



Volume 3 | 3: Thinking Music: Praxis and Aesthetic

382-399 | ISSN: 2463-333X

---

# Remembering Weimar

Kathleen James-Chakraborty

2019 marks the centennial of the Bauhaus and of the first German democratic republic, both famously established in the same rather provincial city. The considerable nostalgia for the cultural products of the Weimar Republic, for which the Bauhaus has come to stand, has rightly never been matched by a desire to return to Germany's tragically ineffective attempt between 1919 and 1933 to establish a stable middle ground between imperialism and communism. Because their coolly machined abstraction has so often since seemed universal, the Bauhaus building in Dessau and the most celebrated products created in the school's workshops in the course of its final decade obscure the degree to which these exciting experiments were inextricably intertwined with political conditions that were and remain literally terrifying. What now appears as reassuringly classic modernism was originally indivisible from the same instability captured by the artists Max Beckmann, Otto Dix, George Grosz, and the opportunities opened up briefly for the architect Erich Mendelsohn. Their metropolitan art and architecture otherwise kept them at a considerable remove from the Bauhaus, at least until the school was briefly based in Berlin before finally closing months after the Nazis came to power.

One might begin by considering the city of Weimar. The city's rich cultural heritage included the presence of Goethe and Schiller during the city's so-called Golden Age, as well as a Silver one when in the middle of the nineteenth century it was a centre for both contemporary music and art.<sup>1</sup> Although recent scholarship highlights the degree to which in its early years, Bauhäusler built quite self-

consciously upon this legacy, clearly the school never sat comfortably in this small city, located at quite a remove (as those attending the constitutional convention in 1919 very much appreciated) from Berlin.<sup>2</sup> The pre-war grand duchy of Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach had been a constitutional monarchy since 1816, but it was never particularly progressive politically, with universal manhood suffrage instituted only in 1909. In the first years of the twentieth century, luminaries such as Henry van de Velde and Henry Graf Kessler struggled to make headway at the rather stuffy court of Wilhelm Ernst, Grand Duke from 1901 until 1918.<sup>3</sup> Their plans, for instance to create a memorial to Friedrich Nietzsche, who spent his last years in Weimar, quickly faltered, although van de Velde did refurbish the house in which the celebrated philosopher had died to serve as an archive.<sup>4</sup> The Belgian designer and architect also managed to establish the Grand Ducal School of Arts and Crafts, which formed the kernel of what became the Bauhaus. Indeed, Gropius's new school was originally housed in the quarters van de Velde had designed for its predecessor and for the older Grand Ducal Art School, established in 1860.

Returning to the city of Weimar reminds us of the disastrous consequences of the failure of the Republic. The experiments undertaken there in 1919 famously faltered. The Bauhaus was expelled in 1925, moving first to Dessau and then in 1932 to Berlin, where it limped along for only a few more months.<sup>5</sup> Thuringia, formed out of eight earlier duchies and principalities including Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach, was established in 1920. Ten years later it became the first German state in which the Nazis participated in the government. The observant visitor traveling today from the train station to the city's charming historic centre will notice the Gauforum, a Nazi architectural ensemble on a scale found in few other German cities of Weimar's modest size. Only a few kilometers to the north and west lies Buchenwald, the site of the largest concentration camp created within Germany itself.

Although many greeted its creation with optimism, whether one supported communist or socialist revolution, a return to the established certainties of the former empire, or the Centre – the territory above all of the Catholic party of that name – one was more often than not disappointed with the Weimar Republic long before the establishment of the Third Reich. Hyperinflation at the beginning of the twenties and massive unemployment at the start of the thirties made daily life a struggle for almost everyone. For many at both political extremes these and other challenges justified violent street battles particularly in the early and late years of what was after all a very short experiment in democracy.<sup>6</sup> There are streets across Germany named for Gustav Stresemann, but with the possible exception of Walter Rathenau, who was assassinated in 1922, the era produced no politicians on the national stage who are remembered today with real fondness.

In culture, of course, the situation is entirely different. Weimar-era Berlin in particular retains its sparkle across almost all forms of creative expression, from cinema and dance to song and theatre. The city's legendary cabarets, with their reputation for decadence, as well as their tolerance for same sex attractions, created the template for many later "scenes" that were seldom more daring.<sup>7</sup> The situation was little different in fields ranging from astronomy, where Erich Mendelsohn's Einstein Tower appeared to stride into nearby Potsdam's Telegraphic Hill, to if not zoology then certainly the zoo itself, to which elephants occasionally paraded through the streets. Critics, poets and philosophers flourished, and the Bauhaus, once it moved to Dessau, was just a short train journey away.<sup>8</sup>

The question remains whether we would remember the cultural achievements of the Weimar Republic with such wistfulness if the next dozen years had witnessed anything less catastrophic than Nazi dictatorship, the Second World War, the Holocaust, and the division of the country. The chasm between utopian vision and the horror of what followed throws into bold relief how tenuous many of what proved to be the most enduring artistic experiments originally appeared as well as the degree to which they were initially forged out of a frightening level of political, economic and social disarray.

Consider Walter Gropius, the founder of the Bauhaus. In the summer of 1914, when he attended the Cologne meeting of the German Werkbund, a group established eight years earlier to ensure that industrialization not be inimical to German cultural achievement, he was the thirty-one-year-old scion of a quite conventional bourgeois Prussian family active in architecture, politics and the military.<sup>9</sup> By that date Gropius, in partnership with Adolf Meyer, had distinguished himself as an architect of innovative industrial structures, including the Model Factory at the Werkbund's exhibition, in conjunction with which the meeting was held. He had also had a brief affair with Alma Mahler, the much younger wife of the renowned conductor. When he and the equally young and ambitious Bruno Taut allied themselves with van de Velde in a dispute with Herman Muthesius over the direction in which German design reform should be headed, he assumed what for many years seemed in retrospect the more conservative position, championing the role of the individual artist over standardization. By November 1918, however, Gropius had been awarded the Iron Cross twice for his service on the front, had married and separated from Mahler, and was ready to join Taut and the critic Adolf Behne in establishing the Arbeitsrat für Kunst, the artists' equivalent of the workers' groups that emerged to support the November Revolution. While the Werkbund had brought architects and designers together with industrialists and critics, the Arbeitsrat sought the support of a Socialist government, preoccupied as it turned out

with establishing a semblance of order, for artistic revolution. Its program, written by Taut, declared:

Art and people must form a unity. Art should no longer be the pleasure of a few but should bring joy and sustenance to the masses. The goal is the union of the arts under the wings of a great architecture. From now on the artist, as the shaper of the sensibilities of the people, is along responsible for the external appearance of the new nation.<sup>10</sup>

It is unthinkable that Gropius, who in the last years before the war was trying to persuade industrialists to adopt new architectural forms that he assured them would smooth their relationships with their workers, would have put his name to anything this radical had his faith in imperial Germany not been blown to bits along with the lives of many of the soldiers alongside whom he fought.<sup>11</sup>

During the nine years in which he directed the Bauhaus in first Weimar and then Dessau, Gropius oscillated between drawing upon the advantages that stemmed from his entirely conventional background and bringing into being what was at the time an often shockingly experimental alternative to it. Certainly, he was trusted with what became the Bauhaus in large part because of van de Velde's recommendation, based on their brief alliance in Cologne, but also because of his eminently respectable lineage in tandem with his status as a war hero. The Bauhaus Manifesto and Program that he issued just months after signing the Arbeitsrat declaration focused on the same unity of the arts under the umbrella of architecture without any reference to the relationship with the government threaded through its more obviously political predecessor.<sup>12</sup> Lyonel Feininger's woodblock "Cathedral," which accompanied it, often mistakenly titled "Cathedral of Socialism" was similarly Janus-faced.<sup>13</sup> On the one hand the subject and technique both evoked late medieval Germany in a way that could be read as patriotic; on the other both were also clearly in step with Taut's call for crystalline city crowns that would create utopian communities cutting across class lines.<sup>14</sup>

Between 1919 and 1928 Gropius was the interface between the government officials, industrialists and journalists upon whose support the school depended on the one hand and on the other students and faculty often unconstrained by a respect for established authority, whether artistic or political.<sup>15</sup> A shrewd publicist, he maintained this delicate balance throughout his directorship, but it proved beyond either the interest or capabilities of his hand-picked successor, Hannes Meyer, whose politics were to the left of Gropius's.<sup>16</sup> After only two years, in which Meyer proved more successful than Gropius had been in creating profitable partnerships

with industry, Gropius helped arrange his ouster because his leftist political views were seen as too extreme. Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, the school's third director, expelled the openly Communist students and proved able to continue to keep the school, whose focus was now largely on architectural education, going for three more years.<sup>17</sup>

The Bauhaus and the climate of European artistic experimentation in which it was embedded, which included Dutch De Stijl and Russian Constructivism, have often been lauded for being politically progressive, but they were not inherently so.<sup>18</sup> Certainly, the celebrated Constructivist El Lissitzky designed propaganda for the new Soviet Union, but he spent most of the twenties in Germany.<sup>19</sup> A number of Bauhäusler accompanied Ernst May and other German architects to the Soviet Union, where some were eventually murdered by Stalin's secret police.<sup>20</sup> And several served the German Democratic Republic loyally after World War II, consciously choosing to remain in a Communist state.<sup>21</sup> Nonetheless, as Robin Schuldenfrei has made clear, despite the clear intentions of at least some Bauhäusler to create designs that workers would use in the daily lives, many Bauhaus goods were luxury productions, hand crafted out of precious materials and intended to support the social rituals of those who had the leisure not to work. Gropius himself, she demonstrates, had photographs of his house in Dessau doctored to make marble look like less expensive porcelain or enameled metal.<sup>22</sup>

During the Weimar Republic Bauhaus design remained associated with the sliver of the bourgeoisie who supported experimentation.<sup>23</sup> The new approach to design disproportionately appealed to women eager to burst the bounds of convention. These included the women who studied at the Bauhaus, whom Gropius tried to relegate to the weaving workshop.<sup>24</sup> Once there, they generally set themselves apart from their more fashion-oriented counterparts in metropolitan centers like Berlin, who nonetheless represented much of the original market for the products they designed.<sup>25</sup> They were part of a larger phenomenon. During the twenties, women from across Europe, such as Eileen Gray and Charlotte Perriand, both based in Paris, and Margarete Schütte-Lihotzky, who moved from her native Vienna to Frankfurt, as well as Lily Reich, a Berliner who briefly presided over the Bauhaus's Weaving Workshop, carved out careers in modern design and architecture.<sup>26</sup> In doing so they built upon the achievements of an earlier generation of women involved in the Arts and Crafts movement.<sup>27</sup>

A century after its founding the Bauhaus garners the lion's share of the attention paid to Weimar-era experimentation in architecture and the visual arts, but at the time it was an avant-garde alternative to the biting satirical, but still representational paintings of artists such as Max Beckman, Otto Dix and Georg

Grosz, as well as the dynamic urban architectural fashion embodied in the architecture of Erich Mendelsohn.<sup>28</sup> Both paintings and buildings have often been grouped together under the label of Expressionism, but like the Bauhaus these metropolitan artists and architects often wheeled by the mid 1920s away from jagged forms.<sup>29</sup> Instead of adopting, however, the contrapuntal abstraction associated with De Stijl and Constructivism, Beckmann, Dix and Grosz were among those who remained committed to representation. The resulting painting is often termed *Neue Sachlichkeit*, although sober objectivity does not quite capture the cynicism embedded in these depictions of degeneracy populated by prostitutes, ex-soldiers and profiteers. While Bauhaus painting was increasingly abstract, photographs, most taken by the students, that do represent the human figure document the playful fun being had by healthy young bodies.<sup>30</sup> These contrast strongly with the emphasis *Neue Sachlich* painters placed on bodies distorted by everything from violence and disease to gender-bending fashion, including a tolerance of homosexuality that many contemporary viewers found perverse. Although *Neue Sachlichkeit* art continues to fascinate, it is clearly culturally specific and, to the degree that it does evoke nostalgia, it is on different grounds than those which make the Bauhaus bewitching.

