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May the strength of the German spirit, that victorious force which is all that remains for us and which no world power and no greed of rapacious enemies can take away from us, prove its creative powers once again by forging this new art, with which we will build ourselves a better future.¹

--Walter Curt Behrendt, *Neue Aufgaben der Baukunst*, 1919

Through the forces of the vast spiritual energy which permeates the work of our time, the spectacle of a new creative era is unfolding before our eyes, one in which the form of our time is being born into reality.²

--Walter Curt Behrendt, *Der Sieg des neuen Baustils*, 1927

**Behrendt and the Historiography of Modern Architecture**

Walter Curt Behrendt's architectural criticism in Germany between 1907 and 1927 reveals a remarkably continuous and often nationalistic rhetoric, that of a nation needing to maintain and re-forge its identity by creating a modern architecture. Before the First World War, a "New Style" (*Neuen Stil*) was to replace an outdated academic eclecticism and push Germany's culture into the modern world. During the war, hardship and patriotism dictated a similarly sober (*Sachlich*), Prussian building style for rebuilding and tackling the impending housing crisis. After the war, a rational, appropriately modern program of the decentralization of German cities and the creation of a national house--a "New Building" (*Neues Bauen*)--were promoted as ways to lift a defeated country out of its psychic and architectural low point. This continuous search for a new, appropriate style reached its high point after the economic recovery in 1924.
when, after a brief episode of expressionism, the avant-garde in Germany re-
joined Behrendt in calling for a rational, objective building style--a New
Objectivity (Neue Sachlichkeit)--to solve the national housing crisis. When
Behrendt proclaimed the "victory of the new building style" at the
Weissenhofsiedlung in 1927, he referred not so much to the beginning of a new,
international architecture without reference to tradition, but to the successful
resolution of his long fight for an appropriate building style for modern Germany.
For twenty years he had tried to define and direct the diverse efforts of his
colleagues to give appropriate expression to the epoch which they saw unfolding
before them. The "New Architecture" that resulted and was proudly displayed in
Stuttgart, although not in itself nationalistic, was in fact the outcome of a process
of the construction of a national identity. Behrendt sought to direct Germans
towards an architectural expression for their own particularly rational, modern,
and objective world view.

In an attempt to differentiate Weimar modernism from both the
conservative Imperial period that had preceded it, and from the rabidly
nationalist Nazi period that followed, architectural historians such as Barbara
Miller-Lane, Norbert Huse, and most recently Richard Pommer and Christian
Otto, have all obfuscated the existence of any specific national and cultural
trends in the development of a modern architecture in Germany. These more
orthodox histories of modern architecture have framed the development of the
new style as the inevitable result of industrialization, as an international search
for the new and ideal, as a revolution. They have maintained that Germany's
devastating defeat during the Great War and the political and social upheavals

which followed in 1918 allowed a new, younger generation of artists to push to
the forefront of German architecture. As presented, these younger architects
intuitively designed expressive, utopian architectures that seemed to have no
regard for precedent, nation, or German tradition. With the improved economy
and the increased power of the socialist city governments after 1924, however,
these younger architects were shown to have re-channeled their innovative
energies to more objective (sachlich) forms needed to design large social housing
estates. Citing the words of Adolf Behne, a long-time collaborator of Bruno
Taut's expressionist circle and former secretary of the revolutionary Arbeitsrat
für Kunst, historians ever since have insisted that the new objectivity would have
been "unthinkable" without expressionism.\textsuperscript{4} In this model of development,
modern architecture in Germany began with a utopian "Cathedral of the Future"
(Zukunftskathedrale) and progressed deterministically to a rational "machine for
living" (Wohnmaschine).\textsuperscript{5}

Disassociating the architecture from political events before and after,
these historians portrayed architectural modernism as an intimate part of the
cosmopolitan "roaring twenties" in Germany, as non-national or even
international in character, and thus peculiarly "un-German."\textsuperscript{6} Post-World War II
historians who looked back on this period, many of whom were part of the
diaspora fleeing the National Socialists, have minimized any identification of the
"International Style" with a tainted German nationalism. In the process they have
all but ignored tradition, except in relation to National Socialism. Only recently
have historians such as Hartmut Frank and Werner Durth begun to suggest that
more tradition-bound architects such as Heinrich Tessenow and Paul Bonatz were
in many respects just as "modern" as any of the avant-garde.\(^7\)

Behrendt's picture of the development of modern architecture thus differs from the established ones in two fundamental ways: nationalism and continuity. Caught up in the search for national identity that characterized the European continent at the turn-of-the-century, Behrendt struggled to transform the artistic eclecticism of the nineteenth century by playing to nationalist sentiments and advocating the reformulation of long-standing German traditions of structural, rational, and sober buildings to create a modern architecture. This essay will show in three major parts, corresponding to the pre-war, war, and post-war periods, how Behrendt moved from traditionalism and nationalism to high modernism after 1924 without resorting to the utopian, non-national fantasies of Expressionism. Throughout this search in which he embraced explicitly German traditions before the war, espoused overtly nationalistic arguments regarding the superiority of German culture and traditions during the war, and finally developed all the elements of high modernism in his quest to post-war reform efforts, Behrendt maintained a steady call for objective, functional, rational, and German architecture that adumbrated the heroic modernism of \textit{Neue Sachlichkeit}.

By demonstrating the continuity of post-war building efforts with their imperial and war-time origins, this essay continues the work of Stanford Anderson and Joan Campbell who uncovered a closer relation of the modern style to the efforts to create a specifically German form before and during the war.\(^8\) More importantly, this essay offers a reinterpretation of the development of modern architecture during the first decades of the twentieth-century, presenting a fluid, continuous call for an objective, national architecture where others have
seen as a disjointed, revolutionary era that began only with Expressionism after the war. The continuity in Behrendt's writings suggest that avant-garde Weimar architecture, and even more generally the "New Sobriety" of Weimar culture, was more "German" than heretofore acknowledged and not merely a product of an international *Zeitgeist* floating halfway between Russia and America.

I. Nationalistic Recourses to Tradition in Imperial Germany

Walter Curt Behrendt was plunged into the nationalist debate by virtue of his birthplace in Metz, Lorraine, that contested region of Germany that passed between national hands at least four times in seventy-five years (Figs. 1, 2). Born on December 16, 1884, he was the eldest of the two children of Alfred and Henriette (Ohm) Behrendt, both of Western German origin and Jewish descent. The Behrendt family lived successively in Metz, Mainz, Wiesbaden, and Braunschweig before Alfred assumed his final post as director of the Reichsbank in Hannover. Walter attended the humanistic *Gymnasium* in Mainz and Wiesbaden, and from 1903 to 1907 he studied architecture and engineering at the technical universities in Charlottenburg (Berlin) and Munich. Afterwards he began his prolific publishing career by writing for architectural periodicals, and also decided to pursue a doctorate in engineering, graduating from the technical university in Dresden in 1911. Throughout his adult life Behrendt worked for various ministries of the Prussian civil service and eventually became responsible for publicizing the innovative, large-scale housing programs funded by the state during the Weimar era. Independently, he was an active member of such reform organizations as the German Werkbund, "Der Ring", and the Arbeitsrat für Kunst.
In his writings, which began in 1907 and continued past his emigration from Germany in 1933, Behrendt managed to juggle a similar balance of often opposing forces. He attempted to inform the general public about modern architecture by contributing to conservative periodicals such as the Deutsche Bauhütte and Daheim, and to liberal newspapers such as the Vossische Zeitung and the Magdeburgische Zeitung. He also frequently published harsh criticisms of the conservative building activity and exhibitions in Berlin while serving as editor for the Neudeutsche Bauzeitung, the primary voice for many reform minded architects and designers of the day, and in Kunst und Künstler, the mouthpiece for French avant-garde art and the Secession movements in Munich, Berlin, and Vienna.11 As editor of the progressive architectural periodicals Die Volkswohnung and Die Form, and architectural editor of the Frankfurter Zeitung after the war, his articles and editorials appeared in response to and in support of those by Peter Behrens, Walter Gropius, Mies van der Rohe, and most of the major players in the future development of German modern architecture.

Historiographically, the importance of Behrendt's writings has been confirmed many times. A southern German newspaper identified Behrendt's first book, a biography of the famed Alfred Messel (1911), as "the first biography ever of a totally modern architect," giving Behrendt instant acclaim.12 Lewis Mumford, a close friend and colleague of Behrendt's, commended the author's Der Kampf um den Stil im Kunstgewerbe und in der Architektur (The Fight for the New Style in the Arts and Crafts and in Architecture) (1912-20) for being a "fundamental document" for the development of modern design "that should long ago have been translated into English."13 Behrendt's most famous book, Der Sieg
des neuen Baustils (The Victory of the New Building Style) (1927), which was published at the same time as the Weissenhof exhibit, is still frequently cited as one of the first works to discuss modern architecture as a style. Reyner Banham, for example, declared that Behrendt's book summarized the atmosphere of the pivotal year 1927 better than any other work. The cover, which featured a heroic image of celebratory flags flying over the Weissenhofsiedlung of 1927, appears frequently as an icon of the advent of heroic modernism (Fig. 3). Leonardo Benevolo identified Behrendt's last book, Modern Building (1937), as the first major work in any language to attempt an overall appraisal of the Modern Movement, while Mumford professed that it was the "best single text on the whole movement."

Although he built nothing, Behrendt's diverse abilities and responsibilities allowed him to play a central role in the creation of a modern architecture in Germany. Through his employment in the Prussian housing bureaucracy and his activity in architectural reform circles, he had access to the whole spectrum of architectural thought of the era. His writings both determined and reflected most of the artistic and political forces of his day. In his search for a new style Behrendt was uniquely able to harmonize the progressive quest for a rational, functional building style and the conservative program of finding an appropriate German, national style. His rigorous education, though not untypical for aspiring Germans at the time, gave Behrendt the firm cultural basis that would allow Mumford later to exclaim: "No modern critic could, perhaps, boast such a combination of fundamental professional training, practical experience, and mature critical judgement, based on the widest sort of humanistic study."
Behrendt was born at the end of the chaotic burst of capitalist expansion (Gründerzeit) which had begun with the unification of Germany in 1871. He was thus an almost exact contemporary of the entire "younger" generation that fought for a modern architecture during the Weimar era, including Adolf Behne (born 1885), Walter Gropius (1883), Mies van der Rohe (1886), and Paul Schmitthenner (1884). Unlike these architects, who required a much longer period of training and came of age only in the Weimar years, the critic Behrendt established his reputation and theoretical framework during the pre-war Wilhelmine period. Being both a contemporary of the leading architects and almost a generation older than most of the other historians of modern architecture, including Sigfried Giedion (1893), Henry-Russell Hitchcock (1903), Nikolaus Pevsner (1902), and Julius Posener (1904), Behrendt had a broader and more encompassing overview of the multiple forces involved in the development of modern architecture in Germany that either of these groups.

Architecturally, the Gründerzeit was characterized by a giddy feeling of exhilaration and intense national pride. The recent Prusso-German victory over France, the annexation of the wealthy territories of Alsace-Lorraine, and the billions received as indemnity payments from France, all led to an explosive economy, rapid industrial growth, and instant wealth for many speculating Germans. New money and the expanding industry forced the expansion of Germany's cities, both territorially and demographically. Despite the liberalization of society, the dominant architectural taste was that established by the conservative academies funded by the Kaiser and his court. The architecture that accompanied this boom, including the buildings on the new Ringstrasse in
Cologne and the villas in the garden suburbs of Berlin, was marked by a barrage of eclectic, historicist ornament made popular by the Beaux-Arts style of the French academy that characterized most of Europe and America during this time (Fig. 4).20

After the exhilaration came the letdown. By the 1880's and especially after the ascension of Wilhelm II to the throne in 1888, a diffuse discontent arose from all parts of the political spectrum.21 Although force and politics had made Germany a new world power, many reformers believed that culturally she was far from strong. The critics perceived a radical discrepancy between what they saw as a backward, conservative German society and the modern, industrialized civilization that the society created. While industries became world leaders in producing chemicals, optics, and electronics, most German traditions harkened romantically back to pre-industrial times. Liberals and conservatives alike blamed the "liberal capitalism" and the giant corporate trusts for the destructive influences of industrialization on German cities and the once pastoral landscape. Social reformers from the left, center, and even extreme right of the political spectrum accused speculators, corrupt building officials, and the bankrupt educational system in the academy for the squalid, over-crowded housing conditions in Germany's largest cities.22

This perceived cultural devastation provoked heated debate art and architectural circles in Germany. Artists, inspired by the reform efforts of the Arts and Crafts movement in England, commented on the decline in the quality of German cultural production. Industrialists sought to conquer world export markets by producing higher quality, more practical goods. Social reformers
sought to make quality goods affordable for the masses. Architects questioned the materialistic excesses and the appropriateness of the French ornament that had been "pasted" on to so much of the new architecture and, especially in commissions for the Kaiser, began designing in a more nationalistic and subdued style, taking their artistic references from the heavy German romanesque tradition.

