn-Wiener, see Ulrich Wendland, *Biographisches Handbuch deutschsprachiger Kunsthistoriker im ExilLeben*, vol. 1 (1999). Cohn-Wiener (1882-1941) taught a wide range of art history courses at the Humboldt-Akademie and then the Humboldt-Hochschule from 1908-1933, heading the art division after 1919, and president of the entire schools faculty after 1926. His courses regularly drew 300 to 400 people. He also taught at the Jewish Volkshochschule. Deri (1878-1938) worked for the gallery owner Paul Cassirer, was a regular art critic for the *BZ am Mittag* newspaper, and taught for years at the Lessing-Hochschule.

92 "Was ist die Humboldt-Hochschule?," *Vorlesungsverzeichnis der Humboldt-Hochschule* (July-Sept. 1919): rear cover.
Youth). Between June 1912 and November 1918 Behne published over thirty pieces in the party-sponsored *Arbeiter-Jugend*. This "Socialist educational organ" was part of the SPD's increasing involvement in worker education and cultivation (*Erziehung*), hoping to introduce Socialist youth and young workers to a broad spectrum of mainstream cultural and academic fields, including technology, philosophy, the hard and social sciences, aspects of popular culture, and the arts. With a circulation reaching over 100,000 workers and clubs all over Germany by 1914, it provided Behne with a much larger audience than his teaching, or indeed than most of the other arguably better known bourgeois cultural journals for which he wrote. Much like his *Volkshochschule* courses, Behne's essays were largely simple art appreciation lessons and canned art historical pieces. He wrote in a jargon-free, conversational style, that was less provocative and less partisan than that of his other critiques. To draw in and inspire his

---

93 The *Arbeiter-Jugend*, the official mouthpiece of the popular Arbeiter-Jugend Association, was published in Berlin from 1909 to 1933 by the official SPD publisher Vorwärts, Paul Singer G.M.B.H. On the *Arbeiter-Jugend* see Dieter Fricke, ed., *Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung* 1869 bis 1917 (1985), pp. 573-584; the preface to first issue of *Arbeiter-Jugend*, cited in its editor K. Korn’s *Die Arbeiterjugendbewegung* (1922), p. 177; and Bushart, "Kunst-Theoretikus," pp. 24-25. Behne published in the *Arbeiter-Jugend* mostly under the pseudonym "Adolf Bruno." Twelve more articles were written by his wife Elfriede Behne, or at least listed her as author. See Bibliography I for a complete listing of articles. Elfriede Schäfer Behne, a kindergarten teacher, also helped support her family through writing, very often in journals to which Adolf Behne also contributed. The topics of articles on which her maiden name appear in *Arbeiter-Jugend* are virtually indistinguishable from those of her husband; for example "Der Holzschnitt," "Vincent van Gogh," "Das Tier in japanischer Darstellung," and even "Ludwig Richter als Graphiker," about whom Behne was writing his book *Von Kunst der Gestaltung* at that time for the Arbeiter-Jugend Verlag (though it was only published in 1924). See below for more on Elfriede Schäfer Behne.
young, working-class readers, and to help the novice visualize ideas, the articles were almost all accompanied by line drawings extensive photographs—the latter still not a common feature of non-art publications before World War I.¹⁴

Behne’s articles in the Arbeiter-Jugend as well as in his teaching at the Volkshochschulen were intended to expand his students’ academic knowledge and real-world experience, and to inspire them to consider how art might be useful in their daily lives. He did this primarily by making the art icons of bourgeois society approachable, by breaking down the psychological and class barriers that traditionally kept workers out of bastions of elite culture. His articles focused often on masterpieces of traditional European as well as non-Western art rather than contemporary art experiments. Yet one can begin to discern the same passion and theoretical understanding of art that Behne expressed more provocatively in his professional criticism on modern art. While he hoped to explain basic information about artistic technique and art historical facts, he stressed that these were secondary to understanding the passion and spiritual energy that the artists endowed in their work.

Behne’s June 1912 article "Why do we need art collections?,” passionately defended museums as repositories of man-made beauty invaluable for inspiration and the human spirit.⁵ He wrote short introductions to Rembrandt, Millet, and the

¹⁴ The much wider circulating SPD illustrated magazine Die neue Welt, by contrast, contained only line drawings, as photographs were considered too expensive; see Guttsman, Worker’s Culture.

⁵ Adolf Bruno [pseud. of Adolf Behne], "Weshalb brauchen wir Kunstsammlungen?,“ Arbeiter-Jugend 4, no. 12 (June 8, 1912): 190-191.

Egyptian sculptor Thutmes, overviews of Greek Life, Russian Culture, and the art of Islam, as well as encyclopedia type articles on "The Beginning of Art," and "Towers"—a look at various towers in architectural history. In "The Creation of a Painting" (1913), Behne used a painting by the popular Impressionist painter Max Liebermann to explain how an artist works, the step-by-step process from first sketches to finished idea. Behne discussed the process of applying paint in the next article, "The Technique of Painting." He expanded these articles into an entire primer on art appreciation, Die Überfahrt am Schreckenstein, using a popular realist painting of the same name by Hans Richter in the Dresden Gemäldegalerie. The book, completed in 1914, but only published by the Arbeiter-Jugend publishing house in 1924, introduced high art to a public that had little or no exposure to ideas such as composition, balance, dynamism, and color selection. Behne inserted his own diagrams of difficult formal concepts, and made references to popular photography as a way of demonstrating how even the most realistic details in an artwork are not purely imitative and reveal an artists' intention.

Two articles Behne published in the Arbeiter-Jugend in the fall of 1914 on the
"Die gotische Kathedrale" (The Gothic Cathedral) and "Das Glashaus" were noteworthy for how closely they followed Behne’s more professional modern art criticism. They were also the first in the magazine that he signed with his real name rather than his pseudonym (Adolf Bruno), clearly claiming their position as his own. As in nearly all his articles in Arbeiter-Jugend, Behne dealt extensively with technical matters, appealing to the interests of his largely working-class readership. For the Gothic, he discussed masonry, the pointed arch, the developments of ribbed vaulting, and the multiple origins of the Gothic style. He explained the pejorative origin of the term Gothic. Like Worringer and many Expressionist artists and critics, he contrasted the Gothic to the art of the Renaissance, which he claimed strove merely for balance of man and his surrounds. Alluding to the commencement of fighting in World War I in France, and specifically to the controversies circulating amongst historians concerning damage done by German armies to monuments in Rheims and elsewhere after September 1914, Behne noted that German troops were being exposed to some of these great Gothic monuments, and that he hoped that the monuments would be spared more damage. "Today, more than ever," he professed to his readers in closing, "we once again recognize that the Gothic was the highest and most amazing flowering of all architecture."\(^7\) In the end he pronounced that today the Gothic represented a super-energized art that aspired to great new heights.

\(^7\) For the following, see Behne, "Die gotische Kathedrale," Arbeiter-Jugend 6, no. 24 (Nov. 14, 1914): 323-326.
Werkebund exhibition, Behne presented some of the central ideas of the most avant-garde Expressionist art and architecture to his readers as fact, rather than as new theory. He illuminated the technical difficulties still encountered with the relatively untested material, especially in the construction process and in the thermal attributes of double-glazed walls. He also stressed the positive health effects of living with more light (fewer bacteria), and the unparalleled beauty, purity, and lightness that was possible. He pointed out that although glass was expensive and seemed a luxury reserved for the upper classes, Gropius' Werkbund factory had proven it economical even for industrial and commercial purposes. To convey some of the novelty and artistry that could be expressed with glass, Behne quoted several of Scheerbart's aphorisms, such as (Without a Glass Palace, Life is just a burden), or "Backstein vergeht, Glasfarbe Besteht" (Bricks pass, but Colored Glass endures).

Behne's criticism in the Socialist journals rarely advocated specific political agendas, the tone of his short, focused articles is for the most part descriptive and non-confrontational. He presented his ideas on Expressionist art without attribution or disclaimer. He tended to mask both the radical, oppositional nature of much of the new art, and any implied criticism of the older art. His ideas about the light, spiritual nature

---


99 Scheerbart's aphorisms, first written down in a letter to Taut, are published in "Glashausbriefe," Frühlicht, part of the professional planning journal Stadtbaukunst alter und neuer Zeit 1, no. 3 (1920): 45-48. The letters were republished in Ulrich Conrads, ed., Frühlicht (1963), pp. 18-23. See also chapter 4.
of the Expressionist architecture of the Glashaus, for example, can only in hindsight be read as criticism of the classical facades of the Crown’s newest official building projects in central Berlin such as the Siegesallee or the new Prussian State Library by Ernst von Ihne, to which Behne had made reference in other *Arbeiter-Jugend* articles.

Despite the clear connections of the schools and journals to the Socialist party or the political affiliation of his audience, Behne refused to use art as a mechanism to achieve political goals or as tools of political criticism. His foremost goal was to convince his readers about the intrinsic, *geistig* value of art itself, both for individual enrichment, and to promote a sense of community. Echoing Leo Tolstoy, a favorite of Socialist teachers, reformers, and literary figures at the time, Behne argued that art was a form of expression and thus a means of inter-personal communication, which could lead to an enhanced sense of community.  

Just as significant, art was an end itself, one of the most important sources for pure, inspirational beauty in life. Behne urged his readers to visit museums, because unlike so much of the urban environment or the objects which they encountered in daily life, the museum was full of carefully and conveniently pre-selected beauty. He cautioned readers not to rush when looking at art, to take the time and effort to look,  

---


101 See, for example, [Behne], "Weshalb brauchen wir Kunstsammlungen?," although he repeats this argument elsewhere.
understand, and appreciate the beauty of what they were seeing. Encountering great paintings in person, he claimed, would help all people recognize beauty elsewhere, including in the world around them. While nature undoubtedly contained much beauty, its beauty, was random and arbitrary especially the unusual sights most highlighted in the guidebooks. He claimed that art, by contrast, reflected the artist’s inner will to create a higher beauty through their unique ability to recognize, and then to create, an underlying, organic order among forms.

A different, more overtly political explanation was given by the Socialist critic Wally Zepler, who claimed that an engagement with artistic beauty could become part of the Socialist struggle for emancipation and revolution. Art could not only be an end it could become the end of social revolution. Zepler argued that "the experience of great art and of all that was beautiful would in a measure anticipate for the worker the better society for which he was fighting."\(^{102}\) For both critics, art was not merely an object, or a personal expression, but a means to improving the quality of individual lives and of the community more generally, as such, it was a part of "cultural socialism."

Reformed Socialism, Education, and Art

Behne’s thinking on art was greatly influenced by the specific ideas on art promulgated in the *Volkshochschulen*. Although Berlin’s *Volkshochschulen* before World

War I were not officially run by the SPD, they were included in a larger cultural and educational program that was at the heart of the Socialist political agenda. The German Socialist labor movement in fact grew out of societies for worker education, beginning as early as the 1840s. In 1872, Karl Liebknecht had exclaimed in a famous critique of the bourgeois biases of Germany’s education system that "Knowledge is Power, Power is Knowledge." But it was only in 1907 that the SPD launched an official education initiative, the Central Educational Council (Zentralbildungsausschuß), for which Behne would write the text for several slide-lecture kits that were distributed to worker clubs all over Berlin in 1915. The Council, which was dominated by orthodox Marxists, was charged to give the working class "the highest scientific and cultural ideals of our time" in order to enlighten and prepare comrades for the impending revolution and its aftermath, and "to do so in clear distinction to bourgeois ideology and to bourgeois science and art." In addition to running several schools to train party functionaries, the Council was primarily responsible for funding and promoting events to educate and entertain people, as well as to provide opportunities for self-improvement and leisure.

103 Liebknecht complained that Germany’s educational system along with the army and the popular press were three major institutions that made the masses stupid; Liebknecht, Wissen ist Macht – Macht ist Wissen (1872); see Lidtke, Alternative Culture, pp. 160-162.

104 Behne published a series of ready-made slide-lectures for the Zentralbildungsausschuß in 1915 that worker-clubs could borrow from the party headquarters. On the Zentralbildungsausschuß see Guttman, Worker’s Culture, pp. 28-36; Lidtke, Alternative Culture, chapter 7; and Fricke, Handbuch, pp. 680-684.

105 From Leitsätze, SPD Parteitag 1906, p. 122, translated in Guttman, Worker’s Culture, pp. 28-29, and expanded upon pp. 179-182.
This included an extensive series of public educational lectures and courses not unlike those offered by the more bourgeois *Volkshochschulen*, as well as many special cultural events such as poetry readings, concerts, festivals, and theater performances. The programs was all justified as ideologically appropriate, though often, especially in the arts, they differed little from bourgeois events.

Despite its clear mandate, there was great debate within the Council about the relevance of traditional bourgeois culture and education for the emancipatory struggle of the working-class. There were widely divergent opinions about the need or value of defining a specifically Socialist science, math, or art merely to overcome "bourgeois knowledge." Since the arts were generally seen as products of genius transmitting beauty and elevated feelings, they were not easily seen in class terms. The problem of establishing a working-class culture was intensified by the fact that except for some poetry, the proletariat was seen to have produced little of quality in the arts. Rather than discarding large part of bourgeois artistic heritage, the Council elected to "interpret" the existing art according to party ideology, to relate art to the worker’s struggle and to "promote the combative character of the proletariat." The Council sought to expose the masses only to the highest quality art in order they were better prepared to lift art out of its decadent, materialist state, and take over from the bourgeoisie the role as principal bearer of culture. But even before a new Socialist approach was developed, the Council insisted on the value of art education for the

---

106 Clara Zetkin, as translated in Guttsmann, *Worker’s Culture*, p. 169.
masses as a means of inspiring "a strong feeling for life and victory."  Zepler asserted, in fact, that the program of continuing education for workers, particularly art education, was so successful specifically because it provided the workers with a sense of hope and concrete visions for a brighter and better future.

The courses Behne taught at the Volkshochschulen and the articles he published in Arbeiter-Jugend did not reflect the orthodox, Marxist ideology that controlled the Zentralbildungsausschuß. It was closer in spirit to that tendency in the SPD known as reformed Socialism. This centrist to right-wing branch of the Socialist party had developed in the last third of the nineteenth century in Germany when critics of Marx such as Edward Bernstein and Ferdinand Lassalle, who is said to have "awakened the German working-class," began to advocate a less revolutionary path to reform. Rather than the chaos of revolution promoted by Marx and the extreme left of the party, these moderate Socialists advocated an integrative, peaceful evolution towards a Socialist society and government. Intent on maintaining good relations with the government in which they were increasingly involved, and on attracting as large and broad a following as possible, reform-minded Socialists insisted that Socialism and a democratic state

---

107 Guttsman, Worker’s Culture, p. 16.

108 Wally Zepler, who wrote a regular column in the Sozialistische Monatsshefte, noted that the art education for the proletariat flourished despite the fact that workers had few particular abilities and rarely could put their new knowledge to much practical or ideological use; Zepler, "Die psychischen Grundlagen."

109 On the cultural policy of the reformist wing of the SPD see Weinstein, "Wilhelm Hausenstein," pp. 196-197; M. Scharrer, "Der Schrecken des Jahrhunderts,' Sozialdemokratie um 1900," in Asmus, Berlin um 1900, pp. 450-461; as well as sources listed above concerning "Socialist sub-culture."
were compatible. The working-classes, they theorized, in fact required a democratic state to protect individual rights and to maximize the freedom and potential of every individual. This position strengthened the SPD’s support not just among the working-classes, where the overwhelming majority voted Socialist, but also among the other lower and middle classes. Many progressive artists and thinkers, including Behne, who longed for a more communally-based society, joined their ranks.

Behne contributed regularly before and after World War I to one of the primary mouthpieces of reformed Socialism, the esteemed cultural journal Sozialistische Monatshefte. Originally created as a venue to win over academics to the cause of Socialism, it competed with Marxist-oriented journals, and with more elitist, bourgeois cultural journals for educated readers and followers. As a result the journal published a much wider range of authors and points of view that the more orthodox, working-class Arbeiter-Jugend, but still kept its reformed socialist focus. The journal advocated absorbing and re-interpreting appropriate parts of mainstream bourgeois culture rather than demanding a separate proletarian or exclusively Socialist sub-culture. In his articles in the Sozialistische Monatshefte, Behne did not insisting on a revolutionary

---

110 Behne published over 70 articles in Sozialistische Monatshefte from 1913-1933, in addition to regular columns "Bühnenkunst," 1913-1914, and "Kunstgewerbe" from 1919-1924. The journal developed out of Der sozialistische Akademiker, whose purpose was "to win over academics to Socialism." It was published in Berlin from 1897 to 1933, and edited by Joseph Bloch from 1910 on, and became ever more critical of the left-wing of the Socialist party. Other important art critics who contributed to the journal included Lisabeth Stern, Ludwig Hilberseimer, and Paul Westheim. See Fricke, ed., Handbuch zur Geschichte, pp. 603-608; 642-643; Alfons Breuer, "Sozialistische Monatshefte," in Fisher, Deutsche Zeitschriften, pp. 265-280; and the informative essays in Anna Siemsen, ed., Ein Leben für Europa. In Memoriam Joseph Bloch (1956).
aesthetic, as he had in journals such as Der Sturm, März, Pan. Instead, he explored more traditional realms of art history, to criticize the government and even Socialist art policy, and to issue polemical statements on politics, the war, or society. Behne tailored the politics of his articles to suit the publishing venue, never contradicting himself, but choosing a different emphasis.

Systematic studies of the SPD’s cultural and artistic policies and programs have not been attempted. In his study on the SPD’s embrace of modern art, however, Richard Sheppard has speculated that the anti-revolutionary stance of the reformist wing of the SPD kept the party from embracing modernist art before World War I. Despite the policy of the Zentralbildungsausschuß require ideologically-based instruction, the SPD focused more efforts on presenting the best of Germany’s cultural heritage from the past than on promoting a specifically contemporary Socialist art. When contemporary cultural trends were discussed at all, they tended to be negative critiques of the corrupting quality of much bourgeois culture rather than a positive art policy.

Before the turn-of-the-century there had been great debate about the value of the classics of German literature, especially Schiller, for the working class. Pointing out parallels between Socialism and the struggle of the bourgeoisie against feudal society, leaders urged workers to read shining examples of that heritage in order that they might make it their own. Others sought to associate Socialism with the growing trend


112 On the ”Schiller-Debatte,” see Barck, Lexikon sozialistischer Literatur; W.
of Naturalism in the people’s theater (Volksbühnen), literature, and the arts, professing the revelatory value of an honest representation of reality, especially the struggle of ordinary people and the dependence of consciousness on social reality. Great debate ensued over the decision to serialize naturalist novels such as those by Zola as well as other more vulgar depictions of working-class life in Socialist newspapers.\textsuperscript{113}

Discussions swirled around the value of emphasizing high quality art versus the value of showing works that depicted working-class subjects or of overtly promoted class struggle. Behne later entered these discussions when in an essay on Max Liebermann’s Impressionist representations of working people, he affirmed their high aesthetic quality, but criticized them for only showing people “at work,” and alone, rather than real working-class people in touch with a larger community and environment.\textsuperscript{114}

Debate about the relevance of bourgeois heritage for the emancipatory struggle of the working-class led in 1910-12, to the famous "Tendenzkunst-Debatte" (Tendentious Art Debate) just as Behne was starting his career as a critic.\textsuperscript{115} The fierce

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}


\textsuperscript{114} See, for example, Behne, "Max Liebermann," \textit{Wissenschaftliche Rundschau} 2, no. 18 (June 15, 1912): 372-374; and Behne, "Stilbemerkungen zur modernen Kunst," \textit{Die Neue Rundschau} 27.1, no. 4 (Apr. 1916): 553-560.

\textsuperscript{115} Sperber was the pseudonym of Hans Heijermanns. For more on the \textit{Tendenzkunst-Debatte} see documents and discussion in Tanja Bürgel, ed., \textit{Tendenzkunst-Debatte 1910-1912} (1987); Fülberth, \textit{Proletarische Partei}, pp. 123-50; Guttsman, \textit{Worker’s Culture}, p. 34-36.
debate was set off by the Dutch Marxist critic Hans Sperber, who inflamed officials by arguing that the Socialist party should be more critical of existing social conditions and less commercial, rather than promoting the classics and rejecting all tendentious art out of hand as inferior.\textsuperscript{116} He demanded the SPD and worker organizations support only more ideological art. Reformist critics such as Franz Mehring and Heinrich Ströbel countered that Sperber was elevating pro-Socialist literature and art at the expense of artistic quality. Others such as Friedrich Stampfer argued that art criticism in particular could not be concerned with political messages, as art had to be judged solely on aesthetic, ideal qualities.\textsuperscript{117} For reform Socialists such as Ströbel and Stampfer the positive reception of bourgeois art was part of an evolutionary approach to reform, and it was this mindset that shaped the primary policies for a Socialist art in Germany before World War I.

The rejection of modernist art by the SPD was most clearly articulated in the party’s two most effective and ubiquitous means of propaganda: in the Vorwärts daily newspaper, whose primary art editor, Robert Breuer, was one of the early Werkbund press secretaries, and in the party journal Die neue Zeit, the theoretical organ of the SPD run by Karl Kautsky.\textsuperscript{118} Despite Behne’s clear and on-going commitment to the

\begin{footnotes}
\begin{footnote}
\textsuperscript{116} See Sperber, "Kunst und Industrie," and republishing of the entire debate that transpired in the Socialist newspaper Vorwärts and the journal Die neue Zeit. Bürgel has suggested that Sperber’s remarks were inflammatory in order to incite vigorous discussion in the media-saturated metropolis; Bürgel, Tendenzkunz, p. xvi.
\end{footnote}

\begin{footnote}
\textsuperscript{117} See, for example, Stampfer, "Kunst und Klassenkampf."
\end{footnote}

\begin{footnote}
\textsuperscript{118} On the importance of the print media to the Socialists, see chapter 1 and Gutsman, Worker’s Culture, pp. 274-286. On these two "centrist" Socialist publications,
\end{footnote}
\end{footnotes}
establishment of a Socialist culture through writing and teaching, his reputation as an advocate of modern art led him to publish only a single known article in the feuilleton sections of each these official SPD periodicals before World War I. Hausenstein, a more established SPD member who was less directly involved in the promotion of artistic Expressionism, wrote extensively for the party-line Die neue Zeit.

The two articles Behne did write in the SPD’s official publications focused on non-controversial issues: representations of workers, and critiques of local monuments. Even though critical of the state’s official art policy, they were more descriptive and didactic than intentionally provocative. In "Representations of the Worker in Art” from 1913, he sought to disprove the commonly held belief that representing workers in art was a new phenomenon. In the process he surveyed an impressive selection of art works from antiquity to the present, from the Far East to the United States and objects from local history museums.119 In "Berlin’s Monuments,” Behne lamented that although the German capital was reputed to have more monuments than any other city in Europe, all were bad, and none were true sculpture or art with which the people could


119 Behne’s only known article in Die neue Zeit is "Die Arbeitsdarstellung in der Kunst," Feuilleton der Neuen Zeit 32.1, no. 68 (Oct. 24, 1913): 129-133.
truly connect. Taking a stab at the Kaiser and his art commissioners, he declared that all of Berlin’s monuments were pompous, inartistic, and poorly sited, commissioned and laid out by bureaucrats rather than artists or planners.

Although it is safe to assume that Behne was largely sympathetic to the (Socialist) political ideologies of the journals and newspapers in which he published regularly, one should be careful to deduce too many specific political connections from his publishing venues. Behne’s harsh critique of the Kaiser’s art policy and the fact that he directly contributed to official Socialist journals and taught at the Volkshochschule constituted political gestures, but did not mean that he embraced the entirety of the official Socialist agenda. Berlin’s competitive media market forced even some of the most rabidly political publications to reach out to the broadest array of potential advertisers and to as wide an audience as possible. This was especially true of the large metropolitan newspapers in which Behne worked hard to place his articles, all of which were fighting to attract educated, middle-class readers, in addition to their specific constituencies. In the search for new readers, all but the most radical publications worked hard to maintain a certain degree of “objectivity” and avoid being seen as

---

120 Behne’s only documented pre-World War I article in Vorwärts was ”Berliner Denkmäler,” published under the pseudonym Adolf Bruno in the ”Unterhaltungsblatt” insert (July 3, 1913), pp. 508-509. A related harsh critique of public art commissioned by the Kaiser is Behne, ”Der Märchenbrunnen,” Die Hilfe 19, no. 37 (Sept. 11, 1913): 586. No systematic search through the many daily editions of Vorwärts seems to have been attempted yet to search for more articles, so it is possible Behne published more. Richard Sheppard, in his research on the art in the Socialist press after World War I, has documented eight articles of Behne’s in Vorwärts from 1917-1923; Sheppard, Avantgarde und Arbeiterdichter in den Hauptorganen der deutschen Linken 1917-1922 (1995), pp. 10-13.
obviously biased. Most publications searched hard to find experts and specialists in their fields that could deliver well-written, unbiased or at least not overly partisan material. Publishers often invited opposing views, and few if any seemed to require party membership of their authors. Behne’s dismissal from Naumann’s Die Hilfe after he published an overly friendly interpretation of Pechstein’s Expressionism, or the fact that he never published in a journal such as Karl Scheffler’s conservative Kunst und Künstler make clear, however, that one’s long-term tenure at a journal would require views at least somewhat in-keeping with the editors.
III.
Encountering the Avant-garde:
Behne, Sturm, and Expressionist Culture

We who live today have the rare and great fortune to live during a great revolution, not only of art, but of the whole intellectual and spiritual orientation. . . . All around us there stirs and grows a new art--Expressionism.¹

- Adolf Behne, February 1914

The German Avant-garde Before World War I

Behne’s career-long commitment to the artistic avant-garde was not apparent at the outset of his career. His architectural studies, his art history training, and his earliest articles in Friedrich Naumann’s reform-oriented journal all pointed to a conventional bourgeois career and intellectual direction. His teaching in populist Volkshochschulen and regular columns in several Socialist journals after his doctorate suggested more progressive ideas and political sympathies, but in the context of Wilhelmine Germany gave little indication of his future calling. Through somewhat fortuitous encounters with a few experimental painters, radical gallery owners, and fringe literary figures in 1911, Behne was exposed to the art and ideas that would

launch him on a path to champion the avant-garde and on his work to become one of
the most important and original art and architecture critics of early twentieth century in
Europe.

Behne’s intellectual and professional reorientation in 1912 led him to exude a
sense of exhilaration and optimism for the revolutionary times. He wrote a year later:
"We who live today have the rare and great fortune to live during a great revolution not
only of art but of the whole intellectual and spiritual orientation. The time in which we
live so unassumingly and matter-of-factly, will appear to a later generation as
particularly great, great like the epoch of early antiquity, like the beginning of the
Renaissance! . . . We can experience this [same] joy in a young, vibrant and fresh, art all
around us today. All around us there stirs and grows a new art--Expressionism."2

Behne was far from alone in expressing such sentiments of this unique and self-
conscious cultural moment in the history of modern art and architecture. Kandinsky
waxed in 1912,"A great era is beginning . . . the spiritual awakening, the emerging
inclination to regain lost balance. . . . We are standing at the threshold of one of the

2 "Wir, die wir heute leben, haben das seltene und große Glück, einen wichtigen
Umschwung nicht allein in der Kunst, sondern der ganzen geistigen Verfassung
miterleben zu dürfen. Die Zeit, in der wir jetzt so selbstverständlich und alltäglich
leben, wir einer späteren Generation als ganz besonders groß erscheinen, groß wie die
Epoche der frühen Antike, wie die Zeit der beginnenden Renaissance! . . . Und diese
Freude an einer jungen, herben und frischen Kunst können wir heute in reichem Maße
erleben! Rings um uns wächst und regt sich eine neue Kunst --der Expressionismus."
Behne, "Expressionismus," Allgemeiner Beobachter 3, no. 20 (Feb. 15, 1914): 273,
emphasis in original; also in Behne, Zur neuen Kunst, p. 12-13; and cited in Haxthausen,
greatest epochs that mankind has ever experienced, the epoch of Great Spirituality.”

Behne’s friend Bruno Taut exclaimed the same year, "It is a joy to live in our time! . . . An intensity, a nearly religious fervor has gripped all the artists, and they will not be satisfied with subtle changes. . . . Something tangible must happen now.”

Recently christened the "half-time of modernity," the years immediately preceding World War I marked a definitive step in the march from the advent of modernism in the nineteenth century into the cultural experiments of the "golden twenties" of the Weimar Republic after the war. Berlin was beginning to establish itself as a center of the German, and indeed pan-European art world. The new movements in art from across Europe came together in controversial exhibitions and collections, and for the first time German artists were jockeying to create a compelling new art for the modern world. The branches of art and culture which had fossilized as distinct disciplines now cross-fertilized and sparked innovations. Ideas flowed freely from painting to poetry, music, the applied arts, and architecture, and back again. Although Germany’s political and establishment culture was dominated by the ultra-conservative tastes of the Kaiser, many artists saw a world verging on "the new," with potential for

---


5 Klaus-Jürgen Sembach, 1910: Halbzeit der Moderne (1992), and chapter 1 above.
great change in every aspect of modern culture.

Artistic Expressionism not only accelerated Behne’s career as a free-lance art critic, but also helped generate his fundamental philosophy about art. The movement’s emphasis on personal experience and its focus on expressing the inner-most essence of life, rather than on representing mere outward appearance, would remain central to Behne throughout his career. Behne’s well-rounded traditional education, his training in both art and architecture, his early interests in experimental theater, film, and literature, his passion for cultural innovation, and ability to write engagingly about it all drew him to the formative phases of Expressionism, a movement many feel was defined more by critics and intellectuals than by artists. He sought out the new in the arts and realized for the first time the power of criticism, publishing, and the press to affect, indeed guide, artistic developments. Although the forms, artists, and movements that Behne promoted would change often and even radically over time, his concern with the inner values of art remained constant as he moved from art to architectural criticism, from pre-war Expressionism to post-war Neue Sachlichkeit (New Objectivity), from defining functionalism in his famous book Der moderne Zweckbau (The Modern Functional Building, 1926) to criticizing an architecture that he felt had become over-rationalized a few years later. In all of his criticism, the lived, human experience remained the central reason for creating art. For Behne all art, especially architecture, was at its core social, a means of expressing one’s self to others and living free from outer, material constraints. Art provided a means to get reveal the inner-
Adolf Behne, “Im Kampfe um die Kunst,” Wissenschaftliche Rundschau 2, no. 6 (Nov. 15, 1911): 77-81.

Karl Vinnen, ed., Protest deutscher Künstler (1911), was published by the reform-minded though often conservative Eugen Diederichs. Vinnen was a minor Worpswede landscape painter, but achieved great notoriety through this publication, arguably altering the course of modern art with it, a statement in itself about the power of words and the press within the art world. Sections of the book are translated in Washton Long, German Expressionism, pp. 3-13, 38-41, though she translates the Vinnen’s title as “The Struggle for Art,” which does not adequately describe the bellicose nature of the vocabulary and criticisms during these years. On Vinnen’s book and the ideological and artistic battles it ignited, see Peter Paret, The Berlin Secession (1980), pp. 182-199; and Ron Manheim, ‘Im Kampf um die Kunst’: Die Discussion von 1911 über Zeitgenössische Kunst in Deutschland (1987), in Dutch, with German summary.

On November 15, 1911, in the midst of writing his rather traditional dissertation on Tuscan Gothic church ornamentation, Behne published a surprising commentary titled "The Battle for Art." In this short book review Behne condemned the chauvinistic anthology Protest deutscher Künstler (Protest of German Artists) recently published by the landscape painter Karl Vinnen. Vinnen and his authors had attacked German modern art for being overly dependent on cosmopolitan French precedent. In inflammatory prose, they accused German critics and gallery owners of colluding to import French art to the detriment of many German artists. This French influence, they

6 Adolf Behne, "Im Kampfe um die Kunst," Wissenschaftliche Rundschau 2, no. 4 (Nov. 15, 1911): 77-81.

7 Karl Vinnen, ed., Protest deutscher Künstler (1911), was published by the reform-minded though often conservative Eugen Diederichs. Vinnen was a minor Worpswede landscape painter, but achieved great notoriety through this publication, arguably altering the course of modern art with it, a statement in itself about the power or words and the press within the art world. Sections of the book are translated in Washton Long, German Expressionism, pp. 3-13, 38-41, though she translates the Vinnen’s title as "The Struggle for Art," which does not adequately describe the bellicose nature of the vocabulary and criticisms during these years. On Vinnen’s book and the ideological and artistic battles it ignited, see Peter Paret, The Berlin Secession (1980), pp. 182-199; and Ron Manheim, ‘Im Kampf um die Kunst’: Die Discussion von 1911 über Zeitgenössische Kunst in Deutschland (1987), in Dutch, with German summary.
claimed, had led to the "degeneration" of young German artistic talents. Quoting from the hastily organized counter-publication, *Im Kampfe um die Kunst* (The Battle for Art) organized by the still relatively unknown Wassily Kandinsky and Franz Marc, Behne lamented that most German critics, including Vinnen, were all too eager to kill the artistic youth. The critics were willing only to illuminate artistic sources, never to reward novelty or innovation.⁸

He then defended the young artists whose new work was coalescing in Berlin under the term "Expressionism." Despite the varied formal approaches and national origins, Behne argued that these young, so-called Expressionists represented the wave of the future. For Behne, they had initiated the first movement away from realism and naturalism since the Renaissance. He praised them for breaking the progression towards ever greater imitation of outer appearances. Instead these artists expressed what Behne called "the being, the innermost essence, the deepest soul, the eternal, the essential of a thing in a special format that contains and combines all."⁹

With this short article Behne jumped into the heated battle to define modern art in Germany. His celebration of an Idealist sense of "artistic essence" rather than the depicted content or formal style of the paintings, would become one of the hallmarks of his subsequent art and architectural criticism. The fact that he was simultaneously

---

⁸ Wassily Kandinsky and Franz Marc, eds. *Im Kampfe um die Kunst. Die Antwort auf dem Protest* (1911), was published by the more liberal Samuel Piper in Munich.

⁹ "Will man das Sein, das innerste Wesen, die tiefste Seele, das Bleibende, Wesentliche eines Dinges in einer Bezeichnenden Formel, die alles enthält und zusammenfaßt, ausdrücken"; Behne, "Im Kampfe um die Kunst," p. 80.
working on academic historical research for his dissertation and engaged in public fight for modern art in a populist, non-professional magazine, and that he was writing about both architecture and art, foreshadowed the catholic, productive, and influential career that would follow. By defending the young experimental artists, Behne immediately aligned himself with a group of painters around Kandinsky and Marc with which he became intimately associated.

Several months later, in March 1912, Behne continued his defense of modern art in Naumann’s weekly newspaper Die Hilfe with a review of two early Expressionist art exhibits that had recently opened in Berlin: the third exhibit of Berlin’s “New Secession,” featuring prints from the “Die Brücke” (The Bridge) group of artists from Dresden, and the inaugural exhibit of Herwarth Walden’s Sturm Gallery, exhibiting primarily works from the “Blauer Reiter” (Blue Rider) group from Munich. Behne bemoaned the empty galleries, and argued that both groups were defining new ground for modern art with exciting, innovative work. He was disappointed at the way the public and many critics completely misunderstood and ignored this new art, which had broken away from imitation of nature. He wrote that these works restored painting to its fundamentals: “a working with colors, with lines, with light and dark, a filling of a particular surface made of paper, wood, or canvas.” For Behne the stripping away of


11 ”Die Malerei . . . ist ein Arbeiten mit Farben, mit Linien, mit Hell und Dunkel, sie ist das Füllen einer gegebenen Fläche aus Papier, Holz, oder Leinwand”; Behne, ”Die
all excess was "straightforward" (sachlich) and "ethical." It represented a desire to grasp the "thing itself," and embodied the simple and pure core of art and experience.

A week later, though the exhibits had closed already, Behne’s review was republished in Walden’s important avant-garde journal Der Sturm, "because of [the review’s] fundamental importance."

Walden and Sturm: Historical Development

No one was a greater promoter and publicist of this turn to modern art in Berlin than Herwarth Walden, who had founded a multi-faceted propaganda enterprise "Der Sturm" (The Storm), with which his name became synonymous. [Figure 3.1] It was in

12 On Sachlichkeit, see the discussion below. The reference to ethics was a common aesthetic judgment, part of the reform movement that sought "truth" and honesty in art. See, for example, Josef August Lux, "Kunst und Ethik," Der Sturm 1 (1910). It is somewhat paradoxical that in the late nineteenth century critics and criticism were seen as inherently unethical because critics passed judgments based on few actual qualifications. See Beth Irwin Lewis, Art for All? (2003).


Walden’s gallery that Behne first acquainted himself with modern art and artists.

Behne’s fresh interpretations and keen arguments promoting the Sturm artists soon led him to into Walden’s inner circle, where he was regarded as one of the principal “Sturm-theorists.” The unparalleled importance of Walden in jump-starting Behne’s career and of the Sturm in promoting a culture of modern Expressionist art in Berlin warrants further discussion. Walden, the pseudonym of Georg Lewin, was from a prosperous Jewish family in Berlin. He trained as a musician but soon turned to journalism and the promotion of modern art. As a young man in Berlin, he founded exclusive art clubs and salons for poetry readings and cultural discussions, including on architecture. He tried several times to establish a literary magazine, and served brief stints as editor of Das Magazin, and Morgen, and of the theater journals Der neue Weg and Das Theater. In each of these ventures the radical Walden was eventually dismissed as “too modern” and overly progressive.15

In March of 1910 Walden finally succeeded in creating a lasting venue for his own voice when he began publishing Der Sturm, a journal in which Behne published some of his earliest theoretical statements outlining a new art and architecture. Within months of its founding, Der Sturm had become the most important avant-garde art publication in Germany and it soon gained an international reputation.16 [Figure 3.2] The journal was unlike any other art and cultural periodical, full of provocative critique,  

15 On Walden (1878-1941), see especially Mülhaupt, Herwarth Walden.

16 The name of the magazine, as well as Walden’s own pseudonym, were invented by his first wife, the important Expressionist poet Else lasker-Schüler. See Mülhaupt, Herwarth Walden, p. 7.
and printed on large, inexpensive newsprint. The tone and content derived in part from the journalism of Karl Kraus and his famous Viennese periodical Die Fackel, which raged against the evils of capitalism and materialist society and their negative impact on literature and art. Walden and his circle were fighting against what they perceived to be a culture of decadence and fickle fashion, of excess and materialism. He saw straightforward objectivity (Sachlichkeit) and belief in a new intellectual "Idealism," as the only salvation. Since Berlin, unlike Munich, Vienna or Paris, for the most part still lacked serious intellectual critics of the increasingly bourgeois Secession and

17 Publication began weekly, and very cheap at 10 pfennig, to encourage buyers, then from April 1913 bi-weekly, and monthly after July 1914 because of World War I, with slightly increasing prices. Walden had an extraordinarily optimistic 30,000 copies printed of the first issue, though subsequent issues varied at 3,000-4,000. The journal was under constant financial duress, leading often to very poor quality printing, and irregular publishing intervals. The most complete documentation on Der Sturm is Pirsich, Der Sturm; on the circulation numbers see p. 79.

18 Peter Sprengel has postulated that Walden’s Sturm enterprise was indebted to ideas related to Sachlichkeit as it was discussed in architecture. In 1905 Walden had invited the famous Berlin architect Alfred Messel to lecture on modern architecture at his Association for Art (Verein für Kunst). Messel refused, but wrote back some brief comments on the topic that may have influenced Walden. Messel lamented the emphasis on style in recent architecture, and that the further development of a "healthy art [of architecture]" depended on the fact "dass bei der Betrachtung und Beurtheilung der Bauten die innerliche Eigenart des Werkes und die Schönheit seiner Formesprache in den Vordergrund gestellt [werden. . . . Alles] läßt sich in die Worte zusammenfassen: 'Einfachheit' und 'Sachlichkeit'"; Alfred Messel letter to Walden (Oct. 12, 1905), Sturm-Archiv, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz Berlin, hereafter abbreviated as SBPK. Sprengel proposes that five years later, when Walden started Der Sturm under the influence of Kraus, he transferred a similar aesthetic of Sachlichkeit to literature and art, fighting against the stylized, ornamental flair of the feuilleton journalism and Art Nouveau and Secessionist art. Adolf Loos, famous for his critique of ornament and Art Nouveau in a manner very similar to Messel, was one of the first voices that Walden published in his new journal; Sprengel, "Von der Baukunst zur Wortkunst. Sachlichkeit und Expressionismus im Sturm," Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte (DVjs) 64, no. 4 (Dec. 1990): 680-706.
Jugendstil movements, Walden resorted to using some of his modernist literary and artistic friends in Vienna, including Kraus and Adolf Loos, whose essays appeared in the first issue of *Der Sturm*. Subsequent issues included writings by Paul Scheerbart, Alfred Döblin, and Walden’s flamboyant first wife Else Lasker-Schüler, alongside a host of new poetry, literature, music, and criticism created by the artists of Berlin’s burgeoning "café culture," such as those frequenting the vibrant Café des Westens.

A year after the establishment of *Der Sturm*, Fritz Pfemert founded the competing anti-bourgeois *Die Aktion* in 1911. This journal focused on the work of the new Expressionist or "Activist" avant-garde literary figures in the circle around Kurt Hiller, and was much more radical in its political stance than Walden’s *Der Sturm*.

[Figure 3.3] Hiller did not shy away from openly attacking the government and its policies or publishing provocative critiques of the establishment. Behne’s more


21 Activism was a political stance that fused Nietzschean ideals with pacifist Socialism, and stood in many ways opposed to Expressionism. Among its most well known advocates included Kurt Hiller, the theater critic Alfred Kerr (and the novelist Heinrich Mann. On *Die Aktion*, see Gerhard Hense, in *Heinz-Dietrich Fischer, Deutsche Zeitschriften des 17. bis 20. Jahrhunderts* (1973), pp.365-378; and Iain Boyd Whyte, *Bruno Taut and the Architecture of Activism* (1982).
mainstream, Socialist inclinations, as well as his belief in the autonomy of art must have inhibited him from writing for Hiller’s *Die Aktion*, though he did publish two short reviews in the political journal during the war.\(^\text{22}\)

In part through their competition, the two journals helped define and champion Expressionist art and literature. In part a reaction to the political and literary focus of *Die Aktion*, but also reflecting Walden’s own primarily artistic interests, *Der Sturm* increasingly included visual arts, art criticism, and original prints by artists such as Oscar Kokoshka, Max Pechstein, and many of the most well-known German Expressionists. At the end of February 1912, to compete with *Die Aktion* but also with Paul Cassirer’s very successful gallery of "modern"--primarily Impressionist--art, Walden spontaneously invited Kandinsky, Marc, August Macke, and the Blue Rider group to exhibit their work in a rented villa in Berlin’s Tiergarten.\(^\text{23}\) A few weeks later, Walden’s first exhibit opened, and with it the "Sturm Gallerie," which would become one of the leading galleries of modern art in Berlin. A month later in April 1912, Behne

\(^\text{22}\) Behne published only two minor book reviews in *Die Aktion*, in 1916, the middle of World War I, perhaps to earn some much needed money. Behne review of Hermann Bahr, ed., *Expressionismus* (1916), in *Die Aktion* 6, no. 33/34 (Aug. 19, 1916): 473-476; and Behne review of Alfred Döblin, *Die drei Sprünge des Wang Lun* (1916), in *Die Aktion* 6, no. 45/46 (Nov. 11, 1916): 631. At least one attempt to publish another article, possibly on soldier cemeteries or mass graves, was rejected by the editor Franz Pfemert in Jan. 1917; see Pfemert letter to Behne (Jan. 18, 1917), Nachlaß Adolf Behne, SBPK.

wrote his first article—a short, positive review of the artists and their cause for change—in the accompanying issue of Der Sturm.24

Walden’s increasing focus on art and art criticism in 1912 was accompanied by an increasingly international orientation, and by extension to the artists and ideas to which Behne was exposed.25 Walden forged connections to like-minded editors and similar galleries, magazines, and movements all over Europe. In the second Sturm exhibit Walden introduced German audiences to Italian Futurism, while Der Sturm published the first translations of various Futurist manifestoes. Later exhibits brought to Berlin the works of Picasso, Braque, and the “French Expressionists,” as well as the first one-man show of the Russian Kandinsky. As a result of a growing interest in revealing international trends and experiments, Walden featured artists from Belgium, Czechoslovakia, America, Romania, Spain, and Switzerland. Accompanying the exhibits, Der Sturm published criticism by the Italian Futurist provocateur Marinetti and the French poet Apollinaire, theoretical pieces by French painters Fernand Léger and Robert Delauney, as well as the Czech Cubists, to name only a few. All together Walden created 170 exhibits promoting modern art in Germany between 1912 and 1928.26 The success of the gallery and the contacts it provided Walden reinforced the

24 Behne, "Zwei Ausstellungen."


26 Pirsich, pp. 671-690.
importance of Der Sturm as the leading venue for the international artistic avant-garde in Germany. In just a few short years the Sturm enterprise went from upstart literary review to a multi-media propaganda machine, what one author has called the “corporate identity” of the avant-garde in Germany.27

Der Sturm: Focus on Art Criticism

Der Sturm both promoted modern art and acted as a revolutionary force fighting against the corrupting forces within modern industrial culture. As with so many of his bohemian friends and young painters and critics such as Behne, Walden worked tirelessly from the magazine’s inception against what he considered two principal evils: the increasing commercialization of culture and its trivialization when culture was popularized by the “wrong” agents.

The single biggest target in his essays was art critics who published in the popular press: those writers that wanted to, in his words, “play at being mediators

27 See Barbara Alms, “Der Sturm - Corporate Identity für die internationale Avantgarde,” in Alms and Steinmetz, Der Sturm, pp. 15-34; and Pirsich, Der Sturm, p. 62. Constant financial pressures convinced Walden to search for ever more “profit centers” to add to the Sturm enterprise. He turned gallery openings into sumptuous annual “Sturm-balls,” with much sought after tickets. He expanded his publishing house to include books, postcards, art reproductions, original prints, and sumptuous portfolios. The success of his gallery convinced Walden to begin a series of traveling exhibitions after 1913, both within Germany and throughout Europe. In 1916 Walden started a series of “Sturmabende,” salon-style discussions for intellectuals, as well as the Sturmschule, an art school. In 1917 Walden and Lothar Schreyer started a theater company, the experimental Sturmbühne, complete with its own journal, the Sturmbühne.
Walden and his accomplices accused the press of succumbing to commercial pressures. They lamented that the press was more intent on selling advertisements and achieving the greatest possible readership than on maintaining the quality of the news reported or culture printed. As a result, they felt the masses were being influenced and educated about art by unqualified and misguided journalists. Borrowing a term from his Viennese friend Kraus, Walden accused the press and its critics of a "de-literarization" (Entliterarisierung) of culture, a steady reduction in the quality of literature in the public sphere, especially in the newspapers. Behne had also complained about the decreasing quality of published criticism on art in newspapers or journals and the ill-effects these texts had on the public’s understanding of art.

Attacking journalists and the art press on the first page of the first issue of Der Sturm, Walden flared: "We have decided to publish our journal ourselves. In this way we hope that in place of journalism and the feuilleton (!) will come Culture and Art."

---

28 Trust [pseud. of H. Walden], "Die Sittenmädchen," Der Sturm 1, no. 17 (1910): 136. On Walden’s and Der Sturm’s relation to the press see Pirsich, Der Sturm, pp. 605-617.


31 See chapter 1; Behne, "Populäre Kunstabücher" (1911).

For Walden and other Sturm critics such as Joseph Adler, the feuilleton was the most dangerous part of journalism. He felt that feuilleton writers deluded themselves into thinking they were carriers of culture and made great proclamations about art, but in reality "had not the slightest idea what art and literature actually was." Walden complained that true artists and literary figures were excluded from publishing in the mainstream press, which included only "kitschers" and "confection-poets." Instead of dilettante critics, he wanted artists and other authorities to speak for themselves. Otherwise, he felt the press would better only relaying factual information, excluding all cultural criticism. Although Behne would be one of the Sturm’s most faithful critics before the end of World War I, as his writing became more socially engaged after 1917, he increasingly attacked Walden’s often purely form-based approach to understanding art. After 1918 Behne himself became the target of Walden’s pointed attacks.

After the Sturm Gallery opened in 1912, Walden’s attacks on the press became

---

33 Trust, "Die öffentliche Meinung," Der Sturm 1, no. 39 (1910): 311. Although he feuilleton is akin to our "Arts & Leisure" section, it can include essays and reviews on any of the arts, reflections on contemporary life and issues, serialized novels, as well as observations on more technical subjects such as science and technology. Although expertise in subjects is clearly important, the feuilleton features a preponderance of literary figures and cultural critics. Excluded is factual information or other pure news reporting, as well as all politics.


35 Pirsich, Der Sturm, p. 62, 605.

more and more self-serving. Intent on defending his own enterprise and the artists he supported, and modern art more generally, he used his magazine increasingly to respond to critical attacks on his own gallery. Walden’s second wife, Nell Walden, later recalled a flood of negative reviews, what she called befuddled, "ignorant" attacks after nearly every Sturm exhibit.\(^{37}\) Walden responded by dedicating an inordinate amount of space in his journal, often most of the issue, to rebuttals and angry exchanges with art critics. He condemned "the Berlin Press," specific newspapers, particular reviews, and individual critics. The most reprehensible critics, were those who threatened to spread a different understanding of what constituted modern art; they included Fritz Stahl (pseud. of Sigfried Lilienthal), the leading art critic for the esteemed Berliner Tageblatt, which Walden called "one of the most evil institutions of Northern Germany"\(^ {38}\); Karl Scheffler, the staunch defender of Impressionism and the Secession and publisher of Germany’s leading art journal, Kunst und Künstler\(^ {39}\), and Paul Westheim, a contemporary of Behne’s who published the progressive and influential Das Kunstblatt.

\(^{37}\) Nell Walden and Schreyer, Der Sturm.


after 1917. Walden often reprinted large sections or many fragments of the derisive reviews and then responded with biting sarcasm. He pointed out the most trivial of factual errors, accused critics of being "thoughtless," old fashioned, or ill informed, and even commented in detail on their writing style and word choice. He ridiculed with particular zeal the provincial press, where he felt critics were "half-witted," liable to be more conservative, and often had very different ideas on what constituted modern art.

Though far from perfect, Walden was remarkably prescient in selecting those who would become influential modern artists and critics. He was one of the first in Germany to appreciate Loos’ criticism and invited him to lecture at the gallery and publish in Der Sturm. In the 1911 scandal surrounding the design of the so-called "Looshaus" on the Michaelerplatz, Walden publicly defended Loos. After hosting one of the earliest solo exhibitions of Kandinsky’s work, Walden was one of the first to defend the young Russian artists against harsh anti-modern criticism. When the Hamburg art critic Kurt Küchler described Kandinsky as an arrogant young

---


42 Walden, "Warnung an die Provinzialpresse," Der Sturm 1, no. 22 (July 28, 1910): 176.

43 On the Looshaus, see Trust [pseud. Of Herwarth Walden], "Schönheit, Schönheit. Der Fall Adolf Loos," Der Sturm 2, no. 70 (July 1911): 556.
"monomaniac" with "silly theory," "fudging" works of "smudged colors" and "tangled lines" that could only be labeled as inconsequential "idiotism," Walden put his publicity machine to work at Kandinsky’s request. He organized and then quickly published several pages of rebuttals by prominent critics, professors and gallery owners as well as a long list of signatures of support, including Behne’s. A few months later, in reaction to the hostile critical reaction to the Sturm’s famous Erster Deutsche Herbstsalon (First German Fall Salon) of 1913, Walden published the flyer "Appeal Against Art Critics."

44 See Kurt Küchler, "Kandinsky," Hamburger Fremdenblatt (Feb. 13, 1913). Walden republished the article so that friends of modern art would have first hand access to the vicious critique; Der Sturm 3, no. 150/151 (Mar. 1913).

45 Walden’s defense was launched at Kandinsky’s request, and included a thorough defense of Kandinsky’s art to counter the negative review; see "Für Kandinsky," Der Sturm 3, no. 150/151 (Mar. 1913): 277-279, with addenda 3, no. 152/153 (Mar. 1913): 288, and 4, no. 154/155 (Apr. 1913): 5-6; as well as Magdalena Bushart, Der Geist der Gotik und die Expressionistische Kunst (1990), pp. 89-90; M. Strauss, "Kandinsky and 'Der Sturm'," Art Journal 43, no. 1 (Spring 1983): 31-35. Behne later took Küchler to task personally for his remarks in "Ein Wort zum Futurismus," Allgemeiner Beobachter 3, no. 18 (Jan. 15, 1914): 249, that Futurism was academic and arbitrary, nihilist in its trickery, and forced to extremes because only the loudest voices were heard in these bizarre times; see Behne, "'Expressionismus'," Allgemeiner Beobachter 3, no. 20 (Feb. 15, 1914): 273-274.

46 Walden’s "Erster Deutscher Herbstsalon" was named after the "Salon d’Automne" in Paris, which had been started in 1903 by Franz Jourdain. Walden’s Herbstsalon featured 75 artists from 12 countries, and 366 works, and was the first true overview of European avant-garde art, including Russian Cubo-futurism, Czech Cubism, German Expressionism, Italian Futurists, and French Fauves. On the exhibit and its critics, see M.-A. von Lüttichau, "Erster Deutscher Herbstsalon, Berlin 1913," in Stationen der Moderne, ed. Eberhard Roters (1988), pp. 130-140; and M.-A. von Lüttichau, "Erster deutsche Herbstsalon," in Die Kunst der Ausstellung, ed. Bernd Klüser and Katharina Hegewisch (1991), pp. 131-153. The reaction to the exhibit was on the whole very hostile. On the Walden’s reaction, see "Nachrichtung," and "Die Presse und der Herbstsalon," both in Der Sturm 4, no. 182/183 (Oct. 1913): 114-115. This material was also published in a slightly different format as a widely distributed leaflet: "Aufruf gegen Kunstkritiker," recently reprinted in part in Alms, "Der Sturm," p. 28; and
[Figure 3.4] It included a "Lexicon of German Art Criticism" listing some of the offensive expressions found in critiques of the exhibit, including Küchler’s venomous language. On a separate page Walden juxtaposed a long series of excerpts from reviews in newspapers all across Germany highlighting--often out of context--the contradictory opinions and insults critics had made, and thereby emphasizing the subjective, incompetent nature of the criticism.

Walden’s propaganda for modern art was by all accounts very successful, promoting and defending many of the now canonical figures of modern art. In the long run, however, the competitiveness, the viciousness, and the personalized nature of his rebuttals probably hindered his program.\(^{47}\) Walden’s nearly manic efforts to uncover, publicize, and then control the newest artists through his journal, gallery and larger Sturm enterprise gradually developed into a overt concern for monetary value that contradicted some of his own Idealist principles and eventually led to his demise. His focus on critics, the reviews, and the press, rather than on the art itself at times derailed his efforts to get back to the authenticity of artistic expression, not the parvenue opinions of dilettantes and theorists.\(^{48}\) This eventually drove many artists away and

\(^{47}\) On the negative side effects of Walden’s attacks, see Pirsich, Der Sturm, pp. 614-617.

\(^{48}\) Ernst Bloch, in the Expressionism debates, accused Lukács of using secondary information, including much from Der Sturm, and not the actual work of visual artists to create his position that Expressionism was irrational, proto-fascist product of capitalism in its flight of fancy. See Charles W. Haxthausen, "Modern Art After The
created many powerful and influential enemies, including Behne after World War I.\footnote{49}

Expressionist Art Theory \]]

Behne’s ascent as a critic paralleled the Sturm’s rise to prominence. Behne produced positive reviews of the very first Sturm exhibit as well as of many of the succeeding exhibits in various popular and professional journals, and soon became a personal friend of Walden’s.\footnote{50} Through Walden’s circle, Behne began absorbing and exploring more intensely both ideas about what constitutes good criticism and theories of "Expressionism," of which he would become one of the leading exponents.

The origin of the term "Expressionism" is a complex one that reaches back into the nineteenth century.\footnote{51} Few artists ever designated themselves as "Expressionists."

\footnote{49} In 1918 Walden even sought to lay exclusive claim to Expressionist art and the artists involved. See Wolf Dieter Dube, The Expressionists (1972), p. 19.

\footnote{50} Behne’s friendship with Walden is documented primarily in Walden’s personal guest books (visits on Sept. 26, 1913, Dec. 31, 1914, etc.) and in the correspondence in the Sturm Archiv, Nachlaß Walden, SBPK; see Brühl, Der Sturm, p. 331.

Unlike Naturalism or Surrealism, Expressionism was not a movement in the strict sense of the word. It lacked a body of self-conscious and self-critical writing activities resulting in consciously formulated programs. It was, rather a syndrome of thoughts and feelings, a Weltanschauung. The movement gave rise to certain techniques and certain themes, such as "the clash of generations" and a wide-spread revolt against materialism and positivism. It sought mystical access to permanent values, not merely to record what was there, even non-visual ideas. Herbert Read defined Expressionism as reproducing not the objective reality of world, but the subjective reality of feelings that objects and events arouse.

Unlike many of the modern art movements that it embraced, including Cubism and Futurism, Expressionism was primarily the invention of critics and associated gallery owners, not artists. The term became the glue that held together a body of disparate visual attributes that shared some underlying ideas. Used in 1903 by the French critic Auguste Hervé to designate a circle of painters around Matisse, the term was subsequently used in varying contexts and always as an antipode to the dominant style and theory of "Impressionism." The germanized version of the French word expressionistes, rather than the Germanic Ausdruck (expression) first assumed


52 Unified Expressionism is fundamentally a construct, or, as Charles Haxthausen has argued, even an "illusion" without historical basis outside of the art critics who invented it; see Haxthausen, "A Critical Illusion." See also Joan Weinstein, "The Novemberrevolution and the Institutionalization of Expressionism in Berlin," in Twentieth Century Art Theory, ed. Richard Hertz and Norman Klein (1990).
prominence for the German art scene in April of 1911, in reference to a room of French
Post-Impressionist paintings labeled "Expressionists," at the 22nd exhibit of the Berlin
Secession. By the 1912 Sonderbund Exhibit in Cologne, the first extensive survey of
European modern art in Germany, critics were regularly using the term to include
German artists. By the time the literary and cultural critic Gustav Fechter authored the
first monograph on Expressionism in 1914, the movement was identified by many
critics, including Behne, as a particularly German style of art, a trend that increased
with the nationalism of World War I.53

Behne first used the term "Expressionism" in his November 1911 article "The
Battle for Art," where he defended the young moderns from nationalistic attacks. Much
like Walden, he understood Expressionism as a much broader and diverse movement
than we consider it today, encompassing almost all the new ideas in art from Cubism
and Fauvism to Futurism and Expressionism. Behne’s use of the term developed out of

53 On the Sonderbund exhibit, Wulf Herzogenrath, ed., Frühe Kölner
Kunstausstellungen (1981), pp. 240-270; Peter Selz, German Expressionist Painting
(1957), pp. 240-249. Paul Fechter saw Expressionism as the German counterpart to
French Cubism and Italian Futurism, all seeking to counter Impressionism; Fechter,
Expressionismus (1914); Dube, The Expressionists, p. 19; Selz, German Expressionist
Painting, pp. 256, 349n13. Behne, for example, identifies Franz Marc’s Expressionism as
"German. . . as German as the writings of the old [Gothic] mystics," a clear reference to
Worringer; Behne, "Der Maler Franz Marc," Pan (Mar. 28, 1913): 618. For more on
Behne’s nationalism, see Magdalena Bushart, "Der Expressionismus, ein deutscher
Nationalstil?" Merkur 45, no. 5 (May 1991): 455-462, where she refers to the 1980
Guggenheim exhibit that reaffirms that "Expressionism of the early twentieth century is
a style and a sensibility specifically German"; cf. "Preface," in Expressionism, A German
Intuition 1905-1920, ed. Joachim Neugroschel (1980), p. 12; and Rose-Carol Washton
Long, "National or International? Berlin Critics and the Question of Expressionism," in
pp. 521-534.
his study of art history at the university, where he had become familiar with the theoretical works of Gottfried Semper, Conrad Fiedler, Adolf von Hildebrand, Theodor Lipps, Alois Riegl, Heinrich Wölfflin, and especially Wilhelm Worringer. During the second half of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, these historians and theorists had been responsible for changing the nature of art history and art criticism, and eventually art itself.\(^\text{54}\) They redirected art scholars’ attention away from the subject-matter and cultural context of painting and art, and towards its formal and aesthetic qualities.\(^\text{55}\)

Much of this theory can be traced back to Kant’s Critique of Pure Judgment, which isolated art as an autonomous system by focusing on perception, and in the

\(^{54}\) The following analysis is based in part on lectures by Alan Colquhoun at Columbia University in spring 1994; Eleftherios Ikonomou and Harry Francis Mallgrave, eds., Empathy, Form, and Space. Problems in German Aesthetics 1873-1893 (1994); David Morgan, “The Idea of Abstraction in German Theories of the Ornament from Kant to Kandinsky,” Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism 50 (Summer 1992): 231-242; Francesco Dal Co, “Projects, Words, Things,” chapter 2 in Figures of Architecture and Thought (1990); Michael Podro, The Manifold of Perception (1972); Ernest K. Mundt, “Three Aspects of German Aesthetic Theory,” Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism 17, no. 3 (March 1959): 287-310. Paul Zucker contrasts this “esthetic” line of theorizing form in art and architecture with the work of the practicing architects of the modern movement, who he claims focused more on functionalism and tectonics and all but ignored these ideas on form, space and abstraction; Zucker, “The Paradox of Architectural Theories at the Beginning of the Modern Movement,” Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians (hereafter JSAH) 10, no. 3 (1951): 8-14. A more focused discussion on the relation to Expressionist painting is in Selz, German Expressionist Painting, chapter 1; and Perkins, Contemporary Theory of Expressionism, pp. 47-64. While Perkins is insightful about the changing nature of art history and art criticism, he disputes my idea that art itself was also affected.

\(^{55}\) According to Mundt, what united critics of modern art was their common "ability to discuss the merits of a work of art without regard to its subject matter. This capacity distinguishes the modern critic from his colleagues of a hundred years ago"; Mundt, "Three Aspects of German Aesthetic Theory," p. 287.
process dismissed content. At mid-century Semper emphasized among other things the role that materials and techniques played in the development of form in art, and in the applied arts in particular. Continuing the march away from content, Fiedler developed a theory of "pure visibility" late in the century that claimed that art was a totally visual activity, the "development of the intuitive consciousness," where "the content of the work of art is nothing but the design (Gestaltung) itself." Art, he insisted, expanded the visible world around us, making the feelings of life visible.

Fiedler’s theory was popularized and put into practice by the Neo-classical sculptor Hildebrand, who sought to create an orderly design method based on principles of classicism, in opposition to what he considered the "apparent chaos" of Impressionism. In his very influential book The Problem of Form in Painting and Sculpture, which Behne had reviewed in 1911, Hildebrand too claimed that art is solely "a problem of visual manifestation." Distinguishing between a visual form

________________________


59 Impressionism, of course, was itself developed as a means of focusing on perception, light, color and technique, though often in a more positivist, scientific rather than the creative, emotional manner.

60 Adolf von Hildebrand, *Das Problem der Form in der Bildenden Kunst* (1893,
(Daseinsform) and an essential form (Wesensform), he developed what he called an "architectonic method," by which all artists could bring order, unity and monumentality into human perception of forms.

In Munich, Lipps articulated a related theory of empathy that explained how artistic forms were conceived by artists in large part as a reaction to the psychic enjoyment that artists and viewers received when perceiving the forms.\(^{61}\) At around the same time, Riegl countered what he considered Semper’s deterministic and materialistic arguments by focusing his attention on the Kunstwollen of artists that expressed the artistic spirit of the age.\(^{62}\) Over time the focus shifted ever further from the art object to the subjects, both the artist while creating the artwork, and the viewer, who could experience similar feelings when observing the art work. Riegl’s arguments ascribing to artists the power to shape culture through form were intoxicating to modern architects such as Behrens and Gropius who sought to change culture through their artistic achievements.\(^{63}\)

The new focus on form and the will of the individual artist in art theory and

---

(1907, 1913) translated as The Problem of Form in Painting and Sculpture (1907). Behne had reviewed Hildebrand’s book in [Behne], "Zur Einführung in die Literatur über moderne Kunst," Wissenschaftliche Rundschau 1, no. 13 (Apr. 1, 1911): 309-311. See also below.

\(^{61}\) On Vischer, Lipps, and empathy, see Ikonomou and Mallgrave, Empathy, Form, and Space, esp. pp. 17-29, 89ff.

\(^{62}\) On Riegl see Margaret Iversen, Alois Riegl. Art History and Theory (1993); and Margaret Rose Olin, Forms of Representations in Alois Riegl’s Theory of Art (1994); and the essays in Richard Woodfield, ed., Framing Formalism: Riegl’s Work (2001).

\(^{63}\) See chapter 5.
history was accompanied by an increasing interest in an exoticized East, the mystical, and the occult. The East served as an escape from the materialism of the West, and the illumination of ancient and widespread precedents validated some of the more radical ideas of modern art. Serious historical and theoretical investigation and eventually popular interest moved from the limited canon of Western classicism to include transitional movements, regional styles, ethnic and folk art, as well as Asian and what Behne termed "so-called primitive" art.64

In his influential dissertation Abstraction and Empathy (1908) and his Form in Gothic (1911), Worringer had followed earlier historians such as Riegl in interpreting variations in artistic form through time and across the world not as signs of artistic cycles or levels of artistic dexterity and talent, but rather as the will and intent of the artist (Kunstwollen).65 With somewhat circular logic, Worringer argued that since form

---


65 See Worringer, Abstraktion und Einfühlung: ein Beitrag zur Stilpsychologie (1908), translated as Abstraction and Empathy: a Contribution to the Psychology of Style (1914); as well as Worringer, Formprobleme. Good summaries of Worringer’s writings and his influence on Expressionist theory can be found in Donahue, Invisible
was derived from artistic will, one could in turn read and interpret the artist’s will from
the forms, and with it the forces and era that had spawned this will. Formal and
stylistic particulars were seen to reflect both the psychological disposition of the artist,
and the historical epoch.

In response to Lipps’ empathy theory, on Riegl’s *Kunstwollen*, as well as his own
fascination with the psychological and mystical, Worringer defined two predominant
poles in art: the "abstract" (Archaic, pre-Socratic Greek, Byzantine, Egyptian, Oriental)
and the "empathetic" or naturalistic art (classic Greece, Renaissance, Realism). 66 Against
the positivist naturalism and organic, flowing forms that came from a desire, or
"empathy" to see things reproduced in a natural and familiar way (e.g., the classical
style), Worringer championed the a-perspectival abstraction drawn from intuition and
the jagged geometry of Eastern and "primitive" art. He hypothesized that the artists
who created this abstraction transcended agoraphobic anxiety about modern chaos and
confusion by creating spiritual clarity, order and the truth out of the "thing itself." 67

Peg Weiss, *Kandinsky in Munich* (1979), p. 159n.25, argues that Worringer’s
definition of "abstract," which he equated with an existential state of loneliness, was
antithetical to the more purely formal definition which developed out of naturalism in
the Jugendstil circles around Lipps, August Endell and Obrist in Munich. As will be
described in greater detail below, Behne’s ideas about abstract form combined the two.

66 Peg Weiss, *Kandinsky in Munich* (1979), p. 159n.25, argues that Worringer’s
definition of "abstract," which he equated with an existential state of loneliness, was
antithetical to the more purely formal definition which developed out of naturalism in
the Jugendstil circles around Lipps, August Endell and Obrist in Munich. As will be
described in greater detail below, Behne’s ideas about abstract form combined the two.

67 See Worringer, *Abstraction and Emphthay*; and Worringer, *Form in Gothic*;
and Worringer, "Entwicklungsgeschichtliches zur modernsten Kunst," in *Im Kampfe
um die Kunst*, pp. 92-99; republished in *Der Sturm* 2, no. 75 (Aug. 1911): 597-598,
partially translated in *German Expressionism*, pp. 9-13. Even within the naturalism,
Worringer was careful to distinguish between mere copying or imitation of nature,
which he did not consider art, and nearly all other forms of representing nature, which
Using racial and national characteristics, he called for a new German or Northern art, alive and mystical, related to the spirit of the Gothic cathedrals and stained-glass painters who synthesized the two approaches. This synthesis of abstraction and naturalism, of the intuitive and the rational, of fantasy and objectivity, presaged the Expressionist ethos. In Worringer’s theory, art went from being a process of imitation of the natural world, to a process of creating an autonomous, independent object, from a focus on objective, external appearances, to a search for the intuitive, emotional world of artistic creativity and the perception of forms.

