

Mies, Politics, and the Bauhaus Closure

RANDALL OTT
University of Colorado

From the very moment of its inception by Walter Gropius in 1919, the Bauhaus School never enjoyed a politically stable, much less supportive, public climate. In retrospect widely celebrated as the greatest art and design school of the modern age, the Bauhaus throughout its relatively brief 14-year existence was constantly faced with ideologically based attacks and subsequent abrupt closures, as the school's peripatetic wanderings from Weimar to Dessau and finally to Berlin in search of acceptance—or at least tolerance—clearly indicate. No matter where this progressive and experimental school opened its doors, political controversy seemed to rapidly and virulently follow.

It is within the context of this climate of constant political hostility in various locales and under various regimes that we must view the harsh actions taken by the Modern architect Mies van der Rohe upon his assumption of the directorate of the Bauhaus in the summer of 1930, while the school was still located in Dessau. The fierce turmoil surrounding the Bauhaus' final years of existence under Mies—the accusations of Bolshevism, the inspections by the local Dessau authorities, the relocation to Berlin, and the school's ultimate padlocking and collapse at the hands of the Nazis—are well known aspects of Bauhaus lore. Committed to cleansing the school of any and all political taints as the only hope for its survival, and faced with not just hostility but a near riot as a reaction to his appointment in Dessau by many of the students, Mies immediately called in the local police to clear the school. He then ordered each student into his office individually and threatened immediate expulsion if the rules were not adhered to. A follow-up letter informed each student “to not stay late in the canteen in the evening, to avoid political discussions, and to take care not to make any noise in the town and to go out well dressed.”¹ Mies felt that authoritarianism, a concept quite foreign to the original Bauhaus ideal, was necessary to keep the more radical, left-leaning students under control.² Hannes Meyer, an outspoken Communist sympathizer who had been Mies's immediate predecessor as director and who had to be summarily fired by the city under intense political pressure, sadly described these changes of Mies's as a “return to the school

of instruction.” Meyer noted that: “The influence on the students over the way life was lived at the Bauhaus was wiped out.”³ As Sandra Honey has put it, “spiritually the real Bauhaus ended with Meyer's dismissal.”⁴ Under Mies, social activism of any overt sort within the school was brutally repressed. Controversial works—a painting on the subject of abortion, for instance—were removed from exhibitions before they opened.⁵ Mies's tough approach seemed to work for a while, even after the school had been forced by a cutoff of municipal funds in Dessau to relocate to Berlin as a private institution. Ultimately, though, despite all Mies's tough actions, the Gestapo trucks appeared at the door of the Bauhaus in Berlin on the morning on April 11th, 1933, for final loading. The school would never reopen.

What is much less well known about the final, Miesian years of the Bauhaus is the exact nature of the changes that Mies made in pedagogy, as opposed to the specific limitations he put on the students' political activism. What were his specific curricular steps toward creating a “school of instruction?” And what ramifications did these changes have for the pre-existing modernist program of aesthetics at the Bauhaus? In response to the political retrenchment within the increasingly conservative climate that surrounded the school, especially in its final days in Dessau and Berlin, did Mies try to foster an aesthetic retrenchment as well? Further, what did these decisions say about Mies's own reasons for taking on the controversial, difficult and thankless task of sanitizing the Bauhaus? Before confronting, though, these complicated issues surrounding Mies's pedagogical actions as director, we should review in more detail the nature and force of the political travails that afflicted the Bauhaus in Weimar and in Dessau, prior to Mies's arrival, in order to give a full context to his decisions.

No sooner had Gropius founded the school in Weimar, the small, non-industrial and inherently rather conservative capital city of Thuringia (a provisional Federal state which, interestingly enough, was to give the Nazis their first statewide electoral victory in 1930⁶), then did he have to begin defending the Bauhaus against what would become common accusations of cosmopolitanism. Vague assertions of “po-