Meanwhile, Mendelsohn's dynamic functionalism proudly heralded the temporary ascendancy of a politically progressive Jewish bourgeoisie that had good reason to make a decisive break with Wilhelmine historicism. The Bauhaus welcomed many Jewish students, including residents of what was then the British Mandate of Palestine, but the faculty remained almost exclusively Christian. Moreover, although the school certainly produced luxurious objects, it also maintained a wary distance from the metropolitan commercial culture that Mendelsohn served. With a much bigger office and many more prominent commissions than either Gropius or Mies, Mendelsohn quickly moved from the eccentric form of the Einstein Tower, the commission that established his reputation, to defining urban modernity in a series of office buildings, department stores, apartments, a union headquarters and a cinema erected in the downtown districts of Berlin, Breslau, Chemnitz and Stuttgart. Astutely aware of how his buildings were photographed, he was also a key figure in introducing the German intelligentsia to recent architectural developments in both the United States and the Soviet Union.<sup>31</sup> His own photographs and those he published that were the work of others, including most notably Arthur Köster and the Danish architect Knud Lonberg-Holm, captured the dynamism of the contemporary metropolis, which he understood to be defined in part by speeding motorcars as well as the bold night-lighting he specialized in designing.<sup>32</sup> In contrast, Lucia Moholy's many photographs of the Dessau Bauhaus all

show it by day and focus on its transparency.<sup>33</sup> Most also emphasize the stability of what was in fact a dynamic composition that like its contemporary, Mendelsohn's Schocken Store in Stuttgart, featured wrap-around facades and bold identifying lettering.

Although the Bauhaus reliably attracted the attention of the German national press, as well as many visitors from abroad, Neue Sachlich painting and Mendelsohn's dynamic functionalism were undoubtedly more visible in Germany at the time, and Mendelsohn's architecture more influential internationally in the short term.<sup>34</sup> The balance shifted above all after the Nazi seizure of power encouraged Beckmann, Grosz, Mendelsohn, and many Bauhäusler, including all three of the school's directors, to move abroad. The largest and most influential group, including Grosz, Mendelsohn, Gropius, Mies, and former Bauhaus students Anni and Joseph Albers, Herbert Bayer, and Marcel Breuer, eventually settled in the United States. Although not as many fled the Third Reich or did so as quickly as those who believe that modernism was inherently politically progressive would like to believe (Bayer and Mies remained until 1937) this exodus effectively rebranded the Bauhaus.<sup>35</sup> The school whose opponents had vilified it for being socialist or even communist paradoxically gained its greatest appreciation and influence only in the context of the Cold War when its legacy was appropriated by the Americans as a badge of liberal democracy. Reviving the Bauhaus as an aesthetic means of assuaging this far more consequential political and moral failure was initially an American and then a specifically West German strategy adopted in the Communist East, where Weimar was located between 1945 and 1989, only really beginning in 1976, when the Dessau Bauhaus building was finally renovated by Konrad Püschel and Salman Selmanagic, both of whom had studied there.<sup>36</sup>

This useful narrative glided over many uncomfortable truths, although certainly there were Bauhäusler, including most notably Otta Berger, who perished in the Holocaust.<sup>37</sup> The Nazis labeled both the Bauhaus and Expressionism as degenerate, and Bauhaus masters Feininger, Kandinsky, Klee and Schlemmer were included alongside Beckmann, Dix, Grosz and many others in the notorious exhibition held in Munich in 1937.<sup>38</sup> Beyond this overt condemnation and the anodyne conventions trumpeted by the Third Reich, however, many of those Bauhäusler who were not Jewish, socialist or communist, continued their careers without needing to adjust their aesthetics terribly much. Although there is no reason to believe that they were sympathetic to the new regime's political goals, Bayer, Gropius, Mies and Reich all designed parts of exhibitions for the Nazi government.<sup>39</sup> Reich's textile displays for the world's fair held in Paris in 1937, which were displayed in a pavilion designed by

Albert Speer, were little different from those she had created nine years earlier for the Barcelona exposition of 1928.<sup>40</sup>

Walter Benjamin's criticism of the Nazis anesthetization of politics has provided convenient cover for those who want to equate a taste for an aesthetic that in fact identifies them as members of a cultivated cultural elite with meaningful opposition to fascism.<sup>41</sup> Since the earliest court cultures built magnificent palaces in Mesopotamia and tombs in Egypt as staging grounds for displays of political and military might, politics has often been aesthetic. Many of the bourgeois regimes established after the American and French revolutions minimized this display in conscious opposition to their aristocratic and royal predecessors, but even the Weimar Republic, under the leadership of Erwin Redslob, who would later help to establish the Freie Universität in Berlin, attempted to put its aesthetic stamp on German democracy.<sup>42</sup> That it failed to do so in comparison to the Third Reich may say more about the degree to which it was ineffectual, leaving a gap that the Bauhaus has come to have appeared to fill, than about the aesthetic tastes of its leadership, which probably in most cases diverged no more from convention than the buildings of Albert Speer did from those of American and French contemporaries who also espoused a modern neoclassicism. For Paul Philippe Cret, for instance, a native of France who built his career as an educator and architect in the United States, commitment to democracy entailed creating a stable public sphere that stood in meaningful opposition to the quickly dated commercial architecture conceived by Mendelsohn.<sup>43</sup> Moreover, Cret and his ilk, including city planner Henri Prost, attempted to impose an order on cities from Casablanca to Philadelphia, only some of which were colonial, that would stamp out the urban ills documented by German painters Bechmann, Dix and Grosz.<sup>44</sup> Their efforts were generally much more successful than Hitler and Speer's aborted plans for Berlin. Monumental avenues of this kind would await the East German regime led by Walter Ubricht, which would erect such showpieces in Dresden, Leipzig, Magdeburg and Rostock, as well as Berlin.<sup>45</sup>