Behne claimed Worringer’s new method represented "the logical application of Kantian principles to art history," by "moving the focus of research from the objects being perceived, to perception itself." It was an objective "method that sees all facts of art merely as arrangements of certain a priori categories of artistic sensibility, and a method by which these form-creating categories of the soul are the real problems to be investigated." The focus, Behne explained, was on "aesthetics" and "beauty," rather than on the "correct" imitation or stylistic tendencies. The leap from art historical analysis to a program for contemporary art was not difficult from here. In Kandinsky’s implied a willful attempt by the artist to come close to the beauty and spirit of nature. See Worringer, Abstraction and Empathy. Behne reiterates this point in his review of Worringer’s book; Behne, "Moderne Kunstbücher" Die Tat 5, no. 9 (Dec. 1913): 937-938.

anthology The Battle for Art, Worringer urged "we want once again for art to have a suggestive power that is more potent than the suggestive power of the higher and more cultivated illusionism that has been the fate of our art since the Renaissance." 69

Although Worringer’s books were historical inquiries, the lessons for contemporary art were many, and the critics and artists of the movement immediately identified his ideas as relevant.

In parallel to these historical and theoretical developments, the turn-of-the-century reform movement in the applied arts rejected the use of historical ornament in favor or increasing formal abstraction and an approach to design that sought both objectivity (Sachlichkeit) and free artistic creativity. The Munich Jugendstil designer Hermann Obrist pleaded in 1901 for an "expressive art" (Ausdruckskunst) that "harmoniously" combined "fantasy" with a "strict, logical, constructive . . . functional" approach manifested by the "purist . . . or engineering type." 70 His colleague August Endell was developing a theory of abstraction with an emphasis on pure line, color and form. 71 As early as 1898 Endell had defined an abstract "Formart," an approach to art

---


70 Hermann Obrist, "Zweckmässig oder Phantasievoll?," (Nov. 1901) in Obrist, Neue Möglichkeiten (1903), pp. 125-129. In introducing another of Obrist’s essays, the editor of the important journal Der Kunstwart called Obrist one of the most serious artistic spirits of the day, who wanted nothing more than to combine a heartfelt fantasy with a clear focus on the object (Sache); Avenarius, in Obrist, "Neue Möglichkeiten in der bildenden Kunst," Der Kunstwart 16.2 (Apr. 1903): 18.

71 August Endell (1871-1925), the son of an architect, was a student of Lipps, who was teaching in Munich at the time. Both he and Obrist were part of a vibrant...
"which excites the human soul only through forms, forms that are like nothing known, represent nothing and symbolize nothing, an art which works through freely found forms, as music does through free sounds." Eventually this focus on pure materialist "form" shifted to a focus on the mental and emotional Geist (spirit) contained in and emoted by those forms. As a result, subsequent scholars, theorists, and artists, including Behne and many Expressionist artists, no longer saw art primarily as representation, but rather as a metaphysical presentation of an artist’s will and emotions in pure forms.

Expressionism


72 August Endell, "Formkunst," Dekorative Kunst 1, no. 6 (Mar. 1898): 280; also quoted in Weiss, Kandinsky in Munich, p. 167n28, with a slightly different translation on p. 25.

73 This new emphasis on Geist is seen in the theories of Worringer and Kandinsky, discussed in further detail below. The contrast with earlier ideas can be seen even in the title of Hildebrand’s Das Problem der Form in der Bildenden Kunst versus Kandinsky’s Über das Geistige in der Kunst. Weiss, in Kandinsky in Munich has explored the difficulty of translating the German term Geist as well as related term geistig, Geistige, and even Durchgeistigung, a word fundamental to understanding the mission of the German Werkbund. Geistig is more ambiguous, and less supernatural or occult than implied in the English word "spirit." It combines intellectual, emotional, and transcendent qualities, and is opposed above all to the material, corporeal or physical. The Geisteswissenschaften (humanities) are thus contrasted to the Sozialwissenschaften (social sciences) and Naturwissenschaften (natural or physical sciences).
Behne’s Embrace of Expressionism

Behne was quickly swept up in these new theoretical trends, and by Worringer’s ideas in particular. In both his historical studies and his criticism he promoted an intuitive rather than an intellectual approach, highlighting the “artistry” over content or style of artworks.74 What mattered to him was understanding the essence and the process of creating art, not the philological tracing of movements or styles. Following Worringer, Behne argued that art since the Renaissance, in contrast to the more mystical and “organic-lively” art of the Gothic, had become increasingly superficial, excessive in its focus on rationality and appearances, a trend he felt had culminated in Impressionism.75 Both Worringer and Behne believed a new art was needed to counter this tendency and championed instead an intuitive, abstract art that corresponded to modern man’s experience of the world.

When Behne first encountered contemporary art in Walden’s gallery and read

74 See, for example, Behne, “Populäre Kunstwissenschaft,” Wissenschaftliche Rundschau 1, no. 11 (Mar. 1, 1911): 247-250. Weiss, Kandinsky in Munich, pp. 7,10,133, and passim, has shown how much of this turn towards intuition and pure art was also developed in the Kunstgewerbe and Jugendstil movements, particularly in Munich around the turn-of-the-century. She argued that they stimulated the imagination, promoted planar forms, inner necessity, honesty in the use of artistic media, and reverence for works of art in themselves, without reference to the real world. The contemporaneous Symbolist art suggested that condensed, abstracted images could purvey profound significance, while symbolist theater suggested that pure color, light, sound, movement could increase dramatic effects.

75 The Socialist critic Max Raphael had written earlier in Der Sturm that the New Secession artists did not want to give a glimpse of the fleeting as the Impressionists had done, but to evoke the enduring and eternal; Raphael, “Die neue Malerei, Neue Sezession,” Der Sturm 2, no. 58 (Apr. 1911): 463, summarized in Long, German Expressionism, p. 4.
theoretical essays by the artists exhibited there, he saw before him the translation of these ideas to canvas and paper. Since both Behne and Walden interpreted "Expressionism" as an attitude and experience, not a style or type, they subsumed many different types of post-Impressionist art under the term, including Fauvism, Cubism (Analytic, Synthetic, and Czech), and Futurism. Neither man was interested in differentiating these movements, since they hoped to create a single Sturm identity for modern art. Unlike Worringer, Behne and Walden refused to be constrained by a priori principles (Begriffe), styles or types. To them Expressionism included all modern art of quality. As Walden succinctly explained it, "We call the art of this century Expressionism, in order to distinguish it from that which is not Expressionism." The art historian Charles Haxthausen has even suggested that the term "Expressionism" functioned in German art criticism for a decade or so as the term "modernism" would later function in the discourse on twentieth century avant-garde culture.

---

76 Alms, "Der Sturm, Corporate Identity."

77 Behne wrote often of his contempt for Begriffe; see, for example, Behne, "Zur neuen Kunst" Der Sturm 5, no. 1 (Apr. 1914): 2; and Behne, "Prinzip oder Takt?" Die Glocke 3, no. 29 (Oct. 20, 1917): 116-119, where he wrote "Hüten wir uns vor den Begriffen," p. 119.

78 Walden, “Kunst und Leben” Sturm (1919) as quoted in Selz, German Expressionist Painting, p. 256. In 1918 Walden defined Expressionism even more narrowly, as those artists associated with his Sturm gallery. See Dube, The Expressionists.

79 For a similar pan-European attitude about Expressionism in the work of Hausenstein, see Haxthausen, "A Critical Illusion." Haxthausen’s excellent analysis notes that for Hausenstein, like Behne, Expressionism was not just the name of a coherent art movement, but a theory of the avant-garde: not Renato Poggioli’s individualist, experimental avant-garde, but Peter Bürger’s anti-bourgeois
As a result, Behne’s use of stylistic terms is vague and sometimes contradictory. In a review of the 1913 Herbstsalon, for example, he discussed Expressionism, Cubism, and Futurism almost interchangeably. Both Cubism and Futurism were defined in relation to "simultaneity," one of the central hallmarks of Expressionist poetry. By 1914, however, he had begun to differentiate Expressionism from Cubism more explicitly. In a review of a Picasso exhibit, he characterized the artist’s turn-of-the-century representational paintings as "sentimental," and his first successes with Cubism around 1907-1908 as "Expressionist." Behne discerned a profound change in Picasso’s most recent work from 1913, which he saw as totally formal, and labeled "Cubist." In his Sturm lecture on "German Expressionism" given at the end of the year, Behne explained the overlapping nature of the terms: "Expressionism represents the goal. Modern art wants to be an art of expression. Cubism represents the language to which many, but not all, Expressionists resort. Futurism represents a name for the emotional individualism; see Bürger, Theory of the Avant-Garde (1984) and Poggioli, The Theory of the Avant-Garde (1968). After the war Hausenstein became quite conservative, while Behne moved further to the left.

\[^{80}\text{Behne, "Der erste deutsche Herbstsalon," Dresdner neueste Nachrichten (Sept. 28, 1913). On simultaneity see Däubler, Der neue Standpunkt (1916); and Rosemarie Haag Bletter, "Bruno Taut and Paul Scheerbart's Vision: Utopian Aspects of German Expressionist Architecture." (Diss. 1973), chapter IV, esp. pp. 356ff. The Neo-Pathetiker friends of Walden’s were considered to have invented the idea of "simultaneity" in poetry. Walden later became a strong supporter of the formalist "word-art" of poets such as August Stramm.}\]

whirlwinds that played the role of instigator.” In subsequent articles Behne began increasingly to favor the term "Cubism" over "Expressionism," seeing Cubism not only as a formal language, but also as an attitude, a euphoric feeling of being amidst a rushing whirlwind of life, much as Expressionism had been early on. This change was in part motivated by the nationalism of war, during which the term "Expressionism" was increasingly used to describe only German painters, and primarily those that Behne associated with an older generation of modern artists such as Pechstein that still favored realism. For Behne, "Cubism" signified a more dynamic, pure and transnational attitude to form and expression in art.

Despite the variety of artists and approaches gathered under the Sturm banner, Wassily Kandinsky stood out for Behne as the central figure defining the new modern art. In his book Über das Geistige in der Kunst (Concerning the Spiritual in Art, 1911) and his essay "Über die Formfrage" ("On the Question of Form") in the Blue Rider Almanac (1912), Kandinsky had elaborated what Behne considered the key concept of Expressionism: "inner necessity" (innere Notwendigkeit). [Figure 3.5] Kandinsky had defined it as "the impulse felt by the artist for spiritual expression." Reacting against


83 Behne, "Biologie und Kubismus," Der Sturm 6, no. 11/12 (Sept. 1915).

the "nightmare of materialism, which has turned the life of the universe into an evil, useless game," he had sought refuge in a more spiritual realm.\textsuperscript{85} For Kandinsky, the inner need of the artist comprised three mystical elements, which was expressed in every true art work. First was the artist's own individual personality. Second was the spirit of the age, or style, which would change over time. Third was an element of pure artistry, which he considered constant and universal in all art. All three were vague and hard to define, but it was in part the ambiguity which allowed so many different artists to gather under the banner of Expressionism, and also required critics to expound on the theory and explain it to the public. In the chapter "About Painting," and in much of his essay in the Almanach, Kandinsky elaborated on this last element, postulating intricate emotional and spiritual meanings for certain colors and shapes that he considered "objective."\textsuperscript{86}

Behne had expressed a similar formalist theory of painting. Within months of the release of Kandinsky's book, Behne argued that the essence of a painting must be derived "from the thing itself," that painting was "a working with colors, with lines, with light and dark, a filling of a particular surface made of paper, wood, or canvas."\textsuperscript{87}

\begin{flushright}
Blue Rider Almanach in the art library of the F.U. Berlin, with a date of Sept. 4, 1912, and heavy underlining in the essay by Kandinsky; see Bushart, "Kunst-Theoretikus" p. 70n29, and 70n36. Good summaries of Kandinsky's aesthetic theory appear in Selz, German Expressionist Painting, chapter 18.
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{85} Kandinsky, Concerning the Spiritual in Art, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{86} Kandinsky, Concerning the Spiritual in Art, pp. 23ff.

\textsuperscript{87} Behne, "Die neue Sezession" p. 207. Kandinsky's Über das Geistige in der Kunst was published in Dec. 1911; while the Blue Rider Almanac came out in May 1912,
For Behne, the new art was not a representation or imitation of anything, certainly nothing in nature or the visible world. Instead, this new art was an expression through the process of artistic creation of an artist’s inner experience of specific ideas and things. The resulting color and lines were "symbols" that together recreated (Gestalten), not represented, the inner essence of the experience.

Some historians have claimed that Behne’s formalist approach and his insistence on the autonomy of art went further than Kandinsky’s own position. Magdalena Bushart has even argued that Behne’s position was unique in pre-War Europe. Where Kandinsky’s “inner necessity” demanded a close correlation of color and line to the spiritual and inner psychological needs of the artist, and Franz Marc wrote about how the zeitgeist delivered the symbols for abstract art, Behne insisted that colors and

---

88 "In formaler Beziehung haben die Bilder Franz Marc's mit der Natur nicht das geringste zu tun"; Behne, "Der Maler Franz Marc," p. 618.

89 Continuing with his analysis of Marc’s paintings, he writes "Keine Form, die irgendeiner Form der Natur anders als ganz von ungefähr zu vergleichen wäre, aber die Existenz, die Seele der Kreatur, das bewegte Wunder eines Waldes ist hier gestalten, nicht nachgeahmt. . . Der Geist des Malers ist gerichtet auf das Innere der Natur, und dieses Innere der Natur gestalten er durch die Erschaffung von Symbolen. Der Künstler ist wieder ein Schöpfer, ein Bildner und Gestalter." Behne, “Der Maler Franz Marc,” p. 618, emphasis in original.

90 Bushart, “Kunst-Theoretikus,” p. 18. Bushart also cited as a possible source a definition of non-abstract, “pure painting” by Behne’s friend Curt Herrmann, a board member of the New Secession through whom Behne met several modern artists. See Herrmann, Im Kampfe um die Kunst (1911); cited in Bushart, "Kunst-Theoretikus," p. 70n33, 70n36.
lines provided no direct equivalent for experience or psychological states. He postulated that art was a pure play of forms almost completely devoid of outside references. Here Behne’s formalist ideas recall the “pure visibility” of Fiedler, who was also one of the first to introduce the idea of “inner necessity” into art.

But Behne wanted it both ways. Caught up in Expressionism’s spiritual rebellion against the materialism of the age, he saw art as simultaneously as an intuitive, experiential, even spiritual venture, as well as a play of visible and material forms. True art, for Behne, was neither about imitation of nature nor wilful abstraction, but rather about human expression without recourse to non-artistic ends. In other words, he saw art as a direct translation of contemporary life into aesthetic form. He


92 Fiedler wrote: "Artistic activity begins when man, driven by inner necessity, grasps with the power of the mind the entangled multiplicity of appearances and develops it into a configured visual existence”; quoted in Selz, German Expressionist Painting, p. 5. Riegl also used the term "innere Notwendigkeit" when defining the term Kunstwollen; Alois Riegl, Spätrömische Kunstindustrie (1901), p. 22. Detlef Mertins claims that Behne implicitly derived his ideas of Gestaltung from Fiedler, who was reintroduced through Hermann Konnerth’s popular Die Kunsttheorie Konrad Fiedlers (1909); see Mertins, "Anything but Literal: Sigfried Giedion and the Reception of Cubism in Germany," in Architecture and Cubism, ed. Eve Blau and Nancy Troy (1997), pp. 244n19; also quoted in Mertins, "Transparencies Yet to Come: Sigfried Giedion and Adolf Behne,” A+U 97, no. 10, no. 325 (Oct. 1997): 16n25. As Anthony Alofsin has explored in depth, however, similarity of ideas should not necessarily be interpreted as influence, especially in the modern era; Alofsin, Frank Lloyd Wright—the Lost Years, 1910-1922 (1993). My research has not uncovered any specific evidence of this, though Behne was clearly very familiar with Hildebrand, and no doubt knew Fiedler’s work.
considered the Expressionist art in Walden’s gallery an articulation of lived experience rather than sensory impressions; it was generative not imitative, Idealist not realist, oriented to the future not the past. This new art, he felt, valued the subjective as opposed to objective, inner feelings as opposed to outer forms, eternal values rather than fleeting appearances, inner truth rather than external reality. Although Behne’s ideas on art and the artists he promoted changed many times throughout his career, his desire to see life translated into art remained a constant throughout his career.

Publishing, the Press, and Expressionism

Coupled with his friendship with Walden, Behne’s ability to articulate a clear and sympathetic vision for the new theory of art brought him increasingly into the Sturm fold, despite publishing relatively few pieces in Der Sturm. His close identification with the Sturm enterprise and its art soon led to his dismissal from Naumann’s more conservative Die Hilfe. Naumann considered Behne’s views on modern art too radical, and disdainfully wrote to Behne: "I can recall that . . . I declared your article on Max Pechstein to be unsuitable. . . . This article could of course appear in any journal which is not focused on coherently shaping the minds of its readers."  

93 Behne, Zur neuen Kunst (1915), passim, esp. pp. 18-23.
94 Behne contributed only nine articles to Der Sturm from April 1912 to November 1916; see bibliography.
95 "Ich [habe] . . . in der Redaktionskonferenz Ihren . . . Aufsatz über Max Pechstein für ungeeignet erklärt. . . . Dieser Aufsatz kann selbst verständlich in jeder Zeitschrift erscheinen, die auf eine zusammenhängende Meinungsbildung ihrer Leser kein Gewicht legt . . . wenn in einem Aufsatz die beabsichtigte Entfernung von der
Naumann maintained that for two decades he and fellow editor Theodor Heus had been bent on promoting Naturalism ("naturforschende Malerei"), and it would be too big a jump to print an article that promoted the "purposeful distancing from the most truthful re-presentation of appearances." As a consequence, Naumann rejected all further articles by Behne.

It did not stall Behne. That same fall he was elected to give the first official tour through Walden’s "Erster Deutscher Herbstsalon,” alongside Apollinaire, Marinetti, and Hausenstein “in order to teach and win over the public” to the cause of Expressionism.\(^6\)

In November 1914 Walden published Behne’s first book, *Zur neuen Kunst* (Towards a New Art), a compilation of earlier articles that had appeared in *Der Sturm* and elsewhere, as part of the "Sturm-Books" series.\(^7\) [Figure 3.6] In December 1914 Behne was given the honor of presenting the introductory lecture to the exhibit on "German...
Expressionists.\textsuperscript{98} His writings and lectures quickly became something of an unofficial "Sturm-theory," articulating and clarifying Walden’s own views that at times seemed not to go far beyond a simple \textit{l’art pour l’art} approach.\textsuperscript{99} Although Behne was soon recognized as one of the principal "Sturm-theorists," not all Sturm artists felt he deserved the position.\textsuperscript{100}

Behne was by no means beholden to Walden or Der Sturm, nor did he write exclusively for them. He felt an obligation towards a broader public, including those who were critical, confused or even offended by the new art and its departure from all that was familiar. In frustration Behne concluded that "the public is estranged from the new form[s]."\textsuperscript{101} Interestingly, however, Behne also acknowledged that the public in recent years had become more receptive to innovation and novelty. A general insecurity about all of modern life, he claims, had resulted in a public that was less smug, less sure about its reactions, less confident in laughing or dismissing the new,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{98} Behne’s lecture was published as "Deutsche Expressionisten."

\textsuperscript{99} Bushart, "Kunst-Theoretikus" p. 18.

\textsuperscript{100} On Behne’s role as early "Sturm-Theorist," especially his influence on Walden and his book \textit{Einblicke in die Kunst} (1917), see Pirsich, Der Sturm, p. 64. Bushart cited several letters by the Sturm artists Adolf Knoblauch that say that Behne was lucky to have fallen into the role. Alfred Döblin also was critical of Behne, see Bushart, "Kunst-Theoretikus," p. 73n76 and n79.

\textsuperscript{101} Behne, "Bruno Taut," \textit{Pan} 3, no. 23 (Mar. 7, 1913): 540. Behne claimed the public tended to interpret the new art using preconceived categories without looking closely at the art; Behne, "Zur neuen Kunst." Such demeaning generalizations about the lay public were the norm: art critics had long blamed a philistine or ignorant public for failing to understand new art. See B.I. Lewis, \textit{Art for All}.\end{flushright}
and more willing to wait until it had been fully evaluated.¹⁰²

The solution for connecting the people to the radical forms of Expressionism, he concluded, was unprecedented publicity and supportive commentary to convince the public of its worth and modernity. As a result, artists increasingly looked beyond their small group exhibits and manifestoes for support. They needed big-city critics and gallery owners to decode and promote this art to the public in order to realize their own pedagogic goal of creating a new German art and culture, and to change the public conception of taste, spirit, and nation.¹⁰³ With the establishment of Walden’s journal and other related enterprises after 1910, the publicity of modern art had switched almost completely from small artists' groups with limited means, to big city art dealers and professional journals and the mass media that had much more extensive resources.¹⁰⁴

The result was a quantitative explosion in the publicity surrounding Expressionist art, particularly exhibitions and publications, just as Behne was launching his career. Few movements in art and literature may be said to have been accompanied by so much contemporary theoretical writing and by such a diversity of publications as


¹⁰³ Bushart, Geist der Gotik, p. 57. Behne talks about the artists desire to be understood in Zur Neuen Kunst, p. 17. Although many Expressionist artists such as Kandinsky and the Blue Rider group began their careers working in rural conditions, they became increasingly dependent on, and eventually moved to the metropolis.

Expressionism.\(^{105}\) It ranks among the most self-conscious art movements in history. Although the artists themselves wrote a great deal, the lion’s share of the intellectual work was done by what one historian has called a set of "pure theoreticians’, a band of knight-errant Doctors of Philosophy or Law, who neither painted or wrote, but explained."\(^{106}\) This band of critics and their myriad of publications dominated the artistic scene, often overshadowing or recasting the actual art produced.\(^{107}\) Expressionism was a modern art movement shaped and even created by critics and the press. As Shearer West recently noted, "The unity of such a 'spiritual' style was achieved through the agency of dealers, newspapers and magazines."\(^{108}\) Through Behne’s role as semi-official Sturm critic after 1913, as well as his invention of a concept of "Expressionist" architecture in 1912 that will be discussed in the next chapter, Behne would play a defining role as well. His ideal of a scholar-critic discussed above was a fundamental part of why Expressionism became so popular and important.

\(^{105}\) The 18 thick volumes of Paul Raabe’s Index Expressionismus (1972) cover the hundreds of published periodicals and books, including much on Expressionist art, though the voluminous index of hundreds of journals is dedicated exclusively to literary and artistic Expressionism, and does not tackle the journals devoted to art and architecture or the general cultural publications. See also Paul Raabe, "Illustrated Books and Periodicals," in German Expressionist Prints and Drawings, vol. 1, ed. Stephanie Barron (1989), pp. 115-130; and Perkins, Contemporary Theory of Expressionism, with a good bibliography of the rich array of theoretical texts on art from the period.

\(^{106}\) Perkins, Contemporary Theory of Expressionism, p. 11.

\(^{107}\) Perkins and Gordon both feel that critics tried to group many artists into a single group called "Expressionism," and historians have continued the practice, but in reality the artists did not feel much shared spirit, not should their work be grouped. See Perkins, Contemporary Theory of Expressionism; and Gordon, Expressionism.

\(^{108}\) Shearer West, Visual Arts in Germany 1890-1937 (2000), p. 84.
An enormous increase in the output of mechanically reproducible graphic work by German artists also fueled the explosion of publications around Expressionism. Some of the most important expressionist art works were found not in gold frames on the walls of homes or museums, but in periodicals, books and posters. The Expressionist movement was not built by a few artistic giants, but by scores of competent artists who together reinvigorated the arts of drawing, wood-block prints and many other forms of art on paper published in journals such as Der Sturm. Their art, both originals and reproductions in magazines, was thus surprisingly affordable, allowing for and encouraging a whole new type of collector, including young people such as Behne, and even working-class citizens. Expressionism became an art “for and by the people.” Behne began collecting prints and inexpensive paintings early on, both buying them and receiving them as gifts sometimes in return for articles he wrote on certain artists.

Behne took advantage of the publishing explosion to jump start his career. He wrote over 160 articles in his first four years as a critic, over 430 by the "end" of Expressionism in late 1920. After engaging with Der Sturm in 1912 he began to

109 Raabe, "Illustrated Books and Periodicals.” Worringer saw the hand-carved woodblock print was seen as an especially "Germanic" art form, appropriate for the expressive character of these artists and the art they sought to make.

110 See Kai Gutschow, "Expressionism as Democratic Art: Adolf Behne’s Criticism of Art For and By the People,” unpublished MS for the session on "Art and Democracy," at the College Art Association, Boston, Feb. 2006.

111 See bibliography for a complete list of published articles. Hausenstein and Worringer declared the end of Expressionism in late 1920. In late 1920 the USPD split.
publish articles in a greater variety of publications. Despite his training in architecture and art history, he had shied away from the professional art press before the war. Instead his contributions were largely published in both prestigious cultural journals and popular magazines, their very subject matter marking Behne’s developing stature as a seminal artistic avant-garde critic. His frequent articles in Socialist journals were a sign of his increased interest in Socialism and the working class. By publishing articles in the feuilleton section of Germany’s major mass-circulation newspapers, Behne was reaching out to the classes ignored by the elitist press.

---

112 Out of a total of approximately 275 articles from before World War I, Behne wrote only nine articles in Der Sturm, eleven in Fritz Hellwag’s Kunstgewerbeblatt, seven in the upstart cinema journal Bild und Film, six in Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration, and two in the short-lived Die neue Kunst (see bibliography). On the professional art journals see Lutz S. Malke, ed., Europäische Moderne. Buch und Graphik aus Berliner Kunstverlagen 1890-1933 (1989); Maria Rennhofer, Kunstzeitschriften der Jahrhundertwende in Deutschland und Österreich 1895-1914 (1997).

113 In the spring of 1913 he began publishing in Alfred Kerr’s Pan, Theodor Heuß’s März, Die Gegenwart, Diederichs’ Die Tat, and the Preußische Jahrbücher. On these important cultural journals, see Fischer, Deutsche Zeitschriften; and Fritz Schlawe, Literarische Zeitschriften 1910-1933 (1973). Pan was first published by Paul Cassirer, but gradually taken over by Kerr, who turned towards ever more avant-garde and anti-bourgeois material. Die Tat was part of Diederichs’ National-Social reform program.

114 He wrote 45 articles in the Arbeiter-Jugend between June 1912 and November 1918; and over a hundred as regular columnist for the Sozialistische Monatshefte between April 1913 and February 1933. See chapter 1 above for more on both journals and Behne’s political involvement and affiliations.

115 The latest research shows that Behne published a series of articles in the Dresdner neueste Nachrichten, then one article each in the Kölnische Zeitung, the Frankfurter Zeitung, the Socialist daily Vorwärts, the Hamburger Fremdenblatt, Hamburger Nachrichten, and Berliner Tageblatt, and in the spring of 1914 a series of articles in the Königsberger Hartungsche Zeitung on East Prussian architects. On the
Articles in popular magazines point to his desire to educate the masses about the new art.\(^{116}\)

The reasons for this breadth of publishing were many. Money was always an issue. By the end of 1913 Behne was supporting himself, a wife and child, with a combination of freelance writing and teaching.\(^{117}\) [Figure 3.7] As Behne’s wife Elfriede Schäfer Behne recalled years later, though times were often tough, “the family cherished intellectual things at the expense of material ones,” preferring to buy books, theater tickets and trips, rather than other fancy things.\(^{118}\) Behne dedicated his life to the cause of criticism, literally living off of his ability to publish as widely as possible. His

\(^{116}\) When \textit{Wissenschaftliche Rundschau} was taken over by \textit{Die Umschau} in 1913, Behne switched too, and also began publishing in the popular magazines \textit{Allgemeiner Beobachter}, \textit{Velhagen & Klasings Monatshefte}, and the illustrated \textit{Zeit im Bild}. For general remarks about the significance of such popular and illustrated magazines, see K. Schottenlohrer, Karl and J. Binkowski, \textit{Flugblatt und Zeitung. Ein Wegweiser durch das gedruckte Tagesschriftum}, vol. 2 (1922), revised edition (1985).

\(^{117}\) Although not fully verifiable, Behne taught continuing education classes from the summer of 1912, up until 1933, and then again after 1945.

\(^{118}\) Elfriede Wilhelmine Adelheid Schäfer (June 16, 1883 - May 7, 1960), was the second of four children and only daughter of railroad engineer Karl Schäfer (who died when Elfriede was 6) and Anna März. From age 17 on she worked as a nanny in Hessen, then Berlin, then the French Riviera, before becoming a Kindergarten teacher in Berlin and marrying Behne on June 5, 1913. She continued to work as a teacher while, raising the Behne’s two daughters, Karla (Dec. 1, 1913 - Mar. 3, 1966) and Julia (July 11, 1921 - ?). See family anecdotes recorded by Behne’s wife Elfriede in Dec. 1942, Box 8, Folder 70, Nachlaß Behne/Wirsig, Rep. 200 Acc.3860, Landesarchiv Berlin.
criticism was not beholden to an employer, clients or even a single journal. This fact alone begins to distinguish Behne from other well known architectural critics such as Behrendt, a Prussian government official in Berlin, and Platz, Director of the Building Department in the city of Mannheim.

Avant-garde journals such as Walden’s Der Sturm paid notoriously little, if anything. Their authors wrote for the cause of modern art, and to support their artist friends.¹¹⁹ Newspapers and some popular magazines, on the other hand, paid handsomely, by the line. Other journals paid by the page, or per article. As a result, Behne often shopped articles around in search of better commissions, balancing his concerns for the money with those for prestige or circulation.¹²⁰ He frequently published the same article or some slight variation of it, or a combination of two or more articles in several different journals or newspapers to insure additional income, as well as to address different readers or emphasize important points.¹²¹ Writing a regular

¹¹⁹ Pirsich gathered evidence, including a letter from Behne to Walden from Aug. 22, 1915, to claim that Walden probably paid no commissions during the first few years, except for a complementary issue of the journal in which one’s article was published. Die Aktion also paid nothing for contributions. There is no record whether Behne received any payment for his book Zur Neuen Kunst, though correspondence with Walden does acknowledge many complimentary copies, which he gave away to friends, and to reviewers. Walden’s Sturm enterprise was always notoriously short of money, especially after World War I; see Pirsich, Der Sturm, pp. 75-77, 168.

¹²⁰ In November 1912, for example, Behne tried in vain to publish an article on Bruno Taut in Karl Scheffler’s prestigious Kunst und Künstler before settling in March 1913 on publishing an article in Alfred Kerr’s Pan. See below for further examples.

¹²¹ An added reason for republishing articles was the writing process itself. Behne wrote easily, in a fluid prose that probably did not need much revision. Undoubtedly he believed it was more important to publish in quantity than achieve perfection. The catchy turn-of-phrase for which he achieved some notoriety even in his
now, however, came only with some practice and repetition. Behne developed his arguments over time, working out ideas from one article to the next. The more he wrote, the more he advanced and clarified his ideas. Once he got an idea down successfully, however, he was not shy of republishing it, often. The books were developed from many earlier articles, many passages copied directly.

Behne’s sick phases are documented in short postcards and comments in countless letters he wrote to friends and colleagues. See, for example, the 181 letters in correspondence between the Behnes and the slightly younger painter Walter Dexel and his wife, at the Getty Research Institute Archives, excerpts of which appear in W. Witt, *Hommage à Dexel (1890-1973)* (1980), pp. 87-108. See the bibliography below for a list of Elfriede’s publishing.

Beginning in 1915, when Behne was called up for military duty, and again in the late 1920s when illness and convalescence often made work impossible, his wife Elfriede also published extensively, under both her maiden and married names. She later acknowledged having written many of Behne’s articles during the inflation period in order to bring in money. She also composed much of the correspondence that

---

122 Behne’s sick phases are documented in short postcards and comments in correspondence letters he wrote to friends and colleagues. See, for example, the 181 letters in correspondence between the Behnes and the slightly younger painter Walter Dexel and his wife, at the Getty Research Institute Archives, excerpts of which appear in W. Witt, *Hommage à Dexel (1890-1973)* (1980), pp. 87-108. See the bibliography below for a list of Elfriede’s publishing.

123 Elfriede’s work appeared primarily in the working-class journals, including *Arbeiter-Jugend, Die Lesestunde* and *Wohnungswirtschaft*. She mentions writing for Behne in her family remembrances written in Dec. 1942, in Box 8, Folder 70, Landesarchiv Berlin. Such collaboration was certainly not unique, and may even have seemed natural among the colleagues and friends who often worked and socialized in large groups. There were a number of husband and wife teams inspired each other in the arts and often collaborated; such as the Waldens, the Gropius’, the Moholy-Nagys, the Mendelsohns, and the Behrendts, to name just a few.
Behne had with artists and publishers. Although many of the articles published under Elfriede’s name were clearly her own inspiration, including pieces on toys and classrooms related to her work as a nursery school teacher, others followed Behne’s topics, ideas and style very closely, including articles on art historical figures. There must have close collaboration in their work. Perhaps Behne even used her name occasionally to publish in more venues under a different name, much as when he used a pseudonym early in his career.

Circulation numbers were key. The avant-garde magazines were printed in very low numbers, their importance in the history books far outweighing the few hundred copies that were often printed. But, as Behne’s correspondence attests, these journals were re-circulated extensively among friends and colleagues, and Behne both borrowed and loaned specific issues. The most popular, more mass-market journals had circulations of around 5,000-10,000, while some newspapers had circulations of over 100,000, with three editions a day. Their readers, however, certainly did not read as much or as intensely as the readers of subscription journal readers.¹²⁴

Behne’s enormous output corresponded well with the anti-elitist, anti-bourgeois platforms of the Expressionists and Socialist movements, which sought to reach out to the working-class and the broader public in order to inspire efforts to create a more universal, collective culture. These artists’ impassioned rebellion against the academy, the Secession, the bourgeois establishment and industrial capitalism led them to more

¹²⁴ Die Gegenwart had a circulation of 30,000 before war; see Schlawe, Literarische Zeitschriften, p. 65.
popular art forms such as print graphics, word-art, and poetry. The art historian
Barbara Wright has even gone so far as to claim that writing about art in journals and 
newspapers was, for many critics and artists, a form of politics, part of a prevalent neo-
Kantian philosophy that promoted art and ethical action as a way to oppose the wanton 
materialism of the dominant culture and the pettiness of regular politics.  

Expanding "Expressionism" to Other Disciplines

Behne’s most important contribution to the discourse of modern art and 
aritecture before the War was not the theoretical definition of a new art, but rather 
the expansion of his Idealist vision of what constituted Expressionist thought to other 
cultural production and intellectual fields. Although the term "Impressionism," had 
long been used to describe non-artistic endeavors such as philosophy, the term 
"Expressionism" until 1912 had been used almost exclusively in reference to painting 
and literature to denote an art that focused on inner essence rather than external 
appearances, such as "Impressionism." Similar to the art historians Riegl, Worringer, 
and Wölflin, however, Behne believed that the spirit of an age manifested itself in

125 Barbara D. Wright, "Sublime Ambition: Art, Politics and Ethical Idealism in 
the Cultural Journals of German Expressionism," in Bronner and Kellner, eds., Passion 
and Rebellion, pp. 82-112. Whereas Worringen, Behne, and much of the first generation 
of pre-War Expressionists were often influenced in their vision of better society by the 
occult, mystical tracts, or non-Western art, the post-war generation was increasingly 
inspired by the working-class utopian experiment in Russia and the personal belief that 
art was a form of politics that could provide benefits for all.

126 See, for example, Richard Hamann, Der Impressionismus in Leben und 
Kunst (1907), where he describes Nietzsche’s philosophy and literary style as 
"Impressionist."
equivalent ways in all media. Riegl, for example, had written: "Basic laws are common to all . . . media, as is the Kunstwollen, which rules them all; but these laws cannot be recognized with the same clarity in all media."127 In his quest to define art as an autonomous discipline without outside references, Behne did not believe that any field expressed or directly represented a zeitgeist or a universal Kunstwollen. Rather, he felt that the new art of Expressionism merely "interacted with the zeitgeist" and had much in common with other contemporary intellectual and spiritual endeavors.128

In an analysis of the paintings of Franz Marc from late March 1913, Behne addressed Worringer’s call for a new art when he argued that Marc’s abstracted, strong forms were giving expression to "a new age of intuition, of metaphysics, of synthesis." He proclaimed: "We live in a new age, and we can even call it an 'Expressionist' age."129 Later that fall Behne began to expound on this new age in an in-depth critique of Taine’s "milieu theory" of art history that marked a key turning-point in the development of Behne’s ideas.130 As Behne saw it, Taine’s art history sought to use positivist scientific principles to focus on exterior values of race, technique, artist’s biography, and contextual atmosphere as the primary determinants of art. In the process Taine all but ignored the fantasy, color sense, perceptual qualities, and other


130 Behne, "Kunst und Milieu."
"psycho-physical" inner values that Behne felt were key to the artistic process. Behne claimed that Taine’s ideas, "like Charles Darwin’s theory of evolution," were deterministic "children of the materialist, positivist nineteenth century," an epoch then drawing to a close. It was becoming clearer to Behne that the new era was based on other principles: "today we go from the inner to the external; in all areas we stand under the sign of a new inner and spiritual reality. . . . In place of Impressionism is coming Expressionism."\(^{131}\) The new spirit, he felt, was most clearly visible in painting, but it could be found in other disciplines as well. Behne wrote that Taine’s context-focused milieu theory was "Impressionist" in comparison to Wölfflin’s study of the inner essence of forms, which he labeled an "Expressionist" art history. Similarly, in literature Behne claimed that the psychological novels of Heinrich Mann were "Expressionist" compared to the "Impressionist" work of his "less able" brother Thomas Mann.\(^{132}\)

Behne expanded his analysis beyond the arts when in the same article he characterized the ideas of the theoretical biologist Jacob van Uexküll as "Expressionist."\(^{133}\) Much as contemporary artists, critics, and philosophers, the biologist

---


\(^{132}\) Behne repeats this claim in several articles: first in "Kunst und Milieu," p. 599-600; then "Impressionismus und Expressionismus," in the appropriately named section of the Berliner Tageblatt: Der Zeitgeist n.39 (Sept. 29, 1913): 1, which was republished as part of Behne, Zur neuen Kunst, p. 27-28; and in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 41-53.

\(^{133}\) Behne first mentions Uexküll (1864-1944) in September 1913 in "Kunst und Milieu," the same year as Uexküll’s book Bausteine was published, and refers to his ideas in many essays after that. His most in-depth analyses, however, were written during the war: "Deutsche Expressionisten," (Dec. 1914); and "Biologie und Kubismus"
Uexküll was fighting against the materialism of his age. In biology, Behne claimed, such a materialism was represented by Darwin’s soulless and deterministic theory of evolution. Following Uexküll, Behne also became critical of the monistic, inductive theories of Ernst Haeckel expressed in his popular books *Kunstformen der Natur* (Artforms of Nature, 1899) and *Kristallseelen* (The Souls of Crystals, 1917).[^134] In the former, Haeckel analyzed and illustrated in exquisite, lurid detail a wide range of invertebrate organisms as the embodiment of pervasive, universal patterns and order. In the latter Haeckel used crystals to argue for the oneness of all material and spiritual forces, claiming that all objects, both animate and inanimate, had a soul. In the pure, prismatic arrangements of crystals, for example, he saw a near Nietzschean "will" and "desire." Haeckel’s books and ideas were very influential, including among many Art Nouveau and Secession artists searching for a beauty and order in nature.[^135] Even Behne had used Haeckel’s drawings to illustrate a point in the *Arbeiter-Jugend* that beauty in nature leads naturally to our enjoyment.[^136] But after reading (Sept. 1915), which both appeared in *Der Sturm*, partially as a response to Uexküll’s rejection of Behne’s assertion that his ideas were related to Expressionist art.


[^136]: [Behne], "Von der Schönheit in der Natur," *Arbeiter-Jugend* 5, no. 3 (Feb. 1, 1913): B.44-45, where he uses the Kantian argument that beauty in nature leads to enjoyment.
Uexküll, Behne followed the biologist in accusing Haeckel and his "monistic" theory of over-simplifying the essence of life and nature by seeing everything beholden to a single root explanation.

Insisting that nature was more than a random "survival of the fittest" or a "dance of atoms," Uexküll had set out to explain the non-physical, "unseen," "wondrous" and inner spiritual aspects in all living creatures. Rather than define life in such a way that "organisms are just machines," he began to break down life into a complex set of inter-relating and inter-acting spheres of influence and perceptions. In books such as Umwelt und Innenwelt der Tiere (The Outer and Inner World of Animals) and Bausteine zu einer biologischen Weltanschauung (Building Blocks towards a Biological Worldview), Uexküll concluded that every organism lives in a unique "surrounding world" (Umwelt), which is determined by the specific way each animal was physically configured to interact with it and what sensory stimulations it responded to. The sum of all possible stimuli was its "sign-world" (Merkwelt), while the sum of all possible responses or actions to the sign-world was its "effectual world" (Wirkungswelt).

---


138 Uexküll, Umwelt und Innenwelt der Tiere (1909); Uexküll, Bausteine.

139 Uexküll is often mentioned as one of the fathers of semiotics and the science of signs. See his Theoretische Biologie (1920), translated as Theoretical Biology (1926), and the Estonian website www.zbi.ee/~uexkull/ for a list of publications on Uexküll. Uexküll’s terms, Wirkungswelt and Innenwelt, also relate to aesthetics and art history, note for example Hildebrand’s idea of "Wirkungsform" and "Daseinsform"; see Ákos Moravánsky, Die Erneuerung der Baukunst. Wege zur Moderne in Mitteleuropa, 1900-1940 (1988), p. 344.
Corresponding to this focus on the perception and interaction with the physical world, Uexküll also defined an inner world (Innenwelt) of instinct and intuition which directed and oriented the organism. He added to this the special position that man has in this whole system, insisting that reality can only be defined by the sensibility and subjective perception of each individual person. Throughout his writings, detailed empirical descriptions of animal behavior, from plankton to humans, was interlaced with metaphysical speculation and explanation.

Behne recognized immediately the similarities of his own ideas on a new art with Uexküll’s Idealist, almost vitalist conception of nature that focused not on forms but on perception and a subjective interaction with the world. The key link was the concept of the “organic” that had been used in much Expressionist art literature, including Worringer’s. It referred not to the curved forms of organisms, but rather to an organizational and functional principle whereby all parts grow together to form a whole that is greater than the sum of its distinct parts, where very part is functionally inter-dependent on the other, such that no piece could be removed without destroying the whole. In Uexküll’s biology, Behne saw the concept of “organic” explained in a manner that could be applied to many fields, including art and architecture. In an article directed towards the educated, Sturm Gallery audience, Behne argued,

"Every artwork that is worthy of the name is an organism. An unorganic artwork is a contradiction in terms. Creating organically is the essence of

---

140 For example Worringer, Abstraktion und Einfühlung. On the use of the word “organic” in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century as Behne was using it, see Caroline von Eck, Organicism in Nineteenth-century Architecture (1994).
all artistic work, and the gift of letting mental things grow organically is
what distinguishes an artist . . . from a non-artist. The essence of the
organic is twofold: purposiveness in relation to a distinct goal, and lively
activity as a product of coordinated functions. The goal of an
expressionist picture . . . [is] the expression of an experience."

Behne discerned in Uexküll’s writings an "Expressionist" attention to the inner
essence of life rather than on mechanistic or "Impressionist" physical form. For Behne,
Uexküll offered literal proof of the Expressionist proclamation that "art and life are
related . . . that art is identical to life." Quoting Uexküll, Behne wrote that art, like life,
is an "event" (Geschenis), a "creation" (Schaffung), an "autonomous" process, not a set of
forms determined by materials, stylistic tendencies or other extrinsic values. In
contrast to things such as machines that are "made" or intellectually "calculated," art
"arises" and "grows from the inside out," like organisms. The artist is an "instinctual
animal," a mere vessel for this creative process, with greater spiritual and psychic inter-

---

141 "Jedes Kunstwerk, das den Anspruch auf diese Bezeichnung erheben kann,
ist ein Organismus. Ein unorganisches Kunstwerk ist ein Widerspruch in sich selbst.
Organisch schaffen, ist das wesen der künstlerischen Arbeit, und die Gabe, geistige
Dinge organisich wachsen zu lassen, ist das, was den Künstler, im weiteren Sinne, vom
Nicht-Künstler unterscheidet . . . Zweierlei gehört zum Wesen des Organischen: die
Zweckmäßigkeit in Rücksicht auf ein bestimmtes Ziel und die lebendige Tätigkeit in
zusammengreifenden Funktionen. Das Ziel des expressionistischen Bildes haben wir

142 Behne, "Biologie und Kubismus," p. 70.

143 Uexküll writes: "Das Wesentliche am Tier ist nicht seine Form, sondern seine
Umformung, nicht die Struktur, sondern der Lebensprozeß, 'Das Tier ist ein bloßes
Geschehnis'"; Uexküll, Bausteine, p. 29. Also: "Die Gestalt eines Hauses oder eines
Tieres ist nämlich nicht bestimmt durch Eigenschaften des Baumaterials, sondern
lediglich durch seine Funktion"; Uexküll, Bausteine, p. 40. See Behne, "Expressionisten."
Kant in his Critique of Judgment had written famously in the third moment of his
Analytic of the Beautiful: "Schönheit ist Form der Zweckmäßigkeit eines Gegenstandes,
sofern sie ohne Vorstellung eines Zwecks an ihm wahrgenommen wird."
connection to the plans, organization, and constructions of the world we live in.\textsuperscript{144}

Responding to Uexküll’s architectural metaphors that all organisms are "built," "like a house," according to "building plans," Behne proclaimed that "Art is a geistig organism," with each form, like an organ or a "room," carefully linked though a "strong composition," and related to all the other forms of the artwork through "function" (\textit{Funktion}). The result was a unified whole from which no pieces could be removed.

Behne felt that the final purpose for both nature and art was beauty. Uexküll, borrowing explicitly from Kant, maintained that the "recognition of purposiveness (\textit{Zweckmäßigkeit}) in our surroundings is beauty," while Behne insisted that the "young artists" (Expressionists) make beauty the central focus of their efforts.\textsuperscript{145}

Although Behne repeatedly invoked Uexküll’s "Expressionist" mindset, the biologist for his part seemed skeptical about being associated with the art movement.

After visiting an exhibit of Futurist art at the Sturm gallery in the summer of 1914, Uexküll published a small piece in the prestigious journal \textit{Neue Rundschau} comparing the new art to what he called the outdated monistic scientific theories that reduced all

\textsuperscript{144} Behne, "Deutsche Expressionisten," p. 114; and Behne "Biologie und Kubismus," p. 69, for this and the following. Uexküll’s prose is replete with architectural metaphors, though Behne does not focus or quote them much.

matter to identical "shards" (atoms) and "ignored all mysticism."146 At the opening lecture to the Sturm exhibit "Deutsche Expressionisten" in December 1914, Behne sought to correct Uexküll’s misunderstanding, and correlated in some detail Uexküll’s theoretical biology with ideas on modern art.

Although Uexküll’s critique in the summer had no hint of nationalism, Behne’s response six months into World War I included aspects of wartime jingoism when he proclaimed Expressionism to be German. In explaining the name of the exhibition, "German Expressionism," Behne announced: "Not much needs to be said about the term 'German'. Just this: with respect to the painters shown here, Campendonk, Franz Marc, and Kokoshka, I would urge you to think not so much about other painters born in Germany, . . . but rather about the painters of our Gothic, such as the creators of the Strasbourg stained glass . . . or later spiritual descendants such as Mathias Grünewald. 'German'--that means . . . impetuous presentations, the urge to fantasy, and the reign of the spirit.”147 He defined Expressionism as "nothing but the love of expression . . . the expression (Ausdruck) of an experience." In reality, however, he saw this art as a grounded reawakening of timeless tendencies in true art. He also lamented that

---


Expressionism was increasingly being seen by critics as merely an attention-grabbing fashion or simply as "naked formalism, lifeless aestheticism." Behne insisted that such assessments could not be further from the truth, claiming that expressionism was a pure art that emerges out of an inherent "inner richness of forms . . . leaving out everything that could prevent the direct realization of colors, forms and lines."\(^{148}\)

Behne later tried to sell a greatly expanded version of this Sturm lecture on Uexküll to Rene Schikele’s highly respected pacifist journal Die weißen Blätter, but ended up publishing it as "Biologie und Kubismus" in Walden’s Der Sturm in September 1915, and again in Diederich’s Die Tat in November 1917.\(^ {149}\) Ambivalent about the growing German nationalism during the war, Behne all but left out the increasingly nationalistic term "Expressionism," and instead focused on "Cubism," which he considered "the Idealism of modern art."\(^ {150}\) Although Cubism too was

\(^ {148}\) Behne, "Deutsche Expressionisten," p. 114. It is interesting to note that the historian Iain Boyd Whyte has (undeservedly) labeled Behne as "ever susceptible to the fashion of the moment," thus corresponding to the "popular" opinion about Expressionism; I.B. Whyte, Bruno Taut and the Architecture of Activism (1982), p. 91.

\(^ {149}\) In a letter to Walden from Nov. 23, 1914, Behne claims he wrote "Biologie und Kubismus" in November 1914, even before "Deutsche Expressionisten" was published. In a letter from Aug. 22, 1915, Behne complained that he was being rejected in publishing this piece in Schickele’s Die weißen Blätter, that he had wanted to publish in Der Sturm all along "were it not for the evil mammon." Both letters in Behne Nachlaß, SBPK.

\(^ {150}\) Behne, "Deutsche Expressionisten," p. 114; Behne, "Biologie und Kubismus," p. 71. Mertins, "Anything but Literal," pp. 222-224, claims this emphasis on Cubism was motivated by Behne’s discovery of the theory of Czech Cubism, especially Josef Capek’s essay "Moderne Architektur" in Der Sturm 5, no. 3 (Dec. 1914): 18ff, and a conscious turn away from Expressionism, towards a more "constructive" Cubism that would eventually lead Behne to modern architecture. A close reading of all of Behne’s texts from the era, however, reveals very little change in theory, or even terminology,
increasingly criticized as a "cold, intellectual method," Behne insisted it was born of feelings and emotions. He saw in Uexküll’s explanation of life as a cacophony of overlapping stimuli and perceptions a model for what Expressionist artists of all types were presenting in their work. Cubism in particular, he felt, was the "visual exploration of the feeling of life. . . . The Cubist painter is in the middle of all things, they surround and encircle him, their abundance enthralls him, their incessantly moving, mysterious, autonomous life is intoxicating. [His work is] no positivist result, no explanation, no moral, use or lesson, but instead glorification, amazement, and adoration." Behne argued that Impressionism, and in fact all art since the Renaissance, had tried to escape life through the use of linear perspective and station points outside the world picture of the subject. Cubism and the new modern art, on the other hand, reveled in the

and no references to Czech Cubism. The change in emphasis is more likely due to the criticism the term Expressionism was increasingly subject to, the pacifist nature of Schikele’s journal that would have demanded minimal jingoism with which the term was increasingly associated after the begin of the war in August 1914, Behne’s flexible use of terms (Begriffe) within the Expressionism family, and a direct response to Uexküll’s trouble with Futurism, which Behne saw as closely related to Cubism. See also Moravánsky, Erneuerung der Baukunst, pp. 152ff., cited in Simone Hain, "'Ex oriente lux'. Deutschland und der Osten," in Vittorio Magnano Lampugnani and Romana Schneider, eds., Moderne Architektur in Deutschland 1900 bis 1950. Expressionismus und Neue Sachlichkeit (1994), pp. 133-134; Vladimír Slapeta, in Czech Cubism: Architecture, Furniture, and Decorative Arts, ed. Alexander von Vegesack (1992); and Irena Zantovska Murray, "The Burden of Cubism: The French Imprint on Czech Architecture, 1910-1914," in Blau and Troy, Architecture and Cubism, pp. 41-57. On the exchange between Berlin and the East, see Timothy O. Benson, ed., Central European Avant-gardes: Exchange and Transformation, 1910-1930 (2002), esp. pp. 34-67; as well as Vladimir Slapeta, "Prag - Wien- Berlin," in Jiri Svestka and Tomáš Vlček, eds. 1909-1925 Kubismus in Prag, Melerie, Skulptur, Kunstgewerbe, Architektur (1991), pp. 86-90

dynamic, overlapping series of subjective worlds of which all organisms are a part. 

Cubism tried to recreate this dynamic feeling through it a-perspectival composition of forms that expressed feelings of simultaneity, multiplicity, and animation.¹⁵²

Behne’s preoccupation with defining Expressionism, both diachronically in opposition to the Impressionist and Renaissance worldview that preceded it, and synchronically in relation to other contemporary disciplines and cultural endeavors in a clear and enlightening manner, represents precisely what he himself had called for in his early demand for new scholar-critics to promote a new discourse of art. This ability to show the relations between different movements and ideas, to sense common denominators, to fashion clearly understood and memorable models of interpretation that would be understood by a broad, lay public, would remain one of Behne’s hallmarks as a critic.

Despite the power and originality of Behne’s comparative, critical interpretations, he clearly drew from many authors, artists and theories that were circulating in the café culture and journals of the day. Some, such as Worringer and Kandinsky, were openly discussed. But most, including Fechner and Fiedler, are impossible to identify definitively.¹⁵³ Others, such as Nietzsche or Simmel were sources


so common in his day that they warranted little more than a reference or an aphoristic quote.

One interesting example in the context of Behne’s interpretation of Uexküll is the French philosopher Henri Bergson, whose name Behne cited in the above-mentioned article on Expressionism. Bergson, who was born in 1859, the same year as Darwin’s *Origin of the Species* was published, was most celebrated in Germany for his almost Nietzsche-like "Lebensphilosophie," that encouraged a more intuitive grasp of being, and encouraged people to celebrate the irrational side of life. In his 1907 book *L’Évolution*, published in a German translation in 1912 by Diederichs, Bergson too criticized at length the mechanistic sensibility of Darwin’s thought. Unlike Uexküll, he accepted evolution as a scientifically established fact. But Bergson criticized the philosophical interpretations that had been given of Darwin for failing to see the importance of duration and hence missing the very uniqueness of life. He proposed that the whole evolutionary process should be seen as the endurance of an *élan vital* (vital impulse) that is continually developing and generating new forms. Evolution, in short, is creative and generative, not mechanistic.\(^{154}\) Although Behne only mentioned Bergson’s name, he clearly had a greater interest and acquaintance with these ideas.

through the reform culture promoted by Diederichs and the constant search for philosophical underpinnings for a creative, intuitive lifestyle that was threatened by the industrial metropolis.

Behne’s engagement with Expressionist art beginning in 1911 was instrumental in helping him find a definition of art that was true to his values and the time. The fluid exchange between artists from all the arts that characterized this cultural moment pushed Behne to move beyond a narrow stylistic or medium-oriented sense of what constituted good art. Through the ideas of philosophers such as Bergson and Nietzsche, through his engagement with biologists as divergent as Darwin and Uexküll, through his engagement with the theoretical writings of Kandinsky and the novels of Heinrich Mann, Behne came to understand that an appropriate modern art was at its core the same in every medium. His training in both art history and the practice of architecture soon allowed him to make the jump from his convictions about modern painting to defining a new architecture for the modern world.
IV.
Inventing an Expressionist Architecture:
Behne and Bruno Taut

"Criticism should be partial, passionate and political, that is to say, written from an exclusive point of view, but a point of view that opens up the widest horizons."¹
- Charles Baudelaire, 1846

Defining an Expressionist Architecture

Behne’s expansion of the theoretical concepts of an Idealist, Expressionist worldview to other arts, to history, and to biology extended as well to architecture. In reviewing the work of the painter Franz Marc in Alfred Kerr’s esteemed cultural review Pan, Behne had proclaimed in March of 1913, "We live in a new age, and we can even call it an 'Expressionist' age."² Despite his enthusiasm for this new age, he lamented the omission of architecture within the contemporary artistic debates. This, he felt, was


² "Wir sind in einem neuen Zeitalter, und es ist sogar durchaus erlaubt ihn die Bezeichnung eine 'expressionistischen' Zeitalter zu geben"; Behne, "Der Maler Franz Marc," Pan (Mar. 28, 1913): 617. Alfred Kerr’s cultural journal Pan, published by Cassirer, was critical of Wilhelmine society and materialism and is not to be confused with the sumptuous Secessionist journal with the same name published by Julius Meier-Graefe from 1895-1898 in Munich.
contrary to the argument that the same "bloodflow . . . pulsed" though all the arts at any given time.³ Behne, however, had discovered the work of the young architect Bruno Taut, whose work he believed embodied the same emotional and spiritual essence as the Expressionist painters.⁴ In was in response to Taut’s architecture that Behne’s criticism turned "personal, passionate, political," and opened up a new way of creating architecture for the modern age.


⁴ Bruno Taut (1880-1938) was born in Königsberg, East Prussia, the home of Immanuel Kant; Taut’s high school was located next to the cemetery where Kant was buried. Taut’s architectural training was through a local vocational school (Baugewerkschule), where he had a local masonry internship, then worked for architects in Hamburg, Wiesbaden, Berlin, and finally for the prestigious Theodor Fischer in Stuttgart from 1904-1908. When he returned to Berlin in 1908, he attended classes at the Charlottenburg polytechnic with Theodor Goecke. In 1909 he set up his own architectural practice, entered many architectural competitions successfully, and built several innovative apartment buildings in Berlin. In 1913 he formed an office partnership with his brother Max (1884-1967), and Franz Hoffmann, who did most of the technical designing and construction management. The most authoritative and comprehensive sources on Taut include in reverse chronological order: Winfried Nerdinger, et al., Bruno Taut. 1880-1938. Architekt zwischen Tradition und Avantgarde (2001); Kurt Junghanns, Bruno Taut - 1880-1938 3rd ed. (1998); Manfred Speidel, Bruno Taut: Natur und Fantasie, 1880-1938 (1995); Brigitte Lamberts, "Das Frühwerk von Bruno Taut (1900-1914) unter besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner Berliner Bauten," (Diss. 1994); Regine Prange, Das Kristalline als Kunstsymb. Bruno Taut und Paul Klee (1991); Kristiana Hartmann, "Bruno Taut," in Baumeister, Architekten, Stadtplaner. Biographien zur baulichen Entwicklung Berlins, ed. Wolfgang Ribbe and Wolfgang Schäche (1987), pp. 407-426; Iain Boyd Whyte, Bruno Taut and the Architecture of Activism (1982); the catalogue from the Berlin Akademie der Künste: Achim Wendschuh and Barbara Volkmann, eds. Bruno Taut 1880-1938 (1980), especially the long essay by Franziska Bollerey and Kristiana Hartmann, "Bruno Taut. Vom phantastischen Ästheten zum ästhetischen Sozial(ideal)listen," pp. 15-85; and Rosemarie Haag Bletter, "Bruno Taut and Paul Scheerbart’s Vision: Utopian Aspects of German Expressionist Architecture." (Diss. 1973), and articles that derived from this groundbreaking work, cited below.
Several weeks before his review of Marc’s colorful paintings, Behne had introduced Taut in the same journal *Pan* as a "new" architect and listed several recent and current projects. Behne then proceeded to interpret Taut and his design philosophy, describing him as someone who

"immerses himself deeply and totally in the essence of his projects, but does so without any preconception of certain order or form. His work comes to him from the *ground* up, he creates from his inner self. Taut experiences his projects with an intensity that spares him from all templates. For him every form must be unique, because with every new project the same circumstance can never repeat themselves. . . . That he has found such spiritually endowed, organic forms amidst the great variety of his programs is a testament to the breadth and integrity of this person."  

Equally important for the future development of this young architect, the critic insisted, was that he avoided repeating or introducing elements from his own previous work. Taut was not satisfied with past accomplishments. If given the same commission twice, "he would attack the problem very differently the second time."  

Behne went to great lengths in the short article to distinguish the novelty of

---

5 Behne’s article was subtitled “Zuschrift an den Pan über einen neuen Architekten”; Behne, "Bruno Taut," p. 538.


7 "Taut hängt nicht fest an Geleisteten, er würde die Aufgabe das zweite Mal ganz anders angreifen”; Behne, "Bruno Taut," p. 539.
Taut’s extant built work from the typical, contemporary “historical architecture.” Taut, he argued, avoided all formal influences that came “from outside” the "necessities of the project." Yet Taut also took advantage of his "right" to use "purely ornamental forms," because in other instances he knew how to build "puritanically simple." According to Behne, an insightful example of his thinking was visible at the roof ridge of his "Am Knie" apartment building in Charlottenburg. [Figure 4.2] In order to contrast with the smooth, rounded corner of the facade below, and to "give expression" to the flat roof at the top above, Taut inserted a row of "animated prisms," instead of the "traditional Gothic tiles" that "no one would have noticed. But these new forms disconcert the citizens."  

Behne thus highlighted both the autonomous nature of Taut’s designs that apparently emanated purely from the "necessities," and the "expressive," often ornamental aspects of his designs that consciously sought out the "new," often with some shock values to the complacent bourgeois viewers. Based on this mindset, Behne

---

8 "Die Abkehr von allem Historischen ist für Taut eine einfache Notwendigkeit. Er hält sich alles fern was von außen als Formgesetz, als Einfluß, als Macht herantreten könnte"; Behne, "Bruno Taut," p. 539.


10 "Besetzte Taut den First mit einer Reihe von aus- und einschwingenden Prismen. Hätte er statt ihrer Gotischen Zinnen gewählt, so würde sich niemand gerührt haben. Diese neue Form aber befremdet den Bürger"; Behne, "Bruno Taut," p. 540. The apartment is question was located at Bismarkstraße 116, corner Hardenbergstraße 1, and was built 1911-12; see Nerdinger et al, Bruno Taut, p. 325, which does not list Behne’s article as a relevant source.
concluded, "we may call Taut’s architecture in the inner sense of the word, Expressionist’,” the same label he had given the prose of Heinrich Mann, the poetry of Walden’s wife Else Lasker-Schüler, and the drawings of Kokoshka. With this statement from March 1913, Behne became the first to apply the word "Expressionist" to architecture. It marks the beginning of a long quest to define an Expressionist architecture in relation to a broader modern culture. Through Behne’s "personal, passionate and political" criticism, both he as a critic and Taut as an architect entered the orbit of modern avant-garde art and culture as it had been defined by previous critics and theorists: straightforward, expressive, with no recourse to history, consciously new, often shocking.

Behne’s analysis of Taut’s architecture and design method reconceptualized Taut’s own assessment of his work as published in the professional journal Moderne.

---

11 "Man darf demnach die Architektur Tauts als dem innersten Sinne nach 'expressionistisch' bezeichnen"; Behne, "Bruno Taut," Pan, p. 539. The essay remains untranslated. A handwritten, manuscript version of Behne’s essay continues with a line that was deleted in the published version: "so wie die Prosa Heinrich Manns, wie die Verse Else Lasker-Schülers, wie die Zeichnungen Kokoschkas expressionistisch sind"; manuscript BTA-01-294, in the Bruno Taut Archiv, Sammlung Baukunst, Akademie der Künste, Berlin; kindly provided by Matthias Schirren.

12 Pehnt, Architektur des Expressionismus, p. 13. The sculptor Oswald Herzog also discussed the idea of an Expressionist architecture in his Der Rhythmus in Kunst und Natur (1914), though he worked through empathy theory and defined Expressionism as the rhythms of nature translated into architecture. He too contrasted an "Expressionist" attitude whose forms arose from inner laws, with "Functionalist" thinking (Zweckmäßigheit), which Herzog restricted to the exterior shaping of a building to accommodate function, akin to Behne’s "Impressionism," which focused on exterior image only; see Santomasso, "Origins and Aims."
See Taut’s thoughts about his own work in an article published at the same
culturally more influential journal Pan created a more potent and philosophically rich
analysis of Taut’s architecture. The critic placed the architect’s work within the context
of Expressionist art in a way Taut himself could not. Taut, in fact, did not use the word
"Expressionist" to describe his own work, and was extremely skeptical about the label
when he first read Behne’s characterization. Responding to Behne’s invitation to
critique his manuscript, Taut’s hand-written comments questioned whether any
architecture could ever be truly Expressionist in the same way as poetry or painting.14
However, a few months later, after long exchanges with Behne and the circle of
Expressionist artists, Taut recognized the work of Kandinsky and related Expressionist
ideas as central to the development of a modern architecture. At this point Taut’s built
work began to change notably, becoming more expressive, intuitive, and abstract than it
had been before Behne’s review launched Taut’s own reappraisal of his ideas and their
Expressionist milieu.

---

13 See Taut’s thoughts about his own work in an article published at the same
time as Behne’s: "Es ist die erste Pflicht des Architekten, an jede Aufgabe ohne
Voreingenommenheit, ohne vorgefaßte Formel und bereits fertige Formidee
heranzutreten, zunächst die Aufgabe selbst ihrem ganzenUmfange nach in allen
Voraussetzungen und Bedingungen klar zu entwickeln und dann aus den sich dabei
ergebenden praktischen und Gefühlsmomenten die passende und organisch
erscheinende Form entstehen lassen"; Taut, "Zu den Arbeiten der Architekten Bruno
Taut und Hoffman," Moderne Bauformen 12, no. 3 (Mar. 1913): 121.

14 See Taut’s handwritten notes on a manuscript of Behne’s article "Bruno Taut"
BTA-01-294, Bruno Taut Archiv, AdK; also cited in Magdalena Bushart, "Adolf Behne
‘Kunst-Theoreticus’," in Adolf Behne. Essays zu seiner Kunst- und Architektur-Kritik,
"Operative Criticism"

Behne's article on Taut represents a crucial step in developing a new type of architectural criticism and strengthening his position as one of the leading critics of German modernism. The article marked a profound shift in his criticism. Although Behne had studied architecture and written his dissertation on medieval architecture, before March 1913 he only occasional alluded to architecture in his book and exhibition reviews. These articles had involved for the most part detached reflection and evaluation. In the Pan essay, however, Behne elevated his criticism to what Manfredo Tafuri has called "operative criticism": "an analysis of architecture (or of the arts in general) that . . . has as its objective the planning of a precise poetical tendency, anticipated in its structures and derived from historical analyses programmatically distorted and finalized." In his article on Taut, Behne did not merely report observations or reiterate the architect's ideas, but further proposed a program and definition of architecture. He assumed an active, strategic role akin to that of the architects. He was not only criticizing existing ideas and designs, but also anticipating,

---


16 Manfredo Tafuri, Theories and History of Architecture (1980), p. 141. Tafuri lists Behne as one of the critics susceptible to such operative criticism (cf. pp. 149, 153). According to Tafuri, critics such as Behne found ideal vehicles in the "incessant polemical operation" made possible only by magazines and journalism, and which flourishes "when an artistic revolution is happening and needs the clarifying and divulging support of a deeply involved and committed historiography," pp. 153-154.
Behne’s article on Taut also marked a significant moment in the development of modern architecture more generally. It extended important ideas from modern painting to architecture, which would affect not only his own criticism, but also Taut’s architecture, and much of the Expressionist movement that followed. As Behne insisted years later, the push to "break the spell of the object," the push towards abstraction by modern painters such as Kandinsky, Marc, Severini, and Delaunay, freed all art from all ties to the complexities of the real world. Abstraction, Behne argued, made art autonomous and subject only to "the reality of art: the laws of color, of surface, of line, of form and of light." Rather than focus on new technologies and materials, reforms in the applied arts or social movements as the initiators of innovation, Behne insisted that modern architecture, indeed much of modern material culture, developed primarily out of this "Expressionist Revolution" on exhibit in the Sturm gallery in the months just before he wrote his Taut article. The "energy" and modernization achieved in the Weimar period in "typography, advertising, film, directing, housing culture, and architecture," he claimed, "would have been historically unthinkable without" the earlier innovations in abstract paintings. Admittedly, the abstraction promoted by Behne did not always remain the primary focus of artists and designers in each of these fields. Their focus had turned, however, more towards the emotional essence expressed by form, rather than on a work’s content or symbolic meaning.

---


Behne was uniquely qualified to bridge the divide between art and architecture. His two years of formal architectural training and his art history studies allowed him a broader perspective than most critics or architects. Architects who wrote extensively in the press or served in editorial positions, such as Hermann Muthesius, Walter Curt Behrendt, Heinrich De Fries, or Gustav Adolf Platz, or later Martin Wagner and Taut himself, tended to have a narrower focus that catered primarily to the profession. Similarly, although many of the major art critics of his day, including Karl Scheffler, Max Osborn, Paul Westheim, Fritz Stahl, Wilhelm Hausenstein, and Paul Ferdinand Schmidt successfully dabbled in broader architectural criticism, they lacked the practical insights that Behne had gained from his family’s background in construction and from his architectural studios. Only Sigfried Kracauer, with his art history training and his ten years of work as a practicing architect, can be said to have had a greater range of experience and education, but Kracauer preferred a more generalized cultural criticism over Behne’s intensive engagement with the contemporary art and architectural scenes.

The slightly younger Sigfried Giedion, also a student of Wölfflin’s, used Behne’s idea that modern painting was a primary force revolutionizing twentieth-century architecture to develop a parallel argument in his Space, Time and Architecture.  

