

1991

Review of *Hitlers sozialer Wohnungsbau 1940-1945: Wohnungspolitik, Baugestaltung und Siedlungsplanung*, edited by Tilman Harlander and Gerhard Fehl; *Deutsche Architekten: Biographische Verflechtungen 1900-1970*, by Werner Durth; *Faschistische Architekturen: Planen und Bauen in Europa 1930-1945*, edited by Hartmut Frank

Barbara Miller Lane
Bryn Mawr College, blane@brynmawr.edu

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you.](#)

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.brynmawr.edu/cities_pubs

 Part of the [Architecture Commons](#), [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Custom Citation

Barbara Miller Lane, Review of *Hitlers sozialer Wohnungsbau 1940-1945: Wohnungspolitik, Baugestaltung und Siedlungsplanung*, edited by Tilman Harlander and Gerhard Fehl; *Deutsche Architekten: Biographische Verflechtungen 1900-1970*, by Werner Durth; *Faschistische Architekturen: Planen und Bauen in Europa 1930-1945*, edited by Hartmut Frank. *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 50 (1991): 430-434.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. http://repository.brynmawr.edu/cities_pubs/25

For more information, please contact repository@brynmawr.edu.

and one wonders why an exterior setting was desired for such a group and whether amphitheaters were unusual features for settecento villa gardens. Other questions rise in connection with an anonymous Trevi project from the pontificate of Clement XI that includes the newly unearthed Antonine column. Could it not be that the enthusiasm for showcasing the "new" antiquity in the context of the fountain led to the abandonment of the wall fountain proposal during the Albani reign, and that the problems attendant upon raising the column ultimately resulted in the temporary suspension of the Trevi project?

In addition to the myriad virtues of Kieven's presentation and analysis, a number of issues should be raised. The use of the stylistic designation "Barocchetto" to describe a vaguely Borrominesque tendency in some early eighteenth-century architects perpetuates the notion that the early settecento is a diminutive, precious, and watered-down extension of the baroque. The poverty of the term to describe the creative richness of the arts of the period should lead to its exclusion from scholarly discourse. Similarly, Kieven glosses the fact that Fuga's façade for S. Maria Maggiore showed "cura sorprendente" because it blocked only a section of the façade mosaic from view, explain-

ing her surprise with the condescending "dati i tempi." In fact, Clement XI had commanded Carlo Fontana in 1701 not to obscure from view any part of the façade mosaic of S. Maria in Trastevere in the construction of a new portico. I believe that Benedict XIV's restoration of S. Maria Maggiore was a step backward from the more preservation-conscious early decades of the century. Also, I cannot help but fault the egregious error on page 62 ("Jones" is substituted for "Johns"!). Unhappily, it is the only typographical error I found in the entire catalogue!

The presence of a very few faults in Elisabeth Kieven's *Fuga* only serves to underscore its many sterling qualities, not the least among them the judicious choice of drawings, the lucid and informative discussion of the works, and the inclusion of much new and stimulating material. As an ambitious and synthetic presentation of the intricacies of early eighteenth-century Roman architecture, *Ferdinando Fuga e l'architettura romana del settecento* should occupy a place of honor on the bookshelves of all scholars of Italian settecento art and architecture.

CHRISTOPHER M. S. JOHNS
University of Virginia

THE ARCHITECTURE OF NAZI GERMANY

TILMAN HARLANDER and **GERHARD FEHL**, editors, *Hitlers sozialer Wohnungsbau 1940–1945: Wohnungspolitik, Baugestaltung und Siedlungsplanung* (Stadt, Planung, Geschichte, 6), Hamburg: Hans Christians Verlag, 1986, 446 pp., illus. DM 48.

WERNER DURTH, *Deutsche Architekten: Biographische Verflechtungen 1900–1970*, Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1986, 448 pp., 120 illus. DM 86.

HARTMUT FRANK, editor, *Faschistische Architekturen: Plänen und Bauen in Europa 1930–1945* (Stadt, Planung, Geschichte, 3), Hamburg: Hans Christians Verlag, 1985, 334 pp., illus. DM 39.50.

