

Berlin 1931: Leisure and Identity in “The City of Work”

WALLIS MILLER
University of Kentucky

When asked about their impressions of Berlin, those from the provinces and abroad alike say often enough: “Berlin - it’s incredible how they work there!” It seems to me that in our time, a city has every reason to be proud of the label “City of Work.”

— Otto Ernst Sutter, from his lecture
in the series “Berlin,” 1929¹

Berlin of the Weimar Period still faced the challenge of becoming a powerful European capital city. Even as late as 1929, it could not use the capital designation to its advantage; for other German cities, “capital” only signified Berlin’s youth — in these terms it had only existed for 58 years — and thus lacked the cultural roots that stabilized the rest of the country. In the first article of the 1929 journal *The New Berlin*, the city’s strongest proponents admitted that it had no culture of its own, if culture was defined by its traditional sponsors: “The production of [a city’s own] form, directed by the spirit of the church, the guild, and the ruling class, never existed in Berlin at the scale and level of development of other cities.” Under this narrow definition, the modern forces of business and politics “drove culture into the background”. But a definition of culture based on its task to produce form was broad enough to include Berlin. In this context, business and politics were accepted as new agents of culture, responsible for literally shaping the city, or, as many commentators put it, for giving Berlin “a face.”² “The centralization of economic [and political] power [in Berlin] is making unbridled progress and is naturally leading to a certain type of [urban] form.”³

Under the characteristic features of the imminent metropolis — the European hub of tourism — of Berlin, the lines and folds of work play a meaningful role. A role that I register as absolute activity.⁴

Moreover, it was through work and production that business and politics made their cultural impression on Berlin. One could wander, as Franz Hessel did in the 1920s, through the “temples of work,” the “churches of precision,” and the “halls of glass and concrete.”⁵

The 1931 German Building Exhibition was a public celebration of German production in the city that was most characterized by it. But its directors did not intend that its influence be confined to the business world. Through production, Berlin gained status as a cultural capital, an equally if not most important function in the German context. But, Berlin could have only wielded cultural power with public support, which the city tried to garner with the 1931 German Building Exhibition. Here, according to Tilmann Buddensieg, was the place where the “International Style” was presented to the world.⁶ Certainly, in a time of economic depression and political chaos, it was culture that could best ensure the city’s prominence in the future.

While the epithet “city of work” indicated the utmost modernity, it also reflected Berlin’s commitment to an essential part of the German value system: the work ethic.⁷ Its value was originally religious: everyone had a calling [*Beruf*] assigned by God that it was his or her duty to fulfill.⁸ Via this calling, the individual had access to God and to “the communal whole” and thus significance in the world. Certainly, modernization had transformed the notion of the calling. Specialization of tasks, intrinsic to modern work practices, had diminished the importance of the individual. Rather than carrying sole responsibility for the entire production of a given object, each worker became a link in a chain of events that led to a finished product.

In his 1922 article “Kunst, Handwerk, Technik,” [Art, Craft, Technology], Adolf Behne identified this change in the individual’s place in society with the difference between premodern and modern labor conditions. The identification of the individual with the object he or she produced was too restrictive; only the most general designations — as a “worker” [*Arbeiter*], a “clerk” [*Angestellter*], a “civil servant” [*Beamter*], a “professional” [*Berufstätiger*], or an “intellectual” [*Intellektuelle*] — would accurately place this person in the network that linked all Germans in terms of the functional contribution they made to production and, thus, to society. Germans were defined by their “deeds” and no longer by the objects they produced.