---


Giedion’s survey was instrumental in convincing an entire profession of the close connections between modern art and architecture. But there were important differences between Behne and Giedion. In his first book on modern architecture, Bauen in Frankreich. Eisen, Eisenbeton (1928, Building in France. Building in Iron, Building in Ferro-Concrete), Giedion saw the rational and dynamic constructions of nineteenth-century French engineers as the key precursors to modern architectural designs. 21 His later survey continued this line of thought but pointed almost exclusively to the spatial sensibility created by the transparency and overlapping formal arrangements that Picasso and the French Cubists had invented. This spatial sensibility, Giedion argued, was then transferred to architecture by Gropius, De Stijl, Le Corbusier, and others. Behne, on the other hand, played down what he saw as the primary French contributions of formal techniques and inventions in favor of the spiritual "inner necessity" that he saw as characteristic of the new art. This allowed Behne to label a

Sokratis Georgiadis, Sigfried Giedion, An Intellectual Biography (1993); or Panayotis Tournikiotis, The Historiography of Modern Architecture (1999); and Detlef Mertins, "Transparencies Yet to Come. Sigfried Giedion and the Pre-History of Architectural Modernity." (Diss. 1996) and the articles that came out of this dissertation cited below. There were, of course, many other factors that historians, critics and architects both earlier and later have emphasized as contributing to the development of a new, modern architecture for the twentieth century, including the influence of crafts and design reform, technology, science, new materials, urban, housing and social trends, philosophy, as well as biography and the inspiration of creative artists and architects. For other authors who have stressed the relation of painting and architecture, see Walter Curt Behrendt, Modern Building (1936); Alfred H. Barr, Cubism and Abstract Art (1936); Henry-Russell Hitchcock, Painting Towards Architecture (1948), and more recently Manfredo Tafuri and Francesco Dal Co, Modern Architecture (1979), chapter 8.

much broader group of modern painters as revolutionaries. Although he considered formal dimensions (e.g., abstraction, color, anti-perspectival compositions, space), he highlighted a subjective attitude within the artist, not art’s external characteristics.

Critics are seldom recognized for the active role they played in developing modern architecture. It is significant, then, that it was a critic, not an artist or architect, who was among the first to actively promote the transfer of theoretical arguments from the revolutions in painting around 1910 over to architecture.22 There is, of course, a profound difference between advocating change and actually acting—or persuading others to act—on such ideas. This dissertation, however, seeks to challenge at least in part the pre-eminence usually accorded the artist that stems ultimately from a romantic "cult of genius." Too often we ignore or downplay the role of what Pierre Bourdieu has called the "intellectual field" that surrounds all art and culture, and plays a fundamental role in instigating as well as realizing change.23 Behne published on the influence of

22 Painting and architecture have always had close connections, both formal and theoretical. Behne himself cited the Renaissance innovations in perspective that shifted swiftly from theory and experiments in painting to architecture. Much of Picturesque theory in landscape theory and architecture was derived from paintings. Closer to home, the German Kunstgewerbe, Secession and Jugendstil movements that Behne criticized were replete with painters who had turned to architecture (for example Peter Behrens, Paul Schultze-Naumburg, and Henry van de Velde), as well as artists interested in the idea of a Gesamtkunstwerk and other "aesthetically determined environments" that demanded a unity of the arts, as well as the transfer of formal motifs such as the whiplash line and plant motifs that moved easily from painting and applique to architectural ornament and structure (for example August Endell, Hermann Obrist, and Josef Hoffmann). On the latter see Peg Weiss, Kandinsky in Munich (1982), pp. 33-36.

contemporary painting on modern architecture before many of his contemporaries: before Kasimir Malevich or Vladimir Tatlin in Russia, before Antonio Sant’ Elia and the Futurists in Italy, before Theo van Doesburg and De Stijl artists in Holland, before Le Corbusier and Purists in France or Gropius and Bauhaus professors in Germany. Perhaps only some of the Czech cubist architects wrote earlier about the need to transfer forms from painting to architecture, but the results of their efforts remained centered on exterior surface form, and less in a true reconceptualization of architecture, space, and the modern spirit until after 1914.

Through his criticism, I claim, he was a key force in helping spur further connections and transfers of artistic ideas to architecture. Unlike other critics and historians of modern architecture such as Pevsner, Giedion, and Hitchcock, who would become much more famous after World War II, Behne established his intellectual framework already before World War I as an author and critic alongside the very artists whom his peers later misleadingly gave sole credit for inventing modern architecture—what Giedion had called "a new approach, a new spatial representation, and the new means by which it is attained."

Taut and Expressionist Sachlichkeit

24 Sigfried Giedion, Space, Time and Architecture. Detlef Mertins, in his "Anything but Literal," pp. 219-251, examines the reception of Cubism and its transformation into architecture by Behne, Gropius, and Giedion, but also does not adequately emphasize Behne’s pioneering pre-war work because, like Giedion, Mertins is intent on distinguishing Cubism from Expressionism rather than seeing in them a common spiritual sensibility.
Behne’s article launched a close intellectual friendship with Taut that would fluctuate from conspiring partners to jealous adversaries over their entire careers. The exact circumstances under which Behne got to know Taut and his work are unclear.²⁵ Perhaps Taut’s recently-constructed apartment buildings neighboring Behne’s home in the Charlottenburg suburb of Berlin provided the original introduction.²⁶ The earliest documentation of Behne’s knowledge of Taut is a letter dated December 1912 from Karl Scheffler, the editor of the important Kunst und Künstler art journal, rejecting a proposal by Behne to publish an article introducing the offbeat Taut.²⁷ The more

²⁵ Starting with Taut’s first biographer, Taut scholars have traced Taut’s and Behne’s friendship back to the infamous “Choriner Kreis” of like-minded art colleagues to which Taut belonged in 1904 while working in the Berlin office of Bruno Möhring; see Junghanns, Bruno Taut 1st ed. (1970), p. 7; Whyte, Bruno Taut, p. 7; Bletter, "Introduction," to Behne, Modern Functional Building (1996), p. 4-5; and Rose Carol Washton Long, ed., German Expressionism (1993), p. 60. There is no evidence suggesting or refuting this, though it’s implausible that the high school student Behne (age 19) would have known and been part of this group of older (Taut was 24), idealistic, trained architects and their weekend excursions to the woods of Chorin, where they painted, socialized, and discussed art and philosophy. See also Bushart, "Kunst-Theoretikus," p. 73n.81.

²⁶ Behne lived in with his parents in Charlottenburg, at Schillerstr. 103, until the fall of 1913, within walking distance of Taut’s apartment buildings at Bismarckstr. 10 (corner Grolmannstr. 1, 1908-1909, published in Berliner Architekturwelt 12 (1910): 354-357); Bismarckstr. 106 (corner Hardenbergstr. 1, 1911-1912); and at Hardenbergstr. 3a (1912-1913). See, for example, the postcard from Taut to Behne (Apr. 29, 1913), Nachlaß Adolf Behne, in the Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz Berlin, hereafter abbreviated as SBPK. Taut also built other apartment buildings in Berlin-Neu-Kölln (Rixdorf) (1909-1910, 1910-1911), Berlin-Spandau (1911), Berlin-Lichterfelde (1910-1911), and Berlin-Tiergarten (1912-1914), as well as a school one Berlin-Zehlendorf (1910), an office in central Berlin (1911), an industrial laundry facility in Berlin-Tempelhof (1911-1912). For the most complete catalogue of Taut’s work and literature on each of these projects, see Nerdinger et al, Bruno Taut, pp. 310ff. Charlottenburg was a suburb of the City of Berlin until 1920, when it was annexed, and became a city district.

²⁷ Karl Scheffler, letter to Behne, Dec. 14, 1912, Nachlaß Behne/Scharfe, Bauhaus-
conservative Scheffler considered it premature to write what would have been the first monographic article on this still unknown architect in a journal that primarily supported Impressionist art. By the beginning of March 1913, when the Pan article was published, Behne and Taut were clearly friends. The critic and the architect as well as their wives had begun corresponding regularly, though at first with respectful formality.\textsuperscript{28}

Behne’s article offered a fairly comprehensive overview of Taut’s built and unbuilt work. He mentioned seeing several projects "on the walls of the studio," including a zeppelin hangar and an exhibition pavilion for Leipzig that would open in May. He also discussed Taut’s dreams of building skyscrapers and giant iron bridges.\textsuperscript{29}

Echoing ideas from Worringer, Kandinsky, and his own earlier criticism, Behne described the urge or "necessity" that Taut felt to abandon all historical precedents.

\textsuperscript{28} Correspondence recently discovered in the family of Hedwig Taut, Taut’s first wife, show a familiar, yet respectful friendship developing between the thirty-three year old Taut and his wife of seven years, and the twenty-eight year old Behne and his fiancé, Elfriede Schäfer, to whom he would be married several months later, on June 5, 1913. The earliest surviving correspondence is a postcard from Elfriede to Hedwig Taut (Mar. 7, 1913), BTA-01-466, Bruno Taut Archiv, AdK, kindly provided by Matthias Schirren. Taut’s earliest known letter to Behne from Apr. 29, 1913, begins with the very formal "Veehrter Herr Doktor," not a sign of old friends, but ends with warm greetings to Elfriede; Nachlaß Behne, SBPK.

\textsuperscript{29} Behne, "Bruno Taut," Pan, p. 538. The blimp hangar project is not mentioned in any other Taut literature, but may refer to Taut’s earlier project for an airport.
Behne closed his article with fulsome praise for Taut’s much-published 1910
competition entry for the expansion of Alfred Messel’s famous Wertheim department
store. He insisted that Taut had not borrowed forms from Messel, but rather had
matched Messel’s spirit. "Taut’s work," Behne concluded, "is in general a continuation
(not a reification) of Messel’s."³⁰ [Figures 4.3 and 4.4]

Behne’s reference to Messel placed Taut squarely in the historical development
of modern architecture. By framing Taut as a "Messel student," and his architecture as
the "continuation" of Messel’s direction, Behne was interpreting Taut’s designs as the
most recent incarnation of a proud "Berlin School" of architecture that reached back to
Karl Friedrich Schinkel. The Berlin school emphasized a spartan yet expressive clarity,
especially of structure.³¹ The need to legitimize the avant-garde through the deliberate

³⁰ "Eine Weiterführung Messels (statt einer Versteinerung) ist im Prinzip Tauts
schaffen überhaupt." Behne, "Bruno Taut," Pan, p. 540. Behne repeated the line in
Behne, "Berliner Architektur," Hamburger Nachrichten (Sept. 14, 1913); and at the end
of Behne, "Ostpreußische Architekten in Berlin," Königsberger Hartungscbe Zeitung
(Apr. 17, 1914).

³¹ Messel had died in 1909 as Berlin’s most prestigious and influential architect.
He was posthumously honored by Fritz Stahl’s special issue of Berliner Architekturwelt
(1911), and an important monograph by the young critic Walter Curt Behrendt, preface
by Karl Scheffler, published by the prestigious Cassirer Verlag; Behrendt, Alfred Messel
(1911), republished with a postscript by Fritz Neumeyer (1998). The comparison to
Schinkel and the Berlin school in Behne, "Berliner Architekten"; and Behrendt, Alfred
Messel, p. 127-134. Behrendt too placed Taut as the most talented of Messel’s
successors, the so-called "Messel-Schule," including Paul Baumgarten, Paul Mebes,
Hans Bernouilli and Landsberg, even though Messel was not a professor, and not all
had even worked for Messel; see Behrendt, "Berliner Architekten. Bruno Taut;"
Magdeburgische Zeitung n.159 (Mar. 30, 1913); and Behne, "Berliner Architektur," Zeit
im Bild 12.2, no. 15 (Apr. 9, 1914): 804. On Taut’s connections to Messel, see Whyte,
Bruno Taut, p. 17-18; and Tilmann Buddensieg, "Messel und Taut. Zum ‘Gesicht’ der
Arbeiterwohnung," Archithese 12 (1974): 23-29, 55, part of a special issue on "Das
Kollektivwohnhaus." Tafuri and Dal Co write that Taut’s early architecture was
use and manipulation of history is another one of the central paradoxes of modern art, and a characteristic of operative criticism as defined by Tafuri. Similar to his teacher Theoder Fischer, and indeed many of most well known figures of modern architecture such as Adolf Loos, Mies van der Rohe, and Le Corbusier, Taut had long professed the need to consider continuity with traditions and established archetypes in their search for a modern architecture. Although Behne had insisted that Taut tackled each design situation anew, for Taut architecture was not primarily about invention.

As an art historian, the reflection on the historical continuity of Taut and Messel, as the idea of timeless form-making came with the profession. As a critic, Behne promoted the idea of "the new" as a development that evolved out of the old. Thus he was careful to insist that Taut was not a "reification" or confirmation of Messel, but a

derived from Messel; Tafuri and Dal Co, Modern Architecture. Nerdinger, on the other hand, feels the connections between Taut and Messel are exaggerated; Nerdinger et al, Bruno Taut, p. 18n14.

32 Tafuri, Theories and History, pp. 149-151.

33 Taut, "Kleinhauzbau und Landaufschiessung vom Standpunkte des Architekten," lecture delivered in the fall of 1913 at the general meeting of the German Garden City Association, in conjunction with the Leipzig Building Expo (May 3 to Oct. 31, 1913). It was first published in Gartenstadt 8, no. 1 (Jan. 1914): 9-12; partially reprinted in Wendschuh and Volkmann, Bruno Taut, p. 174. On Taut’s self-admitted claim that all architecture is based on tradition and continuity, see also Hartmann and Bollerey, “Bruno Taut,” in Bruno Taut, ed. Wendschuh and Volkmann, p. 34, where journal entries from 1904-1905 are cited alongside Taut’s posthumous Architekturlehre as proof that Taut always considered tradition as a path into the future, that architecture was not primarily about invention; Winfried Nerdinger, ”Ein großer Baum muß tiefe Wurzeln haben.” Tradition und Moderne bei Bruno Taut,” in Nerdinger et al, Bruno Taut; and Iain Boyd Whyte, ”Der visionäre Bruno Taut,” in Nerdinger et al, Bruno Taut, p. 71-72. Whyte has also claimed that this integration of history and the present was a major part of Activist philosophy; Whyte, Bruno Taut.
"continuation." Similarly, he insisted that Expressionist art was a "reawakening of tendencies that were prevalent in art during all its happiest times."\(^{34}\) Throughout his criticism of Expressionist art there is the concept of a "return" to true art--most famously in his well known book *Wiederkehr der Kunst* (The Return of Art). [Figure 4.5] He sought not a continuity with old forms, but rather only a return of the underlying philosophical conditions of what constituted true art--creative self expression of the artist’s inner essence.

Messel, architect for the AEG before Behrens, and architect to Berlin’s Jewish elite, was for Berliners a father figure of modern architecture. Since the unveiling of his Wertheim facade in 1897, with its innovative expanses of glass and powerful expression of structural columns, critics had claimed this as one of the pioneering structures of modern architecture. Taut praised Messel’s spare and reductive style, "When I saw it [the Wertheim store] for the first time, the clarity and dignity of this work gripped me. I have never seen a building that shows itself so nakedly, so truthfully to the viewer,\

\(^{34}\) "Die expressionistische Kunst . . . ist in Wirklichkeit das Wiedererwachen von Neigungen, die in der Kunst zu ihren glücklichsten Zeiten stehts geherscht haben. . . . Der Expressionismus hat endlich wieder Künstlerische Rücksichten in den Schwerpunkt des Schaffens gerückt!"; Behne, "Deutsche Expressionisten," p. 114. Worringer’s references to Egyptian pyramids and the historical monuments of Eastern art, and his call for a new German art to be derived in the spirit of the Gothic cathedrals offered a clear example for Behne and the Expressionist artists to build on. German Expressionists artists, who strove to provide a unified artistic vision in the face of the chaos of contemporary urban life, had a similar predilection for using tradition, history, and the related categories of the foreign, the occult, and the mystical in justifying and explaining their work. Kandinsky and the Blue Rider’s use of Russian icons and many other historical art works in the *Blue Rider Almanac* are only the most well known examples.
that so unmitigatingly and without any pathos says: I am as I am, and nothing else.\footnote{Als ich es zum ersten mal sah, wirkte auf mich diese Klarheit und Würde geradezu ergreifend. Ich habe noch kein Bauwerk gesehen, das gewissermaßen sich so nackt, so wahr dem Beschauer zeigt, das so unmittelbar und einfach ohne Pathos sagt: ich bin so, wie ich bin, und nichts anderes"; Bruno Taut, letter to his brother Max Taut, from March 3, 1902, upon visiting Berlin for the first time, published in Tilmann Buddensieg, "Schinkel wird nicht erwähnt: Bruno Taut zum ersten mal in Berlin," Neue Heimat 27, no. 5 (1980): 16. These lines were preceded by: "Und nun die Kunstwerke! Wenn ich so das Wort Berlin höre, so taucht immer unter all den mannigfachen Eindrücken ein einziger großer mit besonderer Klarheit unwillkürlich auf, und das ist: das Warenhaus Wertheim, ja man könnte fast sagen: das Warenhaus. Denn was Alfred Messel hier geschaffen hat, ist mehr als ein Warenhaus--, es ist ein Typus als solchen weshalb man den Architekten genial nennen muß."}

Despite Messel’s use of historical—especially Gothic—forms, many felt he had been responsible for turning the tide against academic and eclectic buildings of the nineteenth century and initiating a modern architecture of objectivity and straightforwardness (Sachlichkeit).\footnote{The important Hamburg art museum curator Alfred Lichtwark, who was among the first to use the term "Sachlichkeit," did so in reference to Messel’s Wertheim in 1897, and in Lichtwark, "Sachliche Baukunst," Palastfenster und Flügeltür (1899), republished in Lichtwark, Eine Auswahl seiner Schriften, ed. W. Mannhardt (1917), p. 257ff. See also Harry Francis Mallgrave, "From Realism to Sachlichkeit: the Polemics of Architectural Modernity in the 1890s," in Mallgrave, ed., Otto Wagner. Reflections on the Raiment of Modernity (1993), p. 304; and Bletter, "Introduction," p. 48. Behne continued to maintain years later that Messel was a pioneer: "Berlage, Messel, und Otto Wagner sind die erste Führergeneration im Kampf um die Erneuerung der Architektur. . . Berlage, Messel, Wagner haben der neuen Baukunst das Geschenk der Sachlichkeit gemacht." Behne also included "Arthur [sic] Sullivan" in a footnote to the first sentence. Behne, Der moderne Zweckbau (1926), pp. 12-13.}

In Behne’s eyes, Taut was advancing Messel’s mission. By combining a "puritanical simplicity" with expressive, purely decorative elements Taut created an "original and intuitive art," characterized by a "stringent Sachlichkeit, an inner
soulfulness and natural liveliness." Taut’s *Sachlichkeit*, Behne later clarified, was “not the *Sachlichkeit* of a ‘Functionalist’ or a ‘purist’,” but a special “artistic *Sachlichkeit*.” Behne saw in Taut’s architecture a synthesis of a sober rationality with expressive fantasy that recalled the ideas of both Jugendstil artists such as Endell and the art historian Worringer, whom Behne had read closely. This synthesis was rapidly becoming a hallmark of Expressionist art for Behne.

Before exploring Taut’s Expressionism, it is helpful to examine the complex term *Sachlichkeit* as used by Behne, which is crucial for any understanding of German

---

37 The reference to Taut’s “puritanisch einfach” building comes from Behne, "Bruno Taut," *Pan*, p. 540; while both Taut and Messel are described as creating "[eine] ursprünglich und intuitive Kunst. . . . Der Wert der Arbeiten dieser genannten Künstler liegt in ihrer strengen Sachlichkeit, ihrer Innerlichkeit, und ihrer natürlichen Lebendigkeit"; in Behne, "Die große Berliner Kunstausstellung" *Die Gegenwart* 42.2, no. 28 (July 12, 1913): 437.

38 "Was ihn auszeichnet, ist seine strenge Sachlichkeit, -- freilich eine künstlerische Sachlichkeit, nicht die Sachlichkeit des ‘Zweckkünstlers’ oder des ‘Puritaners’"; Behne, "‘Ein neues Haus!’," *März* 8, no. 1 (Jan. 1914): 323, republished in Behne, "Bruno Taut,” *Der Sturm* 4, no. 198/199 (Feb. 1914): 182; and recently in Peter Srengel and Jürgen Schutte, eds. *Die Berliner Moderne* (1987), pp. 592-596. Whyte, in *Bruno Taut*, p. 238 n.7, guesses that Behne may have been referring to Loos when he wrote of a “Purist,” but this seems to contradict Behne’s statement a few months later that Loos was an Expressionist. On Loos as Expressionist see Behne, "Impressionismus und Expressionismus," and below. In his famous article "Ornament und Verbrechen" (c.1908-1910) Loos explicitly rejected the idea that all ornament should be abolished, a concept he later accused the ”purists” of demanding. Loos’ ideas were in part based on Semper’s dislike of “Purists”; Semper, *Der Stil* I, p. 224, quoted in Peter Singelenberg, H. P. Berlage: Idea and Style (1972), p. 164. More likely, Behne was picking up on general discussions of the time by figures such as Tessenow, Scheffler, Muthesius, and J. A. Lux; see Richard Hamann and Jost Hermand, "Purismus," chapter in *Stilkunst um 1900* (1977, orig. 1959), pp. 440-462.

39 On the synthesis of fantasy and *Sachlichkeit* in Taut and Behne see Regine Prange, *Das Kristalline*, pp. 78-84.
modern architecture in the first decades of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{40} Despite his architectural studies, Behne at this point held a different view of what constituted a\textit{sachlich} approach to modern architecture than did the dominant architect and designers of his day. Muthesius and many of the architects surrounding the Werkbund had begun to define\textit{Sachlichkeit} primarily as a pragmatic approach to form where function, technology, and a quest for typical or pure forms eliminated any need for ornament. They felt clues to a\textit{sachlich} approach were to be found in the newest technological objects and industrial buildings.\textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{40} Stanford Anderson defines Sachlichkeit as: "a convenient umbrella term that invokes simplicity, a rational and straightforward attention to needs as well as to materials and processes"; see Anderson, "\textit{Sachlichkeit} and Modernity, or Realist Architecture," in Mallgrave,\textit{ Otto Wagner}. The concepts embodied in the German adjective\textit{sachlich} and related noun\textit{Sachlichkeit} are complex, with various interpretations and translations (including sobriety, thing-ness, object-ness, objective, reality, practicality, functional, pragmatic, material, factual, matter-of-fact, artless, straightforward), and will be explored in greater depth below. In addition to Anderson, see Bletter, "Introduction," pp. 47-70; S. Anderson, "Introduction," in Hermann Muthesius,\textit{Style-Architecture and Building Art}, (1994); and Mallgrave, "From Realism to Sachlichkeit," pp. 281-321.

\textsuperscript{41} Muthesius wrote in 1902: "\textit{Sachlichkeit}, an abstention from all superficial forms of decoration, a design strictly following the purpose that a work should serve," such as railway terminals, large bridges, steamships, railway cars, bicycles and the like; Muthesius,\textit{Stil-Architektur un Baukunst} (1902) translated as \textit{Style-Architecture and Building Art} (1994), p. 79, also cited in Frederic J. Schwartz, "Form Follows Fetish: Adolf Behne and the Problem of \textit{Sachlichkeit},"\textit{ Oxford Art Journal} 21, no. 2 (1998): 48. This book was preceded by what Harry Mallgrave has called "the second most important document of the period," (after Otto Wagner’s book): Muthesius, "Neues Ornament und neue Kunst,"\textit{ Dekorative Kunst} 4 (1901): 353; in Mallgrave,\textit{Modern Architectural Theory}, p. 228. Behne’s relation to the Werkbund and its ideology will be discussed in further detail below. In his earlier book on the Werkbund, Schwartz was careful also to acknowledge Muthesius’ debt to Riegl and the art historians' idea of\textit{Sachlichkeit} as a spiritual endeavor; Fredric Schwartz,\textit{The Werkbund} (1996), pp. 18ff, esp. pp. 21-22.
Other influential architects, such as professor Friedrich Ostendorf and the autodidact Paul Schultze-Naumburg, who were part of the Heimatstil or Um 1800 movements, had also called for a more sachlich approach to architectural form. But they looked to tradition, not technology for their cues. They recommended continuing the simple, tectonic, conventional forms of Biedermeier classicism. They saw this as a means to escape the merely decorative, irrational forms of Jugendstil, Secession, and Gründerzeit historicist styles.\(^{42}\)

Behne’s use of the word sachlich, by contrast, came out of his art history studies as well as his work as a critic.\(^{43}\) Already in his first article for Der Sturm, in April 1912, Behne had criticized paintings that imitated nature or were representational as "unsystematic and unsachlich."\(^{44}\) Later, in September 1913, he contrasted naturalistic art with the "sachlichen" form of architecture.


\(^{43}\) Peter Sprengel has postulated that Walden’s Sturm enterprise was in part founded on ideas related to Sachlichkeit as it was discussed in architecture; see Sprengel, "Von der Baukunst zur Wortkunst. Sachlichkeit und Expressionismus im Sturm," Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte (DVjs) 64, no. 4 (Dec. 1990).

with Expressionist paintings, which followed Kandinsky’s "Principle of Inner Necessity." Kandinsky’s paintings, he claimed, exhibited an unrestricted use of color by the artist and a "truthfulness in the use of materials." This focus on autonomy in art, on the basic principles and material processes that differentiate painting from other arts, would become the key to Expressionist art in the early Sturm circle. Indeed, it would become a key of all modernist art.

Behne clarified what he meant by Sachlichkeit in Expressionist architecture by defining its antithesis, what he termed an "Impressionist" architecture. He warned explicitly against trying to identify a formal architectural corollary to the light paintings of Monet or the fleeting glimpses of Max Liebermann’s Polo players. As with

45 "Im Schaffen der Expressionisten steht die inner Wahrhaftigkeit in der Verwendung der Mittel;" Behne, "Impressionismus und Expressionismus"

46 One thinks in particular of the "Word Art" (Wortkunst) championed by Walden in poets such as August Stramm, where rules of grammar and ordinary word usage was often sacrificed in favor of a more "abstract" use of the words. Sprengel has noted, however, that after 1912 the "inner essence" and expressive quality promoted by Kandinsky and Marc would often be valued over any cool and unornamented formal purity. Sprengel, in his article "Von der Baukunst zur Wortkunst," traces Walden’s turn from an early Sachlichkeit asceticism, to more "ornamental" forms using the writing of Alfred Döblin, who wrote early articles in Der Sturm in favor of Sachlichkeit, but after Walden’s Futurist exhibit in 1912, became increasingly critical of the ornamental aspects of abstract, expressionist art in the name of Kandinsky’s "inner essence."

47 The dichotomy of Impressionism and Expressionism was common, going back to the very founding of the term Expressionism. Santomasso, however, has proposed without hard evidence that Behne was reacting to Muthesius, who transferred the term Impressionism to architectural discourse when he warned explicitly of an infiltration of an "Impressionist" approach into architecture; see Muthesius, "Wo stehen wir?,” a speech at the annual Werkbund convention of 1911, published in the first Werkbund yearbook Die Durchgeistigung der deutschen Arbeit (1912, reprinted 2000); and Santomasso, "Origins and Aims" p. 13.
Expressionism, Impressionism was for Behne a point of view. Impressionism, because of its reference to the forms of the world, subordinated artistic expression to elements. Behne defined the newest houses of Richard Riemerschmid in Hellerau, for example, as "Impressionist" because their forms "are not developed exclusively from the givens, the form is not the organic product of realities." Behne accused Riemerschmid of basing his designs on a pre-conceived form or style, which Behne disparaged as "a touch of Rothenburg or Old-Nürnberg." [Figure 4.6]

In defining an Expressionist architecture Behne also avoided direct architectural parallels to the abstract paintings of Die Brücke, Blauer Reiter, Cubist, or Futurist artists. Rather he defined Taut’s Expressionist architecture as "pure," elemental, and grounded in original principles. He noted that Taut had excluded the use of columns, caryatids, turrets or any other "derivative or imported elements." Much as Expressionist painters had returned to color, line, and shape, Behne insisted that Taut had "returned to the primal elements of building." In this manner he achieved a "new simplicity, a primitiveness" that "left aside all conventions or derivative elements," and reflected a "new sensibility, a new worldview!" [Figure 4.7] Recalling aspects of Ostendorf’s

---

48 Behne, "Impressionismus und Expressionismus."

49 Reinheit! Das ist vielleicht das Wort, das am ehesten der Architektur Tauts recht wird”; Behne, "Ein neues Haus!,” p. 33, emphasis in original.

50 "Bruno Taut geht hier bewußt auf die Urelemente des Bauens zurück, und läßt alles bei Seite liegen, was nur Konvention, nur Ableitung ist. . . . Auch er bemüht sich . . . um eine neue Einfachheit, um Primitivität. . . . Eine neue Gesinnung, ein neues Lebensgefühl liegt in dieser Architektur!”; Behne, "Ein neues Haus!,” p. 32. Behne used similar terms in many of the articles listed above, though this is a particularly concise and powerful analysis.
spartan design theory—"Design means finding the simplest form"—Behne claimed that Taut had reduced his designs to the two most primal elements of architecture: "the wall and the opening." In contrast, Behne criticized that "Impressionist" architects such as Ludwig Hoffmann, the architect of the new Berlin City Hall, determined the size of windows and rooms from stylistic rules such as those of the Italian Renaissance. [Figure 4.8] "Expressionist" architects such as Taut, by contrast, derived their window and wall sizes exclusively from their intended purpose: to create well-lit, stimulating, enjoyable interior spaces. Modern architecture, he insisted in 1913, must be designed "from the inside out," both functionally and spiritually.52

However, Behne also sought to unite this objective, functional aspect of design with a subjective desire for the free, creative expression of the artist. To this end, he added that the resulting pure composition of wall and openings could be brought to life by a third primal element: "the joy of decoration." More explicitly than in the first article on Taut, Behne highlighted the purely expressive sense of decoration that Taut featured in his work, a personal ornament.

Expressionist Sachlichkeit combined a primal purity with the pleasures of

---

51 Behne, "'Ein neues Haus!'," p. 33, emphasis in original.
52 Behne, "Impressionismus und Expressionismus"; included as part of Behne’s Sturm book Zur Neuen Kunst. In 1924 Behne would become one of the fiercest opponents of Ludwig Hoffmann, joining a small group of progressive architects led by Martin Wagner who sought to oust Hoffmann from his position as official city architect of Berlin. The group of architects joined forces under the banner of "Der Ring," while Behne kept his work to criticism in the press.
53 "Zu den Urelementen des Bauens gehört freilich noch ein Drittes: die Freude am Schmuck"; Behne, "'Ein neues Haus!'," p. 33, emphasis in original.
Behne, "Impressionismus und Expressionismus."  

Behne later referred to Tessenow’s houses as "a bit puritanical" in Behne, "Gartenstadt-Architekturen," Illustriertes-Jahrbuch (1915) 209. Martin Wagner claimed Tessenow’s work embodied "das natürliche Gefühl für das Sachliche, Zweckmäßige, Brauchbare und die überwindung der Materie durch künstlerische Gestaltung"; Wagner, "Gartenstadthäuser," Neudeutsche Bauzeitung 6, no. 7 (1910): 84. Heinrich Tessenow (1876-1950) was born in the northern Prussian port city of Rostock, where he trained as a carpenter and at a vocational school. He subsequently taught at several vocational schools while designing and publishing many unexecuted houses, before he got his big break as one of the architects of the garden city of Hellerau, near Dresden. Here he built several houses and the famous Dalcroze Institute from 1910-12. On Tessenow see Marco de Michelis, Heinrich Tessenow (1991); and Gerda Wangerin and Gerd Weiss, Heinrich Tessenow - Ein Baumeister 1876-1950 (1976). Behne probably got to know Tessenow through Taut. In handwritten comments on Behne’s manuscript for his March 1913 article "Bruno Taut", Taut had proposed Tessenow and Peter Behrens as up-and-coming architects. In addition to Tessenow’s Haus für Adolf Otto (1912-13) in Taut’s garden city of Falkenberg outside of Berlin, Behne probably saw Tessenow’s work in the professional press, in the Werkbund yearbooks, in Tessenow’s popular
decoration. But Expressionist painting shared with Taut’s architectural work an expressive, impassioned energy, a purposiveness of form-making. Behne cited as other examples of an Expressionist Sachlichkeit the architectures of Tessenow and of Loos. Behne saw in the early Secession-inspired apartment buildings of Taut, in the sober, well crafted Biedermeier-inspired homes of Tessenow, and in the stark villas and urban facades of Loos a similar simplicity of form which was derived from function, technique, and materials. Most importantly, all of this was in the service of an architect expressing his individual artistic "inner necessity" and vitality.

Tessenow’s simple worker housing at Hellerau, as well as the house he had designed for the first phase of Taut’s Falkenberg Garden City in 1911 were, despite their penchant for traditional forms, models of "puritanical," sachlich, functional construction [Figures 4.9 and 4.10] The spartan forms of Tessenow’s Dalcroze

---

54 Behne, "Impressionismus und Expressionismus."

55 Behne later referred to Tessenow’s houses as "a bit puritanical" in Behne, "Gartenstadt-Architekturen," Illustriertes-Jahrbuch (1915) 209. Martin Wagner claimed Tessenow’s work embodied "das natürliche Gefühl für das Sachliche, Zweckmäßige, Brauchbare und die überwindung der Materie durch künstlerische Gestaltung"; Wagner, "Gartenstadthäuser," Neudeutsche Bauzeitung 6, no. 7 (1910): 84. Heinrich Tessenow (1876-1950) was born in the northern Prussian port city of Rostock, where he trained as a carpenter and at a vocational school. He subsequently taught at several vocational schools while designing and publishing many unexecuted houses, before he got his big break as one of the architects of the garden city of Hellerau, near Dresden. Here he built several houses and the famous Dalcroze Institute from 1910-12. On Tessenow see Marco de Michelis, Heinrich Tessenow (1991); and Gerda Wangerin and Gerd Weiss, Heinrich Tessenow - Ein Baumeister 1876-1950 (1976). Behne probably got to know Tessenow through Taut. In handwritten comments on Behne’s manuscript for his March 1913 article "Bruno Taut", Taut had proposed Tessenow and Peter Behrens as up-and-coming architects. In addition to Tessenow’s Haus für Adolf Otto (1912-13) in Taut’s garden city of Falkenberg outside of Berlin, Behne probably saw Tessenow’s work in the professional press, in the Werkbund yearbooks, in Tessenow’s popular
Institute, a utopian *Gesamtkunstwerk*, more likely had caught Behne’s eye in his search for an "artistic Sachlichkeit" that united the arts in order to achieve a higher, ideal expression of the human spirit.\(^56\) [Figure 4.11] The Institute was created in collaboration with the rhythmic musician and gymnast Emil Jacques-Dalcroze, the radical set designer Adolphe Appia, and the lighting designer Alexander von Salzmann.

Tessenow’s drawing technique and tender depiction of domestic life reinforced a sense of calm and timeless grace in his work.\(^57\) [Figure 4.12] The intriguing blend of tradition and modernity, of artistry and *Sachlichkeit* in Tessenow’s built and published work still

---

book *Wohnhausbau* (The Building of Dwellings, 1909), or in person at Hellerau. The Dalcroze Institute hosted well attended Festspiele in July 1912 and July 1913 to which over 500 journalists were invited, a huge media spectacle Behne could hardly have missed. Behne traveled frequently to Dresden to review museum exhibits, including for his regular art column in the *Dresdner neueste Nachrichten*. Tessenow worked to create an architecture based on "conventions" and the deliberate borrowing of vernacular craft traditions. His ideas, also documented in his book *Wohnhausbau* and many journal articles, derived from his early work with Paul Schultze-Naumburg’s Saalecker Workshops, his work in Muthesius’ office, and his designs for the Hellerau Garden City. In many respects they were more related to the pragmatic *Kunstgewerbe* or *Heimatstil* movements and even Werkbund ideology than to the spiritual "inner necessity" Behne saw in Expressionist paintings. On the conventionality of Tessenow’s designs, see S. Anderson, "The Legacy of German Neoclassicism and Biedermeier: Behrens, Tessenow, Loos, and Mies," *Assemblage*, no. 15 (Aug. 1991): 63-87.

---


---

\(^57\) Wagner wrote that through the drawings alone one would suspect that Tessenow was part of "die Gruppe der Malerarchitekten," the "care and the loving touch" seeming to defy Tessenow’s attempt to find inexpensive, functional solutions for the problem of worker housing; Wagner, "Gartenstadthäuser," p. 84.
stirs controversies about his position in the development of modern architecture.\(^{58}\)

The same can be said for Behne’s relationship to Loos. Loos’ passionate, elitist defense of true art had endeared him to Walden from the beginning of the Sturm enterprise. The memorable discursive attacks on style and ornament, and on Jugendstil and Secession art that Loos had promulgated in his essays (including in *Der Sturm*) were models of early modernism. The *sachlich* image of his urban facades that were being built in Vienna were later recognized as antecedents to modern architecture.

[Figure 4.13] Behne, however, chose to ignore (or remained ignorant of) Loos’ references to tradition and convention, and his sharp separation of art and utility. This is expressed most clearly by Loos’ 1910 statement in "Concerning Architecture" that "everything that serves a function is to be excluded from the realm of art." For Loos, within architecture, "only tombstones and monuments" could be considered art, everything else was merely construction.\(^{59}\)

In retrospect, it is difficult to see much that was "Expressionist" in the built, painted, or written work that Taut had completed by the time Behne wrote his article in


\(^{59}\) Loos wrote "alles, was einen Zweck dient, ist aus dem Reiche der Kunst auszuschliesen," Loos, "Über Architektur," *Der Sturm* 1, no. 42 (1910): 334. Loos had been championed by Walden since 1910, publishing several article in *Der Sturm*, and giving several lectures sponsored by the Sturm gallery. See above for Loos' possible influence on Walden’s conception of Expressionist art as Sachlich.
March 1913. The absence of overtly Expressionist features is especially noticeable when compared to the contemporary Sturm painters or Taut’s work as it would develop in the ensuing months and years. Behne’s attempt to group this eclectic set of architects (who all wrote prodigiously) under a common label was a rather forced effort to expand his ideas on Expressionism from painting to architecture and beyond. In other ways, however, this was typical given Behne’s ideas about the autonomy of art. Despite his concerns for formal issues in his art criticism, in the end he was more interested on artistic intent, on the creative process, and on the experience of the art than on style or visual results.

The Monument to Iron

Behne’s contacts with Taut late in 1912 or early in 1913 led to a deepening personal friendship. The relationship soon offered Behne his first opportunities to write extensively about modern architecture. In the summer of 1913 Behne began publicizing Taut’s "Monument to Iron" pavilion for the Steel Producers Association which stood at the Leipzig International Building Exposition from April to October 1913. He wrote at least six monographic articles on the pavilion, and

---

60 The oldest surviving correspondence from Taut to Behne, from April 29, 1913, was a color postcard of Taut’s "Monument to Iron" pavilion, thanking Behne for a (now lost) postcard from the Secession exhibit, requesting to see him, and sending greetings to Behne’s fiance Elfriede; see Behne Nachlaß, SBPK.

61 "Monument des Eisens" was at first only the name of the 1912 competition entry submitted by the team of Taut and Hoffmann Architects in cooperation with the Firma Breest and Co. steel producers. It soon became the name of choice for the pavilion commissioned by the Deutschen Stahlwerks-Verbandes in cooperation with
briefly discussed it in at least five more essays.

Except for two essays in 1914, all of his texts on the pavilion were published in popular cultural periodicals. This reflects both Behne’s constant effort to spread the word about modern art and architecture, and his lack of identification with, and standing in, the professional architecture community. The number of articles Behne wrote on the same building and the celebratory tone he set distinguished these articles apart from earlier more descriptive and neutral writings. In contrast to his reviews of individual exhibits, books, and artists, these articles contained a clear ideological agenda, to promote a new form of spiritual art and the hope for a new society that went along with it. Although there is no reason to believe that Behne was actually commissioned by Taut, it is quite clear that Behne was promoting Taut’s as well as his

the Verein Deutscher Brücken- und Eisenbaufabriken at the Leipziger Bau-
Fachausstellung. It is sometimes erroneously called the “Monument of Steel” in English language publications, though clearly the reference to iron was intentional and approved by the steel producers. Although meant to exhibit the latest products of the steel industry and serve as explicit advertisements for their products, it was also conceived as a "monument," an art work very much in the spirit of Loos’ definition of art mentioned above, intended to celebrate the material. For an introduction to the pavilion and bibliography, see the entry in the catalogue in Nerdinger et al, Bruno Taut, p. 329-330. Behne’s wide range of articles on the Leipzig pavilion from which the following descriptive analysis is taken include: Behne, "Monument des Eisens’,” Dresdner Neueste Nachrichten (July 11, 1913); Behne, "Das Monument des Eisens auf der Leipziger Baufachausstellung," Die Umschau 17, no. 30 (July 19, 1913): 619-621; Behne, "Die Leipziger Baufach-Ausstellung," Die Tat 5.1, no. 5 (Aug. 1913): 504-507; Behne, "Der Kino im Leipziger Monument des Eisens," Bild und Film 2, no. 11/12 (Aug., Sept. 1913): 269-271; Behne, "Das Monument des Eisens," Allgemeiner Beobachter 3, no. 12 (Oct. 15, 1913): 167; Behne, "Ein neues Haus!"; Behne, "Das Monument des Eisens von Taut und Hoffmann auf der Internationalen Baufachausstellung in Leipzig," Kunstgewerbeblatt N.F.25, no. 5 (Feb. 1914): 86-88; Behne, "Bruno Taut," Der Sturm 4, no. 198/199 (Feb. 1914): 182-183, a republication of the März article. The building was also mentioned in many more articles.
own artistic and social agenda.\footnote{See, for example, Behne, "Das 'Monument des Eisens',' Dresdner neueste Nachrichten. We have no direct evidence that Behne was commissioned or even encouraged by Taut to write these articles, as was the case with many artists and architects after the war who explicitly asked for Behne’s help, but they could hardly have been written without his approval. In a postcard from May 8, 1913, Behne wrote to Taut that Diederichs had asked Behne for an article on the Leipzig exhibition for the August issue of Die Tat (and Behne did in fact publish his very first article in this prestigious journal in the August 1913 issue, "Die Leipziger Baufach-Ausstellung"). It is likely that Behne, who was still relatively unknown, had requested to write such an article. In the same postcard Behne mentions that he had already written to Hellwag, the editor of the Kunstgewerbeblatt, where Behne would publish a long article on Leipzig in February 1914; BTA-01-468, Bruno Taut Archiv, AdK.}

Drawing on the evolving definitions of Expressionism that he gleaned from Kandinsky, Worringer, and others, Behne’s articles all comment favorably on the "new, revolutionary," and "strict, Sachlich" nature of Taut’s pavilion. This applied not only to the exposed octagonal steel-frame construction, which historians (and even Taut) would later see as influenced by the tectonic and monumentalized forms of Peter Behrens’ exhibition pavilions, but also to the "spare, logical, precise" black-and-gold color scheme.\footnote{Taut admitted the Leipzig pavilion owed a great deal to Behrens in his Die Neue Baukunst in Europa und Amerika (1929), p. 28; translated in Taut, Modern Architecture (1929), p. 58; Nerdinger, Prange and Bletter all emphasize this connection, especially when the Leipzig pavilion is compared to the Cologne Glashaus; Nerdinger et al, Bruno Taut; Prange, Das Kristalline, p. 76ff.; Bletter, "Bruno Taut and Paul Scheerbart’s Vision," pp. 55-57. Taut had also built an even more cubic, rectangular, and Behrens-like pavilion for a steel vendor (Eisenverkaufskontor) at the 1910 construction materials exposition in Berlin; see Nerdinger et al, Bruno Taut, pp. 324-325.} Even the gigantic (nine-meter diameter) gold sphere resting on an open lattice at the top of the stepped pyramid, Behne maintained, was "sachlich" and aesthetically "functional": a necessary antidote and "lively counterpart" to the stack of
"rigid vertical walls" below and the building’s overall "unrelentingly Cubist design" (cubistische Gestalt). He insisted it would be wrong to ask about the rational "functionality" (Zweck) of such a "stern yet playful . . . aesthetic creation" (Gebilde).

Along with the purely decorative Expressionist painted ornaments on the interior by Taut’s friend Franz Mutzenbecher, Behne insisted the gold sphere was built from a sense of fantasy that embodied an "artistic Sachlichkeit, not the Sachlichkeit of a ‘Functionalist’ or a ‘purist.’" In a line very similar to one Taut would later use to describe his work, Behne wrote prophetically that the Leipzig pavilion appealed not to the intellect, but to feelings, having "no other purpose that an inner artistic one."

Behne also pointed out that the pavilion also displayed the latest trends in media technology. It contained an innovative movie theater inside, which showed informational clips about the steel industry, and featured the supergraphics announcing the sponsors’ names in a prominent frieze. The pavilion was a happy convergence of art and advertisement that served as effective business "propaganda" for the steel industry, this after all, was the building’s "function." Its effectiveness was especially convincing, Behne felt, in comparison with the anachronistic logo of the exhibition—a single classical column—or in comparison with the neighboring Concrete Pavilion, a

---

64 Behne, "Das Monument des Eisens," Allgemeiner Beobachter; Behne, "Ein neues Haus!"; and Behne, "Das Monument des Eisens," Kunstgewerbeblatt.


66 On Taut’s pavilion as part of a larger commercial and advertising culture see Schwartz, The Werkbund, p. 182-183.
pastiche of the Pantheon in Rome designed by the conservative architect Wilhelm Kreis. \textsuperscript{67} [Figures 4.15, 4.16, and 4.17]

The "unfortunate" Concrete Pavilion by Kreis, Behne argued, failed to express the potential or spirit of concrete as effectively as Max Berg’s Centenary Hall built in Breslau a year earlier. [Figure 4.18] He claimed that Taut, in contrast to Kreis, had managed through fantasy to "represent" and "celebrate" the "character" and "style" of steel in a "truly artistic" and "beautiful" way, despite the difficulty of doing this in a small exhibit pavilion using a material known for its long spans. The success of Taut’s "terse and wonderfully energetic creation" could be measured, Behne wrote, by the fact that a public not usually attuned to architecture noticed and commented on it extensively. Although steel and concrete, "the two most modern and cutting-edge building materials," were always in competition for predominance in the marketplace, judging by their representative pavilions, Behne insisted, steel clearly had the edge in terms of "energy, sense of purpose and orientation to the future."\textsuperscript{68} Taut, and the "slenderness, purity, luminosity, liveliness, lightness, and freedom" of steel and glass,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{67} Behne felt the official column logo of the exhibit did not reflect the otherwise thoroughly "modern" spirit of the fair; Behne, "Die Säule," Kunstgewerbeblatt 25, no. 8 (May 1914): 144; and republished as "Säulenheiligkeit," Kölner Zeitung (July 16, 1916). For comparative descriptions and photos of Taut’s and Kreis’ pavilions, see Der Industriebau 4, no. 7 (July 15, 1913); and 4, no. 11 (Nov. 15, 1913). On Kreis see Winfried Nerdinger and Ekkehard Mai, eds., Wilhelm Kreis. Architekt zwischen Kaiserreich und Demokratie, 1873-1955 (1994).
  \item \textsuperscript{68} Behne, "'Monument des Eisens'," Dresdner Neueste Nachrichten (July 11, 1913).
\end{itemize}
were clearly the path into the future.  

Architecture as Art

The increasingly close relationship between Behne and Taut resulted in a conscious spirit of collegiality that makes is difficult to sort out the intellectual ownership of the common ideas they espoused. Behne and Taut’s exchanges deepened over the summer and fall of 1913 when Behne was writing his articles on the Leipzig pavilion, and their friendship expanded to include their wives and children. [Figure 4.19] Behne brought to the relationship a scholarly, broadly educated mind, who wrote easily and trenchantly, as well as contacts and insights into Berlin’s world of avant-garde art and the media. Taut brought to the relationship a creative, philosophical mind that sought artistic expression in many media: at first in architecture, then in painting and drawing, and after meeting Behne, increasingly in writing.

Taut had published a few descriptive articles on his own work before meeting Behne, after which he began writing more prolifically, eventually producing over a dozen books, hundreds of articles, and editing a journal. Indeed, Taut became an increasingly savvy user of the media. Taut’s fame today derives not only from his

---

69 Behne, "Das Monument des Eisens von Taut und Hoffmann," Kunstgewerbeblatt, p. 88. It is worth noting that Taut’s next pavilion, his more famous Glashaus in Cologne, used a concrete structural skeleton that was arguably far more advanced than his earlier one out of steel.

buildings but also from the impact and legacy of his publications, particularly his post-war utopian drawings and polemical text-and-image books such as *Bauen* (Building, 1927) and *Modern Architecture* (1929).\(^{71}\) Nonetheless, as Taut admitted himself, architects express even the most complex ideas more forcefully through their designs than through writing. In the spirit of Expressionism, the strength of Taut’s writing was more in poetics and inspiration than in content and information, especially during the period 1913-23.\(^{72}\)

One of the most fundamental beliefs that Behne and Taut shared was the Idealist concept that architecture was above all a fine art.\(^{73}\) Although in part a legacy of the Jugendstil theory, espoused by applied artists such as Obrist and Endell, Behne’s emphasis on the artistic side of architecture rather than the technical tempered his

---


\(^{72}\) Wendschuh and Volkmann, *Bruno Taut*, p. 24. Rainer Stamm has even called his post-World War I books such as *Alpine Architektur* and *Der Welthaumeister* primarily literary, not architectural. Schreiber has called the Crystal Chain letters that Taut initiated with his colleagues after World War I the most important exchange of architectural ideas of twentieth-century, even though it was not published at the time; Daniel Schreiber, “Friedrich Nietzsche und die expressionistische Architektur,” in *Bau einer neuen Welt. Architektonische Visionen des Expressionismus*, ed. Rainner Stamm and Dieter Schreiber (2003), p. 24.

embrace of functionalism and technology, and eventually allowed him to find a balance between tradition and modernity, between the historical forms of the Heimatstil and the dry calculations of the engineer that would remain a hallmark of his critiques through life. Behne described Taut’s work as full of “artistry,” developed “not from the intellect, and not from ‘taste,’ but from fantasy.” He added later that Taut was one of the few architects who was a true artist. Taut himself had written even before he met Behne, “The architect must be an artist, he must have the courage to design an idea. . . . As a whole it must function like something organic and grown: the same factors that lead to an artwork.” As Manfred Speidel has recently shown, Taut continued to be interested and involved with art and painting after his practical architectural education. In 1904 he mused, “I feel ever more like a painter. . . . Thoughts about painting now occupy me constantly. It seems I can give my character fullest expression in this medium—probably better than in architecture.”

---


75 Der Architekt muß Künstler sein, er muß den Mut haben, eine Idee zu Gestalten”; Taut, “Kleinhäusbau,” p. 11, emphasis in original.

76 Taut, letter to his brother Max Taut from June 8, 1904, cited in Manfred Speidel, “Farbe und Licht, Zum malerischen Werk von Bruno Taut,” in Speidel, Bruno Taut, p. 41; and in Manfred Speidel, “Das Frühwerk,” in Bruno Taut, ed. Nerdinger et al, p. 32. Cited as a diary entry in Whyte, Bruno Taut, p. 20. Taut had begun to draw in architecture school between 1889 and 1901, and continued during his first years in practice, particularly after 1904 when he worked in Berlin for Bruno Möhring, who also enjoyed painting and even had some of his works published. Through contacts at Möhring’s office Taut entered the so-called “Choriner-Kreis,” whose members were interested in painting and art.
For both Taut and Behne, "building art" (Baukunst) had a special role in the pantheon of art. Baukunst, Behne believed, was particularly adept at mirroring the spirit of the age. He wrote in September 1913 that it was the "original art, the foundation for all other visual arts, celebrated as 'frozen music,' and herewith the purest of the arts." He continued, "As a form-based art without content or subject, it captures and allows one to recognize more clearly and accurately the actual artistry" expressed by artists than painting or sculpture, which were always hindered by objects taken from the outside world. The subject matter and relationship to natural objects in all the other arts, Behne explained, tended to obscure what Hildebrand had identified as a pure "architectonic element" (das architektonische Element), at the core of all art.

---

77 "Baukunst, die man doch an anderer Stelle nicht müde wird als die Urkunst, die Grundlage aller anderen bildenden Künste, als 'gefrorene Musik,' und damit als die reinste der Bildkünste zu feiern"; Behne, "Kunst und Milieu," p. 601. Taut later expressed similar ideas about architecture as the "mother of all arts"; Taut, Architekturlehre (1977, orig. 1936), p. 175, cited and expanded upon in Lamberts, "Das Frühwerk von Bruno Taut," p. 103ff.

78 "[Baukunst], diese als inhaltlose, formale Kunst, läßt das Eigentlich-Künstlerische deutlicher und schärfer fassen und erkennen als die Malerei und Plastik"; Behne, "Kunst und Milieu," p. 601. Alois Riegl had written that although the Kunstwollen is expressed in all media, "these laws cannot be recognized with the same clarity in all media. The clearest case is architecture," the art most unencumbered by content; Riegl, Late Roman Art Industry (1985, orig. 1901), p. 15, and cited in Schwartz, The Werkbund, p. 22.

79 Behne, "Kunst und Milieu," p. 601. Hildebrand, like Behne twenty years later, was seeking alternatives to the "apparent chaos" of forms in Impressionism. On Hildebrand’s "architektonische Element,” see his Das Problem der Form. Behne had reviewed Hildebrand’s book in [Behne], "Zur Einführung in die Literatur"; and discussed Hildebrand’s theory extensively a few months later in [Behne], "Wie ein plastisches Kunstwerk entsteht," Arbeiter-Jugend 6, no. 9 (Apr. 25, 1914): 139-142. Regine Prange has traced "das architektonische" back even further, to the Romantics; Prange, Das Kristalline, p. 68.
architectonic element, a formal quality that created a transcendent order, allowed both paintings and sculpture to rise above being mere representations of subject matter, to become "art."

Both Behne and Taut wrote at length that art (and architecture) could be neither defined nor controlled with preconceived formulas or common stylistic intentions. By contrast, Taine had written about the determinative impact of culture and time on art, and Riegl had postulated that the art of any epoch was in large part determined by a common Kunstwollen. In early November 1912, around the time Behne was first considering writing an article on Taut for Scheffler’s journal, he wrote that rules definitely existed in art (he felt there were rules for all things in the universe, even if they were not discernable), but these rules could not be universal. Artistic forms were subjective, he insisted, determined by the particular time, place, and the artist or viewer.\(^{80}\) Citing Kandinsky’s "Rule of Inner Necessity," Behne added that rules, as far as they existed at all, came from within the individual artist, not from nature or the zeitgeist. He wrote, "the rule that controls and orders every Expressionist, operates inside the artist. . . . He is beholden only to his own [inner] artistic ideal."\(^{81}\) Echoing Behne’s Idealist discourse, Taut wrote, "It is the first priority of the architect to approach every assignment without preconceptions, without preexisting formulas or

---


\(^{81}\) Behne, "Max Pechstein," Die Hilfe 19, no. 9 (Feb. 27, 1913): 139.
predetermined formal ideas." He then wrote even more decisively, "I am of the opinion that as nice and scientific as rules can be, [in art] there are no rules. There are not rules about which one can say: that is the principle. . . . 'Principium' signifies beginning; yes one can assume that. But to carry a principle to the end, that seems very dangerous. That is why I subscribe to the Roman saying: Principiis obsta! (oppose all principles!). "Behne later wrote almost identically, in clear reference to Taut: "Save us from predetermined principles."

Multi-media Collaboration: Behne, Scheerbart, Taut

Paul Scheerbart

On July 30, 1913, Taut met the fantastical poet, journalist, novelist, inventor, and utopian artist Paul Scheerbart. Scheerbart and his work would have a significant impact on Behne and Taut, deepening their intellectual partnership and spiritual quest for an artistic Expressionist architecture. Scheerbart, a generation older than Taut and

82 Taut, "Zu den Arbeiten." This was Taut’s first extensive article summarizing his work to date.


84 "Hüten wir uns vor Begriffen"; Behne, "Prinzip oder Takt?” p. 119.

85 This date of Taut and Scheerbart’s first meeting, long the subject of speculation and confusion, has now been more definitively established by Leo Ikelaar,
Behne, was a well-known, well-published bohemian figure in Berlin. [Figure 4.20]

Often ill-dressed and reportedly drunk, he was a fixture along with his old friend Herwarth Walden, at the Café des Westens, the meeting place of Berlin’s liberal artistic milieu. [Figure 4.21] Scheerbart, whom Walden called "the first Expressionist," and whom Behne called "the first Cubist," had been writing novels, essays, and feuilleton pieces for over twenty years. His work sought to release architecture from the burdens of constraining rationality, pompous style, and inhuman seriousness. His writings


Scheerbart (1863-1915), the son of a carpenter, was born in East Prussia (Danzig), like Taut. He studied philosophy and art history before coming to Berlin in 1885 to become, like Behne, a journalist and feuilleton writer (early on he wrote regular columns for the Danziger Courier and the Berliner Börsen Courier). Ever animated and full of fantastical ideas, he squandered a sizable inheritance already as a young man (his parents died before he was ten, his ten older siblings before he was sixteen), and lived most of his life poverty stricken and near starvation. He spent his publishing royalties on projects such as his quest for a "perpetuum mobile." The most important sources on Scheerbart and his relationship to Expressionism and Taut are in chronological order: Ralph Musielski, Bau-Gespräche. Architekturvisionen von Paul Scheerbart, Bruno Taut und der 'Gläsernen Kette' (2003); Rosemarie Haag Bletter, "Mies and Dark Transparency," in Mies in Berlin, ed. Terence Riley and Barry Bergdoll (2001), pp. 350-357; John A. Stuart, "Introduction," in Paul Scheerbart, The Gray Cloth (2001), a translation of Scheerbart’s most important architectural fantasy Graues Tuch (1914); Mechthild Rausch, ed., 70 Trillionen Weltgrüße. Eine Biographie in Briefen 1889-1915 (1997); Ikelaar, Paul Scheerbart und Bruno Taut; Rosemarie Haag Bletter, "Paul Scheerbart's Architectural Fantasies," Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 34, no. 2 (May 1975): 83-97; Bletter, "Bruno Taut and Paul Scheerbart's Vision"; Reyner Banham, "The Glass Paradise," Architectural Review n.125 (Feb. 1959): 87-89.

86 See the oft-reproduced photo of Walden and Scheerbart titled "The 'moderns' at their table in the Café des Westens," printed in Der Weltspiegel, an illustrated insert to the Berliner Tageblatt no. 41 (May 21, 1905); reprinted in Ikelaar, Paul Scheerbart und Bruno Taut, p. 12; and in Asmus, Berlin um 1900, p. 342.

conjured up a visionary "glass architecture" (*Glasarchitektur*) that was flexible and mobile, floating and towering, gleaming and transcendent, and that was allied with a modern political and social agenda calling for internationalism, pacifism and a greater equality of the sexes.

While writing his aphoristic handbook *Glasarchitekur* in the summer of 1913, Scheerbart flirted with the real technical and conceptual implications of building with glass, and dreamt of realizing a version of his utopian glass fantasy. In mid-July 1913 Scheerbart wrote to the Heinersdorff art glass company seeking a "*Glasarchitekt*" that might help him, and expressed his desire to found an "Association for Glass

Wiederkehr der Kunst (1919), p. 39. Banham has suggested that Scheerbart fantasized about a clean and well-lit glass architecture to escape the impoverished, sensory-deprived tenement-house conditions in which the chronically down-and-out artist constantly found himself; Banham, "The Glass Paradise," p. 35. Whyte claims that Scheerbart’s first contacts with real architecture came through Walden, and noted that Scheerbart’s many letters to Walden often closed with architectural greetings; Whyte, Bruno Taut, p. 32. Scheerbart first described symbolic and metaphysical implications of glass in *Das Paradies. Die Heimat der Kunst* (1889). In *Münchhausen und Clarissa* (1906) he described full-blown colored glass architectural utopias. In *Lesabendio: ein Asteriden Roman* (1913), a ladies novel, he explored at great length colored glass architecture that can be joined with music, and the idea that the process of building and construction could in itself lead to knowledge and heightened awareness. In "Das Ozeansanatorium für Heukranke" *Der Sturm* 3, no. 123/124 (Aug. 1912): 128-130, he describes a floating glass island with colored glass pavilions with double walls. For summaries of Scheerbart’s work that relates to architecture, see Musielski, Bau-Gespräche; and Bletter, "Paul Scheerbart’s Architectural Fantasies."

---

*Scheerbart, Glasarchitektur* (1914) is a book of 111 very short chapters outlining technical ideas for glass construction and all manner of material culture, historical precedents as well as utopian hopes for a *Glasarchitektur*. *Glasarchitektur* was republished with a postscript by Wolfgang Pehnt (1971); again in 1986 alongside the Glashaus correspondence; and again recently postscript by Mechthild Rausch (2002), from which all citations here are taken. It has been translated into English in Dennis Sharp, ed., *Glass Architecture and Alpine Architecture* (1972), and recently reprinted in *The Light Construction Reader*, pp. 345-368.
Architecture” that would primarily create "propaganda" for glass. Heinersdorff replied, "By chance, a young, very talented architect is just now busy thinking about a glass house very much in the spirit you describe, that is to be built next year at the exhibit in Cologne," referring to Taut. Taut, meanwhile, claimed to have known Scheerbart’s work "well." Receiving at that moment a great deal of positive press from Behne and others for his steel and glass pavilion then on display in Leipzig, Taut was already involved in the preliminary designs for a pavilion in which he proposed to promote the German glass industry. [Figure 4.22: Glashaus Exterior] He eagerly the invitation to exchange ideas on glass with Scheerbart. The two met on July 30, and despite their seventeen-year age difference began an intense spiritual and intellectual collaboration that lasted until Scheerbart’s death in October 1915. Their collegiality developed not only out of an interest in Glasarchitektur, but also from their shared East Prussian roots

---

89 Scheerbart’s first inquiry to Heinersdorff is from July 11, 1913; Heinersdorff’s reply was on July 24. The mostly complete correspondence regarding their interaction has been published in Ikelaar, Paul Scheerbart und Bruno Taut, pp. 88-135; and Scheerbart’s letters in Rausch, 70 Trillionen Weltgrüße, pp. 457-475. Scheerbart had known the whole Heinersdorff family since the turn-of-the-century. Gottfried Heinersdorff had been a member of the Werkbund since 1908, through which Taut had probably gotten to know him. He had also done the glass work on Taut’s Leipzig Pavilion. In addition, Heinersdorff was active in the New Secession and actively pursued contacts to Sturm artists. The Heinersdorff company archives, including the correspondence are in Archiv der Vereinigten Werkstätten für Mosaik und Glasmalerei Puhl & Wagner, Gottfried Heinersdorff, at the Berlinische Galerie; see H. Geisert, et al, Wände aus farbigem Glas (1989).

90 Speidel claims that Taut’s Glashaus was begun in April 1913, and conceived in model by July 1913; Speidel, Bruno Taut, p. 125; and Speidel, "Bruno Taut und die Berliner Architektur 1913 bis 1923," p. 108. Kurt Junghanns claims the Glashaus was complete by the time Taut and Scheerbart met; Junghanns, Bruno Taut, p. 28.
and dialect. Soon after their initial meeting, Scheerbart visited Taut’s steel pavilion in Leipzig. In October 1913 he wrote an introductory article on Taut’s Glashaus (glass pavilion) in the Berliner Tageblatt in which he described his discovery of Taut’s design as “the greatest event in my life.” At some point later that year, Scheerbart decided to dedicate his book Glasarchitektur to Taut. Taut, meanwhile, engaged Scheerbart to write a set of aphorisms about glass for the what came to be known as the Glashaus in Cologne. The aphorisms were inscribed in large letter on a decorative frieze just below the multifaceted, colored glass dome.

During the fall of 1913 and spring of 1914, Taut’s exchanges with Scheerbart coincided with his intensifying collaboration with Behne. In the fall, on the heels of his March 1913 introduction of Taut, Behne penned glowing reviews of the architect’s

---


92 There is a postcard of the Leipzig pavilion that Scheerbart wrote to his poet friend Richard Dehmel, in the Dehmel papers, Staatsarchiv Hamburg.


94 Bletter claimed the Glashaus was "replica of Scheerbart’s ideas"; Bletter "The Interpretation of the Glass Dream: Expressionist Architecture and the History of the Crystal Metaphor," Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 40, no. 1 (March 1981): 33. The mutual dedication of their works is chronicled in their correspondence, published in Ikelaar, Paul Scheerbart und Bruno Taut; as well as in Rausch, Trillionen Weltgrüße, pp. 458ff. Taut first published Scheerbart’s letters regarding their collaboration in his important post-war journal Frühlicht, part of the professional planning journal Stadtbaukunst alter und neuer Zeit 1, no. 3 (1920): 45-48. The letters were republished in Ulrich Conrads, ed., Frühlicht (1963), pp. 18-23. Taut later wrote that this project had merely brought him together with Scheerbart, and that Scheerbart, by admiring Taut, had "indirectly" led Taut to the design; Taut, "Glaserzeugung und Glasbau," Qualität 1, no. 1/2 (Apr./May 1920): 9-14; quoted in Musielki, Bau-Gespräche, p. 87; and in Angelica Thiekötter, ed., Kristallisationen, Splitterungen: Bruno Tauts Glashaus (1993), p. 168.
Leipzig pavilion and essays connecting an Expressionist approach to art and architecture. It is hard to imagine that Behne was not involved in or at least well aware of Taut’s and Scheerbart’s projects for a glass architecture. Although the exact details of the relationships between these three men are difficult to reconstruct, it is certain they interacted frequently, and soon became mutual admirers.\(^5\)

Behne had probably become acquainted with Scheerbart through his life-long interest in the Berlin literary scene.\(^6\) The two shared a deep curiosity about glass and colored mosaics. Scheerbart had written extensively on mosaics in his novels, and Behne’s dissertation analyzed medieval mosaics, leading him to publish several articles

\(^{5}\) Walden gave the eulogy at Scheerbart’s funeral in 1915. Taut’s work is said to be a continuation of Scheerbart’s quest for a glass architecture and the concomitant world spirit. Behne published an obituary for Scheerbart in Zeit-Echo n.5 (1915-16): 77; and commemorative articles on the tenth and twentieth anniversaries of Scheerbart’s death: Behne, "Paul Scheerbart," Ostdeutsche Monatshefte 6.2, no. 7 (Oct. 1925): 735-737; Behne, "Paul Scheerbart," Deutsche Zukunft 3, no. 41 (Oct. 13, 1935): 20. He celebrated Walden’s fiftieth birthday: Behne, "Herwarth Walden," Die Welt am Abend 6, no. 218 (Sept. 17, 1928): B.2. Behne also helped found a "Paul Scheerbart Association" at the Sturm offices on Jan. 18, 1929, to commemorate the fifteenth anniversary of Scheerbart’s death, and to help propagate his legacy. Behne was president, and members including Taut, Walden, Alfred Richard Meyer, Erich Mühsam, and others. See the announcement in Welt am Abend n.25 (Jan. 30, 1929); and in Das Neue Berlin 12 (1929): 43. Walden’s personal copies of Scheerbart’s books, as well as a stack of newspaper clippings on Scheerbart can be found in the Walden Nachlaß in the SBPK.

on the subject.97 In addition, Behne may have met Scheerbart through Walden, who had published and promoted Scheerbart’s work for years. They all frequented the Café des Westens, which Behne was known to have visited in search of contacts and material for his writing.98

These inter-relationships solidified in the context of Walden’s Sturm enterprise.99 Scheerbart had published many of his utopian glass fantasies in Der Sturm, and after his manuscript Glasarchitektur was rejected by his regular publisher for being merely "practical building advice," he came back to Walden’s Sturm-Verlag to publish his it May 1914.100 In an effort to reach out to the public even during the tumult


98 There is debate about how and when Walden met Scheerbart, Ikelaar claiming they met as early as 1895. Scheerbart definitely participated in Walden’s "Verein für Kunst" in 1903 and was photographed at the Café des Westens with Walden in 1905. For a short while in 1909 Walden was editor of the theater magazine Der neue Weg, to which Scheerbart contributed, as did Peter Behrens and Hermann Muthesius. Scheerbart published 34 literary essays in Der Sturm, primarily 1910-12, before Walden’s journal focused more exclusively on visual art. See Whyte, Bruno Taut, p. 32; Ikelaar, Paul Scheerbart und Bruno Taut, p. 47-48. The Behnes and the Waldens were both invited for dinner at the Scheerbart’s house in August 1914; see letter from Anna Scheerbart to Nell Walden (Aug. 14, 1914) published in Rausch, 70 Trillionen Weltgrüße, p. 473.