Much has changed since 1943, when Nikolaus Pevsner wrote that "of the German buildings for the National Socialist Party . . . , the less said the better" (*An Outline of European Architecture*, 7th ed., Baltimore, 1963, 411). The 1950s and 1960s witnessed a number of studies—mostly American and British—that attempted to define the architecture of National Socialism in its own terms, as expressive of Nazi ideology. In the 1970s, a younger generation of German architectural historians began to study the architecture and planning of the Nazi regime in the context of German society and politics during the Third Reich. Most of these latter works focused on the Hitler period as separate, almost unique in the history of architecture. Most, in other words, accepted at face value the claims of Hitler and

other Nazi leaders that the Third Reich, after driving the leaders of the Modern Movement into exile, had completely rejected the teachings of Modernism in an effort to create a new "National Socialist" architecture. Such works often gave most prominence to the neoclassical public buildings commissioned by Hitler and executed, for the most part, by Albert Speer. These treatments permitted, even encouraged, the notion that, with the suicide of Hitler and the crushing defeat of his regime, Nazi architecture (and Nazism itself) was over and done with, and architecture, like society and politics, could start over again in West Germany, "from zero."

The Third Reich, which according to Hitler and his propagandists was to be a "thousand-year Reich," lasted from 1933 to 1945. Twelve years, if we think about it in a detached and logical way, is far too short a time to stamp out one kind of architecture, to create a wholly new one, and to eradicate that new one in turn. Thus it is not surprising that the youngest generation of German historians have recently begun to look at the continuities, rather than the disjunctions, in the history of modern German architecture. In fact, we may wonder why this approach to the history of architecture has taken so long to arise in Germany. But of course the writing of history is not always rooted in logic, and for contemporary Germans, even for those born since 1945, the idea that something of Modernism lasted into the 1930s, or that something of Nazi architecture lasted into the 1950s, has been a painful one, since it seems to imply that National Socialism itself was an integral part of modern German history. The books by Durth, Frank, and Har-

lander and Fehl, each of which rejects the idea of discontinuity in the history of modern German architecture, and others like them, have therefore occasioned bitter controversy in Germany. And each of these books is strongly marked by a foreknowledge of the elements of the controversy.

Tilman Harlander and Gerhard Fehl's *Hitlers sozialer Wohnungsbau 1940–1945* (Hitler's Public Housing, 1940–1945) is scarcely about Hitler at all but, rather, about the housing policy conducted by the Deutsche Arbeitsfront, or Labor Front, under the leadership of Robert Ley. This focus reminds us of the truth about Nazi government first stated in 1942 in Franz Neumann's *Behemoth*: that the state was chaotic at the top, with many Nazi leaders vying for patronage and power. Ley's Labor Front was one of the most powerful of these subempires within the Third Empire, and hence one of the most important patrons of architecture and planning. According to Harlander and Fehl, the Nazi regime did not reverse the housing policies carried on by the Modernists under the Weimar Republic; already from the beginning of the depression, the Republican government under Chancellor Brüning had turned away from the "new dwelling" as it was carried out at Weissenhof, Siemensstadt, Haselhorst, Törten, and elsewhere and had begun to support settlements of small detached cottages, very rustic-looking and often provided with truck gardens to permit some sort of subsistence to the unemployed. After 1933, the Labor Front took over this type of housing for a while and touted it as "heimatlich," close to native values, as exemplifying the strain in Nazi ideology that glorified "blood and soil." But, also according to Harlander and Fehl, this housing policy was soon discarded in favor of large apartment blocks with subsidized rents, built with modern materials and technology, but laid out with generous spaces for large families and executed with many references to regional traditions and rustic siting. The design of these "Volkswohnungen" (analogous to the "Volkswagen") drew upon the teachings of the Modernists of the twenties and employed their technology; but it rejected the Modernists' concern with the "minimal dwelling," since this seemed to contradict the Nazi population policies that favored large families. And it was this new housing policy, developed by the Labor Front for loyal party servants and for the troops who would return after the war, that served as the basis for the further development of German public housing in the 1950s.

These are important insights into the continuities in German housing policy, and they have important implications for our views of architectural patronage under the Nazi regime and its relationship to politics and ideology. Certainly they remind us that Nazi architecture was not just a matter of a few monumental buildings commissioned by Hitler and designed by Albert Speer. The editors' contention that "Hitler's 'Public Housing' [was] a connecting link in the uninterrupted line of mass-housing running through from the 'golden' Twenties to the 'grey' Fifties" deserves the respectful attention of students of modern housing (p. 6). But much more work will need to be done on these issues before we know the whole story: Harlander and Fehl's book is not a comprehensive study of Nazi housing but, rather, a series of documents reprinted from *Der soziale Wohnungsbau in Deutschland*, the official journal of Robert Ley as Commissioner for Public Housing. The documents are preceded by about one hundred pages of introduction along the lines of the argument sketched above, and then the documents themselves

illustrate the development of housing policy from 1940 to 1945. The volume is the sixth in the series called *Stadt, Planung, Geschichte* published by the Lehrstühle für Planungstheorie at the Technische Hochschule in Aachen. Most of these volumes are documentary collections, and they are intended to stimulate further scholarship rather than to provide a definitive history. They perform this task very well, but as with any such publication, the issue of selection arises: what documents were not included, and how was the focus chosen? These questions would be clarified in a systematic study of Nazi housing.