litical activities”⁷ within the Bauhaus and—even more ominously—of the harboring of students “alien to the race”⁸ were made within the school’s first year, and Gropius was immediately forced to reply at the town council that all the school’s students were German speakers and of German origin. He went on to remark that “only 17 students are of Jewish extraction” and of these “most have been baptized.”⁹ While these early accusations were officially found to be groundless, this did little to quiet hostility toward the Bauhaus. Local craftsmen and trade groups remained highly suspicious of the Bauhaus’s aim to collaborate with industry, fearing competition for jobs.¹⁰ By 1924, state funds were slashed in half and the Bauhaus’s status in Weimar became increasingly untenable. Faculty contracts were to be renewed for only six months at a time.¹¹ The Bauhaus masters voted to close the Weimar incarnation of the school only a few months later,¹² and a series of proposals from other, more liberal cities offering to house the Bauhaus were considered, with Dessau’s ultimately being accepted. Dessau, then under Socialist party rule, seemed a more appropriate location for the Bauhaus.

While the Bauhaus seemed to find greater peace during its first few years following the relocation in 1925 to the larger and more industrially oriented city of Dessau, controversy ultimately erupted there as well. Brought to Dessau at the instigation of the Social Democratic mayor Fritz Hesse, the school was given entirely new and customized facilities built to the designs of Gropius, and the curriculum was expanded in 1927 to include a department of architecture, to be headed by Hannes Meyer.¹³ Even so, political attacks soon began again in earnest, municipal budget cuts followed,¹⁴ and Gropius, under the pressure of his own practice, decided to resign as director, claiming “that until now ninety percent of my work has been devoted to the defense of the school.”¹⁵ As a replacement Gropius proposed Meyer, an appointment that, given Meyer’s overtly Communist political leanings and the increasingly conservative climate taking hold even in Dessau, would prove to be nothing short of disastrous for the school. Meyer’s pedantic emphasis on social issues at the expense of all else not only antagonized the painters but fostered a Communist cell amongst the students. Marxist songs were sung, incidents were reported in the right-wing press, and Meyer’s days were numbered.¹⁶

After Meyer’s fiery dismissal in 1930 following a report of the contribution he had made in the Bauhaus’s name to striking Communist miners, Gropius recommended approaching Mies for the job, feeling that only someone with a reputation for staunch political neutrality could save the Bauhaus. Mies, who throughout his European career proved willing to work for any regime, however unpalatable, as long as it would lead to realized buildings, was widely viewed as politically unassociated, and had long argued both privately and publicly for the disassociation of art and politics.¹⁷ Mies seemed an inspired choice, someone who would insure that “not a political creature will be stirring.”¹⁸ Still, given the highly checkered history of recurrent hostility from the

authorities, and given Mies’s own distaste for political intrigue, it is far from clear why Mies agreed to accept the Bauhaus directorate.

Elaine Hochman, in her book *Architects of Fortune, Mies van der Rohe and the Third Reich*, has made an extensive study of this period of Mies’s career, and has discussed a number of potential reasons that may have lain behind Mies’s willingness. Philip Johnson, in a letter to Hochman, suggested that only extreme financial distress could have prompted Mies to accept this post,¹⁹ an opinion that has also been offered by others.²⁰ Hochman finds this explanation to be insufficient, and goes on to speculate at length that:

something else lay in the back of [Mies’s] mind. It was very clear by late July 1930 . . . that the Nazis were looming as an important political force in Germany. What better forum to convince them of Modernism’s apoliticism than the Bauhaus, its most prominent and politicized symbol? Eliminate politics from the Bauhaus and the centerpiece of Nazi opposition to Modernism would collapse. The Bauhaus, in this perspective, offered the key to Modernism’s—and [Mies’s] own—survival under a Nazi government. There was no way he could build in a Nazi-dominated Germany unless modernism was decisively and permanently severed from its crippling, and in Mies’s mind, irrelevant political associations. The Bauhaus would be the laboratory where Mies would prove his case.²¹

These are seductive thoughts, particularly as they present Mies in a rather flattering light—making him into a fundamentally altruistic visionary who would, for the sake of easing the potentially sorry plight of Modernism in Germany under the Nazis as much as for any personal gain, take on the unpleasant task of lifting the Bauhaus from the political gutter and sanitizing it.