99 Kristiana. Hartmann and Franzisca Bollerey insisted that Taut and Scheerbart got to know each other in the context of the Sturm group; Hartmann and Bollerey, "Das Glashaus von Bruno Taut," in Die Deutsche Werkbund-Ausstellung Köln, P.134.

100 Glasarchitektur was written in the fall of 1913, and rejected by Scheerbart’s regular publisher Georg Müller in December 1913 because it contained "merely practical building suggestions." It was subsequently published by Walden’s Sturm
of the war, Walden donated copies of *Glasarchitektur* to public institutions including libraries and military hospitals. Although Scheerbart had all but stopped publishing in *Der Sturm* after 1912, he remained close to Walden and may well have drawn Behne deeper into that circle. Certainly Behne’s publishing activity in *Der Sturm* increased, as did his role as a semi-official Sturm theoretician during and after the Erster Deutscher Herbstsalon (First German Fall Salon) in the fall of 1913. Behne first connected Scheerbart to his own interests in Expressionist art in a review of Walden’s Herbstsalon in September 1913. In it he criticized Alfred Kubin’s "mystical and dark" illustrations on display as inappropriate for the "crystalline clarity and definite lightness" of Scheerbart’s novel *Lesabendio*, and suggested that the "pure and clear" drawings of Paul Klee or Kandinsky would have been more appropriate.\(^{101}\)

Throughout his career, Behne championed this same "clarity," "lightness," "purity," and "freedom" in Scheerbart’s work and in glass architecture more generally. In a 1914 article he celebrated the "wondrous color . . . the liveliness . . . and the unique beauty" of glass, explaining that "Scheerbart does not like the heaviness and elephantine massiveness the public always admires. He loves freedom, fresh lightness and cheerfulness. . . . Glass gives us the possibility of also making our architecture light and free, pure and cheerful. . . . Glass architecture is a [grand] idea. She belongs to the

---

\(^{101}\) Behne, "Der erste deutsche Herbstsalon," *Dresdner Neueste Nachrichten* (Sept. 28, 1913).
future-- and thus to the interests of the youth.” In an obituary for Scheerbart at the end of 1915, Behne wrote: "No adjective can describe you [Scheerbart] . . . for you were beauty personified. . . . You recognized . . . that beauty is in large part movement, dissolution, dynamism and floating. Everything dark and everything crooked had to flee from you into its holes."

Behne asserted often that glass did not have to be transparent to be modern or influential. He wrote: "The appeal of glass does not lie in the fact that through it we can see what transpires outside . . . the walls [of the Glashaus] are nontransparent. Yes, that’s the amazing thing. Glass also has another great attraction that we, we who know glass only as a window pane in our homes, can surmise. . . . Glass is in itself a material of unique beauty, and even when we cannot see through it, as a wall, as an encloser of space, it has an inestimable artistic significance.” [Figure 4.23 and 4.24] In contrast to

\[102^\text{102}\] "Scheerbart liebt das Schwere und Elefantenmäßige nicht, das dem Publikum immer so angenehm ist; er liebt die Freiheit, frische Leichtigkeit und Heiterkeit. Und nun wissen wir auch warum Scheerbart sich für die Glasarchitektur einsetzt: weil das Glas die Möglichkeit gibt, auch unsere Architektur leicht und frei, rein und heiter zu machen"; Behne, "Das Glashaus,” 6, no. 20 Arbeiter-Jugend (Sept. 26, 1914): 293.


\[104^\text{104}\] "Nicht darin liegt der Reiz, daß wir nun nun alles sehen können, was draußen vorgeht; vielmehr sind die Wände undurchsichtig. . . . Ja daß eben ist der Witz. Das Glas hat noch einen ganz andere Reize, als wir, wir die es nur als Fensterscheibe in unseren Häusern kennen, uns ahnen lassen. . . . Das Glas ist ein Material von einziger Schönheit, und auch wenn wir nicht hindurchsehen können, hat es als Wand, als Umschließung eines Raumes eine unabschätzbare künstlerische Bedeutung"; Behne, "Das Glashaus,” p. 292, emphasis in original.
the mature work of modern architects such as Le Corbusier and Erich Mendelsohn (later celebrated as "glass architects" by Sigfried Giedion and Walter Benjamin), the fantastically colored glass walls described by Scheerbart and built by Taut were only translucent, and mostly colored. By closing the viewer’s gaze off from the outside world, Taut was giving the viewer a more individual, interior experience. In doing so he sought to emphasize and celebrate the subjective and the personal--the Expressionist world view. Taut’s glass panels let in light, but was not open to the world. The primary emphasis of his work was not objectivity and rationality, but rather subjectivity, expression, and what Rosemarie Haag Bletter has called the "dark side" of Scheerbart’s work.\(^{105}\) Behne--standing somewhere between Benjamin and Bletter on the issue of glass--felt that even clear plate glass could have an emotional "dark side," a mystical, transformative, and Expressionist spirituality.

Benjamin was fascinated by the duality of rationality and the often comic subjectivity in Scheerbart’s \textit{Glasarchitektur}. This same paradoxical duality was expressed by Behne in his admiration for Taut’s "artistic \textit{Sachlichkeit}.” Both Benjamin and Behne sought a sober mix of objectivity and utopian fantasy that Behne defined as

"Expressionist." It is unlikely, then, that Benjamin interpreted the glass world described by Scheerbart as "anti-humanist" during or immediately after World War I, as has recently been suggested. Scheerbart was, at his core, anticlassical, a quality admired by the Dadaists as well as by Benjamin after the late 1920.

Taut probably knew the Berlin art scene well through his own work as a painter (albeit in a very naturalistic style), and through personal friendships with Franz Mutzenbecher and other artists he got to know in his student days with the Choriner Kreis. But Taut was also a young architect starting up a new practice, busy with commissions in Berlin and Magdeburg. It is more likely, then, that Behne and Scheerbart led Taut to focus more closely on the Sturm circle and to acquaint himself more intensely with the Expressionist art and theory of Kandinsky, Marc, and Worringer. In the fall of 1913 Taut was especially inspired by Walden's Herbstsalon.

---

106 On Benjamin's fascination by rationality and fantasy, see Mertins, "Enticing and Threatening Face of Prehistory," p. 11.


108 Bletter notes that in 1912 Taut worked on designs for a building at Tiergartenstraße 34a, the address where Walden first opened his Sturm Gallery in an abandoned villa, and speculates that Taut got to know Walden in this context, as a client. Although Bletter cites Taut's own CV from 1931 to claim that Taut renovated the villa for Walden, Nerdinger lists this as a new building, presumably a replacement for the villa after Walden abandoned it, designed from late 1912 and finished in 1914. Walden used the original building only for his first two exhibits (Blue Rider and Futurists) in March and April 1912. Nonetheless, Taut may well have become
interested in the recent tenant of the site. In June 1913 Walden moved into an apartment at Potsdamerstraße 134a, the same address as the new gallery and the editorial offices of Der Sturm, and not far from the offices of Hoffmann and Taut Architects at Linkstraße 20. See Bletter, "Bruno Taut and Paul Scheerbart’s Vision," p. 78; Nell Walden and Lothar Schreyer eds., Der Sturm, p. 257; Nerdinger et al, Bruno Taut, p. 329n55; Ikelaar, Paul Scheerbart and Bruno Taut, p. 43.

With existing records, it has not been possible to pinpoint when and how Taut first came in contact with Expressionist painters. Kurt Junghanns claims he was first excited by Walden’s Herbstsalon exhibit in the fall of 1913. Taut and Behne began exchanging ideas on modern painting from the very begin of their relationship; see the postcard from Taut to Behne thanking Behne for the postcard from the Secessionist exhibit; Taut postcard to Behne (Apr. 29, 1913). Based on some questionable formal similarities, Tilmann Buddensieg has claimed that Taut was aware of Cubists well before he met Behne, and in fact was influenced by them in his designs of the Kottbusserdam apartment building, from 1910-11; Buddensieg, "Berlin: Kottbusser Damm," Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (Apr. 30, 1977).

The Marc letter has not been found; but there is a reference to it in a letter from Behne to Bruno Taut (Dec. 27, 1913) BTA-01-471, Archiv Bruno Taut, AdK.
which was on public display in the Sturm gallery in April 1913.\footnote{The model was on display in the Sturm gallery in April 1914, at the same time as an exhibit of Paul Klee’s paintings. See \textit{Vossische Zeitung} n.177 (Apr. 7, 1914), cited in Thiekötter, \textit{Kristallisationen}, p. 170.}

Taut’s "\textit{Eine Notwendigkeit}" (A Necessity) Essay

Taut, who had been working since spring 1913 on the glass pavilion for the Cologne Werkbund exposition, still had to persuade the Werkbund to let him build it. His relatively unknown status, the experimental and artistic nature of his ideas, and the fact that his project was both personally initiated and an advertising pavilion rather than an official exhibition building, made it controversial to the Werkbund’s executive board and planners. As a result, the glass pavilion was left off the first two master plans, and funding by the Werkbund was delayed and reduced to such an extent that Taut was forced to put up large amounts of his own money to see his glass dreams realized.\footnote{The Glashaus is missing from the plan of the exhibition published in the official Werkbund yearbook \textit{Die Kunst in Industrie und Handel} (1913), opp. p. 96. Taut served as own client for the Glashaus. He received only a minor sum from the Werkbund and personally undertook the difficult task of procuring funds and materials from glass manufacturers. In the end Taut had to use RM 20,000 of his own money to realize his glass dream. To add insult to injury, the City of Cologne and the Werkbund asked him to pay for its removal when the German army needed the grounds in 1916 for troop preparations. See Thiekötter, \textit{Kristallisationen}, pp. 15, 158-159, 168; and Kristiana Hartmann, "Ohne einen Glaspalast ist das Leben eine Last," in Nerdinger et al, \textit{Bruno Taut}, p. 56.} When Taut was finally given a building site, it was in front of the official entrance pavilion, right next to the tram station that brought people to the fair, and far away from all the other official Werkbund exhibition pavilions. [Figure ]
In an attempt to gain public support and prove the worthiness of his ideas, Taut turned to the press. In addition to commissioning Scheerbart’s newspaper article, Taut negotiated with a few trade magazines to announce his general plans for a glass building that fall. In December, he arranged a press conference and reception to show off the completed model and present his ideas more fully. The first photos of the model were published in the professional journal Bauwelt on January 1, 1914. By January 6, Taut claimed to have collected sixty press clippings, which he presented as qualifications to the finance committee of the Werkbund. This, along with pressure from the wealthy and influential patron Karl Ernst Osthaus (a founding member of the

---


115 See letter from Taut to Heinersdorff (Jan. 6, 1914), in the Heinersdorff archive; listed in the chronology by Bettina Held in Thiekötter, Kristallisationen, p. 168. It is unclear which 60 articles Taut claimed to have, whether he exaggerated, whether they all explicitly cited the Glashaus, or more likely whether they included all articles ever published on Taut. The archives and extant bibliographies provide references to only a handful of articles (not 60) on the Glashaus, beginning in the fall of 1913; see the catalogue entry in Nerdinger, et al, Bruno Taut, and the bibliography in Thiekötter, Kristallisationen, pp. 174-176. However, the structure of Germany’s newspaper publishing business may have made this possible. A small story or byline in a single Berlin newspaper could have been picked up through news distribution services by literally dozens of small, regional and local newspapers, and in turn collected by one of a number of clipping agencies, to whom many architects and institutions had standing subscriptions.
Karl Ernst Osthaus (1874-1921), as part of his efforts to create an arts community in Hagen, had actively promoted the work of many young and avant-garde artists and craftsmen since the turn-of-the-century, including purchasing art and craft work for himself and his museum, and commissioning many of architecture’s rising stars, including Taut, for whom he arranged a commission to design a turbine power generation plant in 1909. On Osthaus see below, and Carmen L. Stonge, "Karl Ernst Osthaus: The Folkwang Museum and the Dissemination of International Modernism," (Diss. 1993); Anna-Christa Funk-Jones and Johann H. Müller, eds., Die Folkwang-Idee des Karl Ernst Osthaus (1984); and Herta Hesse-Frielinghaus, ed., Karl Ernst Osthaus. Leben und Werk (1971), as well as his collected writings Osthaus, Reden und Schriften, ed. Rainer Stamm (2002). On Osthaus’ relationship with Taut from 1909-1922, see Birgit Schulte, ed., Auf dem Weg zu einer Handgreiflichen Utopie (1994). Osthaus continued his support of Taut when his Folkwang Verlag published Taut’s important utopian writings after World War I; see Rainer Stamm, ‘Das ‘Taut-Werk,’ Bruno Tauts Inkunabeln utopischer Architektur,” in Stamm and Schreiber, Bau einer neuen Welt, pp. 18-23.

Behne, ‘”Ein neues Haus!”’; identical to Behne, ”Bruno Taut,” Der Sturm.
Behne first announced that Taut’s pavilion would include Scheerbart inscriptions and that Scheerbart was the originator of glass architecture in [Behne], "[Das Glashaus]," Zeit im Bild 12.1, no. 5 (Jan. 29, 1914): 280; and Behne, "Das Glashaus," Königsberger Hartungsche Zeitung (Jan. 30, 1914).

In a letter to Taut (Feb. 8, 1914), Scheerbart wrote that he had just read Behne’s newspaper article and now understood the dedication; letter published in Rausch, 70 Trillionen Weltgrüße, p. 460.

to paper to write his essay "Eine Notwendigkeit" ("A Necessity"). It was a composite of ideas circulating among Behne, Scheerbart, Walden, and the Expressionists. Behne arranged that the essay appeared in the same issue of Der Sturm as his own article about the architect, the kind of "artist’s statement" that Walden invited. Taut’s article called on architects to follow contemporary painters in seeking a new artistic spirit. Success in this venture would "necessitate" the creation of a magnificent new communal building, akin to the Gothic cathedrals. Architects were to lead the other arts in creating a temple of the arts whose design and construction would help revitalize and renew modern art. The new building was to be without any real function. The goal was that architecture would merge with the other arts of painting and sculpture to achieve a new unity. Taut wrote: "Let us build together a magnificent building! A building which will not simply be architecture, but in which everything—painting, sculpture, everything together—will create a great architecture, and in which architecture will once again merge with the other arts. Architecture here should be both frame and content. This building does not need to have a purely practical

---


function. Architecture too can free itself from utilitarian demands.\textsuperscript{123} Taut imagined a museum-like temple of the arts, in an open space outside the city, with "large windows [containing] the light-compositions of Delaunay, on the walls Cubist rhythms, the paintings of a Franz Marc or the art of Kandinsky. The interior and exterior piers feature the constructive forms of [Alexander] Archipenko’s sculptures, and [Heinrich] Campendonk will create the ornament. . . . Individuals all should collaborate--as is only possible in architecture--in such a way that the whole rings with a magnificent, unified harmony."\textsuperscript{124}

Building on Scheerbart’s glass fantasies and Behne’s ongoing attempts to define an expressionist architecture, Taut’s article is arguably the first manifesto of Expressionist architecture.\textsuperscript{125} Nearly identical to the vision of the Cathedral of the Future (\textit{Zukunftskathedrale}) that was central to Gropius' Bauhaus manifesto five years later, the essay was key to the development of modern architecture.\textsuperscript{126} The important


\textsuperscript{124} Taut, "Eine Notwendigkeit," p. 175.

\textsuperscript{125} Bletter describes the essay as "the earliest manifesto calling for Expressionist architecture" in Long, \textit{German Expressionism}, p. 124. The manifesto was a particular form of artistic expression, a succinct statement of intent, usually by artists themselves, usually published, often in the popular press, has been described as characteristic of modern art and architecture; see also introduction above.

\textsuperscript{126} Franciscono sees Taut’s words as "virtually those of the Bauhaus proclamation"; Franciscono, \textit{Walter Gropius}, p. 91.
turning point it represented in Taut’s own work, and the foundational role this article played in both Taut’s and Behne’s work over the next ten years, demands exploration about the sources of Taut’s inspired ideas, especially the influence Behne may have had on it.

Taut’s manifesto was a more utopian rendition of the ideas encased in his steel and glass pavilion in Leipzig, which included films and Expressionist sculpture. The nearly complete designs and model for his glass pavilion for the fairgrounds of Cologne, were clearly also on his mind, even if it the pavilion as built fell short of the grand synthesis promised in his words. Taut’s ever increasing respect for Scheerbart and his utopian visions of a *Glasarchitektur* were key sources for both Taut’s manifesto and pavilion. When Scheerbart finished reading Taut’s article in *Der Sturm* he immediately wrote a letter to Taut expressing his approval of the idea, and suggesting they buy land outside of Berlin to realize it. Although nothing ever came of this, Scheerbart’s enthusiasm inspired the architect to push his designs further in the utopian and spiritual direction.

From Scheerbart’s earliest novel *Paradise* (1889) to *Grey Cloth* (the novel written early in 1914 while Taut was composing his own essay), Scheerbart had created vibrant word images of whole new worlds that integrated glass, light, color, music, and motion. The opening scene of *Grey Cloth*, for example, featured a gigantic exhibition pavilion on the shores of Lake Michigan made of colored, double-glazed walls, illuminated by
Scheerbart remarked that every detail of the pavilion was designed to create a harmonious whole, even the dress of the architect’s wife was "grey, and ten percent white" in order to highlight the colors of the architecture. The ironic figure of the all-controlling architect recalled fellow Sturm author Loos’ essay "The Poor Little Rich Man," a critique of Secession-style architects infatuated with the total design environment.  

Scheerbart’s vision began with architecture. It then radiated outward and inward to encompass everything from the smallest technical detail to the overall culture and cosmos, all of which he viewed as interdependent. In Glasarchitektur, for example, he asserted that traditional brick architecture bred a certain dark, closed, heavy mentality, and even mold and sickness. The experience of living in a healthy glass-based world with natural and corrective light, on the other hand, would induce spiritual and cultural transformation, producing a more open, colorful, and lively culture. Behne summed up Scheerbart’s belief in the power of architecture to transform culture when he wrote later in 1918: "The idea of a glass architecture is simple. . . . It is not just a crazy poet’s idea that glass architecture will bring a new culture. It is a

---


Building as elemental activity has the power to transform people. And now building with glass! This would be the surest method of transforming the European into a human being.\footnote{129}

Both Scheerbart’s and Taut’s visions of “a synthesis of the arts” were firmly within the tradition of the “total work of art” (\textit{Gesamtkunstwerk}) of eighteenth and nineteenth-century Romanticism, as well as the turn-of-the-century \textit{Kunstgewerbe}, symbolist and Jugendstil movements. Based on the premise that all art, like nature, embodied universally valid spiritual and material laws, artists had long attempted to synthesize various artistic media into a \textit{Gesamtkunstwerk} that would evoke and intensify these laws. In both their creative process and the resulting art works, many sought greater artistic, social, and philosophical unity to confront the perceived increasing chaos of modernity.\footnote{130} Behne himself cited Richard Wagner’s quest for a

\footnotesize
\begin{flushright}
\textit{Die Idee der Glasarchitektur ist einfach. . . . Es ist keine verdrehte Poetenmarotte, daß die Glasarchitektur uns eine neue Kultur bringen würde. Es ist so! . . . Das Bauen als eine \textit{elementare} Tätigkeit vermag den Menschen zu verwandeln. Und nun ein Bauen aus Glas! Das würde das sicherste Mittel sein, aus dem Europäer einen Menschen zu machen”;} Behne, \textit{Wiederkehr der Kunst}, p. 65. Behne quoted Scheerbart’s lines: "Our culture is to a certain extent a product of our architecture. If we want to bring our culture to a higher level, we must, for better or for worse, change our architecture"; Scheerbart, \textit{Glasarchitektur}, chapter 1, quoted in Behne, "Bruno Taut,” \textit{Neue Blätter für Kunst und Dichtung} 2, no. 1 (Apr. 1919): 13-15; also republished in Volkmann and Wendshuh, Bruno Taut, p. 186; and Ochs, \textit{Architekturkritik}, pp. 55-59.
\end{flushright}

\footnotesize
\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
Gesamtkunstwerk as an important precedent for Taut’s essay, though he felt Wagner’s unity of the arts was outdated, forced, and disjointed. Behne sought more Idealist results, where artists would feel drawn together to achieve an “inner transformation of all of art,” and criticized Taut’s essay for also falling short of this ideal.131

The various turn-of-the-century Secession movements and the related applied arts workshops in Vienna, Munich, and Dresden, and the artist’s colony at Darmstadt, all featured attempts to seek a revival and unity of the arts through collaborative artistic projects. There were many well-publicized examples to which Taut may have known. Among them were the competition in 1900 for a "House for an Art Lover" sponsored by Alexander Koch and his magazine Zeitschrift für Innendekoration, Behrens’ opening ceremony at Darmstadt, or his proposal to create a magnificent theater in the spirit of Wagner in order to purify and transform all of life into an artistic experience through a unity of the arts.132 Kandinsky, whom Taut cited as the primary motivation behind his call to build a temple, had also written about and experimented in the synaesthetic experience of the theater that approached Gesamtkunstwerk.133

131 Behne, Wiederkehr der Kunst, p. 39-40; also translated in Franciscono, Walter Gropius, p. 115.

132 On Koch and the competition, see Sigrid Randa, Alexander Koch. Publizist und Verleger in Darmstadt (1990). On Behrens, see Stanford Anderson, Peter Behrens and a New Architecture for the Twentieth Century (2000), chapter 3; and Behrens, Feste des Lebens und der Kunst (1900), part of the whole selection of neo-romantic material published by Diederichs. On Taut’s relation to Gesamtkunstwerk examples, see Franciscono, Walter Gropius, pp. 95-96; Prange, Das Kristalline, pp. 38-50; Santomasso, "Origins and Aims," pp. 180-182; and Bletter, "The Interpretation of the Glass Dream."

133 On Kandinsky and the theater see Weiss, Kandinsky in Munich, chapter 9.
Although Scheerbart’s novels and the romantic *Gesamtkunstwerk* precedents certainly inspired aspects of Taut’s essay and his subsequent pavilion, there were also more purely architectural precedents that influenced Taut’s and Behne’s ideas. Two months after Taut’s manifesto was published, Behne proposed that the Marmorkino (Marble Cinema) on the Kurfürstendamm in Berlin—designed by the Hungarian Secessionist architect Hugo Pál, with paintings by the artist Cesar Klein and sculptures by R. Sieburg—might be considered an already realized example of such a collaboration of "Expressionist" artists. Behne suggested that Taut would probably soon get the opportunity to build a new house of art, but strangely did not mention any specific projects such as the Glashaus.

Winfried Nerdinger and others have proposed that an additional and important source for Taut’s synthetic building was the concept of the communal *Volkshaus* (Community House) that was promoted a few years earlier by Taut’s former mentor and employer, the teacher and architect Theodor Fischer. In 1906 while Taut was working for him, Fischer published an essay in the influential journal *Der Kunstwart* (Warden of the Arts) journal in which he called for the erection of popular cultural centers, "houses for all." These would consist of colored multiform halls that would hold art exhibits, performances and events of all kinds, with no other purpose than

---

134 Behne, "Berliner Architektur," *Zeit im Bild*, p. 805-806, includes a photo of the interior; also Behne, "Kinoarchitekturen," *Bild & Film* 4, no. 7/8 (Apr./May 1915) : 138. In a postcard to Taut from May 22, 1913, Behne made a special mention of having enjoyed a visit to the Marmorkino; BTA-01-469, Bruno Taut Archiv, AdK.
lifting people’s spirits.  

Built examples, however, were all in Fisher’s rather conventional south-German regional style of classicism, and can hardly be seen as formal precursors of Taut’s pavilion.

A more theoretically developed contemporary architectural source for Taut’s Expressionist manifesto, and one not yet adequately explored by historians, was the work of the Dutch architect Hendrick Petrus Berlage, whom Behne later listed as one of three father figures of modern architecture.  Taut had probably seen Berlage’s work on his 1912 trip to Holland, and may have also met the architect when Berlage headed the team of Dutch designers at the Cologne Werkbund exhibit.

---

135 Fischer actually built closely related buildings in Stuttgart, Pfulllingen and Worms while Taut was working for him in 1904-08, though unlike Taut’s ideas, they were urban; see Nerdinger, et al, Bruno Taut, pp. 10-11; Winfried Nerdinger, Theodor Fischer: Architekt und Städtebauer (1988), chapter 3, esp. pp. 332-334; and Theodor Fischer, "Was ich bauen möchte," Der Kunstwart 20 (Oct. 1906): 5-9; republished in Der Kunstwart (Jan. 1918). See also Franciscono, Walter Gropius, p. 92; Santomasso, "Origins and Aims," pp. 185-187. After World War I Taut explicitly includes the Volkshaus as one of a number of appropriate building types for architects to build to regenerate Germany; see Taut, "Ein Architektur-Programm" (1918).


137 Taut’s trip is mentioned in Nerdinger, Bruno Taut. Whyte mentions that many of Taut’s ideas had been prefigured by Berlage, but does not explore whether or how Taut may have known about Berlage’s work; Whyte, "Introduction," in Thoughts on Style, 1886-1909 (1996), p. 57-58. Berlage gave a speech as representative of the “Dutch Werkbund” on July 3, 1914, just before a speech by Muthesius that launched the famous Werkbund debates, and which Taut probably attended; see Hermann Muthesius, ed., Die Werkbund-Arbeit der Zukunft (1914), pp. 16-20. Like Wagner in Vienna, Behrens in Berlin, and Perret in Paris, Berlage was employer and spiritual
built work, especially his Amsterdam stock exchange (1897-1903), were derived from the ideas of Viollet-le-Duc and Semper. [Figure 4.27] As Manfred Bock has shown, Berlage was also influenced by Messel’s restrained, tectonic forms. The Dutch architect helped turn the tide of nineteenth-century eclecticism towards the primacy of space, construction, and proportion in modern architecture. Although not usually seen as an Expressionist architect, in Holland Berlage inspired a group of young architects to band together beginning in 1915 under the banner of "Dutch Expressionism." His leader of the younger generation in Holland and remained so after World War I. Through his training in Zurich, Berlage was well known and in close contact with many architects in Germany; see Singelenberg, H.P. Berlage, p. 158. Behrens tried to hire him for his Düsseldorf Art Academy in 1903, but settled for fellow Dutchman J.P. Lauwericks, interested in many of the same themes as Berlage, especially in geometry. Osthaus collected photos of his work for the Deutsches Museum für Kunst im Gewerbe in Hagen beginning in 1909, and convinced Berlage to exhibit his work and lecture in Hagen several times before World War I; see also below. On Berlage’s early work see Manfred Bock, Anfänge einer neuen Architektur. Berlages Beitrag zur Architektonischen Kultur der Niederlande im ausgehenden 19. Jahrhundert (1993); and more generally see Sergio Polano, ed., Hendrik Petrus Berlage: Complete Works (1988); and Singelenberg, H.P. Berlage.


139 The critic Max Eisler called Berlage’s stock exchange the "first monument of Expressionism in modern architecture"; Eisler, Der Baumeister Berlage (1920); cited in Iain Boyd Whyte, "Expressionismus und Architektur in den Niederlanden," in Wendingen 1918-1931, ed. Gerda Breuer (1992), p. 37. J.M. van der Meij’s "Het Scheepvaarthuis" in Amsterdam from 1912-13 is often considered the first work of Dutch architectural Expressionism; though the label first arose in an exhibit on Berlage in 1915, and found a supporting voice in the magazine Wendingen starting Jan. 1918. On Dutch Expressionist architecture see Wim de Wit, The Amsterdam school: Dutch expressionist architecture (1983); and Pehnt, Architektur des Expressionismus, pp. 215-246. On Behne’s relationship to Holland, especially after 1920, see Antonia Gruhn-
work was widely publicized, and in Germany he had many close contacts, including Osthaus, who had traveled to Holland in 1912 expressly to photograph Berlage’s work.

Berlage’s greatest impact in Germany came though his theoretical essays and published photos of his work. His lecture and essay Grundlagen und Entwicklungen der Architektur (Foundations and Development of Architecture, 1908), which Taut knew through Behne, had surprising parallels with both Taut’s and Behne’s writings, including the language they used. In the essay Berlage laid out his ideas for the revival of architecture as the rightful leader of the arts. Architecture was to become "the art of the 20th century." The "Modern Movement" that Berlage envisioned emphasized "sachlich, rational, and therefore clear construction," but always with a spiritual (not materialistic) basis. Berlage praised "the naked wall in all its smooth, spare [schlicht] beauty," where any ornament was carefully chosen and integral to the wall. This

Zimmermann, "Das Bezwingen der Wirklichkeit' Adolf Behne und die moderne holländische Architektur," in Bushart, Adolf Behne, pp. 117-146.

Berlage, Grundlagen und Entwicklungen der Architektur (1908), was first given as a series of four German language lectures in Zurich in 1907, then published in 1908 in both Rotterdam and Berlin, and republished in an anthology Über Architektur und Stil (1991), p. 102-157, to which I refer throughout this dissertation. Excerpts were translated as "Foundations and Development of Architecture" in The Western Architect 18 (Aug.-Sept. 1912): 96-99, 104-108, after Berlage’s travel to the US, and recently in the anthology Berlage, Thoughts on Style, pp. 185-257. Berlage’s essay Gedanken über den Stil in der Architektur (1905), translated as "Thoughts on Style in Architecture" in Thoughts on Style, pp. 122-156, contains many of the same ideas, though sometimes more poetically stated. Taut had probably heard of Berlage through his connections to Behrens, Osthaus and Hagen, or through the abundant reports in the journals. In the postcard from Taut to Behne (Apr. 19, 1913) mentioned above, Taut requested to see "Grundlagen der Baukunst." Although we cannot know for sure whether this referred to Berlage’s essay, this title does not seem to appear on any other book or essay published before 1916 (Fritz Schumacher wrote a book with the title in 1916). Behne cited Berlage’s essay many times in later years.
foreshadowed Behne’s analysis of the "simple and spare" (einfach und schlicht) walls of Taut’s apartment building and the sculptural ornament that was created in "free collaboration" with the artist Georg Kolbe. Such collaboration, Berlage had suggested, could be coordinated through the use of a rigorous geometrical systems to harness the entire design process. Although both Taut and Behne in general opposed strict rules in art, such as enforced geometries, they echoed Berlage’s proscription of arbitrary forms, praising "regulated, coherent forms" (gesetzmäßige Formen).

Towards the end of the essay, Berlage again prefigured Taut and Behne’s theoretical ideas when he called for architects to act as artists, to be "creative spirits" (schaffende Geister). He urged artists from all the arts to come together and seek an "artistic consensus," a communal love for an "ideal," as there had been in the middle ages. In the first decade of the century Berlage himself had been involved in the design of several Gesamtkunstwerk-type monuments, including a Beethoven House that used stark, minimal forms that, in conjunction with music and the other arts, were meant to evoke powerful, even sublime emotional responses. Much like Taut, Berlage insisted that this elusive "ideal" was not form-based, but spiritual, achieved by working "in a

141 Compare Behne "'Ein neues Haus!'," and Berlage, Gedanken, p. 155.

142 Taut, "Eine Notwendigkeit," p. 174. Berlage had been careful to emphasize the freedom and creativity that was possible within a geometric structure, indeed, that was required of all the artists in order to avoid copying the past and to create a new architecture. Taut’s use of symmetry, proportion and order in his apartment facades, and his use of numerical symbolism in conjunction with geometry in the Glashaus may also be tied back to Berlage’s geometrical systems. On Taut’s use of geometry see Lamberts, "Bruno Taut."

Explicitly citing the ideas of the Karl Scheffler, Berlage called on artists to seek images from within, since modern society lacked such communal ideals. The new art that followed, he claimed, would be "the product of the community, the work of all." This conflation of art and community, a common motif in the writings of both Behne and Taut, had multiple origins: the applied arts and lifestyle reform movements; in the ongoing cult of Nietzsche; in the theories of the conservative critic Julius Langbehn; and in the ideas of the authors surrounding the neo-romantic publisher Eugen Diederichs to which Behne was at times affiliated.

A final architectural precedent was the Gothic cathedral, which Taut, Berlage, and Behne all cited explicitly. The Gothic cathedral had been idealized by romantics since at least the eighteenth century as a communal work of art and a symbol of a mystical, spiritual past. In his book *Formprobleme der Gotik* (*Form in Gothic*, 1911), for example, Worringer had exalted the Gothic as the ultimate expression of a Germanic spirit that brought together an empathy for clear structural order with the abstraction of

---


146 For a longer history on the interpretation of the Gothic, see P. Frankl, *The Gothic: Literary Sources and Interpretations through Eight Centuries* (1960).
forms. But his book was only the most often quoted of many references to the Gothic in the Expressionist art world. Scheerbart had insisted that it was the origin of all glass architecture. Taut looked to the Gothic cathedral as a precedent for his own ideas on the harmonious collaboration of artists. He imagined them working under the leadership of architecture to create a transcendent work of art filled with light, color, glass, and structure. In his February 1914 essay he called Gothic cathedrals "the sum of all its artists, filled with a wondrous sense of union, they achieved an all-encompassing rhythm that rang through the architecture of the building." In Gothic designs Taut detected an Expressionist-like synthesis of creativity and pragmatism, fantasy and Sachlichkeit, which he characterized as, "construction elevated to the status of passion, and on the other hand a search for what is practically and economically most simple and most expressive."

147 Worringer, Formprobleme der Gothik (1911), translated as Form in Gothic (1954).

148 Scheerbart, Glasarchitektur, chaps. 19, 66.

149 The idealization of the Gothic dates back to early romanticism, with Goethe, Hegel, and the Schlegel brothers all extolling the spiritual and architectural virtues of the Gothic cathedral. See Magdalena Bushart, Geist der Gotik (1990), esp. pp. 30-44; Santomasso, "Origins and Aims"; and Georg Germann, Gothic Revival in Europe and Britain (1972).


Following Woringer, Behne claimed that the Gothic represented the highest and most wondrous achievement in art. He saw in the Gothic painters, sculptors, and master builders a "passion to represent, an impulse to fantasy, and a domination of the spirit. . . . [They] were Expressionists." Citing and quoting Scheerbart, Behne maintained that a new, modern architecture based on glass was unthinkable without Gothic architecture, that "the Gothic Cathedral is the prelude to Glasarchitektur." Later, when the fascination with the Gothic became more popular and took on nationalist overtones during World War I, Behne warned against the contemporary use of Gothic "style" as fashion. Instead he advocated focusing on its more authentic, metaphysical quality as an "art" that embodied a communal, spiritual, and collective expression that combined empathy and abstraction.

Expressionist Art and Theory

Fischer, Scheerbart, Berlage, the Jugendstil, and the Gothic Gesamtkunstwerk all may have contributed to the change that took place in Taut’s thinking between his steel

---


155 Behne, "Wem gehört die Gotik?"
pavilion in Leipzig and his manifesto and glass pavilion in Cologne. But the major cause that influenced Taut in the design of the Glashaus, I would argue, was contemporary Expressionist art and Behne, who pushed the linkages between architecture to Expressionist art. When Behne first wrote about him, Taut voiced some doubt about Behne’s contention that architecture could be Expressionist like poetry or painting. However, by the Fall of 1913, after Taut’s increasing contact with the Expressionist artistic milieu through Behne, Scheerbar, and Walden, he became convinced by the critic’s writings and the paintings on display in Walden’s Gallery, especially the Herbstsalon. Indeed, the artists and sculptors Taut cited explicitly as inspiration for, and collaborators in his utopian temple of the arts--Kandinsky, Delaunay, Léger, Marc, Archipenko, and Campendonk--were all exhibited in the Sturm gallery the previous fall. Even the title of Taut’s manifesto published in Der Sturm, "A Necessity," recalls the urgent spiritual force of renewal summoned by Kandinsky’s "inner necessity." 

---

156 Junghanns claims that Taut’s viewing of Expressionists at Herbstsalon inspired him to write the "Eine Notwendigkeit" essay, though Taut is careful not to call the new spirit Expressionist or German; Junghanns, Bruno Taut, p. 29. See also Santomasso, "Origins and Aims," p. 18.

157 In his introductory article on Taut, Behne had referred to Taut’s abandonment of all historical forms as a "necessity," a self-imposed mandate; Behne, "Bruno Taut," Pan, pp. 539-540. Franciscono claims Taut’s title recalls the mysterious, collective "Necessity" that Richard Wagner proclaimed as the driving force behind the great Gesamtkunstwerk of the future; Franciscono, Walter Gropius, p. 95. Matthias Schirren relates Taut’s title back to the philosophical and ethical "necessitas" expressed in Otto Wagner’s book Moderne Architektur, which proposed a mandate or necessity to synthesize "purpose, function, construction and a sense of beauty" in all art; Schirren, "Das Ethos des Expressionismus," in Stamm and Schreiber, Bauen einer neuen Welt, p. 49.
The transformation in Taut’s thinking extends beyond the artists and precedents he cited to justify and inspire his work and to the theoretical ideas that tied their art to architecture. It is illuminating, then, to examine Taut’s essay closely, comparing it to Behne’s. Picking up on the affinity of the new painting and architecture that Behne had conjectured, Taut had opened his article with a plea to follow the lead of the new painting, although like Behne he warned against copying the "Cubist" forms of the new painting. Good architecture, Taut insisted, was in its essence already cubic and pure. For both Behne and Taut, architecture represented the most original of the arts: the pure assembly of forms without reference to reality, subject only to elemental laws of design (Gestaltung). Taut exceeded Behne, and indeed most Expressionist and Gesamtkunstwerk theories, in emphasizing the primacy and leading role that architects and architecture were to take in effecting changes leading to the creation of a modern art and more broadly of a modern society.\(^{158}\)

Echoing Behne’s earlier proclamation of "a new age of intuition, of metaphysics, of synthesis," Taut pronounced it a joy to live in his time with artists so intently striving for "synthesis, abstraction and what everyone is calling the construction (Aufbauen) of paintings. . . . There is a secret architecture that goes through all this work that unifies them."\(^{159}\) His reference to architecture was more than metaphorical. As in Gothic

\(^{158}\) Lankheit sees the Der Blaue Reiter Almanach and indeed much of the theory coming out of the Expressionist Blue Rider group, especially Kandinsky, as a "cultural synthesis encompassing all the arts," related to the concept of Gesamtkunstwerk, and thereby a precursor to the Bauhaus; Lankheit, introduction to republication of Blaue Reiter Almanach, cited in Franciscono, Walter Gropius, p. 88.

\(^{159}\) Behne, "Der Maler Franz Marc," p. 617. Taut writes: "Es ist eine Freude in
257

unserer Zeit zu leben. . . . Eine Intensität hat Künstler aller Künste ergriffen. . . . Die Plastik und die Malerei finden sich auf rein synthetischen und abstrakten Wegen und man spricht überall von dem Aufbauen der Bilder. . . . Es geht eine geheime Architektur durch alle diese Werke und hält sie alle zusammen”; Taut, "Eine Notwendigkeit,” p. 174. Berlage ended his Grundlagen der Baukunst with the similar optimistic quote from Ulrich von Hutten: "The times are changing. The spirits are awakening. It is a joy to live”; Berlage, Grundlagen, p. 120.

Franz Marc, "Die konstruktiven Ideen der neuen Malerei," Pan 2 (1912): 527-531. Kandinsky too used architectural metaphors to discuss the formal composition of painted forms; see, for example, Kandinsky, Concerning the Spiritual in Art, p. 31.


cathedrals, Taut felt this architectural sensibility was not analogically, but literally at the root of all the new art. With this reference to construction and building at the foundation of modern art, Taut shared the language and theories of Kandinsky, Marc, Worringer and others. Construction was used as a means to justify and explain the increasingly abstract forms of modern painting in the absence of a represented subject matter. In 1911 Franz Marc had already claimed in Pan that great art had always come from "constructive” ideas or inspiration, but that the new art tapped into these "constructions” more directly, without the interference of foreign objects on the painted surface. Likewise Klee wrote in 1912, "A major consequence of the Expressionist creed has been the emphasis on the structural, namely the elevation of the structural to expressive means.” As has been noted, Behne too saw in the new painting and sculpture (in fact in all the arts) a similar "architectonic element” that transcended subject matter and lent an underlying order. It elevated the works above mere
imitation to the level of "art." In several reviews of the Herbstsalon in the fall, Behne had thus referred to the intuited, emotional "constructions" in paint by Cubists such as Delaunay on display in the Sturm Gallery.

In his manifesto, Taut called on architects to follow this "traditional" concept of good design (Gestalten), similar to that which "Kandinsky has achieved in painting in his spiritual compositions." The new art, Taut maintained, embodied a quality that was original to architecture: the freedom from perspective. The greatest works in architecture, he claimed, had been created without perspective, from multiple vantage points. Behne too, following in part the ideas of his mentor Wölfflin as well as Worringer's ideas on abstraction, had written that Expressionism, especially the Cubist's emotional constructions, differed fundamentally from the rationalist, perspectival constructions of realists ever since Masaccio. He recognized that the abandonment of perspective--with the visual and emotional shifts that required--was key to the Expressionist spirit. Later Behne elaborated on these ideas when he claimed that for centuries all the arts had been dominated by a "perspectival" sensibility: "a construction for which the artist presumed an unchanging station point

---


165 Based on the ideas of Ernst Cassirer, Erwin Panofsky would later write eloquently about this mindset implied by perspective; Panofsky, "Die Perspektive als symbolische Form," (1927), translated as _Perspective as Symbolic Form_ (1991).
outside of the objects and events.” Behne could see in the novels of Zola and naturalistic poetry the same distanced, optical approach to composition that the sculptor Hildebrand had demanded earlier in sculpture and the decorative arts. Perspectival literature, he claimed, was primarily psychological or politically tendentious, rendering both author and reader removed from the subject at hand. Cubism, he proclaimed, was diametrically opposed to such "perspectival art," seeking to express form from within life itself rather than to describe it from the outside.

A close comparison of Taut’s and Behne’s essays reveals that the two worked increasingly symbiotically, each developing and expanding upon commonly held ideas, especially with regard to Expressionist theory. Although publication dates and the catholic array of sources that Behne revealed in his writings point to him as the originator of many of the ideas discussed, it is all but impossible to reconstruct who had which idea first. The friendship they shared and the intense discussions they certainly had allowed them to exchange ideas and sources, borrow freely from each other, and inspire one another to develop new ideas. The traditional assumption that the architect created and the critic responded is an oversimplification in this relationship.

The Cologne Glashaus as Collaborative Creation

Behne’s influential role in the creation of a new architecture occurred not just in

---

166 "eine Konstruktion, die für die Künstler einen festen, unwandelbaren Standpunkt außerhalb der Körper und Geschehnisse voraussetzte"; Behne, "Biologie und Kubismus," p. 71, emphasis in original.
The Werkbund Exposition was officially opened on May 16, 1914, but Taut’s pavilion opened late, in early July, in part due to the delays in approval and funding by the Werkbund, and in part due to problems constructing the experimental structure. Soon after the war started, most of the glass was removed for use elsewhere, and the concrete structural core was removed in 1916 to make way for troop exercises. For a chronology of events relating to the Glashaus see Theikötter, Kristallisationen, pp. 168-172.

Soon after the war started, most of the glass was removed for use elsewhere, and the concrete structural core was removed in 1916 to make way for troop exercises. For a chronology of events relating to the Glashaus see Theikötter, Kristallisationen, pp. 168-172.

The Werkbund Exposition was officially opened on May 16, 1914, but Taut’s pavilion opened late, in early July, in part due to the delays in approval and funding by the Werkbund, and in part due to problems constructing the experimental structure. Soon after the war started, most of the glass was removed for use elsewhere, and the concrete structural core was removed in 1916 to make way for troop exercises. For a chronology of events relating to the Glashaus see Theikötter, Kristallisationen, pp. 168-172.
in Expressionist art and literature. Taut’s use of colored glass can be easily traced to the popular cathedral as a metaphor for community. He probably, however, modeled the actual spectrum of yellows, blues, and greens created by the luxfer prisms on the interior, after Delaunay’s painting "A Window" (1911/12) which was exhibited in the Sturm gallery. The stained-glass paintings on the lower level were the collaborative work of Taut’s artist friends Mutzenbecher, Johann Thorn-Prikker, Fritz Becker, Immanuel Margold, and possibly Max Pechstein. These "paintings" were executed by several art-glass specialists.

Scheerbart provided much of the theory and inspiration that lifted Taut’s design for the Glashaus to flights of fancy beyond the comparatively staid Leipzig pavilion. Taut’s pavilion was in many ways a built manifestation of Scheerbart’s utopian ideas on Glasarchitektur, ideas that both Behne and Taut admired as the revolutionary seed that would transform modern architecture and with it, modern society.

---


169 See Thiekötter, Kristallisationen, p. 43-47.

170 Taut’s own guide listed only Mutzenbecher and Margold, though reviews and other catalogues listed more artists; see Thiekötter, Kristallisationen, pp. 164-166; Bletter, "Bruno Taut," p. 73.

171 Scheerbart himself wrote that Taut’s Glashauss was conceived as a program, announcing a new period of architecture; Scheerbart, "Glashäuser," p. 105.
Cloth, describing a fantasy world of glass, came out in mid-April. His book Glasarchitektur, dedicated to Taut, was published by Walden one month later, a month before the opening of the Glashaus. The official visitor’s guide that Taut wrote for the exhibition was prefaced by the entire first chapter of Glasarchitektur and featured on its cover Scheerbart’s glass aphorism: "The Gothic cathedral is the prelude to glass architecture." Scheerbart’s intentionally humorous and ironic aphorisms were engraved on the building. Manfred Speidel contends that the design of the imaginative lamps, the mystical numerology woven through the entire design, and even the use of double glazing for insulation purposes can be traced back to Scheerbart, especially his Glasarchitektur. Regine Prange attributes to Scheerbart the glass floor and inner partitions, as well as the electric lighting and the kaleidescope. Taut, though, was clearly responsible for the overall design: the dynamic experience of circulating through the glass building; the geometry and innovative reinforced concrete structure of the ribbed dome; the inclusion of contemporary stained-glass art and the sparkling water cascade on the lower level.

Behne’s role was as critic, which in this case means as primary interpreter and propagandist. Although visitors and critics had admired the Glashaus, Behne reported that most dismissed it as a joke or a trifle, as part of an "impossible" ideal, more

---

172 Taut, Glashaus. For a list of the aphorisms on the building, see Whyte, Bruno Taut, p. 239-240n.25; and Bletter, "Bruno Taut," pp. 80-82.

173 Speidel, Natur und Fantasie, p. 126; Prange, Das Kristalline, p. 74.

174 Many historians, including Reyner Banham, erroneously wrote that the Glashaus was made of steel and glass; Banham, "The Glass Paradise," p. 34.
amusement than manifesto. Many reviewers were unable to see beyond the unfamiliar physical artifact. Karl Scheffler wrote to Behne that he disliked the Glashaus, and saw no way that glass could be used "architecturally." Felix Linke, on the other hand, announced the arrival of the "New Architecture" in Taut’s Glashaus and explored the new material and spatial experiences made possible by glass. He described Taut’s design memorably as a "Temple of Beauty . . . the main attraction of the whole Cologne exhibition. . . . [it] can be characterized as a giant, half sunken crystal." Linke even noted the relationships to Scheerbart’s fantastical writings, and quoted several of his aphorisms. However, his review, as with so many others, including even Taut’s own visitor’s guide, remained little more than factual descriptions of walks through the building highlighting technical details, artistic installations, and architectural composition.

It was Behne, with language varying from precise technical description to poetic prose and and popular slang, who analyzed the material artifact and the dynamic experiences of the building most potently. His theoretical musings framed the building within the varying architectural, social, cultural, technological, historical, and philosophical contexts that explained the Expressionist nature of Taut’s pavilions.

---

175 On the Luna amusement park see Thiekötter, Kristallisationen, pp.19-22.


177 Linke, Felix, "Die neue Architektur," Sozialistische Monatshefte 20.2, no. 18 (Oct. 14, 1914): 113ff. Behne contributed a regular theater column to this journal, and after the war would become one of its primary art and architectural editors.
Behne was unique in being able to see beyond the physical construction to interpret and even help create the pavilion’s meaning. His intellectual work would have profound implications for the future of architecture and European culture. His essay "Thoughts on Art and Function," published a year after the Glashaus closed, discussed the pavilion as an Expressionist synthesis of function and art, of Taut’s "artistic Sachlichkeit" and Scheerbart’s utopian fantasy. [Figure 4.28] Taut set the tone for the discussion of function when he stated in the first line of the visitor’s guide, "The Glashaus has no other purpose than to be beautiful."\(^{178}\) But these words essentially repeat Behne’s earlier contention that Taut’s Leipzig pavilion had "no other purpose than an inner artistic one."\(^{179}\)

Scheerbart had also expressed a generalized aversion to all that was overly functional, pragmatic, in favor of an artistic glass "paradise."\(^{180}\) But Behne also realized (in ways that would anticipate his later focus on function) that slogans such as these were more extreme than true. The building had a clear function: as a temporary

\(^{178}\) Taut, Glashaus, p. 289.

\(^{179}\) Behne, "Ein neues Haus!", p. 33. In his manifesto Taut had described his temple of the arts as having "no practical function"; Taut, "Eine Notwendigkeit," p. 175.

\(^{180}\) Scheerbart condemned the "Sachstil" and expresses hope for a glass paradise in Glasarchitektur, chaps. 13, 18. In Scheerbart’s short story "Der Architektenkongreß: Eine Parlamentsgeschichte," he expressed a similar critique of the overly pragmatic nature of contemporary architecture through a story about a father who admonishes his son for being too practical, for wanting to become an engineer, and then advises him instead to search inside himself for expression since the world was awaiting a great architect; first in Der Zeitgeist n.1 [supplement to Berliner Tageblatt 48, no. 8] (Jan. 6, 1913), p. 1-2, later reprinted in Frühlicht 1 (Fall 1921, republished 1963); cited at length in Karin Wilhelm, Walter Gropius: Industriearchitekt (1983), pp. 59-61.
marketing pavilion for the glass industry at an exposition full of new products and ideas. For Behne, it was precisely the pavilion’s function as a temporary exhibition that made a certain “functionlessness” possible and appropriate. Similar to Scheerbart and Taut, he believed that temporary exhibition pavilions represented a unique opportunity for architects to experiment and leave aside constraining functions and even all social obligations in order to create pure and ideal expressions of art.\textsuperscript{181} Exhibition pavilions, Behne argued, had to reach beyond their pragmatic function of advertising and representing an industry to contain “a little bit of extravagance . . . freedom . . . and the fantastical.”\textsuperscript{182} Later he suggested further that “when the pressures of economics, commerce and industry are removed, the passion and love of creating should simply be explosive. . . . [Exhibitions should be] a kind of folk festival, an eternal Sunday . . . something celebratory.”\textsuperscript{183}

Behne urged his readers to think of architecture, and especially exhibition pavilions, not as pragmatic constructions or as applied art. He wanted them to see

\textsuperscript{181} Scheerbart had great hope that exhibition pavilions, especially in America, would help spawn a true glass architecture; Scheerbart, \textit{Glasarchitektur}, chaps. 74-76. In his novel \textit{Münchhausen} (1905), Scheerbart described a world’s fair in Melbourne that served as an example to Behne; see Behne, “Die Ausstellung des Deutschen Werkbundes,” \textit{Dresdner neueste Nachrichten} (June 20, 1914). In his manifesto Taut had explicitly warned against allowing social obligations to play a role in the creation of his temple of the arts, which was to seem exclusive, like all great art, with the public slowly learning from it; Taut, “Eine Notwendigkeit,” p. 175. The topic of exhibition pavilions was much discussed before World War I; see Annette Ciré, \textit{Temporäre Ausstellungsbauten für Kunst, Gewerbe und Industrie in Deutschland 1896-1915} (1993).

\textsuperscript{182} Behne, "Gedanken," p. 2.

\textsuperscript{183} Behne, \textit{Wiederkehr der Kunst}, p. 53-54.
architecture as art, "as the original art, the mother of all arts." Behne, "Gedanken," p. 1. This, he felt, might help the public better understand that the true essence of architecture lay beyond function.

Offering an analogy few could refute, he stated that the power of a Gothic cathedral, such as the one at Strasbourg, came not from its pragmatic function of keeping worshipers and the altar dry, but from the experience of "an artistic rush, a transcendent passion to build" (eine höhere Baulust), that could be felt by all. Amending Taut's contention that the pavilion was functionless, and borrowing a phrase from Scheerbart, Behne thus explained that the Glashaus had as its true purpose the expression of a lofty "goal" or "idea," of making manifest to all a "higher passion to build." Behne was careful to remind his readers that this emphasis on art and spiritual ideals did not mean that good architecture ignored function. Rather, through art the architect should be able to animate even the most trivial of functional requirements. Function should not constrain the architect, he suggested, but rather the architect should use it as yet another material to bring his creation to life. Resorting to a more Idealist vocabulary, Behne wrote that the true architect does not degrade forms to functions, but rather elevates functions to forms. He closed his discussion of the artistic


function of exhibition pavilions with yet another memorable analogy when he claimed that architectural function was "not the root, but the leaves. . . . It does not nourish the whole, but plays a vital role in the juices that vitalize all the pieces." Such rich analogies would become a hallmark of Behne’s critical writings, allowing both a lay public to grasp deeper implications directly, and more professional or philosophical readers to make connections that were not otherwise obvious. In this particular example, the analogy of architecture as a tree simultaneously recalled both Goethe’s panegyric to Strasbourg cathedral and the natural, organic life presented by the biologist Uexküll which was vital to Taut’s and Scheerbart’s views on art and architecture.

In addition to this discussion of function in modern architecture (a theme with which Behne would become indelibly tied with his most famous book Der Moderne Zweckbau, (The Modern Functional Building, 1926), Behne’s article, "Thoughts on Art and Function," was also the first publication to explain Taut’s glass pavilion fully in terms of higher philosophical and Idealist intentions. The metaphysical goals of the pavilion that could lead to a new architecture, Behne insisted, were first and most poetically described by Paul Scheerbart. The revelation—inspired by Scheerbart’s ideas—that Behne had in Taut’s Glashaus a year earlier is worth quoting at length:

The longing for purity and clarity, for glowing lightness, crystalline exactness, for immaterial lightness, and infinite liveliness found a means of its fulfillment in glass—the most ineffable, most elementary, most flexible and most changeable of materials, richest in

---

meaning and inspiration, fusing with the world like no other. This least fixed of materials transforms itself with every change of atmosphere. It is infinitely rich in relations, mirroring what is above, below, and what is below, above. It is animated, full of spirit and alive.

The thought of the beautiful cupola room, vaulted like a sparkling skull, or of the unreal, ethereal stair, which one descended as if walking through pearling water, moves me and produces happy memories.

It is an example of a transcendent passion to build, functionless, free, satisfying no practical demands—and yet a functional building, soulful, awakening spiritual inspirations—an ethical functional building.\textsuperscript{188}

With these lyrical words written in at the beginning of World War I, Behne made the Glashaus a symbol, a mystical sign or guidepost for a new world view and future architecture.\textsuperscript{189} Inspired by Taut’s building and Scheerbart’s writings, Behne transfigured glass from a transparent modern technical material to a crystalline expressive spiritual force that could transform culture. The simultaneous perceptions of

\textsuperscript{188} Behne, “Gedanken,” p. 4; translated slightly differently in Bletter, “Bruno Taut’s and Paul Scheerbart’s Vision,” p. 77; and also in Bletter, “The Interpretation of the Glass Dream,” p. 34. The image of the glass skull that glorified the mind and spirit recalls those of the anthroposophist leader Rudolf Steiner; see Bletter “Bruno Taut’s and Paul Scheerbart’s Vision,” p. 77 n103; and Santomasso, "Origins and Aims." Scheerbart had earlier professed that the new architecture would have "cathedralesque effects... and for that reason should also have ethical consequences"; Scheerbart, "Glashäuser," p. 107.

\textsuperscript{189} See also Prange, Das Kristalline, p. 78ff. Frederic Schwartz has compared Taut’s pavilion to the transcendental, mystical sign of the crystal as expounded by Peter Behrens at Darmstadt in 1910; see Schwartz, The Werkbund, p. 184. Annette Ciré and Gabriele Heidecker and have both interpreted Peter Behrens’ early exhibition pavilions for the AEG as built symbols, with close affinities to Behrens’ contemporary poster and logo designs. See Ciré, Temporäre Ausstellungsbauten; and Heidecker, "Das Werbe-Kunst-Stück," in Tilmann Buddensieg and Henning Rogge, Industriekultur: Peter Behrens und die AEG, 1907-1914 (1979); translated as Industriekultur: Peter Behrens and the AEG (1984). The German edition of Heidecker’s essay includes a subtitle "Der Pavilion als Zeichen." Unless otherwise noted, all references are to the original German edition.
functionless freedom and functional practicality, of fluid change and crystalline clarity, of spirited life and of death and resurrection, of the sparkling heavens above and descent into an ethereal world below, set the tone for all future interpretations of this building. These paradoxes and juxtapositions of contrary images became part of the very definition of Expressionism, and a key to the emotional force it had with those who encountered it. It was a crucial link in establishing glass as integral to the development of modern architecture.

Although both Taut and Behne had been profoundly inspired by, and even directly copied some of Scheerbart’s ideas on a Glasarchitektur, it was Behne who disseminated their communal convictions about glass architecture to a wider public, and in a realistic and poetic manner that the public might accept and even embrace. His reputation and stature, at that time, as scholar and critic, rather than as specialized practicing architect or as bohemian artist, gave him an authoritative platform from which to proselytize in the mainstream press. Published in an applied arts journal while Behne was serving in a reserve military hospital, "Thoughts on Function and Art," (as well as other contemporary essays published in more popular venues) later inspired many younger German architects. In the darkest days of the world war that closed the Glashaus and led to its demolition, as well as in the bleak years that followed the

---

190 Bletter, "Bruno Taut and Paul Scheerbart’s Vision."

191 Behne’s byline regularly featured the "Dr." to indicate his rank; while Scheerbart’s article on Taut’s Glashaus in the Berliner Tageblatt was preceded by a note from the editor that he was publishing the technical remarks on glass despite the author’s reputation as a utopian artist; see Scheerbart, "Das Glashaus: ein Vorbericht."
German defeat, Behne’s hommages to Scheerbart and *Glasarchitektur* had particular resonance. A flurry of Behne’s ruminations on glass came during the tumultuous months immediately following the war, when Expressionist artists, and indeed an entire German nation, were searching for new beginnings and visions of a more optimistic future. Through these powerful words, Behne directed Scheerbart’s ideas and Taut’s pavilion to the center of the debate about the development of a modern architecture in Germany.

Behne was not a critic who insisted on reflecting well after the fact and from a dispassionate distance. He rallied support for projects still in their creative inception and he kept projects in the public eye even after they had been razed. His participatory role as critic was intensified by the temporary nature of the glass pavilion itself. Although many thousands of people had seen the building in person, and most reviews of the exhibition contained at least a brief reference to the Glashaus, the pavilion was soon relegated to the status of "paper architecture." After the beginning of the war the building existed almost exclusively in the form of a few iconic photographs and written descriptions and interpretations, of which Behne’s were among the most evocative and influential. Lacking the physical artifact, Behne’s published legacy is in large part responsible for how we interpret the building. Unlike permanent buildings that are more readily reinterpreted by later generations of viewers, Behne’s reviews, his

---

panegyrics on Scheerbart, and the few remaining photographs, became the lens through which all subsequent interpretations have been made.\textsuperscript{193} They formed the basis for discussions on Expressionism after the war, and have been repeated ever since, to present day. Recently, the construction and public exhibition of a large, full-color model, and the meticulous research that went into it, including extensive references to Behne’s writings, have for the first time allowed us to move beyond the sparse historical record.

Rather than view the Glashaus only as the product of an architect inspired by a novelist, I propose that Taut, Scheerbart, and Behne were equal partners using different tools to ply their trade and express architectural ideas. The poet Scheerbart acted as theorist. His practical research and fantastic writings conjured up utopias of glass architectures, and perhaps more importantly provided the spark, hope and encouragement necessary to realize their shared vision. The architect Taut struggled to find physical, architectural forms corresponding to their shared vision for the future and engaged several artists to create pieces of the building. The critic Behne, through

his articles, gave meaning and reveal real architectural implications for the future of
building and Scheerbart’s ideas. When architecture is understood not only as the
physical artifact, but also as the ideas, collaboration, and the process that created it, as
well as the future discourse and offspring that followed it, all three figures must be
credited as architectural collaborators. They realized their mutual vision and
promotion of a new art and architecture together. Each of them--the architect, the
visionary, and the critic--was equally important in that enduring creation.
V.
The Politics of Unifying Art and Life: Socialism and Architecture

"The social is the measure of our time and the rhythm of the foreseeable future."¹

- Wilhelm Hausenstein, 1913

A Sociological Approach to Architecture

Behne’s desire to unify art and life—a central tenet of both Expressionist art and the German Werkbund that had been given physical form in Bruno Taut’s Cologne Glashaus—gave rise to one of the fundamental paradoxes, indeed contradictions, in Behne’s art criticism. On the one hand, Behne promoted a new art that he felt transcended the mundane, materialist society of Wilhelmine Germany, one that aspired to express the spirituality, artistry, and inner needs of the modern artist. In this regard, Behne sought a pure, Idealist vision of art that turned inward to abstraction and autonomy, away from imitating the natural world or representing symbols or other content. On the other hand, Behne wrote passionately about the need to make art accessible to more people, and through his teaching and writing worked to define and to bring all art and an appreciation of beauty to the masses. He sought to transform art and architecture from the exclusive province of the rich and educated elite, into an art

¹ Hausenstein, Der nackte Mensch in der Kunst aller Zeiten 2nd ed. (1913), p. 2.
for and by the people. Only then, he felt, would a new and modern art be possible. The new art for which Behne was searching was to be simultaneously high and low, personal and popular, autonomous and socially relevant.

Increasingly, Behne attempted to resolve this contradiction in two inter-related ways: politics and architecture. As Behne became more ensconced in Walden’s Sturm circle and engaged with the associated Expressionist artists, as well as Socialist-oriented art critics such as Wilhelm Hausenstein and others from the Volkshochschule, he began to develop a distinct form of "cultural Socialism." Refusing to allow art to be instrumentalized or used in the service of politics, and unwilling to participate in bureaucratic party politics, Behne promoted a form of Socialism that focused on empowering individual people and giving them access to a spiritual life, through values of true art. Although certain theoretical foundations of Expressionist painting helped Behne reconcile his desire for both artistic autonomy and a new culture for the masses, architecture offered Behne the best resolution to his conundrum. Architecture, to Behne, was by definition both abstract and social, composed of non-representational formal elements, and serving the functional and social needs of its users. In the course of his on-going relationship with Taut, Behne began to define the outlines of a "sociological approach to art" that would resolve the contradiction between art and life that he witnessed in Wilhelmine culture. This sociological approach to art would

---

2 See chapter 2.

3 See Behne, Adolf. "Ist eine Soziologie der Kunst möglich?,” Die Form 8, no. 1 (Jan. 1, 1933): 2-7; which is a shortened version of the unpublished manuscript manuscript "Skizze zur Sociologie der Kunst," given as a lecture to P.E.N. Club in
remain at the core of his criticism throughout his career, forming the basis for his conviction on modern architecture expressed in his better known criticism of the 1920s.

Spiritual Socialism and Cultural Reform

Most avant-garde artists and critics in the early twentieth century, including Behne, were intellectually and spiritually—if not always politically—attracted to Socialism. In the face of industrialization, the growth of the metropolis, and what they perceived as an alienating society and decadent culture, critics, reformers, and artists from all positions on the political spectrum increasingly sought escape. They longed for a cohesive society that valued community and spiritual production. The groundwork for this Idealistic desire for community had been laid by late nineteenth-century social philosophers who presented sets of antitheses such as community/society, hometown/metropolis, and culture/technology. They developed a rhetoric of need and longing for a more harmonious "unity of art and life," a connection of "the people" (Volk) with their culture and their art. With little power to change the political and social conditions or the overall culture, reformers such as Wilhelm Riehl, Ferdinand Tönnies, Julius Langbehn, Ferdinand Avenarius, attacked to varying degrees the depravities of modern life, and promoted in turn the values of a more communal culture and spiritual lifestyle. More progressive German social thinkers such as Max Weber, Werner

Stockholm, Apr. 22, 1932.

4 The intellectual background for much of the communal Idealism had been provided by a wide range of works such as Wilhlem Riehl’s Naturgeschichte des Volkes als Grundlage einer deutschen Social-Politik (Natural History of the German People as
Sombart, and Georg Simmel highlighted essentially the same pitfalls of modern society, though they were not as violently anti-modern or as severely nostalgic for a past that was perceived to be more whole and secure.\(^5\)

In his 1911 keynote speech to the Werkbund, Hermann Muthesius incorporated this theme of community in this call for all members, indeed all Germans, to band together against materialism and individualism. Rather than focus only on the quality of design, as the Werbund had done to date, Muthesius proposed that the organization work towards the "Spiritualization of German Production" (Die Durchgeistigung der

\(^5\) On German sociologists and commentary on modern society, see Harry Liebersohn, Fate and Utopia in German Sociology, 1870-1923 (1988).
He advocated the return to conventional forms inspired by classicism and the idea of "architectonic form" where, under the leadership of architecture, all the arts would evolve towards standards, types, and a homogenous style. This return to order, Muthesius proposed, was in line with recent socio-economic conditions: "In modern social and economic organization there is a sharp tendency towards conformity . . . and these social and economic tendencies have a spiritual affinity with the formal tendencies of our movement."\(^6\) His call for a new approach to form was thus inextricably linked to a call for generating an organic, spiritualized community in the Werkbund and in Germany. Muthesius closed his talk with the comment that it was the destiny of the German people to revive the arts of design in the twentieth century.

Similar ideals were soon also reflected in the publicity and press surrounding the rise of Expressionism. Expressionist artists, inspired by essays such as Kandinsky’s Concerning the Spiritual in Art, built on this pervasive desire for community by highlighting a "religious sensibility" they perceived in the simultaneous artistic, cultural and geistig revolutions in which they were involved.\(^8\) The critic Wally Zepler, for example, wrote, "For the proletariat, Socialism is truly . . . a belief system, an ethical

---


\(^7\) Muthesius, "Wo stehen wir?," as transl. in Banham, Theory and Design, p. 76.

ideal, and that is why, as many have correctly pointed out, it is truly a replacement for
the decaying religious ideals." Few reformers, whether from the political right or left,
whether proselytizing a "culture of despair" or seeking a utopian unity of art and life,
would have disagreed with the words of Hausenstein that "the social is the measure of
our time and the rhythm of the foreseeable future. It determines our thinking as
emphatically as Revelations has always determined the actions of religious people."  