Hitler's efforts in Berlin and Nuremberg in fact provided an easy out for West German planners and their patrons after the war. Architects and planners who had served the Third Reich were able to quickly transfer their allegiances by pledging loyalty to a modernist style.<sup>46</sup> Ironically those who had maintained a greater distance from the Nazis were not always as willing to follow suit, as demonstrated by the case of Rudolf Schwarz, who lashed out against the Bauhaus in a series of articles published in the architectural journal *Baukunst und Werkform* in 1953, that quickly attracted Gropius's ire.<sup>47</sup> Egon Eiermann, who designed many of the early showcases of the Federal Republic, including the German pavilion at the Brussels World's Fair of



1958 (in collaboration with Sep Ruf); the new Kaiser Wilhelm Memorial Church in Berlin, hurriedly dedicated in 1961 just months after the erection of the Berlin Wall; and the German embassy in Washington, DC, completed in 1964, cut his teeth designing political exhibitions and factory buildings for the Third Reich, areas in which his flair for Bauhaus-inflected modernism served in him in excellent stead.<sup>48</sup>

That aesthetic style does not neatly correlate with particular styles did not in any way hamper the West German government from beginning in the last 1960s to turn towards the Bauhaus in particular, rather than modern art, architecture and design in general, as a key precedent for postwar German democracy. A key moment in this regard was the opening on 4 May 1968 of a Bauhaus exhibition in Stuttgart, attended by Gropius himself. In his oration Lurtiz Lauritzen, the Social Democratic federal minister for housing and urban development in the new coalition government, declared the democratic and liberal spirit of the Bauhaus to have been embodied in its Dessau building, and that the school itself would have been unthinkable without the Weimar constitution.<sup>49</sup> The Social Democrat's rise to power, which would be completed in 1969, when Willy Brandt became chancellor of a coalition with the much smaller Free Democrats, witnessed the increasing importance of culture, as opposed to the church, as a key indicator of the Federal Republic's reintegration into the family of western nations. The Bauhaus joined Beethoven as the face of enlightened German culture standing in clear opposition to the horrors unleashed by the Third Reich. Moreover, it brought this narrative up to date at a time when the majority of those who had attended the school were probably still alive, if in most cases still uncelebrated. Only in the twentieth-first century would scholarly attention decisively shift from those who had taught to those who had studied at the school.

That would happen above all in the context of the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. The archives and life stories of the students who had stayed in the German Democratic Republic (East Germany) began to come into view, expanding the story of the school with material that had been largely out of sight for decades. Reunification also returned attention to Dessau and Weimar, which had hosted relatively few western visitors, and where new Bauhaus museums were quickly founded.<sup>50</sup>

Nostalgia for the Weimar Republic is almost never nostalgia for Weimar itself. Since 1996 the Bauhaus Universität, constructed out of institutions established following the transfer of the original Bauhaus to Dessau, has flourished there. Despite its considerable reputation, and its openness to international dialogue, its presence has not been enough to establish the city as a key centre for contemporary artistic experimentation. Except in 2009, when a series of summer exhibitions demonstrated

the Bauhaus's link to the city's cultural heritage, recent current marketing as a "Cultural City" centers more on Weimar's Neoclassical than its Bauhaus heritage, although the recent opening of a new Bauhaus Museum, designed by Heika Hanada, may begin to change this.

The postwar Federal Republic, whose 70<sup>th</sup> birthday attracted far less attention than either the political or the artistic centennials marked the same year, has thankfully proven far more robust without ever provoking the same sense of adventure or nostalgia as its precarious predecessor. That the original Federal Republic encompassed only about half the territory of the Weimar Republic limited the degree to which it could be considered a complete success at least until the fall of the Berlin wall. The rest of what had been the Weimar Republic was divided after World War II between East Germany and Poland, except for a small sliver ceded to the Soviet Union. Even today, stable democracy has yet to be established in the entire extent of the territory of the Weimar Republic, as the situation of Königsberg/Kaliningrad makes clear. Moreover, at least when the aging Konrad Adenauer was Chancellor, West Germany was almost purposefully boring. Even the Hochschule für Gestaltung in Ulm, a successor the Bauhaus that also only lasted fourteen years, folding in 1968, lacked the ability to appear to reimagine the world from scratch that so energized the original.<sup>51</sup> Its work for Lufthansa and Braun, while coolly understated, remained corporate branding in what was by then a well-established tradition of "good" German design rather truly visionary. Only with Joseph Beuys and Kraftwerk in Düsseldorf, Rainer Werner Fassbinder in Frankfurt and the West Berlin of the Hansa Studio, complete with David Bowie, did parts of the Federal Republic slowly become hip.

A hundred years after the establishment of Germany's first democratic republic, stable democracy remains something no one should take for granted. The Federal Republic, cautious, even stolid rather than dynamic, much less revolutionary, is now, despite the frightening presence of the *Alternativ für Deutschland*, a welcome bulwark against the uncertainty fueled by populist hysteria. Across the border in Poland, not to mention in the United States or the United Kingdom, nationalism is no longer confined to the political fringes. Furthermore, France and Italy, not to mention Hungary within the European Union or Turkey just beyond it, offer little reassurance that voters will not consciously choose to embrace politicians with little commitment to open societies.

The hundredth anniversary of the Bauhaus demonstrated that a new generation shares the nostalgia for it and the other cultural products of the Weimar Republic that those for whom this was their grandparents' era also often had. Today, however, cutting-edge scholarship in the history of modern architecture and design

focuses on the postwar period, with “classic modernism,” as the Germans so often term it, having become instead the focus of city marketing efforts aimed at attracting tourists and businesses.<sup>52</sup> Our challenges are not going to be solved by an escapist focus upon a past that paradoxically still seems new a hundred years on, but by promoting sustainability in the face of catastrophic climate change, although Germany’s 2019 Bauhaus-related soft power cultural initiatives certainly attempted to inscribe the school’s apparent universality in a new respect for the artistic cultures of the Global South.<sup>53</sup> In most of these societies the appeal of indigenous artistic modernisms were linked to the emergence of a middle class that sought alternatives to both the historicism favored by their social and economic betters and the rural vernacular associated with pre-modern peasants. This is territory now colonized by companies like Ikea rather than associated with utopian designs developed with relatively little regard for market forces.<sup>54</sup> In this context, part of the present appeal of the Bauhaus is the degree to which it was ineffectual in delivering the kind of economic growth Gropius originally promised the city fathers of Weimar.