Around 1900, however, a decidedly new trend in the arts appeared, one which Barbara Miller-Lane has termed the "first revolution" leading to the modern style.23 Led by artists such as Henri van de Velde and August Endell, the first attempts at reform abandoned tradition in favor of an organic, energy-filled Jugendstil.24 Later, groups in Munich and Berlin "seceded" from the conservative art academies, from governmental control, and, by extension, from the existing bourgeois, liberal culture that they felt had destroyed Germany.25 Most artists and architects, however, began to tap into earlier traditions in their attempt to replace the eclecticism of the nineteenth century with more simple, rational forms. Reformers such as the Dürerbund and the Bund Deutscher Heimatschutz, for example, tried to protect Germany's many valued cultural and natural resources and promoted a very traditional, naturalistic aesthetic.26

This contradictory and inter-related array of initial Wilhelmine impulses formed the background for Behrendt's writings. He interpreted the turbulent artistic and social scenes as portents of imminent change. Like many of his optimistic contemporaries, Behrendt believed that he stood on the cusp of a whole new era of world history. Industrialization and science, he felt, had already transformed every aspect of society. Social hierarchies were crumbling,
new technologies were imposing new living patterns, cities were exploding in size and importance, international commerce was facilitating the exchange of culture and goods between nations. To prove that the evolution was not merely a passing fad, he often quoted Goethe's diary from his 1786 trip to Venice, "[After visiting the artists] I will turn to the craftsmen, and when I return I shall study chemistry and mechanics. The age of the beautiful is over, only necessity and strong functionalism are required in our day."27

Amidst all the ferment, Behrendt postulated that the old, hierarchical society was slowly being replaced by a new, democratic, modern, more rational one. "The characteristic feature of the new society," he thought, "is an uninhibited rationalism." This rationalist view of the world was "the true mark of the capitalist mode of thinking." Quoting the economist Werner Sombart, Behrendt remarked, "It [rationalism] is the result of the process of exchange in which one thinks only in causal relationships, sorting everything into cause and effect."28 Capitalism and industrialization had transformed the predominant values of German society. As a result, Behrendt felt, the romanticism of the nineteenth century had slowly given way to a society that valued rationalism, functionalism, and objectivity (Sachlichkeit).

Art and architecture, Behrendt argued, paralleled these changes in society. The conservative, academic eclecticism of the last century was slowly giving way to a "New Style" (Neuen Stil) which was characterized by "functionalism, logical and thorough construction, and an honest, workman-like use of materials."29 As Goethe had predicted, since the middle of the last century German artists, and to a greater extent engineers, had begun to create new forms that were based purely
on function and economy. Although these engineering structures were more science than art, by matching the dominant spirit in society, they provided the hope for a new era of artistic production.\textsuperscript{30} This hope was summarized in the words of Henri van de Velde cited on the frontiecepiece of Behrendt's book \textit{Kampf um den Stil}: "It is our good fortune that we find ourselves on a turning-point of history in which art lies on the ground like a gargantuan fallen tree but we also look out over fields of newly sprouted seedlings."\textsuperscript{31} What was needed now, Behrendt wrote, was to unify art and technology, to combine the rationalism of the engineering with the spiritual, creative nature of design into a new, modern style.

By style he did not mean particular formal attributes, but the material expression of the spirit which endowed a whole era.\textsuperscript{32} Underlying this thought was the idea that art was inextricably linked to the society that produced it. As Behrendt wrote,

\begin{quote}
Art is an integral part of all of culture; its fate is determined by the state of the \textit{Zeitgeist} and the general principles of the day. . . . Art is the creation of a community, she gives expression to general aims and feelings, she provides symbols and forms for a way of life.\textsuperscript{33}
\end{quote}

To Behrendt, just as the Greek temple epitomized Greek society and the Gothic cathedral was the product of its spiritual age, so too the eclectic art of the nineteenth was the sign of a confused and tumultuous society. Only the great engineering structures of recent times, he felt, were a true expression of the rationalism and functionalism that Sombart saw as essential to the age. Great art and a new "style", however, would only be possible when all the arts and architecture were endowed with the "unity of will and conviction" that reflected
the social and material conditions of the era.\textsuperscript{34} If the society and technology had begun to show signs of a new era, it was now up to architects and critics to find the proper expression of these same forces in art.

The perceived interconnection between art and society derived from the nineteenth century debates on the appropriateness of certain styles for the age, but more specifically to the theoretical writings of the German-Austrian "critical" historians of art such as Wölfflin, Riegl, and Schmarsow, who were working at this same time to postulate rules concerning the development of artistic forms over time.\textsuperscript{35} Although Behrendt had not studied art history, he frequently quoted these historians and later referred to Heinrich Wölfflin as "my great teacher."\textsuperscript{36} Their rules, which inextricably linked an artist's work with his or her particular culture and time, stood in stark opposition to the rampant cross-cultural stylistic borrowing of the nineteenth century, as well as to the placelessness and perceived alienation that marks much modern art, particularly the international style. The connection of art with its time and place, however, was fundamental to the conception and realization of a new style and modern architecture. Behrendt's efforts to search for the new were defined in relation to the changes in society he saw around him in Germany. His conception of style and his search for the new were by definition linked to place, culture, and nation.

The turbulent Wilhelmine era proved to be both the object of concern and the source of theoretical inspiration for Behrendt's search for a "New Style." Although he wrote four books and hundreds of articles on all aspects of the built environment in Germany and the rest of Europe before the war, Behrendt focused particular attention on the different ways German architects began looking back
to older building traditions to inspire a modern design. In all of his writings he was concerned not so much with the formal aspects of each building or style as with the underlying aspects of functional, proper construction, and how these related to an ideal "German Form." Much as he theorized that artists were tied to their epoch, so too Behrendt's pre-war criticism was an integral part of the Wilhelmine epoch, fully integrated into the national effort to gain international recognition as a modern industrial, military, and culture power. His writings were the expression of nationalistic spirit he hoped architects would soon turn into built form.

Behrendt summarized most of his early ideas on the fight for a new style in Der Kampf um den Stil im Kunstgewerbe und in der Architektur (1920), perhaps the first complete history of the modern movement before the war. The book was commissioned by the Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt in 1912 as a "guide into the future" for the lay German reader. Although it was substantially complete by 1916, it was not published until after the war in 1920. The book provided a complete overview of the goals and aspirations of contemporary architecture and applied arts, but also proposed the way to a more healthy future for German culture. The structure of the argument in Der Kampf um den Stil followed the stages of actual reform its author believed to have taken place. Beginning with social reform, moving to painting, then the decorative and applied arts, and finally on to architecture and city planning, his book analyzed everything "from the sofa cushion to urban planning," as Muthesius had once described the work of the Werkbund.

This incremental and linear progression of the reform process, according
to Behrendt's book, had also advanced from one northern European country to the 
next, in the form of a race among nations, each with its own definable character 
and ability, each trying to find the proper expression of the age. In a now 
familiar story, Behrendt began in England with the social reforms of Thomas 
Carlyle and the artistic work of William Morris and John Ruskin, who attempted 
to restore the status and pride of the English craftsman and upgrade the quality of 
the nation's cultural production. After these early advances, Behrendt wrote, the 
search moved to Belgium with Henri van de Velde, then to Holland with H.P. 
Berlage, and to Austria with Joseph Olbrich. The Jugendstil and Secession 
movements that started in these countries, he continued, had attempted to rid 
themselves of all tradition. Although artists such as August Endell and Bernhard 
Pankok at first showed signs of a promising new naturalism and rationality, 
ultimately, he felt, they lapsed into the same formalism that had characterized the 
confused art of the nineteenth-century academics.39

Although Behrendt conceived of the struggle to find a new artistic 
expression as international, he was careful throughout his career to distinguish 
"certain nuances determined by national characteristics."40 He insisted, for 
example, that the industrial revolution and the recent efforts to find an 
appropriate artistic style were "Germanic" in nature, and opposed to the 
Mediterranean countries of Italy and France.41 While outlining the origin of 
recent reforms in housing, Behrendt commented on how the "English House" had, 
in program, in construction, and interior design become the model of comfort and 
homeyness for "the whole Germanic race, in the old and the new world." The 
Latin countries, notably France, he lamented, had stuck stubbornly to the large,
urban apartment block whose forms had originally been determined by outdated Renaissance planning methods.\textsuperscript{42}

Behrendt was also careful, for example, to remind his readers that it was the German Gottfried Semper who had been among the first to call for a more functional building style, that van de Velde and Olbrich had both done their best work in Germany, and that Berlage's most innovative thoughts had been given as "German" lectures in Zurich and Krefeld.\textsuperscript{43} Similarly, in describing Holland's initial artistic reform efforts he attributed the early success of the planar ornament to the colorful batik arts prevalent in the Dutch colonies in the East Indies. True advances towards a new style, however, came only when Dutch artists turned to stained glass, which Behrendt called a "northern art form." The new material, he claimed, allowed the ornament and technique to rid themselves of their foreign elements and find their true nordic roots. He closed this argument by reminding readers that the largest commissions for this Dutch glass had come from German clients and commissions.\textsuperscript{44} As innovative and well intentioned as these attempts to find new forms were, however, they had not sufficed to forge a new style for the period which had otherwise been so inventive and progressive.

The struggle to find a new style outlined in \textit{Der Kampf um den Stil} culminated in Germany, which the book claimed had played the "greatest," "liveliest," "most pragmatic," and "most significant role" in actually giving form to the new style.\textsuperscript{45} The beginning of Germany's search for a new architecture, Behrendt wrote in his flattering though at times very critical biography of the recently deceased master, had occurred in the work of Alfred Messel. Messel,
one of the most prolific and respected architects in all of Germany, was widely acknowledged to be the spiritual successor to Schinkel, building in a style which Behrendt felt was uniquely suited for Berlin and northern Germany. To make his point he contrasted Messel's sober, northern designs with the work of the southern master Gabriel von Seidl of Munich. Where the former built in a strong, reformed style that hinted at a new architecture, the latter epitomized the eclectic, individualistic work of the last century.46

Messel's greatest contribution to the development of a new style, Behrendt felt, was the Wertheim Department Store on Berlin's Leipzigerstraße, built between 1896 and 1906 (Fig. 5). The innovative, gothicized structural columns on the facade were cited by almost every critic and historian of the modern movement as central to the evolution of a new style.47 For Behrendt this facade offered the first example of the potential of an academic architect working with the principles of functionalism, thereby combining the best of art and engineering. The facade's strongly vertical organization, he claimed, was the first expression of a modern, urban building type that had ventured to differentiate itself from the typically horizontal stacked floors of the apartment block.48 The bold, structural columns with large sheets of glass in between, the giant interior lightwells, and the innovative steel cage construction all represented the perfect balance of artistic effect and rational construction. Behrendt compared the revolutionary nature of the honest construction, and lofty, majestic nature of the gothicized facade to the achievements of the Abbot Suger, who was credited with inventing the light filled structure of the Gothic style of architecture at the Cathedral of Saint Denis in the 1140s. The Wertheim design,
he claimed, exhibited a similar lively sense of the primal effects in the building arts, a proper sense for the principles of a strict organic mode of composition, and a sure sense of the art of proportions and the tectonic manipulation of space.\textsuperscript{49}

On a more nationalistic note, Behrendt commented that although the structural vocabulary used was as modern as some engineering works, the stone veneer and bold roof nonetheless made the store completely German. Instead of continuing the eclecticism that had dominated Berlin's architectural scene, Messel had drawn on German gothic traditions to empower his design. As such, Behrendt felt the Wertheim store surpassed French examples such as Sédille's Magazins du Printemps in Paris, whose facade was still plastered with bombastic, baroque ornament, wholly inappropriate for this monument to modern industrial capitalism.\textsuperscript{50}

Unfortunately, according to Behrendt, Messel's Wertheim facade was only an isolated success, both in Messel's career and in the German architectural reform movement. Inspired by the Wertheim facade, however, turn-of-the-century architects had begun to look to the past for simpler building traditions for answers.\textsuperscript{51} By applying the honest, functional, workman-like use of materials and structure that had characterized earlier epochs to modern materials and building types, Behrendt and others hoped to replace the vapid eclecticism of the present with a thoroughly new architecture. Many of the faults of nineteenth-century architecture, he claimed, had come precisely because it had not looked back to wholesome traditions, but had merely copied forms. Although in his eyes this recourse to tradition ultimately failed to produce a truly new building style,
Behrendt blamed not so much the rootedness of the traditions as the historical forms that were too often merely copied.

The tradition that most architects turned to was the simplified classicism from the turn of the eighteenth century, what became known as the "Um 1800" tradition. The buildings of this era had been re-introduced to German architects around 1900 by Paul Schultze-Naumburg's *Kulturarbeiten* (1901-1916). The style was given a name and popularized by Paul Mebes' book *Um 1800* (1907), whose second and third editions Behrendt edited since the author was too busy with his architectural practice. Although begun in 1914, due to the outbreak of the war, these editions were not published until 1918 and 1920, just in time to be useful in the post-war construction efforts. Both Schultze-Naumburg's and Mebes' books consisted mostly of photographs and were intended as didactic tools to help contemporary architects re-connect (*Anknüpfen*) to the spirit of simple, honest construction that characterized German buildings between approximately 1780 and 1830, especially the rural vernacular of small German hometowns (*Heimat*). This simple tradition that both books illustrated was generally free of superfluous ornament or any applied stylistic features that could be superficially imitated or pasted onto building facades. The prototypical example for both was Goethe's garden House in Weimar, one of the most well-known architectural images in Germany until well into the 1940's (Fig. 6). The authors hoped to recapture the vitality of this vernacular classicism, to bring it up to date with modern living standards and technological innovation, and thereby to pave the road to a modern, simplified, rational, functional building.