A passionate desire for community, unity, and social integration led critics to
conflate religious or spiritual longings with aesthetic visions and philosophical ideals.
In 1912 the critic Ludwig Coelln perceived that amongst the avant-garde, "the
individual artist necessarily recedes; his work becomes a mere function of the general
will."  Paul Fechter, in the first book-length study on Expressionism before World War
I, similarly noted that for the first time since the Renaissance art was being created from
a "communal spiritual situation, where the personal withdraws in favor of the great

---

9 Wally Zepler, "Die psychischen Grundlagen der Arbeiterbildung," Sozialistische Monatshefte 16.3 (1910): 1556. Klara Zetkin had similar thoughts when she wrote, "More and more religion loses its position with the proletariat; therefore, as a substitute, we must offer artistic works that embody our conception. Otherwise the workers would be driven into the arms of religious mysticism, such as prevails among the bourgeoisie. And so we must give consideration to a rational art that reflects our world view"; Zetkin (1907), translated in Willi L. Guttman, Worker’s Culture in Weimar Germany (1990), p. 167.


anonymity of the universal."\(^\text{12}\)

Most Expressionist artists and critics favored social and political philosophies that they saw as humanitarian and democratic and which held an Idealistic view of man’s potential.\(^\text{13}\) For many supporters of Expressionist art in particular, "socialism" was not so much a political or economic program, but an ethical, intellectual, and social ideal that expressed a future, utopian brotherhood of all men. Gustav Landauer, in his *Aufruf zum Sozialismus* (For Socialism, 1911) explained, "Socialism is a cultural movement, a people’s struggle for beauty, greatness and satisfaction. . . . Socialism is the soft reality of the true beauty of people living together."\(^\text{14}\) Taut, who was apparently influenced by Landauer during World War I, later also claimed to have been searching for a "socialism in the non-political, supra-political sense," based on the inter-


\(^{14}\) Gustav Landauer, *Aufruf zum Sozialismus* 2nd ed. (1919, orig. 1911), pp. 22, 87, as cited in Speidel, postscript to Bruno Taut, ed., *Die Stadtkrone* (2002, orig. 1919), p. 8. Landauer’s book, translated by David Parent as *For Socialism* (1978), was a compendium of three essays that came out of his involvement with the "Sozialistischer Bund," a vehicle for propagating his views on decentralization and mutualism. Landauer (1870-1919), a "romantic Socialist" and one of the founders of the Garden City Movement, was an anarchist who attacked the centralized, capitalized state as the root of all contemporary evil, proposing instead *Geist* and a new egalitarian community as a way forward into a more Socialist future. Influenced by Saint-Simonian doctrine, he was elitist, anti-democratic, and anti-Marxist, seeing the proletariat as a hindrance to reform, and wanting a dictatorship of artists to lead the way to reform.
relationship of man with man.”¹⁵ Such a spirit of brotherhood became a key component in the artist rebellions before World War I. Artists and other reform groups countered the entrenched institutions of official art with new artists’ groups. They battled the elitism and affluence of the German art community by creating their own exhibits, sometimes in very populist venues, such as worker clubs or in the working-class districts. The avant-garde group Die Brücke, for example, consciously sought an escape from the bourgeois, middle-class roots from which most artists came. This group of artists, many of them former architecture students, located their group’s studio in a rebuilt butcher shop in a working-class neighborhood of Dresden. They strove to create a communal way of life, shared art production work, and invited unaffiliated artists to exhibit with them.¹⁶

Expressionist artists also battled the academy in the media through which they worked and in the content of their art work. They specialized in less expensive, more

---

¹⁵ Taut, Stadtkrone, pp. 59-60; also cited in Bushart, Geist der Gotik, p. 169; and translated in Whyte, Bruno Taut, p. 53, 83. Whyte traces Taut’s ideas on Socialism back to his engagement with “Activism” and the ideas of the author Kurt Hiller during World War I. Hiller had written in the same spirit: “Socialism is no party doctrine but a way of thinking; it is the focusing on the soul of the fraternity”; Kurt Hiller, “Ortsbestimmung des Aktivismus,” Die Erhebung 1 (1919), p. 363; cited in Whyte, Bruno Taut, p. 100. Whyte places the source of both Hiller’s and Taut’s ideas in Landauer’s book; see Whyte, Bruno Taut, pp. 53-57. However, Manfred Speidel has recently cast doubt on aspects of Taut’s pre-revolutionary ties to Hiller and Landauer, noting that Taut neither quoted Landauer nor voiced any ideas about Socialism until 1919: Taut, "Der sozialismus des Künstlers," Sozialistische Monatshefte 25 (Apr. 1919): 259-262; and quotes Landauer for the first time in Taut, Die Auflösung der Städte (1920). See Speidel, postscript to Die Stadtkrone, p. 34.

¹⁶ Shapiro, Painters and Politics; on Socialism in Die Brücke see Long, German Expressionism, pp. 21-22.
populist art forms such as wood block prints. Their prints and paintings often represented more ordinary, contemporary or working-class people and scenes. They frequently included vernacular or esoteric objects and references in their work that nostalgically recalled more spiritually unified eras. Kandinsky, Gabrielle Münter and several of their friends, for example, moved out of the city of Munich into the village of Murnau, in part to tap into a rich tradition of Bavarian folk art as well as what they perceived as a more communal, spiritually healthy small-town atmosphere. They longed for a unified culture and to be reintegrated with society in some future world that would right social wrongs.

The longing for community had spawned a new art, which in turn was to produce a new society and political system. Revolutions in art were tied to visions of revolutions in politics, the new visual forms standing in for the rebellious, even revolutionary social values in which the artists believed. The avant-garde especially, had long theorized that art might lead society and politics to change. Behne, like Kandinsky and Taut before him, had explicitly connected the revolutionary art of

17 Donald Drew Egbert, Theda Shapiro and others have shown that connections between revolutions in art and revolutions in society and politics since the French Revolution, had become commonplace, even a constituent part of modernity; Egbert, Social Radicalism in the Arts (1970); and Shapiro, Painters and Politics. On the connections of Socialism and Art Nouveau in Spain and Belgium, which Hausenstein considered the spiritual home of Socialist art, see, for example, Maurice Culot, "Belgium, Red Steel and Blue Aesthetic," and Tim Benton, "Modernismo in catalonia," in Art Nouveau Architecture, ed. Frank Russell (1971); Amy Ogata, Art Nouveau and the Social Vision of Modern Living (2001); Alan Colquhoun, Modern Architecture (2003), pp. 18-21; Hausenstein, Die bildende Kunst der Gegenwart (1914); and Egbert, Social Radicalism, pp. 603-621.
Expressionism and the current tumultuous times when he wrote, "We who live today have the rare and great fortune to live during a great revolution not only of art but of the whole intellectual and geistig orientation." What began as a spiritual revolution in the nineteenth century, by 1905 had begun to produce breaks in artistic form and style, and by World War I had moved on to politics. Although German artists clearly sought a revolutionary art to reflect or promote new and revolutionary social and political ideals, few Expressionist artists engaged in party politics before World War I.

The trauma of mechanized warfare and the upheaval of revolution in the wake of World War I only confirmed for many Expressionist artists the depravity of the Wilhelmine society of which they were a part, and the need for salvation. They saw art even more as a redemptive force, "a cosmopolitan, secular equivalent of religion" as the critic Peter Schjeldahl recently called it. One artists group in Behne’s original hometown of Magdeburg proclaimed immediately after the devastation of war and political revolt, "The new will make art into religion. No longer the arcana of a closed

---


20 Exceptions to the rule that Expressionist artists were seldom engaged in politics included the Jewish painter Ludwig Meidner (1884-1966), a committed Socialist who early on cited rebellion and even revolution in his work, and the circle of literary expressionists around Franz Pfemert and Hiller’s journal Die Aktion, which sought to use the power of radical literature and art to effect reform of culture, society, and ultimately politics. On Meidner see Shapiro, Painters and Politics, p. 261; on Activism see Whyte, Bruno Taut.

21 Peter Schjeldahl, New Yorker 80, no. 38 (Dec. 6, 2004): 117.
circle. . . . What politics has destroyed, art will make good. Through art man finds his way to humanity. . . . We believe in a great and liberated art, and in the salvation of man through it. . . . our great redeemer: Art." At nearly the same time in Berlin, Ludwig Coelln added: "Before there was the political revolution, there was the revolution in art. Long before the end of the war cleared the way for the spirit of the new times politically, this spirit had come alive in the new art. This is what today the working people must know: that the young artists and the young art are its allies. . . . The new art hails the revolution. It knows that now the day of its victory has come as well."23

Worringer, whose ground-breaking publications had fueled the early development of Expressionism, noted after the war that the thoroughly spiritualized art which he had earlier discerned in the Gothic and in more primitive art was above all "an expression of the masses, the collective artistic expression of unified multitudes."24


Behne later echoes that sentiment when he wrote: "What is Socialism? It is a spirit! . . . Socialism, or brotherliness, develops naturally from communal action." Behne also continued to tie the communal spirit to the revolutionary developments in art: "We are in the middle of a series of constantly renewing art revolutions, which for generations have had their strongest influence in the West. Revolutions in art led the way for revolutions in politics, and also differ from those in politics because they have never temporary come to a standstill." Eventually, he felt, this would translate into a more communal, Socialist politics. In 1924 Behne wrote, "If one goes beyond the superficial aspect of art, one must recognize that the new art is a fighter for a coming Socialism."

Political Socialism and Expressionism

Expressionist critics were not shy about introducing politics into the search for a new art, as Behne’s quote illustrates. Their work as intermediaries between the public


[27] "Wer nicht an der Oberfläche der Kunst haften bleibt, muß erkennen, daß die neue Kunst Kämpfer ist für einen kommenden Sozialismus"; Behne, Von Kunst zur Gestaltung (1925), p. 3; the lines are from the preface of this book published by the Arbeiter-Jugend Verlag, dated Aug. 1924.

and the artists, and their positions in politically motivated media such as the press perhaps even required it. Critics from both ends of the political spectrum looked to turn the avant-garde’s fervent attack on both the academy and on bourgeoisie culture into political action. In 1914 the Activist critic Ludwig Rubiner, for example, tried to capture and promote the zealous energy he saw in Expressionism for political purposes, differentiating between art-for-art’s-sake, and art with a polemical mission, a "commitment to cultivating our initiative on earth.” He relished the "upheaval, the dawning of the first day . . . the perpetual revolution through all times" that he saw, and beckoned "Painter, you have a will: you topple the world; you are a politician! Or you remain a private person."²⁹

Although the initial experimental and revolutionary art associated with Expressionism before World War I was to a large extent ignored by the main-stream bourgeois press, when critiques did appear, they were primarily negative, and often became politicized.³⁰ The new art was increasingly associated with a popular culture that included the working classes. Karl Scheffler, the staunch defender of Impressionism and conservative editor of Kunst und Künstler, repeatedly denounced the Expressionists as "revolutionaries," "conceited copy-cats, and sensationalist


sansculottes." He condemned their art for its "proletarian outlook," thereby reinforcing the Kaiser’s degradation of modern artists as from the street, "gutter-artists."\(^{31}\) Attacks such as Scheffler’s reviews of the Sturm’s ground-breaking Herbstsalon were in fact what caused Walden to publish his "Lexicon of German Art Criticism," and an "Appeal Against Art Critics" in Der Sturm, much of it with political undertones.\(^{32}\)

The first professional critic to define a more positive connection of artistic Expressionism and political Socialism was the Munich-based Hausenstein.\(^{33}\) Although Munich was not a strong-hold of Socialism in Germany, it was not surprising that some of the earliest connections of political and cultural criticism were published in this older center of German art, distant from the oppressive influence of the Kaiser on art and politics. Hausenstein was a founding member of Munich’s New Secession in 1912, and had written in defense of modern art in the Munich publisher Piper’s Im Kampf um die


\(^{32}\) See chapter 2 above, and also Volker Pirsich, Der Sturm, Eine Monographie (1985), pp. 611-612.

\(^{33}\) Joan Weinstein claims Hausenstein was "not only a leading leftist art critic / historian, but the first significant supporter of expressionist art from a leftist perspective"; Weinstein, "Wilhelm Hausenstein," p. 193, and pp. 196-199 for Hausenstein on modern art. On Hausenstein see also Haxthausen, "Critical Illusion"; Egbert, Social Radicalism, pp. 591-592; Metzler Kunsthistoriker Lexikon; Johannes Werner, "Der Kunstschriftsteller Wilhelm Hausenstein," Börsenblatt für den Deutschen Buchhandel n. 69 (Aug. 29, 1995): A287-A290; and Dieter Sulzer, Der Nachlaß Wilhelm Hausenstein (1982).
Kunst, a reaction to Karl Vinnen’s chauvinistic critique Protest deutsche Künstler in 1911. Although Hausenstein did not write much in defense of individual avant-garde Expressionist artists, he had gotten to know Kandinsky and Marc personally in Munich, and had written in support of Kandinsky in Der Sturm in 1912. In the fall of 1913, Walden chose Hausenstein alongside Behne and his Volkshochschule teaching colleague Max Deri as one of the few sympathetic experts to lead tours of the Herbstsalon in Berlin.

Earlier that year, Hausenstein published two ground-breaking works in which he sought to tie developments in art history to economic and socio-political developments through the ages: Der nackte Mensch in der Kunst aller Zeiten (The Nude in Art through the Ages), and a related essay "Versuch einer Soziologie der bildenden Kunst" (An Attempt at a Sociology of the Visual Arts). Convinced of the synthetic, unified nature of all history and human work, and that "socio-economic forces were the basis for all culture," he set out "to explain the changes in artistic form


35 Hausenstein’s Der nackte Mensch in der Kunst aller Zeiten was first published c.1912, and a completely revised, greatly expanded edition was published in 1913, the edition cited here unless otherwise noted. The theoretical component of the Der nackte Mensch was republished as Die Kunst und die Gesellschaft (1917), a book that, through Bakunin, had tremendous influence on establishing a "Socialist art" for revolutionary Russia later that year. Hausenstein’s essay on the sociology of art, "Versuch einer Soziologie der bildenden Kunst," Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft 36 (1913): 758-794, was republished as the book Bild und Gemeinschaft (1920). See also Weinstein, "Wilhelm Hausenstein," pp. 194-196 for the following.
out of the principles of historical materialism" as advocated by Marx. Using a cyclical reading of history proposed by the French social philosopher Henri Comte de Saint-Simon, Hausenstein discerned a historical alternation between two predominant types of societies. "Organic" or "positive" societies, he claimed, were collective, synthetic and highly structured, in which the role of each individual was carefully prescribed (e.g. feudalism, or primitive agrarian democracies such as the Germanic tribes).

"Critical" or "negative" societies, in contrast, were loosely structured, characterized by the disintegration of economic and social life, the emergence of a market economy, and a focus on the individual (e.g. classical and Hellenistic Greece, the Renaissance, or the capitalism of late nineteenth-century Europe). Hausenstein, as a committed Socialist, clearly favored the communal "organic" over the individualistic "critical" society.

Focusing on the nude in art, which he held was a politically neutral subject with easily comparable content, Hausenstein then suggested that the formal development of art corresponded to the same cyclical and dialectical pattern as that of societies more generally. "Critical" societies, he maintained, produced art that was naturalistic, spatially dynamic, individualized, and created for private pleasure. "Organic" societies, on the other hand, created art that was formally more stylized, frontal, abstract, and


ornamental. Artists in these organic societies tended to subordinate their ideas to a collective notion of beauty, or served communal interests in the creation of public, or "monumental" works.\textsuperscript{38}

The main purpose of revealing such a detailed historical pattern, Hausenstein claimed, was to use it to understand the present, and to project a future art.\textsuperscript{39} He discerned an increasingly "organic" approach to art in the present, a "Socialist art" that would eventually correspond to a more communal society. He wrote in 1913, "Today, in a time in which Socialism for the first time is nascent. . . . the best sons of the bourgeoisie anticipate a monumental style of painting which seems to intimate the public of the future. . . . Our vitality is rooted in the organized power of the proletarian existence. It grows with the unstoppable rise of a new class that will change the face of the earth."\textsuperscript{40} Just as sure as Socialism was gradually emerging from bourgeois capitalist society, Hausenstein argued the new art of Expressionism was gradually overcoming Impressionism. Naturalism was giving way to artifice. A focus on the object was giving way to formal logic. Frenetic constellations of tiny dabs of pigment were giving way to calm, broad swaths of color. Differentiation, specialization, complexity, and division were giving way to integration, synthesis, simplicity, and closure.

\textsuperscript{38} Although "monumental" implied large-scale, Hausenstein’s use of the word "monumental," had connotations of public monument, and should not be confused or conflated with artistic definitions of monumental that implied classical, symmetrical, and over-scaled form.

\textsuperscript{39} Hausenstein, \textit{Der nackte Mensch}, p. 1, on using history to reveal the present.

\textsuperscript{40} Hausenstein, \textit{Der nackte Mensch}, pp. 1-2, 22, 183; partially cited in Weinstein, "Wilhelm Hausenstein," p. 196.
In art, this recent trend could be traced back at least to "the Socialist" artist Vincent Van Gogh, according to Hausenstein. Taking his cues from Julius Meier-Graefe, one of Van Gogh's staunchest supporters, Hausenstein argued that Van Gogh had shown the way towards the future with his proposals for "Socialist artists' organizations" and his energetic "Fourier-like series of paintings of communist life." 41 The most recent example of such an approach, according to Hausenstein, was the work of Kandinsky and Marc who were moving towards a "collective," "Socialist," and "anonymous style." 42 Although the general theme of Hausenstein's argument is clear, his somewhat suspect characterization of Expressionism as "calm," "anonymous," and full of "formal logic" reveals how much his pre-determined system and its political component influenced his reading of the art.

Despite his sympathies with Hausenstein's personal politics, and a shared emphasis on the formal element in art derived from the Idealist tradition of aesthetics from Herbart and Hildebrand to Wölflin, Behne was critical of Hausenstein's methods. 43 Although Hausenstein had argued explicitly that he was focusing on form,

---

41 Hausenstein, Bild und Gemeinschaft, p. 106; Hausenstein, Der nackte Mensch, pp. 8-10; Hausenstein, Bildende Kunst der Gegenwart p. 110.


43 Behne, "Kunst und Milieu (II)," Die Gegenwart 42.2, no. 39 (Sept. 27, 1913): 616-619; in which he criticizes the social history of art proposed by the French art historian Hippolyte Taine, especially his book Philosophie d'art (1881), translated into German as Die Philosophie der Kunst (1907). See also chapter 2 above; as well as Egbert, Social Radicalism, p. 591.
not content as other "social historians" of art had, Behne claimed that Hausenstein’s approach, like Taine’s, was "Impressionist." Behne rejected Hausenstein’s focus on material factors external to the art work rather than on the spiritual essence expressed from within the art. He criticized Hausenstein for forcing the individual achievements of art into a rigid, a priori schema that saw socio-economic factors as the root of all human production. Hausenstein had quoted the esteemed German art critic Julius Meier-Graefe on the concept that the essence of art lies beyond reason, in the realm of intuition and the spirit, but he also insisted that art is not completely free. "Art," Hausenstein professed, "appears only as a materialization of the zeitgeist." For him form and content were forever inter-dependent. He even allowed that art might occasionally need to be harnessed for political purposes by using symbols and analogies, as it was in Tendenzkunst. Behne, by contrast, had insisted on the autonomy of art, arguing that true art was never overtly tendentious, and always a purely formal exercise with no outside references.

Before World War I, Behne’s understanding of art as autonomous would not allow as overt a connection of art and Marxist theory or politics as expressed by the Socialist Hausenstein. He preferred Kandinsky’ definition of art as the expression of “inner-necessity” by the individual artist in tune with the spiritual concerns of society, or Worringer’s "psychological" approach to artistic expression. Worringer, like

44 Hausenstein, Bild und Gemeinschaft, pp. 17-18.

45 Hausenstein, Der nackte Mensch, p. 6.

Hausenstein, had attempted to link historical cultures with their art and had observed several predominant, non-individual approaches to art—Primitive, Oriental, Classical and Gothic. Unlike Hausenstein, who had criticized Worringer’s types as overly “socio-psychological” and without a firm historical basis, Behne admired Worringer’s ideas precisely for their emphasis on the spiritual and ineffable. Though Behne was also critical of the rigid categories into which Worringer tried to press individual artistic achievements. For Behne, a thorough understanding of history was necessary for a good art critic, but only as a means of gaining insights into what kinds of problems and ideas artists dealt with when creating art and obtaining a feel for the essence of “true art.” Any evaluation or criticism of art in the present had to be made independently, autonomously, and empathetically, without reference to history, society or politics, from the critics’ own intuition.

One theory of art admired by both Behne and Hausenstein was that of the French sociologist of art Jean-Marie Guyau. Both critics admired Guyau’s theory that

47 See Worringer, Formprobleme der Gotik (1912)

48 On Hausenstein’s critique, see Hausenstein, Der nackte Mensch, p. 2-4; on Behne’s reaction to Worringer, see chapter 2, and Bushart, “Kunst-Theoretikus,” p. 15.

49 Jean-Marie Guyau (1854-1888) was a prominent French scholar who wrote on the role of the artist in society. For a summary of Guyau’s thought, see Hans-Peter Thurn, “Jean-Marie Guyau,” in Klassiker der Kunstsoziologie, ed. Alphonse Silbermann (1979), pp. 28-42; Frank J.W. Harding, Jean-Marie Guyau, 1854-1888, Aesthetician and Sociologist (1973); the introduction to the new translation of Guyau’s most important work, Die Kunst als soziologisches Phänomen (1987, orig. 1912); and Bushart, ”Kunst-Theoretikus,” pp. 16,22, 70n26-28, 72n72. The unpublished conference paper by Maria Stavrinaki, ”Les arts doivent agir spatialement, c’est-à-dire socialement: la critique architecturale d’Adolf Behne (1918-1926),” at the Exposé zum Ersten deutsch-französischen Forschungs-Atelier, Université Marc Bloch, Strasbourg, Nov. 22-24, 2002,
the highest aspiration for an artist was to express a personal intimacy in such a way that all humans could empathize with it. In his own sociologically inspired analyses of art Hausenstein praised Guyau’s "artistic oriented sociology of style." He was particularly convinced by Guyau’s contention that the fundamental essence of all art is to create sympathy with the viewer, "to produce an aesthetic emotion with social character." Behne too was taken by the Frenchman’s focus on art as the expression of individual tenderness in such a way that it could be experienced by a larger public. But rather than limit the response to mere sympathy, or an aesthetic with a "social character," Behne, much like his Expressionist colleagues, sought an art that could project the complete range of human inner-emotions.

Although Behne did not explicitly cite Guyau until after World War I in works such as his primer on modern art Von Kunst zur Gestaltung or his famous analysis of modern architectural functionalism Der moderne Zweckbau, Magdalena Bushart has conjectured that Behne borrowed from Guyau before World War I. But these ideas explored some aspects of Behne’s relationship to Guyau, but only dealt with the period after World War I.

50 Hausenstein quotes the French original of Guyau’s L’Art au point de vue sociologique (1887 and 1903) in his Kunst und Gesellschaft, p. 6,7,10. He was critical of a number of "social" approaches to art, including the "social-moral baffoonery" of P.J. Proudhon’s Du principe de l’art et de sa destination sociale (1865); the bad taste of the "new-Proudhonist" Emil Reich, Die bürgerliche Kunst und die besitzlosen Volksklassen (1894); and even another favorite of Behne’s, the overly bourgeois Russian Leo Tolstoy.

51 Bushart, "Kunst-Theoretikus," p. 16. Bushart cites the German translation of Guyau’s work Die Kunst als soziologisches Phänomen (1912) as evidence of the circulation of his ideas in Germany, but does not establish Hausenstein or any contemporary references to Guyau.
were common during the period, expressed in variations by many critics and artists since Symbolism and Jugendstil at the turn of the century. Guyau, for example, was a favorite of Henry van de Velde’s, with whom Behne would be closely allied in the Werkbund debates of 1914. Behne’s interest in and shared convictions with authors such as Guyau or the biologist Uexküll underscore his Idealist conceptions of art. For each, art was a fundamentally geistig expression that allowed communication with a larger humanity, a communion more metaphysical than political or material and formal. Such a sociologically defined approach to art would remain with Behne throughout his career and his search for a new art and architecture appropriate to modern life.

Towards a Socialist Architecture

Behne, like many of his Expressionist artist colleagues, wanted to create a new, modern society and a new, modern art, each feeding the other. Already in 1905, August Endell had exclaimed, "I am no Social-Democrat . . . . But much that socialism promotes on political and economic grounds, appears to me as necessary on artistic grounds, though for different reasons. Above all I am convinced that a deep artistic culture can only be realized when the desire for, and understanding of, art comes alive and flourishes in the working classes." Both men believed that the common people’s

---


53 "Ich bin kein Sozialdemokrat . . . . Vieles, was die Sozialdemokratie aus politischen und wirtschaftlichen Gründen fordert, merkwürdigerweise aus ganz
innate artistic ability and understanding could be released given the proper education and opportunity. As an Idealist who believed in the autonomy of art, however, Behne also avoided overtly political and didactic pronouncements in his early criticism.

Architecture offered a way out of the ideological and operative impasse. For Behne, architecture and the applied arts were bound much more closely to the realities of everyday life than painting. The functional requirements, costs, longevity, and public nature associated with architecture and more generally the applied arts, have almost always forced designers and architects to consider social requirements and political attitudes more closely than fine artists. Architecture also gave the greatest opportunity for real impact on human lives and culture. As the Marxist agitator Clara Zetkin declared in her essay "Art and the Proletariat," from 1911, "Architecture is the highest and most difficult of all the arts; but it is also the most social (die sozialste) of all the arts, the strongest expression of a communal life."

concluded similarly that "Architecture is a social art. . . . To think about good and proper building is no different than thinking about good and proper living. Since, to say it again, the architects are not trying to implement some sort of new style, but rather they want to contribute to the design of a better and proper life for the people."\(^55\) Taut voiced nearly the same ideas later, "The relationship of architecture to society, that is to the State and its various groups, as well as to the public in general, is doubtless very big. Architecture is in the public eye more than the works of any other art. . . . Architecture is the societal art (Gesellschaftskunst) par excellence."\(^56\)

But before World War I there was still no conception of what might constitute a "Socialist architecture." Although the Socialist party and affiliated trade unions had constructed many community centers and union halls, as well as representative institutions such as the headquarters of its Vorwärts publishing house, they were uniformly traditional, undifferentiated from their bourgeois counterparts.\(^57\) In her 1911

\(^{55}\) "Architektur ist eine soziale Kunst"; Behne "Die deutsche Baukunst seit 1850 (V)," Soziale Bauwirtschaft 2, no. 18 (Sept. 15, 1922): 230. The article was the last in a five part series that ran since June 15 (no. 12) in this professional building journal edited by Behne’s Socialist friend Martin Wagner. The articles are reprinted in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 97-121. In 1927 Behne wrote in a Socialist cultural journal: "Über gutes und richtiges Bauen nachdenken heißt nichts anderes als über gutes und richtiges Leben nachdenken. Denn, um es nochmal zu sagen, nicht irgendwelche neue Stilform wollen die neuen Architekten durchsetzen, sie wollen beitragen das Leben der Allgemeinheit besser und richtiger zu gestalten"; Behne, "Wege zu einer besseren Wohnkultur," Sozialistische Monatshefte, 33.1 = Bd.64, no. 2 (Feb. 14, 1927): 123, emphasis in original; republished in Hartmann, Trotzdem Modern, p. 360.


\(^{57}\) Guttsman, Worker’s Culture, p. 185.
essay, the staunch socialist critic Zetkin regretted that "the spaces [in which we live] have not been created artistically from the Socialist worldview. The style--style seen as the outer form of inner essence--of our union halls, Volkshäuser and work places is no different from that of the bourgeois business or transportation buildings. . . . In short, the spiritual life of the working class has not yet found even the slightest hint of an architectural formal language." Although working definitions of party-sanctioned Socialist or Communist architecture in Germany would have to wait until after the Russian Revolution in 1917, the seeds for a new architecture connecting the spirit and the needs of the people, in particular the working-class, began to germinate in Behne’s circles during the early 1910s. Expressionist artists and critics in favor of a more communal and even Socialist approach to art focused increasingly on architecture as the leader of the arts, as the art that could potentially unify all the other arts, inspire artists and whole communities to work together, and produce monuments with which all could identify.

Taut’s glass pavilion served as a link for Behne between the ethereal world of Expressionist ideas and the concrete world of an enlightened but practical architecture. Far from being a purely aesthetic exercise, the Glashaus was both manifesto and exemplar of a new social order. In 1918 Behne wrote that Glasarchitektur as proposed by Scheerbart and Taut, and hinted at in Gropius’ use of glass at his model Werkbund

---

factory in Cologne, had begun to provoke a "European spiritual revolution, transforming a limited, lazy creature of habit, into an alert, radiant, fine and gentle person." In Scheerbarths literary works such as Glasarchitektur, Lesabendio, and the fable "Architektenkongreß," completed before his collaborations with Taut and Behne in 1913, Scheerbarth waxed poetically about the potential of glass architecture to bring about a new culture, one of openness and community. He wrote: "If we want our culture to rise to a higher level, we are obliged, for better or for worse, to change our architecture. . . . We are not at the end of a cultural period, but the beginning. . . . The new glass-milieu will completely change people." Rejecting the over-ornamented, private bourgeois interior of the Wilhelmine era as well as the stuffy culture and politics it represented, Scheerbarth and Behne began to fantasize about a more modern and socially progressive interior and culture made possible by glass.

The visionary Glasarchitektur proposed by Scheerbarth did not explicitly advocate a political position, but the open and communal utopia he described clearly contrasted with Wilhelmine culture and politics. His novels on glass architecture were an ironic commentary on Germany’s development before World War I, critical of the materialist,


61 Scheerbarth, Glasarchitektur.
capitalist, imperialist, and elitist values that he felt dominated German society. Glass, as Scheerbart hypothesized, was a way "to forge a connection between the era of Socialism, technology, and militarism and my amazing and very religious life. . . . [My books attempt] to move a desiccated period driven by the masses toward a 'new' romanticism and a 'new' piety."\textsuperscript{62} Scheerbart’s fantastic glass utopias represented both a futuristic vision for a new, improved society, and the continuation of an age-old convention of assigning near magical powers to glass, seeing glass-crystal symbolism as a metaphor of transformation to signify a changed society.\textsuperscript{63}

The political implications of Scheerbart’s work were clear to his contemporaries, though his satire and humor could obscure "his work’s serious political aspect."\textsuperscript{64}

Benjamin wrote his essay "The True Politician," a favorable philosophical critique of Scheerbart’s book soon after he was given a copy of Scheerbart’s Lesabendio as a wedding present in 1917. Scheerbart would be fundamental to developing Benjamin’s leftist political views. A similar mix of Expressionist, Activist, and Nietzschean ideas circulated through the work of authors such as Salamo Friedländer and Erich Unger.


close friends of both Scheerbart and Benjamin.\textsuperscript{65} The Activist artists associated with the politically-oriented journal \textit{Die Aktion}, which occasionally published Scheerbart’s work, were more anarchist than they were Socialist or Marxist. They sought to overthrow an all-controlling government and hoped to empower individuals to band together to help themselves. It was a utopian, cultural Socialism, a world seen through "rose-colored glasses," not through the antiseptic lenses of transparent glass, as has often been asserted. It was only a decade later, well after the trauma of war, after rise of the iconoclastic sensibilities of Dada and Surrealism, after the rise of a spirit of "New Objectivity," and especially after the rise of Social Realism in Russia, that Benjamin could propose the Scheerbart as an early influence on anti-humanist thought and see activism as counter-revolutionary.\textsuperscript{66}

\textsuperscript{65} See Schneider, "The True Politician."

\textsuperscript{66} Benjamin’s published remarks on Scheerbart have often been taken out of context. They were written in the vastly different cultural circumstances of late Weimar Germany. To infer Benjamin’s early views on Scheerbart from his later writings would be to ignore the fundamental cultural, political and ideological ruptures that so characterize German history in this period. Starting in the late 1920s, Benjamin attempted to synthesize some of his profound appreciation for the crystalline clarity and openness of Scheerbart’s glass fantasies with his respect for the mystification of modern life by the Surrealists, the cold rationality of nineteenth-century engineering, and the objectivity of the modern architecture of Le Corbusier and J.J.P. Oud. He picked up the call for a new architecture of glass, "a hard, smooth material to which nothing can be fixed. . . cold and sober. . . [with] no aura. . . creating rooms in which it is hard to leave traces"; see in Benjamin, Selected Writings, Vol. 2, 1927-1934, ed. M.W. Jennings, H. Eiland and G. Smith (1999) the essays "Surrealism," pp. 212, 215; "The Return of the \textit{Flaneur}," p. 26; "Short Shadowns (II)," pp. 701-702; and "Experience and Poverty," pp. 733-734. Only after 1929 could Benjamin seek a world in which privacy, traditional dwelling and all "humanlikeness" would be eviscerated in favor of an cold, anti-auratic rational form of housing and architecture as was being proposed, according to Benjamin, by Giedion, Mendelsohn and Le Corbusier; see Benjamin, Selected Writings, Vol. 2, pp. 264, 733, as; well as his famous essay "The Author as Producer."
Housing the Masses

Housing would become one of the defining problems of modern architecture, and one Behne would confront many time in his career as a critic. Of course well before he became a critic, Behne had been enmeshed in housing issues; his grandfather owned a large construction firm and his father was a contractor who built apartments in Berlin. Housing had been a central concern of Marxists and Socialists at least as far back as Friedrich Engels’ analysis of the plight of the working masses and their inhuman housing conditions in England. Turn-of-the-century non-profit organizations entered the housing fray by commissioning improved dwellings. The 1910 master plan competition for Berlin directly addressed the housing crisis. A decade later, the Weimar welfare state launched housing legislation to ameliorate the inhuman living conditions. Developing affordable and decent housing in the crowded metropolis became key for the modern architect with a social conscience. Through manifestos such as Le Corbusier’s *Towards a New Architecture*, housing for the masses would become the defining problem of modern architecture.

In their concern for "solving" the housing problems, modern architects developed ever more rational methods of design, and financing, a harsh pragmatism.

---


68 Le Corbusier, *Vers une architecture* (1923); transl. into English as *Towards a New Architecture* (1927), and into German by Hans Hildebrandt as *Kommende Baukunst* (1926). Behne had first reviewed Le Corbusier’s work in Behne, "Junge französische Architektur," *Sozialistische Monatshefte* 28.1, no. 12/13 (June 8, 1922): 512-519, just before he began publishing his survey "Die deutsche Baukunst seit 1850".
that Behne would become increasingly critical of by the end of his career.  

Architecture’s engagement with the social problem of housing expanded the scope of the profession. Architects went from being content to design individual objects, to the hubristic belief that through an expansive approach to architecture, they could house the masses, fix cities, and cure social ills. Le Corbusier gave his readers a choice of two equals means of fixing modern society when he asked, "Architecture or Revolution?" at the end of his manifesto for modern architecture.

In Germany the issue of worker housing (and later of the design of factories for the worker) were forced onto center stage by a specific constellation of historical, political, and economic circumstances. Politicians, industrialists, and reformers such as Naumann and the Werkbund concluded that one had to improve the life of the worker in order to become economically competitive as a company or as a nation. Friedrich Naumann’s Christian-Social politics, with its mantra "Foreign affairs through power politics . . . internal affairs through reform," might be considered representative of the Werkbund politics before World War I. Many Werkbund members were

---


70 Julius Posener has dubbed this constellation the "Wilhelmine Compromise"; Posener, Berlin auf dem Wege zu einer neun Architektur (1979), pp. 12,49ff.

decidedly against the politics and conservative taste of the Kaiser, but nonetheless devout nationalists and supporters of the build-up of the German navy as a means of exerting Germany’s growing international power. Werkbund members were closely allied with some of Germany’s largest industrialists and corporate trusts such as Bosch and the AEG, seeking to reform the quality of German design from the top down as a way of increasing consumption of products at home as well as increasing exports.\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{72} The political orientation of the Werkbund and its members was diverse. Few if any Werkbund members belonged to the radical artistic avant-garde before World War I, either politically or artistically. Behne was one of the primary intermediaries between these camps. With the possible exception of the Glashaus, the built works of Gropius, Taut, and other progressive Werkbund members before World War I fit well within the Werkbund ideals of creating restrained, well-designed, classically inspired buildings. The Werkbund’s associations with corporate industry made it on the whole more conservative than Behne, both politically and culturally. Founding members included members of the Garden City Association (for example Osthaus and Schultze-Naumburg), whose work Behne supported for artistic and political reasons. But the organization also had a great deal in common with the more conservative Dürerbund and Heimatschutz bund. The factory at Hellerau, for example, was received with great acclaim by the Heimatschutz, which had campaigned for the reform of factory designs—an effort that paralleled that of the Werkbund. The Werkbund and Dürerbund later published several books together, such as Werner Lindner and Georg Steinmetz, \textit{Die Ingenieurbauten in ihrer guten Gestaltung} (1923). Schultze-Naumburg and German Bestelmeyer were members of both the Werkbund and the Heimatschutz; while Naumann and Fritz Schumacher were members of both the Werkbund and the Dürerbund; Matthew Jefferies, \textit{Politics and Culture in Wilhelmine Germany} (1995), chaps. 2,3; Joan Campbell, \textit{The German Werkbund} (1978), pp. 24-26. On the complex politics of the early Werkbund, see Wolfgang Hardtwig, "Kunst, liberaler Nationalismus und Weltpolitik, der Deutsche Werkbund 1907-1914," in Nationalismus und Bürgerkultur in Deutschland 1500-1914 (1994), pp. 246-273; Frederic Schwartz, \textit{The German Werkbund} (1996); Mark Jarzombek, "The Discourses of a Bourgeois Utopia, 1904-1908, and the Founding of the Werkbund," in Imagining Modern German Culture, 1889-1910, ed. François Forster-Hahn (1996), pp. 127-145; and Werner Oechslin, "Politisches, allzu Politisches . . . : ‘Nietzscheleinge’, der ‘Wille zur Kunst’ und der Deutsche Werkbund vor 1914," in Architektur als politische Kultur. philos hypotheses practica, ed. Hermann Hipp and Ernst Seidl (1996), pp. 151-190; also republished in Oechslin, \textit{Moderne Entwerfen} (1999).
As a means of increasing productivity, but also of expanding the market for consumer products, the association embraced the factory worker and maintained at least rhetorical interest in Socialist causes such as creating better work environments. Naumann’s reform-minded journal Die Hilfe, for example, was dedicated to "Workers, Craftsmen and Rural Folk." Naumann saw the Werkbund’s mission as "the spiritualization of work, which would lead to the personal and social elevation of the worker as well as the artistic training of afficionado and consumer."

The common goal of increasing Germany’s economic power and image in the world’s political marketplace unified the many reform ideas and political appeals of the diverse Werkbund members. Through the creation of company towns and garden cities, as well as reforms in city planning, housing, factory design, transportation improvements, and the creation of new building types such as community centers (Volkshäuser), industrial reformers associated with the Werkbund reformers began to shape a built environment that simultaneously insured long-term profits and catered to the psychic and physical needs of the working class and general public.

In addition to his work with the Werkbund, it was above all Behne’s interaction with Bruno taut that began to politicize his art criticism. Taut was deeply sympathetic to working-class and communal ideas, but biographers suggest that his political and social

---

awareness intensified after he beginning to work with Behne and Scheerbart. What first attracted Behne to Taut’s work were not the famous exhibition pavilions or the industrial architecture, but what Behne called the "more important" apartment buildings such as those under construction in middle and working-class Berlin neighborhoods such as Charlottenburg and Rixdorf. In both his first article on Taut in March 1913, as well as one in which he introduced Taut to the Sturm circle a year later, Behne highlighted the straightforward, functional, yet artistically inspired nature of Taut’s apartment designs as particularly modern. Behne recognized in these apartments many of the same expressive form making that he had seen in the paintings in Walden’s Sturm Gallery, a concordance that had inspired Behne to label Taut’s architecture as "Expressionist."

---

74 Tilmann Buddensieg, "Schinkel wird nicht erwähnt," Neue Heimat 5 (1980): 15; also cited in Brigitte Lamberts, "Das Frühwerk von Bruno Taut (1900-1914)," (Diss. 1994), pp. 112-116. Lamberts warns against seeing Taut as too much of a Socialist before World War I, and that Behne was undoubtedly more political than Taut. Taut’s son Heinrich Taut, who later claimed his father was not a political man, quoted his father as saying, "The more a person is an artist, the more distant he is from politics; a good architect is a very bad politician"; cited in ibid., p. 115. Johanna Kutschera goes even further, labeling Taut a "spiritual aristocrat," for his extreme positions regarding the role of the artist in leading society to new culture before the war, and identifies a turn to true Socialism only after 1920; see Kutschera, Aufbruch und Engagement (1994), pp. 1581-166. On Taut’s politics, see also Weinstein, End of Expressionism, p. 78; Richard Sheppard, Avantgarde und Arbeiterdichter in den Hauptorganen der deutschen Linken 1917-1922 (1995), p. 103-104; Whyte, Bruno Taut, pp. 144-145.


77 Buddensieg has argued that Taut borrowed elements and approaches in the
For Behne, the work of the celebrated Berlin architect Alfred Messel had provided a useful reference point when interpreting Taut’s architecture. Behne had discerned a similar simplicity and straightforward approach to architectural form-making. Messel represented not only a continuation of the respected, innovative and functional "Berlin School" of architecture, but also part of the turn-of-the-century housing reform movement so crucial to Socialist thinking about reform. In the context of several non-profit building societies dedicated to improving the housing situation and over-crowding in Berlin, Messel had sought more humane housing for the metropolitan masses than the notorious rental barracks (*Mietskaserne*) built by for-profit developers to maximize profit with minimal expenses. His designs for several rent-subsidized apartment buildings for the Berlin Savings and Building Society (Berliner Bau- und Sparverein) were some of the first working-class apartments to be designed by an architect of standing in Berlin.78

Buddensieg has speculated, borrowed from Messel’s apartments a refined asymmetry facade design of his Kottbusseer Damm apartments directly from Expressionist paintings and theory he had encountered in Walden’s Sturm Gallery; Buddensieg, "Berlin, Kottbusser Damm," *Frankfurter Zeitung* n.100 (Apr. 30, 1977). See also chapter 3; and Whyte, *Bruno Taut*, p. 27-29.

---

that subordinated the articulation of individual apartments to a unified, communal block design. Both architects strove to knit simple, identical apartments into a cohesive whole without subjecting the design to controlling devices such as monumental symmetry or a single ornamental "order" of classical derivation. They sought to harness the art of architecture to create contemporary socially-oriented, high-quality dwellings for the lower and middle classes. Recognizing and defining an appropriate form of social housing would also become one of the central themes in the careers of both Taut and Behne, and of modern architecture more generally.

Referring both to contemporary critics and to Taut’s pre- and post-war writing on social housing, Buddensieg has argued convincingly that Messel and Taut both designed their pre-war apartments according to the classical idea of *convenientia*, seeking to relate their designs to the character and social position of the inhabitants. They had sought to find an expression for the communal social structure of the residents. As early as 1907, Scheffler had written in reference to Messel’s apartments, "From the social requirements of the identical apartment plans comes the aesthetic. . . . The desire to create unity from the individual pieces," derives from "the contemporary

---

democratic spirit, with its tendency to equality.** Messel biographer and architectural critic Walter Curt Behrendt supported the same design ideas from an urban perspective, arguing for the need to create more unified street facades in order to develop a greater "feeling of community.**

Taut’s effort to find an aesthetic expression or design ideas to correlate with the lifestyle and political sensibilities of the apartment dwellers led him to emphasize simplicity, “In its appearance the house had to pay tribute to the local milieu of the working-class metropolis. For that reason, the architecture had to strive to a simple solution, employing continuous lines and clear contrasts. . . . In order to find economic and social solutions to these [housing] problems, one must proceed with utmost simplicity.”** Behne supported Taut’s drive for simplicity by arguing that all great architecture of the past had been "honest, unprejudiced and simple . . . sachlich," with artists always striving to create "forms that were communal."**

---


Taut’s architecture "cleaned architecture of all traditionalism and conventionalism."\(^{84}\)
The straightforward, or *sachlich* nature of Taut’s design, according to Behne, implied that it was free of pre-conceptions and thus open to enjoyment and understanding by a wider scope of people, including workers.

Taut later gave these ideas more overt political references when he wrote of his apartments that a "Socialist-proletarian spirit" led him to string simple elements together into an economical series, reducing the isolation or individuality of any piece in favor of a "collective spirit."\(^{85}\) Through this approach, Taut claimed, architects become "social organizers," and architecture becomes "didactic," representing or "expressing" the political ideology of the residents and eventually of the era, countering the self-absorbed symmetry and monumentality that had characterized previous capitalist design. The economy, simplicity and efficiency of Taut’s Socialist *Siedlungen* after World War I were in many ways thus pre-figured in Taut’s Wilhelmine apartment blocks.\(^{86}\) Although the forms, materials and layout would change, this emphasis on simplicity, *Sachlichkeit*, and repetition remained part of the program of modern architecture until well after World War II.

---


One feature of Taut’s apartment building at Kottbusser-Damm 2-3 (1910-11) in the working-class suburb of Rixdorf is particularly worth commenting on in the context of politics: a cinema, or as Berliners called it, a “Kintopp”. As Peter Mänz has shown, the origins of the cinema before World War I in Germany were decidedly populist, concentrated at first in working-class districts such as Rixdorf. The appealing visuality of film, the fascination with a technology of moving images, and the cinema’s familiar origin in acting and variety shows, made it an attractive and powerful medium that reached across class. Before moving indoors in the first years of the twentieth century, movies were frequently part of traveling shows that set up on the empty lots and fair grounds (Rummelplätze) of working-class districts. They provided low-cost, sensational entertainment that allowed workers to experience vicariously the

---

87 Taut built apartments at Kottbusser Damm 90 (1909-10), and Kottbusser Damm 2-3 (1910-11). For more see the bibliography in Nerdinger et al, Bruno Taut, p. 323-324; Zöller-Stock, Bruno Taut, p. 18; and Lamberts, "Das Frühwerk," pp. 42-54; Buddensieg, "Berlin, Kottbusser Damm." Andres Janser curiously does not deal with this earliest cinema in her essay, "'Die bewegliche kinematografische Aufnahme ersetzt beinahe die Führung um und durch den Bau,' Bruno Taut und der Film," in Nerdinger et al, Bruno Taut, pp. 267-274. The working-class Berlin suburb of Rixdorf, called "the largest village in Germany" by its inhabitants, grew exponentially in the last third of the nineteenth century, spreading to such an extent that it eventually merged with the city. It was renamed Neu-Kölln in 1912, and annexed into Greater-Berlin in 1920. "Kintopp" was an elision of "Kino" and "Topf" in the local Berlin dialect used among the working class, and referred to the joining of a cinema with a bar or greasy-spoon type eating establishment; Peter Mänz, "Frühes Kino im Arbeiterbezirk: ein neues 'Volksvergnügen' im Spannungsfeld von Kulturindustrie, Arbeiteralltag und Arbeiterbewegung," Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften 2, no. 2 (1990): 81-101, here p. 85.

88 On cinemas in Rixdorf, see Mänz, "Frühes Kino"; and more generally on the origins of film see Sylvaine Hänsel and Angelica Schmitt, eds., Kinoarchitektur in Berlin 1895-1995 (1995); R. Pabst, ed., Das deutsche Lichtspieltheater (1926); Guttsman, Worker’s Culture, p. 263-274.
stretches of New York, the temples of India, and other flights of fancy. By 1912, when Behne met Taut, the popularity of cinema among workers had drawn the attention of SPD politicians. Although fans of the cinema extolled the "untold masses of geistig light that finds its way through the cinematic lens into the giant masses of the people, into the millions of the working class," SPD officials were critical of these "breeding grounds of bad taste," and worked to prevent the cinema from becoming a part of the official Socialist sub-culture. The politicians understood the mass attraction of the film and its potential as a means of education (Volksbildung), though not yet as a means of mass revolutionary propaganda.

Details of why Taut’s Kottbusser-Damm apartment included a cinema or who was responsible for its inclusion are lost, but it is clear that Taut was accommodating the latest trends of working-class culture. The building, Taut explained, specifically "addressed the local milieu of the working-class metropolis." Mänz has shown that the neighborhood of Rixdorf where Taut’s apartment was located had twenty-seven cinemas by 1912, most with fewer than 200 seats, and as Behne later explained, many were installed in retrofitted rooms. A few were designed in pre-planned spaces.

---


91 Taut, "Zu den Arbeiten," p. 121.

92 Statistics in Mänz, "Frühes Kino," p. 84 The city of Berlin, meanwhile, had over 200 cinemas by 1912. In Behne, "Kinoarchitekturen," Bild und Film 4, no. 7/8 (Apr./May 1915): 133, Behne lists three phases of theater design: 1) retrofitted rooms; 2) purpose-built rooms in apartments; and 3) separate movie palaces, usually downtown,
within apartment buildings. Behne claimed that Taut’s cinema was the first theater in Berlin to be intentionally built to show film. But the inclusion of a cinema in new apartments was also rapidly becoming more popular in working-class, strongly "red" towns such as Rixdorf. A piece of fiction in Kinematograph magazine from 1912, for example, celebrated that a much needed new apartment building was being built in Rixdorf to house over 140 worker families, "more than enough," the author suggested, to warrant that the architect should include a cinema in the building for residents.

Behne was an early fan of the cinema, an enthusiasm that may have begun before 1905 when he and his parents lived in the working-class district near the Centralviehhof of Berlin, a neighborhood similar to Rixdorf. After becoming interested in his friend Taut’s ideas and architectural practice (including the Kottbusser Damm apartment and cinema, Behne began writing regularly on the cinema in the summer of 1913. He was one of the first trained art historians to recognize the importance of the cinema for modern visual culture. Before World War I he wrote reviews and commentary on film in his regular column "Stage Arts" in the Sozialistische Monatshefte. His polemical pieces in the new magazine Bild und Film often dealt with

intended more for the middle-class, who began viewing films in large numbers only after 1910.

93 Behne, "Kinoarchitekturen," p. 133. Behne’s claim is still supported today; see Nerdinger et al, Bruno Taut, p. 324.


95 Behne’s contributions to the development of modern cinema have not been explored, and lie outside the scope of this work; see Bushart, p. 8. See bibliography for cites to his well known, frequently republished and translated essays on cinema.
the architecture of cinemas, including extensive discussion of cinemas design by in Taut in the Kottbusser Dam apartments, the Leipzig Steel Pavilion and the projection device in the Glashaus. As cinema became ever more popular in Berlin after World War I, especially the late 1920s, Behne wrote enthusiastically about the role of film in modern life and art, arguing that film was as much an art form as painting or literature, but with a decidedly more contemporary and modern sensibility.

As early as February 1914 Behne connected the modernity and metropolitan mass appeal of the cinema with the new art of Expressionism. In response to a conservative critics' attack on Futurism and modern culture more generally as overly loud, fast, nihilist, "technical . . . and artificial: like cinema," Behne turned the tables on

---

96 On Bild und Film, see Behne’s the two articles "Kinokunst," in the "Bühnenkunst" columns of Sozialistische Monatshefte 19.2, no. 14 (July 24, 1913): 885-888; and Sozialistische Monatshefte 20.1, no. 4 (Feb. 26, 1914): 266-268. On film and architecture, see Behne, "Der Kino im Leipziger Monument des Eisens," Bild und Film 2, no. 11/12 (Aug./Sept. 1913): 269-271; and Behne "Kinoarchitekturen," Bild und Film 4, no. 7/8 (Apr./May 1915): 133-139. Janser discusses in detail Taut’s proposals for including an exhibit of "film-buildings"--films of existing buildings--at the Werkbund exhibition in Cologne in 1914. The experiment, which drew good reviews from the "cinephile" Peter Behrens but was ultimately rejected by the Werkbund, was seen as a new means of representing architecture more dynamically and realistically than the still photograph. See Janser, "Die bewegliche kinematografische Aufnahme," pp. 269-270.

the bourgeois critics and the pejorative connotations of film. He celebrated Expressionism (which included Futurism in his mind) as the art of a time of grand change, of youthful exuberance, of freedom and hope for the future for all people. He suggested that architects be encouraged to create dynamic, playful forms for cinemas "that readily demonstrate connections to the tents of traveling troops." After the upheaval of the German revolution, in the waning days of Expressionist art, Behne called for more artists to emulate the energy and pure joy of life that emanated from the Rummelplätze that had spawned cinema, as Dada artists were beginning to do. Behne and Taut, from early on, were aware of the energy and working-class spirit that the cinema and its accompanying counter-establishment milieu could bring to the development of both modern art and architecture.

Garden Cities

While the design of working-class apartments or the inclusion of a cinema did

---


100 Behne, "Zirkus,'" Freiheit 2, no. 210 (May 3, 1919): 2-3. The emphasis on playful spirit emulates the spirit of the "Glaspapa" Paul Scheerbart, as well as Taut’s own manifesto "Down with Seriousness" in the first issue of his magazine Frühlicht, a supplement to the new journal Stadtbaukunst Alter und neuer Zeit 1, no. 1 (Jan. 1920): 13-16.
not constitute a political stance per se, Taut’s architectural work became ever more socially and politically committed, just as he was getting to know Behne in 1913. That spring Osthaus had arranged for Taut to replace the Swiss architect Hans Bernouilli as consulting architect to the German Garden City Association.\footnote{101} This led to Taut’s commissions for a small housing settlement (Siedlung) in Falkenberg, southwest of Berlin, and for the Siedlung Reform outside of Magdeburg, the city where Behne was born. The German Garden City Association, founded in 1902 as a "propaganda society" with the principle aim of "winning over the public" to the causes of "internal colonization" and "industrial decentralization," was based on the English group founded by Ebenezer Howard. The German group, including the brothers Bernard and Hans Kampfmeyer, promoted strongly educational, liberative and communal ideals, and allied themselves prominently with the reformist branch of the SPD.\footnote{102} Rather than revolution, they sought "peaceful path to reform" by improving housing and living

\footnote{101} Taut had been associating with the German Garden City Association since at least 1910, when he took part in an official tour with the association of English garden cities. On Taut’s work with the German Garden City Association, see Whyte, \textit{Bruno Taut} (1982), pp. 11-12, 29-32; Iain Boyd Whyte, "Bruno Taut und die sozialistischen"; Kristiana Hartmann, \textit{Deutsche Gartenstadtbewegung, Kulturpolitik und Gesellschaftsreform} (1976) 122-124; Kristiana Hartmann’s essay in Nerdinger et al, \textit{Bruno Taut}, pp. 137-135; and Speidel, \textit{Bruno Taut}, pp. 116-124.

\footnote{102} Iain Boyd Whyte,"The Politics of Expressionism," \textit{Architectural Association Quarterly} 12, no. 3 (1980): 11-17. John Maciuika has discussed a profound change that took place in the Garden City Association when Muthesius, Riemerschmid and Karl Schmidt joined in 1907. The organization reoriented it utopian tendencies towards the more pragmatic goal of creating places "for the fusion of modern business, a conservative and bürgerlich Wilhelmine social hierarchy, and healthy suburban living through neo-traditional design"; Maciuika, "Hermann Muthesius," pp. 354-355.
conditions for the working class. The reformist and centrist tendencies of the Garden
City association led them to embrace and harness capitalism to create the cheapest
possible housing with the highest possible standard of living for residents using non-
profit building associations strongly supported by the unions.

Behne, working ever more closely with Taut as publicist and intellectual partner,
was able to publish an article on Taut’s innovative polychrome designs for Falkenberg
in the Garden City Association’s official journal Gartenstadt in December 1913 even
before Taut contributed one. [Figure 5.3] Architectural and cultural reformers as far
back as Ferdinand Avenarius in 1896, Alfred Lichtwark in 1899 and Fritz Schumacher in
1901 had called for a reintroduction of bright color into architecture as a means of
fighting "our grey times" and the drab, schematic building developments of the late
nineteenth-century. Taut, who at one point early in his career had seen himself

---

103 This was an explicit reference to Howard’s first book, Tomorrow—a Peaceful
Path to Real Reform (1898), which was retitled Garden Cities of Tomorrow in 1902.
Whyte highlights the fact that many of the goals of the Garden City Association were
shared by anti-semitic associations on the extreme right, as well as the Bodenreform
group on the far left. He identifies the Garden City Association as "left of centre" in
this context, closely allied to the SPD; Whyte, Bruno Taut, p. 11. Taut’s Choriner Kreis
had similarly mixed ties to both the conservative Wandervögel movement, as well as
the anarcho-Socialism of the Friedrichshagener Kreis. Whyte paints Taut, the Garden
City movement, and Activism more conservatively than many historians; see Bletter,
"Introduction," p. 6; and Whyte, p. 7-11.


105 Fritz Schumacher, "Farbige Architektur," Der Kunstwart 14, no. 20 (1901):
297-302; republished in Fritz Schumacher, Streifzüge eines Architekten (1907), pp. 111-
125. See also Alfred Lichtwark, Palastfenster und Flügeltür (1899), republished in
Lichtwark, Eine Auswahl seiner Schriften, ed. Wolf Mannhardt, intro. Karl Scheffler
(1917) p. 256.
primarily as a painter, reflected in his diary in 1905, "Colorful spatial compositions, colorful architecture, these are areas in which I personally might say something."\textsuperscript{106} His first use of vivid color in independent commissions came in two church renovations in 1906 and 1911. Similar to the efforts by Die Brücke and Blauer Reiter Expressionist painters to incorporate vernacular imagery and bright color into their paintings, Taut worked to introduce vivid color on the interiors through the restoration of original vernacular color schemes, and a collaboration with his friend and later Expressionist painter Franz Mutzenbecher.\textsuperscript{107} Taut’s designs, as Manfred Speidel has shown, resulted in a unique use of color as an independent rather than merely applied element that helped "dematerialize" architectural elements in ways that foreshadow his own use of color in the Glashaus, and even the work of De Stijl artists a decade later.\textsuperscript{108}

Behne did not explicitly link Taut’s use of color to early Expressionism or the art


\textsuperscript{107} On Taut’s early church interiors and the use of color see Manfred Speidel, "Ornamente," in Speidel, Bruno Taut, p. 78-98. Taut describes the colors in Taut, "Zu den Arbeiten." Speidel suggests connections of Taut’s work to early Expressionism as well as to the Stuttgart School of painters around Alfred Hölzel, to which Mutzenbecher belonged briefly; see Speidel, "Ornamente," p. 92.

that he was simultaneously promoting at the Sturm gallery, but he did claim that "the exuberant use of color in art is again growing everywhere, in sculpture as much as in painting and the applied arts," and that architecture had no reason to be left behind. The reason for Taut’s innovative use of color, Behne explained, was not merely formal, but primarily economic and social. The very essence of the garden city concept, he felt, required architects to reconcile two opposing factors: the need to minimize building expenses by using the repetitive rowhouse type, and the need to accommodate the desires of the inhabitants to have individualized residences. Taut’s use of color, Behne explained, bridged these two concerns. "The danger of uniformity is happily removed through the aid of color! And exactly this application of color . . . seems to me to be a perfect expression for the freedom of the garden city resident, which is not the arbitrary will of a villa owner, but rather the self-determination of a member of a social organism!"  

Behne saw Taut’s search for more ideal housing and a communally-oriented future as inherently "political." "Politics," as Behne defined it at the time, involved not so much "the grabbing of material power," as the "daring" act of defining a better future, "reaching out amidst the richness of one’s own time to find the inspiration for freedom,  

---


110 "Die Gefahr der Uniformität wird durch das Hilfsmittel der Farbe sehr Glücklich beseitigt! Und gerade die farbige Abwandlung . . . scheint mir ein treffender Ausdruck zu sein für die Freiheit des Gartenstädters, die doch nicht die Willkür etwa eines Villenbesitzers ist, sondern die Selbstbestimmung des Mitgliedes eines sozialen Organismus!"; Behne, "Bedeutung der Farbe," p. 250.
expansive development, and a future that leaves behind all conventions.”

For Behne, the use of color at Falkenberg was both an artistic gesture related to Expressionism, and a political gesture that addressed the new communal spirit of reformist Socialism in the garden city. Behne even considered moving into Falkenberg, but the housing development was not finished in time for the newlywed Behne.

In his own articles, Taut embraced the garden city as one of the most important means of creating a more equitable, Socialist architecture for the working masses, and of re-invigorating and renewing modern architecture. In a critique of the architectural competition to expand Berlin’s royal opera house published in the Sozialistische Monatshefte—a publication to which, not coincidentally, Behne frequently contributed—Taut complained about how difficult it was for contemporary architects to develop appropriate designs given the confused and contradictory concerns of the day to which they had to respond, “modern empire, caste-society, and populism.”

---


112 In a post card to Taut, Behne mentions that he will move from his parent’s apartment in the Schillerstr. 103, to Steglitz or Lichterfelde before Falkenberg is complete; Behne, letter to Taut (Apr. 30, 1913). Akademie der Künste, Berlin, Abt. Baukunst, Bruno Taut Nachlaß, BTA-01-467. By the fall, Behne had moved to Grünstr. 16, also in Charlottenberg; see, for example, Max Taut letter to Behne (Jan. 28, 1914), Nachlaß Behne, SBPK. Behne married Elfriede Schäfer on June 5, 1913, and their daughter Karla was born Dec. 1, 1913.

113 Taut, "Das Problem des Opernbaus," Sozialistische Monatshefte 20.1, no. 6
architects find direction in the Socialist ideals of the garden city, "Every epoch develops its typical building problems that correspond to the central questions of the day and develop innovation in architecture. The typical idea of our day, the idea with which every person in engaged, one must see as social engagement. Royal operas will not give us a new architecture, only people’s theaters, new garden cities, and all buildings that evolve from our social idealism can do that."114 Using ideas on the "organic" related both to those Behne had developed after reading the biologist Uexküll, as well as those Hausensteina had developed using Saint-Simon’s dialectical history, Taut insisted that a truly modern building had to be "organic," a completely integrated and synthesized body of functional elements. Such organic architecture, he claimed, could only develop when all levels of society and civilization came together to realize "the social," a form of organization in which the individual was subordinated to the whole community. Rather than stifle the individual, however, Taut reassured his readers by invoking the American poet Walt Whitman, suggesting that such social unification would result in a renewal and empowerment of the individual conscience.115


114 Taut, "Das Problem des Opernbaus," p. 356; translated slightly differently in Whyte, Bruno Taut, p. 29. Taut had expressed nearly identical thoughts in a lecture to the German Garden City Association in the fall of 1913, where he stated that in architecture "a new idea has arisen, a truly modern idea that promises to become part of our worldview, accepted by all... This is the social conscience"; Taut, "Kleinhausbau und Landaufschiebung," pp. 9-12; also republished in part in Wendschuh and Volkmann, Bruno Taut, p. 174.

115 Taut, "Das Problem des Opernbaues." Taut did not actually quote any words by Whitman, though Whitman was a very common reference at the time, especially in the Socialist press, many of his works excerpted in cultural journals or serialized in
Behne summarized many of the ideas that he and Taut shared on the garden city in the 1915 annual yearbook and calendar of the Mosse publishing house, one of the three largest publishing houses in Berlin. The very wide and diverse audience embraced by the Mosse publishing program would assure that this book had a much wider and more populist distribution than the professional journals in which Taut published his ideas on the garden city.\footnote{Behne, "Gartenstadt-Architekturen," Illustriertes Jahrbuch. Kalender für das Jahr 1915, ed. V. Band (1915), pp. 196-209.} Building on the art historical ideas of Riegl and Worringer that tied a society’s architecture to the general spirit of the times or a communal will to form (Kunstwollen), Behne stated that there were two new tasks that architects were tackling in architecture: industrial buildings and garden cities. While the former provided primarily a new functional type of building problem, he wrote that the latter was accompanied by "a completely new spiritual force . . . the social conscience."\footnote{"So kommt bei der Gartenstadt-Architektur eine neue geistige Kraft, eine neue Gesinnung zur technischen Neuheit hinzu: die soziale Empfindung"; Behne, "Gartenstadt-Architekturen," p. 196.} Behne insisted that "much as the Gothic had the idea of the kingdom of God," modern social consciousness would be the singular inner driving force that would generate a new architecture of the day.\footnote{On the influence of Riegl and Worringer on Behne, see chapters 1 and 3, as well as below.}

Behne argued that architects such as Taut had the power to shape society through the social conscience expressed in their designs. The architects’ charge was to

German newspapers.
find an appropriate expression for the garden city—"a quintessentially modern building program"—which had the worker at its core, but also included the modern factory and the infrastructure that connected it all. Taut, he claimed, had devoted himself passionately to meeting the functional needs of Falkenberg’s residents, not dictating their lives, but subconsciously shaping and educating them. "The residents have everything at hand," Behne declared, "and the architect has the residents in his hand. . . . In the end, every art is a shaping of people. Architecture does this most strongly and visibly." Taut’s architecture, Behne theorized, had the potential to shape people and by extension culture directly. In this way, Art was a kind of politics, art would lead people to a new society.

VI.
Balancing Rationality and Fantasy:
Behne’s Critique of Industrial Architecture

[Modern industrial architecture] should be a true and convincing expression of its purpose, function, and life within. . . . The common goal is to create a body for the inner life that is organic, expressive, and convincing.¹

- Adolf Behne, 1913

Industrial Architecture and the Werkbund

For Behne, Taut’s apartments and garden cities were elegant architectural reconciliations of two disparate concepts--that of artistic Expressionism and of a *sachlich* or socially-responsible functionalism. Although Taut’s work certainly stimulated Behne’s ideas early on, it was the Werkbund and Walter Gropius who would inspire Behne to refine his theory that the richest form of a functionalist modern architecture integrated both Expressionism and Socialism. The positions that emerged out of Behne’s engagement with the Werkbund before World War I set the course for his

architectural criticism after the war, particularly his most famous work, the Modern Functional Building (1926). Although the social, cultural, and political context inevitably changed, Behne remained convinced throughout his career that modern architecture needed to be more than simplistically functionalist. Rather it had to embody the same spirit of "artistic Sachlichkeit" that he had identified in his first article about Taut back in 1913.²

As with so many of the institutions forging modern architecture and design in Germany, the Werkbund was primarily a media and propaganda organization. The Werkbund was the single most potent force in reforming the German professional design establishment prior to World War I. Its mission appealed to Behne, in both its generalized fusing of art and industry and in its specific attention on reforming industrial architecture. Behne was committed to the idea that the new industrial architecture had the power to advance the development of a thoroughly modern architecture for all society, and thus to transform German culture. Through his critiques of German industrial architecture, particularly the work of Taut and Gropius, Behne worked in tandem with the Werkbund’s vast publicity machine to promote design reform in industrial buildings. Already as a young critic, Behne was able to convey his message and publish iconic photos such as the American elevators in venues

---

that had a large and diverse circulation. His writings had a far greater mass appeal than the small museum lectures, specialized industrial and architectural journals, and even the Werkbund yearbooks in which most Werkbund members published. Behne was, in many respects, a far more important popularizer of these still well-known images and ideas than the architects themselves.

Yet, as Behne became more strongly committed to a synthesis of cultural Socialism and Expressionism, he became increasingly disillusioned with the Werkbund’s program, which he saw as overly tainted by a pedantic, industrial pragmatism. At the 1914 Werkbund debate in Cologne, Behne not only stood on the side of artists against capitalism and big industry, he also declared that the Werkbund was incapable of promoting the true artistic spirit that would be necessary to reform design and contemporary culture in Germany.

The Werkbund as Media and Propaganda Organization

The Werkbund emerged from the discourse on the role of the machine in the applied arts and the role of the artist in the mass production of consumer goods.

\[3\] An example of Behne’s attempt to circulate the Werkbund’s factories to a wider audience is alluded to in a letter from Behne to Gropius’ office from July 18, 1914. Behne asked for a copy of a specific photo of the Fagus offices from the Werkbund yearbook to be used in an article on "artistic business architecture" commissioned by the Illustrirte Zeitung (Leipzig), one of the widest circulating illustrated weeklies in Germany. Attempts to locate this article have been unsuccessful, publication may have been canceled due to the declaration of war the next month. See Behne letter in the Gropius Papers, #123 (= Arbeitsrat für Kunst. cf. Harvard Catalogue II) = GN 10/196, Bauhaus-Archiv.
Founded in 1907 by a group of artists and industrialists, its mission was "to increase the quality of industrial production with the cooperation of art, industry and crafts, through the use of education, propaganda, and the articulation of unified stands on relevant questions." This outgrowth of the English Arts and Crafts movement’s response to the dislocating pressures of industrialization found ready reception in turn-of-the-century Germany. The organization was dedicated to improving the design quality and the commercial value of all German products, "from the sofa cushion to urban planning."

Its scale of synthesis and power to influence drew Behne to the organization.

The association of artists (including many architects), manufacturers and other reform advocates attempted to reconcile powerful and sometimes seemingly contradictory forces. On the one hand were the forces of capitalism and industrial...
production that were propelling the young German nation into the ranks of an economic superpower. On the other hand, these same dynamic forces created a disturbing materialism that threatened the spiritual and metaphysical balance of art and culture revered as part of the German psyche and tradition. The Werkbund thus struggled to reconcile the same traditional oppositions as did Behne and Taut: autonomous form and social relevance, art and industry, expression and function, creativity and production. A synthesis of these opposing poles, members hoped, would lead to measurably greater sales and exports of German-made goods as well as an immeasurable but vital national design culture.

Media and museum interests were strongly represented in the Werkbund’s membership, particularly after 1912. Unlike the populist Heimatschutzbund or many other reform organizations, the Werkbund was an exclusive organization, open only to invited "artists, fabricators, craftsmen, businessmen and economists," as well as to "writers, experts and promoters (individuals as well as companies)," who all paid dues on a sliding scale according to income. Although many Werkbund members were practicing artists or industrialists who controlled large production facilities, founding

6 The list of opposing elements that the Werkbund sought to harmonize through reform efforts could go on: culture and technology, craft and machines, spirit and material, uniqueness and standardization, tradition and modernity.

7 The Werkbund boasted an exclusive, professional membership, and had no interest in developing a mass membership. It maintained strict entrance qualifications, vetting all prospective members for their "suitability." Membership rose steadily: from 492 in 1908; 843 in 1910; 971 in 1912, and 1870 in 1913, the year Behne joined; Jefferies, Politics and Culture, p. 104; and Ernst Jäckh, "5. Jahresbericht des DWB 1912/13," in Die Kunst in Industrie und Handel, pp. 97-98.
members such as the architects Muthesius, Behrens, Fischer, Poelzig and Schumacher would go on to shape the course of German architecture not only through their buildings, but also through their theory, teaching, lectures, legislation and extensive writing on Werkbund issues.