We can never, obviously, know for sure what lay in Mies’s mind as he considered and then accepted the Bauhaus directorate, and Hochman’s reasonable suggestions would certainly explain part of Mies’s actions. There is no doubt that Mies dealt swiftly and harshly with all expressions of political activism when he arrived at the Bauhaus, rapidly and brutally excising the “germ cell of Bolshevism”²² fostered by Meyer. Yet the actual changes in pedagogy that he instituted upon arriving at the school suggest that at least part of his motive in assuming the directorate may have been much simpler and more personal than a desire to save the depth and breadth of Modernism in Germany. Glimpses of another more subtle and considerably less selfless agenda can be tracked in the intricacies of the school’s overall focus, project assignments and faculty actions under Mies.

Quite apart from the goal of enforcing political quietude, Mies acted with decisiveness to remake the Bauhaus in his own *aesthetic* image. His foremost goal in accepting the directorate may have been no more than a desire for influence, especially for future influence on the course of Modern architecture by teaching the students in Modernism’s most

prominent institution the specifics of his own quite personal style of composition. So much of what he did as director seems single-mindedly focused on achieving this.

Without doubt the most critical change in curriculum and pedagogy under Mies's directorate was the final transformation of the Bauhaus away from what had been fundamentally an art and basic design school towards an almost complete emphasis on architecture.²³ Though founded by the architect Gropius, the original curriculum of the Bauhaus initially contained no formal education in architecture whatsoever,²⁴ Gropius apparently feeling that directed training in architecture should wait until all the basic course work in visual design was completed.²⁵ This stance caused considerable controversy within the Bauhaus,²⁶ and Gropius's hiring of the socialist Meyer to head the newly formed architecture department in 1927 was an attempt to formally rectify that situation.²⁷

When Meyer himself took over the Bauhaus directorate after Gropius's resignation, the importance of architecture was greatly enhanced, to the frustration of many of the Masters who were teaching in art.²⁸ Meyer's dictum that "Building is a biological and not an aesthetic process" gained him few friends among the painters, and particularly alienated Klee and Kandinsky.²⁹ Nonetheless, the aesthetically oriented preliminary course continued to be offered under the same painting instructors throughout Meyer's directorate.³⁰

Upon Meyer's firing in 1930 and Mies's assumption of the directorate, the emphasis toward architecture and away from the fine arts was continued, and by the time of the move to Berlin in 1933, had become even more complete. Klee resigned soon after Mies's hiring, and Kandinsky was left with little to do, feeling that Mies was intent on curtailing the last vestiges of art education at the Bauhaus.³¹ "The dominance of architecture over the remaining workshops was made clear when, in 1930, the furniture, metal and mural painting workshops were combined into a single department for interior design."³² Further, architecture now was listed first in all course descriptions of the various departments at the Bauhaus.³³

Mies's reinforcement of architecture at the Bauhaus represented, in effect, a continuation of Meyer's curricular policies, and it is not easy to see how this continuation could be construed to represent an attempt by Mies to depoliticize the school and eradicate remnants of the Meyer era. Architecture's ascendancy could not, even if that ascendancy was instituted by the left-leaning Meyer, be curtailed by Mies without risking Mies's own ability to strongly influence the school and its students. Supporting this supposition are Mies's actions—or more appropriately, inactions—regarding the urban planner Ludwig Hilberseimer, a well known Communist sympathizer who was one of the stalwarts of the architecture department from the Meyer era. Hilberseimer was allowed to continue teaching, and in fact found his influence at the school markedly increased given the enhanced stature of architectural studies under Mies.

Surely political considerations, if paramount to Mies, would have suggested an early exit for Hilberseimer. Instead, he and Mies were to become particularly close, and Hilberseimer would even be invited to join Mies in Chicago at IIT after Mies's emigration. The reason is clear: Hilberseimer proved to be aesthetically impressionable. So absolute was Mies's aesthetic influence at the Bauhaus that Hilberseimer, though hired by Meyer, exorably moved toward Mies's positions. As Howard Dearstyne, an American student at the Bauhaus, was to remember, "Under the influence of Mies van der Rohe Hibs moderated his views—he had met his master, and he listened to his voice."³⁴ Hilberseimer's students did schemes for hundreds of housing units, each unit a fairly faithful recreation of Mies's own Lemke House design. Continuing architecture's—particularly Miesian architecture's—ascendancy at the Bauhaus was critical to Mies, and if Hilberseimer was aesthetically compliant, political leanings would take a back seat. Mies was to learn a hard lesson here, as Hilberseimer's Communism was a factor in the Nazi's final closure of the Bauhaus in Berlin.³⁵