Werner Durth's *Deutsche Architekten: Biographische Verflechtungen* (German Architects: Biographical Interconnections) traces the career paths of a group of architects born in Germany between 1900 and 1910, "too young to serve in the first World War, young enough to make a new beginning after the second" (p. 18). These men—the principal protagonists are Rudolf Wolters, Friedrich Tamms, Konstanty Gutschow, and Rudolf Hillebrecht, although others such as Julius Schulte-Frohlinde, Herbert Rimpl, Ernst Neufert, Hans Stephan, Friedrich Hetzelt, and Wilhelm Wortmann make frequent appearances—were the students of relatively conservative teachers (Schumacher, Tesenow, and Bonatz in most cases; Fischer and Poelzig in a few), began their careers in the thirties, most as members of the staff of Albert Speer, and prepared under Speer's direction, in the last years of the war, plans for the reconstruction of German cities, which they then helped to carry out in the 1950s. Tamms, for example, took over the replanning of Düsseldorf in 1948 and set forth a reconstruction plan, based on those developed under Speer, that was enormously successful and widely acclaimed. Gutschow played a similar role in Hamburg, Hillebrecht in Hannover, Wortman in Bremen. All of Durth's protagonists were sponsors of Modernism after 1945, just as they had to some degree been its protectors during the Third Reich. They had learned nationalism from their original teachers and a fondness for technology through working for Speer. Theirs was the Modernism of the Deutsche Werkbund, transformed by the experiences of the Third Reich, and reenunciated in the 1950s. In the fifties, this group were the authors of Germany's first postwar steel, concrete, and glass curtain-wall buildings, as well as of the reconstruction plans already mentioned. They became, in the sixties, the teachers of a younger generation, which now "took over their inheritance, without knowing the history of that inheritance" (p. 382).

Durth's is a large and subtle book, based on immense familiarity with memoirs and personal recollections of the period of the thirties and forties, on wide reading of architectural publications from the thirties through the sixties, and on a full knowledge of current research and theory about the nature of politics in the Third Reich. Durth is most persuasive as he explains how Speer's staff thought of themselves as a technocratic elite within the Nazi state, and how this self-image enabled them to ignore the horrors of the Holocaust even as they helped Speer to organize slave labor, first for the construction of Hitler's buildings and then for the conduct of the war. (They remained on Speer's staff when he became Minister of Armaments and War Production in 1942.) Durth's emphasis on group biography, on treating his protagonists as a generational cohort with many personal interconnections, often makes for difficult reading, since no one life is followed through from start to finish, and the organization is chronological rather than the-

matic. But, taken on its own terms, the argument is striking and persuasive. Durth has gotten to the heart of the personal experiences of a group of important architects whose lives have been hard to understand. And he performs his task with an objectivity that was not easy to achieve: he writes with eloquence of the extreme discomfort of doing research on the Third Reich, because one reexperiences "the ordinariness of things." He speaks of the need to avoid judging or extolling, and of the danger of "Bagatellisierung der Banalität des Bösen" ("trivializing the banality of evil," Hanna Arendt's famous characterization of life in the Third Reich, p. 16). All researchers on Nazi history have felt the agony of the effort to be objective; it is good to see these problems restated by an architectural historian. Durth stops short of drawing any morals from his story, but they are easy to draw. His evidence sheds further light on the political naiveté of German architects in the thirties, on their egocentrism, on their technocratic arrogance, and suggests that we may find these qualities among architects in other times and places. Hence, although Durth makes every effort at objectivity, his is a highly moral story.

Yet despite the great virtues of Durth's book, it is a fragmentary account of Nazi architecture, or even of Nazi architects. The architects who served the Third Reich in other capacities than as members of Speer's staff (Kreis and Giesler, to mention only two) make only peripheral appearances. The men of the same generation who were not seduced by Nazi commissions are also absent. The members of the old guard of conservative architects who wanted to serve the Third Reich but were not welcome (Schmitthenner, Schultze-Naumburg, and to a lesser extent Bestelmeyer) are not treated in any detail. Although he headed the staff and developed the policies that are the main focus of the book, Speer himself is almost absent. Durth is right to say that too much of the architectural history of the period has focused on Speer, but surely we need to know more about him here. Buildings are also almost entirely absent in this account, in contrast to planning. Again, Durth says, too much attention has been paid to the definition of a style of Nazi architecture, and to avoid this it is necessary to talk about institutions and personal experiences. Thus Durth's book is a history of the experiences and planning activities of a small group of Speer protégés, without much consideration of the larger context, and without much consideration of why they received the tasks they received. Many of the group knew Speer through Tessenow and gravitated to his service as a result of personal connection. But why did he choose them? Why not others? Were they any good, as architects? Was Speer? Or were they all drawn together through common youth and lack of experience? These questions are not addressed, even though sociological and political studies on the Third Reich have shown that the new regime tended to draw into its service precisely untried youths without well-formed personal or political allegiances.

