

# THE THIRD BAUHAUS AND THE THIRD LANDSCAPE OF THE WÖRLITZ GARTENREICH

JEAN-FRANÇOIS LEJEUNE

University of Miami

112

"Modern buildings - Oswell Blakeston wrote in 1932 - call for modern artistic photographs to do them justice." The critic's appeal underscored the necessary condition for the diffusion of the ideology of the new architecture, for "the directness of instrumental realism was as inadequate to the acclaimed new aesthetic of modernist architecture as the blurred mists and shifting foci of pictorialism."<sup>1</sup> Among the many techniques used by the "new photography," the surprising viewpoints, the equal intensity of attention irrespective of the subject, the emphasis on material surface and abstract structure, and more importantly the exclusion of context, were the most effective in conveying the principles of the new architecture. Thus "the machine for seeing" met "the machine for living."<sup>2</sup> Along with Bertolt Brecht who outlined a more political criticism, Walter Benjamin denounced the universalizing of this uncritical formalism - his reflection was not specifically addressed to architecture - and argued with premonition against the "creative" principle in photography "which raises every tin can into the realm of the All but cannot grasp any of the human connections that it enters into."<sup>3</sup>

Repeatedly reproduced since the 1920s, the exhilarating photographs of the Bauhaus-Dessau by Lucia and László Moholy-Nagy's (to name their most famous authors) were instrumental in establishing the mythical image of the white complex rising, splendidly isolated, out of the countryside.<sup>4</sup> For generations of architects, the urban reality of Gropius's masterpiece was ideologically obscured. Its distorted representation - particularly after the 1930s, the dramatic changes brought to the building due to material failure, and its partial destruction in the allied raids - made the analysis of its context a secondary affair, unworthy of attention and scholarship. Hence it is to many visitors' surprise that the reconstructed Bauhaus appears today as a major public building, a truly monumental presence at the heart of a tree-lined residential neighborhood of the 1920-1930s.

More unexpectedly, its workshop wing faces a residential square, now named Bauhaus Platz. New research led by scholars at the Stiftung Bauhaus during the early 1990s has shown that this highly contextual relation was not the effect of chance but of very deliberate urban design decisions that, for the most part, preceded the construction of Gropius' project. Thus the celebrated "open fields" have been hiding a momentous urban history whose traces can be read on contemporary aerial photographs.<sup>5</sup>

Karl Henrici's competition entry of 1890 for the plan of extension of Dessau did not carry the first prize, but it was a foundation stone in German city planning. It was indeed the first urban plan directly inspired by Camillo Sitte *Der Städtebau nach seinen künstlerischen Grundsätzen*, published one year earlier.<sup>6</sup> Through this competition for a new district to the west of its historic center, the city was eager to recover part of the prestige that it had gained during the second half of the eighteenth century under Prince Friedrich Franz von Anhalt-Dessau (1740-1817), and that been damaged by industrialization and the expansion of the workers' districts. Henrici's project for an "elegant district" was a genuine urban proposal that included a sophisticated network of streets, squares, parks, and public buildings, all arranged according to Sitte's principles of terminated axes, controlled viewpoints, and planned irregularities.<sup>7</sup> Its gridded, picturesque, and multi-centered pattern contrasted strongly with most other entries, and among them Joseph Brix's first prize, a "beaux arts" composition focused on a large square straddling the main avenue.

No development materialized in the next 20 years and it is eventually in 1924 that Dessau city planner Theodor Overhoff laid out a definitive version of the masterplan for a middle-class neighborhood. At the center of the new district and at the intersection of the street connecting to the train station, the revised plan included the square proposed by Henrici, Brix, and other competitors. Yet, in the new socio-political context, the city was not inclined to consider the proposed church as an appropriate catalyst for construction around the square. At the outset of 1925, renewed hopes of development emerged with the end of the economic crisis; at the same time, negotiations were going on for the transfer of the Bauhaus from Weimar - what Schlemmer called "the dance of German cities around the golden Bauhaus."<sup>8</sup> In March, Dessau Mayor Hess proposed the affiliation of the Bauhaus to the State Art and Crafts School. This financial combination allowed to make a sizable offer to the Bauhaus, which was offered the site originally reserved for the church.