While Mies's attitude toward architecture differed considerably from that of Meyer—Mies believing that the aesthetic was in fact the soul of architecture—nonetheless both he and Meyer were first and foremost very pedantic architects, and, unlike Gropius, wished to deeply imprint their view of architecture on others through taking a very heavy handed attitude to pedagogy in architecture at the Bauhaus. There was a crucial difference between them, though. Meyer's pedantry was based on a deep and undeniably sincere social vision of what architecture should achieve for the masses. Mies's pedantry, on the other hand, sprung from an aesthetic, not social, vision, a quite personal view of the handling of space and materials that he wished to pass on to others. This desire to see his own aesthetic embraced by his students and thus propagated into the future, not any concern about politics, seems to have driven his changes in curriculum at the Bauhaus.

We can see this most clearly in the types of projects that Mies assigned his students and the specific aesthetic of the results. According to Howard Dearstyne, Mies immediately upon arrival at the Bauhaus assigned a project for a "Court House," a walled typology whose general implications Mies had recently explored in the Barcelona Pavilion. As Dearstyne readily admits, "This problem gave us our first introduction to Mies's open planning. The houses that we did, guided by the hand of the master, were very much alike."³⁶ In fact, they were totally derivative of Mies's own recent work. The more open, less fully walled variants of this type of project done by students closely resembled Mies's Gericke House proposal of 1930.³⁷ It is clear from these examples that Mies ruled these students with a heavy hand, allowing little deviation from his own personal aesthetic in the Bauhaus's architectural studios. The range of typologies studied was much narrower than under Hannes Meyer's leadership, and the results, aesthetically-speaking, were much more uniform. Even when, indeed, something other than a house was

assigned, design clues were still taken directly from Mies. Student Eduard Ludwig's proposal for the redesign of an old department store in Dessau in 1932, for example, precisely copies Mies's earlier project of 1928 for the Adam Department store in Berlin.³⁸ The glass wall raised on stilts, the horizontal metallic strips in the curtain facade, and even the rendering technique of photomontage fastidiously follow Mies's example. With Mies as director, the Bauhaus was to uniformly propagate a Miesian formula of design.

The changes Mies made in the teaching of the architecture studios at the Bauhaus seem motivated mostly by a desire to foster this propagation, rather than arising from any desire to produce student work more politically pleasing to the conservative regimes in either Dessau or Berlin. The pitched roof, which was already being widely touted as the "German roof" by Nazi commentators,³⁹ did not appear during Mies's directorate; nor did axial symmetry, a greater sense of mass or weight, or any other indicators of a return to architectural tradition. Modernism, though solely of an exclusively Miesian brand, remained steadfastly absolute. While it is true that one could argue that Mies's use of the luxury home as a studio typology might have been less irritating to official taste than the worker's housing often encouraged by Meyer, Mies, however, did not intervene to halt these kinds of utopian, left-leaning projects when others, like Hilberseimer, did occasionally assign them. A visionary plan for a vast worker's housing estate at the Junker's Factory of 1932, for example, could only have been realized by a Socialist state.⁴⁰ Despite the politically precarious position of the Bauhaus during his directorate, aesthetic conformance to the Miesian cannon, rather than politics, seems to have been the key criterion as Mies considered actual issues in studio pedagogy.

Further support for the supposition that Mies saw his pedagogical mission as that of making the Bauhaus into his own image can be gained by considering his actions in bringing Lilly Reich, his professional collaborator and mistress, into the Bauhaus faculty in 1932. Reich, whom the students rather derogatorily referred to as "Mies's right hand 'man,'"⁴¹ was an expert in interiors who had helped Mies extensively on the Barcelona Pavilion as well as numerous other commissions. She was placed in charge of the newly consolidated components of the interior design department, and also given control of the weaving department, one of the Bauhaus's most economically successful sub-units.⁴² With these consolidations and changes, the school became effectively divided into two major components, exterior and interior architecture, the one in Mies's control and the other in the control of his closest confidant. Reich, fully steeped in Miesian ways, worked with the students not only in her departments, but in the architecture studios as well.⁴³ Reich, like Mies, had no predilection toward traditionalism in composition, and clearly her appointment did not represent an attempt on Mies's part to curry political favor with the right-wing authorities in Berlin. Again, an aesthetic commonality with Mies seems to have been the overriding concern.