Publishers such as Eugen Diederichs, politicians such as Naumann, and art patrons such as Osthaus formed another important constituency on the Werkbund board. The Werkbund’s membership soon also included many important editors, historians, museum curators and educators. Behne’s architectural critic and journalist peers, such as Hellwag, Breuer, Osborn and Avenarius, Behrendt, Justus Brinkmann, Hans Curjel, Cornelius Gurlitt, Werner Hegemann, Hans Hildebrandt, Edwin Redslob, Walter Riezler, and Fritz Wichert all became members.\(^8\)

The Werkbund was effective in reaching a mass audience not only through its members’ products, but also through publishing. In order to assure that its message of reform would reach the widest possible audience and have the greatest impact, it focused its efforts on education and outreach, leaving changes in actual production to individual members and firms.\(^9\) In addition to actual product reform, the Werkbund

\(^8\) Complete lists of memberships are available in the first two Werkbund yearbooks, 1912 and 1913. Fischer, Zwischen Kunst und Industrie, pp. 594-606, provides a list of most important members of the organization from the founding through the 1960s.

\(^9\) Related pre-war propaganda organizations that shaped the discourse of reform, both conservative and progressive, include the Dürerbund (founded 1902), German Garden City Association (1902), Bund Heimatschutzbund (1904), Werdandibund (1907), as well as professional organizations such as the Bund Deutscher Schriftsteller, Bund Deutscher Architekten, etc.
sought to promote the exchange of ideas through consumer education and general propaganda. Their propagandistic and pedagogical mission focused on three areas: annual meetings, exhibition work, and a publishing program. The annual meetings included lectures and exhibits and were purposefully held in cities all over Germany—most famously in Cologne in 1914. Non-members as well as members were encouraged to participate in order to maximize the audience.

By 1913 the Werkbund board included ten major museum directors who promoted the association’s mission in museums throughout Germany. The Werkbund’s exhibition work was centered around the Deutsches Museum für Kunst im Handel und Gewerbe, in Hagen. The museum had been founded by Karl Ernst Osthaus in close cooperation with the Werkbund in 1909 specifically as a "propaganda organ." Its primary goal was the collection and dissemination of educational materials

---


11 Hagen, in the Ruhr, was the hometown of the important patron and collector of modern art and architecture Karl Ernst Osthaus and his Folkwang Museum. Since 1904 Osthaus had worked to develop an experimental artist’s community on the outskirts of Hagen, based in part on the Mathildenhöhe in Darmstadt as well as on garden city principles, but completely private. Osthaus hired the architects Peter Behrens, Henry van de Velde, J.M.L. Lauweriks, as well as Walter Gropius and Bruno Taut to design some of the most important houses and public buildings in Hagen. Other designs were commissioned from Josef Hoffmann and August Endell. See Peter Stressig, "Hohenhagen: Experimentierfeld modernen Bauens," in *Karl Ernst Osthaus, Leben und Werk*, ed. Herta Hesse-Frielinghaus (1971), pp. 385-510. Behne observed later about Behrens’ house at Hagen that it "had more to do with reduction than production, more with graphics than architecture. But there was in this work an unmistakable hint of a modern attitude . . . a pleasure in concise, precise, technical form"; Behne, *Der moderne Zweckbau* (1926); a slightly different translation in *The Modern Functional Building*, ed. Rosemarie Haag Bletter (1996), p.105.
about the applied arts reform movement. The museum specialized in the creation of traveling exhibits that toured cities and towns all over Germany and Europe, and even eight cities in America. The museum thus acted as a defacto "mobile" Werkbund museum.

Another important part of the Werkbund propaganda machine was its publishing program, in which Behne was involved. DWB members decided early on not to maintain their own journal, but instead to propagate their message through established, large-circulation daily newspapers and art journals, where high-profile members could easily command space that reached a broad audience. As a result, one of the first tangible manifestations of the Werkbund, besides printing its own governing structure and rules of conduct, was the establishment of a Werkbund publicity office, the "Illustration and News Center" (*Illustrations- und Nachrichtenzentrale*). More than a

---


14 The formation of a press center is first announced in *Deutscher Werkbund, Satzung* (1908), pp. 40-41, Werkbund Archiv, ADK 1-39/08. After being approved at the 2nd annual DWB meeting in Frankfurt in Oct. 1909, an *Illustrations-Zentrale* was announced to all member is a draft Rundschreiben of Jan. 12, 1910, Anlage 2, ADK 1-
press and public relations office for the Werkund, the center distributed photographs and factual information about all manner of high-quality design, especially to popular periodicals and newspapers.\textsuperscript{15}

In 1910 the collection of the \textit{Illustrationszentrale} was subsumed in a new "Center for Photographs and Slides" (\textit{Photographien- und Diapositivzentrale}), the result of a three-way partnership of the Werkbund, Osthaus' new Deutsches Museum, and the renowned Berlin photographer Franz Stoedtner.\textsuperscript{16} The center pooled the photo collections of all three founding institutions. In addition it actively collected and photographed high-quality graphics and images from books, periodicals, and contemporary ephemera such as posters and advertising. Finally, it commissioned Stoedtner and his photographers to document the most important contemporary architecture and industrial facilities in Germany and neighboring countries, including Berlage's Amsterdam stock exchange. It made all these photographs available to the press, including to Behne, and to the qualified public, for publications, lectures, and

\begin{flushright}
60/10c, also in KEO Archiv DWB 1/45, and the letter of Apr. 23, 1910, ADK 1-60/10b, also KEO DWB 1/51. This Illustrations-Zentrale was dissolved after the world's fair in the summer of 1910 in Brussels, where the DWB exhibited much of its work in photo form and made catalogues available; see \textit{Vetrauliche Mitteilungen} (Jan. 1911) ADK 1-47/11. The formation of a photo section at Osthaus' museum is reported in the Verhandlungsbericht of the 2nd annual meeting (1909), pp. 23-25, ADK 1-44/109.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{15} The professional journals, by contrast, usually solicited the artists directly for materials.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{16} On the \textit{Diapositivzentrale} see Sabine Röder, "Propaganda für ein neues Bauen," in Moderne Baukunst (1994), pp. 8-17; and Katrin Renken, "Von der 'Photographien und Diapositivzentrale' zum Bildarchiv," in Deutsches Museum für Kunst in Handel und Gewerbe, ed. Michael Fehr (1998), pp. 323-342. The legacy of this organization is the important German photo archive Foto Marburg.
\end{flushright}
Many of these images were used in the Werkbund’s most successful publicity effort, a series of yearbooks (Jahrbücher) published for the Werkbund by the publisher and DWB member Diederichs between 1911 and 1915. The first four yearbooks covered the themes of the spiritualization of German production, industrial architecture, transport, and the Cologne Werkbund exhibition of 1914. They provided a popular, branded venue in Germany’s competitive media market for the Werkbund’s elite members to theorize and publicize the debate on Werkbund debates. The yearbooks also served as propaganda for the general public about a "re-education to form," and as handbooks for industrialists and retailers to stimulate good design and offer guidance. In his review of an advance copy of the first yearbook, Die Durchgeistigung der Deutschen Arbeit (The Spiritualization of German Work), Behne praised Diederichs for his reform-minded publishing program, and recommended that "everyone should read it." In 1913 Behne listed the second yearbook, Die Kunst in Industrie und Handel (Art in Industry and Business) as the best art-related book of the

17 The Werkbund published four consecutive yearbooks: Die Durchgeistigung der der deutschen Arbeit (1912); Die Kunst in Industrie und Handel (1913); Der Verkehr (1914); Deutsche Form im Kriegsjahr: Die Ausstellung Köln 1914 (1915); and later Kriegsgräber im Felde und Daheim (1917); and Handwerkliche Kunst in alter und neuer Zeit (1920). Print runs of the famous yearbooks (Jahrbuch) were 10,000 in 1912, 12,000 in 1913, and 20,000 in 1914, with copies distributed to all members, given away as prizes in schools, and sold in bookstores. The first two have recently been reprinted (1999 and 2000), with identical forwards and afterwards in both English and German by Bernd Nicolai and Frederic Schwartz, providing a good introduction to their publishing history and influence.

year, praising its orientation to the future as opposed to criticism of the past as well as its pedagogical method of using many photographs and short essays rather than drawn-out theoretical essays. The easy-to-understand format, as well as the wide distribution of the books by the Werkbund positioned the association at the center of Germany’s artistic reform efforts.

Located in Berlin, the defacto press capitol of Germany, rather than in the Dresden Werkbund headquarters, the publicity offices were coordinated by Fritz Hellwag, the editor of the Kunstgewerbeblatt; Robert Breaur, the art editor of the Socialist daily Vorwärts; and Max Osborn, the art editor of the Vossische Zeitung—all publications for which Behne wrote. By April 1912, the Werkbund’s ever-increasing emphasis on developing and publicizing reform agendas and programs propelled the organization to relocate its entire operations from Dresden-Hellerau, to Berlin. The Werkbund was thus firmly seated in the center of both the German press and German culture.

Behne was invited to become a Werkbund member in late spring 1913, probably

---

19 Behne, "Moderne Kunstbücher," Die Tat 5.2, no. 9 (Dec. 1913): 936-942. Diederichs had sent him printers proofs of the yearbook in May; see postcard Behne to Taut (May 22, 1913) BTA-01-469, Bruno Taut Archiv, AdK. On the yearbooks, see the introduction by Nicolai and the postscript by Schwartz in the reprints of the 1912 and 1913 yearbooks; Campbell, German Werkbund, p. 37; Jefferies, Politics and Culture, p. 105.

20 Schwartz wrote, "To no small extent, the Werkbund owes its important role as one of the cornerstones on which accounts of modernism have been constructed precisely to these publications"; Schwartz, "Postscript," p. 18.
as a result of his collaborations with Taut. Membership gave him a free copy of the annual yearbook and easy access to the large collection of publicity and illustration materials in the Diapositivzentrale and by Osthaus' Museum. Above all, however, Werkbund membership provided the young scholar-critic contact with the most important applied arts and architectural thinkers of the day. These contacts granted him access to subjects, inspiration, and to the publications through which he would earn his living. Membership in the elite organization also conferred status. As early as January of 1914 Behne added the initials "DWB" (Deutscher Werkbund) to his printed letterhead when corresponding with important affiliated architects such as Gropius.

Werkbund membership boosted Behne's stature as one of the leading art critics of the day. It gave him ready access to people, ideas, and graphic material, all of which allowed him to publish timely and insightful articles in a variety of sources. The

---

21 As the Werkbund archives were lost in World War II, we do not know the exact date or sponsors of Behne's Werkbund membership; though Behne was listed in the membership list of the 1913 yearbook that came out mid-year; "Mitgliedsliste," Die Kunst in Industrie und Handel. Bernd Lindner has suggested less persuasively that Behne became involved with the Werkbund through connections to the more conservative and populist Dürerbund and its program of aesthetic reform of life; Lindner, "Mut machen zu Phantasie und Sachlichkeit," Bildende Kunst 33, no. 7 (1985): 292. Taut had become a member of the Werkbund in 1910, probably in connection with his friendships and ongoing engagements with Theodor Fischer and Osthaus, both founding members of the Werkbund. Taut's Harkort Turbinenhaus was publicized in Der Industriebau 1 (1910): 83-87; and in the first Werkbund yearbook Die Durchgeistigung. His Leipzig pavilion was publicized in Der Industriebau 4, no. 7 (July 15, 1913): 150-156; and in the second Werkbund yearbook. His Glashaus was published in the fourth yearbook Deutsche Form im Kriegsjahr, pp. 78-82.

22 Behne letter to Gropius, Jan. 14, 1914. By July 1914, and at least until 1921, Behne had the initials printed on his letterhead. See Behne letters to Gropius in Bauhaus-Archiv.
Werkbund gave him both opportunity and audience. Behne’s critical output quickened following his Werkbund membership. By the summer of 1913 Behne was publishing on a wider range of topics and in more venues than before. His pieces moved from a primary focus on painting and fine art, to extensive investigations of all the applied arts, including posters, graphic arts, advertising displays, and architecture—especially industrial architecture—all important areas of debate and reform within the Werkbund.

Categorizing Industrial Architecture

Behne’s extensive writing on industrial architecture that ensued in the wake of his Werkbund membership not only profoundly boosted his own reputation as a critic, but also shaped his ideas and eventually had a major impact on modern architecture. Second only to garden cities, Behne highlighted industrial architecture as a primary means of renewing modern architecture and, by extension, modern life. Behne did not consider factories to be inherently endowed with modern "social conscience" that he had ascribed to garden cities. Their significance lay instead in their associations with production and the maintenance of the flow of the most up-to-date items for the

---

23 See, for example, Behne, "Psychologie des Käufers," Frankfurter Zeitung, n.177 (June 28, 1913): 2; Behne, "Kino und Plakatkunst," Bild und Film 2, no. 10 (July 1913): 235-237; Adolf Bruno [pseud. Behne], "Berliner Denkmäler," Vorwärts 35, no. 127 (July 3, 1913): 508-509. Behne’s regular column "Bühnenkunst" in Sozialistische Monatshefte, which began July 24, 1913, as well as Behne’s other forays into film and theater criticism beginning that same summer were more likely part of an on-going interest in Berlin’s avant-garde literary scene than connected to his Werkbund membership.
modern consumer and industrial economy. Factories were bastions of capitalist production and symbols of economic power of the owner class over the worker. They were monumental signs of the constantly renewing capitalist economy, even of modernity itself. As physical spaces of work, hulking presences in the cityscape, and the home space for working-class unions and political organizations, industrial buildings caught the attention of many socially-oriented and Marxist critics, even if they had little influence over factory designs. The modernity of industrial buildings, the urban and corporate symbolism bestowed upon them, and the dramatic power of their scale and engineering feats stimulated art and architecture critics to consider them the modern counterparts to the communal ideal of the Gothic cathedral.

The problem of finding contemporary, appropriate, artistically inspired designs for industrial building, Behne claimed, had only been around since the turn-of-the-century, since the time that architects became convinced that every building should "express its own purpose, function and life."²⁴ German architects had begun to discuss the architectural, and not just engineering, implications of industrial materials and new technologies during the nineteenth century. By 1902 Muthesius had promoted the iconic and aesthetic value of technology as part of the creation of a new, more objective and functional approach to all architectural design.²⁵ Before 1907 when the Werkbund

²⁴ Behne, "Heutige Industriebauten," Velhagen und Klasings Monatshefte 28, no. 5 (Jan. 1914): 53, for this and the following.

²⁵ Hermann Muthesius claimed that the exact date that Germans learned to appreciate the beauty of the machine and engineering works was 1902, at the Düsseldorf exhibition; Muthesius, "Der Weg und das Ziel des Kunstgewerbes," in Kunstgewerbe und Architektur (1907) p. 14-15. See also Muthesius, Stilarchitektur und
was created, Scheffler and Naumann had persuasively argued that industrial speed and precision, and the functional character of industrial architecture, especially steel construction, should be fundamental in determining a contemporary aesthetic. As Behne pointed out, however, industrial architecture did not become a truly public and socially relevant issue worthy of media attention until Behrens’ began constructing factories for the AEG in Berlin after 1908 [Figure 6.1] Behne acknowledged that the public had little interest in theory: it "only concerns itself with things when its interest is awakened through something gripping, something amazing," which the Behrens’ AEG work was perceived to be. The publicity generated by the AEG, the Werkbund, and Behrens himself after the completion of the AEG turbine factory in Berlin launched a particularly intense discussion on industrial architecture. Much of this discourse was contained in the new periodical Der Industriebau, which began publication in January 1910, and which Behne followed closely. One of the most persistent themes in this

---

**Baukunst; Muthesius, "Kunst und Maschine," Dekorative Kunst 9, no. 4 (Jan. 1902): 141-147; and Muthesius, Die Einheit der Architektur (1908).**

26 Friedrich Naumann, "Die Kunst im Zeitalter der Maschine," Der Kunstwart 17, no. 20 (July 1904): 317-327; Scheffler, Moderne Baukunst, particularly chapter 1, "Stein und Eisen." Another crucial early work highlighting the modernity of steel construction at this time was Alfred Gotthold Meyer, Eisenbauten. Ihre Geschichte und Aesthetik (1907), republished (1997).

27 Behne, "Heutige Industriebauten, p. 53.

28 On AEG, Behrens, factories, and publicity, see Anderson, Peter Behrens; and above all Tilmann Buddensieg and Henning Rogge, Industriekultur: Peter Behrens und die AEG, 1907-1914 (1979). Buddensieg includes an anthology of Behrens’ theoretical essays and an anthology of press reviews of the AEG buildings.

29 Der Industriebau was launched by industrial architect and Werkbund
journal, and indeed throughout the Werkbund discussion, was that art would come to the service of industry to create more beautiful buildings that would have positive, economic, social, and cultural effects. 30

Already early in 1909 the Werkbund, in association with the Illustrationszentrale and the Heimatschutzbund, had begun to collect photographic material for a major exhibition on factory architecture. Members were called upon to submit examples that showed the ways in which industrial architecture embodied the essence of modern life and could be used to generate other nonindustrial designs as well. 31 This collection of photographs was substantially expanded after it was merged into the Diapositivzentrale, and subsequently included in two of the Deutsches Museum’s most

member Emil Beutinger. It included extensive reviews of Werkbund member factories, including the AEG, and theoretical essays by Werkbund members, including Behrens. Beutinger was from Heilbronn, a leading center of Werkbund activists. He had strong ties to Naumann and the Werkbund president and art publisher F. Bruckmann. On Der Industriebau see Jefferies, Politics and Culture, p. 107. Behne’s papers included several clippings from this magazine; see Behne Nachlaß, Bauhaus-Archiv.


31 Wolf Dohrn, "Eine Ausstellung architektonisch guter Fabrikbauten,” Der Industriebau 1, no. 1 (Jan. 15, 1910): 1-2. The exhibit mentioned here traveled primarily in the industrial Ruhr valley and Saxony, but also to the 1910 Ton- Zement- und Kalkausstellung in Berlin. The DWB collection of factory architecture was organized by a Prof. W. Franz, of the TH Charlottenburg, presumably in coordination with the contemporary "Press and Illustration Center." The factories submitted were evaluated by a commission comprised on Poelzig, Riemerschmid, Wagner, Urbahn and Dohrn; and reconstituted in 1910 to include Osthaus, Muthesius, Franz and Paquet. See references in Jefferies, Politics and Culture, p. 106; Müller, Kunst und Industrie, p. 46; Campbell, German Werkbund, p. 39 n21; and Wilhelm, Walter Gropius, p. 127n121.
important traveling exhibits. The exhibit "Moderne Baukunst" comprised some of the new photos by Stoedtner, and the "Industriebauten" exhibit organized by Walter Gropius featured German and American industrial buildings. Photos from these exhibits were circulated even more widely when they were published in the 1912 and 1913 Werkbund yearbooks. Thanks to the immense popularity and circulation of the yearbooks, images of the industrial architecture that Gropius had curated soon appeared in magazines and art journals all across Germany and Europe.\textsuperscript{32} When Le Corbusier published his airbrushed versions in \textit{L'Esprit nouveau} and in \textit{Vers une architecture} after World War I, they became icons of modern architecture.\textsuperscript{33}

Although Behne had studied in Berlin, and had written on Behrens' medieval-inspired industrial architecture, he began contributing professionally to the debate on industrial architecture only in 1913, after joining the Werkbund. The following year he met up with his classmate Gropius again, and promptly began praising his work. If Behne's thinking on apartment houses and garden cities had been shaped primarily

\textsuperscript{32} Paul Schultze-Naumburg, \textit{Die Gestaltung der Landschaft durch die Menschen} 3 vols. (1916-17), the last volumes in his "Kulturarbeiten" series; and Werner Lindner, and Georg Steinmetz, \textit{Die Ingenieurbauten in ihrer guten Gestaltung} (1923), co-published by the Heimatshutzbund and the Werkbund, were only two of many publications that developed from the early Werkbund collection of industrial architecture.

through his relationship with Taut, his criticism on industrial architecture evolved out of his involvement with the German Werkbund and Gropius. Gropius had been an early advocate of standardization and prefabrication for worker housing since at least 1909, and was also familiar with the Expressionist art scene in Berlin. But Behne’s interest focused primarily on Gropius’ advocacy of industrial buildings and methods in association with the Werkbund. Behne saw in the industrial architecture of both Taut and Gropius not only an architectural expansion of an Expressionist mindset—an emphasis on "artistic Sachlichkeit" and the large scale use of that utopian building material glass—but also part of his Socialist agenda of linking the new art and architecture with communal values and the working-class. For Behne, factory design was as much of a social and political act, as an artistic and technical one.

As early as May 1913 Behne began collecting photographs of industrial

---

34 As early as 1906, after only one semester of architectural studies, Gropius began building simple buildings on his uncle Erich’s farm in Pomerania, including around 1909 some standardized worker housing. While working for Behrens and witnessing the design and the construction of the AEG factories in 1909-10, Gropius had proposed to Walther Rathenau and the AEG build prefabricated worker housing. In 1912, while working on the Fagus factory, he designed more worker housing for his uncle in Pomerania. In 1912-13 Gropius and his partner Adolf Meyer designed a group of lower-class worker homes near Wittenberge. Also in 1910 Gropius had become involved with Alma Mahler, the wife of the famous Viennese composer Gustav Mahler, and through Mahler, he became familiar with Expressionism and got to know the work of Oskar Kokoschka, whose work he saw in the Sturm gallery in Berlin in 1912. See Reginald Isaacs, Walter Gropius. Der Mensch und sein Werk (1983), pp. 68-74, 93-96, 98, 115-117; in the abridged English version, Isaacs, Walter Gropius. An Illustrated Biography of the Creator of the Bauhaus (1991); also Winfried Nerdinger’s catalogue of complete works, Der Architekt Walter Gropius 2nd ed. (1996), pp. 38, 214-215, 220-222; and Annemarie Jaeggi, Adolf Meyer: der zweite Mann (1994), pp. 228-231, 236-239, 255, 276-279, 281.
buildings by Taut, Hans Erlwein of Dresden, Richard Riemerschmid of Hellerau, and Behrens in order to prepare lectures and articles on "Modern Industrial Buildings." One version of this research work, the essay "Romantics, Emotionalists, and Rationalists in Modern Industrial Building," was published in the October 1913 issue of the prestigious Preußische Jahrbücher. Modern industrial architecture, he claimed in the article, had become a topic of truly populist interest that required further investigation and critique. Behne commented that media-savvy companies were realizing the power of print advertising in the professional and general press, particularly the popular illustrated weekly magazines, and strategically chose good design for their products as a photograph-able method of building a corporate identity. The very existence of the media, Behne argued, helped promote good design. As a critic using Werkbund illustrations, Behne became part of the publicity campaign to inspire companies to improve designs and to disseminate these designs to a mass audience.

For Behne, modern industrial architecture was by definition an architecture that

---

35 In a postcard to Taut from May 22, 1913, Behne refers to photos of Taut’s work and of other industrial architecture for an article and a lecture with the title "Moderne Industriebauten." He also asks Taut his opinion about three categories of industrial architects "Romantiker, Pathetiker and Zweckkünstler"; postcard in BTA-01-469, Bruno Taut Archiv, AdK. There are also references to an article with the same name in the Socialist newspaper Vorwärts Beilage "Sonntag" n. 28 (1913), which I have not been able to locate. See Behne, "Romantiker."

36 Behne, "Romantiker," p. 171; Behne, "Heutige Industriebauten," p. 53. Scheffler too had claimed that model factories were even becoming tourist attractions; Karl Scheffler, "Moderne Industriebauten" Vossische Zeitung (Sept. 26, 1912); revised in Scheffler, Architektur der Grossstadt (1913).

37 Behne, "Fabrikbau als Reklame," Das Plakat 11, no. 6 (June 1920): 275-276.
was a "true and convincing expression of its purpose, function, and life within. . . . The common goal is to create a body for the inner life that is organic, expressive and convincing."³⁸ Borrowing from his contemporaneous critiques of Expressionist art and Taut’s architecture, which he also characterized as "organic"–purposive in relation to a distinct goal, and lively as a product of coordinated functions–Behne wanted more than a Werkbund-like coordination of art and industry. He sought a spiritual, integral, and "artistic Sachlichkeit" in industrial design.³⁹

Behne was critical of structures that disguised the functional character of the building or dressed it in a fashionable style. He dismissed the Moorish style waterworks at Sanssouci and contemporary structures such as the Berlin subway stations at Dahlem and Podbielski-Allee, which took the form of a thatched roof farmhouse and a medieval castle.⁴⁰ Historical tradition, he claimed, was "dangerous" for industrial architects, as industrial structures were necessarily required to be a part of "modernity," to be "modern . . . [and] absolutely new."⁴¹ In this respect, he claimed, America in particular had an advantage, as it "lacked traditions" to fall back on and was

³⁸ Behne, "Romantiker," p. 171.


⁴⁰ The pumphouse at Sanssouci was built in 1841 by Ludwig Persius; the Dahlem U-bahn station was built by F. and W. Hennings and the Podbielskiallee by H. Schweitzer, both 1912-13, as part of the subway expansion into Berlin’s Southwest suburbs. For images and discussion see Jefferies, Politics and Culture, pp. 94-98.

forced to be inventive and contemporary. Taut had exclaimed similarly "Die Kunst ist in America nicht zu Hause"; see Taut, "Kleinhausbau," p. 10.

Behne exclaimed that American industrial architecture was still the best in the world, and that an overseas study trip should be obligatory for German architects. He felt that American grain elevators, whether they were designed by engineers or artists, had a definite "beauty," due in large part to the extreme reduction of forms, and that they should serve as models for German architects.

In his article, Behne distinguished three types of architects creating industrial architecture. All were equal in talent and functional approach, and thus all "equally modern." But, added Behne, they could be ranked by their conception of the "essence, value, and soul" of modern industry. The first type he identified was the "Romantic" (Romantiker), exemplified by Richard Riemerschmid and his factory at Hellerau Garden City. [Figure 4.6] Behne seems to have drawn this label from Werkbund discussions. A

---

42 Taut had exclaimed similarly "Die Kunst ist in America nicht zu Hause"; see Taut, "Kleinhausbau," p. 10.

43 Although Behne explicitly mentions the images of American grain elevators published in the Werkbund yearbook, he does not mention Gropius in this Sept. 1913 article. He did mention that Behrens had made a study trip to America in 1912, though did not mention Berlage, who had traveled to America in 1910 after having discovered Wright’s Wasmuth portfolio, and had given a lecture on American architecture, including on Wright, at Osthause's museum on March 25, 1912; Peter Stressig, "Walter Gropius," in Hesse-Frielinghaus, Karl Ernst Osthause, p. 505n10. Behne’s reference to the lack of traditions in America had been a common trope since at least the turn-of-the-century; see Jaeggi, Fagus, pp. 49-52.

year earlier Gropius had described Riemerschmid’s factory as "non-sachlich peasant-romanticism." Behne criticized the Romantics for putting an overly calm and kind face on the power and starkness of modern industry. They attempted to make factories cozy, with a village-like character, or integrated them artificially, tableau-like, into an existing context. For the twenty-nine year old Behne, Riemerschmid in particular represented the conservative approach of an older generation from Bavaria that refused to acknowledge the youthfulness of metropolitan life and industry in the north. A few weeks earlier, Behne had derisively labeled him an "Impressionist."

The second type of industrial architect was the "Emotionalist" (Pathetiker). Here Behne singled out Behrens and what he considered the architect’s overly dramatic passion for the heroic, pathos-laden aspect of modern industry. Behrens had sought to elevate industrial architecture to a cultural product through his writings as well as a series of built works that united convention and new forms of expression. In his early


46 Behne, "Impressionismus und Expressionismus."

47 As Stanford Anderson has noted, the German word "Pathetiker" is awkward to translate. According to the Oxford Dictionary of Art, in ancient Greek art "pathos," the quality of being emotional or transient, was often contrasted with "ethos," implying permanent or Idealist. This idea is often wrongly attributed to Aristotle’s Aesthetics, but was actually a part of Greek rhetoric; see also chapter 4. Although Anderson uses the term "patheticist" to describe the emotional art of van de Velde, the English label "Emotionalist" corresponds more closely with Behne’s ideas, as does "Rationalists" for the German "Logiker"; Anderson, Peter Behrens, pp. 6ff. esp. n.13.

48 Stanford Anderson has argued effectively for interpreting Behrens’ career as an on-going attempt to balance the use of Expression and Convention in modern
exhibition pavilions Behrens had employed simple, stark geometric forms that Behne
had related to the conventions of the Tuscan Gothic style.49 In his popular AEG
factories later on, Behrens’ forms became ever more reductive and monumental,
combining exposed brick and concrete with occasional Doric forms in an effort to
synthesize the technological forces of modern life with the artistic willfulness needed to
create strong forms.50 [Figure 6.1] Behrens employed unified, massive forms with
minimal detail or ornament that he claimed could be better appreciated from the high
speed of metropolitan life. Convinced that all genuine monumental art needed to
synthesize the core values and will of a people at any given moment, Behrens
attempted to "crystallize" modern materials, techniques, and needs into aesthetically
willed, idealized forms that could be symbols of industry, the nation and the era.51

49 Behne had written his dissertation on the Tuscan Gothic, and wrote his first
architectural article on Behrens in 1911, "Peter Behrens und die toskanische Architektur
des 12. Jh," Kunstgewerbeblatt N.F.23, no. 3 (Dec. 1911): 45-50. It is unclear how or
when Behne got to know Behrens’ work, though his fame in Berlin at the time would
make him hard to miss. It is possible he became familiar with the architect in the course
of his architecture studies 1905-1907, or his art history studies 1907-1911. See also
chapter 1 above.

50 Behrens wrote extensively on the topic of "Kunst und Technik." See the essays
on the topic assembled in Buddensieg, Industriekultur, D274-D291, especially the
lecture "Kunst und Technik" first delivered in May 1910, published in Der Industriebau
1, no. 8 (Aug. 15, 1910): 176-180, and 1, no. 9 (Sept. 15, 1910): lxxxi-lxxxv.

51 The summary of Behrens’ theory below is taken from Anderson, Peter
Behrens, chaps. 5-8, particularly pp. 104ff, 145ff, 161ff, 165ff.; Anderson, "Behrens’
Changing Concept of Art and Life," Architectural Design 39 (Feb. 1969): 72-78; and
Buddensieg, Industriekultur. Behrens, like Behne and many others in their generations,
borrowed from Riegl the idea of Kunstwollen, and that architecture, which unites art and
life, is the primary and strongest evocation of zeitgeist, and with it that architects
They expressed a combination of power and simplicity, of artistic control and technological precision, of "Kultur" and "Zivilization." But for Behne, true art, including good industrial buildings, should be less willful, less self-consciously symbolic of grand culture, less emotionally dramatic.

Behne did credit Behrens with raising popular consciousness of industrial architecture, and ascribed Behrens’ great reputation to the "contemporary social relevance" of his industrial buildings. His architecture resonated with a large percentage of Berlin’s population as an expression of contemporary life. The Berlin architect’s relevance was especially apparent, Behne felt, in comparison to the work of the Viennese "aristocrat" Otto Wagner, whom Behne claimed was primarily focused on purely "material" issues such as tectonics, technique, and honesty of materials. He also noted that Behrens had been praised in the media for expressing the "nobility of work," "the dynamism of the times," and the "rhythm of modern industry" in his factories.

The third, and highest category of industrial architect that Behne identified was the "Rationalist" (Logiker). This category received his greatest praise. Exemplified by Poelzig and Taut, Behne felt the work of these architects came closest to the vital spirit pointed the way to any new era.

52 Behrens, "Einfluß von Zeit und Raumausnutzung auf moderne Formentwicklung," in Der Verkehr (1914), p. 7-10, the 3rd Werkbund yearbook.

53 "Den Ruhm, den etwa Peter Behrens genießt, heftet sich offenbar besonders an die soziale Zeitgemäßigkeit seiner Bauten"; Behne, "Geh. Baurat Otto Wagner-Wien," Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration 35, no. 5 (Feb. 1915): 382. Whyte has suggested that Taut’s early apartment buildings were influenced by Wagner’s architecture.
of the American industrial buildings. Poelzig’s water tower in Posen (1911) and chemical factory in Luban (1912) expressed to Behne a freedom and clarity very different from the ponderous and representational work of Behrens. [Figures 6.2 and 6.3] He felt Poelzig’s work exuded an unmitigated Sachlichkeit, a rational objectivity that seemed at first glance to deny all potential for "artistic" creative expression. Upon further observation and reflection, however, Behne explained that he felt ever more drawn in by a convincing Expressionist esthetic, by willed artistic forms that appeared ever more pure and powerful: "amazing . . . they truly took my breath away."

In a similar vein Behne wrote that Taut’s Monument to Iron pavilion in Leipzig had not over-dramatized steel "as a mute, strong and brutal superpower," but rather had presented it as "a material sent by the engineer and made more intelligent [by the architect], becoming the foundation for some of the most accomplished modern art

---


55 In a 1909 lecture to the Werkbund that was published in 1911, Poelzig himself had written that industrial buildings, unlike so much contemporary architecture, should be developed without historical precedent. Their architectural form should be direct, sachlich, and functional, developed logically, efficiently and economically out of requirements of material and time, subservient to the demands of the engineer and businessman. Poelzig’s lecture was read at the October 1909 Werkbund meeting in Frankfurt, was excerpted in Verhandlungsbericht of the 2nd Congress, was later published as "Der neuzeitliche Fabrikbau," Der Industriebau 2, no. 5 (May 1911): 100-106; republished in Julius Posener, ed., Hans Poelzig: Gesammelte Schriften (1970), pp. 38-42; and translated as Hans Poelzig, Reflections on his Life and Work (1992), p. 46-50. Similar thoughts were expressed in Josef August Jux, "Der moderne Fabrikbau," Der Industriebau 1, no. 4 (Apr. 1910): 77-83; and Mackowsky, "Der Industriebau und die moderne Baukunst" Der Industriebau 4, no. 8 (Aug. 15, 1913): 177-179.

56 Postcard Behne to Taut (May 22, 1913) BTA-01-469, Bruno Taut Archiv, AdK.
works. 

Rather than romanticize or monumentalize industry, Behne felt these "Rationalist" architects reflected industry "simply, naturally and obviously," creating in an organic way buildings that "grow naturally, from the inside." Behne’s argument about Werkbund-related industrial buildings was an extension of his contemporaneous writings on Expressionist art and Taut’s Expressionist architecture. He was thus able to interpret the industrial works of Poelzig and Taut as totally modern, functional, rational and *sachlich*, but still filled with an artistic "inner necessity" and a sense of humanity that raised them from mere mechanisms to the level of "organic" artworks.

Behne’s division of the contemporary industrial architecture scene into three groups highlights the critic’s unique ability to cut through a myriad of examples, to create an overview of a broad range of material, and to organize it into distinct, understandable categories that acted simultaneously as critique of past work and as guide to the future. Following his own ideals of a "scholar-critic," Behne’s writing had

---


The categories were "pathetisch," "lebemännisch," and "sachlich," with 60 "Romantics" having only a minor presence this time. Behne disliked most of the premiated designs, noting that competitions with a large jury almost always result in compromise, and impersonal conventional designs. Behne noted that "as expected," a very conservative, historical design was premiated by the Kaiser’s art commission; Behne, "Die Botschaft in Washington," März 7, no. 3 (Sept. 20, 1913): 429-431.

In a later review of over one hundred designs for the German embassy in Washington Behne distinguished three similar trends: the "playboys," who wanted to create opulent palaces for diplomats without representing anything; the "monumentalists," who sought to represent German national pride boldly with forests of columns; and the "sachlich" architects who sought to find a middle-ground that both represented Germany and created a compassionate, humane residence for the ambassador.60 Ten years later, in his famous book Der moderne Zweckbau, Behne would elaborate a similar matrix of functional form by dividing all modern architects once again into three groups again: the functionalists, the rationalists, and the utilitarians.61 These categories allowed contemporary architects, patrons, and the public to differentiate the many overlapping ideas of functionalism and objectivity in a manner that remains insightful to this day.

Behne summarized for a general audience many of his observations and critiques on industrial architecture in a his article "Today’s Industrial Buildings," that

60 The categories were "pathetisch," "lebemännisch," and "sachlich," with "Romantics" having only a minor presence this time. Behne disliked most of the premiated designs, noting that competitions with a large jury almost always result in compromise, and impersonal conventional designs. Behne noted that "as expected," a very conservative, historical design was premiated by the Kaiser’s art commission; Behne, "Die Botschaft in Washington," März 7, no. 3 (Sept. 20, 1913): 429-431.

61 Behne, Der moderne Zweckbau.
appeared in the popular family magazine Velhagen & Klassings Monatshefte in January 1914.\textsuperscript{62} [Figure 6.4] Taking a more conversational tone than he did in the highbrow Preußische Jahrbücher he reiterated the three main types of industrial architecture and some of the most important architects working in Germany. A profusion of illustrations, many taken from the Werkbund yearbooks, also made graphic for a much wider audience the central concepts.

When he republished a nearly identical version of this popular article in the business journal Die Welt des Kaufmanns (The World of the Businessman) in June 1914, he was clearly targeting yet another audience: factory or business owners.\textsuperscript{63} [Figure 6.5] Although Behne did not alter his text to cater to the different but still lay audience, he did change the selection and order of the images, and thus the tone and force of his message.\textsuperscript{64} In the illustrated family magazine Behne opened with a dramatic, attention-grabbing image of a Montreal grain elevators borrowed from Gropius' exhibit collection. Recognizing the power of images both to draw in and educate his lay audience, he also included a larger overall number of images. In the necessarily more conservative, establishment journal that catered to businessmen, Behne opened with more familiar images on German soil: the Munich central market by Richard Schachner

\textsuperscript{62} Behne, "Heutige Industriebauten."


\textsuperscript{64} The publication of the grain elevators by Behne is not mentioned by Banham, even though this was probably the first of many times this photo was republished before being included in Le Corbusier’s Vers une architecture; Banham, Concrete Atlantis.
(1912), and an uncharacteristically staid image of Poelzig’s chemical factory at Luban.

With this more educated readership, he let his words make his argument more subtly than images, which might be read in very different ways by owners than the public.

Who made this editorial decision remains open to speculation. In both cases, however, the medium and message were carefully coordinated to maximize the impact on the different audiences.

Dry Technique and Pioneering Fantasy: Walter Gropius

In his articles on industrial architecture, Behne frequently discussed the Fagus shoe-last factory by his architecture school classmate Gropius, who was by then one of the Werkbund’s rising stars in the discourse on industrial architecture.65 [Figure 6.6] By January of 1914, Behne had read Gropius' theoretical essays on industrial architecture in the first two yearbooks, and obtained his first photos of the Fagus factory from the Werkbund press office. At this point, he wrote to Gropius’ Berlin office using a circumspect tone and claiming to know only Gropius’ Fagus factory. He requested photographs of other recent work that he could include in an article commissioned by

65 The literature on Gropius (1883-1969) is extensive. For the issues discussed here, see in reverse chronological order: Jaeggi, Fagus; Winfried Nerdinger’s catalogue of complete works, Der Architekt Walter Gropius 2nd ed. (1996); Isaacs, Walter Gropius (1983 and 1993); Wilhelm, Walter Gropius; Marco de Michelis, ed. "Walter Gropius 1907/1934," in Rassegna 5, no. 15/3 (Sept. 1983) special issue; Herbert Weber, Walter Gropius und das Faguswerk (1961); Giulio Carlos Argan, Gropius und das Bauhaus (1962, orig. 1951); Sigfried Giedion, Walter Gropius (1954, orig. 1933). The Fagus factory and the model Werkbund factory at Cologne were both design by Gropius in partnership with Adolf Meyer.
the Munich popular family magazine Zeit im Bild on new architecture in Berlin. At Gropius’ request, they met a few days later at his atelier. Until Behne’s death, they would vacillate between being best friends, professional accomplices, and sparring partners in the development of modern architecture in Germany.

Although the Gropius office was brimming with new work and had recently completed several projects, Behne published only two photos. The first was a photo of an ornate chair and desk designed for a Berlin client. The second was a reproduction of a provocatively modern charcoal drawing of the phase-two extension to the Fagus factory with the now iconic, though monumental, brick entry facade, which Behne was the first to publish. [Figure 6.7]

---

66 Behne, letter to Office of Walter Gropius, (Jan. 15, 1914), Gropius papers, #123 (= Arbeitsrat für Kunst. cf. Harvard Catalogue II) = GN 10/201, Bauhaus-Archiv. The requested images were used in Behne, "Berliner Architektur," Zeit im Bild. The letter is cited in Franciscono, Walter Gropius, p. 106, who claims (without evidence) that Behne and Gropius met just before Behne wrote the letter. The critic and the architect may also have encountered each other during their two years studying architecture at the TH in Berlin, 1905-1907; see chapter 1 above.


68 In a letter from Gropius to Behne from Mar. 12, 1914, Gropius mentions sending the photo of the writing desk for the Mendel apartment in Berlin, with carvings by R. Scheibe; Gropius papers, #123 = GN 10/198, Bauhaus-Archiv, Berlin. The desk is among the furnishings listed as project W169 in Nerdinger, Walter Gropius, p. 295; and the illustration is reproduced in Jaeggi, Adolf Meyer, catalogue no. 141, p. 387. The Fagus drawing published by Behne is now in the Busch-Reisinger Museum at Harvard (BRM-GA 3.1), and is illustrated in the Nerdinger catalogue on p. 37. As far as this author has been able to determine, Behne was the first to publish this (or any) drawing of the Fagus factory extension, which included the iconic, monumental entry facade. Although mentioned obliquely in the Bauhaus correspondence, Behne’s April 1914 article "Berliner Architektur" in Zeit im Bild in which this drawing appears, has to my
In his first published comments on Gropius' work in January 1914, Behne praised him as one of the leaders of the new "artistic" approach to industrial design but placed the architect in the camp of the "monumentalists" around Behrens.\textsuperscript{69} In several lectures and articles Gropius composed in conjunction with his exhibits on industrial architecture, he addressed themes that showed the impact of Behrens: the need to create a "contemporary" aesthetic, a style in keeping with the speed, industrialization and efficiency of the day, and the need to tear down the problematic divisions between art and technology, between architect and engineer.\textsuperscript{70} In the articles he combined his lifelong passion for art as well as the expertise in industrial architecture he had acquired through his work with Behrens and the Werkbund.\textsuperscript{71} Despite the clear influence, Gropius departed from Behrens' ideas in his concern for the worker and other social aspects of industrial architecture--the very concern that motivated Behne.

information not been cited by any previous author and does not show up in any of the standard Gropius bibliographies.

\textsuperscript{69} Behne, "Heutige Industriebauten."

\textsuperscript{70} Although we cannot know for sure which of Gropius' essays Behne had read, they all repeated salient points, and Behne must at least have known what is arguably the most important of the articles, the 1913 essay "Die Entwicklung modernen Industriebaukunst" in the 1913 Werkbund yearbook, which Behne had received in the form of printers proofs from Diederichs directly. Behne had reviewed the yearbook, and had borrowed photographs from it for his article. Gropius' five main essays on industrial architecture before 1914 are summarized in Wilhelm,\textit{ Walter Gropius}, pp. 23ff. Wilhelm argues that Gropius followed Behrens in all his pre-1914 writings; Wilhelm, "Fabrikenkunst: Die Turbinenhalle und was aus ihr wurde," in Buddensieg,\textit{ Industriekultur}, p. 165n54. See also Bauer, "Architektur als Kunst."

\textsuperscript{71} See Anderson,\textit{ Peter Behrens}, p. 306-307 n4; and Isaacs,\textit{ Walter Gropius} (1983) 90-97, for the dates.
In Gropius’ earliest extended essay on industrial architecture, a lecture to the Werkbund held at Hagen in April 1911, he pronounced that a great new architecture could evolve only when it tapped into the spirit and fundamental building problems of the age: "Totally new formal tasks have always been decisive in the creation of the monumental architecture of an age. . . . a new monumental building art today will evolve from the problems presented by technology and industry."72 Later he declared: "Modern life needs new building developments (Bauorganismen) corresponding to the lifestyle of our times."73 Gropius continued his argument by attempting to derive an aesthetic from the program and the spirit of the times. He claimed that during this technical age, an age that focused so much on economics and the maximizing of materials, money, labor and time, it was no longer appropriate to use forms from the past such as the Rococo or Renaissance: "The new forms will not be arbitrarily invented, but will erupt from the life of the time. . . . The energy and economy of modern life will determine the new artistic forms. . . . The new time demands its own spirit: exact forms, the exclusion of all arbitrariness, clear contrasts, an ordering of all parts, the sequencing

72 Gropius, "Monumentale Kunst und Industriebau," his first lecture on industrial architecture, held at Osthaus' Folkwang Museum on April 10, 1911, a transcript of which is available in the Sammlung Gropius, Bauhaus-Archiv, Berlin; published in Wilhelm, Walter Gropius, pp. 116-120; cited here and below from Hartmut Probst and Christian Schädlich, eds. Walter Gropius. Ausgewählte Schriften. 3 vols. Berlin: Ernst, 1968, 1987, 1988, vol. 3, p. 28. Although this lecture was not published until decades later, Gropius repeated most of the central points in all his essays on industrial buildings before World War I.

of all similar parts, and unity of form and color.”

Like Behrens, Gropius believed that industrial buildings could only become truly important cultural artifacts when interpreted by an artist, not just by an engineer. Explicitly citing the art historical and theoretical work of Riegl and Worringer as key to his arguments—as both Behne and Behrens did—Gropius insisted that only "artist-architects" could transform what would otherwise remain "dead material" and mere "calculated form" into buildings would be both integrally related to contemporary life and monumental art. Relying on similar sources to escape from "materialist" theory that saw form in art as a product material and technique, Behrens, Gropius and Behne all focused on the benefits that artistic contributions by architects would bring to industrial building. Industrial architecture, Gropius proposed, provided a perfect challenge to contemporary architect trying to solve the apparent contradictions of contemporary life and art. The functional requirements of factories demanded the most contemporary solutions. Nonetheless, he insisted that the power of the will of the artist, not function, be the primary determinant of form. Here, however, the similarities between Gropius, Behrens, and Behne end.

After additional personal contacts with Gropius and a visit to his model Werkbund factory at the exposition in Cologne, Behne began to differentiate Gropius’

\footnote{Gropius, "Monumentale Kunst und Industriebaur," p. 32; and Gropius, "Sind beim bau," p. 6; also Gropius, "Die Entwicklung moderner Industriebaukunst," p. 17-18; and cited in Wilhelm, Walter Gropius.}

\footnote{Gropius, "Monumentale Kunst und Industriebaur," p. 28. On Gropius’ reliance on Riegl and Worringer, see Wilhelm, Walter Gropius, pp. 26, 30-33.}
work from that of Behrens more clearly. According to Behne, in the Cologne model factory, Gropius,

fortunately avoids a slavish imitation of Behrens’ work. More than that, he [Gropius] recognizes the weaknesses of this artist [Behrens], and is careful not to exaggerate further what already had a forced poignancy. He stays away from the unfortunate schematism in which this pioneer has fallen over time. Gropius sees value not in heavy masses or the cyclops-like muting of forms, but rather in the spiritualization of the material, for which he draws on all the latest resources and innovations of technology.” 76

Although Behne had initially admired Behrens' artistically inspired, Idealist and non-positivist stance that synthesized art and technology, he soon became disillusioned. He confessed to Taut in May 1913, "Behrens is falling ever more out of favor with me." 77

In his search for an innovative architecture that explicitly rejected all he became increasingly critical of the "ponderousness" of Behrens’ "temples of industry." For Behne, Behrens’ pedimented factories inspired by antique monuments had succeeded in simplifying the forms of factories, but only by over-emphasizing "the ponderous, massive and powerful" qualities of modern industry. Continuing with classical metaphors, Behne claimed Behrens had interpreted industry as a "cyclops, as a giant


77 "Von Behrens komme ich immer mehr ab"; postcard Behne to Taut (May 22, 1913), BTA-01-469, Bruno Taut Archiv, AdK. Behne also admitted sheepishly that he did buy Behrens’ "Arbeiter-Möbel" (worker furniture) for his apartment.
whose only expression is thunder and whirlwinds."\textsuperscript{78} Such factories, he wrote, had an
air of true operatic tragedy, "as if [created] under the shadows of Agamemnon and
Aegisth."\textsuperscript{79} For Behne, Behrens was more concerned with glorifying the machine and
representing the power of modern industry, than with creating an honest expression for
industrial architecture. Behne later criticized the "closed and divided" forms of Behrens'
St. Petersburg Embassy in a similar way, labeling it "Impressionist," a style which he
had maligned so vehemently as materialist, capitalist and imperialist.\textsuperscript{80}

To Behne, these famous buildings reflected the materialistic values of the
Wilhelmine era without actually benefitting the worker or creating a communal
architecture for the future.\textsuperscript{81} He felt Behrens' "cathedrals of labor" were monuments of
German industrial power, and not sympathetic with the true "social conscience" he
considered essential to social, political, or artistic reform. Behne then resorted to what
one editor called "misguided party politics."\textsuperscript{82} Behne bluntly condemned Behrens'
designs as having "done nothing at all to alter the wage-slavery of the workers inside."

Although Behne conceded that wages were not the responsibility of the architect, he insisted that Behrens did have the ability "to prevent places of sweat and toil by the masses for their daily bread from appearing as though they were sites of exaltation."

The deep understanding of industrial work that people claimed was embodied in Behrens' buildings was for Behne "merely stone rhetoric, meant to flatter the megalomania of the owners. Their solemn character is actually profanity." Behne explained that the problem was not that art was used to address issues of industry and economics, but "that it is the trademark of a particular kind of art, 'bourgeois' art that favors being pretentious and insincere."

Behne cited Gropius' designs for the 1911 Fagus factory and the model Werkbund office and factory in the 1914 Cologne exhibit as legitimate "breaches" in the bastions of bourgeois monumentality. To be sure, the main entries to Gropius’ two

cover design by Behrens, as well as articles by Muthesius and Friedrich Paulsen, editor of Bauwelt.


84 Behne, "Die Fabrik," p. 486.
factory buildings were still monumental brick facades, their massiveness even emphasized by the incised lines, not unlike Egyptian pylon gates, as both Reyner Banham and Wolfgang Pehnt have observed. In the sculptural ornament that adorned the walls of the model office in Cologne, in the sleek glass walls that wrapped the side facade of the Fagus office wing, and in the glazed corner stairs and interior facade of the Werkbund factory, however, Behne saw a unique combination of art and industrial rationality. They provided Behne with a Werkbund-sanctioned escape from the hegemony of Behrens’ ponderous factory facades. [Figures 6.8 and 6.9]

Although history and even Behne’s later criticism have tended to focus on the austere, sleek walls of glass in Gropius’ pre-war factory buildings, Gropius’ model factory at Cologne was in its own way a collaborative art work between architects, sculptors and artists, not unlike Taut’s nearby Glashaus. Reliefs by Gerhard Marcks and Richard Scheibe of men laboring embellished the porticoes on either facade of the office. Free-standing sculptures by Hermann Haller and Bernhard Hoetger adorned the grounds. Georg Kolbe and Ernst Hass painted the walls and the ceiling of the entry vestibule with abstract and animated Expressionist murals of figures shaping forms. A prominent inscription that read "material awaits its form" provided a mood of optimism about the role of the artist in shaping the future. Expressionist murals by Hans Blanke and Otto Hettner adorn the rooms adjacent to the roof garden with bucolic, almost primitive scenes of workers dancing, drinking and frolicking in the fields. [Figures 6.10,

---

85 Reyner Banham, Theory and Design in the First Machine Age (1960); Pehnt, Expressionstische Architektur, p.42.
6.11, and 6.12] While many had criticized Gropius for his extensive use of applied sculpture in the model factory as inappropriate for the efficiency and functionalism expected of an industrial building, Behne insisted that the experimental nature of an exhibition building made it an appropriate test-site for the young architects’ mandate to "ornament" our lives through architecture. For Behne, even industrial architecture should aspire to be an artform for expressing the human spirit.

Behne felt that Gropius had created "one of the best pieces in the Cologne exhibition," that his work "achieved an appealing mix of dry technique and pioneering fantasy." Although this assessment reminds of the "artistic Sachlichkeit" Behne had identified in Taut’s early work, Behne was critical of Gropius’ use of glass when he compared the model factory to the Glashaus. Whereas Taut had shown how glass might be used in a completely "artistic" way, Behne issued faint praise when he wrote that "Gropius’ factory shows how much more glass can be exploited in a purely practical manner." He credited Gropius with using glass in a way that broke down the penchant for monumental form associated with massive brickwork, but felt Gropius’ overly "block-like" stacking of rectangular glass panes "is perhaps the point with which

---


criticism must take issue.\textsuperscript{88}

Behne recognized that Gropius remained wedded more to a classical and monumental approach than a distinctly hopeful vision for the future, as Taut and Scheerbart had.\textsuperscript{89} In Gropius’ architecture, art works were additive rather than integrated. His glass acted as mere enclosure instead of a transformative screen between inside and out. Gropius himself had stated that similar to Behrens, he was searching for a "monumental beauty," a new "sacred style."\textsuperscript{90} Although both he and Taut had been inspired by Worringer in their search for a more "primitive" and "expressive" architecture based on experience rather than rationality, Gropius’ ideal was not the light, dynamic, colorful, and creative Gothic, but the "monumental, spare contained form, autonomous, healthy and pure" form of ancient Egyptian temples that

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{88} "Die Quaderhaftigkeit, mit der Gropius das Glas übereinander legt, ist vielleicht der Punkt, wo die Kritik mit einem Einwand kommen muß"; Behne, "Die Fabrik," 864.
  
  \item \textsuperscript{89} Banham painted Gropius’ pre-war work as classicist; see Banham, Theory and Design, pp. 79-87. Ludwig Grote interpreted Gropius’ glass stairs as being influenced by Scheerbart; see Grote, "Walter Gropius. Ein Weg zur Einheit künstlerischer Gestaltung," in Walter Gropius (1952) n.p.; cited in Wilhelm, Walter Gropius, p. 60. Gören Lindahl, however, explicitly rejected any influence of Scheerbart on Gropius; Lindahl, "Von der Zukunftskathedrale bis zur Wohnmaschine. Deutsche Architektur und Architekturdebate nach dem ersten Weltkrieg," in Idea and Form, ed. N.G. Sandblad (1959), p. 230. Franciscono cited several connections between Gropius and Scheerbart, but only after World War I, in the context of the Arbeitsrat für Kunst, when Taut, Behne and Gropius were working very closely together; see Franciscono, Walter Gropius, p. 86n41, 124.
  
  \item \textsuperscript{90} Gropius, "Monumentale Kunst und Industriebau," pp. 28-30, 32-33, for this and the following.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Worringer had seen as an early "abstract" architecture. As with Muthesius and many of the Werkbund members, Gropius was seeking to establish a "stylistic unity" that could arise only "through the establishment of conventions . . . through a rhythm of repetitions, through a uniformity of forms that have been recognized as good." This put him in direct opposition to Taut, who Behne insisted had "cleaned architecture of all traditionalism and conventionalism." The legacy of Gropius' work in Behrens' office was that he valued rules, proportions, and a proper "architectonic expression" with uniform, simple volumes "that would appear to a passerby as spatially grounded."

Even materials "without an essence" (Wesenslosigkeit) such as glass and concrete, Gropius felt, should be manipulated in order to give them corporeality and permanence.

The Politics of Glasarchitektur

Karin Wilhelm has speculated that Gropius' early glass walls were not only prescient uses of modern building systems, but that they also represented conscious moves towards a "democratic" architecture. Despite the "dry technique" that Behne

91 Gropius, "Entwicklung moderner Industriebaukunst," p. 22.; Worringer had praised Egyptian art in Abstraktion und Einfühlung (1908); transl. as Abstraction and Empathy (1953). Worringer's Ägyptische Kunst (1927) contains wonderful visual comparisons of Egyptian architecture with concrete grain elevators, and Bauhaus designs (Figs. 8-10, 21-22), though the elevator illustration was the airbrushed version from Le Corbusier's Vers une architecture (1923). See also Werner Hegemann, "Weimarer Bauhaus und Ägyptische Baukunst," Wasmuths Monatshefte 8 (1924): 69-86.

identified in Gropius’ use of glass, Wilhelm speculated that Gropius’ political interpretation of glass was akin to that of Scheerbart’s.\textsuperscript{93} Positing a life-long conviction about the inter-connectedness of architecture and social values in Gropius, she claimed that by removing the "representative" and "interpretative" facade from architecture, at least in certain parts of his facades, Gropius was deliberately opening the building’s inner-working to a wider audience, both to the workers on company grounds, and to the public passing by.\textsuperscript{94} Gropius’ glass curtain wall, Wilhelm postulated, broke down the barrier to the exclusive domain of the private corporate interior, with all its connotations of bourgeois class separation and property ownership.\textsuperscript{95} She claimed the glass not only exposed the office and factory floor to public critique—a fundamentally democratic principle—but acted as a display window of sorts that led to a greater sense

\textsuperscript{93} Wilhelm correlates Gropius’ position with ideas proposed in Scheerbart’s utopian article "Architektenkongress," in which government officials announce to a congress hall full of architects the need for a glass architecture. Unfortunately, Wilhelm gives no evidence that Gropius knew of or derived any part of his designs from Scheerbart’s ideas. She also cites several of Gropius’ post-war writings on modern architecture’s attempt to “deny” the wall and thereby “seek to retain the connection of interior space with the greater space of the cosmos”; Gropius, ”Glasbau,” Die Bauzeitung 23, no. 25 (May 25, 1926): 165, cited in Wilhelm, Walter Gropius, pp. 59-66.

\textsuperscript{94} Wilhelm cites Peter Jessen’s comment in the 1915 Werkbund yearbook dedicated to the Cologne exhibition that Gropius’ glazed spiral stairs allowed “the work and traffic to unfold before everyone’s eyes”; Jessen, ”Die Deutsche Werkbund Ausstellung Köln,” Jahrbuch des DWB (1915), p. 34, cited in Wilhelm, Walter Gropius, p. 64.

\textsuperscript{95} As proof that contemporaries were aware of the social implications of Gropius’ glazing, she cites Robert Breuer’s critique that this exposing of the interior had gone to far. Breuer feared revealing the inner workings of a factory may useful for control, but was rather "unseemly," "uncultivated," and even "embarrassingly asocial"; Breuer, ”Die Cölner Werkbund Ausstellung,” Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration (Apr.-Sept. 1914): 420, cited in Wilhelm, Walter Gropius, p. 64.
of pride and equality between workers and owners in their identification with the main
work of the business. Wilhelm’s sometimes forced argument emphasized Gropius’
post-war writings to explain his pre-war work, and used somewhat ineffectively Jürgen
Habermas’ theory on the opening of the public sphere and Max Weber’s discussion of
the "protestant ethic" to equalize the position of the worker and owner. Nonetheless,
Wilhelm’s arguments begin to expand our understanding of the symbolic potential of
glass during the time, pointing to the idea that glass, in addition to technical or
fantastical associations, had emancipatory social and political potential, especially for
the worker.  

Behne was well aware of the economic and social relevance of industrial
architecture and glass, as evidenced in a review of Gropius model Werkbund factory he
published in the popular review Die Umschau in October 1914. Expanding upon the
Werkbund’s reform of modern graphics and advertising, he repeated Gropius’ claims
that a well-designed factory could increase public awareness of a company and its
products more thoroughly than any graphic advertisement. Behne also highlighted
Gropius’ quest to find an appropriate architecture for the age, an idea that Gropius had
derived from Behrens, Riegl, German cultural reformers as well as the international
Arts and Crafts movement. Behne agreed with Gropus’ claim that good factory design

---


98 Gropius visited England with Behrens in 1908; see Isaacs, Walter Gropius
would lead to a happier and thus more productive worker. On this point, Behne quoted an article by Gropius in the 1913 Werkbund yearbook at length: "From the social standpoint, it is not unimportant whether the modern factory worker toils in ugly industrial barracks or in well-proportioned spaces. He will work more joyfully on great communal endeavors in a space designed by an artist that speaks to everyone’s in-born sense of beauty and counters the monotony of machine work. With increased satisfaction the spirit of the worker and the productivity of the business will surely grow."

Behne’s atypically long quotation from Gropius’ essay documented his concurrence with many of the architect’s ideas. But reading between the lines also reveals differences in their political ideas. Despite their shared concern for the condition of the worker, in the end the frame of reference for both Behrens and Gropius—whose privileged backgrounds and whose status as architects to corporations (1983), p. 91. His work has been tied to the William Morris and the English Arts and Crafts movement most famously in Nikolaus Pevsner, Pioneers of the Modern Movement (1936); and earlier in Walter Curt Behrendt, Der Kampf um den Stil im Kunstgewerbe und der Architektur (1920). On Gropius’ attitudes towards society and culture see Wilhelm, Walter Gropius, p. 17-22. Colquhoun noted that Gropius’ ideas are similar to those expressed by Frank Lloyd Wright as early as 1901 in his essay "The Art and Craft of the Machine"; see Alan Colquhoun, Modern Architecture (2002), p. 55, 68, though the similarity with Wright is more likely a product of their common interest in the machine and Arts and Crafts, than a direct borrowing transferred through the Wasmuth portfolio (1911) that he had seen at nearly the same time as he was first seriously engaged with his work on factories for the Werkbund.

and entrepreneurs made difficult any dispassionate stance towards capital—remained that of the bourgeois factory owner, his profits, and his image. Behne, through his attempts to have modern art accepted by a much wider public, and through his empathy for the struggle of the working class, would seek to redress this bias, able to articulate a more sympathetic response to the condition of the worker and the programs of Socialism.

Taut’s "Expressionist" industrial buildings presented a more worker-oriented set of design principles for Behne. The critic characterized Taut’s work as "primitive" and "simple," composed of "primal elements" that expressed a "new mentality, a new feeling for life," and thus a social conscience. He felt that Taut’s Reibetanz industrial laundry facility in Berlin, for example, catered specifically to the sensibility of a pedestrian worker through its scale, its lively rhythm, and its animated sense of color. [Figure 6.13] Behne contrasted Taut’s building with that of Gropius’ teacher: "the insensitive space-philosopher Peter Behrens, who justifies the cold sterility of his naked walls by referencing the speeding blur of the motorcar. Behrens pays homage to the owner, who of course pays for the whole thing, rather than to the large numbers of proletariat that pass by on foot, and to whom Taut offers a little eye candy on their miserable journey."

---

100 Behne, "Ein neues Haus!," p. 32.

Behne’s Early Critique of the Werkbund

Although Behne joined the Werkbund in order to gain access to its propaganda, designers, and reputation, he also responded to it as a critic. Already in his first articles, Behne had condemned the "romantic" and "sentimental" designs of the prominent Werkbund members such as Riemerschmid, and commented that the "pathos-laden" monuments of Behrens looked backward rather than forward. He had targeted such comments both to the general public with articles in the general press, as well as to professionals and Werkbund members by publishing in some of the Werkbund’s most closely allied journals, such as the Kunstgewerbeblatt. The depth to which he explored the issues varied from one forum to another, yet the message remained fairly constant. There was, overall, a polite acknowledgment of the Werkbund’s efforts and the exhibit intentions.

But Behne, who had defined "politics as the "daring" act of defining a better future and "reaching out amidst the richness of one’s own time to find the inspiration for freedom, expansive development, and a future that leaves behind all conventions," grew increasingly disillusioned with the backward-looking nature of the Werkbund’s attempt to define German design.\(^\text{102}\) His detailed analysis became very critical, accusing

\(^\text{102}\) Referring to Roman art as both symbolizing brute force, and a relationship to the Orient, Behne wrote, "Sie ist politisch, soweit man Politik ausschließlich als Prozeß des Strebens nach äußerer Gewalt anerkennt. Aber sie ist keineswegs mehr politisch, wenn man unter Politik versteht: aus dem Reichtum der Stunde die Regung zu schöpfen, die, weit alle Konventionen überfliegend, Befreiung, Erweiterung, Zukunft bedeutet"; Behne, "Rom als Vorbild," Sozialistische Monatshefte 23.1, no. 6 (Mar. 28,
organizers of not promoting the artistic side of the architectural work, and highlighting only three worthwhile monuments: Van de Velde’s theater, Gropius’ factory and above all Taut’s Glashaus.\textsuperscript{103}

Gropius’ and the Werkbund’s synthesis of art and technology had healed some of the divisive rifts between that had formed between the engineer and architect in the nineteenth century. By seeking a synthesis of art and technology, of form and structure, they had begun to mend the split of the so-called underlying "core-form" (\textit{Kernform}) and visible "art-form" (\textit{Kunstform}) in modern architecture.\textsuperscript{104} However, Behne argued that in many of the buildings designed by Werkbund architects, including Behrens’, the "art-form" remained over-burdened by symbolism and an expression of monumentality that was unrelated to the "core-form." In other Werkbund sanctioned designs, such as the glass in Gropius’ Werkbund factory, he believed that the opposite was true, that the

\textsuperscript{103} Behne, "Die Ausstellung des deutschen Werkbundes in Köln."

\textsuperscript{104} See Wilhelm, Walter Gropius, p. 23. The terms \textit{Kernform} and \textit{Kunstform}, differentiating an idealized internal structural core or essence from the physical, external form, were first coined in nineteenth-century. They became standard interpretations of architectural form through the writings of Gottfried Semper and Carl Bötticher that remain to this day when we differentiate the engineered structural form from the form-making working of the architect. See Semper, \textit{Der Stil in den technischen und tektonischen Künsten} 2 vols. (1861-1863), reprint (1977); Bötticher, \textit{Die Tektonik der Hellenen} 2 vols. (1843-1852). On the influence of these terms and the related theory of "tectonics" through the early twentieth century down to the present, see Werner Oechslin, \textit{Stilhülse und Kern: Otto Wagner, Adolf Loos und der evolutionäre Weg zur Modernen Architektur} (1994), translated as Otto Wagner, Adolf Loos and the Road to Modern Architecture (2002); and Kenneth Frampton, \textit{Studies in Tectonic Culture. The Poetics of Construction in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Architecture} (1995).
"art-form" was over-determined by the "core-form," thereby all but erasing that element that elevated architecture to an art. For Behne, Werkbund architects remained wedded to the conservative notion of harnessing art for the cause of industry, of creating an aesthetic and a contemporary "style" that could sell German technical products and force the creation of a German style, rather than creating true art or simple functional form. Behne’s criticism focused less on style and forms, and more on the individual spirit and "inner necessity" required in a work as a means to achieve a genuine modern art.

As early as April of 1914, two months before the opening of the Cologne exposition, Behne insisted it was futile to discuss whether it was possible to create a "new style" that represented the zeitgeist, as Muthesius and many of the Werkbund members were claiming. Such thinking, he felt, represented an overly "intellectual" approach to the subject. IN an argument that reminds of Loos, Behne defined true art as "something singular that finds meaning only in itself. It [art] is not characteristic 'of its time,' but rather stands for the most part . . . in opposition to that which is characteristic 'of its day.' Art has nothing to do with the characteristic, only with beauty!"

While Behne disagreed with Loos’ rejection of functional building as art,

---

105 For Behne, the factories that Behrens had built for the AEG and that Gropius built for Fagus and the Werkbund represented something of an "official" Werkbund policy as it had been developing. As many have commented, there was no "official" Werkbund policy, though the leadership and guiding figures at any one point in time did dominate discussions and revealed particular ideals.

106 "Jedes Kunstwerk ist etwas Singuläres und erschöpft seine Bedeutung in sich selbst. Es ist nicht charakteristisch für seine Zeit, vielmehr steht es meist . . . in Gegensatz zu dem, was für 'seine Zeit' charakteristisch ist. Die Kunst hat es überhaupt
both Behne and Loos were critical of the artificiality of the Werkbund’s creation of a contemporary "style" and its imposition of German design conventions.\footnote{Adolf Loos, "Die Überflüssigen" März 2, no. 15 (Aug. 1908): 185, is a critique of Werkbund and Art Nouveau tendencies to create a "style." The article was based on Loos’ participation at the Werkbund Jahrestag in Munich in July 1908, to which he was invited despite not being a member because of his influential criticism of the applied arts in Vienna a decade earlier. It is worth noting that both Riemerschmid and Behrens noted that style or type is not something that can be consciously achieved; see Hermann Muthesius, ed., Die Werkbund-Arbeit der Zukunft (1914).}

Behne’s Idealist artistic stance put him at odds with the Werkbund and led to ever harsher criticism of the organization. In fact, Behne may have joined the Werkbund in part to wield this critique with more authority. Although the Werkbund’s mission statement had called for a unified stance on important issues, one of the most progressive but also debilitating qualities of the organization was that it allowed, even encouraged discussion and disagreement among its members in its goal of stimulating reform and the development of ideas. Frederic Schwartz has recently suggested that the Werkbund consciously used slippery terms such as "Quality," "Work," and "Type" for their "discursive indeterminacy or, better mobility," so that the discourse could simultaneously resonate across realms of industry and art, expertise and opinions.\footnote{Schwartz, The Werkbund, p. 122; also cited in Bernd Nicolai’s forward to the reprint of the Werkbund yearbooks, p. 6.} Although these slippery terms allowed many to read their own interpretations into the organization’s propaganda, the contemporary artist Endell had complained that "dangerously unclear" words such as "quality" and "Typisierung" featured in Werkbund

programs led only to "grave misunderstandings" and thus should be avoided.\textsuperscript{109}

The consequence of these internal debates was that the Werkbund became what its first executive secretary, Wolf Dohrn, once called an "association of intimate enemies": an association of corporate competitors representing themselves as a unified group, but in reality often presenting and promoting work that was more a product of competition or a desire to maximize sales and profits.\textsuperscript{110} For many critics and members alike, a Werkbund exposition on the scale of that at Cologne was thus destined to mediocrity. Muthesius and Theodor Heuß, another founding member of the Werkbund, admitted that the Cologne exhibition reflected only a slight increase in the general level of design, and almost no exceptional achievements, especially in architecture. Although true progress necessitated both singular achievements and broad acceptance of ideas, Muthesius lamented that the Werkbund exposition clearly only reflected the latter: "The weakness of a beginner’s work . . . indecision . . . and flatness."\textsuperscript{111} Likewise, the critic Robert Breuer complained that although the Werkbund had been started by some outstanding artists, it had tended ever more towards general cultural production, and thus would not be able to create the latest artistic trends or

\textsuperscript{109} August Endell, contribution to the Werkbund discussion on July 4, 1914, published in Muthesius, \textit{Werkbund-Arbeit}, p. 58.