Alone, he [the modern individual] is nothing; he is open to all sides, the carrier of functions, completely pressed into a working whole. The craftsman created a whole but was himself rootless, a rolling snowball, without any relationship to a whole...Gluing together the individual and his work is an old conception of the age of craft, it is a materialistic conception of work.⁹

The exhibition cultivated the value of work to German culture as it, in turn, made claims to individual identity. The magazine insert that described and advertised the exhibition exclaimed that “Over the entry to the building exhibition, bedecked with flags, it could rightly say: Here, you will recognize yourself!”¹⁰ To further elaborate, the brochure went on to say:

The soul of our time confronts us in the overflowing presentation of the building will of our time. So is the face of the person of 1931, with all of his worries, ambitions, desires, hunger, thirst, upswings, creativity, and with the thousand stirrings of his subconsciousness, which he can’t explain in words.¹¹

This three month event covered a lot of ground both physically and conceptually. In seventy buildings linked by twelve kilometers of streets, five sections showed off German progress in planning,

building governance and sponsorship, architecture, construction, and materials procurement. Documentation of completed projects were accompanied by re-enactments of construction processes and full-scale displays of materials, structures, and buildings, both in- and outdoors. 1200 firms participated in the exhibition, which provided a further occasion for 106 meetings and congresses to take place on and around the site between the event's opening on May 9 and its closing on August 2nd.¹²

While its name suggested that it was a professional event, the intention of its organizers was different. Since 1924 German building professionals, including some architects, and the city of Berlin had been planning an event that, they hoped, would expand their appeal. As the project developed, press reports made it clear that the exhibition's major audience was to be the general public, "all of the German people."¹³ "Above all," wrote one reporter in 1926, "the building professional must thankfully recognize that his area of expertise will be generously displayed for the general public to behold."¹⁴ This was consistent with the exhibition's goal: to produce an educational event [a *Lehrschau*] rather than a trade exposition.

Such a goal was not unique to the 1931 exhibition. The 1924 exhibitions in Stuttgart, one sponsored by the city, the other by the Werkbund as a counter-exhibition called *Die Form*, were the first attempts to appeal to a wide audience but did not have the scope or the progressive exhibition technique of the 1931 Berlin exhibition, whose planning began in the same year.¹⁵ The 1927 Werkbund Exhibition (the *Weissenhof Siedlung*) had also intended to attract a non-professional audience. By the time it opened, however, it had become a venue for professionals, largely those converts to modernism, to evaluate the state of their art.¹⁶ The national context of the 1931 exhibition in Berlin and its widely-publicized goal to be an educational event distinguished it from *Weissenhof* and other such events and probably contributed to the tenacity with which the building industry, public officials, and, most of all, the architects, pursued their public audience.

During the years of the exhibition's planning, building production was thought of as the context that would display German work and German leisure. The earliest designs from a 1925 competition to transform a few scattered automobile exhibition halls into a site that could be clearly identified as exhibition grounds included a 3500-seat concert hall and an amusement park.¹⁷ While their programs seemed to have little to do with the main function of the site, these two elements were somehow important enough to the organizers' concept of an exhibition that they were only abandoned around 1930, when the depression sharply reduced the size of the project. Both the concert hall and the amusement park were placed at thresholds to the exhibition site, either between the exhibition and the city or, in another scheme, between an area permanently dedicated to a Building Exhibition and the main exhibition area itself.¹⁸ Entertainment was to frame every visitor's experience of the exhibition.

Although the plan to place a concert hall on the exhibition grounds - at the western periphery of the city center — left it far away from other cultural activities, it seemed to legitimize the exhibition as a cultural event in of itself. The amusement park probably absorbed some of this cultural reputation as well, which raised the status of what was usually seen as a lower class activity. As the host to cultural events, both high and low, the exhibition did not simply represent German life but was to be literally integrated into everyone's — or at least the Berliners — weekly schedule of activities. While, in the end, these venues were lost to the depression, the assumption that the exhibition would be a part of daily life in Berlin was not. Other entertainments realized for the event remained: a communications tower, miniature train, and "The German Village." Beginning on the pages of the daily newspapers, images from these events were the ones used to lure visitors from all parts of the political spectrum to the event. They appeared on the pages of the communist paper, *Die Rote Fahne* [*The Red Flag*], as well as on those of the more

centrist *Berliner Herold*.¹⁹ In the advertisements, mention of the exhibition came first — "Berlin's greatest exhibition since 1896" — but the list of entertainments was much more comprehensive and, given the images, seen as more attractive. It was the entertainment that would lead Germans to purchase season passes and spend their free time at a show of their own work.