The gradual and almost complete dominance of Mies's personal aesthetic sensibility upon the evolution of the teaching pedagogy at the Bauhaus became clear in even some of the remaining, more peripheral areas of the curriculum—those few areas not directly incorporated into architecture or interior design. Mies's championing of Walter Peterhans, a professional photographer and mathematician who taught photography courses at the Bauhaus, is a case in point.

Hired by Hannes Meyer in 1929 to initiate regular curricular studies in photography as a subsection of the advertising workshop, Peterhans represented a significant change from the Bauhaus's previous attitude toward teaching photography, which had been the informal precinct of the painter László Moholy-Nagy. Peterhans's appeal to Meyer was clear. One of a group of new faculty that Meyer felt could help "place design on a scientific basis,"⁴⁴ Peterhans was known as a consummate technician with an extraordinary expertise in the actual chemical processes of photography, and was known to have no inclination toward the much more aesthetically and compositionally directed work in photography that Moholy-Nagy had been encouraging in an informal way since 1925. Moholy-Nagy's attitude toward capturing accidental, arbitrary and unclear object relationships⁴⁵ had no appeal for the highly dogmatic, pragmatic, and ultimately technical stance of Meyer. When Moholy-Nagy handed in his resignation upon hearing of Meyer's appointment as director, it was for Meyer a welcome development.⁴⁶ A "scientific" attitude toward photography could now be offered under the leadership of a new teacher like Peterhans, and photography could become a legitimate course for study in the curriculum. Though the rigor and scientific basis of Peterhans's approach was not for everyone—some students complaining that the courses were "too technically mathematical, since [Peterhans] invested a great deal of interest in the chemical processes of photography,"⁴⁷—it nonetheless fully satisfied Meyer's desire to technically ground the Bauhaus's art offerings.

Under Mies's directorate, Peterhans's position was improved beyond anything Meyer had provided—sympathetic though Meyer had been to Peterhans's ideas. Photography had been merely a subsection of the advertising workshop during Meyer's directorate, and Peterhans chafed at the idea of close collaboration with Joost Schmidt, a left-leaning, socialist sculptor who ran the overall advertising workshop. Peterhans felt that photography should not just provide "tools" for typographers.⁴⁸ Peterhans labored in isolation with his students. When Mies moved the Bauhaus to Berlin, Joost was not invited to join the faculty, while Peterhans not only was brought to Berlin but found photography raised to an autonomous discipline of study equal to that of advertising.⁴⁹

It would be easy to read these particular developments in purely political terms. In that interpretation, Joost Schmidt's well-known leftist leanings made him inappropriate for the politically besieged Bauhaus staff, and so Mies left him

behind at the first opportunity,⁵⁰ while Peterhans, who had no known political affiliations, could be taken along to Berlin. But this purely political reading does not explain why Mies changed the curriculum in Berlin to make photography a full-fledged area of study. Nor does it offer any clues to explain why Mies, after the Bauhaus had closed and Mies had arrived in America in 1938 to assume the directorate at IIT, brought Peterhans to Chicago to teach, just as he had Hilberseimer.⁵¹ Peterhans would go on to have a twenty year career at IIT teaching visual training for architects.⁵² Clearly something more than political neutrality interested Mies about Peterhans.

To understand what else other than politics may have been on Mies's mind in so enhancing the position and influence of Peterhans, we must consider carefully the kind of photography that Peterhans encouraged. For Peterhans, photography was "a process of precise detailing in halftones."⁵³ Subtlety of surface, texture and light, rather than the compositional collisions of unnerving depth and form such as those encouraged by Moholy-Nagy, was Peterhans's goal.⁵⁴ Those who followed this path of absolute fidelity to detail, Peterhans wrote, "would experience a delicate nearness and certainness of the subject."⁵⁵ Rather than spatial pyrotechnics, Peterhans reveled in qualities of reflection, transparency, and shine. Glass, wood, fur, leather, various kinds of foil, and endlessly subtle variations of textile swatches—"wool, silk, chiffon, etc."⁵⁶—were the subject matter of his exacting, non-figural, and rather spare *trompe-l'oeil* compositions.