In their writings Behrendt, Mebes, and Schultze-Naumburg all insisted on
the approach to such buildings from 1800, not on the form or style. They were not advertising another revival or a historicist application of traditional details, but rather a sympathetic, evolving continuation of known national types and building traditions. In attempting to forge a new, national architecture, the "style of our grandfathers" was particularly appropriate because many buildings from this recent era still dotted the German landscape, it provided familiar, small-town building types that would help the reformers fight the big city, and unlike more monumental styles, it provided humble examples for the average person to learn from. Perhaps most importantly for Mebes and Schultze-Naumburg, the era around 1800 also had featured some of Germany's greatest heroes, including Goethe, Herder, and Frederick the Great, who had been among the first to attempt to isolate a uniquely German aesthetic. By harking back to this period reformers hoped to revive not only an appropriate architecture, but also a pride and self-assurance in German culture that was self-evident in the late eighteenth century and during the "wars of liberation" against Napoleon in the early nineteenth century.55 Like the contemporary populist (Völkisch) writers Julius Langbehn and Arthur Moeller van der Bruck, the emphasis was on folk traditions whose mass appeal would allow reformers to effectively shape a national culture.56

Behrendt praised the Um 1800 movement for having united German architects and inaugurated a single, dominant style to replace the eclecticism that had preceded it.57 Indeed, before the war most German architects, including both the protagonists of the modern movement as well as the more conservative "Stuttgart School" of architects, all built almost exclusively in the same simple, classical style. This unity of architects working towards a common goal,
Behrendt observed, was the first step towards a new, modern style for the epoch. Moreover, the logic and rationality of the simple classicism provided basic rules of proportion, tectonics, and construction techniques that were easily followed, especially by the many artistic reformers who were not architects by profession such as Henri van de Velde, Peter Behrens, and even Schulze-Naumburg himself.58

Despite the positive results achieved by Schultze-Naumburg's and Mebes' books, Behrendt lamented that in the hands of inferior, academically-trained architects the Um 1800 classicism was too often only a meaningless simplification of nineteenth-century styles. In an article from 1909 on Ludwig Hoffmann, Berlin's conservative, academic municipal architect until 1924, for example, Behrendt showed his general distaste for the "foreign" classicism, but nonetheless tried to sort out the differences between a mere imitation of styles and a slightly more conscientious use of the classical spirit that could lead to further reforms:

Hoffmann shows himself to be an eclectic like so many of the others in his borrowing of historical forms. But it is important to differentiate the various methods of design in order to make it clear which kind of eclecticism has some possibility for fruitful development. On the one hand there is the painstakingly correct, mostly formal, and yet cold and unloving manner of the more theoretical artists. On the other hand there is the less 'correct' manner of Hoffmann, who does not always stand up to academic-scientific scrutiny, but who instead speaks of and to the emotions. Both methods make use of foreign, borrowed forms. Both speak freely in a foreign style. In the one, form remains only a means, while in the other form transcends to create its own power and existence.

Continuing his criticism, but reversing his referents, Behrendt differentiated
Hoffmann from his overly academic peers, "the one [Hoffmann] builds and constructs, the other merely decorates. The one composes and organizes, the other only pastes and fools around. The one creates new values, the other merely ruins old ones." Despite the positive appraisal of Hoffmann's work, Behrendt was critical of the classicism he employed.

Behrendt felt that Hoffmann, Mebes, Messel, Schultze-Naumburg, and their followers had too often encoded the architecture from the period 1750-1830 into a kit of parts, a "Heilserum 1830" (the 1830 healing remedy), as Muthesius once put it. In their attempt to forge an "Um 1900" style they had resorted not to the spirit of Um 1800, but to the forms. Although Behrendt praised Schultze-Naumburg's Kulturarbeiten for having helped to rid a large section of the German populace of their "poor taste" for ornamental goods, he also blamed the books for having promoted an overly simplistic image of the work to be done to transform the positive aspects of Um 1800 building aspects into a new spirit for the present. Alluding to the fact that Schultze-Naumburg frequently resorted to extreme, over-simplified, and "unfair" comparisons in order to more easily and forcefully make a point, Behrendt warned:

Schultze-Naumburg has understood, in a folksy way, how to reach out and educate a very broad segment of the consuming population. His devious method of example-counter-example, however, actually works more horizontally than in depth. Its results are often more stark than actually true.

Behrendt felt that by resorting to this often pedantic, comparative technique in trying to cure German ills the books acted more as superficial propaganda for the masses than as in-depth scholarly sources for the architects to properly select and
effect solutions.

The extensive use of the simplified classicism in the villa districts and new housing projects in Berlin before the war made by architects such as Hoffmann were, for Behrendt, a sign of the unfortunate "cosmopolitan" and "international-izing" tendencies growing in Germany. Classicism, he remarked, had become a true "international style," reaching beyond all borders, even to the colonial style of America. Echoing Schultze-Naumburg's Kulturarbieten, Behrendt lamented that slowly local, regional, and national identities were being destroyed in favor of this "Großstadtstil," and that "instinctive, folk traditions of art are no longer tenable," no longer "able to uphold long-standing national art traditions." Displaying a characteristic ambivalence to Schultze-Naumburg's ideas, however, Behrendt wrote that although the Um 1800 style derived from German traditions and recalled the spirit of Goethe, ultimately it was not German. The "foreign" classical style, he felt, proved to be antithetical to the new spirit of building for which Behrendt was searching: "The new artistic spirit which is surfacing is completely anti-classical and attempts with all its powers to overcome the classical tradition." Despite the simplicity and the rationality of the Um 1800 style, "classicism [unlike the Gothic], is not an intuitive, constructive style, but a derivative one that merely uses forms taken from antiquity in a decorative manner." Through Messel, classicism had provided an initial reform impetus but according to Behrendt would not lead Germany to the new style.

Tradition itself was thus not enough. As Behrendt commented later in life: "Tradition is only useful when we have it in the back of us as a driving force pushing us forward to new aims, and helping us solve our own problems in the
spirit, not in the form of our historical past.”66 Behrendt was not interested in the style or formal characteristics of a tradition, but rather the overall structural and rational expression (*Ausdruck*) of traditional buildings as they correlated to a modern German nation. Schultze-Naumburg had originally expressed similar wishes for a new style based only in spirit on traditions, but he diverged from Behrendt in his architectural work and subsequent writings which stressed tradition to the exclusion of innovation. Disregarding their original similarities and focusing almost exclusively on their subsequent political views, historians have framed the two as exact opposites.67 In retrospect, however, it is only a very fine line that separated the populist traditionalism of Schultze-Naumburg that finally drove him to be one of the most fervent and racist supporters of National Socialism, and Behrendt's trust in harrowed German traditions of simple, functional, honest, and well-crafted buildings that led him to become one a vigorous champion of the new architecture.

II. Patriotism and the Superiority of German Architecture During WWI

Behrendt's at times nationalistic search for a new style intensified with the outbreak of the First World War in August of 1914. For Behrendt, as for many Germans, the war was a dramatic yet hopeful sign of an outdated epoch coming to a dramatic end and with it the beginning of a new era. The period that had begun in 1871 with the founding of the nation and had been characterized by industrialization, social turmoil, and the plague of the large city might soon be replaced by the beginning of a victorious new era of youth and rejuvenation. The initial success of the German troops in Belgium and France provided German
reformers with ammunition to assert the superiority of their own organizational skills, technology, will power, and culture. Among the most blatantly nationalistic were Behrendt's colleagues in the German Werkbund, who had often seen their organization as an instrument of German national power. For them, the war was a real world testing ground for the recent nationalist debates in the arts that had surfaced at the Cologne Werkbund exhibition of 1914. Exhibition organizers, for example, were gleeful when the Parisian press had referred to their exhibit as an "artistic Sedan" that was very likely a government sponsored venture. As Behrendt's mentor Karl Scheffler said, "Alongside other European nations, we are currently standing before the important question, which nation can and will be the cultural leader?"

In April of 1915, only a few months after the beginning of the war, Behrendt published an article on the "Nordic Spirit in French Art" that was as nationalistic as any of Muthesius' speeches from the same period about the superiority of German organization, culture, and form. Behrendt's article attempted to demonstrate the Germanic origin of the best French architecture. Continuing his search for a new architectural style, he hoped to show that Germanic architecture was inherently more progressive and modern than the French academic tradition. Tracing events back to the fall of Rome at the hands of the nordic tribes, Behrendt declared that western art saw a slow but steady expulsion of Roman elements in favor of more Germanic characteristics. Recalling Wölfflin's arguments for a more painterly expression in art, Behrendt claimed that Roman architecture, guided and purified by a "racial instinct," gradually lost its symmetry in favor of a "more painterly and functional
Almost identical words in his last book summarized the nationalist feelings that recalled other *Völkisch* writers of the day:

> Because in the ideas of that new spirit, there unfolds a new sort of creative instinct which is called intuitive imagination, an imagination particularly characteristic of Nordic, and especially perhaps of German architecture, which finds its greatest satisfaction in producing forms of individual character, developing the buildings out of the particular conditions, in contrast to the generalizing tendencies of Mediterranean classicism.\(^{72}\)

This gradual dissolution of the hierarchical Roman imperial architecture, according to Behrendt, had culminated in the great Gothic cathedrals and the other monuments of Gothic construction. Citing Wilhelm Worringen's influential essays on the relationship of German and French Gothic art and recalling Goethe's famous lines in front of the Straßburg cathedral, notably in the contested Alsace, Behrendt professed the specifically German nature of the structural, functional, and spiritual qualities of the Gothic style.\(^{73}\) Although art historians had by now proven otherwise, Behrendt concluded that much of what the world considered consummately French, such as the medieval monuments of Carcassonne and Aigues Mortes, was actually Nordic, or German, in origin.

Moving fluidly between his explanations of the Gothic style and present reform efforts, Behrendt claimed "This strong drive towards expression, towards character and individualization of form, this desire for a more monumental pathos has become characteristic of German building today. . . . It has always been the tell-tale sign of Germanic art."\(^{74}\) Hoping to revive the proud, nordic spirit of the Gothic cathedrals, he insisted that this spirit had not died out, but had merely been held down by the sterile authority of international classicism. Alluding to
the present fight for a new style, he argued that nordic art was inherently progressive and sober (Sachlich) in spirit. The scientific and industrial revolutions that were slowly reforming artistic expression in the northern European countries signaled the end of a five hundred year domination of classical, Mediterranean culture over Europe. Much as the northern Gothic style had ushered in a new period of structural, rational, spiritually honest style to replace the outdated styles of ancient Rome, so too in the early twentieth century, nordic cultures led by Germany, he believed, would find the proper expression for the new industrial age.

For Behrendt, the most promising sign for the recent re-emergence of a Germanic style had been achieved in Germany's modern factories, steel exhibition halls, and concrete storage silos, which even if not German in origin, were nonetheless northern in spirit. Using the analogy of a sleeping monster, he exclaimed proudly, "It is as if these awesome, powerful behemoths of architectural construction, symbolize the reawakening genius of nordic art which is slowly raising its heavy, stiff appendages." He insisted that buildings as diverse as Messel's Wertheim Department store, Hans Poelzig's factories, and Tessenow's single-family houses were the embodiments of a new, German style "in which the Kunstwollen of a new epoch had grown into an actual form." If any country were capable of bringing this nordic force back into power, it would be Germany. Such a German spirit, he wrote, would "provide the world with the long awaited powerful, architectural expression of the spirit of the new historical epoch."

Behrendt remained confident of a victorious conclusion to the war even
until 1917, when he described how the patriotism brought out by the war would help in creating a more modern style of architecture afterwards. While the beginnings of a new "German style" had been achieved before the war, he said, "only with an invigoration of a national pride, which this war has regenerated, can a strengthening of our national artistic sensibility be achieved. . . only then can German architecture take its proper place as world leader." The writer Thomas Mann captured a similar mood when he wrote in a letter to Richard Dehmel in 1914 "It is the feeling that all will have to be new after this profound, mighty visitation, and that the German soul will emerge stronger, prouder, freer, and happier." A year later Karl Ernst Osthaus wrote to Gropius of the "new spirit that will be born on the front line."

If the war provided Behrendt and other German architects with the opportunity to write patriotically about an imminent German form it soon also forced them to focus on actual issues of housing reform and city planning. Already in the first days of the War, while the Cologne exhibit was closing its doors, retreating Russian troops twice pillaged and completely destroyed large parts of the province of East Prussia around Königsberg (Figs. 2, 7, 8). Citing official estimates, Behrendt recorded the destruction of over 24 cities, 600 towns, 33,000 buildings, and 100,000 apartments. In addition, nearly one million refugees had fled the territory under Russian occupation.

East Prussia, although on the outermost limits of the empire and very rural, had always played a central role in Prussian politics. On a purely pragmatic note, the region's Junker estates had long been the breadbasket of Germany. With the country at war, the borders closed to foreign trade, the troops
abroad, and winter only months away, it became essential to replace the many farms and farming communities that had been destroyed. Perhaps more importantly, however, East Prussia, as Behrendt reminded his readers, was the "ancestral home of the Prussian kings." For over two hundred years, leaders since Frederick the Great had undertaken a "push to the East" (Drang nach Osten) to modernize and "Germanize" (Germanisierung) the mixed populations and to provide "living space" (Lebensraum) and an extended Heimat for the constricted Germans without benefit of extensive overseas colonies. In programs that were referred to as "inner-colonization," Prussian authorities had carefully built hundreds of villages and encouraged thousands of Germans to settle and to farm the plains of Silesia and Poland over the years. For Behrendt, these historic campaigns provided the perfect model for the upcoming reconstruction (Fig. 9).

The opportunity to rebuild entire cities soon drew the attention of reformers, almost all of whom had been active in reform organizations such as the Dürerbund, the Heimatschutz Bund, the Garden City Organization, and the Werkbund. Despite their varied backgrounds, the main theme was clear to all and was expressed most succinctly by the architect Gustav Langen: "The purpose here is to make Heimat." The reformers wanted to insure an orderly, planned redevelopment of the housing stock and the various settlements so as to avoid the piecemeal planning and fake architecture (Scheinarchitektur) which they felt had characterized most of the German pre-war architecture since unification. They viewed the reconstruction as an opportunity to test on a large scale, with government support, many of the new ideas and solutions to the vaunted housing
question (*Wohnungsfrage*) that had dominated German and European architectural reforms efforts before the war.

For both pragmatic and ideological reasons, a royal decree of August 27, 1914, ordered reconstruction to begin during the middle of the war. This was done, according to Behrendt, with nearly unparalleled determinism and "popular will" (*Volkskraft*), as a "proud sign of national strength."88 Although the government had budgeted large sums for the effort, the hinterland of eastern Prussia lacked sufficient qualified planners, architects, and builders to undertake the vast program of reconstruction. After meeting with several reform organizations, the government heeded the advice of the Deutscher Heimatschutz and set up a comprehensive and organized bureaucratic structure to oversee reconstruction, including centralizing control over all architectural decisions and hiring accomplished architects from all over Germany.