\textsuperscript{110} This phrase is often credited to Walter Curt Behrendt, and his article "Die Deutsche Werkbundausstellung in Köln," \textit{Kunst und Künstler} 12, no. 12 (Sept. 1914): p. 626, though Behrendt himself credits Dohrn, and Muthesius attributes the same phrase to "a close observer of the Werkbund," in his lecture from July 3\textsuperscript{rd} "Die Werkbundarbeit der Zukunft," in Muthesius, \textit{Werkbund-Arbeit} (1914), p. 35.

achievements. "The Werkbund is no Mt. Olympus of artists," he wrote, "Art and the Werkbund have really nothing in common. . . . [The Werkbund] is a union of artists, manufacturers, craftsmen and business men whose primary goal is practical, propagandistic, and money-making work," not the instigator of spiritualized form advocated by the association’s mission.¹¹²

The trained architect, Prussian bureaucrat, and freelance critic Behrendt wrote perhaps the harshest critique in his review of the Werkbund exposition, in Scheffler’s conservative Kunst und Künstler.¹¹³ He remarked that the reform movements begun at the turn-of-the-century and promoted by the Werkbund since 1907 had "come to a standstill." The buildings on display appeared as if "a respected collection of senile academics had seen their charge as arduous. . . . or worse that they performed their duty with indifference and the greatest of reluctance." Old and young architects were condemned alike. Gropius, "a student of Behrens" erected a "quite problematic" building according to Behrendt. He judged Gropius to be an overly intellectual artist who "thinks and reasons too much, and senses and sees too little."¹¹⁴

Behne was thus far from alone when he criticized the fundamental principles of Werkbund production. He praised the Werkbund’s exhibition program of uniting art


¹¹³ Behrendt, "Die Deutsche Werkbundausstellung," p. 617 for this and the following. Behrendt’s review is discussed in Wilhelm, Walter Gropius, p. 70-71.

¹¹⁴ Behrendt, "Die Deutsche Werkbundausstellung," p. 618.
and life by exhibiting real buildings and products rather than replicas as well as its mission to achieve "Quality" and the spiritualization of German products. But he felt most of the classicizing architectural works at the exposition fell short of these goals. In Behne’s memorable prose, the Werkbund seemed to have forgotten that the "spirit" is something "light and free that seeks to escape the weight of earthly concerns," not something full of pathos or tragedy that brought to mind "the slaying of kings, mystical priesthood, and boundless Assyrian sacredness." Most architects, he lamented, remained "so overly deferential, so overly serious . . . with their false monumentality." They shied away from fantasy and the qualities that Behne believed were at the core of the exhibition pavilion "type": "the provisional, the exciting, the celebratory"—exactly the features that Behne praised in Taut’s Glashaus. Although Behne’s review focused to a large extent on style and the backward quality of the pseudo-classical monumentality of most of the buildings at the exposition, his more fundamental objection was to the use of ponderous traditions and conventions as a means of creating quality and

---


116 Behne, "Die Ausstellung des Deutschen Werkbundes, I," Dresdner Neueste Nachrichten 22, no. 164 (June 20, 1914), for this and the following quote. Attempts to locate part II of this critique have been unsuccessful. As will be explored below, Behne’s critique of DWB became even harsher and more explicit in the context of World War I, as in 1917 he rejected the Werkbund’s attempts to synthesize life and art as mere sentimental lies that ignored the true character of art; see Behne, "Kritik des Werkbundes" Die Tat 9.1, no. 5 (Aug. 1917): 430-438; republished in Janos Frecot, ed., Werkbund Archiv Jahrbuch 1 (1972): 118-128; translated in Francesco Dal Co, Teorie del Moderno: architettura, Germania, 1880-1920 (1982), pp. 226-233.
contemporary artistic designs.

Cologne Werkbund Debate

The Opposing Arguments

Behne’s criticism of the Werkbund and its exhibition were fundamentally the same as the explosive objections that Henry van de Velde and his supporters had to Muthesius at the infamous Werkbund debates on July 3rd and 4th, 1914, in Cologne.117 There is no evidence that Behne participated in the discussion, perhaps because he was a relatively young, new member of the Werkbund with little standing. Gropius, Behne’s exact contemporary, also did not contribute to the discussion, although he was a rising star in the Werkbund. Instead Gropius ceded his time to the older and more established artist Endell, whose views on art would no doubt carry more weight than the young architect’s. Nonetheless, Behne must have aware of what transpired. His

slightly older friend Taut was one of the most controversial participants, and the
discussion generated a veritable "press-war" afterwards in Berlin's major newspapers.118
The debate, which is recorded verbatim in Muthesius' book Die Werkbund-Arbeit der
Zukunft (The Werkbund Work of the Future, 1914), warrants elaboration here to
illuminate the context for Behne's increasingly harsh critique of the Werkbund.119

[Figure 6.14]

Muthesius had long been arguing for the need to establish typical forms in the
applied arts as a means of insuring economic vitality for Germany's emerging national
economy in the global marketplace.120 This position had troubled some of the younger,
progressive, architecturally-oriented Werkbund members, including Gropius, Taut, and
Osthaus. Behne found Muthesius' positions particularly disturbing. Muthesius had
insisted that Typisierung was especially pronounced in architecture, which, "unlike the
free arts," was always beholden to the leveling influence of functions and daily life.

118 Discussion of this lengthy "press-war" that ensued in the influential Berliner
Tageblatt in the weeks following Cologne is missing from most historical analyses; see
Anna-Christa Funk, Karl Ernst Osthaus (1978); and Francisconco, Walter Gropius,
Appendix C, pp. 262-274.

119 Muthesius, Werkbund-Arbeit.

120 Muthesius suggested that all great epochs in art and culture began with
individual experiments, but eventually settled on more "typical" modes of expression.
He called this process "Typisierung," the gradual development of established design
conventions within a general cultural production that "eschewed the extra-ordinary and
sought the orderly." Such a typical expression for the modern era, he insisted, had
already been recognized by critics all over the world in the German exhibits at the
world's fairs in St. Louis (1904) and Brussels (1910). He then proclaimed that "there can
be no doubt that this unified stylistic expression, despite all the individualistic
differences of the work, has been achieved in the modern applied arts today";
Muthesius, Werkbund-Arbeit, pp. 42, 44-45.
Although even Muthesius admitted that "the only lasting value is the contemporary," he believed that architecture was inherently more tied to tradition and conventions than the other arts. He insisted that it was these two qualities, architecture's close relationship to the habits of daily life and its natural adherence to tradition, that made it simultaneously the most effective means of educating people about good form and the best means of demonstrating national character abroad.¹²¹

But Behne was not convinced. Architecture for him was a mode of individual artistic expression, not a national propaganda tool. As early as the beginning of January 1914, in his popular article "Today's Industrial Buildings," Behne added to his three categories of German industrial architecture a brief critique of Muthesius' position.¹²²

---

¹²¹ Muthesius often wrote about architecture as an especially good measure of national culture as well as an effective propaganda tool. Behne cited these ideas in two short excerpts of Muthesius' writing that were appended to two of Behne's articles, Behne, "Ungerechte Selbstvorwürfe," Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration 35, no. 1 (Oct. 1914): 68; and Behne, "Geh. Baurat Otto Wagner--Wien," Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration 35, no. 5 (Feb. 1915): 390.

In the best spirit of the Werkbund, Muthesius was also concerned with promoting his ideas through the media, an area that directly impinged on Behne's endeavors as a critic. In addition to refining the quality and technical perfection of the German production, Muthesius felt the Werkbund needed to redouble its efforts to promote and popularize the emerging unified style, to educate the public and create a communal taste: "the public requires a certain uniformity in what it sees in order to understand, and in order to get used to a certain style of expression." (pp. 43-44). In his 6th thesis from the Werkbund debate to be discussed below, Muthesius urged that such advances in German design should be made known to the world through "effective propaganda," especially through illustrated magazines; Muthesius, Werkbund Thesis no. 7, in Muthesius, Werkbund-Arbeit, p. 32; translated in Conrads, Programs and Manifestoes, p. 28. This, Muthesius claimed, would eventually lead to the high quality production and spiritualized form towards which the Werkbund had always been working, and would allow German firms to increase their exports and lead the world towards a modern form.

¹²² Behne, "Heutige Industriebauten," Velhagen & Klasings Monatshefte, p. 63-
Of all the modern architects working on industrial buildings, Behne singled out Muthesius for working most strongly with historical forms and perpetuating an inappropriate "house-like" aesthetic alongside the latest advances in technology. Referring directly to Muthesius’ well known country houses, Behne closed his article with the statement that the confusion of factories looking like castles or country houses could be avoided only if factory owners hire a new breed of "true industrial building artists." When Behne republished his article in the business journal Die Welt des Kaufmanns (The World of the Businessman) in June 1914, just as the Werkbund exhibition opened, he warned the German business community even more explicitly about the fallacy of Muthesius’ recourse to historical conventions as a means of increasing exports and Germany’s cultural reputation.

On January 16, 1914, the day after Behne first contacted Gropius about publicizing the architect’s work, Gropius wrote to his friend and supporter Osthaus expressing similar concern over the conservative position of Muthesius and his followers. In reflecting on the authors that Muthesius was organizing for the 1914 yearbook focusing on transportation, Gropius was dismayed that "unpleasant" forces were limiting the discussion to quality and technical issues, and ignoring the need for

64.

123 Behne, "Heutige Industriebauten," Velhagen & Klasings Monatshefte, p. 64.

124 Behne, "Heutige Industriebauten," Die Welt des Kaufmanns. The fact that Behne did not even mention Muthesius in his extensive April 1914 survey of Berlin architecture also shows his objections to this powerful architect and ideologue; ” see Behne, "Berliner Architektur," Zeit im Bild 12.2, no. 15 (Apr. 9, 1914): 801-806.
"new forms." Gropius hinted to Osthaus that it may be an opportune time to press for the inclusion of their more artistic point of view, and was soon able to convince elements of the Werkbund board that "considerable tension was in the air" between the two camps, and that there was "danger of secession." All agreed to avoid public conflict before the Cologne exposition, but insisted the two positions be given opportunity to "collide against each other" in Cologne, in order "to show up the black sheep." 

In his famous Werkbund speech of July 3, 1914 in Cologne and a set of summary theses that he had distributed to all registered participants a week earlier, Muthesius demanded more clearly and forcefully than ever before that the Werkbund work towards *Typisierung* of German products and the establishment of artistic conventions instead of emphasizing artistic innovation, primarily for business reasons. Muthesius was careful to note in his speech that "Art is free, and must remain free. She has the right to make mistakes, which will to a certain extent confirm her freedom." But he insisted the Werkbund was not primarily an artist’s group (*Künstlergruppe*). It was, instead, an ally of modern business, catering to industry and the mass production of quality consumer goods. What most distinguished his July 1914 speech from earlier lectures and writing was a more explicit reaction against artists as primarily experimental form-givers within the Werkbund. Even though Muthesius’ lecture was considerably less controversial than the theses he had distributed, his lecture opened an

125 Letter from Gropius to Osthaus (Jan. 16, 1914) KEOA, KÜ/335, republished in Funk, Karl Ernst Osthaus, n.p.

126 Letter from Gropius to Osthaus (Feb. 26, 1914) KEOA KÜ/335, republished in Funk, Karl Ernst Osthaus, n.p.
unbridgeable divide in the Werkbund’s membership, all but forcing members such as Behne to take a stance on the matter.127

Immediately after Muthesius’ lecture, van de Velde distributed ten counter-theses that rejected Typisierung, and reaffirmed a commitment to inspired individual creation and the will of the artist as the only way forward for the Werkbund.128

127 Muthesius himself, in the opening remarks to the debate on July 4th, as well Posener in Anfänge, p. 204, and others have commented on the significant differences between Muthesius’ public lecture on July 3, 1914, where he defended the freedom of the artist and justified the development of typical form over long periods of time in a softer and less provoking manner, and the summary theses that he distributed, where he called on Werkbund members to create or design such typical form; see Muthesius, Werkbund-Arbeit, p. 55. In his lecture, which he claimed was addressed primarily to the Werbund’s businessmen, not its artists, Muthesius sought to convince Werkbund industrialists to continue to work with artists towards Typisierung. Muthesius’ Typisierung was a call to artists to help businessmen and industry to "reduce" the chaos of cultural production and to further "abstract" the essence of the modern typical forms. As Muthesius saw it, the mediocre work exhibited at Cologne was not a sign that radical rethinking or innovations in form were necessary, but rather a clarion call for an even more concerted effort to refine quality and improve technology.

128 Historical interpretations of van de Velde’s counter-theses have varied widely. Too many have seen his position as a nostalgic plea for the arts and crafts in opposition to Muthesius’ more “modern” call for “standardization” and the mass-production of modern “types.” Many see van de Velde’s comments as vestiges of his earlier Art Nouveau and Secession theories promoting the unfettered energy of the whiplash line, nature, and artistic genius as the way out of the stranglehold of classicizing historical styles on design. Others have viewed van de Velde’s comments as a “romantic” call to return to medieval craftsman ideals, which become a central theme of the early Bauhaus. Although van de Velde’s ideas included these dimensions, a more complete interpretation would acknowledge the complex politics of the Werkbund debate that pitted more conservative titans of industry against a band of fiercely independent artists eager to revolutionize the world around them.

Previous discussions of Muthesius’ Typisierung have tended to mis-translate and mis-represent the architect’s use of the term as "standardization." Based on this mis-interpretation, many historians have given Muthesius credit for anticipating the standardization and machine-aesthetic that was to become a hallmark of avant-garde design and International Style modern architecture after World War I in Germany. See Schwartz, The Werkbund, p. 238n212 for an outline of the various (mis)interpretations.
However, in arguments that I have followed here, Stanford Anderson has more perceptively argued that Muthesius did not feel rationalized standardization was inevitably pervasive in all aspects of society, but rather intended to reinforce the conservative statement made by the classicism of his own buildings and well as most of those at the Cologne exposition; see Anderson, "Deutscher Werkbund – the 1914 Debate." Schwartz has expanded our understanding of the debate by focusing on the economic implications. Although Muthesius has often been interpreted as a supporter of big business, industrialization and capitalism, as opposed to van de Velde, who emphasized individual craft production, Schwartz interprets van de Velde’s position as an artists defense of the role of creation within the market economy, supporting the free market ideal that individual creativity should be protected and rewarded in the capitalist system through institutions such as trademark law and royalties; Schwartz, The Werkbund, pp. 147ff.

Although the Belgian designer still gets credit for setting off a heated discussion and ensuing press wars between advocates of the opposing views, evidence suggests that it was above all the powerful patron Osthaus and two of his proteges, Gropius and Taut, who most staunchly rejected Muthesius.129 Behne, we recall, had been one of the earliest critics, promoters, and intellectual collaborators of these same two young architects. All three believed the fundamentally creative genius endowed in the work of individual artists was key to cultural innovation and social unity. With the support of Behrens, Endell, Obrist, Breuer, and others, this group managed to force Muthesius that same evening to withdraw his theses and to explain that they were purely personal opinions rather than proposals for Werkbund policy. They also pressured Muthesius to announce that he in no way sought to limit the freedom or opportunities of artists.

A direct confrontation of the divergent ideologies occurred the day after

129 See, for example, Stressig, "Walter Gropius," p. 465-468; as well as Funk, Karl Ernst Osthaus, for documentation to support the thesis that Osthaus was the primary force behind the young artists. Funk also documents some of the extensive press-war that ensued in the pages of the Berliner Tageblatt between Muthesius and his opponents.
Muthesius’ speech in a pre-arranged discussion that began to distinguish more clearly
the two camps and their positions. Behrens, whose work Behne had classified as overly
monumental, opened the discussion with brief remarks criticizing the artificiality of
Muthesius’ idea of norms and conventions. He was followed by Endell, Obrist, and
Osthaus, who were even more staunch supporters of artistic freedom and creativity.
Endell complained bitterly about Muthesius’ emphasis on the vague word "quality."
Whereas Muthesius and the official Werkbund program tended to emphasize "technical
quality," Endell, Taut, and many of the pre-war Expressionist artists such as Kandinsky
had preferred to focus on "spiritual quality, or beauty . . . beauty that is based on
personal experience." Foregrounding technical quality and Typisierung, both Endell
and his teacher Obrist warned, would result in the "premature sterilization of invention
. . . one of the few remaining pleasures that we moderns have left."

Behne had expressed nearly identical thoughts just two months earlier when he
criticized architects such as Paul Baumgarten and Paul Mebes for over-emphasizing the
role of tradition in their work, leading to designs that were "Dead, . . . impersonal and
lifeless." A few years later he expressed nearly the same sentiments when he
condemned what he called the Werkbund’s "Reform Erector-set Style"
(Reformbaukastenstil): "We have been brainwashed by the German Werkbund, the

130 August Endell in Muthesius, Werkbund-Arbeit, p. 58.

131 Hermann Obrist in Muthesius, Werkbund-Arbeit, p. 62.

132 "Erstarrung. . . etwas Unpersönliches, etwas Unerlebtes"; Behne, "Berliner
Architektur," p. 804.
Dürerbund, and the Kunstwart," no longer questioning why certain furniture is
"nothing but an upright, painfully accurate, rectangular dark box." The "serious art
magazines" try to convince us that it is a "triumph of modern living culture which has
finally returned to simplicity and functionality. But this furniture is obviously not any
better than the imitative Renaissance-buffet which it replaced. Instead, it is as bad as
that or even worse. While the old piece at least had an imitated sense of life, [the new
one] is totally dead!"133 For Behne, Endell, and the supporters of van de Velde,
Muthesius’ Typisierung implied compromise, homogenization, and an undesirable
leveling of values that would stifle artistic excellence. All recognized that Muthesius’
policies, if enacted, would greatly reduce the role of the artist in the industrial design
process in Germany and "lead to the end of new German culture," as Behne put it.134

Taut gave the most impassioned defense of the Expressionist viewpoint that had
been defined collaboratively by Behne, Scheerbart, and Taut in the months prior to the
Cologne exhibition. For Taut, as for Endell and Behne, "beauty" was the only true goal

133 "Wir sind allerdings so zähe, namentlich vom Deutschen Werkbund, vom
Dürerbund, vom Kunstwart und ähnlichen Bestrebungen bearbeitet worden daß wir
uns gar nicht mehr wundern, wenn etwa in seriösen Kunstzeitschriften Schränke . . .
abgebildet werden, die absolut nichts sind als ein aufrecht stehender, penibel akkurat
viereckiger, dunkler Kasten . . . [der] als einen neuen Triumph der modernen
Wohnkultur anpriest, die endlich wieder auf das Einfache und Zweckentsprechende
zurückgehe. Aber dieser Schrank ist selbstverständlich nicht besser als das angeblich
von ihm verdrängte, nachgemachte Renaissance-Buffet, sondern, so schlimm dieses
war, er ist noch schlimmer. Denn hatte jenes noch einen nachgebildeten Schein von
Leben, so ist dieser völlig Tot!"; Behne, Wiederkehr der Kunst, pp. 10-11, emphasis in
original.

134 "Und dann sei ja die neudeutsche Kultur fertig," Behne, Wiederkehr der
Kunst, p. 11.
of art. Like Behne, Taut borrowed from Scheerbart the idea that art must be unfettered, light, cheerful, and affecting the senses, not intellectual or ponderous. He lamented that Muthesius had defined *Typisierung* as leading only to a "general increase" in the quality of design, insisting that being satisfied with averages could only represent the watering down of creativity and innovative ideas.  

Taut then proclaimed that the development of high quality, spiritualized form was possible only through the efforts of the most creative artists. Art, he asserted, was analogous to a pyramid, with a few original artists at the tip, the masses of followers below, and the general public defining the base. The reference of a pyramid followed Kandinsky’s use of the same theory. It also recalled Nietzsche’s vision of artists on the mountaintops leading the people in the valley’s below.  

[Figure 3.6] Extending his analogy of a pyramid even further, Taut insisted that all groups need a single strong leader at the top in order to be truly productive. The weakness of the Werkbund exhibit and the opposing views of the discussion made it clear to Taut that in order to be truly focused and productive, the Werkbund needed an "art-dictator." He proposed that either van de Velde or Poelzig be elected. Poelzig was the only other architect besides Taut whom Behne had labeled "Rational," designing with an "artistic Sachlichkeit" that Behne had earlier referred to as "Expressionist."

---

135 Taut’s contribution to discussion in Muthesius, *Werkbund-Arbeit*, pp. 74-76.

136 See Kandinsky, *Concerning the Spiritual in Art*.

137 Behne, "Heutige Industriebauten."
Muthesius’ call for business to lead, and was met with quite a bit of misunderstanding and criticism, including charges of elitism. The tone and direction of Taut’s proposal amidst the heated debate seemed to be a departure from his earlier call for a peaceful, Babel-like collaboration among many artists to build a great new temple of the arts. But in fact it built on earlier ideas that he had developed through his collaboration with Behne and Scheerbart. His views were based on an utopian conception of art and his understanding of architecture as the mother, or leader of the arts, and not on conscious political or social elitism. Although the temple of the arts he proposed in his Der Sturm a few months earlier was to be a collaborative work, expressing the unity of the artists, Taut warned in that same article that "every social intention should be avoided. The whole project must be exclusive, the way all art at first presents itself solely within the artist. The people should then educate themselves on this art, or await the arrival of teachers." Taut meant for the building to be built by a community of artisans, and ultimately for the greater good of society. But an overt political program or social function was to be avoided in order to give full range to the pure artistic expression and to the new order it might engender.

Taut’s belief in the regenerative power of artistic collaboration was far from

---

138 See the comments by the conservative critic and historian Walter Riezler, the conservative publisher Ferdinand Avenarius, and even the sympathetic critic Robert Breuer, all in Muthesius, Werkbund-Arbeit.


140 Taut, ”Eine Notwendigkeit,” p. 175.
unique. Gropius, heavily influenced by Behrens, had written extensively that the work of finding contemporary new forms could only be done by the best artists. Art, and especially high "monumental art," Gropius insisted, involved ideas that transcended the merely technical, material and natural. Drawing on a vision of the creative artist inspired by Nietzsche, Gropius had written several times of the power of the individual human will to recognize and create order amidst the chaos of life and the world: "The development of an artwork demands personality, the power of genius. Only the genius has the power to tackle the earthly with something unearthly, to reveal the unknown. He grabs the spirit of the cosmos, and captures it in a physical creation. . . . Only genius can create a truly monumental art. . . . The artistic genius always strives to express the most important thoughts of the day." Employing an artist to bring taste and propriety to the masses would not only garner the owner fame as a promoter of culture, but also profits. Eventually, he claimed, it would also benefit the community, bringing better work and designs to all. Despite his overly technical interests and his Behrens-like tendency to monumentality that Behne had criticized, it is clear that Gropius himself was firmly committed to the role of the artist in shaping the modern world. It was perhaps only his insistence that artists express the most important thoughts "of the

---

141 Franciscono, Walter Gropius, p. 72-73.


143 Gropius wrote: "It is the genial ideas [of the artist] that are especially worthy and perfect enough to be mass-produced by modern industry, benefitting not just the individual, but the community"; Gropius, "Entwicklung moderner Industriebaukunst," p. 18.
day," with which Behne might have quibbled. Behne maintained that art was never "of the day," but about more eternal spiritual values and fundamental human experiences.

Werkbund Debate as Politics

Underlying the Werkbund debate were fundamental differences in opinion about the nature of art and its relationship to society, in other words, politics. On the one hand Muthesius’ seemingly progressive position on type and convention emphasized the conservative interests of big business and the German role in international trade. On the other hand, van de Velde’s Socialist position paradoxically highlighted individual creativity as the path to innovation. Although both van de Velde and Muthesius had drawn many of their convictions from the early Socialist thinker William Morris and the English Arts and Crafts movement he helped found, the context in which they developed their positions profoundly determined their ideological stances.

Van de Velde began his career as a painter in the context of the Belgian Art Nouveau movement, whose overt ties to Belgium’s revolutionary Socialist movement sought a consciously innovative formal vocabulary in parallel to the working-class movement. Under the influence of Max Stirner, Nietzsche, Bakunin, Tolstoy, and Kropotkin, van de Velde eventually turned to the applied arts and architecture, and made it his goal to create a meaningful environment for the working man, an ethical
artistic goal that he saw as a parallel with the Socialist movement. The Société Anonyme craft workshops he founded in response were a for-profit corporation based on Morris’ company, but the principle of collaborative, anonymous manufacturing of artistically inspired products using machines was something both Taut and Behne would promote as key to developing a new art with which people could identify. In an unpublished essay from 1914 that Behne reprinted in his Wiederkehr der Kunst (The Return of Art, 1919), for example, Taut had declared that architects, like other applied artists, should avoid signing their works. Behne for his part proposed that when art became truly communal, the architect would lose all ego, and "act simply as the gathering consciousness of the many." Although van de Velde’s designs remained highly individual, aligned more with the Art Nouveau and the Arts and Crafts movement which interested him at the begin of his career, he was, ideologically and temperamentally, aligned closely with Behne and other Expressionists inventing a new artistic spirit for Europe.

---


145 "Er ist nur wie das zusammenfassende Bewußtsein der Vielen"; Behne, Wiederkehr der Kunst, p. 77. In this same book Behne reprinted a long excerpt of an unpublished article from 1914 by Bruno Taut on the virtues of anonymous architectural production, pp. 79-80. Taut’s article was solicited for "Soll der Baukünstler wie der Maler und wie der Plastiker sein Werk signieren?" Bauwelt 5 (1914): 27-30. The Arbeitsrat für Kunst in which Behne and Taut were leading figures was based on many similar principles of anonymous production and exhibition.
To Behne and his colleagues, Muthesius represented the oppressive Wilhelmine establishment they were trying to escape. The architect had developed his theoretical stance and ideological alliances while employed in the Commerce Ministry of the conservative Prussian bureaucracy. In the course of his work reforming the Prussian applied arts education system as well as his ministry’s more general mission of increasing the quantity and quality of German production and trade, Muthesius identified increasingly with the government’s conservative politics, hierarchical social order, and desire for order and consistency above any individual creativity. Not unlike van de Velde, Muthesius sought a coherent written and design "style" that was to be part of a "harmonious culture." But his emphasis was less on benefitting workers or the individual, than on representing the nation.

146 In his dissertation "Hermann Muthesius," esp. chaps. 6, 7, and even more forcefully in his forthcoming book Before the Bauhaus: Architecture, Politics, and the German State 1890-1920 (2005), Maciuika attempts to paint Muthesius’ design reform as precursors to Bauhaus methods, but this argument underplays the political confrontation between the industrialists and the Gropius and Van de Velde group who started the Bauhaus.

147 For years Muthesius had been seeking to counter the chaotic individualism and arbitrary forms that he and many contemporaries, including Behne, had perceived since the turn-of-the-century in the Art Nouveau movement, in the applied arts reform movement that followed, as well as in the modern, industrialized consumer culture around him. In his own designs he borrowed much from the English country house, about which he had published extensively, but also the popular Biedermeier revival or "Around 1800" movement that reintroduced a stripped-down classicism as a means of limiting expression. He proposed that the people and country that first arrived at a unified new style would determine future artistic developments, and soon dominate the world’s markets. See Fedor Roth, Hermann Muthesius und die Idee der harmonischen Kultur (2001); Maciuika, "Hermann Muthesius"; and Hermann Muthesius, Das Englishe Haus, 3 vols. (1904), republished with an intro. by Manfred Bock (1999); and as an abridged translation as The English House (1987). The "Um 1800" movement was expressed most saliently in Paul Mebes, Um 1800 (1907), with 2nd and 3rd editions
escape the eclectic and decadent form-making of Wilhelmine culture were often not radically different from Behne and artists such as Gropius and Taut, he was increasingly perceived and accused of representing a government sanctioned position, never a popular stance among artists.

More specific political connotations of the Werkbund debate emerged in the comments by Osthaus to the association's members. Unlike Endell, who simply dismissed Muthesius' "type" as an inappropriate goal for the Werkbund (he preferred "beauty" as the goal), Osthaus pointed out that the term *Typisierung* promoted by Muthesius had its origins in discussions about the creating worker housing. Osthaus explained that the strictures and functional requirements necessary to build such housing was incompatible with art and more generalized design reform. By using "typical," uniform or standard forms for items such as windows, he claimed worker housing such as the units that Metzendorf had recently erected in Essen could realize tremendous cost savings. Much as Behne and Taut had justified the use of repetitive and simple forms for worker housing and garden cities, Osthaus then proclaimed that "types develop everywhere that living conditions are identical. . . . Where similar living conditions exist, where a large number of workers all live off of similar wages, similar

______________________________


148 Osthaus' contribution to the discussion, in Muthesius, *Werkbund-Gedanke*, pp. 64-68.
forms will develop out of these similar living conditions. Osthaus noted, was also apparent in the famous "type-furniture" and other applied arts products manufactured by the Deutsche Werkstätten (German Workshops) at Hellerau. He even commended Riemerschmid, who was in the audience, for his inventive method of combining a few standardized parts to create a large collection of furniture including different beds, dressers, and tables. He claimed that this design method had huge "social benefits," allowing ever greater numbers of consumers to take advantage of the good design for an affordable price.

Osthaus opposed, however, a blanket application of type covering all facets of design and art. Here he showed his greatest affinities to the positions of van de Velde, Taut, Gropius, and Behne, sharing their underlying social commentary. He argued that modern Germany was too diverse and dynamic to justify the standards or conventions such as those proposed by Muthesius and Riemerschmid. "Everything is still in the process of becoming," he claimed. Incomes were diverging rapidly, life was in constant flux, individualism was ever more celebrated, traditions were still so different in the North than in the South, new materials such as concrete had not yet been adequately

\[1^{49}\] Osthaus also had very similar utopian, Idealist conception of art conviction about the nature of art. In his talk, for example, he characterized Riemerschmid’s process as "calculating." By extension the Werkbund’s design reform efforts, had nothing to do with art. Osthaus ended his lecture with a long quote from Schopenhauer on the defining role played by the "Idea" in the creation of great art, and how principles and rules lead only to poor imitations; Osthaus in Muthesius, Werkbund-Gedanke, pp. 65-66, quoting Arthur Schopenhauer, Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung (1814, 1844), translated as The World as Will and Representation (1969). esp. vol. 1, chapter 43 and vol. 2, chapter 35.
The socio-political implications of the opposing positions were by no means clear. Amidst the debate of future leadership that pitted Romantic idealism about the expressive genius of artists against the pragmatic production of industrialists, a great deal of ambiguity remained about which position was more pro-worker, nationalist, or traditional. It was for this reason, perhaps, that the political ramifications of certain positions drew the most passionate, personal commentary during the debate, although the moderator of the Werkbund discussion had explicitly prohibited such attacks. Osthaus’ comments, for example, were opposed by Muthesius supporters such as the Stettin museum director and journal editor Walter Riezler, who claimed the

150 "Die ganze Kunst- und Architekturgeschichte ist nichts anderes als die Geschichte schöpferischer Leistungen und ihres Einflusses auf das Milieu"; Osthaus in Muthesius, Werkbund-Gedanke, p. 66. In their lectures both Behrens and Riemerschmid had also insisted that typical form was something that could not be willed or purposefully created, Typisierung being an inevitable consequence of development, the purest resolution of a problem created by the best artists, which others followed.
Werkbund’s central mission lay not in producing inspired artistic achievements, but in solving everyday problems. Good solutions, he maintained, could not be achieved without the approval of the masses. The liberal critic Robert Breuer retorted that Riezler was trying to instigate a "Sociology of Art," deriving art not from forces internal to art, but rather from a popularity contest or paternalistic decree. Such an approach, warned Breuer, constituted demagoguery. Supporting Taut’s Saint-Simonian-like views of artist’s leading society to new frontiers, Breuer claimed that art arises not from the masses, but against it. The artist is more often right than the majority, he insisted. In a similar manner, Behne had also warned that art was not to be "of the times," or overly accommodating of specific circumstances, appealing rather to broader, eternal Ideals and a sense of "das Künstlerische."[151]

Behne’s Support for the Artists

Behne’s criticisms of the Werkbund exhibition, Taut’s Glashaus, and Gropius’ model factory must be seen as not only a set of aesthetic or an economic positions, but more importantly as part of a political debate about the role of art in modern industrial society. Behne did not participate directly in the vehement press and letter writing battles that followed the Werkbund debate, but his position can be gleaned indirectly from the ideas expressed by Taut, with whom Behne had shared so many ideas in the past year, as well as supporting statements by Endell, Obrist, and Osthaus. More direct

evidence can be found in the many reviews Behne wrote of the Cologne exhibit discussed earlier, especially of Taut’s Glashaus. In texts such as “Thoughts on Art and Function” from 1915, Behne articulated an Expressionist stance that emphasized the role of the individual, creative artist as the only force capable of creating transcendent, expressive form appropriate for the modern world. His harshest critiques of Muthesius’ position would wait until near the end of World War I, when any hope Behne had in industrial capitalism had collapsed, and the only way out seemed to be through art.

Although Behne was on the side of van de Velde, there were also important differences in their motivations. The historian Marcel Franciscono has pointed out that van de Velde’s camp, especially Endell, had recognized that Muthesius’ goal of raising the quality of industrial design on the broadest possible scale would inevitably lessen industry’s dependency on the individual artist. Muthesius’ ideas on convention and repetition inevitably meant the actual design of objects would return to limited pattern-book artists, although they might now be guided by the formal types established by the fine artists.

More recently Frederic Schwartz has also explored van de Velde’s counter-theses in light of contemporary socio-economic theories, showing van de Velde to be one of a number of artists "rooted in the economic realities of the times" who were

---


153 Franciscono, Walter Gropius, p. 263.
"attempting to integrate themselves into this evolving modern economy" by promoting an individual creativity encouraged by copyright and trademark laws. While this hypothesis may hold true for some of the applied artists, including van de Velde and even Gropius, it fits less well for other Werkbund members who supported the artists. Osthaus, the wealthy patron and collector of fine and applied arts, including designs by van de Velde, had little reason to justify his support for the genius of the artist on economic grounds. Taut, although working hard to "sell" his creative designs to clients as well as industry in order to establish himself and his fledgling architectural firm in Berlin, was primarily motivated by philosophical and ideological convictions about the nature of art and the human will to create. As a critic Behne also showed no evidence of being motivated by a desire to integrate either himself or his artist friends and colleagues into a capitalist economy. For Behne, all fine and applied art was not a commodity but an expression of the inner-life of the artist.

Despite a determination to bring art to the people and to unify art and life, for Behne, Taut, Osthaus, and many of the Werkbund’s most rebellious young minds, art was an antidote to the materialism and capitalism of decadent Wilhelmine culture, not a means of engaging with it. A close investigation of the positions taken by Behne’s Expressionist colleagues reveals a bias in Schwartz’s argument towards the important factions of the Werkbund’s industrialists and artists who were motivated by consumption and the consumer market. But the Werkbund’s influence on the

---

154 See Schwartz, Werkbund, pp. 147ff., quotes from p. 149.
development of modern architecture and design stemmed only partly from its ties to hegemonic economic and social forces. Schwartz’s approach thus under-represents the role that the Werkbund played in reforming production and creativity itself.

Behne and Taut promoted an "artistic Sachlichkeit" as well as the "rational" industrial architecture of Gropius and Poelzig. When viewed in the context of the Werkbund debate, such a synthesis of clear, functional forms with a passion and fantasy that only an artist could bring, would seem to be a contradiction. Far from promoting a willful, arbitrary, or abstract sense of form or aesthetics, Behne anticipated his later championing of functionalism, but also his more human-oriented approach to form-making. Although Behne’s positions changed in many respects after World War I with the development of modern architecture in the Weimar Republic, his emphasis on the human, artistic element in the creation of a modern architecture developed from this pre-war Expressionist sensibility and was solidified in the context of the Werkbund discussions.
Epilogue

The Werkbund debates, Taut’s Glashaus, as well as the accompanying exhibit buildings that so inspired Behne’s thinking on the development of modern architecture, all came to an abrupt close in the first week of August 1914, when the German Kaiser declared war on Europe. Soon after, Behne began a brief tour of duty on the western front and then as a hospital attendant in the Berlin suburb of Oranienburg, writing throughout almost without interruption. He swung from bouts of patriotism early in the war, to deep depression about the state of the industrial world order late in the war.¹ His criticism of the Werkbund and the missions it promoted became harsher. He turned more inward to the Idealist position of Expressionist art that he would retain so for his entire career.

In his well-known article “Critique of the Werkbund,” published in the former Werkbund publisher Diederichs’ journal Die Tat in August 1917, Behne launched a full-scale attack on the institution which had done so much to bring about reform towards more sachlich design in Germany.² Behne suggested that the Werkbund’s mission of uniting art and industry was farce, doomed to failure because of contradictory goals.


Business and industry, he claimed, by their very nature tended towards sentimentality and convention, while pure art was an elementary formal force that could not be harnessed into a "style" or any other goals. In an article from the same year published in the more obscure Expressionist magazine *Marsyas*, he lamented how business and modern technology had come to dominate modern man. In his own field, he felt the technical modes of reproduction were inflicting "violence" on any notion of a true art.

In the Fall of 1918, Behne even began to criticize his mentor Walden for having gone over to the other side, accusing the art dealer of being bourgeois in the way he promoted art as a commodity and luxury, rather than as an idea and "Inner necessity".

By the end of World War I, Behne’s advocacy of appropriate new art for the age turned from Expressionism to Cubism and eventually to Constructivism. Through support of these movements, he began to play an even more pivotal role in the development of a modern art and architecture in Germany. In March 1919, Behne became the executive secretary of the Arbeitsrat für Kunst (Working Council for Art), a group modeled after the Soviet worker’s councils, intent on promoting utopian artistic


experimentation in the face of the gloom of post-war Berlin. Acting as secretary
genral of the group, Behne was responsible for all the exhibits, publications, as well as worker-outreach programs initiated by the group. In part through contacts he
developed in the Arbeitsrat, Behne introduced his friend Gropius to Lyonel Feininger, and eventually helped convince the architect to hire him and several other artists as "Form-Masters" at the Bauhaus.

Behne also became ever more Socialist, politically, and artistically. In the midst of Germany’s failed revolution in November 1918, he briefly joining the new USPD party that split from the mainstream SPD. He became one of the primary art editors for Die Freiheit (The Freedom), the official mouthpiece of the USPD, and after the party collapsed in 1923, he moved on to become art editor of Die Welt am Abend (The Evening World), a communist newspaper sold mostly on the streets to workers, rather than through subscriptions. Behne also contributed significantly to discussions of art in two of the most important socialist journals of the Weimar era, the Sozialistische Monatshefte (Socialist Monthly), and DieWeltbühne (The World Stage).

In the late summer of 1920 Behne traveled to the "International Socialist Exhibition of Modern Art" in Amsterdam, and in the process became the first important

---

member of the German avant-garde to seek out the artists of the De Stijl movement. Through articles and books Behne began to convince Germans to look towards Holland for ideas of renewal and modern architecture. When Theo van Doesburg ventured east to Berlin, he first stayed in Behne’s apartment, where he was introduced to Taut, Gropius, Adolf Meyer, Fred Forbat, and Raoul Hausman, among others. Behne and these acquaintances eventually inspired van Doesburg to move to Weimar in 1921, where he was instrumental in helping move Gropius and the Bauhaus away from Expressionism. Behne’s 1922 article "Kunst, Handwerk und Industrie," written in the wake of these events, was one of the key theoretical essays that convinced Gropius and many other architects to abandon an Expressionist emphasis on craft in favor of technique, technology, and modern production methods.  

Although he cannot be said to have invented the ideas or the terms, Behne became ever more instrumental in identifying and promoting a new type of architecture that emerged after World War I as "Neues Bauen." Always seeking "the new," Behne was determined to reveal through his criticism what he called a "sociological approach" to architecture, one that balanced between the needs of the individual and the masses. Building on ideas that he had first formulated and explored before the war, Behne outlined a strategy that combined an emphasis on rational, sachlich design, with attention to the inner spiritual needs of the users and inhabitants of this new

---

architecture. In his book Der moderne Zweckbau (The Modern Functional Building), written to a large extent in 1923, Behne laid out with remarkable clarity the complete range of approaches to functionalism circulating in Germany at the time. In later books such as Neues Wohnen, Neues Bauen (New Living, New Building, 1927) and Eine Stunde Architektur (One Hour of Architecture, 1928), as well as his often reprinted article "Dammerstock" (1930), Behne continued his attempt simultaneously to shape a modern architecture, and to insure that it retained a humane character in the face of increasingly rational and mechanistic tendencies. Increasingly, he was forced to balance his often harsh critique of modern architecture, with a criticism of older, traditional, and according to Behne, clearly anachronistic approaches.

Although his ideas would continue to evolve and accommodate the changes in the context around him, the origin for most of Adolf Behne’s increasingly well-known ideas and arguments had their origins in his pre-World War I criticism. It was during these crucial years that the foundation and much of all the necessary intellectual and critical work was done that would allow for the radical architectural developments after the war that still inform our architectural thoughts today. The intellectual milieu in which Behne established his ideas about modern architecture distinguish him from his more famous critic colleagues such as Sigfried Giedion, allowing him to be both more perceptive and more influential on contemporary developments.

---

8 Posener, for example, insists that the years before 1918 were the decisive ones, not merely a prehistory to modern architecture, Berlin auf dem Wege 8. See also V.M. Lampugnani and R. Schneider, eds. Moderne Architektur in Deutschland 1900 bis 1950. Reform und Tradition (1992).
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Bibliography I – Archives

The following is a list of archives consulted for material related to the life, career, and writings of Adolf Behne, including names of collections consulted:

Akademie der Künste, Berlin
  Abteilung Baukunst
    Sammlung Behne
    Sammlung Martin Wagner
    Sammlung Erwin Gutkind
    Nachlaß Bruno Taut
    Nachlaß Hans Scharoun
    Nachlaß Max Taut
    Nachlaß Franz Hoffmann
    Nachlaß Martin Mächler
    Nachlaß Richard Döcker
    Nachlaß Adolf Rading
    Nachlass Hans und Wassily Luckhardt
  Archivabteilung Literatur
    Sammlung Bildende Kunst
      Nachlaß Paul Westheim
      Nachlaß Oskar Nerlinger
      Nachlaß Georg Groß

Art Institute of Chicago
  Hilbersheimer Papers

Bauhaus Archiv, Berlin
  Nachlaß Behne,Scharfe
  Nachlaß Walter Gropius (also at Harvard)
  Sammlung Arbeitsrat für Kunst

Berlinische Galerie
  Nachlaß Behne
  Nachlaß Höch
  Raoul-Hausman Archiv

Bundesarchiv Berlin
  Abteilung Presse und Funk des Kulturbundes zur demokratischen Erneuerung Deutschland
  Reichskulturkammer

Bundesarchiv, Potsdam = Deutsches Zentral Archiv
  Sammlung Reichskunstwart, Bestand R16
Deutsches Architektur Museum, Frankfurt
  Döcker Nachlaß
  Nachlaß Hannes Meyer
Deutsches Literaturarchiv, Marbach a.N
  Cotta Nachlaß,
  Essig Nachlaß
  Siegfried Kracauer Nachlaß
Deutsches Museum, Munich,
  Nachlaß Sörgel
Fondation Le Corbusier.
Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nürnberg, Archiv für Bildende Kunst
  Sammlung Ernst May
  Nachlaß Poelzig
Getty Archives, Santa Monica
  Walter Dexel Papers
  Karl Schneider Papers
Sammlung Niels Gutschow
Houghton Library, Harvard University
  Gropius Collection
Hochschule der Künste, Berlin, Archiv
  Personalakten
Institut für Geschichte und Theorie der Architektur, ETH, Zurich.
  CIAM Archive,
  Giedion Archiv
Kaiser Wilhelm Museum, Krefeld
  Dr. Franz Stoedtner photo collection
Karl-Ernst-Osthaus-Archiv, Hagen
Knud Lonberg-Holm Archives (Marc Dessauce)
Landesarchiv Berlin
  Nachlaß Behne/Wirsig
Leo Baeck Institute, New York, Collection Arthur Segal.
Library of Congress, Washington, DC
  Mies van der Rohe papers
Nationalgalerie, Zentralarchiv, Berlin
  Nachlaß Bode
  Nachlaß Dexel
Netherlands Architecture Institute (N.A.I.), Rotterdam
  J.J.P. Oud Archive
  H.P. Berlage Archive
Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst, Amsterdam
  Theo van Doesburg Archives
Nederlands Letterkundig Museum, The Hague
Nachlaß Oud
Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie (RKD), The Hague,
Van Doesburg Archive.
Rijksdienst Beeldende Kunst, Den Haag,
Nachlaß Theo van Doesburg
Staatsarchiv Weimar
Bestand Bauhaus
Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, handschriftenabteilung, Berlin
Behne Nachlaß
Sturm Archiv = Nachlaß Walden
Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek (SUB) Hamburg,
Nachlaß Max Sauerlandt.
Nachlaß Karl Scheffler
Nachlaß Werner Jakstein
Staatsgalerie Stuttgart
Oskar Schlemmer Archiv.
Stadtarchiv Frankfurt aM, Institut für Zeitgeschichte
Personalakten, Fritz Wichert
Stadtarchiv Magdeburg
Stadtarchiv Stuttgart, Bauabteilung
Stadtbücherei Hannover
Kurt Schwitters Archiv
Stiftung Seebühl
Emil Nolde Collection
Teige Archive, Památník narodního písemnictví Praha. Literarní archiv (PNP).
Wenzel Hablik Archiv, Itzehoe
Werkbundarchiv
Muthesius Korrespondenz
Bibliography II – List of Periodicals

The following is a list of all periodicals in which Adolf Behne and his wife are known to have published, along with the range of dates for their articles. It is intended to show the vast range of venues in which Behne published over his career as well as the broad reach his ideas had. With a few exceptions, all periodicals were personally inspected by the author, searching within the years indicated as well as in a range of issues before and after, until the author was confident there were no more articles by the Behnes.

ABC (1926)
(Acht) 8 Uhr-Abendblatt (1924 - 1930)
Die Aktion (1916)
Allgemeine Thüringsche Landeszeitung Deutschland (1924)
Allgemeiner Beobachter (1913 - 1914)
Der Ararat (1920)
Die Arbeit (1928)
Arbeiter-Illustrierte-Zeitung (1926 - 1931)
Arbeiter-Jugend (1912 - 1918)
Architectura (1923 - 1926)
Arquitectura (1928)
Architektur und Schaufenster (1928)
Atlantis (1933 - 1935)
Der Aufbau (1926)
Aufbau (1945 - 1948)
Bau-Rundschau (1913 - 1916)
Die Baugilde (1924 - 1930)
bauhaus (1928)
Baukunst (1925 - 1926)
Bauwelt (1911 - 1929)
Berlin am Mittag (1947)
Berliner Börsencourier (1913 - 1928)
Berliner Illustrierte Zeitung (1923 - 1930)
Berliner Tageblatt (1925, 1932)
Berliner Zeitung (1948)
Bibliothek der Unterhaltung und des Wissens (1935)
Bild und Film (1912 - 1915)
Bildende Kunst (1947 - 1948, 1957)
Bouwkundig Weekblad (1923 - 1928)
Die Buchgemeinde (1928/29)
Cahiers d’art (1927)
Cercle et carrée (1930)
Der Cicerone (1919 - 1921)
La Cité (1928 - 1933)
Contimporanul (1925)
Die Dame (1923 - 1932)
De 8 en Opbouw (1933)
De Stijl (1919-1921)
Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung (1936 - 1937)
Deutsche Bauzeitung (1929 - 1935, 1937)
Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration (1913 - 1925, 1934)
Deutsche Zukunft (1935 - 1937)
Deutscher Buch- und Steindrucker (1924)
Dresdner Neueste Nachrichten (1913 - 1914)
Eulenspiegel (1929 - 1931)
Evening Standard (ca. 1933)
Fachblatt für Holzarbeiter (1927)
Der Falkenberg (1923)
Farbe und Form (1925 - 1927)
Faust (1925/26)
Feuer (1920 - 1922)
Die Form (1925 - 1933)
Das Forum (1919)
Frankfurter Zeitung (1913 - 1935)
Die Freie Welt [Beilage Freiheit] (1919 - 1922)
Die Freiheit (1919 - 1922)
Frühlicht (N.F. 1921)
Frühlicht [Beilage Stadtbaukunst alter und neuer Zeit] (1920)
G - Material zur elementaren Gestaltung (1923)
La Gaceta Literaria (1928)
Gartenstadt (1913)
Die Gegenwart (1913 - 1914)
Die Gewerkschaft (1919)
Gewerkschaftliche Frauenzeitung (1922 - 1931)
Die Glocke (1917, 1925)
Hamburger Nachrichten (1913)
Hamburger Schiffarts-Zeitung [Beilage Hamburger Fremdenblatt] (1913)
Het Overzicht (1922 - 1923)
Heute und Morgen (1948)
Die Hilfe (1910 - 1913)
Das Hohe Ufer (1919)
Horizont (1948)
Humboldt-Blätter (1928)
i 10 (1927 - 1928)
Das Ideale Heim (1927 - 1928)
Illustrirte Zeitung (1920 - 1929)
Innen-dekoration (1918 - 1934)
Jahrbuch der jungen Kunst (1920 - 1921)
Klassenkampf (1926)
Klei (1923 - 1924)
Kölnerische Zeitung (1913 - 1924)
Königsberger Hartungsche Zeitung (1914)
Die Kornscheuer (1921)
Der Kreis um das Kind (1928)
Kulturwille (1924 - 1926)
Kunst der Zeit (1928)
Die Kunst für Alle (1916)
Kunst und Jugend (1932)
Kunst und Wirtschaft (1927)
Kunstauktion [Weltkunst] (1930)
Das Kunstblatt (1919 - 1931)
Der Kunstfreund (1918)
Kunstgewerbeblatt (1911 - 1916)
Der Kunsthandel (1916)
Der Kunstwanderer (1925)
Die Lese (1914-1918)
Die Lesestunde (1926 - 1942)
Licht - Bild - Bühne (1924)
Die Literarische Welt (1926 - 1928)
MA (1921 - 1923)
Magazin für Alle (1932)
Marsyas (1917)
März (1913 - 1917)
Menschen (1919)
Mitteilungen für die Freunde der DBG [Beilage Die Lesestunde],
Mitteilungen der Volkshochschule Groß-Berlin (1922)
Moderne Bauformen (1931)
Monatshefte für Kunstwissenschaft (1914 - 1919)
La Monde (1929)
Münchner Neueste Nachrichten (1919)
Nakanune (1923)
Das Neue Berlin (1929)
Neue Blätter für Kunst und Dichtung (1918 - 1919)
Die Neue Erziehung (1925)
Das Neue Frankfurt [Die neue Stadt] (1927 - 1931)
Die Neue Kunst (1913 - 1914)
Das Neue Reich (1919)
Die Neue Rundschau (1916 - 1933)
Das Neue Rußland (1924 - 1932)
Die Neue Schaubühne (1919)
Die Neue Stadt [Das Neue Frankfurt] (1932)
Die Neue Welt [Beilage Vorwärts] (1918)
Die Neue Zeit (1913)
Nieuwe Rotterdammers (1923)
Ostdeutsche Monatshefte (1925 - 1927)
Pan (1913)
Pasmo (1924 - 1925)
Der Pelikan (1924)
Das Plakat (1920 - 1921)
Die Post (1914)
Preussische Jahrbücher (1913)
Reclams Universum (1926 - 1928)
Die Republik (1919 - 1924)
Rheinische Blätter [La revue Rhenane] (1922)
Rheinische Heimblätter (1927)
Die Saale Zeitung (1917)
Sächsische Schulzeitung (1928)
Das Schiff [Beilage Typographische Mitteilungen (1925 - 1926)
Der Schünemann-Monat (1927)
Seidels Reklame (1922 - 1925)
Die Sendung (1931 - 1932)
(Sept) 7 Arts (1923 - 1927)
Der Silberne Spiegel (1919)
Sonntag (1946 - 1948)
Soziale Bauwirtschaft (1921 - 1930)
Sozialistische Monatshefte (1913 - 1933)
Stavba (1923 - 1927)
Die Strasse (1925)
The Studio (1930 - 1936)
Der Sturm (1912 - 1916)
Süddeutsche Freiheit (1919)
Das Tagebuch (1923 - 1930)
Tagespost (1947)
Tägliche Rundschau (1917)
Die Tat (1913 - 1926)
Technische Rundschau [Beilage Frankfurter Zeitung]
Tér és Forma (1929)
Typographische Jahrbücher (1925)
Uhu (1926 - 1930)
Ulenspiegel (1945 - 1946)
Die Umschau (1913 - 1932)
Velhagen und Klasings Monatshefte (1914)
Das Volk (1921)
Volk und Zeit [Beilage Vorwärts etc] (1924 - 1925)
Volksbühne (1920, 1927)
Volksbühnen-Blätter (1926)
Vorwärts (1913 - 1920)
Vossische Zeitung (1923 - 1927)
Wasmuths Monatshefte für Baukunst (1921 - 1931)
Die weißen Blätter (1915 - 1917)
Die Welt am Abend (1924 - 1932)
Die Welt des Kaufmanns (1914)
Der Welt Spiegel [Beilage Berliner Tageblatt] (1926)
Die Weltbühne (1922 - 1933)
Weltkunst [Kunstauktion] (1930)
Wendingen (1923)
Das Werk (1942)
Die Werkstatt der Kunst (1916)
Wiener Weltbühne (1933)
Wissenschaftliche Rundschau (1910 - 1912)
Wohnungskultur (1925)
Wohnungswirtschaft (1926 - 1933)
Das Wort (1923 - 1924)
Zeit-Echo (1915 - 1916)
Zeit im Bild (1913 - 1915)
Zeitbilder [Beilage Vossische Zeitung] (1926)
Zeitschrift für Aesthetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft (1925)
Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Architektur (1919)
Zeitschrift für Kunst (1947 - 1948)
Zentralblatt der Bauverwaltung (1922 - 1932)
Der Zweemann (1920)
Der Zwiebelfisch (1926)
Bibliography III – The Writings of Adolf Behne and Elfriede Schäfer Behne

The following bibliography lists all published and cited essays by Adolf Behne found by the author before December 2004. Unlike many writers concerned about their posterity, Behne did not compile lists of his own published texts. This bibliography is built on those assembled by Janos Frecot, Haila Ochs, and Rosemarie Haag Bletter, who had already tapped existing periodical indexes, searched through the major journals, listed the articles found in Behne’s own papers, and made many serendipitous discoveries. In addition, I gathered references from architect’s archives and clipping files throughout Germany and the United States; from searches of long runs of periodicals and newspapers where Behne was known to have published at least one article; from references in other primary literature from the period; and from citations in the extensive research bibliography on modern German architecture, most of which contains references to essays by Behne. All scholars researching Behne’s bibliography will be indebted to the tireless, extremely detailed work of the late Jürgen Scharfe of Halle (then GDR), Behne’s first official biographer, whose research notes became accessible as part of the Behne Papers at the Bauhaus-Archiv in the late 1990s. Magdalena Bushart’s anthology Adolf Behne: Essays zu seiner Kunst und Architekturkritik, also cited many previously unknown sources. In conversations


with the author in 1997-1998, Bushart announced that she was continuing a project begun by Frecot in the 1970s to publish the complete writings, and perhaps the complete correspondence of Adolf Behne. Such publications would presumably have contained an extensive bibliography, but this work has not yet appeared, due in part to cut backs in Berlin’s re-publishing industry. In September 1997 Bushart was kind enough to share a very comprehensive (unpublished) draft of a bibliography she had created in the course of her work. This bibliography, however, contains some 400 additional citations.

Yet I am certain that more writings by Behne exist. Germany’s fragmented but extremely prolific media industry published over 5,000 newspapers and periodicals before World War I, and many more afterwards, many of which contain just a single article by Behne. Behne also published essays in journals and newspapers throughout Western and Eastern Europe, especially during the 1920s. Until more serial publications are fully indexed and put on-line, however, finding these sources can only come through accidental discoveries.

I have also included in this bibliography all known works by Elfriede Schäfer Behne, Adolf Behne’s wife, because the husband and wife often collaborated and exact authorship of their work can at times not be determined.

Works are listed chronologically by publishing date as printed on the publication, as accurately as I have been able to determine. This has led to sometimes significant discrepancies with the dates of other published references and
bibliographies of Behne’s work, which often rely on the dates on the bound volume (e.g. Jahrgang 1912/13), or past erroneous citations, not on the actual publication date of the individual periodical. Where more is known about exactly when a text was written or when the publisher actually released it and it differs significantly from the listed publication date, I have mentioned this in a note following the bibliography entry.

In the notes I have also listed recent facsimile reprints, republications, revised editions, and translations, as well as dedications, reviews, responses, graphic design and other helpful information related to understanding the context of Behne’s publishing work. Since nearly all of Behne’s writings included phrases, paragraphs, pages, or even entire sections borrowed directly or revised only slightly from his own earlier writings, I have not attempted to acknowledge most of these overlapping publications in is own lifetime, though these are frequently noted in the text of the dissertation.

Abbreviations:
[Behne, Adolf]. = Authorship by Behne unconfirmed, but suspected.
[Adolf Bruno, pseud.]. = Behne writing under pseudonym (his first and middle names only).
** = Confirmed publication, but exact source or date unknown (usually a clipping or copy exists, but without a definitive source).
### = Publication cited and probable, but not personally confirmed by the author.
1910
*Notes:* Section titled 'Kunstwissenschaftliche Rundschau'.

1911
*Notes:* Section titled "Kunstwissenschaftliche Rundschau"
"Max Klingers neue Blätter 'Vom Tode'," *Die Hilfe* 17, no. 16 (Apr. 20, 1911): 255.
"Max Slevogt," *Die Hilfe* 17, no. 29 (July 20, 1911): 461.
"Kunstwissenschaftliche Neuerscheinungen," *Wissenschaftliche Rundschau* 2, no. 2 (Oct. 15, 1911): 44.
"Im Kampfe um die Kunst," *Wissenschaftliche Rundschau* 2, no. 4 (Nov. 15, 1911): 77-81.

1912
"Ludwig von Hofmann," *Die Hilfe* 18, no. 7 (Feb. 15, 1912): 111.
[Adolf Bruno, pseud.]. "Weshalb brauchen wir Kunstsammlungen?," *Arbeiter-Jugend* 4, no. 12 (June 8, 1912): 190-191.
*Notes:* Dedicated to "Meinen Eltern." Dissertation sponsors listed as Dr. Adolph


1913
"Impressionismus, Expressionismus, Kubismus," Dresdner Neueste Nachrichten 21, no. 50 (Feb. 22, 1913).
"Max Pechstein," Die Hilfe 19, no. 9 (Feb. 27, 1913): 139.
"Franz Marc," Dresdner Neueste Nachrichten (Mar. 27, 1913).

Notes: Signed "A.B." or Alfred Baeumer instead?
[Adolf Bruno, pseud.]. "Die Entstehung eines Gemäldes," Arbeiter-Jugend 5, no. 10
"Cafe Brandenburger Tor," *Berliner Börsen-Courier* (May 21, 1913) ##

*Notes:* Cited in Behne postcard to Taut (May 31, 1913) Taut Archiv.

"Die Berliner Sezession," *Die Gegenwart* 42.1 = Bd.83, no. 22 (May 31, 1913): 342-345.


"Kino und Plakatkunst," *Bild und Film* 2, no. 10 (July 1913): 235-237.


"Das Monument des Eisens," *Dresdner Neueste Nachrichten* (July 11, 1913).

"Die Große Berliner Kunstaustellung I," *Die Gegenwart* 42.2 = Bd.84, no. 28 (July 12, 1913): 435-437.

"Die Große Berliner Kunstaustellung II," *Die Gegenwart* 42.2 = Bd.84, no. 29 (July 19, 1913): 454-457.

"Das Monument des Eisens auf der Leipziger Baufachausstellung," *Die Umschau* 17, no. 30 (July 19, 1913): 619-621.


"Futurismus," *Dresdner Neueste Nachrichten* (July 22, 1913).


"Der Kaiser und die Kunst," *Die Tat* 5.1, no. 6 (Sept. 1913): 576-587.


"Der Märchenbrunnen," *Die Hilfe* 19, no. 37 (Sept. 11, 1913): 586.

"Die Juryfreie," *Die Gegenwart* 42.2 = Bd.84, no. 37 (Sept. 13, 1913): 587-589.

"Kunst und Milieu (I)," Die Gegenwart 42.2 = Bd.84, no. 38 (Sept. 20, 1913): 599-603.
"Kunst und Milieu (II)," Die Gegenwart 42.2 = Bd.84, no. 39 (Sept. 27, 1913): 616-619.
"Der erste deutsche Herbstsalon," Dresdner Neueste Nachrichten (Sept. 28, 1913).
Notes: Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 17-21.

"Der Herbstsalon," Die Gegenwart 42.2 = Bd.84, no. 42 (Oct. 18, 1913): 668-669.

"Der erste Deutsche Herbstsalon," Die Tat 5.2, no. 8 (Nov. 1913): 841-843.
"Die Letzten der Sezession," Dresdner Neueste Nachrichten (Nov. 16, 1913).
"Die Berliner 'Herbstausstellung,'" Zeit im Bild 11.4, no. 48 (Nov. 26, 1913): 3283-3284.
"Thutmes," Dresdner Neueste Nachrichten (Nov. 30, 1913).

"Die Berliner Herbstausstellung," Die Gegenwart 42.2 = Bd.84, no. 49 (Dec. 6, 1913): 778-780.

1914

"Goethe und Nietzsche über Popularwissenschaft," Die Lese 5.1, no. 17 (1914): 277-278.
Notes: Republished in Sprengel and Schutte, Die Berliner Moderne, pp. 592-596.
"Heutige Industriebauten," Velhagen und Klasings Monatshefte 28, no. 5 (Jan. 1914): 53-

Notes: "Chronik des kulturellen Lebens: Bildende Kunst"

Notes: Signed "A.Br."


Notes: Signed "Dr.A.B." Section titled "Kunst- und Literaturnachrichten."

Notes: Excerpt quoted in Herzogenroth and Teuber, Die Deutsche Werkbundausstellung Köln 1914, pp. 139.

Notes: Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 24-26; Schutte and Sprengel, Die Berliner Moderne 1885-1914, pp. 592-596.


"Expressionismus'," Allgemeiner Beobachter 3, no. 20 (Feb. 15, 1914): 273-274.

Notes: Not signed.

"Der Maler Munch'," Die Gegenwart 43.1 = Bd.85, no. 8 (Feb. 21, 1914): 127-128.


Notes: Not signed.

"Berliner Kunstausstellungen," Dresdner Neueste Nachrichten (Mar. 18, 1914).
"Das Ende der Berliner National-Galerie," Die Gegenwart 43.1 = Bd.85, no. 13 (Mar. 28, 1914): 201-203.
Notes: "Chronik des kulturellen Lebens - Bildende Kunst"
"Museen als Volksbildungsstätten," Die Post (Apr. 9, 1914). ##
Notes: Scharfe cite.

[Adolf Bruno, pseud.] "Wie eine plastisches Kunstwerk entsteht (I)," Arbeiter-Jugend 6, no. 9 (Apr. 25, 1914): 139-142.
Notes: Signed "Dr. A.B." Section titled "Kunst- und Literaturnachrichten."
Notes: Republished in Max Taut 1884-1967, pp. 54-55.
"Die Säule," Kunstgewerbeblatt N.F. 25, no. 8 (May 1914): 144-146.
Notes: Signed "A.Br."
"Die Ausstellung des Werkbundes. I," Dresdner Neueste Nachrichten 22, no. 164 (June 20, 1914).
Notes: Cited in letter Behne to Gropius, July 1914.
"Die neue Nationalgalerie," Die Tat 6, no. 4 (July 1914): 442-445.
Notes: Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 29-36.
Notes: Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 26-29.

[Adolf Bruno, pseud.]. "Wie eine plastisches Kunstwerk entsteht (II)," Arbeiter-Jugend 6, no. 18 (Aug. 29, 1914): 277-278.
Notes: "Dieser Aufsatz ist vor dem Krieg geschrieben."
"Der Krieg in der bildenden Kunst (I)," Die Umschau 18, no. 39 (Sept. 26, 1914): 788-792.

Notes: Translated in Washton Long, German Expressionism, pp. 60-63.

1915
Notes: Printed Nov. 1914. 2nd ed. 1917. Fascimile reprint (Lichtenstein: Kraus, 1974) in a compilation of all ten Sturm books; republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 41-53. Excerpts previously published: pp. 5-11 from Sturm (Apr. 1914); pp. 18-28 from Zeitgeist (Sept. 1913); pp. 28-32 from Die Tat (Nov.
1913). Dedicated to "Meinem Bruder Vaterlandsverteidiger"; 2nd Ed. to "Meinem Bruder".


Review of E. Behrens, Das kriegerische Frankreich (Munich 1915), in Zeit-Echo, no. 21 (1915): 328.

"Paul Scheerbart †," Zeit-Echo, no. 5 (1915/16): 77.


Notes: Republished in Tenzler, Über die Schönheit, pp. 210-212; März and Kühnel, Expressionisten, p. 328.

"Kinoarchitekturen," Bild und Film 4, no. 7/8 (Apr./May 1915): 133-139.

"Kunst, Geschmack und Nachahmung," Kunstgewerbeblatt N.F. 26, no. 8 (May 1915): 142-144.

"Berliner Kunstaustellungen," Die weißen Blätter 2, no. 6 (June 1915): 811-814.

"Der Schrei nach dem Fachmann," Die weißen Blätter 2, no. 7 (July 1915): 935-937.

1916

"Aegypten (II)," *Arbeiter-Jugend* 8, no. 23 (Nov. 4, 1916): 182.


1917


Notes: Cover by Richard Jaunthur.


"Rom also Vorbild?," Sozialistische Monatshefte 23.1 = Bd.47, no. 6 (Mar. 28, 1917): 303-306.
Notes: Signed A.B. Scharfe cite.
Notes: Signed A.B. Scharfe cite
Notes: Also exists as Sonderdruck! Republished in Frecot, Werkbundarchiv Jahrbuch, pp. 118-128. Translated in Francesco Dal Co, Teorie del Moderno, pp. 226-233. Response by Fritz Hellwag in 9, no. 6 (Sept. 1917) issue, and by Bruno Raunecker, 9, no. 10 (Jan. 1918), both republished in Frecot, "Bibliographische Berichte."
Notes: Signed "A.B." Scharfe cite.
"Wo bleiben die neuen Dramatiker?," Vorwärts 34, no. 261 (Sept. 23, 1917).
Notes: Beilage "Sonntag" No.38.
"Wem gehört die Gotik?," Sozialistische Monatshefte 23.3 = Bd.49, no. 22 (Oct. 31, 1917): 1126-1129.
Notes: Response by C.E. Uphoff, "Offener Brief an Adolf Behne" 9, no. 10 (Jan. 1918): 887-889.

1918
"Die Kathedrale von Reims," Sozialistische Monatshefte 24.1 = Bd.50 (Apr. 9, 1918): 346-351.
[Adolf Bruno, pseud.]. "Was ist Kunst?," Arbeiter-Jugend 10, no. 9 (May 4, 1918): 68-69.
"Neue Kunstmücher," Vorwärts 35, no. 163 (June 18, 1918); Beilage "Sonntag" No.22.
Notes: Signed "B".
"In Memoriam Hermann Essig," Neue Blätter für Kunst und Dichtung 1, no. 3 (July 1918): 64-65.
Review of M. Jungnickel, Trotz Tod und Tränen (Munich 1918 ?), in Neue Blätter für Kunst und Dichtung 1, no. 3 (July 1918): 65.
Notes: Response by Walden, Der Sturm 9, no. 9 (Dec. 1918): 114-115.

1919
"[Honore Daumier]." In Jungvolk-Almanach 1919. Berlin: Buchhandlung Vorwärts, 1919. ##
Notes: Jg.=1914-19. 8 plates in back.