Analyzed in relation to this planned environment the siting and design of the building by Walter Gropius, Ernst Neufert and Carl Fieger can be interpreted as a highly contextual response to the particular conditions of the site. In the words of Harald Kessler: "[the Bauhaus building] oddly appeared like a fragment of Henrici's plan. It is not

a solitary complex in open land, but a part of a potential new center, which turned away from the old city and oriented itself toward new development."<sup>9</sup>

Gropius did not emphasize the urban context of his works. Yet this fact should not hinder us to underscore the cultural and educational background – the “collective memory” – of the architect and most of its collaborators: the Expressionist medievalism, the Werkbund, the theories of Camillo Sitte, and the Garden City.<sup>10</sup>

### **Handwerk und Kleinstadt in Weimar and Dessau**

Gropius's first experience with urban planning was in Weimar, immediately after his nomination at the head of the Bauhaus. In the manifesto of April 1919, he demanded a new cooperative living arrangement for teachers and students, coupled with opportunities for theater and music buildings. He envisioned the concept of a *Baubausiedlung* where, along the argument of Tessenow in *Handwerk und Kleinstadt*, the students would “learn how to build...learn it concretely, with the hands, executing carpentry and other types of work.” The first but unrealized project designed in 1920 by Bauhaus student Walter Determann resembled a large campus whose colorful wood houses were symmetrically organized along an axis: its beaux arts reminiscences were tempered by an expressionistic use of the ground and a Taut-inspired glass pyramid.<sup>11</sup>

It was Fred Forbat, a former student of Theodor Fischer and a member of the Bauhaus office, who was put in charge of the new project. At Am Horn, a hilly site overlooking the Park an der Ill, Forbat and Gropius planned a small village whose plan combined both the principles of standardization and a typical Sittesque design. The heart of the Siedlung, laid out for about four hundred residents, was a triangular plaza bordered on two sides by eighty students houses built in three- to five-story bars; a tower marked the entrance of the square whose third side, occupied by nineteen detached houses, opened to the landscape and the sloping terrain reserved for cultivation. A bridge-gate connected the plaza to a L-shape structure of two streets bordered with fifty-three rowhouses carefully laid out in the spirit of the garden city tradition. On the eastern edge the plan included an area dedicated to workshops that Farkas Molnár rendered as Bruno Taut's “crown of the city” over Weimar. One prototype of detached house, built by Georg Muche and financed by Adolf Sommerfeld on the basis of Forbat's sketches for the Bauhaus exhibition of 1923, was the lone reminder of this *Gesamtkunstwerk*: its plan showed a Palladian inspired U-structure around a central, barrel-vaulted square living area.<sup>12</sup>

In comparison with Am Horn, the four master houses built in Dessau on the edge of the Siedlung Hohe Lache formed a pale and urbanistically uninspired grouping – a suburban anomaly. Their luxurious and spacious setting, that was criticized by both students and young faculty at the school, formed a striking contrast with the tight and problematic domestic spaces of the Siedlung Törten (1926-28). In actuality, the interest and quality of the Törten Siedlung resided in its ingenious urban design. Noteworthy were its concentric, fan-shaped network of

streets, the pedestrian paths meandering through the blocks, the Sittesque method of setting back or pushing forward houses to mark street entrances and other spatial moments of the district; and particularly the 4-story mixed-use building of the Konsumverein, which, from a distance appeared like a modernist version of Theodor Fischer's *Volksbaus*, a type further propagated by Taut. Back from Törten, let us turn once again the corner of Bauhausplatz to discover the “reef gently lapped by a placid tide.”<sup>13</sup>