The programs and ideas that filled the professional and popular press concerning the rebuilding were remarkably similar among the various reformers. Schultze-Naumburg, for example, representing the Bund Deutscher Heimatschutz, urged Germans to use this opportunity to prove that Germany has overcome the lackluster architecture that had characterized the *Gründerzeit* and early Wilhelmine era. He proclaimed that it was a sign of Germany's unending energy and organizational skills that the country was already engaging in the important, systematic effort of reconstruction, even while the battles raged at its borders. He felt sure that this "rescue operation" would "flourish into a cultural monument (*Kulturwerk*) and become a shining example for a modern, beautiful building program."89 Behrendt, in a later issue of the same journal, echoed these
calls for a modern, German architecture when he commented on the large organizational network that was set up to oversee reconstruction: "The most fortunate preconditions [exist] for the success of this large *Kulturwerk*." For both reformers the success of the overall project was seen as a test of the quality and cultural worth of their nation. At this point, all were interested in rebuilding the fatherland, eager to jump at "the opportunity to sacrifice a bit and to show one's national pride through cooperation." 

Behrendt summarized the results of the effort in an article on the reconstruction of Goldap, a small town of about 10,000 residents on the easternmost border of Prussia. As a typical colonial town of the eighteenth century, Goldap had a grid-plan, large market square, and a large stock of architecture from around 1800 (Fig. 10). The Königsberg office in charge of reconstruction appointed Heinrich Keller to be district architect for the whole province of Goldap and to act in place of a design review board, responsible for maintaining the "craftsman-like ideals," and a "high sense of quality" for all construction. Keller, in turn, hired and later collaborated with the architect Fritz Schopol in the design of an overall reconstruction plan, including the reparceling of some properties and the establishment of a strict design code to standardize and harmonize construction. In terms of planning, these efforts were almost identical to the centralized planning that Behrendt had advocated as early as 1911 in his well publicized dissertation, *Die einheitliche Blockfront als Raumelement im Stadtbau* (The Uniform Facade as a Space Creator in City Building). Both used a strong, centralized planning office to control haphazard, speculative, or unwanted growth and construction.
Architecturally, the design of the houses were intended to match the existing *Um 1800* tradition, which Behrendt had deemed particularly appropriate for the war-torn nation, since "We have become a poor people, and economic necessity forces us to utmost restraint and simplicity." Referring to the wars of liberation from Napoleon (*Befreiungskriege*) after 1800, Mebes also recalled "how one hundred years ago our forefathers, in similarly difficult times, understood how to build with feeling and properly, with simple solutions," and urged Germans to turn to the well-crafted classicism of 1800. The simple, rational, and functional buildings erected were as much forced by a will to create a new, modern Germany as by the time schedule, the shortage of materials, and the lack of academy trained architects (Fig. 11). Behrendt credited his good friend Heinrich Tessenow, also Keller's teacher, for the "rejuvenation of German building" that was evident in Goldap. Describing similar proposals for other parts of East Prussia in 1914, Behrendt reported optimistically, "hopes are arising for a generous, modern-minded city building," and continued, "one can already speak of a new, German architecture [characterized by a] pleasant objectivity (*Sachlichkeit*) and a conscious emphasis on a wise functionalism."

Although not extensive when measured against other reconstruction efforts, the construction in East Prussia provided an opportunity to test modern planning methods and simple, rational construction techniques in the name of rebuilding Germany. The pre-war search for a new national style and the war-time nationalism continued almost uninterrupted after the war. The experiences learned in the East proved to be invaluable after the war in trying to solve the plight of Germany's cities and their chronic housing shortage. As Hartmut Frank
has shown, many of the young architects that would figure prominently in the development of Weimar architecture, including Bruno Taut, Ernst May, Hans Scharoun, and Tessenow himself, were active in the East. For many of the younger ones it was their first chance actually to build. In the process of solving the post-war housing crisis all the elements of modern architecture were developed, including decentralized suburban housing settlements, standardization of building elements, rationalization of the construction process, and a simple, design, whose only decoration came from color, shape and massing. The organizational skills and the new house plans first used in Prussia and then in the effort to build a new Germany after the war, were reused almost identically, by the same architects, in the large socialist housing schemes on the outskirts of Frankfurt, Berlin, and Hamburg. Accompanying this continual reuse of technology and organization was much of the rhetoric and spirit of rebuilding a country after a devastating defeat. Replacing an outdated eclecticism with a "New Style," rebuilding the East with a sober Prussian classicism, and solving the housing crisis after the war with an efficient, functional "New Building," proved to be part of a single effort by Behrendt to forge a new national architecture.

III. Developing Modernism by Reforging a Defeated Germany

The reconstruction of the East that started in October of 1914 continued throughout the war, but it slowed considerably as more troops and money were diverted to the war effort, and stopped altogether after the war, only to be completed in 1927. As the war drew out longer than expected, architectural
reformers began to tackle larger housing problems which became ever more intense. Although actual war-time destruction remained minimal on German soil, especially when compared to the destruction in France and Belgium, civilian building maintenance and construction had been at a complete stand-still for four years during the war due to lack of funds, labor, and materials. Behrendt also wrote as early as 1916 of the pressure that returning veterans who had valiantly served their fatherland would put on the government. The timeliness of his ideas were confirmed in 1917 when proposals by the planner Adolf Damaschke to create hundreds of small villages for veterans and families (Kriegerheimstätten) sparked an unprecedented amount of public attention and praise. More pressure to address the housing problem came from the officials working for the city of Berlin, who showed that city dwellers were far less fit for military service than recruits from the country. Further reports showed that birthrates during the war in the city were at an all-time low. Intent on creating a healthier city with able-bodied citizens, the City urged immediate attention to the housing question and the planning of German cities.

After the armistice in November of 1918 did not bring the long-awaited triumphal peace, the housing situation in German cities grew rapidly worse. The Kaiser fled to Holland, revolutionary uprisings ensued in many German cities, and the newly installed socialist government was forced to accept defeat and sign the burdensome peace treaties in Versailles. According to the peace treaty Germany was solely responsible for all the destruction in the war, and was thus required to pay huge reparations, to give up her colonies, and to hand over the resource-rich Ruhr and Rhine provinces, and much of Silesia and Pomerania,
thereby once again cutting off East Prussia from the rest of Germany (Fig. 2).
With no available export markets and little currency to import materials, large
construction efforts proved impossible. Building materials such as bricks, which
required coal for firing, became difficult to obtain. Shortages of housing, food,
work, and fuel forced an exodus of Germans from the large cities, many
emigrating from Germany altogether. Refugees from the territories in the east
that had been ceded to Poland flooded into the cities and a general rise in
marriage and birth rate exacerbated the lack of housing. As a result, Behrendt
cited official estimates that up to 800,000 dwelling units were desperately
needed.\textsuperscript{101} Finding a solution to the housing crisis became an issue of national
survival.

Behrendt and many of his colleagues soon dedicated all their efforts to
solving this crisis, and in the process developed all the attributes of a new,
modern architecture. In 1916 Behrendt gave up his job in the architectural office
of the City of Berlin in order to fight on the western front. After returning from
his tour of duty in 1918, he proselytized his views from several independent yet
undoubtedly related venues. Early in 1919, he was put in charge of publicity for
the Prussian Ministry of Public Health and the Department of Public Housing, a
post he held until 1926. Although his writing slowed during the war, after the
war he wrote more than ever, editing two editions of Mebes' book, and finishing
his own \textit{Kampf um den Stil}. Behrendt also wrote extensively for \textit{Deutsche
Allgemeine Zeitung} and became an editor of the progressive \textit{Frankfurter Zeitung}.

The primary vehicle by which Behrendt spread his opinions was the new
magazine \textit{Die Volkswohnung} (The National House), a bi-weekly publication
dedicated exclusively to solving the housing problem in Germany through small, single-family, rural and suburban houses.\textsuperscript{102} It published any and all information circulating on the housing problem, including information on new building laws, building materials, construction techniques, material and labor costs, and much commentary on all sides of the decisive issues. It featured the writings of the prominent architectural thinkers, including Ernst May, Bruno Taut, Walter Gropius, Paul Schmitthenner, and Mies van der Rohe. The magazine also published extensive reviews of books by Muthesius, Tessenow, Fritz Schumacher, the city architect of Hamburg, and Carl Fuchs, the president of the Heimatschutz Bund.

The common theme in all their writings was the small, suburban single-family or row house as a solution to Germany’s urban housing problems.\textsuperscript{103} Through their writings, the reformers hoped to reinvigorate the pre-war "Settlement Movement" (\textit{Siedlungsbewegung}) that had started to build garden cities and other decentralized housing solutions before the war. The architects were united in their condemnation of the metropolis (\textit{Großstadt}), in their praise for the German small town (\textit{Kleinstadt}), and in advocating the dissolution of the city into smaller, rural settlements. All advocated an architecture that was simple, well crafted, objective, and as will be described below, largely standardized and rationalized.

Behrendt summarized most of his ideas on post-war rebuilding, including those in \textit{Die Volkswohnung}, in the short book \textit{Neue Aufgaben der Baukunst} (New Assignments for the Building Arts), part of "Der Aufbau" (The Build-up), a series of publications commissioned in October of 1918 by the German Secretary
of State Conrad Haußmann to inspire reconstruction efforts. Behrendt stressed the importance of housing as the lifeblood of the nation when he wrote, "the two cornerstones for the reestablishment of our spiritual and economic life are the feeding and housing of the people. The housing and settlement question, which carries within it the food question... has become the life question of our nation." He urged Germans to concentrate on those issues that facilitated the "building of the nation," that provided a "ray of hope in these dark times," that "help us to believe in ourselves once again." The energy to overcome the spiritual and material poverty brought on by the defeat of the war, he declared, could only come from the inside, from "our own national spirit (Volkskraft) [and] our own soil."

While pointing out the gloomy situation in Germany, Behrendt's writings were generally hopeful. Like many of his Werkbund colleagues, Behrendt was forced to rethink his cultural mission from a heroic propagandizing of German form during the war to restoring a poor, defeated country afterwards. As before the war, however, reform was closely linked to national identity. Citing reports from the Werkbund's newsletter, the Mitteilungen des Deutschen Werkbundes, Joan Campbell maintained that the Werkbund welcomed the November revolution, recognized the socialist Republic as the "legitimate heir to German state power," and soon pledged all their creative abilities to rebuilding the nation. Despite the calls for a new Germany, the Aufbau (building-up) started from a well-known and established base. Throughout the writings there was an emphasis on continuity, on restoring an original strength, on maintaining specific skills and powers. In Behrendt's writings, moreover, it is difficult to distinguish
between his point of view as a Prussian official responsible for lobbying for national policy and his independent ideas and aspirations for Germany and German architecture. The overlapping, though not necessarily conflicting, roles demonstrate the inter-connection that existed in the Weimar state between official policy and very progressive, even radical reformers. In both cases the primary issue was to fortify a "New Germany" with a "New Architecture" that nonetheless continued a proud German tradition.

Reaching to history for inspiration again, Behrendt wrote that in order to restore itself physically and culturally, Germany would have to resort to the same tactics that Frederick the Great had employed to "heal the country after a long war and to return the country to greatness: to inner-colonization." In order to "rebuild" and "renew" this national spirit Behrendt advocated a policy of *Dezentralisation*, as he had done since the beginning of his career. Contrasting the food, fuel, and work shortages in the over-crowded German cities with what he saw as an apparently limitless wealth and space of the countryside, Behrendt wanted Germans to leave the city and return to the land in order solve its housing and food shortages. Only by restructuring German society, by resettling the population from the cities to country, could a new national energy be created, and with it a new, more modern architecture. Quoting Friedrich Ratzel, the social geographer from whom Behrendt took many of his ideas on the character of the German people through history, Behrendt remarked that "In the process of settling a country, everything that slows the crowding of a people keeps a country young." The move out of the unhealthy city and into the countryside was essential, he wrote, if Germans were to become both individually and as a
country more self-sufficient.

The combined voice of the Volkswohnum architects, as well as the size of the potential disaster in German cities, convinced the government to act almost immediately after the revolution of 1918 and to make decentralization of housing settlements an official state policy. With the help of liberal politicians like Conrad Haußmann and Bernhard Dernburg, the imperial Colonial Minister who had written the introduction to Peter Behrens and Heinrich de Fries' very influential pamphlet *Vom Sparsamen Bauen*, the interim government drew up plans to encourage the "re-population of the flat-land." The legislation, which was placed in the new constitution under §28 on August 11, 1919 as the State Settlement Laws (*Reichssiedlungsgesetz*), tried to make large areas of land that were mostly in Prussia available for smaller farmers, especially those that were leaving the city. As Behrendt related it, the laws facilitated the expropriation and subdivision of inefficient, large farms, made funds available for the reclamation of wetlands and other previously unusable government property, and generally tried to increase the number of Germans that gained their livelihood in agriculture. Although the process of buying back the large farms of the nobility was a slow process, it started the process of decentralization and what Behrendt hoped would be an eventual regeneration of Germany.