Despite this initial lack of success, that Bauhaus design proved more enduring than democracy challenges us not to put too much faith in symbols, handsome as they may be. It is democracy that is, joined now by a million species, once again endangered.<sup>55</sup> In this context, design may be just a distraction from the real challenges, which remain ecological, economic and political rather than aesthetic or even cultural.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Annette Seemann, *Weimar: Eine Kulturgeschichte* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2012); and Peter Merseburger, *Mythos Weimar: Zwischen Geist und Macht* (Munich: Pantheon, 2013).

<sup>2</sup> Wolfgang Holler, Ulrike Bestgen and Ute Ackermann, *Das Bauhaus kommt aus Weimar* (Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 2009).

<sup>3</sup> Laird M. Easton, *The Red Count: The Life and Times of Harry Kessler* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006); Antje Neumann, ed., *Harry Graf Kessler – Henry Van de Velde: Der Briefwechsel* (Cologne: Bohlau Verlag, 2014); and Katherine Kuenzli, *Henry van de Velde: Designing Modernism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019).

<sup>4</sup> Meredith Hindley, “Nietzsche is Dead,” *Humanities* 33 (2012) 4. (<https://www.neh.gov/humanities/2012/julyaugust/feature/nietzsche-dead>); and Ole Fischer, *Nietzsche’s Schatten: Henry van de Velde – von Philosophie zu Form* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 2012) 502-60.

<sup>5</sup> Magdalena Droste, *The Bauhaus* (Cologne: Taschen, 2019).

<sup>6</sup> Gerald Feldman, *The Great Disorder: Politics, Economics and Society in the German Inflation, 1914-1924* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997); Richard J. Evans, *The Coming of the Third Reich: How the Nazis Destroyed Democracy and Seized Power in Germany* (New York: Penguin, 2004); Mark Jones, *Founding Weimar: Violence and the German Revolution of 1918-1919* (Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press, 2016); Benjamin Carter Hett, *The Death of Democracy: Hitler's Rise to Power and the Downfall of the Weimar Republic* (New York: Henry Holt, 2018), and Robert Gerwarth, *Die größte aller Revolutionen: November 1918 und der Aufbruch in eine neue Zeit* (Munich: Siedler Verlag, 2018).

<sup>7</sup> Christopher Isherwood, *The Berlin Stories* (London: New Directions, 1945), remains the ur-text in English on the subject.

<sup>8</sup> The literature on Weimar culture is too vast to survey here. Useful titles include John Willett, *Art and Politics in the Weimar Period: The New Sobriety, 1917-1933* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978); Detlev J. K. Peukert, *The Weimar Republic: The Crisis of Classical Modernity* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993); and Anton Kaes, Martin Jay and Edward Dimendberg, eds., *The Weimar Republic Sourcebook* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

<sup>9</sup> Frederic J. Schwarz, *The Werkbund: Design Theory and Mass Culture Before the First World War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), and Fiona McCarthy, *Gropius: The Man Who Built the Bauhaus* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2019).

<sup>10</sup> Bruno Taut, "Arbeitsrat für Kunst program," in Rose-Carol Washton Long, ed., *German Expressionism: Documents from the End of the Wilhelmine to the Rise of National Socialism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995) 193-94.

<sup>11</sup> Walter Gropius, "Monumentale Kunst und Industriebau," as republished in Karin Wilhelm, *Walter Gropius: Industriearchitekt* (Braunschweig: Vieweg Verlag, 1983), 119.

<sup>12</sup> Walter Gropius, "Bauhaus Program," in Long, *German Expressionism*, 247-48.

<sup>13</sup> Droste, *Bauhaus*, 19. For examples of its misnomer see, for instance, <https://www.theartstory.org/artist-feininger-lyonel-artworks.htm>, and <https://www.wikiart.org/en/lyonel-feininger/cathedral-of-socialism-1919>, both consulted 5 March 2019.

<sup>14</sup> For Taut see Iain Boyd Whyte, *Bruno Taut and the Architecture of Activism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); and Bruno Taut, *The City Crown*, translated and edited by Matthew Mindrup and Ulrike Altenmüller Lewis (London: Routledge, 2015).

<sup>15</sup> Much of the Weimar-era aspect of this story is documented in Volker Wahl, ed., *Das Staatliche Bauhaus in Weimar: Dokumente zur Geschichte des Instituts 1919-1926* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2009). See also Patrick Rössler, *The Bauhaus and Public Relations: Communication in a Permanent State of Crisis* (London: Routledge, 2017).

<sup>16</sup> Thomas Flierl and Philipp Oswald, eds., *Im Streit der Deutungen: Conflicting Interpretations* (Leipzig: Spector, 2019); and Philipp Oswald, ed. *Hannes Meyers neue Bauhauslehre: Von Dessau bis Mexico* (Berlin: Bauwelt, 2019).

<sup>17</sup> Franz Schulze and Edward Windhorst, *Mies van der Rohe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012) 90-175.

<sup>18</sup> For an early example see Lauritz Lauritzen's speech, published in *50 Jahre Bauhaus: Ansprachen zur Eröffnung der Ausstellung am 4. Mai 1968 im Kleinen Haus der Württembergischen Staatstheater* (Stuttgart: Württembergischer Kunstverein, 1968) 8-9.

<sup>19</sup> Victor Margolin, *The Struggle for Utopia: Rodchenko, Lissitzky, Moholy-Nagy, 1917-1946* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).

<sup>20</sup> Ivan Nevgodin, "Das Bauhaus in UdSSR – ein russisches Roulette," in Annike Strupkus, ed., *Bauhaus Global: Gesammelte Beiträge der Konferenz Bauhaus Global* (Berlin: Martin Gropius Bau/Bauhaus Dessau, 2009) 105-09.