For the visitors or residents coming from the train station, its bridge-like structure marked the entrance of the new district and brought to mind the memory of the *Torbaus* or “gatehouse”, a centuries-old traditional sight of the German city, and a building type that was favored by the Garden City movement for its picturesque effects. Winfried Nerdinger has shown that Gropius had envisioned a similar concept for an administrative building planned in Berlin for the Sommerfeld group (1920). Facing a square, the U-shaped complex – to be built in wood and supported by pillars located on the sidewalks – bridged the street as a large expressionist, Frank Lloyd Wright-inspired gatehouse; typologically and urbanistically, this project was an obvious precursor of the Bauhaus.<sup>14</sup> Another plan, sketched at the Bauhaus-Büro by Carl Fieger in 1928, reveals how strongly the Bauhaus of the early Dessau period remained connected to the urban tradition: it showed a large cultural and sport complex between the Bauhaus and the train station, that recalled both Baroque planning and urban proposals by Eric Mendelsohn and Hans Poelzig.

As a result, what is most extraordinary about the Bauhaus is how urban the building is. Consider, for instance, how the short section of street created by the two parts of the building – now transformed in a small piazza – and the two entrance doors and glass-enclosed staircases facing each other seem to recall Vasari's *Uffizi* in Florence; the sophisticated use of setbacks along the streets; the bridge that offers protection from the sun and the rain; the transparent studios, illuminated at night, facing the square across the avenue; or the steep outdoors steps that provide entry to the housing wing, magnifying its height and forcing the visitor to look up. In such a context “the importance of the diagonal views of the Bauhaus” mentioned by Colin Rowe and emphasized by the “new photographers” as mentioned at the outset of this very essay, can even be construed as a final expressionist move, the ultimate demonstration of the collective memory of the *Die Gestalt der deutschen Stadt* before the advent of the “New Man” and the surrender to the Taylorist dreams of mechanization.<sup>15</sup>

### **The first and second landscapes of the Gartenreich**

The second Bauhaus, or Bauhaus-Dessau, was a multifaceted promoter of the modern industrial movement. As a result traditional historiography has erroneously associated the entry of Dessau into modernity with the arrival of the Bauhaus and its protagonists.<sup>16</sup> In fact, from the middle of the eighteenth century onward the region played a pioneering role in the construction of modern Germany, of its socio-economic structure,

education system, industry, architecture and urbanism. It is useful to remember that both the first examples of neo-classical architecture and the first “English” garden in Germany were built around Dessau in the second half of the eighteenth century: the Wörlitz Schloss (1769-1773), work of the important architect Friedrich Wilhelm von Erdmannsdorff, and the historical Gartenreich or “Garden Realm” that resulted of the comprehensive absolutist reform work led by the enlightened prince Franz von Anhalt-Dessau, right at the end of the destructive Seven-Year War. Beyond its inherent artistic vision the prince’s program included the reconstruction of the landscape damaged during the Civil War, the redevelopment of agriculture, the beginning of a program of public education, and early mills and other industrialization projects. At the heart of this spectacular effort that established the first man-made landscape of the region was a vast system of parks centered on the famous “romantic” park of Wörlitz (built in phases from 1763 to 1798 and later). The influence of this realization enthusiastically discussed by Goethe was considerable and opened the way to the seminal works of Lenné in Potsdam and Berlin during the first half of the nineteenth century.<sup>17</sup>

After a long decline the discovery of large, easy to exploit reserves of lignite spurred the renaissance of Dessau and its region. The AEG company created by Emil Rathenau was the leader of this industrial development, opening mines, building power plants, and constructing a vast and progressive networks of new workers’ settlements. In the first three decades other key figures appeared on the Dessau scene and, among the most influential, the industrialist, philosopher and statesman Walter Rathenau (1867-1922), the aviator and industry founder Hugo Junkers (1859-1935), city planners Gustav Langen and Stephan Prager, landscape architect Leberecht Migge (1881-1935), industrial architects Werner Issel and Georg Klingenberg, and the Swiss-born architect and urbanist Otto Rudolf Salvisberg (1882-1940). It is in the periphery of Wittenberg, that the latter designed one of the most accomplished garden cities of the period (1916-18).<sup>18</sup> Piesteritz’s 470 houses, town hall, school, churches, and gatehouses were designed and built by Salvisberg as a small town surrounded by a quasi-continuous row of houses and whose plan blended both medieval and Baroque features. The three interconnected squares and the entry sequence from the two main gate houses formed the most remarkable spaces of this “small town utopia.”<sup>19</sup> Built by and for the State to house workers of a wartime factory, the Siedlung was the brainchild of Walther Rathenau, son of Emil Rathenau and one of the few German industry leaders who realized that governmental direction of the nation’s economic resources would be crucial for victory in the first World War.<sup>20</sup> Walter Rathenau’s role at the head of the War Department was a spin-off — a paradoxical one in light of his anti-militarist philosophy — of his advocating, from around 1910, plans for a collective economy (*Gemeinwirtschaft*) based upon state-regulated private enterprises. His experience of ruthless capitalist competition lived in Bitterfeld led him in *Zur Kritik der Zeit* (1912), and later in *Mechanisierung des Geistes*