Harmut Frank's *Faschistische Architekturen* (Fascist Architectures, no. 3 in the Stadt, Planung, Geschichte series) is also about continuities, although it has other agendas as well. While Harlander and Fehl, and Durth, avoid discussion of form and style, Frank's volume energetically concentrates on just these issues. The main theme of the book, as stated by its editor, is that "National Socialism had no time to create its own style. . . . [It] could only make a purposeful selection from preexisting

tendencies in architecture. . . . Its few buildings certainly do not stand outside the continuum of the architectural development of this century" (p. 10). Frank hopes, by investigating this point, to redeem German architecture for architects and for Germany. "Today's anti-fascism," he says, has "turned against the further use of all architecture that had any contact with National Socialism" (p. 9). If it is possible to detach architecture from politics, Frank suggests, it will be possible for younger German architects to reclaim their rightful heritage. The book attempts to achieve this goal by comparing Nazi architecture to that of other "fascist" regimes, by stressing the existence of Modernism under each regime, and by emphasizing the multiplicity of styles that continued under fascism.

Frank's volume is a compilation of essays on architecture in Germany, Italy, Spain, and Vichy France. (Nine of the seventeen essays deal with Germany.) The essays are based on papers given at a conference at the Hochschule für bildende Künste in Hamburg in 1983, which added greatly to existing controversy in Germany. The selection of some contributions and, in some cases, the titles themselves appear to be intended to accentuate the controversial nature of the work. So does the advertising for the volume, which stresses shocking juxtapositions: "the spectrum of examples reaches from Le Corbusier's 'Maison des hommes' to the SS-Comradeship Housing Development in Berlin Zehlendorf" (description from the back cover of Harlander and Fehl). Many of these papers seem to have been little revised for publication, so that they are almost entirely lacking in documentation, or in reference to the principal secondary literature. It is said that an English edition is planned; if so, I would hope that the controversial tone might abate somewhat (since what is controversial in Germany is not so controversial in the United States), and that the essays would be fully documented from both primary and secondary sources.

A few of the essays are "think pieces," intended to set forth the themes of the book. These include Harmut Frank's "What Language Do Stones Speak?" Marco De Michelis's "Fascist Architectures" (which gives the book its title), Ludovica Scarpa's "The Subjective Factor: Architecture and Politics in the Thirties," and Chup Freimert's "On the Functionalism of the Aesthetic: Liberation or Anesthesia." Most of the essays, however, deal with specific cases of architectural history in the thirties. Among the most interesting are Winfried Nerdinger, "Temptation and Dilemma of the Avant Garde in the Mirror of Architectural Competitions from 1933-35"; Gerhard Fehl, "Modernism under the Swastika: An Attempt to Clarify the Role of Functionalist Architecture in the Third Reich"; Maria-Ida Talamanca, "Italian Agrarian Housing in Libya"; Carlos Sambricio, "The Fascist Alternative: Spanish Architecture 1936-1945"; Jean-Louis Cohen, "Vichy: French Building-Culture between Authoritarianism and Technocracy"; Jean-Claude Vigato, "Compromise Architecture: Between Heimatstil, Classicism, and Modernism"; and Wolfgang Voigt, "The Stuttgart School and Everyday Architecture in the Third Reich." The other entries are very brief and narrow in focus or, like Giorgio Ciucci's "Pagano and Terragni," retrace extremely well worn ground.