The ideal example of such a decentralization effort, according to Behrendt, had already been attempted during the war in the relocation of the Hirsch Metal manufacturing company to the countryside. The employees of this arms manufacturer in Eberswalde, he wrote, required large amounts of milk in order to overcome the side effects of the poisonous fumes that accompanied the
manufacturing process. When war-time rations grew too thin the company owners purchased cows and later a large piece of land and commissioned the architects Paul Mebes and Paul Emmerich, who had earlier built their factory, to build a large, efficient farm buildings and a small Siedlung for factory workers. Over the years, Behrendt continued, the whole unit gradually became nearly self-sufficient, producing its own fertilizer, feed, milk, and even fresh vegetables for the employees, all at greatly reduced prices. Beginning his article with the words of the radical anarchist Petr Kropotkin advocating a complete integration of city and country, Behrendt explained that this "Industrial Farm" (Industriegut) was not the product of theoretical musings, but rather came out of the necessity of war. The "sleek Sachlichkeit" of the buildings and the efficient functioning of the farm were the perfect example for Behrendt of the potential reunification and harmonious integration of city and country, the two main components of the soul of a working person.

Even if housing could not realistically always be harmonized so closely with industry, Behrendt nonetheless urged the creation of thousands of housing units outside of the city limits. His goal was to forge a new national house (Volkswohnung), "in which a new strong and happy humanity might be raised." By Volkswohnung Behrendt did not mean a particular dwelling type, but rather the housing of the whole community. In words that recall Schultze-Naumburg and the Heimatschutz movement, Behrendt maintained that under ideal circumstances the Volkswohnung would allow all Germans to own a piece of the land, to live and eat off of the land, and "finally be bound to their homeland again." Quoting Ratzel again, Behrendt wrote, "the German sensitivity for
family and house, one of the most important elements of our national character, has proven itself a life force that was often successful in regenerating the nation from its very heart after devastating loses." In conjunction with his program of decentralization, Behrendt claimed, the establishment of a *Volkswohnung* would "shape the face of the new Germany." It was a "matter of national pride." he continued, that such a project should be "solved in an honorable fashion, by the most talented artists available, even in these economically depressed times."116

As with the decentralization effort, the new socialist government proved very amenable to these suggestions. On January 15, 1919, it passed legislation to alleviate the most urgent housing problems by installing a series of powerful district housing commissioners (*Bezirkswohnungskomissaren*). These officers were not subject to any local or state laws, and thus were free to institute all necessary measures to promote small housing construction. They were empowered to expropriate all land and even the materials necessary for housing construction in exchange for pre-approved compensation. The commissioners were also able to stop all unnecessary "luxury" construction and to force certain construction industries to operate, even if at a loss.117 Attempting to find new funds to finance construction, the government also began to collect a rent tax (*Mietsteur*) after 1920, which taxed all rent increases that had resulted from the housing shortage during the war. Continuing state patronage of the settlement movement, the federal government passed very steep taxes (*Hauszinssteuer*) on all existing property after 1925 to finance new housing construction, most notably the vast projects on the outskirts of Frankfurt, Berlin, Hamburg, and
In trying to develop the *Volkswohnung* and to refortify Germany during the economically strapped times of the post-war era, money became the determining factor in all discussions. Summarizing the characteristics of the new *Volkswohnung*, Behrendt began with a single word: economy (*Sparsamkeit*). Only by saving could Germans satisfy all their housing needs, and also be productive enough to regenerate her industry and pay off her loans. Much like the simplicity of the *Um 1800* style that he had advocated for the constraints involved in rebuilding East Prussia, Behrendt here went even further and demanded a *Neues Bauen* (New Building). A new, rational, and realistic architecture was to replace the outmoded, labor and capital intensive way of building. Even if at first there was some antipathy towards the new, he felt confident that the harsh economy would force architects to be innovative. National identity and national survival would couple with economic circumstances peculiar to Germany to produce a new, more modern, efficient method of building. As early as 1919 in his *Neue Aufgaben der Baukunst*, Behrendt was able to list all of the defining ideals which were translated into the new style after 1925, and seen most vividly in the Weissenhof. Most of these ideas came directly from past nationalistic experiences, including the pre-war search for a new style and the reconstruction of East Prussia.

One of the most controversial questions that arose even before the details of the architectural expression, was that of building type. The question in housing was whether it was more efficient to build in dense, tall blocks or to build low, single-family or row-house type dwellings: "*Hochbau oder
In deciding on type, money again became the issue. Building materials were considered cheaper for small buildings, especially for row houses. Advocates of the high-rise blocks countered that roads, sewers, water, and electricity had to be factored into the cost. In counter-response, Behrens and De Fries came up with intricate sub-division methods to maximize garden space for septic systems and minimize facade lengths to cut down on utility installations. Behrendt, who had long been a supporter of the single-family house as the most suitable dwelling for Germans, stressed the decreased effects of land speculation in rural and decentralized housing, the lower construction costs, the improved hygiene, and the psychological benefits of owning one's own home. Even while praising some of the new designs for apartment blocks in Berlin and Vienna, Behrendt both before and after the war remarked on greater advantages of the single family home or row house in the suburbs. Similarly, when reviewing competitions for "Communal-kitchen" (Einküchenhaus) living arrangements, Behrendt pointed out that these innovative social constructs only represented partial solutions to the ills of big-city living.

The most radical proposal to the discussion of building type came in 1920, when Max Berg, the city architect of Breslau, proposed to build large skyscrapers in German cities to alleviate the housing problem. Although some German architects proposed skyscraper apartments, most agreed that in such times of economic hardship only the government or big business could erect such highrise buildings. By creating large amounts of centrally located office space and freeing up apartments currently being used for business purposes, however, Berg's proposals simultaneously addressed the housing crisis and the growing
interest in the benefits of business. Behrendt, who was against all centralization, wrote extensively on the skyscraper issue, at times waffling back and forth, trying always to highlight the modern and German attributes. On a planning scale, for example, he commented that the American building type was unsuitable for the historically sprawling character of German cities like Berlin.\textsuperscript{126} On the other hand, he also recognized that the real estate economics in Chicago and New York had been almost identical to the ones present in Germany, and thus made the skyscraper a logical choice. Well aware of the "chaos" and urban planning disasters that had been perpetrated with the skyscraper canyons of New York which "may be excusable on the virgin soil of a colonial empire," he warned of the need for careful planning in Europe, especially in Germany, with such an old, urban tradition in which the cathedral as monumental center had always determined the face of the city.\textsuperscript{127}

The skyscraper designs themselves also sparked Behrendt's sense of national identity. He praised the steel-cage construction in the American examples as the complete fulfillment of its purposes and typical of the ingenuity that had made American engineering works the most innovative in the world, well on the way to a "New Style."\textsuperscript{128} In Behrendt's only publication in a foreign periodical, an article in the \textit{Journal of the American Institute of Architects} of 1923, however, he pronounced that German skyscrapers were far more functional and modern than those of the America.\textsuperscript{129} Although he admired the early work of Richardson and Burnham in forging what he called a "national style" in America, Behrendt condemned the more recent American "piles of stones," "parades of columns" and temple fronts for being "backward" and clinging to the eclecticism
and academicism of the French Beaux-Arts (Fig. 12). Illustrating the irregular plans of Mies van der Rohe's skyscraper projects of 1921, the first publication of these now-famous drawings in America, Behrendt showed how construction, if logically developed, produced new architectural forms and was capable of monumental effects without resorting to classical decoration (Figs. 12, 13). He praised in particular the polygonal, crystalline forms as being structurally more sound. Recalling his earlier tirades against the French house, he stressed that programmatically the German skyscraper, i.e. that of Mies, was much more efficient than the square blocks of the American skyscraper, which he claimed responded only to the grid of the city and had no regard for the function of the building.

The Journal of the American Institute of Architects, as flagship of the American architecture profession, fueled the nationalist fire when it published several heated defenses of American skyscrapers immediately following Behrendt's article. In one of these, George C. Nimmons fretted about the unfunctional nature of the irregular plans of Mies' plans and questioned why any architect would want to display the "bones" of a building (Fig. 15). He also complained about the complete lack of ornament in the glass boxes, "devoid of what civilization in the past has considered desirable building adornment." "In fact," he continued, "the bugs of the earth or the living things of the sea can do better in the design of their habitations." In another confused response to Mies' plan, William Parker wanted to label it "A Picture of a Nude Building Falling Down the Stairs," alluding wittily to Marcel Duchamp's painting at the Armory show ten years earlier, America's shocking introduction to modern art (Fig. 14).
Although no true skyscrapers were built, almost every large German city held competitions, and some such as Cologne and Hamburg did begin to build tall office buildings. Due to strict laws limiting building heights in most German cities and the lack of sufficient capital during the inflationary period after the war, the primary means of solving the housing shortages remained decentralized, small housing units. Although economics often dictated larger blocks of apartments, most housing settlements were designed with private gardens as well as public, park-like grounds. Public facilities such as stores and communal laundries were kept to a minimum in Germany, as reformers insisted that dwellings be minimal yet self-sufficient. Weissenhof is proof that opinions remaining divided to the end, as apartments, row-row-houses, and single-family homes were all inter-mixed.

Besides building type, Behrendt focused on a need for greater standardization as a means to achieving more and cheaper housing, and he soon became one of the most ardent supporters of the "standardization movement" (*Normungsbewegung*). Much like the drive towards decentralization, the first steps towards a solution had occurred due to the demands for mechanized production during the war. In 1918 he reported in a Werkbund newsletter, shortages of time, materials, and labor, had led the German government to found a national standards institute (*Normenausschuß der deutschen Industrie*) in December of 1917. Responding to the urgent housing needs in Germany, the Standards Institute formed a division responsible for building construction in the summer of 1918. The major purpose of the institute was to standardize all
aspects of the production of small houses. Window details were normalized so that only one size window pane needed to be manufactured and so that they could be assembled in factories instead of on the site. Roof and ceiling joists were given standardized dimensions so that lumber companies could minimize their inventory and save time and money in the milling process. Engineers more closely calculated the spans that each beam could carry, attempting to use material more efficiently. Planners even tried to standardize entire houses, setting dimensions for each room type to match up with the normalized building materials and space efficiency principles.

The standardization movement that soon swept the German building industry at first came up against a great deal of opposition, especially amongst the younger, avant-garde artists who espoused a free, creative expressionism. The biggest complaint Behrendt registered, however, was from local architects who were unwilling to give up their age-old traditions and building techniques in favor of industry-wide norms. As a result, the Standards Institute also began issuing regional norms that took into account specific climates, building technologies, and local traditions. Trying to win people over to the efficiency of standardization, Behrendt also reminded readers that similar techniques had been implemented under Frederick the Great, who had developed a whole catalogue of standardized building types in order to save money, to make construction more efficient, and to allow craftsmen to move to various parts of the country without having to relearn their techniques locally (Fig. 9).

The other major responsibility of the Standards Institute was to test new building materials, especially the substitute ones (Ersatzbauweise) that were
being used after the war in the light of the extreme shortages in materials such as brick and concrete.\textsuperscript{138} Although many builders experimented with rubble-filled walls and with ancient rammed-earth construction, both Die Volkswohnung and the government advocated a return to wood building, a resource Germany could easily produce herself. Although wood construction had historically not been favored in Germany, the very fact that it was used so extensively in northern countries such as Norway and Sweden was proof for Behrendt that it was a tenable building material for Germany as well. Die Volkswohnung devoted many pages to the subject in the early post-war years, demonstrating the advantage of wood-frame construction and giving tips and ideas for its cost-saving and innovative use. Even Gropius became convinced, building his famous Sommerfeld house in a log construction, and titling one of his essays on the positive aspects of wood construction, "\textit{Neues Bauen.}"\textsuperscript{139} As early as 1919 Behrendt also reported that the Ministry of Housing was suggesting factory-made houses out of wood to insure a high quality, inexpensive production process.\textsuperscript{140} The component and assembly nature of wood construction made it particularly applicable to these processes.

One of the most controversial results of the call for wood construction regarded the roof. Because of the savings in lumber and the increased space it provided under the roof, the journal advocated the use of flat or near flat roofs and required German industry to find appropriately economical ways of waterproofing it. Later in his book \textit{Der Sieg des neuen Baustils}, Behrendt advocated the flat roof because of the spare, cubic, economic aesthetic that this roof shape naturally created. In a much celebrated and very nationalistic war of words,
many tradition-bound architects such as Paul Schultze-Naumburg labeled the flat-roof "un-German." Behrendt's Volkswohnung, however, developed it out of the need for an efficient modern architecture appropriate to Germany's economic situation and demand for a functional, rational architecture.\footnote{141}

To make up for the perceived drabness of German cities that resulted from a lack of care and maintenance during the war and the cheap, substitute building materials that had been used afterwards, Behrendt urged a more liberal use of color in German architecture and signed Gropius and Taut's manifesto, "Aufruf zum Farbigen Bauen" (Call for more Colorful Building). This call for color was shared by almost all reformers of the day, including the Heimatschutzbund and the most conservative elements of the Werkbund.\footnote{142} He commented on the inexpensive and as yet almost completely unexplored design potential of color, and urged that color be used to differentiate buildings, and even entire city sections from each other. He also reminded readers that gardens provided inexpensive, natural color to the environment, stressing the importance of flowers and greenery in helping to provide a "new, happier air" in the cities.\footnote{143}

The question of standardization of materials naturally led to the problem of rationalization of labor. Here the central problem was the construction process itself. In response to the shortages of materials, the surplus of labor, and the need to return to the basics after the mechanization of war, beginning in 1919 Behrendt and the younger, more avant-garde Werkbund members began to advocate a return to more traditional hand-crafting.\footnote{144} Gropius, one of the primary defenders of the return to honest, medieval traditions, used the craft ideal as the basis of the Bauhaus that he formed in Weimar that same year. For
construction projects on the scale of Germany's housing needs, however, Behrendt soon realized that handicraft was too limited.

The solution came in the "socialization" of the workplace. Already in the first issue of Die Volkswohnung the architect Erich Leyser commented on the government's general attempt to socialize the economy and asked architects from all over Germany to submit ideas on implementing a similar process in the construction industry. In June of 1919 Martin Wagner responded to his request with a detailed program on the "Socialization of the Building Industry." Both authors wrote of the need for greater centralized planning and the need to form large state-run or union-run construction companies that could afford to manufacture their own construction materials and thereby avoid the costly middleman. Behrendt, who had advocated the same ideas as early as his dissertation in 1911, also theorized that by mass-manufacturing such specialty items as mouldings, built-in furniture, and the central stove, a higher quality would be achievable than if market prices had to be paid. In addition, such companies could more easily train large numbers of workers and provide a more stable job than the speculative ventures that had dominated the construction industry before the war.