(1913) and *Von kommenden Dingen* (1917), to warn about unconditional belief in progress, to denounce the negative consequences of industrialization on society and culture, and to resolve that contradiction without abandoning capitalist principles. The backbone of Rathenau’s *Gemeinwirtschaft* was to be the electrification of the entire country, a theory that was to directly influence both Henry Ford’s capitalist projects and revolutionary Soviet Union.<sup>21</sup>

Piesteritz was but one of a score of *Werksiedlungen* built in the triangle Wittenberg-Bitterfeld-Dessau by Garden City associations and industry giants such as AEG, Bitterfeld Elektro-Chemie, and the film industry AGFA (Wolfen, Dessau). The most suggestive of the industrial villages was undoubtedly Zschornowitz (1919-20), built in the awesome shadow of the largest AEG powerhouse in Central Germany. Its garden city layout and “heimatschutz” square and streets were the works of Georg von Mayenburg.<sup>22</sup> Even more astonishing was the middle class Hohe Lache Siedlung located in the outskirts of the city near the Bauhaus. Created by the municipal garden city association, it appeared like the abstract encounter between urbanity and rural condition, between pure urban forms as fragments and the cultivated garden as potent symbol of the self-sufficiency goals of the workers’ housing movement. and designed by Theodor Overhoff from 1919, it was completed around 1925-26 in collaboration with Leberecht Migge for the layout of collective and private gardens.<sup>23</sup> The plan was based upon a series of urban “analogous” moments: the U-shaped entrance plaza, the Lindenplatz defined by four long buildings with arcaded ground floors, the “street of gables,” the unbuilt elliptical square, and the spectacular *Achteck*, a totally enclosed octagon with two symmetrical gates, whose “metaphysical” quality was best observed from a Junkers plane or along the “medieval” sequence of access from the street to its center.

Not surprisingly it was also in Dessau, at the heart of the Gartenreich, that Leberecht Migge associated with Leopold Fischer (a pupil of Adolf Loos and head architect of the *Dessau Anhaltische Siedlungsverband*) reinterpreted the tradition of garden design and realized his project of “Selbstversorgung-Siedlung” (self-sufficient Siedlung). The 91 double houses of Dessau-Siebigk with large subsistence gardens, built far from the city like a social *castrum* on a grid of parallel streets, were part of Migge’s vision of “German inner colonization.” In construction one year before Törten, Leopold Fisher’s Loosian but traditionally built volumes were the unfortunate victims of the exclusive modernist propaganda of the pre- and post-war eras, in other words of the “Myth Bauhaus.”<sup>24</sup>

### The Third Landscape and the Repair of Modernism

Reborn in 1985 in the former GDR and housed in the reconstructed Gropius’s building, the “third Bauhaus” is now confronted with the consequences of the modernization process spurred by Rathenau and the forced, uncontrolled industrialization of the East German post-war era. The “second” landscape is today’s traumatic product of a century of industrial exploitation and

pollution: A landscape of dead lakes, of empty minespits, of abandoned factories and machines, in the middle of surviving nature and human settlements.<sup>25</sup>