Nearly all the essays discuss the persistence of some form of Modernism into the 1930s. And nearly all stress the diversity of styles that received official encouragement from fascist regimes. Nerdinger, in a provocative discussion of Mies's entry in the Reichsbank competition of 1935, reminds us that many

of the German Modernists would have liked to have had the patronage of the Nazi regime, or thought they would for a little while. Fehl discusses the streamlined and functional buildings that Herbert Rimpl, Emil Fahrenkamp, Hermann Brenner, and Werner Deutschmann erected for industry and for the armed forces during the Third Reich. He also notes the "programmatic eclecticism" favored by the Nazi government and points to the influence of Modernism—in terms of the absence of historical references—even on the most officially ideological buildings. The implication of these essays, which is made explicit by Frank, De Michaelis, and Scarpa, is that there was no "fascist style." Instead, a number of styles—including a functional Modernism, a nativist regionalism, and a streamlined monumental neoclassicism—persisted and received official favor under fascist regimes. These observations permit Frank to argue that architectural style has no political meaning, that stones speak no language, and that architecture, in contrast to architects, is therefore relatively autonomous from politics. The same argument is made by De Michaelis and Scarpa.

That a variety of architectural styles, including some that grew out of the International Style, persisted and won official favor under Nazi and fascist regimes, will not surprise anyone who has followed the scholarship on this period over the past twenty years. I made the case for Germany in 1968, and since that time many American scholars have investigated these issues for Italy: Diane Ghirardo, Dennis Doordan, Spiro Kostof, Thomas Schumacher, and Henry A. Millon, to mention only a few. That there were commonalities in style among the various countries in this period is also no surprise: Hellmut Lehmann-Haupt and Bruno Zevi talked about these commonalities in the fifties, as I did in the sixties and thereafter; the most recent treatment is Franco Borsi, *The Monumental Order* (New York, 1987). It is perhaps a bit disconcerting to see these points made as if they are new. But these views are relatively new in German scholarship, they are important, and they are well worth continued discussion. We might, in fact, extend these generalizations about fascist architecture in the 1930s and 1940s by looking at England and the United States, where a form of Modernism flourished independent of the leaders of the International Style, where regional traditions were strongly renewed in a time of

depression and war, and where government buildings tended to be monumental, axial, somber, and dignified, with just a touch of streamlined archaism, not unlike the buildings of Piacentini and Speer. This sort of comparison would make some parts of Frank's case even stronger.

Does this mean, though, that "stones speak no language" and that architecture is autonomous from politics? Of course not. Architecture is the most political of all the arts. What it does mean is that architectural form (and architects) respond to social and political forces on several levels. In an era of extreme economic and urban crisis, all governments wanted to reassure their public with dignified, severe, and durable-looking major public buildings, while at the same time encouraging rustic and regional styles that reminded newly urbanized populations of their earlier roots in a preindustrial society. These were some of the forces that led to a remarkable commonality in several styles and in many countries during the 1930s and 1940s.

But the language of architecture is also situational, the product of a specific political situation in a particular time and place. To take the Nazi case only, buildings designed as SS training camps or for Nazi party rallies cannot be discussed as if they were Hilton Hotels or football stadiums. Nazi buildings were designed to serve the Nazi political program and the Nazi world view. They were publicized incessantly in Nazi propaganda as representative of the political program of the Third Reich. They were intended as the envelopes within which the new National Socialist *Gemeinschaft* would be created, and they functioned to create it. Speer's Nuremberg Party Grounds were the site of Hitler's fulminations against the Jews, and of the nearly ecstatic mass experience that permitted Germans to support war and Holocaust. The experiences that people have in buildings are not lost from memory; they become historical facts in themselves. Hence, Nazi buildings were intended for ideological purposes, they functioned that way, and we must remember them that way. If their style is thereby corrupted for future generations, it is our business as architectural historians to recognize that fact.

BARBARA MILLER LANE
Bryn Mawr College
Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin

AMERICAN ARCHITECTURE

ROBERT M. FOGELSON, *America's Armories: Architecture, Society, and Public Order*, Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press, 1989, xx + 268 pp., 44 illus. \$30.00.

I learned a good deal about *America's Armories* while looking for the book in the library. While an architectural historian would consider this subject a building-type study and shelve it alongside recently published histories of forts, prisons, courthouses, and state capitols, the Library of Congress catalogue system places it with United States military history, next to books on the National Guard. A search for Robert M. Fogelson's previous publications took me to three other sections of the

stacks: to a shelf of material on California's urban problems for *The Los Angeles Riots*, part of a series on Mass Violence in America (1969); to a case of books on police administration for *Big City Police* (1977); and to HV90 V, where *Violence and Protest: A Study of Riots and Ghettos* (1971) sits next to other studies of Violence in American history (just after HV90 P for Peace).

These shelvings suggest the intellectual orientation behind Fogelson's presentation of the armory as both product and physical symbol of late nineteenth-century property-holders' fears of urban riot and class warfare. His other publications indicate that the author, a professor of history and urban studies at MIT, comes to his subject from a background in the history of do-