Not only was the compositional asceticism and rigidly frontal, almost depthless quality of these images quite similar to the planar, rapidly emptying, almost vacuous courtyard spaces being designed by Mies at this time, but the very choices of materials and surface effects reverberated deeply with those of Mies's own sensibility. Peterhans's photos remind one immediately of the silks, tufted leathers, differential transparencies of glass, planes of wood, and polished marble reflectances within Mies's Barcelona Pavilion and Tugendhat House, both then just recently completed. In both Peterhans's and Mies's works of this period, tonal quality, textural variation, and a sense of surface luminosity overruled any expression of spatial virtuosity. Surely this profound aesthetic commonality between their works rather than political necessities is principally responsible for the curricular changes Mies instituted in the Bauhaus's handling of photography. Again, Mies's desire to imprint his own aesthetic sensibility on the Bauhaus curriculum, not politics alone, informed his choices of whom to support on the faculty.

Throughout his time as director, Mies, while cognizant of the need for political quietude at the school, consistently placed first his desire to build a consensus for his preferential style. Even as Hitler made known his own preference for monumental classicism, even as Nazi commentators began complaining of the "swinishness" of Modernist devices and began writing articles with titles such as "Flat Roofs, Flat Heads,"⁵⁷ even as the Reichstag burned, Mies would not swerve from his own aesthetic path, nor consider that the

Bauhaus should for its own survival. Expelling Communist students should be enough to satisfy the Nazis. He was badly mistaken. When Mies visited Alfred Rosenberg, the Nazi minister of culture, to protest the final padlocking of the Berlin Bauhaus and to ask for its reopening, he was told bluntly by Rosenberg: "I don't like what the Bauhaus is doing. I know you can cantilever something, but my feeling demands a support."⁵⁸ Clearly the Bauhaus's Modernist vocabulary of form played no small part in the school's ultimate demise, communists or no.

One way to read Mies's actions, given the circumstances, is to assert that he knew his own days of building in Germany were finished before even taking on the Bauhaus task, and that he saw the teaching of his aesthetic to the Bauhaus students as his only way of preserving his spatial sensibility for future generations. His work could survive through these students, who would live to work in happier times. Again, this is a seductive reading. Yet Mies's continued attempts to curry Nazi favor even after the closing of the Bauhaus—his proposal for the Nazi Pavilion at the 1935 Brussels World Fair, for example—show that he had real hopes to build, and build grandly, for the Nazis. It seems simpler to accept that his basic nature was authoritarian and pedantic, and that he was obsessed at the Bauhaus with imprinting his own style on others. Hannes Meyer's description of this as "a school of instruction" seems near the truth.

Mies's subsequent actions as head of IIT reinforce this premise. His desire to impose an aesthetic hegemony at IIT exceeded even that of his Bauhaus days, and this occurred while he was inundated with practice opportunities. His pedagogical actions in Chicago, including that of bringing with him several personalities from Berlin whom he knew to be absolutely loyal to his views, were those of an authoritarian figure who broached little disagreement, and had an absolute commitment to the cause of his own aesthetic. The total uniformity of the work at IIT over several decades makes the uniformity of the Bauhaus work seem tame, indeed.

NOTES

¹ Quoted in Frank Whitford, *Bauhaus* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1984), p. 193.

² Whitford, p. 192.

³ Quoted in Whitford, p. 193.

⁴ Sandra Honey, "Mies van der Rohe: Architect and Teacher in Germany," *Mies van der Rohe: Architect as Educator* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1986), p. 45.

⁵ Howard Dearstyne, *Inside the Bauhaus* (New York: Rizzoli, 1986), pp. 230-1.

⁶ Elaine Hochman, *Architects of Fortune, Mies van der Rohe and the Third Reich* (New York: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1989), p. 76.

⁷ Hans M. Wingler, *The Bauhaus* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1969), p. 39.

⁸ Wingler, p. 41.

⁹ Whitford, p. 44.

¹⁰ Whitford, p. 151.

¹¹ Whitford, p. 151.

¹² Wingler, p. 93.