Thus which contribution can be made by the new Bauhaus, considering its world-wide repute as a standard-setting designer and as an artistic and pedagogical avant-gardist institution? In an ironic turn of history the Bauhaus has now become an avant-garde center for environmental reform and devotes most of its forces to the preservation of the cultural, industrial and residential heritage of the region. As Harald Kegler, director of the *Industriell Gartenreich* (Industrial Garden Realm program), has clearly stated:

*under these circumstances it can be looked upon as a chance to reexamine the standards of Modernism as expressed by the Bauhaus, and to formulate — if we can say this pathetically — standards of the twenty-first century by means of concrete examples. Thus the main objective for the Bauhaus could be Repair of Modernism, not as a reinstatement but as a critical renewal. The Bauhaus has since its reopening secured its position as a museum of Bauhaus history; at the same time it has established itself in the role of an international workshop for the future, combining the cultivation of heritage and research, the discussion of international trends in urban and landscape development, as well as artistic and planning experiments.<sup>26</sup>*

The huge brown-coal open cuts in the landscape of the region are certainly the most striking and visible interferences in the metabolism of nature. Here, the price in the belief in technical progress and the mechanistic ideas of controllability and curability have become obvious. At this time the existing remains, traces, abandoned machines, factories and pipelines, but also surviving inhabited Siedlungen, can be considered as starting points for a “landscape of renewal,” the “third landscape of the Gartenreich.” Since 1989 the Stiftung Bauhaus has been arguing and fighting for the preservation of “the collective memory” of the region, a difficult process in light of the psychological and ideological complexity of the reunification period and process.

The results of this collective action involving many actors in the local communities should be the foundation stone of the Expo Hannover 2000, an event to be decentralized in several areas of Germany including the triangle Dessau-Wittenberg-Bitterfeld. Among the works in progress are the renovation of the industrial sector of Bitterfeld and of the 400-meter long powerplant of 1916 as Expo location, the planting of new gardens to foster the self-restoration of the devastated landscape, the renovation and pedestrianization with private funds of the Piesteritz Siedlung now listed as “historic monument, a “New Work Center” and film museum in Wolfen where Agfa and later Orwo were major employers, etc. The most spectacular may be Ferropolis, located in the infamous Golpa-Nord open cut, approximately six miles from Wörlitz Park. The open cut closed only a couple of months after the reunification. By intervening rapidly the Bauhaus was able to interfere into the just began process

of what could be called a “euphemistic” sanitation by quick flooding for a beach, by wiping off all traces of remembrance of the mining landscape, and the vague promise of economic prosperity based on tourism. After long discussions with former miners, the concept emerged: to erect a “new town” at the edge of the open cut, a “town” to be made up of huge mining equipment that was about to be sold for scrapped metal, and at the center of which will be a “collage city” made up of five monstrous mobile excavators.<sup>27</sup>

In the words of Harald Kegler, these projects can best be considered as “acupuncture at neurologic points of the worked-out landscape. They make use of the fragments and create new physical connections across the landscape itself; moreover, in more political terms, they help establish new interpretations and forms of institutional cooperation.”<sup>28</sup> Thus the political message of the Third Bauhaus is of a very different nature. Its role might be more than ever to convince but within a climate of depression and de-industrialization that contrast with the enthusiasm of the 1920s. Two hundred years after the first Gartenreich of Prince von Anhalt-Dessau, it will hardly inaugurate a new paradisiacal landscape but a landscape of hope, of unusual beauty, “a landscape which is based upon a new understanding of work and labor, which accepts the cultural heritage of its ancestors, which carefully removes the ecological burden, and is a promise for a new society in the manner of van Anhalt.”<sup>29</sup> The School of Garden Art, scheduled to open in the Gartenreich area in the area for the year 2000, must be seen as a critical decision that sadly reflects on the absence of any landscape architecture within the curriculum of the Bauhaus-Dessau.<sup>30</sup>

Contrary to von Erdmandsdorf in the 18th century and Gropius in the 1920s the Third Bauhaus appears unwilling or unable to put forward a strong esthetic image of itself within the traditional medium of architectural representation. Exhibitions have emphasized the multifaceted heritage of the region without any esthetic or ideological prejudices. Since its reopening the Bauhaus foundation is primarily made up of urbanists, sociologist and historians; architects represent but a informal minority. As a result, absence of curiosity, deliberate ignorance or intellectual censorship have been the response of the leading architectural circles. Some have questioned whether these actions should truly define the identity of the Bauhaus at the end-of-the century?