- <sup>21</sup> Aida Adadzic Hodzic, *Selman Selmanagic und das Bauhaus* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 2018); and Wolfgang Thöner and Peter Müller, *Bauhaus-Tradition und DDR-Moderne. Der Architekt Richard Paulick* (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2006).
- <sup>22</sup> Robin Schuldenfrei, *Luxury and Modernism: Architecture and the Object in Germany, 1900-1933* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018) 138-56.
- <sup>23</sup> Frederic J. Schwarz, "Utopia for Sale: The Bauhaus and Weimar Germany's Consumer Culture," in Kathleen James-Chakraborty, ed., *Bauhaus Culture from Weimar to the Cold War* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006), 115-38.
- <sup>24</sup> Ulricke Müller, *Bauhaus Women: Art, Handcraft, Design* (Paris: Flammarion, 2009); Elizabeth Otto and Patrick Rössler, *Bauhaus Women: A Global Perspective* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2019); Elizabeth Otto and Patrick Rössler, eds., *Bauhaus Bodies: Gender, Sexuality, and Body Culture in Modernism's Legendary Art School* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2019).
- <sup>25</sup> Kathleen James-Chakraborty, "Clothing Bauhaus Bodies," in Otto and Rössler, *Bauhaus Bodies*, 123-44.
- <sup>26</sup> Eve Blau, *The Architecture of Red Vienna* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999) 117-19, 183-89, 199; Mary McLeod, *Charlotte Perriand: An Art of Living* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2003); Christiane Lange, *Ludwig Mies van der Rohe and Lilly Reich: Furniture and Design* (Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2007); and Jennifer Goff, *Eileen Gray: Her Work and her World* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2015).
- <sup>27</sup> Catherine Zipf, *Professional Pursuits: Women and the American Arts and Crafts Movement* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2009).
- <sup>28</sup> Kathleen James, *Erich Mendelsohn and the Architecture of German Modernism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Stephanie Barron and Sabine Eckmann, eds. *New Objectivity: German Art in the Weimar Republic* (Munich: Prestel, 2015); Olaf Peters, ed., *Berlin Metropolis: 1918-1933* (Munich: Prestel, 2015); Matthew Gale and Katy Wan, *Magic Realism: Art in Weimar Germany, 1919-1933* (London: Tate Publishing, 2018).
- <sup>29</sup> Timothy O. Benson, ed., *Expressionist Utopias: Paradise, Metropolis, Architectural Fantasy* (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1994); Stephanie Barron and Wolf-Dieter Dube, *German Expressionism: Art and Society* (New York: Rizzoli, 1997); and Wolfgang Pehnt, *Die Architektur des Expressionismus* (Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz Verlag, 1998).
- <sup>30</sup> Rose-Carol Washton Long, "From Metaphysics to Material Culture: Painting and Photography at the Bauhaus," in James-Chakraborty, *Bauhaus Culture*, 43-62.
- <sup>31</sup> Erich Mendelsohn, *Amerika: Bilderbuch eines Architekten* (Berlin: Rudolf Mosse Verlag, 1926); Erich Mendelsohn, *Russland, Europa, Amerika: Ein architektonischer Querschnitt* (Berlin: Rudolf Mosse Verlag, 1929).
- <sup>32</sup> Simone Förster, *Masse braucht Licht, Arthur Kösters Fotografien der Bauten von Erich Mendelsohn: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Architekturphotographie der 1920er Jahre* (Berlin: Winter Industries, 2008); and Suzanne Strum, *The Ideal of Total Environmental Control: Knud Lönberg-Holm Buckminster Fuller, and the SSA* (London: Routledge, 2017) 29-37.
- <sup>33</sup> Jeffrey Saletnik and Robin Schuldenfrei, eds., *Bauhaus Construct: Identity, Discourse and Modernism* (London: Routledge, 2009) 6-7 for Moholy's difficulties in asserting authorship of these.
- <sup>34</sup> Regina Stephan, ed., *Erich Mendelsohn: Dynamics and Function: Realised Visions of a Cosmopolitan Architect* (Ostfildern: IFA, 1999) for Mendelsohn's own work in the British Mandate of Palestine, Czechoslovakia, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States.
- <sup>35</sup> Winfried Nerdinger, ed., *Bauhaus-Moderne in Nationalsozialismus: Zwischen Anbiederung und Verfolgung* (Munich: Prestel, 1993).

- <sup>38</sup> Paul Betts, "The Bauhaus as Cold-War Legend: West German Modernism Revisited," *German Politics and Society* 14 (1996) 75-100; Kathleen James-Chakraborty, "From Isolationism to Internationalism: American Acceptance of the Bauhaus," in James-Chakraborty, *Bauhaus Culture*, 153-70; and Wolfgang Paul, "Renovation 1976," in Margret Kentgens Craig, ed., *The Dessau Bauhaus Building* (Basel: Birkhäuser, 1999) 160-73.
- <sup>39</sup> Sigrid Welte-Wortmann, *Bauhaus Textiles: Women Artists and the Weaving Workshop* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1993) 128.
- <sup>40</sup> Stephanie Barron, ed., *Degenerate Art: The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany* (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991).
- <sup>41</sup> In addition to Nerding, *Bauhaus-Moderne*, see Michael Tymkiw, *Nazi Exhibition Design and Modernism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2018).
- <sup>42</sup> Karen Fiss, *Grand Illusion: The Third Reich, the Paris Exhibition, and the Cultural Seduction of France* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010) 108-09.
- <sup>43</sup> Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," in Hannah Arendt, ed., *Illuminations* (New York: Schocken Books, 1968) 241.
- <sup>44</sup> Christian Welzbacher, *Erwin Redslob: Biographie eines unverbesserlichen Idealisten* (Berlin: Metthes & Seitz, 2009).
- <sup>45</sup> Elizabeth Grossman, *The Civic Architecture of Paul Cret* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- <sup>46</sup> David Brownlee, *Building the City Beautiful: The Benjamin Franklin Parkway and the Philadelphia Museum of Art* (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1989), and Gwendolyn Wright, *The Politics of Design in French Colonial Urbanism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991) 85-160.
- <sup>47</sup> Herbert Nicolaus and Alexander Obeth, *Die Stalinallee: Geschichte einer deutschen Strasse* (Berlin: Huss-Medien, 1997).
- <sup>48</sup> Werner Durth, *Deutsche Architekten. Biographische Verflechtungen 1900-1970* (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1986).
- <sup>49</sup> Ulrich Conrads, Magdalena Droste, Winfried Nerding, and Hilde Strohl, eds., *Die Bauhaus-Debatte 1953: Dokumente einer verdrängten Kontroverse* (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1994).
- <sup>50</sup> Greg Castillo, "Making a Spectacle of Restraint: The Deutschland Pavilion at the 1958 Brussels Exposition," *Journal of Contemporary History* 47 (2011): 97-119.
- <sup>51</sup> As published in *50 Jahre Bauhaus*, 8-9.
- <sup>52</sup> Kathleen James-Chakraborty, "Beyond Cold War Interpretations: Shaping a New Bauhaus Heritage," *New German Critique* 116 (2012): 11-24.
- <sup>53</sup> Christian Wachsmann, *Vom Bauhaus beflügelt: Menschen und Ideen an der Hochschule für Gestaltung Ulm* (Stuttgart: Avedition, 2018). See also Paul Betts, *The Authority of Everyday Objects: A Cultural History of West German Industrial Design* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).
- <sup>54</sup> In this context the Zeche Zollverein has re-emerged (entirely incorrectly) as a Bauhaus building, so that Germany's largest state, North Rhine-Westphalia, which has no Bauhaus heritage, can get a share of attention. See <https://www.bauhaus100-im-westen.de/de/>, consulted 5 March 2019, and see Kathleen James-Chakraborty, *Modernism as Memory: Building Identity in the Federal Republic of Germany* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2018) 199.
- <sup>55</sup> Ulmer Museum, *Ulm School of Design 1953-68* (Ostfildern: Hatje-Cantz Verlag, 2003).
- <sup>56</sup> Pauline Garvey, *Unpacking IKEA: Swedish Design for the Purchasing Masses* (London: Routledge, 2017).