As they designed the exhibition grounds, Martin Wagner and Hans Poelzig had introduced other activities which conflated display and actual experience; this only seemed to reinforce the exhibition's role as a venue for Germans to examine themselves, their activities, and their values. Besides referring to the main exhibition area as the *Ausstellungsforum*, thus letting it be characterized by public exchange, they included a congress hall, a *Volkswiese* [a public or people's lawn] a sport forum, and an art exhibition area — for amateurs — as part of their design. These areas essentially put Germans at leisure on display, whether they were engaged in a discussion during a meeting at the congress hall, enjoying a festival on the *Volkswiese*, playing a game on one of the fields in the sport forum, or showing and trying to sell works of art in the exhibition area or the adjacent cafe.

Poelzig and Wagner's overt placement of the public on stage at the exhibition was immediately controversial. Critics claimed that they had designed a forum for the masses with exhibition facilities, not an *Ausstellungsstadt* [an exhibition city or center]; the architects had taken too much attention away from the professional exhibitions for the sake of showing off the general public.²⁰ In the end, the exhibition's organizers removed most of the public spaces. In the light of budget constraints and a lack of funds, an exposition — or advertisement — of production and its objects seemed to take precedence over that of leisure and, in part, of the Germans themselves. A large restaurant at the base of the communications tower, the women's pavilion — "The Ring of Women" — that included a terrace for open-air dancing, and the various entry and connecting spaces such as "The German Village" were the only public spaces left when the exhibition opened; these all had important locations but secondary functions. By this time, members of the public were exhibited indirectly, through the products of their work, which also happened to be the sites of their leisure.

When Poelzig and Wagner first proposed their famous Congress Hall, they rendered it as a steel skeleton on the pages of *Das neue Berlin*. By making it look like part of the construction section, they succeeded in blurring the distinction between entertainment venue and exhibit or, more specifically, between leisure and work.²¹ While the Congress Hall was absent from the exhibition itself, there were other examples included in the event where work and leisure were coincident. The three sections that displayed full-scale buildings were almost entirely displays of domestic environments: the exhibition ended at a courtyard filled with Weekend-houses and the farmhouses that were a part of the "Rural Settlement" exhibit while it virtually began with the architecture section called "The Dwelling of Our Time". In the face of high unemployment, the counterpart of the workplace — the site where most leisure time was spent — framed the individual efforts of the German building industry.

These sections put personal lives on stage, or, at least, provided the stage for their anticipated performance. At "The German Village," the costumed performance was already underway. Here, a series of restaurants and workshops surrounding a space used for folk dancing linked the construction sections and the full-scale displays at the end of the exhibition. Its traditional fare reoriented visitors toward the past not the present or future. After leaving the Village, visitors entered the still-empty buildings in the open area, carrying their fresh impressions of the activities of their fellow countrymen with them. "The Dwelling of Our Time," however, remained outside of this connection to German tradition and was thus freer to bring the future within reach. Organized by Mies van der Rohe, it was composed of a variety of houses, apartments, and other dwellings, designed by members of the progressive faction of

the Werkbund, and a Materials Show, designed by Lilly Reich. According to Mies,

The Dwelling of Our Time does not yet exist. But changed living conditions demand its realization.²²

Unlike "The German Village", which was already inhabited by stereotypes, "The Dwelling of Our Time" might have only been considered as a stage for the lives of the visitors themselves, where they could have observed "the drama of the quotidian," what was otherwise hidden from public view. In this situation, as Barbara Kirschenblatt-Gimblett has observed, "one becomes increasingly exotic to oneself, as one imagines how others might view that which we consider normal."²³ This situation was not without its permanent consequences on daily life: "The challenge in such displays is to avoid performance, that is, to maintain an asymmetrical reciprocity," she said, "whereby those who are being watched go about their business as if no one were paying attention to them, though we have long known that what we observe is changed by virtue of being observed."²⁴ Much as Mies had hoped when he claimed that exhibitions were the final stage in the production process, the exhibition might have had an effect on production, but here, on the production of leisure, of life in the home.