In an article of March 1924, "The Industrialization of the Construction Industry," that adumbrated many of the techniques of Ernst May and Walter Gropius, Behrendt went a step further and analyzed how the construction process might be fully integrated into the rapid industrialization of all production processes in Germany. Citing Martin Wagner's words on the applicability of construction to an assembly-line process, and a pamphlet by Frederick Witte,
“The Rational Household,” Behrendt advocated a full-scale rationalization of the construction industry using the innovative ideas of the American engineers Frederick Winslow Taylor and Henry Ford.\textsuperscript{148} Behrendt urged that the construction industry learn from the very successful examples of such taylorization that had already been instituted in the design of ocean liner cabins.\textsuperscript{149} Only through the rise in production and the lowering of prices associated with industrialization, he wrote, could Germany's housing shortage be solved. In a positive response to Behrendt's article, Mies van der Rohe later suggested that the primary goal of modernizing building construction should not be only the industrialization of the construction process, but rather the invention of radically new materials that would facilitate the mass-production and pre-manufacturing of component parts.\textsuperscript{150}

Behrendt and \textit{Neue Sachlichkeit}

By 1924 Behrendt and \textit{Die Volkswohnung} had proposed most of the ideas of functionalism, standardization, and rationalization that later became so closely connected to the \textit{Neue Sachlichkeit}. In this same year Behrendt also changed the name of \textit{Die Volkswohnung} to \textit{Der Neubau} to widen the focus from housing to include all innovative new construction, including more of the avant-garde. His prominent role as critic and advocate of the war-time and post-war housing reform movement earned him respect among his peers. In 1924, for example, he was elected to the administration of the Werkbund representing the younger, more progressive faction on the board. In 1925 he was elected the first editor of
the influential Werkbund magazine *Die Form*. In the same year he was elected, along with Mies van der Rohe, to head the commission in charge of the Weissenhofsiedlung in Stuttgart, and in 1926 he was asked personally by Mies to call on Le Corbusier in Paris to invite him to build in Stuttgart.

Behrendt's published criticism continued to play a crucial role in the promotion of a more modern architecture for Germany, a *Neues Bauen*, as he had called his quest for a new, rational, realistic architecture since 1919. His criticisms of the establishment, for example, were key elements in the formation of "Der Ring," a group of progressive architects frustrated in their quest for a new style by the overly conservative policies of Ludwig Hoffmann. With Behrendt's help, the group managed to oust the old city architect of Berlin Ludwig Hoffmann, whose work Behrendt had critically analyzed early in his career and who still stipulated an outdated academic classicism for all public building and stifled the avant-garde with conservative building inspectors.

Even after assimilating with the the avant-garde, Behrendt continued his nationalistic attempts to promote a new German architecture. In 1924, for example, he wrote in support of plans by the progressive Professional Association of German Architects (B.D.A.) to send an exhibition of their architectural experiments to America. In his own journal Behrendt urged that the government should sponsor such an exhibition, paying the younger artists, who had had few chances to build in the recent economic recession, to finish their designs and show them off in America. Since Germany had been forbidden to exhibit at international exhibitions since the war, Behrendt urged the government to consider such an exhibit as an exercise in "German cultural propaganda."
would not only reveal to the world the advances of German architecture, but encourage the German architects to solve the housing crisis at home.  

Behrendt also remained optimistic about German efforts at socializing and industrializing the construction industry even after being invited to visit the United States in 1925 to attend the International City Building Conference in New York along with other German housing specialists such as Ernst May. After touring many construction sites in several states he remarked disappointedly that despite America's technological lead in so many areas, her construction industry seemed hopelessly outdated. The final resolution of the housing problems facing Germany, he felt, would come "not from America but instead from the old world," especially in Germany.

Behrendt's search for a new style were finally fulfilled in 1927 with the eissenhofsiedlung, perhaps the earliest and most significant group of modern dwellings in Europe. As Henry Russell Hitchcock confirmed two years later, "The Stuttgart Exposition of 1927 was in many ways symbolical. . . But there was no country besides Germany which could have organized such a demonstration in 1927. . . it is from Germany that the manner of the New Pioneers has more directly spread." In time for the exhibition, Behrendt consolidated several of his most recent articles on the new architecture and published the now famous manifesto announcing the "victory of the new style." It proved to be the last work in a long series by Behrendt that began in 1908, with an article "about the new style," continued in 1912-1920 with the "fight" for a new style and many analyses outlining the aspirations of the new architecture, and culminated in the "victory" of 1927. Behrendt summarized the quest for
the new architecture in *Der Sieg des neuen Baustils* when he wrote:

> What drives and carries the new movement is not an addiction for the new... but the opposite: it is the will to return to the fundamental rules and elements of all building, and to do it as the Ancients had done it; it is the desire to confront the reality and meaning of the present; it is the spiritual effort to work through these meanings and to give form to them in design; it is the effort to free one's self of the confining burden of useless leftovers and paralyzing historical forms, and at the same time to work creatively, without prejudice or hesitation, as we see all around us today in the industries of mass-production which are determining the character of our time.160

Throughout his career Behrendt had searched for and defined a new architecture that rested on tradition and national identity but also expressed the rationalism that he felt marked the era in which he lived. His writings show a continuous search that moved from the *Neuen Stil* in Imperial Germany, to the sober *Um 1800* style during the war, to the *Neues Bauen* afterwards. Each stage revealed the nationalist rhetoric of a nation needing to maintain and reforge its identity through architecture.

As mentioned at the beginning of this essay, the integration of nationalism with the search for a modern architecture that Behrendt demonstrated throughout his life has seldom been acknowledged or accounted for. Although Behrendt advocated a realistic, objective throughout his life, critics have, for example, often wrongly referred to Behrendt's post-war decentralization policies as "romantic anti-urbanism," grouping him with the circle around Bruno Taut and Heinrich Tessenow.161 Both Behrendt's and Taut's decentralization plans, for example, sought to end the misery of the big city by resettling the countryside. In addition, Behrendt signed Taut's "Aufruf zum Farbigen Bauen," and also the
manifesto "Das Architektur Programm" issued by Taut's radical Arbeitsrat für Kunst. Further connections came when Taut published the first section of his utopian vision for a dissolution of Germany cities, "Die Erde eine Gute Wohnung," in Die Volkswoh...
clear after 1924 when many of the avant-garde architects called for a rejection of expressionist fantasies, leaving the "blind alley of expressionism" in favor of a return to a more fundamental, rational building techniques and designs, a Neue Sachlichkeit very similar to ideas Behrendt had maintained throughout his long search for a new style.  

Even Taut, who before the war had built several small Siedlungen with many simple Um 1800 details, "returned to reality," to the more sober, rational building methods in works like his Siedlung Britz in Berlin, after "succumbing to the urge of self-expression" in the "wave of expressionism."

This failure to acknowledge the differences between Behrendt and Taut is the result of a larger, entrenched historiographical dichotomy that goes back to the Weimar era and still determines our analysis of the development of modern architecture: tradition versus modernity. In the process of proselytizing their own architectural program, Behrendt and the progressive architects defined a rigid formal polarity between their own will for a "new architecture" and the "opponents" (Gegner) such as Ludwig Hoffmann, Paul Schultze-Naumburg, and "Der Block" group of architects which formed in opposition to "Der Ring," and who built in a more overtly traditional and regional manner. In so doing they reinforced a split among modernists that Karl Scheffler pointed out as early as 1913, when he commented that efforts by modern architects to create a "New Style" came from two dominant directions: one looked to history and traditional German building to alleviate the harshness of modern life, the other turned to pure creativity to forge a completely new set of forms.

This strictly formalist polarity became radicalized in the struggle for Weimar architectural commissions, each side defining themselves in contrast to
each other. Tradition became allied with nationalism, and later with National
Socialism. The "new architecture" in turn became allied with internationalism
and democracy. The polarities only grew deeper when the National Socialists
advocated a more populist *Heimatstil* architecture, and the opposing democracies
took in the more progressive historians and architects. In the process architects,
critics, and historians alike have covered over the initial German nationalistic
impulses which set off the search for a new modern style. Walter Curt Behrendt's
integration of modernity, tradition, and nationalism thus serve as a useful
example with which to begin a re-examination of the split between tradition and
modernity which has dominated historical thinking. We must reassess whether
the *Neues Bauen* was perhaps more German than international; whether the
nationalism of imperial and war-time Germany usually associated with the "older
generation" was really so antithetical to the new architecture of the "younger
generation"; as well as why historians have for several generations ignored
nationalism in their analyses and studies of a period of European history that was
fraught with such sentiments.
Endnotes

N.B. Because Behrendt's writings are difficult to obtain in this country, I have elected to quote his words in full, in the original German, in the endnotes, often including more than the few words translated in the text when they reinforced my ideas in order to provide a more useful reference for further research.

1. "Möge die Kraft des deutschen Geistes, diese siegreiche Kraft, die uns allein noch geblieben ist und die keine Macht der Welt und keine Habsucht raubgieriger Feinde uns nehmen kann, sich auch darin wieder schöpferisch erweisen, daß sie uns diese ersehnte neue Kunst schafft, mit der wir uns eine neue und bessere Zukunft bauen wollen." Walter Curt Behrendt, Neue Aufgaben der Baukunst, Der Aufbau, no. 6 (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1919), 27. See also below note #104.


3. Barbara Miller-Lane wrote that the new architecture was the result of "two revolutions, the broader one, which around 1900 gave rise to the modern movement as a whole, and the narrower one, led by Gropius and his followers after 1918." She gives primacy to Expressionism for helping to clear architecture of all traditions before embarking on the modernist path. Architecture and Politics in Germany 1918-1945 (1968; Cambridge, Mass., 1985). See also Norbert Huse's influential book "Neues Bauen" 1918 bis 1933. Moderne Architektur in der Weimarer Republik 2nd ed. (1975; Berlin, 1985), 9, which quotes Miller-Lane verbatim, and Karin Kirsch, Die Weissenhofsiedlung. Werkbund-Ausstellung "Die Wohnung" - Stuttgart 1927 (Stuttgart, 1987).

Richard Pommer and Christian Otto remarked similarly, "At the end of World War I, the self-constituted avant-garde of European architecture consisted of a few tiny factions, all given to utopian daydreams in the absence of a coherent architectural style and program, or any way to take over the established systems of architectural production. Nine years later, the avant-garde had organized itself into a coherent movement, the Modern Movement. . . No event did more to bring about and to sum up this transformation than the exhibition housing settlement which opened in the summer of 1927 on the Weissenhof hill overlooking Stuttgart." Weissenhof 1927 and the Modern Movement in Architecture (Chicago and London, 1991), 1.

4. Adolf Behne, "Kunst, Handwerk, Technik", Die Neue Rundschau 33 (1922): 1037, trans. as "Art Handicraft, Technology," by Diane Blaurock, Oppositions 22 (Fall 1980): 103-104; and for commentary in the same issue see Francesco Dal Co, "The Remoteness of 'die Moderne,'" 75-95; and Joan Campbell, German


letter from Hugh Morrison to Ken Cramer, Dartmouth archivist, from Aug. 1971. See note in manuscript file at Dartmouth College.

10. Lewis Mumford wrote that Behrendt's career in Germany ended in 1933 because "though his parents had espoused protestantism, they were Jewish in origin." *Dictionary of American Biography*, 52. Marco de Michelis also cites anti-semitic, nationalistic criticisms of Heinrich Tessenow's competition entry for the Monument to the Soldiers who died in the First World War (1930), for which Behrendt was a juror. The architect Friedrich Sproemberg, for example, in October 1932 called Tessenow's design "Berlin's Jewish Monument, dreamt up by the Jew Walter Curt Behrendt, and celebrated by the Jew Siegfried Kracauer." Michelis, *Heinrich Tessenow 1876-1950 das Architektonische Gesamtwerk* (Stuttgart, 1991), 306.

11. A survey of the major architectural periodicals in Germany for this period as well as the Weimar period is sorely needed. The magazine *Neudeutsche Bauzeitung* was directed by Behrendt, H.P. Berlage, Hans Bernoulli, Paul Mebes, Hermann Muthesius, Karl Scheffler, and Karl Schmidt, while the layout and type of the magazine were designed by Peter Behrens. Behrendt served briefly as head editor, from 1909 to 1910. After 1910 the magazine became the official organ of the newly formed Bund Deutscher Architekten (BDA), an attempt to wrest control of the architecture profession away from the conservative government and academy. On the art component of *Kunst und Künstler*, see Sigrun Paas, "'Kunst und Künstler' 1902-1933. Eine Zeitschrift in der Auseinandersetzung um den Impressionismus in Deutschland," PhD diss., University of Heidelberg, c.1975.


18. The only built work known to the author is Behrendt's own, small, wooden house he designed with his associate John Späth in the last months of his life, in 1945, in Norwich, VT., very much in accord with Behrendt's theoretical writings. See Pencil Points 26:2 (Feb. 1945): 55-59.


21. This phenomenon of cultural pessimism was not new to Germany at the time and has been tracked back to at least the seventeenth century as a peculiarly German "Cultural Despair." The subject has a vast literature, though very little of it is related to architecture or the visual arts. See the bibliographic essay by A. Mohler, Die Konservative Revolution in Deutschland, 1918-1932 (Darmstadt, 1989). The best overviews are by George L. Mosse, The Crisis of German Ideology. Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich (1964; New York, 1981); and Fritz Stern, The Politics of Cultural Despair: A Study in the Rise of a Germanic Ideology (1961: New York, 1965).