<sup>55</sup> Brad Plumer, "Humans are Speeding Extinction and Altering the Natural World at an 'Unprecedented' Pace," *New York Times*, 6 May 2019.

## References

- 50 Jahre Bauhaus: Ansprachen zur Eröffnung der Ausstellung am 4. Mai 1968 im Kleinen Haus der Württembergischen Staatstheater*. Stuttgart: Württembergischer Kunstverein, 1968.
- Barron, S. ed. *Degenerate Art: The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991.
- . and S. Eckmann, eds. *New Objectivity: German Art in the Weimar Republic*. Munich: Prestel, 2015.
- . and W-D. Dube. *German Expressionism: Art and Society*. New York: Rizzoli, 1997.
- Benjamin, W. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," in H. Ahrendt, ed., *Illuminations*. New York: Schocken Books, 1968). 217-51.
- Benson, T. O. ed. *Expressionist Utopias: Paradise, Metropolis, Architectural Fantasy*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1994.
- Betts, P. *The Authority of Everyday Objects: A Cultural History of West German Industrial Design*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- . "The Bauhaus as Cold-War Legend: West German Modernism Revisited." *German Politics and Society* 14 (1996): 75-100
- Blau, E. *The Architecture of Red Vienna*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999.
- Brownlee, D. *Building the City Beautiful: The Benjamin Franklin Parkway and the Philadelphia Museum of Art*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1989.
- Castillo, G. "Making a Spectacle of Restraint: The Deutschland Pavilion at the 1958 Brussels Exposition." *Journal of Contemporary History* 47 (2011): 97-119.
- Conrads, U., M. Droste, W. Nerdinger, and H. Strohl, eds. *Die Bauhaus-Debatte 1953: Dokumente einer verdrängten Kontroverse*. Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1994.
- Droste, M. *The Bauhaus*. Cologne: Taschen, 2019.
- Durth, W. *Deutsche Architekten. Biographische Verflechtungen 1900-1970* (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1986).
- Easton, L. M. *The Red Count: The Life and Times of Harry Kessler*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.
- Evans, R. J. *The Coming of the Third Reich: How the Nazis Destroyed Democracy and Seized Power in Germany*. New York: Penguin, 2004.
- Feldman, G. *The Great Disorder: Politics, Economics and Society in the German Inflation, 1914-1924*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Flierl, T. and P. Oswald, eds. *Im Streit der Deutungen: Conflicting Interpretations*. Leipzig: Spector, 2019.
- Fischer, O. *Nietzsche's Schatten: Henry van de Velde – von Philosophie zu Form*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 2012.
- Fiss, K. *Grand Illusion: The Third Reich, the Paris Exhibition, and the Cultural Seduction of France*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- Förster, S. *Masse braucht Licht, Arthur Kösters Fotografien der Bauten von Erich Mendelsohn: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Architekturphotographie der 1920er Jahre*. Berlin: Winter Industries, 2008.
- Gale, M. and K. Wan, *Magic Realism: Art in Weimar Germany, 1919-1933*. London: Tate Publishing, 2018.
- Garvey, P. *Unpacking IKEA: Swedish Design for the Purchasing Masses*. London: Routledge, 2017.