- ¹³ Dearstyne, p. 205.
- ¹⁴ Magdalena Droste, *Bauhaus* (Berlin: Benedikt Taschen, 1990), p. 162.
- ¹⁵ Quoted in Whitford, p. 185.
- ¹⁶ Droste, p. 199.
- ¹⁷ Hochman, p. 94.
- ¹⁸ This hope was voiced by Oscar Schlemmer, see Tut Schlemmer, *The Letters and Diary of Oscar Schlemmer* (Wesleyan University Press, 1972), p. 267.
- ¹⁹ Hochman, p. 83.
- ²⁰ For instance, by David Spaeth in his editorial remarks in Howard Dearstyne's Bauhaus recollections, see Dearstyne, p. 220.
- ²¹ Hochman, p. 83-84.
- ²² Wingler, p. 188.
- ²³ Whitford, p. 193.
- ²⁴ Whitford, p. 49. Schlemmer was to remark: "There are no architectural classes at the Bauhaus: none of the apprentices seeks to become an architect, or at least he cannot for that reason."
- ²⁵ Dearstyne, p. 197.
- ²⁶ Dearstyne, p. 198-9.
- ²⁷ Gillian Naylor, *The Bauhaus Reassessed* (New York: Dutton, 1985), p. 143.
- ²⁸ Naylor, p. 166.
- ²⁹ Quoted in Naylor, p. 171. Schlemmer was to describe the new mission of the Bauhaus thus: "The Bauhaus will reorient itself in the direction of architecture, industrial production, and the intellectual aspect of technology. The painters are tolerated as necessary evils now." Schlemmer, p. 221.
- ³⁰ Naylor, p. 167.
- ³¹ Wingler, p. 184.
- ³² Whitford, p. 193.
- ³³ Wingler, pp. 182-4.
- ³⁴ Dearstyne, p. 214.
- ³⁵ Hilberseimer's Communist sympathies were well known to the authorities, so much so that upon the ultimate closing of the school by the Nazis, the firing of Hilberseimer (along with Wassily Kandinsky) was set as one of the conditions for allowing the school to reopen, see Wingler, p. 189.
- ³⁶ Dearstyne, pp. 223-4. Dearstyne goes on to note, p. 226, that: "Mies was designing houses in those days and he set to designing houses too, one after another."
- ³⁷ See, for instance, Pius Pahl's house on a lakeshore, in Dearstyne, p. 229. Note, in particular, the use of the bullnose staircase and its position in the plan.
- ³⁸ Dearstyne, p. 231.
- ³⁹ Barbara Miller Lane, *Architecture and Politics in Germany, 1918-1945* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 135.
- ⁴⁰ Droste, pp. 216-7.
- ⁴¹ Dearstyne, p. 227.
- ⁴² Whitford, p. 193.
- ⁴³ Dearstyne, p. 227.
- ⁴⁴ Wingler, p. 164.
- ⁴⁵ Wingler, p. 480. Moholy-Nagy also had a pronounced predilection toward extreme viewpoints, often with unusual, diagonal lines and intense foreshortening.
- ⁴⁶ Naylor, pp. 166-7.
- ⁴⁷ Eckhard Neuman, *Bauhaus and Bauhaus People* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1993), p. 275.
- ⁴⁸ Droste, p. 220.
- ⁴⁹ Wingler, p. 182.
- ⁵⁰ Droste, p. 219.
- ⁵¹ Out of all Mies's Bauhaus colleagues, only Ludwig Hilberseimer and Walter Peterhans were brought to IIT.
- ⁵² Dearstyne, pp. 216-7.
- ⁵³ Droste, p. 222.
- ⁵⁴ Peterhans was to write in 1930: "We are concerned here with concrete problems of photographic technique and not with the illusory, Moholy problem of photography with distorting lenses or without perspective . . .," quoted in Frank Whitford, ed., *The Bauhaus, Masters and Students by Themselves* (New York: Overlook Press, 1992), p. 276.
- ⁵⁵ Quoted in Droste, p. 222.
- ⁵⁶ Whitford, *The Bauhaus, Masters . . .*, p. 276.
- ⁵⁷ Lane, p. 135.
- ⁵⁸ Hochman, p. 122.