23. See above, note #3.


32. "Erst wenn auf Grund solcher sozialen Entwicklung die gesellschaftliche Ordnung wieder hergestellt sein wird, wird sich der Wille zum Stil realisieren und die angestrebte Einheit der künstlerischen Kultur zur Tatsache Werden
können." Behrendt, *Der Kampf um den Stil*, 20. Behrendt also noted: "Dabei ist unter Stil nicht historischer Stil, die Übereinstimmung formaler Einzelheiten zu verstehen, sondern die Einheit des Wollens und der Gesinnung, die allgemeine Gleichheit des Räumlichen Empfindens, die sich in der Bauweise ausspricht." Behrendt, *Die einheitliche Blockfront*, 33. See also note #78 below for Mies van der Rohe and Le Corbusier on style.


34. Behrendt, *Kampf um den Stil*, 74ff., 140-144.


36. From an essay on architectural education written while professor at Dartmouth College after 1941 in "Walter Curt Behrendt" Manuscripts, Box II. Avery Archives, Columbia University, New York.

37. Behrendt's book covered the same material, from substantially the same point of view, as Nikolaus Pevsner's more famous *Pioneers of Modern Design From William Morris to Walter Gropius* (1936; Harmondsworth, 1975).


39. Behrendt, *Kampf um den Stil*, 117-120. It is interesting to see that Behrendt maintained this same story, with its nationalistic bent, even in his last book written after his emigration to America, where he had chapters titled "The Dutch and Austrian Contribution," "The Role of America," and "Northern versus Mediterranean Spirit." *Modern Building*, 93-139.


41. *Kampf um den Stil*, passim. See also the chapter in *Modern Building* "Northern versus Mediterranean Spirit," 102-104, where he wrote, "It has already been mentioned that the new spirit of building spread first in northern Europe, with the Germanic countries well in the lead."
42. "In dieser Form ist das englische Haus als ein Muster von Komfort und Behaglichkeit, im Programm, im Aufbau und in der inneren Einrichtung dem Kontinent oder, genauer gesagt, den Ländern germanischer Rasse in der Alten und Neuen Welt zum vielbewunderten Bild geworden. Während man in den romanischen Ländern, vor allem in Frankreich, auch heute noch hartnäckig an den Formen des großstädtischen Etagenhauses festhält, wie sie bedingt sind durch das der Stadtbaufestart der Renaissance entlehnte Planschema... kommt umgekehrt das Landhaus nach englischem Muster in den germanischen Ländern mehr und mehr in Aufnahme und hat neuerdings selbst in dem Lande Eingang gefunden, das sich in seiner Wohnweise aller höheren Ansprüche schlechthin begeben zu haben schien, in Deutschland." Behrendt, Der Kampf um den Stil, 155-156.

43. Behrendt wrote that the new style "received its strongest impulse with Henry van de Velde, the Fleming, who left his native country to make Germany the land of his adoption, where he found himself on the mother-ground of his proper Germanic-Nordic spirit." Modern Building, 102-103. H.P. Berlage, Gedanken über Stil in der Baukunst (Leipzig, 1905) was a printed version of lectures given in Krefeld in January 1904. These were later revised and given as lectures in Zurich, and published as Grundlagen der Baukunst (Rotterdam, 1908). Behrendt most likely knew Berlage personally, as Berlage was one of the co-editors of the Neudeutsche Bauzeitung during Behrendt's tenure as editor from 1907-1908.

44. Behrendt, Der Kampf um den Stil, 67.

45. "daß Deutschland den Stärksten unmittelbar praktischen Anteil in der künstlerischen Bewegung hat." Behrendt, Kampf um den Stil, 7. See also pp. 68, 74, 95, 156 for similar quotes.

46. Behrendt, Alfred Messel, 62, 65; Behrendt, Kampf um den Stil, 221.


48. The vertically organized facade became standard for all department stores in Berlin. Unwilling to give up the valuable wall space taken up by the windows, store owners and architects soon reverted to the horizontal facade organization.

49. Behrendt, Alfred Messel, 64-65, 133.

50. Behrendt, Alfred Messel, 57-78.

51. Behrendt wrote that the Wertheim facade gained great influence among the young generation by its "undaunted realism," and thereby gave a fresh impetus to the new spirit of building. Modern Building, 79.


55. See Schultze-Naumburg, Hausbau, Kulturarbeiten 1, 24-25; Mebes, Um 1800, 3rd ed, 1, 3 (all subsequent references to this edition).

56. Julius Langbehn, Rembrandt als Erzieher; von einem Deutschen (Leipzig, 1890) issued a similar clarion call for a new German artistic creativity to replace the sterility and stylistic borrowing of late nineteenth-century art. See also Arthur Moeller van den Bruck, Der Preußische Stil (Munich, 1915), a nationalistic panegyric on the Prussian building style in the works of Gilly, Schinkel. For background on Völkisch thought in Germany see Mosse, Crisis of German Ideology, and Stern, Politics of Cultural Despair. Although both of these authors wrote with the explicit purpose of showing such populist thought as a pre-cursor to National Socialism, the broad range of intellectuals that ascribed to similar thoughts before World War I would seem to indicate that there was no
necessary connection. Behrendt's otherwise progressive ideas, although very German and nationalist, offer an example of how such populist ideas did not necessarily lead to National Socialism.

57. See Behrendt in Mebes, Um 1800, 9, 11-12; and also Behrendt, Kampf um den Stil 81, where he gives direct credit to Schultze-Naumburg's Kulturarbieten for having initiated this effort.

58. Behrendt, Kampf um den Stil, 80-83.


60. Behrendt, Der Kampf um den Stil, 81-83; and Muthesius, "Wo stehen Wir?" 190.

61. "Paul Schultze-Naumburg hat es verstanden, in volkstümlicher Weise, namentlich auch auf breite Kreise des konsumierenden Publikums erzieherisch einzuwirken. Seiner verfühlerischen Methode von Beispiel und Gegenbeispiel, die zwar mehr in die Breite, als in die Tiefe wirkt und meist mehr schlagend als wahrhaft gerecht ist, war der Erfolg beschieden." Behrendt, Der Kampf um den Stil. 81. Behrendt criticized the British Arts and Crafts movement in a similar way, claiming that their influence was not so much the invention of original, innovative forms that would change society so much as reaching out to a broad audience, 41. See also F. Avenarius "Beispiel und Gegenbeispiel" in Der Kunstwart 25:12 (March 1912): 410, for commentary.

62. "Das die ursprüngliche, im eingeborenen Volkstum wurzelnde Kunstüberlieferung sich nicht lebensfähig erwiesen hat, um durch eine umfassende Belebung des nationalen Kunstgefühls die neue klassizistische Welle aufzuhalten, das bezeugt doch auch einen auffallenden Mangel der Gegenwewart an starken und originellen Künstlerpersönlichkeiten." Behrendt in Mebes, Um 1800, 11. Behrendt also used the terms "Weltstil," "Weltsprache,"
"Weltbürgerlichen Neigungen," "planetarischen situation," and "Stark international gefärbte Strömung," to define the classicism of Um 1800.

63. Although the Um 1800 style recalled German traditions, both Behrendt and Schulze-Naumburg pointed out that its classicism was foreign and not Germanic. While Behrendt saw this as a fundamental flaw, Schultze-Naumburg provided a complicated argument that the classicism had been "Germanized," by the great Prussian architects Friedrich Gilly and later Schinkel. Nordic simplicity and power were combined with classical rule and proportion. In the resulting "Prussian Style" (c.f. Arthur Moeller van der Bruck's book by this same name of 1916) so admired by Schultze-Naumburg, the classicism of the ancient Greeks was appropriated, fused with indigenous forms and ideal, and converted to a Germanic ideal. Such a translation from a "Southern" to a German style was possible, according to the author, since all truly great cultural developments, evolved out of the combination of opposite principles, "as when father and mother combine to produce a child." See Schultze-Naumburg Hausbau, Kulturarbeiten 1, 35; and Behrendt in Mebes, Um 1800, 9-11.

64. "Das neue Kunstideal, das sich hier kundgibt, ist durchaus anti-klassizistisch gerichtet und sucht in seinem lebendigen Streben nach Ausdruck mit aller Kraft die klassizistische Tradition zu überwinden." Behrendt in Mebes, Um 1800, 8. Although published in 1920, Behrendt's footnote dates the writings to 1914.

65. "Der Klassizismus ist nicht, wie die Gotik, ein treibhaft bildender, sondern ein abgeleiteter Stil, der die von der Antike übernommenen Einzelformen in dekorativem Sinne also Kompositionsmitte verwertet." Behrendt in Mebes, Um 1800, 10.

66. Avery Archives, Box II.

67. See note #3 as well as below.

68. Campbell, German Werkbund, 71-77, on nationalism at Cologne. The Battle of Sedan of 1870 in northern France was perhaps the most decisive German victory in the Franco-Prussian war that had deposed Napoleon III and allowed for the creation of the German Empire a year later. Instead of a superior German craft and architectural production, the victory at Sedan was often attributed to (wrongly so) another innovation of German industry, the Krupp steel, breech-loading rifle. The literature on the Werkbund is extensive, though not all sources highlight its nationalistic aspects. Campbell is still the best source in English, but see also Sebastian Müller, Kunst und Industrie: Ideologie und Organisation des Functionalismus in der Architektur (Munich, 1974), who has a chapter entitled "Der Deutsche Stil," 77-84. For source material see Fischer, ed., Zwischen Kunst und Industrie. For Behrendt's comments see Der Kampf um den Stil, 7, 74, 88-99, 156, and passim.


72. Behrendt, Modern Building, 103. These words echo almost exactly those of Julius Langbehn in his Rembrant als Erzieher. For Langbehn that the Germans were "the most artistic of all peoples." In his book he called on all Germans to act on this latent artistic genius and to unite to lift German culture to its proper international significance. With an optimism that would infect German culture for the next few decades, he prophesied that Germany was awaiting a renaissance of the arts and with it a return to cultural potency. See Stern Politics of Cultural Despair; but also Müller, Kunst und Industrie, 80.


75. "Deutschland, dem Stamm- und Heimatland des neuen Kunstgeistes." Behrendt, "Der Nordische Geist," 242; and "Die Baukunst nach dem Kriege,"


78. "Messels Wertheimhaus, Poelzigs Fabrikbauten, Tessenows Wohnhäuser, das sind beispiele, in denen das Wesen der neuen deutschen Stilform angedeutet ist, in denen das Kunstwollen einer neuen Zeit bereits greifbare Form gewonen hat." Behrendt, "Die Baukunst Nach dem Kriege," 226. It is interesting to note the similarity to Mies van der Rohe words of 1923, "Architecture is the will of an epoch translated into space," (Baukunst ist Raumgefaßter Zeitwille) in "Bürohaus," G 3 (June 1923). Le Corbusier wrote similarly: "Style is the unity of principle animating all the work of an epoch, the result of a state of mind which has its own special character," Towards a New Architecture, trans. Frederick Etchells, (1927; New York, 1983), 82.


81. Letter from Thomas Mann to Richard Dehmel as cited in Whyte, Bruno Taut, 43. See also 43-51, and Michelis, Heinrich Tessenow, 68-93, for an excellent brief introduction to the reform efforts during this period.
82. Letter from Karl Ernst Osthaus to Walter Gropius, cited in Whyte, Bruno Taut, 43.


86. Frederick's name was constantly evoked in the reconstruction efforts in the east as well as in the rest of Germany after the war. In Behrendt, see "Baukunst nach dem Kriege," 220; Neue Aufgaben, 21. See also for example, Theodor Heuß, "Vorfragen ländlicher Siedlungen," Die Volkswohnung 1:18 (Sept. 24, 1919): 225. See Michelis, Heinrich Tessenow, 85, for commentary.


90. "In dieser klaren, einfach gegliederten Organisation sind in der Tat die glücklichsten Vorbedingungen für das Gelingen des großen Kulturwerkes gegeben." Behrendt, "Der Wiederaufbau Ostpreussens," 381.
91. "In solchen praktischen Siedlungswerk, in dem ein opferfreudiger, vaterländischer Gemeinsinn zu wirken und zu helfen bereit ist." Behrendt, "Der Wiederaufbau Ostpreußens," 388.


94. Behrendt in Mebes, Um 1800, 10-11.

95. Mebes, Um 1800, xiv.


97. Frank, "Heimatschutz und Typologisches Entwerfen."


100. Behrendt referred to the peace as a "Gewaltfrieden," echoing the conservative and nationalist views that saw the Versailles treaty as a stab in the back by the revolutionary Socialists at home. Behrendt, "Die Wohnungsfrage in Deutschland," Deutsche Politik 5:2 (1920): 87.


102. Die Volkswohnung Zeitschrift für Wohnungsbaun und Siedlungswesen, published by Ernst & Sohn in Berlin. It began publication in January 1919, and continued until December 1923, when it switched names and became Der...
Neubau. Behrendt was main editor of both, quitting in 1925, when he took over the publication of the Werkbund magazine Die Form. The editorial board included Otto Bartning, Hans Bernoulli, Jürgen Glas, Gerhard Jobst, Paul Mebes, and Paul Schmitthenner, many of the same architects who had edited the Neudeutsche Bauzeitung before the war, see note #11. On Die Volkswohnung, see Lindahl, "Von der Zukunftskathedrale bis zur Wohnmachine," 246, 280; Whyte, Bruno Taut, 108-109; and Michelis, Heinrich Tessenow, 111.


104. Behrendt, Neue Aufgaben, 5. The essay was published by the Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt as the sixth issue of "Der Aufbau," a publication series edited by Conrad Haußmann. Haußmann, a liberal politician, had been the last Secretary of State for the German Empire under Prince Max von Baden, in October of 1918, just before the revolution ended all government in Germany. He later became a founding member of the left-liberal DDP party, and chairman of the Reichstag committee designated to draw up the Weimar constitution, responsible perhaps for some of the liberal housing legislation that was enacted. See Deutsche Biographie vol. 8, s.v Haußmann, Conrad.