- 
- Gerwarth, R. *Die größte aller Revolutionen: November 1918 und der Aufbruch in eine neue Zeit*. Munich: Siedler Verlag, 2018.
- Goff, J. *Eileen Gray: Her Work and her World*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2015.
- Gropius, W. "Monumentale Kunst und Industriebau." in K. Wilhelm. *Walter Gropius: Industriearchitekt*. Braunschweig: Vieweg Verlag, 1983. 116-20.
- Grossman, E. *The Civic Architecture of Paul Cret*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Hett, B. C. *The Death of Democracy: Hitler's Rise to Power and the Downfall of the Weimar Republic*. New York: Henry Holt, 2018.
- Hindley, M. "Nietzsche is Dead." *Humanities* 33 (2012) 4  
(<https://www.neh.gov/humanities/2012/julyaugust/feature/nietzsche-dead>)
- Hodzic, A. A. *Selman Selmanagic und das Bauhaus*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 2018.
- Holler, W., Bestgen, U. and Ackermann, U. eds. *Das Bauhaus kommt aus Weimar*. Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 2009.  
<https://www.bauhaus100-im-westen.de/de/>  
<https://www.theartstory.org/artist-feininger-lyonel-artworks.htm>  
<https://www.wikiart.org/en/lyonel-feininger/cathedral-of-socialism-1919>
- Isherwood, C. *The Berlin Stories*. London: New Directions, 1945.
- James, K. *Erich Mendelsohn and the Architecture of German Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- James-Chakraborty, K., ed. *Bauhaus Culture from Weimar to the Cold War*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006.
- . "Beyond Cold War Interpretations: Shaping a New Bauhaus Heritage." *New German Critique* 116 (2012): 11-24.
- . *Modernism as Memory: Building Identity in the Federal Republic of Germany* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2018).
- Jones, M. *Founding Weimar: Violence and the German Revolution of 1918-1919*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Kaes, A., Jay, M. and Dimendberg, E., eds. *The Weimar Republic Sourcebook*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Kuenzli, K. *Henry van de Velde: Designing Modernism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019.
- Lange, C. *Ludwig Mies van der Rohe and Lilly Reich: Furniture and Design*. Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2007.
- Long, R-C. W. ed., *German Expressionism: Documents from the End of the Wilhelmine to the Rise of National Socialism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Margolin, V. *The Struggle for Utopia: Rodchenko, Lissitzky, Moholy-Nagy, 1917-1946*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- McCarthy, F. *Gropius: The Man Who Built the Bauhaus*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2019.
- McLeod, M. *Charlotte Perriand: An Art of Living*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2003.
- Mendelsohn, A. *Amerika: Bilderbuch eines Architekten*. Berlin: Rudolf Mosse Verlag, 1926.
- . *Russland, Europa, Amerika: Ein architektonischer Querschnitt*. Berlin: Rudolf Mosse Verlag, 1929.
- Merseburger, P. *Mythos Weimar: Zwischen Geist und Macht*. Munich: Pantheon, 2013.
- Müller, U. *Bauhaus Women: Art, Handcraft, Design*. Paris: Flammarion, 2009.
- Nerdinger, W. ed., *Bauhaus-Moderne in Nationalsozialismus: Zwischen Anbiederung und Verfolgung*. Munich: Prestel, 1993.



- 
- Neumann, A. ed. *Harry Graf Kessler – Henry Van de Velde: Der Briefwechsel*. Cologne: Bohlau Verlag, 2014.
- Nevgodin, I. "Das Bauhaus in UdSSR – ein russisches Roulette," in A. Strupkus, ed. *Bauhaus Global: Gesammelte Beiträge der Konferenz Bauhaus Global*. Berlin: Martin Gropius Bau/Bauhaus Dessau, 2009. 105-09.
- Nicolaus, H. and A. Obeth. *Die Stalinallee: Geschichte einer deutschen Strasse*. Berlin: Huss-Medien, 1997.
- Otto, E. and P. Rössler, eds. *Bauhaus Bodies: Gender, Sexuality, and Body Culture in Modernism's Legendary Art School*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2019.
- Oswalt, P. ed. *Hannes Meyers neue Bauhauslehre: Von Dessau bis Mexico*. Berlin: Bauwelt, 2019.
- Paul, W. "Renovation 1976," in M. K. Craig, ed, *The Dessau Bauhaus Building*. Basel: Birkhäuser, 1999. 160-73.
- Pehnt, W. *Die Architektur des Expressionismus*. Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz Verlag, 1998.
- Peters, O. ed. *Berlin Metropolis: 1918-1933*. Munich: Prestel, 2015.
- Peukert, D. J. K. *The Weimar Republic: The Crisis of Classical Modernity*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1993.
- Plumer, B. "Humans are Speeding Extinction and Altering the Natural World at an 'Unprecedented' Pace." *New York Times*, 6 May 2019.
- Rössler, P. *The Bauhaus and Public Relations: Communication in a Permanent State of Crisis*. London: Routledge, 2017.
- Saletnik, J. and R. Schuldenfrei, eds. *Bauhaus Construct: Identity, Discourse and Modernism*. London: Routledge, 2009.
- Schuldenfrei, R. *Luxury and Modernism: Architecture and the Object in Germany, 1900-1933*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018.
- Schulze, F. and E. Windhorst. *Mies van der Rohe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.
- Schwarz, F. J. *The Werkbund: Design Theory and Mass Culture Before the First World War*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Seeman, A. *Weimar: Eine Kulturgeschichte*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 2012.
- Stephan, R. ed. *Erich Mendelsohn: Dynamics and Function: Realised Visions of a Cosmopolitan Architect*. Ostfildern: IFA, 1999.
- Strum, S. *The Ideal of Total Environmental Control: Knud Lönberg-Holm Buckminster Fuller, and the SSA*. London: Routledge, 2017.
- Taut, B. *The City Crown*, M. Mindrup and U. A. Lewis, trans. and eds. London: Routledge, 2015.
- Thöner, W. and P. Müller. *Bauhaus-Tradition und DDR-Moderne. Der Architekt Richard Paulick*. Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2006.
- Tymkiw, M. *Nazi Exhibition Design and Modernism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2018.
- Ulmer Museum. *Ulm School of Design 1953-68*. Ostfildern: Hatje-Cantz Verlag, 2003.
- Wachsmann, C. *Vom Bauhaus beflügelt: Menschen und Ideen an der Hochschule für Gestaltung Ulm*. Stuttgart: Avedition, 2018.
- Wahl, V. ed. *Das Staatliche Bauhaus in Weimar: Dokumente zur Geschichte des Instituts 1919-1926*. Cologne: Böhlau, 2009.
- Welte-Wortmann, S. *Bauhaus Textiles: Women Artists and the Weaving Workshop*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1993.
- Welzbacher, C. *Erwin Redslob: Biographie eines unverbesserlichen Idealisten*. Berlin: Metthes & Seitz, 2009.

Whyte, I. B. *Bruno Taut and the Architecture of Activism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Willett, John. *Art and Politics in the Weimar Period: The New Sobriety, 1917-1933*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.

Wright, G. *The Politics of Design in French Colonial Urbanism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Zipf, C. *Professional Pursuits: Women and the American Arts and Crafts Movement*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.