In conclusion, if the absence of debate and scrutiny might be seen as a positive contributing factor to the Bauhaus’ action, one cannot but think that it is also highly emblematic of the dismal state of architectural criticism, theory and education of front of the challenges of the 21st century.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from Terry Smith, “Pure Modernism and Co,” *Making the Modern: Industry, Art, and Design in America* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1993), p. 402. Oswald Blakeston’s quote is in “Still Camera Today,” *Architectural Review* 71. (April 1932) p. 154.

<sup>2</sup> Terry Smith, op. cit., pp. 402-3.

- <sup>3</sup> Walter Benjamin, "A Short History of Photography," translation by Phil Patton of "Kleine Geschichte der Photographie," *Litterarische Welt*, Sept. 18, 25, and Oct. 2, 1931.
- <sup>4</sup> I am indebted to Rolf Kuhn and Harald Kegler, and their collaborators at the Stiftung Bauhaus Dessau for their help during my stays at the Bauhaus in November 1992 and May-June 1995. See also Harald Kegler, "Ort und Auftrag," *Bauhaus Dessau: Dimensionen 1925-1932* (Dessau: Bauhaus Dessau, 1993), pp. 22-31; on the reconstruction of the Bauhaus, see Ralf Koerner, *The Bauhaus Building at Dessau. Architecture-Symbol-Myth*, Master of Art Thesis, University of Miami, 1994.
- <sup>5</sup> In fact, even the recent photographs of the Bauhaus, as for instance in Dennis Sharp's book for Phaidon, have made a point to exclude any relation to context, from the outside to the inside and vice-versa.
- <sup>6</sup> George R. Collins & Christiane Crasemann Collins, *Camillo Sitte: The Birth of Modern City Planning* (New York: Rizzoli Int., 1986) and particularly chapter 8 "Sitte's impact on German City Planning." The first edition of Sitte is dated from 1889.
- <sup>7</sup> On the competition see Gehrard Fehl, "Sitte ed Henrici: il principio dell'individualità," *Camillo Sitte a i suoi interpreti* (Milano: Franco Angeli, 1992), p. 73; Karl Henrici, *Konkurrenzentwurf der nordwestlichen Stadterweiterung von Dessau* (Aachen, 1890).
- <sup>8</sup> Oskar Schlemmer, in C. Kutschke *Bauhausbauten der Dessauer Zeit* (Weimar, 1981), p. 19. Quoted by Harald Kegler, op. cit., p. 24.
- <sup>9</sup> Kegler, op. cit., p. 24. In contrast, it is fair to mention that later projects (1930) by Hilbersheimer and Fieger proposed the complete destruction of the center of Dessau.
- <sup>10</sup> On these influences on Gropius, see Julius Posener, *From Schinkel to the Bauhaus: Five Lectures on the Growth of Modern German Architecture* (New York: Wittenborg, 1972). On page 44, Posener recalls how he found, in the Berlin Senate Library, a book on the English Garden City whose first owner was Gropius (1911).
- <sup>11</sup> See the Bauhaus Manifesto and Michael Siebenbrodt, "Toward a New Working and Living Community: Plans for a Housing Development in Weimar (1920-1923)," *Social utopias of the Twenties: Bauhaus, Kibbutz and the Dream of the New Man* (Dessau: Stiftung Bauhaus Dessau, 1995), p. 47, note 2 and 4.
- <sup>12</sup> Walter Gropius, "Wohnhaus-Industrie," *Ein Versuchhaus des Bauhauses in Weimar* (München, 1925), pp. 5-14. Forbat developed a system of volumetric components that Gropius & Meyer presented in 1923 as a forerunner of "a big construction game" to build "machines for living."