106. "In diesen Tagen der Not und des Dranges ist die Beschäftigung mit den Fragen des Aufbaues unseres Geistes- und Wirtschaftslebens eine Art von innerer Selbsthilfe. . . was nun zunächst in den Arbeitsgebieten für den Aufbau der Nation getan werden muß, werden wir nicht nur der sache selbst dienen, sondern auch in das erdrückende Dunkel der Gegenwart einen neuen Strahl von Hoffnungen hineinleiten. Wir werden den glauben in uns wieder aufrichten. . .
Behrendt, Neue Aufgaben, 5. See also his "Die Wohnungsfrage in Deutschland," passim.


109. See Behrendt, "Der Sinn der Siedlungsbewegung," Die Volkswohnung 3:1 (Jan. 10, 1921): 1, where he uses the words "Wiederaufbau" and "Erneuerung."; Behrendt, Neue Aufgaben, 15; Behrendt, Kampf um den Stil, 249, 262-264.

Behrendt had been advocating decentralization since his very first articles in 1907, see "Wohnungskultur," 266; and "Die Zukunft des Mietshauses," Dekorative Kunst 13:6 (March 1910): 249.


111. Peter Behrens and Heinrich de Fries, introduction by Bernhard Dernburg, Vom sparsamen Bauen, ein Beitrag zur Siedlungsfrage (Berlin, 1918), contains many of the same ideas later advocated by Behrendt. "Inner colonization" in this case fell under the responsibilities of the Colonial Minister Dernburg, long known for his zealous economic nationalism in the expansion of the German Empire during the first fifteen years of the century. The book was dedicated to Georg Count of Hertling, the Reichschancellor from 1917-1918. For commentary on this book and the whole Siedlungsbewegung it started see Lindahl, "Von der Zukunftskathedrale bis zur Wohnmaschine," 267-270.


114. "Ist [das] ideal der Volkswohnung einmal verwirklicht, dann wird, wenn nicht jeder Einzelne, so doch die überwiegende Mehrheit... aufs neue fest an die


117. See Behrendt, "Die Verordnung zur Behebung der dringensten Wohnungsnott," Die Volkswohnung 1:3 (Feb. 10, 1919): 44; and "Die Wohnungsfrage in Deutschland," 90.

118. See Behrendt, "Die Wohnungsfrage in Deutschland," 92; and Pommer and Otto, Weissenhof 1927, 18.

119. See chapter entitled "Wege zur Lösung," in Behrendt, Neue Aufgaben, 17. See also Behrens and de Fries, Vom Sparsamen Bauen, which argues that national economy practically dictated inexpensive buildings.

120. "Neues Bauen" is often used as a comprehensive label to represent all avant-garde architecture in Weimar, especially expressionism and after 1925 the New Objectivity, or Neue Sachlichkeit. See for example Huse, "Neues Bauen". The term was also the name of an article on wood construction by Walter Gropius in Der Holzbau (1920): 5, cited in Huse, "Neues Bauen", 131, n.25. "Neues Bauen" was also the name of an exhibition by Bruno Taut's Arbeitsrat für Kunst that opened in May 1920; see Whyte, Bruno Taut, 203. Before either of these two, however, "Neues Bauen" was the title of Erwin Gutkind's book Neues Bauen, Grundlagen zur Praktischen Siedlungstätigkeit (Berlin 1919), dedicated to all of the same issues as Behrendt's Die Volkswohnung. Behrendt wrote an article in this compendium called "Kunst und Technik" which urged the unification of art and technology, 237-240. See also note #29 above where Behrendt defined the Neuen Stil as "functionalism, logical and thorough construction, and an honest, workman-like use of materials."

121. See Behrendt, "Hochbau oder Flachbau?" Die Volkswohnung 4:10 (May 24, 1922): 149-150. Following Behrendt's article is a chart comparing costs for low and high rise construction in each of Germany's various states, showing that low-rise construction was cheaper.
122. See Behrens and de Fries, Vom Sparsamen Bauen.


130. Behrendt thus precedes Lewis Mumford's very similar berating of American architecture in Sticks and Stones (New York, 1924), parts of which Behrendt had translated and published in Kunst und Künstler 23:6 (March 1925): 240-244.


133. See the chapter on "Rationalization" and "Standardization" in Pommer and Otto, Weissenhof 1927, 61-70, which outlines the precursors to the extensive
standardization at Weissenhof.


136. Behrendt, Neue Aufgaben, 22.


138. See Behrendt, "Ersatzbauweisen," Die Volkswohnung 1:7 (Apr. 10, 1919): 94-5; and Neue Aufgaben, 18-19. Bricks and concrete reinforcing steel were in short supply after the war because of the occupation of resource rich territories by France and Russia.

139. Gropius, "Neues Bauen."


Campbell, *German Werkbund*, 141-146.


148. See Martin Wagner, "Alte oder neue Bauwirtschaft" (Berlin, 1924); and Frederick Witte, "Die rationelle Haushaltführung" (Berlin 1921).

149. Behrendt, "Industrialisierung des Wohnungswesens," 42. In an attempt to dismiss the established historical models about the development of a modern style in Germany as first laid out by Behrendt, Pevsner and Posener, Rainer Tolzmann has written that the modern style was a result of post World War I American cultural imperialism through the ideas of Taylor and Ford. Citing the Dawes plan and other American contributions to the rebuilding of Germany, he maintains that Weimar modernism was not German, but American. Rainer Hanns Tolzmann, "Objective Architecture: American Influence in the Development of Modern German Architecture," Phd. diss, University of Michigan (Ann Arbor, 1975).


153. See note #120 above.


155. "so ist darauf zu dringen, daß diese Beteiligung als eine *Aufgabe deutscher Kulturpropaganda* im Ausland erkannt und demgemäß auch von den zuständigen Reics- und Staatsbehörden behandelt wird." [original italics] Behrendt,

156. See Behrendt, Städtebau und Wohnungswesen in den Vereinigten Staaten, Bericht über eine Studienreise (Berlin, 1927), 85 and passim. The book was the result of Behrendt's April 1925 trip to New York, where he befriended Lewis Mumford. See also Fig.10. See also the official conference proceedings by the International Federation for Town and Country Planning and Garden Cities, International Town Planning Conference, New York 1925. Report (London, 1925).


159. See "Vom neuen Stil," (1908); Der Kampf um den Stil (1912-1920); Neue Aufgaben der Baukunst (1919); and Der Sieg des neuen Baustils (1927), all by Behrendt.


166. The quotes in this paragraph from Behrendt, *Modern Building*, 144, 146.

167. Behrendt in his *Der Sieg des neuen Baustils* has a chapter entitled "Die Gegner," in which he describes three different groups opposed to his quest for a new, modern style of architecture, which had by that time spread to the rest of the world.

Biographical summary of Walter Curt Behrendt 1884-1945

1884 12.16. Born in Metz, Lorraine, as only son, and eldest of two children to Alfred and Henriette (Ohm) Behrendt, both of Western German origin. Family lived successively in Metz, Mainz, Wiesbaden and Brunswick before Alfred assumed his final post, as director of the Reichsbank, in Hannover.

Gymnasium in Mainz and Wiesbaden.

1903-07 Studies at the Tech. Univ. (T.H.) in Charlottenburg and Munich.

1907-11 Doctor of Engineering at the T.H. in Dresden.


1908-1933 Writes for Karl Scheffler's progressive art magazine Kunst und Künstler, serving as architectural editor after the war.

1911 Publishes his dissertation Die Einheitliche Blockfront als Raumelement im Stadtbau (Bruno Cassirer).

Publishes biography Alfred Messel (Bruno Cassirer).

1912-16 Works as architect for Prussian Ministry of Public Buildings, Berlin.

1912 Joins Deutscher Werkbund.

Commissioned by Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt to write book on the present state of architecture and the applied arts in Germany. Substantially complete before the war, it is published in 1920.

1913 4.15. Marries Lydia Hoffmann, concert pianist.

1914 Commissioned by Paul Mebes to edit second edition of Um 1800, not published until after war.

Editor of Architektonische Rundschau vol. 31 (1914), the last year before the magazine is renamed Wasmuths Monatshefte für Baukunst.

1914-15 After war is declared on Aug. 1, he publishes numerous articles on the reconstruction of Eastern Prussia.

1916-18 Serves on the Western Front.

1918 Publishes second edition of Paul Mebes' Um 1800 (begun 1914).


1919-24 Founder and editor of Die Volkswohnung, a magazine to lead the housing reconstruction efforts after the war.

1919 Publishes Neue Aufgaben der Baukunst (DVA) manifesto for reconstruction and decentralization of German cities. Also appears as "Der Aufbau" no. 6, ed. by Conrad Haußmann.

Signs Taut's "Aufruf zum Farbigen Bauen," appears in Bauwelt.
1920  Publishes Der Kampf um den Stil im Kunstgewerbe und in der Architektur (DVA, begun 1912).
Publishes 3rd edition of Paul Mebes' Um 1800.

1922  Begins as editor of Frankfurter Zeitung, architecture department.


1924  1.10. Transforms Volkswohnung into Der Neubau, and expands subject matter to include all efforts towards a new, more modern architecture to coincide with economic recovery in Germany.
5.10. Reports of formation of "Der Ring," a group of progressive young architects protesting conservative building minister Ludwig Hoffmann. Behrendt becomes member by 1926.
Elected to administration of Deutscher Werkbund, representing a younger, less conservative group.

1925-26  Elected editor of Die Form, official magazine of the Werkbund.

1925  3.30. selected along with Mies van der Rohe and Poelzig to be artistic advisor of Weissenhofsfiedlung in Stuttgart.
Tours several cities in USA, befriends Lewis Mumford and Charles Whitaker.

1926  10.4. Personally asked by Mies van der Rohe to invite Le Corbusier to build at Weissenhof while Behrendt was in Paris.

1927-33  Technical Adviser to Minister of Finance, Department of Public Building.

1927  Publishes Der Sieg des Neuen Baustils in tandem with the Stuttgart Weissenhof Exhibit (Fr. Wedekind).
Publishes Städtebau und Wohnungswesen in den Vereinigten Staaten, the results of his 1925 trip (Guido Hackbeil).

1928  Publishes Die Holländische Stadt (Bruno Cassirer).


1934  Emigrates to USA at the invitation of Mumford and Whitaker, who secure him a lectureship at Dartmouth College in Dept. of City Planning and Housing.

1937  Publishes Modern Building, from his lecture notes at Dartmouth.

1937-41  Professor of City Planning and Housing, University of Buffalo. Technical director, Buffalo City Planning Association; Founder and Director, Planning Research Station, Buffalo.

1941  5.1. Becomes American Citizen.

1941-45  Lectureship (with rank of Professor) at Dartmouth.

1945  Builds and publishes designs for his own small, wooden house in Norwich, Vt., with John Spaeth.

4.26. Dies in Hanover, NH.
No bibliography for any portion of Behrendt's work has been published to date. Citations for the following bibliography came from Bibliographie der Deutschen Zeitschriftenliteratur mit Einschluß von Sammelwerken (Osnabrück); and Bibliographie der Rezensionen (Leipzig); but also from S. Waetzoldt, ed. Bibliographie zur Architektur im 19. Jahrhundert (Nendeln, 1977). This list can make no claims for completeness as many publications are neither indexed nor available in this country. Others were too difficult to access, as for example Behrendt's many contributions while serving as editor of the various magazines and newspapers, especially the Frankfurter Zeitung, probably between 1920 and 1925. I have arranged this bibliography chronologically by year in order to more easily trace and organize changes in Behrendt's thinking and writing, but alphabetically within each year as most of the articles are without specific dates.

Unable to locate in this country

1907


"Neue Architekturen," Werkkunst (Berlin) 2 (1907): 245. •


"Der Pariser Platz in Berlin," Deutsche Bauhütte 11 (1907): 118-120.


1908


"Backstein als Baumaterial," Dekorative Kunst (Munich) vol.21, 11:9 (June 1908): 405-413. Also as Die Kunst. Angewandte Kunst vol.22.


"Wismar," Die Hilfe No.3 (1908).

"Zur Stilgeschichte der Gegenwart," Deutsche Bauhütte 12:10-11 (March 5-12, 1908): 81, 97.

1909


"Vom Kleinen Landhaus und vom Sommerhaus," Daheim (Leipzig) 45:24 (1909). •

1910


"Messels Museumspläne," Der Tag (Berlin) April 9, 1910. •


1911


"Einfamilienhäuser für die Großstadt," Die Hilfe No.46 (1911).

Reviews: Der Architekt (Vienna) in Karl Scheffler, Architektur der Großstadt (Berlin 1913); Der Baumeister 10:8 suppl. (May 1912): B159-162, by A.E. Brinckmann; Hamburger Fremdenblatt (Nov. 3, 1912), by E. Kalkschmidt; Kunst und Künstler 10:6 (March 1912): 326; Technisches Gemeindeblatt (Berlin) 15 (1911): 148, by Reich.


"Ludwig Hoffmanns Bebauungspläne für die Stadt Athen," Vossische Zeitung (Berlin) 352, July 19, 1911.


"Ein Stadterweiterungsprojekt (Schöneberg)," Magdeburgische Zeitung March 23, 1911.

"Zu den Arbeiten des Architekten Paul Baumgarten, Berlin," Moderne Bauformen 10:12
(1911): 589-600.

1912

"(Charlottenburg)" Magdeburgische Zeitung Nov. 9, 1912. •

"Erweiterungsbau des Wertheim Haus," Magdeburgische Zeitung May 30, 1912. •


"Der Neubau des Joachimthalschen Gymnasiums in Templin (Mark)," Vossische Zeitung July 25, 1912. •
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