Excerpt published in "Glasarchitektur," Frühlicht 1 (Jan. 1920), and reprint Frühlicht (1963); De Stijl (Oct. 1921); Hartmann, Trotzdem Modern, pp. 297-298.
Reviews: F. Paulsen, Bauwelt 11, no. 21 (May 20, 1920): 288; B[jermann], Cicerone 12, no. 7 (Apr. 13, 1920): 310; O. Beyer, Feuer 1, no. 9 (June 1920): 717; Freiheit 2,


"Lyrische oder architektonische Bühne?," Die neue Schaubühne 1, no. 3 (Mar. 1919): 77-80.


"Die Waffen nieder!," Süddeutsche Freiheit 1, no. 15/16 (March 3, 1919): 3-4.
Notes: Signed "A.B."

Notes: Signed "a.b."

Notes: Scharfe cite.


"Was wird aus den Museen?," Freiheit 2, no. 151 (Mar. 29, 1919): 2-3.
Notes: Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 55-59; excerpt in Wendschuh and Volkman, Bruno Taut, p. 186.


Notes: Not signed.


Notes: Signed "A.B.

Notes: Not signed. Preceeds AB "Ausstellungen."


Notes: Excerpt republished in Thater-Schulz, Hannah Höch, p. 560-564.


Notes: Republication in Schlösser, Arbeitsrat für Kunst Berlin 1918-1921, p. 103; März and Kühnel, Expressionisten, p. 157-158.

"Berliner Sezession 1919," Freiheit 2, no. 221 (May 9, 1919): 2.


Notes: Not signed. Excerpt republished in März and Kühnel, Expressionisten, p. 357.


"Historische, ästhetische und kritische Kunstbetrachtung," Das Hohe Ufer 1, no. 6 (June 1919): 134-136.

"Zum Gedächtnis Herrmann Essigs," Neue Blätter für Kunst und Dichtung 2, no. 3 (June 1919): 57.


Notes: Not signed

""Kunstgewerbe"--Zeitdokumente, Führer, Totenliste, Kurze Chronik," Sozialistische Monatshefte 25.1 = Bd.52, no. 13/14 (June 10, 1919): 593-595.


"Farbfreudigkeit und mehr . . . ," Freiheit 2, no. 311 (July 3, 1919): 2.

""Kunstgewerbe"--Briefmarken, Ausschreibewesen, Farbfreudigkeit, Totenliste, Kurze Chronik," Sozialistische Monatshefte 25.1 = Bd.52, no. 15/16 (July 7, 1919): 682-684.

Notes: Excerpt republished in Wendschuh, Hans Scharoun: Zeichnungen, p. 10.


Notes: From a Bauhaus typescript of Feininger reviews, in archives of Nationalgalerie Berlin, republished in März and Kühnel, Expressionisten, p. 357.


"Der Künstler im sozialistischen Staate," Das Neue Reich 1, no. 19 (Aug. 3, 1919). ##

Notes: Cited in Thater-Schulz, Hannah Höch, p. 481.


Notes: Republished in Hartmann, Trotzdem Modern, pp. 56-60.


Notes: Response to H. Walden, Der Sturm.


Notes: Response by H. Walden, Freiheit 2, no. 383 (Aug. 12, 1919): 2; and counter-


Notes: Not signed.

Notes: Not signed.


Notes: Not signed

Notes: Signed "A.B."


Notes: Signed "A.B."


Notes: Signed "ad." Behne, "Werkstattbesuch Golyscheff" in same issue.


Notes: Excerpt republished in Thater-Schulz, Hannah Höch, p. 570-2.


1920


Notes: Reprint in Schlösser, Arbeitsrat für Kunst Berlin 1918-1921, pp. 77ff.


-----, Contribution. In Behne, Ruf zum Bauen.


Notes: Distributed by Franz Hanfstaengel, Munich (Karlsplatz 7). Delivered in 8 installments of 5 plates = 37pl. in heliotype and 3 color lithographs (Mondrian, Rodchenko, Van Doesburg). A small brochure of this publication was published with the same name. Excerpt in Die Form 1 (1925/26): 31-32.


Notes: Response to Karl Rapp, Plakat 11, no. 3 pp. 112-117.


Notes: Republished in Schlösser, Arbeitsrat für Kunst 1918-1921, p. 111.

Notes: Signed "A.B."


Notes: Excerpt republished in Frecot, "Bibliographische Berichte," pp.138-140.


Notes: Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 53-55. Special anniversary issue "Neuland der Kunst".


Notes: Not signed.


"Die Abderiten," Der Zweemann 1, no. 6 (Apr. 1920): 6-8.


Notes: Not signed


Notes: Not signed


Notes: Signed "AB"

"Fabrikbau als Reklame," Das Plakat 11, no. 6 (June 1920): 274-276.
Notes: Sonderheft "Baukunst." Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 78-81.

"Hermann Essig †," Feuer 1.2, no. 9 (June 1920): 665-674.

Notes: Signed "A.B."


"Kitschk unst oder Kunstkitsch?," Das Plakat 11, no. 7 (July 1920): 304-311.


Notes: Excerpt republished in Heartfield, Jean Heartfield, pp. 44-45 ##; Thater-Schulz, Hannah Höch, p. 680-685; Schader and Schebera, Kunstmetropole Berlin, p. 103.


Notes: Excerpt republished in Schneider, Hermann Finsterlin, p. 144.


"Zum Thema der überkonfessionellen Gotteshäuser," Die Tat 12, no. 6 (Sept. 1920): 471-473.


Notes: Signed "A.B."


Notes: Not signed.


Notes: Excerpt republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, p. 141


Notes: By Elfriede Behne?


Notes: Signed "A.B."

"Max Krause †," Der Cicerone 12, no. 23 (Dec. 2, 1920): 861-862.


Notes: Not signed.


1921


Notes: Also as separate publication? Reprint (Berlin (GDR): Klaus Guhl, 1977).


"Oskar Fischer," Jahrbuch der jungen Kunst 2 (1921): 149-152.

"[Hochhäuser für Stuttgart]," Wasmuths Monatshefte für Baukunst 6, no. 11/12 (1921/1922): 377.

Notes: Response to Richard Herre, WMB; response by P. Bonatz, WMB.

"Der offene Zeichensaal," Freiheit 4, no. 6 (Jan. 5, 1921): 2.


Notes: Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 67-73; Hartmann, Trotzdem Modern, pp. 300-304.


Notes: Signed "A.B."

Notes: Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 73-77; Hartmann, Trotzdem Modern, pp. 92-96.


Notes: Jg.=1920/21. Special issue on Holland.


"Die Schlacht der Heilande," Freiheit 4, no. 82 (Feb. 18, 1921): 2.

Notes: Cover by Hannah Höch.

Notes: Response by Walden in Sturm 12, no. 3 (1921): 64.

Notes: "Zur Eröffnung der Ausstellung im Kronprinzenpalais. Ansprache von Adolf Behne".
Notes: Not signed.
Notes: Not signed.

"Was versteht das Ministerium unter Volksbildungsstätten?," Freiheit 4, no. 140 (Mar. 24, 1921): 2.

"Deutschland und die europäische Kunstbewegung," Sozialistische Monatshefte 27.1 = Bd.56, no. 7 (Apr. 11, 1921): 297-301.

"'Kunstgewerbe'--Osthaus †, Cuypers †, Mode, Qualität und Luxus, Bevormundung oder Selbsthilfe?, Totenliste, Kurze Chronik, Literatur," Sozialistische Monatshefte 27.1 = Bd.56, no. 8 (Apr. 25, 1921): 372-376.
Notes: Excerpt republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 138-139
"Die Sammlung der Antiken Gipsabgüsse," Freiheit 4, no. 218 (May 12, 1921): 2-3.
Notes: "Zur Tagung des Bundes der entschiedener Schulreformer"
"Bild und Buchstabe," Das Plakat 12, no. 6 (June 1921): 338-344.
"Sozialismus und Expressionismus," ?, (c. June 1921 ?): 75-6. ##
Notes: Copy in Behne papers. Reprint from Die Freie Welt 3, no. 23 (June 9, 1921): 179-180.
"Walter Kampmann," Das Plakat 12, no. 6 (June 1921): 319-334ff.
"'Kunstgewerbe'--Städtebau, Kleinmiethaus, Kaldenbach, Kurze Chronik, Literatur," Sozialistische Monatshefte 27.1 = Bd.56, no. 11 (June 6, 1921): 518-520.
Notes: Excerpts republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 135-137.
Notes: Reprint in ?, (n.d.), pp. 75-76.
"Kunstbücher," Freiheit 4, no. 266 (June 10, 1921): 2.
Notes: "Arbeiter-Büchertisch"
"Schulkunstausstellungen," Freiheit 4, no. 278 (June 17, 1921): 2-3.
Notes: Signed A.B.
"Vincent van Gogh," Freiheit 4, no. 296 (June 28, 1921): 2.
"Zum Thema Picasso," Die Neue Rundschau 32.2, no. 7 (July 1921): 783-784.
Notes: Excerpt published in De Stijl 4, no. 10 (Oct. 1921): 158; Kulturwille 1, no. 10 (1924): 175-8; and Wendschub, Hans Scharoun: Zeichnungen, pp. 52
Notes: Signed "A.B."
"'Kunstgewerbe'--Buchkultur, Ornament, Bauwesen, Kurze Chronik, Literatur,"
Sozialistische Monatshefte 27.2 = Bd.57, no. 17 (Aug. 29, 1921): 780-784.


"Die 100. Ausstellung des 'Sturm',' Freiheit 4, no. 422 (Sept. 9, 1921): 2-3.


Notes: Signed "AB."


"Die neue Aufgabe der Kunst," Sozialistische Monatshefte 27.2 = Bd.57, no. 18/19 (Sept. 19, 1921): 813-815.


Notes: Not signed

"Der Film am Dienstag: Bewegungskunst," Freiheit 4, no. 452 (Sept. 27, 1921): 2.


Notes: Jg. 1921/22. Also as separate reprint (Berlin: Ernst Wasmuth, 1922).

Photographs provided by Th. Wijdeveld and Theo van Doesburg. Excerpt republished in Hartmann, Trotzdem Modern, pp. 307-313.


[Mittelalterliches und Modernes Bauen]," De Stijl 4, no. 10 (Oct. 1921): 158.


Notes: "Arbeiter Büchertisch"


Notes: "Gemälde und Photographie -- Matisse --Kokoschka -- Otto Dix."


6, no. 2 (1922): 92.
   Notes: "1. Karl Blechen 1789-1846; 2. Paul Cézanne 1836-1906; 3 Henri Matisse, geb. 1869."
"Der Film als Kunstwerk," Sozialistische Monatshefte 27.2 = Bd.57, no. 26/27 (Dec. 15, 1921): 1116-1118.
   Notes: By Elfriede Behne?

1922
   Notes: Sonderdruck from Wasmuths Monatshefte 6, no. 1/2 (1921/2): 1-32.
   Notes: Also (Dresden: Sibyllen Verlag)?
Review: Querschnitt n.4/5 (1921): 180f ##.
   Notes: Republished in Zimmermann, Der Schrei nach dem Turmhaus, pp. 317-318.
"Hochhaus Friedrichstraße," Freiheit 5, no. 73 (Feb. 12, 1922): B3.
"Kunstgewerbe--Hochhausproblem, Baukultur, Kurze Chronik, Literatur.
"Im Herzen längst Geheimrat gewesen ... Oder: Der Konflikt in der Akademie,
Notes: Not signed
"Eine Gelegenheit, die nicht verpaßt werden darf," Freiheit 5, no. 174 (Apr. 12, 1922).
Notes: Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 61-67.
"Kunstgewerbe--Farbige Fassaden, Baukultur, Tagungen, Kurze Chronik, Literatur,
Sozialistische Monatshefte 28.1 = Bd.58, no. 10 (May 1, 1922): 430-432.
Notes: Signed "A.B."
Notes: Signed "A.D."
"Junge französische Architektur," Sozialistische Monatshefte 28.1 = Bd.58, no. 12/13 (June 15, 1922): 146-149.


[Behne, Adolf]. "Die bunte Stadt," Freiheit 5, no. 287 (July 31, 1922). ##
Notes: Scharfe cite.


Notes: Republished in Zimmermann, Der Schrei nach dem Turmhaus, p. 320.

Notes: Not signed.

Notes: Republished in Schneede, Die Zwanziger Jahre, pp. 117, 119.

"Die deutsche Baukunst seit 1850 (IV)," Soziale Bauwirtschaft 2, no. 16/17 (ca. Sept. 1, 1922): 203-206.


"Die deutsche Baukunst seit 1850 (V)," Soziale Bauwirtschaft 2, no. 18 (ca. Sept. 15, 1922): 229-231.

"Das bunte Magdeburg und die 'Miama',' Seidels Reklame 7, no. 7 (Oct. 1922): 201-206.
Notes: Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 82-92.

Notes: Translated by Diane Blaurock as "Art, Handicraft, Technology,”

Notes: Excerpt republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 139-140.


Notes: Translated in Kaes, Jay et al., Weimar Republic Sourcebook, pp. 489-490;
Benson and Forgács, Between Worlds, p. 408

1923
"Architektur," MA 8, no. 5-6 (1923): 7.
Notes: Deutsches Sonderheft.

[Bauhaus Festwoche]," Nakanune (1923) ##
Notes: Translated in Zimmermann, Der Schrei nach dem Turmhaus, pp. 319; cover reprinted in Le Coultrie, Wendingen, pp.130-131.
Reviews: Das Kunstblatt 7 (1923): 159.
"Kronika nemeckého Stavebního umení po válce," Stavba 2, no. 6 (ca. Apr. 1923): 97-100.
"Nemecký dopis [=Deutscher Brief]," Stavba 2, no. 3 (1923): 47-49.
Notes: "Deutscher Brief" In Czech. Translated by Karel Teige. Bauhaus-Archiv has 1pp. excerpt translated. Bauhaus Presse, Mappe 151, GL 22/153 has typescript in German.
"O Stavbe mest," Stavba 2, no. 8 (1923): 145.
Notes: 12pp., 30pl. Behne's essay "Die Sammlung Gabrielson-Göteborg"; Hilberseimer "Anmerkungen zur neuen Kunst"; Friedlaender "Goethes Farbenlehre und die moderne Malerei."
Reviews: Das Kunstblatt 7, no. 9 (Sept. 1923): 287.


"Le mouvement artistique en Allemagne (I)," *(Sept)* 7 *Arts* 1, no. 12 (Jan. 18, 1923): 2.


"Le mouvement artistique en Allemagne (II)," *(Sept)* 7 *Arts* 1, no. 13 (Jan. 25, 1923): 1.


"Max Krause," *Architectura* 27, no. 25 (July 14, 1923): 144-146.


""Kunstgewerbe'--Allgemeines Niveau, Holland, Tschechien, Kurze Chronik, Literatur," *Sozialistische Monatshefte* 29 = Bd.60, no. 7 (July 24, 1923): 453-455.


Notes: Signed "Dr. AB"

Notes: Reprinted in Bauhaus, Für das Staatliche Bauhaus, p. 34.
"Internationální vystava architektury ve vymaru (Staatliches Bauhaus)," Stavba 2, no. 6 (ca. Sept. 1923): 107-108.
Notes: Signature dated 7.9.1923. Translated by Karel Teige.
"Bauhausresume," Sozialistische Monatshefte 29 = Bd.60, no. 9 (Sept. 18, 1923): 542-545.
"Über den Geist der Siedlung," Der Falkenberg, no. 6 (Oct. 1, 1923).
Notes: Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 123-126; Hartmann, Trotzdem Modern, pp. 338-341; Droste, Georg Muche, pp. 41-42; Bauhaus, Für das Staatliche Bauhaus, p. 56.
"De 'Bauhaus'-tentoonstelling te Weimar," Nieuwe Rotterdammer (c. Nov. 1923) #
Notes: Cited in Klei 15, no. 21 (Nov. 1, 1923): 245-253.
"Le 'Bauhaus' a Weimar," (Sept) 7 Arts 2, no. 6 (Nov. 15, 1923): 1-2.

1924
[Behne, Adolf]. "Eine wirkliche Renovation," Volk und Zeit 6, n.43 (? (1924 ?): 5. ##

Notes: Signed "A.B." Scharfe typescript in Bauhaus-Archiv.


Notes: In Russian. Also "Die Strömmungen in der zeitgenössischen deutschen Kunst" ? Design by Alexandra Exter. Translation by Jürgen Scharfe of "Pervoj vseobsej germanskoj vystavki v Moskve."

"Der Tanz der Russen," Das Neue Rußland 1, no. 7,8 (1924): 45.

Notes: "Vorwort zu der Mappe "Die Tänzer" von Sasha Stone. Also in Das Wort (Dec. 12, 1924).

"Die technische Grundlage," Wohnungskultur 1, no. 23 (1924): 25.


Notes: Dedicated to Behne's children Karla and Julia. Written spring 1914; introduction dated spring 1924. In Behne, Oranienburg listed as already published 1914. Later published by Konzentration A.G.?


Notes: Czech translation of "Architektur," MA 8, no.5-6 (1923): 7.


Notes: Photo reprinted in Bauwelt 50, no. 11 (Mar. 16, 1959): 304.

"Separatismus im Kronprinzenpalais," Das Tagebuch 5, no. 6 (Feb. 9, 1924): 193-194.


Notes: Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 92-95; Hartmann, Trotzdem Modern, pp. 325-327.


Notes: In Dutch.


"Reichskunstwart," Das Tagebuch 5, no. 7 (Feb. 16, 1924): 212-213.

Notes: In Dutch.

Notes: Title: "Ontvangen Boeken." In Dutch. Signed A.B. (or A. Boeken, also writes about Russian art, cf 44, no. 20 p. 213). Bauhaus-Archiv has translated typescript. Also Mappe 156, GL 22/248, Pressearticle has typescript.

Behne, Arnolf [sic]. "L'art en Russie soviétique (I)," (Sept) 7 Arts 2, no. 21 (Feb. 24, 1924): 1-2.
Notes: Continued in n.22. Translated by J.B.

"Das moderne deutsche Plakat," Deutscher Buch- und Steindrucker 30, no. 6 (Mar. 1924): 397-400ff.

Behne, Arnolf [sic]. "L'art en Russie soviétique (II)," (Sept) 7 Arts 2, no. 22 (Mar. 6, 1924): 3.
Notes: Continued from n.21. Translated by J.B.

"Für das Weimarer Bauhaus," (Acht) 8 Uhr-Abendblatt [= National Zeitung], no. 78 (Apr. 1, 1924).

"Kunstberichte aus Russland I (a)," Architectura 28, no. 11 (Apr. 5, 1924): 45-46.

"Um das Weimarer Staatliche Bauhaus," Allgemeine Thüringsche Landeszeitung Deutschland, no. 109 (Apr. 18, 1924).

"Kunstberichte aus Russland I (b)," Architectura 28, no. 13 (Apr. 19, 1924): 53-54.

Notes: Special issue in cooperation with German art show in Russia.

Notes: "Das Mosse Haus"; "Das neue Gewerkschaftshaus"; "Sammlung neuer Kunst in Weimar"; "Berliner Sezession"

"Herriot als Kunstfreund," (Acht) 8 Uhr-Abendblatt 77, no. 122 (May 24, 1924). ##
"Russische Kunstberichte I," Die Weltbühne 20.1, no. 24 (June 12, 1924 ): 813-815.
Notes: 3-part article, pieces reprinted in Das neue Rußland 4, no. 9/10 (1927): 42, and Das Wort n.80 (July 12, 1924).

"Reklame als Bilder-Rätsel," Das Tagebuch 5, no. 25 (June 21, 1924): 844-848.
"Kunstgewerbe--Städtebau, Baukultur, Reklame, Totenliste, Kurze Chronik, Literatur," Sozialistische Monatshefte 30 = Bd.61, no. 6 (June 24, 1924): 406-411.
Notes: Excerpt republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 132-133, 140-141
"Über die moderne Baukunst in Frankreichs," Sozialistische Monatshefte 30 = Bd.61, no. 6 (June 24, 1924): 374-379.
"Wölfflin," Das Tagebuch 5, no. 26 (June 28, 1924): 898-899.
"Russische Museen," Das Wort 2 (Halle), no. 80 (July 12, 1924): 3.
"Der Unsinn der Kunst-Kommissionen," Das Tagebuch 5, no. 29 (July 19, 1924): 1006-1007.
"'Wucht!'," Das Tagebuch 5, no. 33 (Aug. 16, 1924): 1156-1157.
Notes: Not signed. Next day correction indicates an author "Adolf Ochne" [sic].
Notes: Lecture at 2nd Kongress für Aesthetik.
"Lyon," Volk und Zeit 6, no. 43 (Oct. 26, 1924): 4-5.
Notes: Special issue "Modernes Bauen".
"Lyon," Volk und Zeit 6, no. 45 (Nov. 2, 1924): 4-5.
Notes: No date listed. Same as no.43, different pics.
"Die Kunst unter dem Strich," Das Tagebuch 5, no. 45 (Nov. 8, 1924): 1601-1602.


"Der Wille ruft Handwerk und Technik auf," Die Baugilde 6, no. 22 (Dec. 1, 1924): 545-546.

"Funktion und Form," Sozialistische Monatshefte 30 = Bd.61, no. 12 (Dec. 2, 1924): 767-768.

Notes: Republished in Hartmann, Trotzdem Modern, pp. 127-129.


Notes: Excerpt republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 137-138


Notes: (Halle) "Vorwort zu der Mappe 'Die Tänzer' von Sasha Stone."


Reviews: M. Bauer, Kulturwille 2, no. 8 (Aug. 1, 1925): 169; Das Kunstblatt 9, no. 5 (May 1925): 158; Monatshefte für Bücherfreunde 1 (1925): 239; L. Lauria, Die Welt am Abend n.92 (Apr. 25, 1925): #.

Wiskott, 1925, pp. 181-191
"Von holländischer Baukunst," Volk und Zeit 7, no. 11 (1925): 4-5.


Cover and illustrations by Oskar Fischer, Berlin. Excerpt republished in Der Aufbau 1, no. 6 (July 1926): 97-8.


Notes: Translated from "Neues Bauen", Das Schiff (1925), by Karel Teige.


"Der neue Stadtbaurei," Das Tagebuch 6, no. 8 (Feb. 21, 1925): 277-278.

Notes: Republished in Fleischmann, Walter Dextel, Neue Reklame, p. 97ff.


Notes: Not signed.


Notes: Not signed


Notes: Signed "A.B."


Notes: Excerpt from Der moderne Zweckbau, "das in Kürze im Drei-Masken-Verlag erscheint."


Notes: "Monumental Künstler oder Stadtbildgestalter?"


Notes: Excerpted and criticized by H. Walden in Der Sturm 16, no. 5 (1925): 67-8.


Notes: Not signed. Excerpt from Der moderne Zweckbau "to be published shortly at the Dreimasken Verlag in Vienna."


[Behne, Adolf]. "Endell als Architekt," n.t. (May 1925?) **

Notes: Not signed. Copy in Bauhaus-Archiv marked "AB."


Notes: Excerpt republished in Herzogenrath and Liska, Arthur Segal, p. 55.


"Preislisten," Das Tagebuch 6, no. 23 (June 6, 1925): 844-845.

Notes: Response by Nierendorf, pp. 956-7.

"Vernunft oder Repräsentation im Städtebau?", Sozialistische Monatshefte 31 = Bd.62, no. 6 (June 15, 1925): 352-354.


"Der Film und die Bildkunst," Der Kunstwanderer 7, no. 11 (July 1925): 377-379.


"Die Hauptstadt der Republik," Sozialistische Monatshefte 31 = Bd.62, no. 7 (July 13, 1925): 410-413.


Notes: Not signed.


Notes: Not signed.


Notes: Graphic layout by El Lissitzky. Response to Werner Hegemann in WMB no.6, pp. 242ff. Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, 143-147.


Notes: Special issue "Die Arbeit in der bildenden Kunst"


"Wie will der Mann das Haus?", Die Glocke 11.1, no. 23 (Sept. 5, 1925): 733-734.


Notes: Signed "b."


Notes: Special issue: "Elementar Gestaltung."


Notes: Signed "A.B."

"Der Sieg der Farbe," Die Form 1, no. 2 (Nov. 1925): 31-32.
"Der Film auf dem Wege zur Kunstform," Kulturwille 2, no. 11 (Nov. 1, 1925): 225.
Notes: Signed "Adolf Rehne" [sic].

Moskauer Theater," Architectura 29 (Nov. 21, 1925): 405-409.
"Provinz Berlin. Stadtbaurat Methusalem," n.t. (Nov. 29, 1925 ?): 7. **
"Das Bauprojekt der Sezession," n.t. (c. Dec. 1925 ?) **
Notes: Copy in Bauhaus-Archiv.

Notes: Signed "Elf.B."

1926

Notes: Written Oct./Nov. 1923. Cover by Rudolf Geyer (an aerial view of El


Notes: Copy in Bauhaus-Archiv.

"Das moderne Landhaus," ? [n.t.] (ca. 1926): 53-55. **
Notes: Copy in Bauhaus-Archiv.


"Warum nicht schön?," ABC 2, no. 3 (1926): 8.


"Worin besteht die Not der Künstler?," Sozialistische Monatshefte 32 = Bd.63 , no. 1 (Jan. 11, 1926): 36-38.

"Ist der Stadtbausrat Frontoffizier?," Die Weltbühne 22.1, no. 2 (Jan. 12, 1926): 77-78.


Notes: Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 142-143.


"Anton von Werner-Renaissance," Die Form 1, no. 6 (Mar. 1926): 130.


Notes: Response to John Heartfield, "Grün - oder Rot?" Weltbühne 22.1, no. 11 (Mar. 16, 1926): 434-5; which in turn reacted to Behne’s article “Tempelhofer Feld


Notes: Special issue "Wohnen und Bauen. Wie das Volk leidet an der Wohnungsnot"

"Was ist Stil?,” Die Lesestunde 3, no. 7 (Apr. 1, 1926): 117.

"Für Deutschland bearbeitet . . .,” Die Weltbühne 22.1, no. 16 (Apr. 20, 1926): 635.


"Dr. Karl Thiemes Katzen sprung,” Kulturwille 3, no. 5 (May 1, 1926): 98-99.

"Museumsbesuche,” Die Lesestunde 3, no. 9 (May 1, 1926): 145-146.


Notes: Not signed. "Sonderteil: Die Baukunst der Berliner Kunstausstellung.”


Notes: Not signed. Article starts with "[Kl.]


"[Eine Rundfrage über das Thema: Kunst /Handwerk /Maschine],” Farbe und Form 11, no. 6/7 (June/July 1926): 74.

"?,” Die Weltbühne 22, no. 22 (c. June 1, 1926): 870. ##

Notes: Listed in Holly, Die Weltbühne bibliography

"Zwei Sportplätze,” Das Tagebuch 7.1, no. 24 (June 12, 1926): 840-841.

"Zum Umbau des Berliner Opernhauses,” Sozialistische Monatshefte 32 = Bd.63, no. 6 (June 14, 1926): 387-390.


"Von der menschlichen Fassade und vom unmenschlichen Grundriss,” Der Aufbau 1, no. 6 (July 1926): 96-97.

"Buchläden,” Die Literarische Welt 2, no. 27 (July 2, 1926): 7.

"150 Sturm-Ausstellungen,” Die Weltbühne 22.2, no. 27 (July 6, 1926): 36.

"Das Haus,” Soziale Bauwirtschaft 6, no. 14 (July 15, 1926): 165.


"Zeitung und Publikum," Kulturwille 3, no. 10 (Oct. 1, 1926): 190 [sic!].
Notes: No author.
"Das Haus des Völkerbundes und die deutschen Architekten," Frankfurter Zeitung, no. 778 (c. Nov. 1926 ?): 1-2. **
Notes: Special issue: "Groß-macht Presse".
Notes: Republished in Hartmann, Trotzdem Modern, pp. 356-359.
Notes: "Kurfürstendamm 232"
Notes: Republished in Ochs, Adolf Behne, pp. 130-1.
Notes: See discussion Alfred Döblin, "Kunst, Dämon und Gemeinschaft" Das Kunstblatt 10, no. 5 (May 1926): 184-7; for report on discussion between Behne and Döblin in "Aufbau Abende" of Sozialistische Monatshefte
"Kunstausstellungen. Akademie - Kandinsky - Sturm," Die Welt am Abend 4, no. 282
  Notes: "Das Werk von Walter Gropius. Kleinhaus - Siedlung - Hausbaurevolution"

  Notes: Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 127-128.

  Notes: No author.

"Ankunft in Moskau," Das Neue Rußland 4, no. 9/10 (1927): 42.
  Notes: Sonderheft "10 Jahre S.U."

"Das Bauhaus Dessau," Fachblatt für Holzarbeiter 22 (1927): 33-34.

"[Diskussion über Ernst Kállais Artikel 'Malerei und Fotografie']," i 10 1, no. 6 (1927): 227-237.
  Notes: Republished and translated in Fricke, Bauhaus Photography, pp. 134-5.


  Notes: Cover and design by Walter Dexel. See also 2nd revised edition, 1930.

Notes: In Czech. Yearbook: internationaler almanach der aktivität der gegenwart = mezinárodní sborník soudobé aktivity (Brno). Behne article: "co se deje v umeni?". Reviews: i 10 1, no. 7 (1927): 257;
"Was ist schön?," Arbeiter-Illustrierte-Zeitung 6, no. 5 (1927): 15.
"Wassily Kandinsky," i 10 1, no. 1 (1927): 11.
Reviews: Die Baugilde 10, no. 7 (Apr. 10, 1928): 498; Die Form 4, no. 17 (1929): 399 (2nd year); Der Kreis 3, no. 28 (1926/7): 192 ##;
"Kultur, Kunst und Reklame," Das Neue Frankfurt 1, no. 3 (Jan. 1927): 57-60.
Notes: Reprinted in Hirdina, Neues Bauen, pp. 229-232.
Notes: Reprinted in Weltbühne 82, no. 23 (June 9, 1987): 727-728.
Notes: No author
Notes: "Gar kein Berliner - 'Raus ins Freie' - Zilles Denkmal"
Notes: "Franzosen - Zille - Plakate"
"Wege zu einer besseren Wohnkultur," Sozialistische Monatshefte 33.1 = Bd.64, no. 2 (Feb. 14, 1927): 121-123.
Notes: Republished in Hartmann, Trotzdem Modern, pp. 359-361.
Review of Fritz Hellwag, Die Geschichte des deutschen Tischlerhandwerks (Berlin 1926 ?), in Die Welt am Abend 5, no. 45 (Feb. 23, 1927).
"Ist die neue Bauart unbehaglich?," Berliner Illustrierte Zeitung 36, no. 13 (Mar 27, 1927):
515-517.
"[E. Munch]," Volksbühne (Apr. 1, 1927).
"[An Peter Panter]," Die Weltbühne 23.1, no. 16 (Apr. 19, 1927): 646.
"Kunstausstellungen. 'Neue Sachlichkeit,'" Die Welt am Abend 5, no. 100 (Apr. 30, 1927): B.3.
"Ausstellung und Kritik," Kunst und Wirtschaft 8, no. 5 (May 1, 1927): 114.


Notes: Excerpt in Lang, Heinrich Ehmsen.
Review of Ewald, Im Flugzeug über Berlin (Marburg/Lahn 1927), in Die Welt am Abend 5, no. 115 (May 18, 1927).
"Neue Landhausbauten," Das Ideale Heim 1, no. 6 (June 1927): 327-332.
"Peter Paul Rubens," Die Welt am Abend 5, no. 149 (June 29, 1927): B.3.
"Kunst-Pädagogik," Farbe und Form 12, no. 7 (Aug. 1927): 133-134.
"Schlote zwischen Burgen. Gedanken zum Thema: Industriebauten am Rhein,"
"Zur Ästhetik des flachen Daches," Das Neue Frankfurt 1, no. 7 (Oct./Dec. 1927): 163.
Notes: Signed "Adolf Behme" [sic]
"Wie wird das Haus des Völkerbundes aussehen?," Vossische Zeitung, no. 263 (Nov. 3, 1927).
"Die Wohnung als Instrument," Reclams Universum 44.1, no. 8 (Nov. 17, 1927): 189.
Notes: Jg.=1927/28. Part of whole issue on "Die neue Zeit in Haushalt und Heim"
"[La Presse Europeenne se prononce]," Cahiers d'Art 2 (Dec. 1927): xvi.
Notes: Special imprint on Völkerbund.

Notes: Gropius Presse, Mappe 183, GL 23/413.

Notes: See response by F. Ostermoor, Welt am Abend n.288 (Dec. 9, 1927).


Eine Stunde Architektur. Stuttgart: Akademischer Verlag Dr. Fritz Wedekind, 1928.

Notes: DBG Buch-Nr. 269. Introduction signed "Jershöft, July 1928".
"Heinrich Zille.
Notes: "Max Liebermann, Hans Meid, Anders Zorn, Max Slevogt, Ernst Stern, Lesser Zury, Käthe Kollwitz, Heinrich Zille".
"Kunst als Waffe," Kunst der Zeit 2, no. 5/6 (1928): 117.
Notes: Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 155-157.
Notes: Special issue, "10 Jahre Novembergruppe."
"Worin besteht die Revolutionäre Kunst?," Das Neue Rusland 5, no. 3 (1928): 30-32.
"L’École fédérale de l’Association générale allemande des Travailleurs," La Cité 7, no. 6 (1928): 85-96.
Notes: Special Issue: "10 Jahre Novembergruppe."
Notes: Reprint in Hirdina, Neues Bauen, pp. 204-6.
"Oeffnet die Museen!," Die Welt am Abend 6, no. 5 (Jan. 6, 1928): B.1.
"Türme," Reclams Universum 44.1, no. 16 (Jan. 12, 1928): 385-388.
Notes: Special issue on modern architecture.


Notes: "Zusammengestellt aus dem Material von Adolf Behne"


Notes: In Spanish.


Notes: Signed "Elf.B."


"Um das Messegelände," Die Welt am Abend 6, no. 121 (May 25, 1928): B.3.

"Ateliers," Die Dame, no. 20 (June 1928): 10-12, 32, 34, 36.

"Berlin -- Bilderbericht," Das Neue Frankfurt 2, no. 6 (June 1928): 110-111.


"Die Bundesschule des Allgemeinen Deutschen Gewerkschaftsbundes in Berlin-Bernau," Das Neue Frankfurt 2, no. 6 (June 1928): 112-113.


"Die Bundesschule des Allgemeinen Deutschen Gewerkschaftsbundes in Berlin-Bernau," Sächsische Schulzeitung, 7, no. 5 (June 20, 1928): Pädagogische Beilage, 37-44.

"Die Gewerkschaftsschule in Bernau bei Berlin," Zentralblatt der Bauverwaltung 48, no. 25 (June 20, 1928): 397-402.


Notes: Republished and cover illustrated in Herzogenrath and Liska, Arthur Segal, p. 307.


*Notes*: Signed "Dr. B." Section "Wandern und Reisen"


"La Escuela de la Asociación General de Obreros Alemanes en Bernau (Alemania),"  

*Notes*: In Spanish. Translation by J.M.V. (= José M. Mendoza Ussía).

"De School van den 'Allgemeinen Deutschen Gewerkschaftsbund' in Bernau,"  

*Notes*: In Dutch.


*Notes*: "Die Ausstellung am Fischtalgrund." 3-part article


Schäfer [Behne], Elfriede. "Ludwig Richter, der Zeichner des Volkes und der Kinder,"  
*Die Lesestunde* 5, no. 18 (Sept. 15, 1928): 455-457.


Notes: Signed "E.B."


"Der Film als Pädagoge," Das Neue Frankfurt 2, no. 11/12 (Nov./Dec. 1928): 203-205.


"Bildende Kunst in Deutschland 1918-1928," Die Literarische Welt 4, no. 45 (Nov. 9, 1928): 5-6.


"Moderne Kunst," Die Lesestunde 5, no. 22 (Nov. 16, 1928): 525-527.

"Die Kunstgeschichte am Ende und am Anfang," Sozialistische Monatshefte 34.2 = Bd.67, no. 11 (Nov. 19, 1928): 980-983.


Review of J. Dorenne, Paul Gauguins Lebenskampf (Freiburg i.B. 1928 ?), in Die Welt am Abend 6, no. 281 (Nov. 30, 1928): B.2.


"Berlins neuer Wohnbau," Berliner Illustrierte Zeitung 37, no. 50 (Dec. 9, 1928): 2187-2189.


Notes: Response to Justi, Berliner Tageblatt (Dec. 13, 1928).


Reviews: E. Völter Die Baugilde 11, no. 3 (Feb. 10, 1929): 200; F. Hellwag, Die Form 4, no. 1 (Jan. 1, 1929): 24; KN., Welt am Abend 6, no. 284 (Dec. 4, 1928);

"A Berlin-Zehlendorf lakásügyi kiállításról," Tér és Forma 2, no. 6 (Budapest: 1929).

Notes: Translation of "On the Housing Exhibition a Berlin-Zehlendorf."


Notes: Schriftleitung Bruno Rauecker. Typescript by Scharfe in Bauhausarchiv.


Notes: Also appeared as Grossstadtprobleme (Berlin 1930). Reprint, with preface by Julius Posener (Berlin/Basel: Bauwelt, 1989).


Notes: Signed "AB".


Notes: Signed "AB".


"[Die Städtische Kunst-Deputation kauft]," Das neue Berlin 1, no. 3 (1929): 62.

[Behne, Adolf].  "Und was wird aus dem Reichstag und aus dem Platz der Deutschen Republik?," Das neue Berlin 1, no. 3 (1929): 65.

Notes: Signed "A.B."

"An das 'Neue Frankfurt'," Das neue Berlin 1, no. 4 (1929): 86.


Notes: Signed "AB".

Review of Edwin Redslob, intro., Berliner Architektur der Nachkriegszeit (Berlin 1928), in Das neue Berlin 1, no. 4 (1929): 87.

Notes: Signed "B".

[Behne, Adolf].  "Kurt Kroner †," Das neue Berlin 1, no. 7 (1929): 147.

Notes: Signed "AB".

"Kunstausstellung Berlin," Das neue Berlin 1, no. 8 (1929): 150-152.


Notes: Signed "Schriftleitung". Response by Bruno Taut, p. 258.

"Heinrich Zille," Das neue Berlin 1, no. 10 (1929): 189-195.


Notes: Signed "B".


Notes: Signed "AB".


"Unser Titelbild: Ludwig Richters "Der Schreckenstein"," Die Lesestunde 5, no. 29 (Jan. 16, 1929): i.


Schäfer [Behne], Elfriede.  "Unser Titelbild 'Die Schifferin'," Die Lesestunde 6, no. 2 (Jan. 16, 1929): i.


Notes: "Grünewald - Liebermann - Rohlfs"
"Honoré Daumier," Die Lesestunde 6, no. 3 (Feb. 1, 1929): 41-44.
Notes: "Ausstellung im Lichthof des Kunstgewerbemuseums"
Notes: Review of Heinrich Zille and Otto Nagel, Für Alle! (Berlin 1929).
"Inkrustationen [Begegnung des Autors mit dem Leser]," Die Lesestunde 6, no. 5/6 (Mar. 10, 1929): 90.
Notes: Questionaire to many authors
Notes: Signed "Elf.B."
"In welcher Ebene ist Kunst politisch?," Sozialistische Monatshefte 35.1 = Bd.68, no. 3 (Mar. 18, 1929): 225-226.
Notes: "Alexander Calder in der Galerie Neumann-Nierendorf"
Notes: "Drei Sterne im Baedeker". See photo Welt am Abend (Apr. 19, 1929).
Notes: "Tagung der Reichsforschungsgesellschaft"
"Wilhelm Leibl, der Maler des deutschen Bauern," Die Lesestunde 6, no. 9 (May 1, 1929): 151-154.


Notes: "Wilhelm Worringen über ägyptische Kunst"


"Alexander Calder (U.S.A.)," Das Neue Frankfurt 3, no. 6 (June 1929): 121.

Notes: Republished in Hirdina, Neues bauen, pp. 308.


"L'art graphique en Allemagne," Monde, no. 54 (June 15, 1929).


Notes: Signed "E.Behne"


Notes: "Meister Zille ist heute früh gestorben."


Notes: No author.


Notes: Zille-Gedächtnisausstellung im Kronprinzenpalais. No author.


Notes: "Ausstellung in der Berliner Tischlerschule"


Notes: Signed "Elfr. Behne"


Behne, Elfriede. "Was für Bücher schenken wir unseren Kindern?,” Gewerkschaftliche
Behne, Elfriede. "Architekt und Hausfrau, oder Wer lernt vom Anderen?，“
Wohnungswirtschaft 7, no. 4 (Dec. 20, 1929): 54-56.

1930


Notes: Dedicated to Heinrich Zille. Cover by Walter Dexel. Excerpt republished in Wohnungswirtschaft 7 (1930): 96-100; "Was ist schön?,” A-I-Z n.51 (1927) ##.

Notes: Republished in Seuphor, Cercle et Carré, pp. 123-131.


"[Die Presse über die Ausstellung]," Das Kunstblatt 14, no. 1 (Jan. 1930): 16.
Notes: Response to E. Kallai, Das Kunstblatt 13 (1929): 373; which responded to
Behne, Das neue Berlin (1929): 150-152.
Notes: Partially republished in Lang, Heinrich Ehmsen.
Notes: Partially republished in Jansen, Ernst Barlach, p. 305-307.

Notes: Signed "A.B."


"Dammertstock," Die Form 5, no. 6 (Mar. 15, 1930): 163-166.


"Neues Wohnen -- Neues Bauen," Wohnungswirtschaft 7, no. 6 (Mar. 15, 1930): 96-100.
Notes: Response by Karl Maab, p. 135.
"Verkehr und Tradition," Sozialistische Monatshefte 36.1 = Bd.70, no. 3 (Mar. 17, 1930): 256-258.
Notes: Republished in Hirdina, Neues Bauen, pp. 306-8.
Notes: Republished in Hirdina, Neues Bauen, pp. 306-8.
"'Ehret eure deutschen Meister!',' Die Welt am Abend 8, no. 82 (Apr. 7, 1930): B.1-2.
"Was ist nationalsozialistische Kunst?," Das Kunstblatt 14, no. 5 (May 1930): 154.
"Heinrich Zille and his successors in the Germany of the present day," The Studio 99, no. 447 (June 1930): 422-428.
Notes: American edition titled Creative Art 6, no. 6.
"Bruno Taut 50 Jahre," Wohnungswirtschaft 7, no. 11 (June 1, 1930): 225.
Notes: Republished in Wendschuh and Volkmann, Bruno Taut, p. 81.
Notes: Excerpts republished in Fleischmann, bauhaus, drucksachen, pp. 280-281.
"Ist Grünewald noch modern?," Sozialistische Monatshefte 36.2 = Bd.71, no. 6 (June 10, 1930): 570-573.
"Die Städtebauer auf neuem Wege. Siedlungen Siemensstadt und Reinickendorf in
"Rouault," Die Welt am Abend 8, no. 141 (June 20, 1930): B.2.
"'Modernität' als missverstandenes Ziel vieler 'Kunstgewerbeschulen'," Das Werk 17,
no. 7 (July 1930): 214-215.
"Neue Wege der Treppe," Der Uhu 6, no. 10 (July 1930): 69-76.
"[Antwort an Karl Scheffler]," Die Weltbühne 26.2, no. 28 (July 8, 1930): 74.
"Junge Leute und Klassiker," Die Welt am Abend 8, no. 156 (July 8, 1930): B.2.
[Behne, Adolf]. "Neues Bauen in der Sowjetunion," Die Welt am Abend 8, no. 157 (July
9, 1930): B.2.

Notes: No author listed.

"Arthur Segal, a personality of importance in contemporary German Art," The Studio
100, no. 449 (Aug. 1930): 126-134.
Notes: American edition called Creative Art 7, no. 2.
Review of W. Hausenstein, Drinnen und Draußen (Munich 1930), in Die Welt am
Review of A. Heilborn, Heinrich Zille (Berlin 1930), in Die Welt am Abend 8, no. 194
Notes: "Neue Bücher. Kunst"
Review of G.G. Wietzner, Der Pulsschlag deutscher Stilgeschichte (Stuttgart 1930), in
"Die Museumsinsel -- Eine Tragödie Berliner Städtebaus," Das Neue Frankfurt 4, no. 9
Review of H.H. Naumann, Das Grünewald-Problem und das neuen deckte
Selbstbildnis des 20-jährigen Mathis Nithart (Jena 1930), in The Studio 100, no.
"Die Bundesschule des ADGB in Bernau bei Berlin," Soziale Bauwirtschaft 10, no. 17
(Sept. 1, 1930): 375-376.
"Ein neuer Wohnbautyp," (Acht) 8 Uhr-Abendblatt (Sept. 5, 1930).
"Dammerstock Schlüßwort," Die Form 5, no. 18 (Sept. 15, 1930): 494.
Behne, Elfriede. "Maria Montessori," Gewerkschaftliche Frauenzeitung 14, no. 9 (Sept.
B.2.
"Das preussische Kriegermal," Sozialistische Monatshefte 36.3 = Bd.72, no. 9 (Sept. 26, 1930): 891-893.


Notes: 2. Beilage, "Bau und Raumkunst". Festnummer zur Jahrhundertfeier der Berliner Museen.


Notes: Republished in Pistorius, Der Architekenstreit, pp. 88ff.


Notes: American edition called Creative Art 7, no. 4


Notes: Signed "B".


"Kollektiv' - und 'En gros'," Wohnungswirtschaft 7, no. 21 (Nov. 1, 1930): 406-408.

Notes: Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 160-163.


Note: Not signed.


Notes: Response to critique (p. 846) of Behne article "Der Kunstsalon" pp. 694.


23 (Dec. 10, 1930): 2129-2133.
Notes: Response to counter-critique (p. 929-30) of Behne article "Der Kunstsalon" pp. 694.
Notes: Republished in Gaßner, Wechselwirkungen, pp. 367ff.

1931
Notes: Republished in Willmann, Geschichte der AIZ, p. 125.
Notes: American edition titled Creative Art 8, no. 1.
Notes: "Eine Rundfrage über die Wertsteigerung an Werken moderner Kunst."
Notes: Signed "Elf.B."
"Karl Friedrich Schinkel (1781-1841)," Die Sendung 8, no. 10 (Mar. 6, 1931): 153-155.
Notes: Rundfunkwoche
Behne, Elfriede. "Große Männer schreiben ihren Müttern," Gewerkschaftliche
"Moderne Illustratoren," Die Lesestunde 8, no. 6 (Mar. 16, 1931): 96-97.
"Constantin Meunier," Die Lesestunde 8, no. 7 (Apr. 1, 1931): 125.
Notes: Signed "Elf.B."
Notes: Republished in Frecot, "Bibliographische Berichte," p. 156.
Notes: Republished in Reichlin, "'Moderne bauformen'."
Notes: Republished in Burmeister and Fürlus, Hannah Höch, pp. 431-432.
"The Breslau Academy, the State Art School of the Silesian Capital: an Important Centre of German Teaching," The Studio 101, no. 459 (June 1931): 443-449.
Notes: Also titled Atelier 1, no. 3.
Notes: Republished in Herzfelde, John Heartfield, p. 22; and in Heartfield and
Heartfield, John Heartfield, p. 185-6.
"Frank Lloyd Wright," Die Welt am Abend 9, no. 141 (June 20, 1931): B.2.
"Der Brand des Münchener Glaspalastes," Die Lesestunde 8, no. 13/14 (July 1, 1931): iii.
"Über Käthe Kollwitz," Sozialistische Monatshefte 37.2 = Bd.74, no. 9 (Sept. 14, 1931): 904-907.
Notes: Reprint in Hoffmeister, Revolution und Realismus, p. 28.
Notes: Signed "A.B."
"Max Taut's Gewerkschaftshaus in Frankfurt am Main," Wasmuths Monatshefte für
"Der Teller für alle?," Die Welt am Abend 9, no. 276 (Nov. 26, 1931): B.2.

1932

Notes: Republished in Frecot, "Bibliographische Berichte," pp. 142-147.

Notes: "Ausstellung des Bundes revolutionärer Künstler."

Notes: "An den Quellen des Chabur," "Am Rande Berlins," "In den Geheimrats Dschungeln".
"Kann die Kunst im Leben aufgehen?" Sozialistische Monatshefte 38.1 = Bd.75, no. 2 (Feb. 8, 1932): 138-143.

Notes: Republished in Hartmann, Trotzdem Modern, pp. 214-221.


Notes: Also titled The London Studio 3, no. 12


Notes: Rundfunkwoche

"Exhibition of Maria Slavona at the National Gallery Berlin," The Studio 103, no. 469 (Apr. 1932): 240.

Notes: Also titled The London Studio 3, no. 13


"Sonderheft Berlin," Die Neue Stadt [Das Neue Frankfurt] 6, no. 3 (June 1932): 49.

Notes: Special issue on Berlin edited by Behne


Notes: No author listed.


"Sonne, Luft und Haus für Alle!," Die Neue Stadt [Das Neue Frankfurt] 6, no. 3 (June 1932): 58-59.


"Heinrich Zille. Eine Würdigung," Mitteilungen für die Freunde der DBG, no. 11/12 (June 1, 1932).

Notes: Beilage to Die Lesestunde

"Ist der Impressionismus undeutsch?," Sozialistische Monatshefte 38.1 = Bd.75, no. 6 (June 3, 1932): 522-524.

"Das wachsende Haus," Die Umschau 36, no. 25 (June 18, 1932): 490-494.

Notes: Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 163-167.
"Moderne englische Malerei," Die Dame, no. 22 (July 1932): 6-9, 40-41.
"Nur eine Reproduktion," Sozialistische Monatshefte 38.2 = Bd.76, no. 8 (July 29, 1932): 689-691.
Notes:Response to Willi Grohmann "Europäische Malerei der Gegenwart" Die neue Stadt 6, no. 5 (Aug. 1932). See also discussion by W. Stern, Die neue Stadt 6, no. 11 (Feb. 1933): 251
Notes:Translated in De 8 en Opbouw 4, no. 3 (Feb. 4, 1933): 22-23.
Notes:Signed "A.B."
Notes:Signed "A.B."
"Max Slevogt †," Die Lesestunde 9, no. 21/22 (Nov. 1, 1932): i-ii.

1933
"Streifzüge durch das mittelalterliche deutsche Kunst (I)," Die Lesestunde 10, no. 1/2 (Jan. 1, 1933): ix-x.
"Leonardo's 'Last Supper' Preserved in a Mosaic Translation," The Studio 105, no. 479 (Feb. 1933): 120.
"Streifzüge durch das mittelalterliche deutsche Kunst (II)," Die Lesestunde 10, no. 3/4 (Feb. 1, 1933): xi-xii.


"Streifzüge durch das mittelalterliche deutsche Kunst (III)," Die Lesestunde 10, no. 5/6 (Mar. 1, 1933): x-xi.

"[Birthday wishes]," La Cité 9, no. 5-6 (Apr./May 1933): 10.

Notes: Also published as Sonderdruck. Copy at TU Berlin signed by Behne.

"Streifzüge durch das mittelalterliche deutsche Kunst (IV)," Die Lesestunde 10, no. 11/12 (June. 1, 1933): xi-xii.


1934


"Blick auf Bautzen," Die Lesestunde 11, no. 11 (Nov. 1934): II.


"Das Rathaus in Breslau," Die Lesestunde 11, no. 12 (Dec. 1934): II.

1935


"Was bedeutet Renaissance?" Art historical introduction in Dmitry S. Mereschkowski,

*Notes:* Behne also serves as photo editor for book.


*Notes:* Signed "A.B." Also titled *The London Studio* 9, no. 46.


*Notes:* Also titled *The London Studio* 9, no. 47.


*Notes:* Signed "A.B."


*Notes:* Signed "A.B."


*Notes:* Also titled *The London Studio* 9, no. 49.


*Notes:* Also titled *The London Studio* 10, no. 53.


*Notes:* Not signed. Also titled *The London Studio* 10, no. 54.


*Notes:* Also titled *The London Studio* 10, no. 57.
1936


Notes: Cover by Karl Heinz de la Croix


Notes: Not signed. Also titled The London Studio 11, no. 60.


Notes: Also titled The London Studio 11, no. 62.

"Michelangelos 'Morgendämmerung'," Die Lesestunde 13, no. 5 (May 1936): II.

"Alte Bauten im neuen Licht," Die Lesestunde 13, no. 6 (June 1936): 198-199.

"Spitzweg, 'Das Liebespaar'," Die Lesestunde 13, no. 7 (July 1936): II.


"Stilkunde II: Der Römische Gewölbestil," Die Lesestunde 13, no. 9 (Sept. 1936): 306, IX-X.


"Stilkunde IV: Romanischer Stil," Die Lesestunde 13, no. 11 (Nov. 1936): 374, IX-XI.

"Der Bamberger Altar von Veit Stob," Die Lesestunde 13, no. 12 (Dec. 1936): II.

"Berlin--Franz Marc (Memorial Exhibition), Hans Poelzig--an appreciation," The Studio 112, no. 525 (Dec. 1936): 344.

Notes: Also titled The London Studio 12, no. 69.


1937


Notes: In Swedish. 233pp. Also published (Malmö, Fachlitteratur, 1937).


Notes: Signed "B".


*Notes:* Also titled "Unterhaltungsblatt zur DAZ". Response to Börries v. Münchhausen in *Deutschen Allgemeinen Zeitung* n.462 (Oct. 3, 1937).


*Notes:* Signed "b"

1938


*Notes:* Includes a large plate of drawings by Johannes Woldt. Cover by Kurt Tillessen.


1939


*Notes:* Signed "A.B."


*Notes:* Signed "B."

1940

   Notes: Signed "B."
"Das Chorgestühl im Bamberger Dom. Ein Zeichen edelstene deutschen handwerks,"
   Die Lesestunde 17, no. 3 (Mar. 1940): 22.
   Notes: Signed "Behne".
"Caspar David Friedrich," Die Lesestunde 17, no. 5 (May 1940): 39, cover.
"Peter Paul Rubens," Die Lesestunde 17, no. 6 (June 1940): 49-50.
"Karl Blechen," Die Lesestunde 17, no. 7 (July 1940): 60, fronticepiece.
"Bilder aus den alten Niederlanden," Die Lesestunde 17, no. 9 (Sept. 1940): 78-79.
   Notes: Signed "ab".
   Notes: Signed "ab".

1941
"Jan van Eyck," Die Lesestunde 18, no. 6 (June 1941): 73-74.

1942
"Das Problem der Sichtbarkeit," Das Werk 29, no. 6 (June 1942): 145-148.

1943
Editor, Alte deutsche Zeichner. Meisterwerke deutscher Graphik von den Karolingern

1944

1945
Introduction, in Erste Ausstellung der Kammer der Kunstschaffenden. Gemälde,
   Notes: Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 169-172.
1946
Notes: Wilmersdorfer Kunstaustellung, Volkshochschule. Amt Bildende Kunst in der Abteilung für Volksbildung.
Notes: Veranstaltet vom Volksbildungsamt im Magistrat der Stadt Berlin und von dem Kulturbund zur demokratischen Erneuerung Deutschlands. Republished in Ochs, Architekturkritik, pp. 177-180.
Reviews: Bildende Kunst 1, no. 7 (1947): 29.
Notes: #1= Adolf Jannasch, Carl Hofer (1946); #2= Adolf Behne, Heinrich Ehmsen (1946); #5= Oskar Nerlinger; #7= Ludwig Justi, Otto Nagel (1948).
"Was ist schön?," Sonntag 1, no. 23 (Dec. 8, 1946): 5.

1947
Notes: Kunstaustellung, Kulturwoche des FDGB. Durchgeführt vom Schutzverband bildender Künstler in der Gewerkschaftsgruppe Kunst und Schriftum.
Notes: Veranstaltet vom Magistrat der Stadt Berlin, Abteilung für Volksbildung,
in Zusammenarbeit mit dem Schutzverband bildender Künstler.
Ausstellungsleitung Albert Klatt.
"Eine Ehrenrettung!"  In Expressionismus. Eine Historische Schau expressionistischer


Notes: Includes his June 30, 1945 lecture at reopening of Volkshochschule
Reviews: A.M. Bildende Kunst 1, no. 7 (1947): 29; W. Eschbach, Einheit 2, no. 6
(1948): 207 #.


Notes: Publishers vary: Mitteldeutsche Druckerei und Verlangs Anstalt, Erich
Morgner, or Erich Ziegler.

"Zu einigen Bildern Karl Hofers." In Karl Hofer. Künstler unserer Zeit, no. 4. Berlin:

"Ungelöste Probleme der Kunstgeschichte," Bildende Kunst 1, no. 1 (ca. Apr. 1947): 20-
21.

demokratischen Erneuerung Deutschlands, 1947.
"Von Hatschepsut bis Heckel. Wiedersehen mit Museumsgut," Sonntag 2, no. 4 (Jan. 26,

Notes: Response by Ludwig Justi, Sonntag 2, no. 7 (1947): 10.
Notes: Response to Ludwig Justi, Sonntag 2, no. 7 (Feb. 16, 1947): 10.

Notes: Script of Rundfunk Sendung, Mar. 9, 1947.
Reviews: Bildende Kunst 1, no. 3 (June 1947).
Notes: Republished in Kliemann, Max Dungert, p. 17.
"Lebensvolle Blume 'Rinnsteinkunst',' Tagespost (Potsdam: June 22, 1947).
"Max Liebermann," Sonntag (c. 1947/8). **
"[Epilog zur Nolde Ausstellung]," Berlin am Mittag, no. 184 (Sept. 10, 1947).

Notes: No name, but ascribed to Behne by A.W. Dressler, Nachlaß, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nürnberg.


Notes: "Zur Ausstellung seines Nachlasses im Graphischen Kabinett des Kulturbundes"

1948


Notes: Vortrag vom June 30, 1945, zur Eröffnung der Volkshochschule Wilmersdorf.


Notes: Preceeded by note of Behne's death.


"Was will die moderne Kunst?," Bildende Kunst, no. 1 (1948): 3-6.

Notes: Response by Heinz Lüdecke, Bildende Kunst 2, no. 5 (1948): 10-3; Hermann Müller, Bildende Kunst 2, no. 6 (1948): 23; Alexander Gonda, Bildende Kunst 2, no. 6 (1948): 23-4.


Notes: Magistrat von Gross-Berlin, Abteilung für Volksbildung, Amt für
bildende Kunst.


Notes: Signed "A.B."


1949


1957 - PRESENT (See also reprints mentioned above)


Notes: Translation of 1964 edition of Behne, 1923, Der moderne Zweckbau.


Notes: Bibliography of writings of Adolf Behne. Also reprints of several Werkbund related articles, and correspondence with Gropius.


"Art, Handicraft, Technology (1922)," Oppositions, no. 22 (Fall 1980): 96-104.

Notes: Translation of "Kunst, Handwerk und Technik" Die neue Rundschau (1922). See also separate translation by Christiane Crasemann Collins in Francesco Dal Co's Figures of Architecture and Thought (1990), and analysis in same book.


Notes: Partial reprints of Eine Stunde Architektur (1927); Taut, Max Taut, Bauten und Pläne (1928); and "Dammerstock" (1930).


Notes: Reprint from Weltbühne (Feb. 1927).


Notes: Reprint of "LH gestorben," Die Weltbühne 28.2, no. 47 (Nov. 22, 1932):
779-780.


Notes: Reprint of 1929 periodical and separate bound publication.


Notes: Spanish translation of Der moderne Zweckbau


Notes: Includes extensive bibliography.


Notes: English translation of Der moderne Zweckbau (1926). Includes extensive bibliography.


Notes: Republished series "Neue Werkkunst," edited by Roland Jaeger.


PROPOSED BOOKS OR ALTERNATIVE TITLES NEVER ACTUALLY PUBLISHED


Kunst oder Sentimentalität. Munich: Delphin, ca. 1918.


ESSAYS CITED BUT NOT FOUND, UNPUBLISHED, OR UNATTRIBUTED
"Moderne Industriebauten ?," Vorwärts (or Neue Welt) ? 30, no. 28 (Feb. 2, 1913):
"[Modell des Glashauses]." In Glashaus Köln, B. Taut. ca. June 1914
"[Sturm Exhibit]," Freiheit 2, no. 213 ? (ca. May 5, 1919).
"Bau und Mensch," ? (ca. 1920s?): 5.
"?," Volk bühne 1, no. 1 (Sept., Oct 1920): 9. ##
"Monografie o modern," (ca. ?).
"?," Spiegel ? (ca. June 1920).
"[Bauhaus]," Die Dame (Aug. ?? 1922 or 1923)
"?," Pasmö, no. 9 (ca. 1924).
"Aus der Geschichte der Landschaftsmalerei," Das Werk ??, no. 11 (ca. 1923 or 1929?): 313.
"[Über tschechische Architektur]," Die Strasse (c. 1925?).
"?," Berliner Tageblatt (ca. July 11, 1925?)
"?," Obras (ca. ?).
"?," Evening Standard (ca. ?).
"Karl Scheffler und das Kronprinzenpalais," Die Kunstauktion (May/June 1930)
"?," Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration (ca. 1934).
"?," Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung (ca. 1936).
"?," Deutsche Zukunft (ca. 1936).
"?," Deutsche Bauzeitung (ca. 1937).
"?," Deutsche Zukunft (ca. 1937).
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------. "Paul Scheerbart's Architekturfantasien." In Wendschuh and Volkmann, Bruno Taut, pp. 86-94.
Bloch, Ernst. "Diskussionen über Expressionismus," Das Wort 3, no. 6 (June 1938): 103-112.
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Appendix I.
A Brief History of the Behne Papers

Many critics’ records were destroyed or lost in World War II, others were consciously discarded or abandoned. The history and fate of the collection of Behne papers that has recently found a safe home at the Bauhaus-Archiv sheds light on the increasing value placed on papers related to critics and the press, and on the rise of Behne’s fame more directly.

The Behne papers in the Bauhaus-Archiv contain very few personal items or records. The collection consists primarily of clipping of many articles Behne wrote, as well as many more he collected and annotated on various subjects of interest. In

---

11 The fate of manuscript material related to the career of Walter Curt Behrendt is perhaps typical. Three small file boxes of manuscripts of late essays in the Avery Archives of Columbia University in New York were accepted by Adolf Placek, a fellow German emigre, likely from Behrendt’s wife Lydia, who had searched for someone to take the files before she died in 1971; see letter of Hugo Häring to Lydia Behrendt (ca. 1946) HHA-01-138 in Häring Nachlaß at the Akademie der Künste in Berlin; and correspondence of Lydia Behrendt with Lewis and Sofia Mumford throughout the 1960s in the Mumford Archives at the University of Pennsylvania. According to a note in the manuscript file for Behrendt at Dartmouth, where he taught after emigration, as well as a letter from Hugh Morrison to Dartmouth archivist Ken Kramer from August 1971, a larger collection of Behrendt’s papers was apparently stored in a closet of Carpenter Hall at Dartmouth, but was thrown out in the 1960s for space reasons; see email from Barbara Krieger of the Dartmouth Archives to Barbara Reed from Oct. 5, 1992, forwarded to Elizabeth Byre and then to the author. The author also witnessed as the papers of the historian Spiro Kostof nearly met the same fate after his untimely death in Berkeley. His Wurster Hall office needed to be emptied to make room for another faculty member, and at the last minute, literally with dumpsters rolled in front of his office door, the author and some other former assistants managed to convince the C.E.D. Archives at Berkeley to take at least the contents of at least the filing cabinets. Many other papers were discarded, and the impressive book collection was dispersed to friends and sold.
addition it includes a very random array of correspondence that Behne received from friends and colleagues, including from some of the most significant names of the avant-garde art scene in Weimar Berlin. The collection actually began as an "Autographen-Sammlung" belonging to Behne’s daughter Karla (1913-1966), basically a fanciful collection of letterheads from correspondence sent to her father from throughout Germany and Europe. Behne deposited this collection and at least one very large grey suitcase of other important material in the basement of his home in Berlin in 1944 before being evacuated during the destructive battle for Berlin 1944-1945. After Behne died in 1948, his wife Elfriede and their daughters Karla and Julia tried in vain to have some of Behne’s books republished and his work memorialized or studied in some other way.

Much of the material ended up temporarily in the hands of Ulrich Conrads, who based his well-known book Phantastische Architektur (1960, Fantastic Architecture) in large part on this material. He wrote in the preface "It became clear that Adolf Behne should have written this book, as he was the leading editor for the Arbeitsrat für Kunst, and beyond that was involved in every important architectural situation of our century." Conrads then republished Behne’s most memorable work, Der moderne Zweckbau (1926, The Modern Functional Building) as volume ten in his

---

12 Ellen Lupton and E.L. Cohen, Letters from the Avant-Garde: Modern Graphic Design (1995), shows a similar approach to collecting this material.


14 Ulrich Conrads and Hans G. Sperlich, Phantastische Architektur (1960); transl. as The Architecture of Fantasy (1962).
groundbreaking "Bauwelt Fundamente" collection of architectural reprints, and arranged for an Italian translation a few years later. In 1974 he published in Die Bauwelt a long series of excerpts and short letters that he claimed were left over from the publication of his book. These materials later ended up in the Behne papers at the Bauhaus, though Conrads insists the core of Behne’s papers had been lost. The collection remained the property of the Behne family, with his daughter Karla, until she died in 1966, then were held by Karla’s daughter Eva Gießler and Behne’s younger daughter Julia, until they were sold to the Bauhaus.

Through Conrads’ efforts, but also in part due to the growing interest of liberal West German scholars in researching and celebrating the Socialist, communal legacy of Weimar architecture and art, Behne’s star began to rise. In 1972, Janos Frecot of the Berlinische Galerie began to collect copies of Behne articles and published a first bibliography of his works along with several important political critiques by Behne about the Werkbund. Without knowing about Frecot’s work, Prof. Jürgen Scharfe

15 Behne, Der moderne Zweckbau, Bauwelt Fundamente, no. 10 (1964); Behne, L’architettura funzionale II Vitruvo, no. 2 (1968).


17 Janos Frecot, "Bibliographische Berichte: Adolf Behne," Werkbund Archiv 1 (1972): 80-117. Under Eckehard Fürlus, the Berlinische Galerie later actively began to purchase and collect original Behne correspondence and manuscripts through auctions to complement letters in their collections of the papers of the Dada and collage artists Hannah Höch and Raoul Hausmann, both close friends of Behne’s, resulting in a small collection of Behne letters to various artists and architects.
(1948-1995), an art historian at the Staatliche Galerie Moritzburg, Halle in the former GDR, fastidiously began to collect and make an inventory Behne’s complete writings at nearly the same time. In time Scharfe also convinced Behne’s heirs to lend him their collection of Behne papers. Scharfe was often hampered in his efforts by the difficult political bureaucracy of East Germany, but he worked tirelessly over many years, pouring through contemporary journals and newspapers, many unavailable in the West, and compiling copies or transcripts of most Behne articles and other relevant archival material. Scharfe started contract negotiations with the VEB Verlag, which actively republished Socialist-oriented materials, and a bit later, after finding out about their shared interests, also agreed to collaborate with Frecot on a volume of essays for the Fundus series of Socialist reprints.\textsuperscript{18} In the late 1970s, Ingeborg Pace of Heidelberg began research for a doctoral dissertation on Behne, and corresponded with both Scharfe and Frecot about compiling a more complete bibliography and about the nature of Behne’s criticism.

Unfortunately none of these ventures produced any published results. In the early-1990s Haila Ochs, who had earlier written on architectural criticism and the press, used Frecot’s collections of article to publish the first anthology of Behne’s most important architecture-related essays in the popular Birkhauser Architektur

\textsuperscript{18} Letters from Jürgen Scharfe to Julia Behne (July 10, 1973); from Frecot to Scharfe (Jan. 29, 1974); and from Frecot to Scharfe (Mar. 14, 1975), all in the Behne/Scharfe Nachlaß. Earlier Julia Behne had denied the request of Behne’s friend Exner to publish a small anthology of Behne’s writings.
A year later the art historian Magdalena Bushart convened a conference in Berlin on Behne that led several years later to the publication of the only extensive study of Behne’s work to date, *Adolf Behne: Essays zu seiner Architekturkritik* (2000, *Adolf Behne, Essays on his Architectural Criticism*). After Scharfe’s death in 1995, Behne’s papers were held for a brief period again by Behne’s granddaughter, Eva Gießler, who allowed Bushart access. After some lengthy negotiations, the Galerie Holstein arranged for the Bauhaus-Archiv to purchase the original collection of Behne papers alongside Scharfe’s research notes on Behne as well as smaller projects by Scharfe on Alfred Gellhorn and Konrad Wittwer. When this author was granted access to the material in 1997-1998, the material was still uncatalogued and left in Scharfe’s original boxes. All evidence of Behne’s original organizational structure have disappeared.

---


20 Bushart, *Adolf Behne*. 