- <sup>13</sup> Colin Rowe (with Robert Slutzky), "Transparency: Literal and Phenomenal," *The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa*, pp. 160-176 (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1982) pp. 160-176. First published in *Perspecta* (1962). In this essay, Rowe omits to discuss the transparency of the building in relation to its context or to its function.
- <sup>14</sup> Winfried Nerdinger, *Walter Gropius: Opera Completa* (Milano: Electa, 1988; original edition Bauhaus-Archiv and Harvard University, 1985), pp. 69-71.
- <sup>15</sup> Colin Rowe, *ibidem*. In English, *Form and Character of the German City: from Karl Gruber, Die Gestalt der deutschen Stadt: ihr Wandel aus der geistigen Ordnung der Zeiten* (München: Callwey, 1952; first published in 1937). On the influence of expressionism on Gropius, see Julius Posener, op. cit., fifth lecture.
- <sup>16</sup> On the Gartenreich, Dessau, Rathenau, etc. see Regina Bittner, Heike Brückner, Harald Kegler, et. al., *Bauhaus Dessau: Industrielles Gartenreich Dessau-Bitterfeld-Wittenberg* (Berlin-Dessau: Stiftung Bauhaus Dessau, 1996).
- <sup>17</sup> See for instance George Teyssot and Monique Mosser, *The Architecture of Western Gardens* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989), pp. 302-3.
- <sup>18</sup> Harald Kegler, *Die Piesteritzer Werksiedlung* (Dessau: Bauhaus Dessau, Werksiedlung GmbH, Stadtverwaltung Wittenberg, 1992).
- <sup>19</sup> Kegler, op. cit., p. 26.
- <sup>20</sup> Claude Lichtenstein (editor), *Otto Rudolph Salvisberg (1882-1940): Die andere Moderne* (Zürich: gta Verlag, 1985).
- <sup>21</sup> Walter Rathenau founded the AEG-sister Elektrochemischen Werke in Bitterfeld (1893). A Jew, Rathenau was murdered in 1922. On his life, see Graf Hary Kessler, *Rathenau and his life* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co, 1930).
- <sup>22</sup> Using the nearby lignite pits, the first electric power plan of Zschornewitz (1916) was put into production by AEG to supply Berlin. See Herlind Reiß, *Kraftwerk und Kolonie Zschornewitz*. (Dessau: Bauhaus-Dessau, 1995).
- <sup>23</sup> From Torsten Blume, *Die Siedlung "Hohe Lache," Dessau* (Dessau: Stiftung Bauhaus Dessau, 1994) and Theodor Overhoff, *Die Siedlung Hohe Lache bei Dessau* (Dessau, 1921) reprinted by Arbeitskreis Siedlungen im Verein Industrielles Gartenreich e. V., 1994.
- <sup>24</sup> Torsten Blume, "Gartenstädte: Reform und Industrialisierung," *Bauhaus Dessau: Industrielles Gartenreich Dessau-Bitterfeld-Wittenberg*, op. cit., pp. 116-121; and Harald Kegler, "Die Selbstversorger-Siedlung in Dessau Ziebigk," *Bauhaus Dessau: Industrielles Gartenreich*, op. cit., pp. 130-131. The Myth Bauhaus will be the theme of a "revisionist" exhibition at the Bauhaus-Dessau scheduled for 1999-2000.
- <sup>25</sup> Since 1989 the de-industrialization of the region has been rapid: most industrial companies have been shut down and the unemployment rate is very high.
- <sup>26</sup> Harald Kegler, unpublished lecture at the Bauhaus-Dessau, June 1995.
- <sup>27</sup> The excavators were listed as Historic Monuments as of 1995, a long reversal on the earlier public opinion that favored their destruction.
- <sup>28</sup> Harald Kegler, unpublished lecture at the Bauhaus-Dessau, June 1995.
- <sup>29</sup> Idem.
- <sup>30</sup> The planned creation of the school is to put in relation to the famed Potsdam School of Garden Design which propagated the principles of landscape design – and particularly of Peter J. Lenné – until the first decades of the 20th century.