Once the seal of the quotidian is pierced, life is experienced as if represented: the metaphors of life as a book, stage, and museum capture this effect with nuances particular to each metaphor.²⁵

This exhibition of production, which vied for a share of the public's free-time, generally provided visitors with the opportunity to become "spectators of themselves" at work and at leisure.²⁶ As a display of German work, the exhibition might have been understood as a performance of habitual behavior. At once, the building products, construction processes, and full-scale buildings could have been seen as the consequence of the workplace routine; this might have established a context for understanding the full-scale buildings — in particular — as the site of personal routine. But "The Dwelling of Our Time" had implications outside the exhibition as well: it suggested that, ultimately, the house as stage was to be imported into the landscape of the everyday. Not only in a comparison of their role as "visitors," played on the exhibition site, to their normal social roles but also in the normal roles themselves were people to experience an exchange between habitual action and observation or reflection. With a domestic context in place that gave people the opportunity to sort out action from the context that motivated it, daily life was to become a Brechtian performance.

Lilly Reich's "Materials Show" introduced the architecture section with just this kind of exchange. Here, one's functional encounter with objects was transformed into a series of sensory experiences. Rather than being viewed as a means to complete a given task, the object was the focus of attention itself. In the main part of the architecture section that followed, the materials seen previously were found within the units on display. Mies' general reflections on the dwelling, applied to this context, suggest that a physical awareness of the surroundings was accompanied by its metaphysical counterpart.

The apartment is a use item. May one ask for what? May one ask to what it relates? Obviously only to physical [*körperliches* - bodily] existence. So that all may proceed smoothly. And yet man also has spiritual needs, which can never be satisfied by merely making sure that he can get beyond his own walls.²⁷

Perhaps it was the books lining the shelves of some of the units that gave a presence to this intangible counterpart. Besides the books, personal possessions — objects that symbolized the preferences of some fictional resident — were, at best, few. The books, apparent in the photographs of many of the units, were not the symbol of the intangible cognitive world but an entry into it. While

they were arranged in an orderly fashion beside desks, on shelves, or in cabinets in some of the units, they were lying around either closed or open, looking as if they had been touched, in many others. If, for some of the units in "The Dwelling of Our Time", the book was a trace of life, it literally brought life to the image of the unit designed by Hilberseimer. Here is where one finally could find a person: a man sitting at a desk, reading. He was joined in the photographs by only one other person: another man, hat in hand, staring at the punching bag in Breuer's House for a Sportsman.²⁸

The fact that the presence of the individual was not marked by personally symbolic objects but, if by anything, then, by traces of metaphysical activity was probably responsible for the refusal of many viewers to accept these units as even possible to inhabit; they did not fulfill the needs of a real person. The absence of many — but not all — of the domestic functional spaces might have reinforced this conclusion. Most of the reviewers that criticized the section for these omissions were looking to relieve the housing shortage with designs for the *Kleinwohnung* [the small apartment], an apartment that would have been occupied by blue-collar workers or clerks [*Arbeiter* or *Angestellte*] according to existing custom. The lack of a generous kitchen space, storage space, and a workshop area made the "Dwellings of Our Time" irrelevant to any immediate attempt to provide housing for these people. The kitchens were always compact and often just a cabinet, in which any larger-scale baking, canning, or other cooking production would have been impossible. Except for cabinetry and a stair that suggested the existence of a basement (in Lilly Reich's one-story house), there was no indication that storage was a part of the program for any of the units. The common rooms that were displayed were not workshops and laundries, but libraries, cafes, and exercise rooms, spaces more generally associated with the free development of the mind and body and with the life of the modern professional class. As were the objects shown in Reich's Materials Show, the house as the site for functional activities associated with subsistence had been redefined.

Among those who did accept the units as viable were some who also felt that their appeal was class-based, that, despite their minimal appearance, they were not designed for members of the working class. Georg Kaufmann, a journalist who was preoccupied with "domestic culture" [*Wohnkultur*] said that

The dwellings completely ignore the needs of 80% of the population. In the formation of the minimal apartment, the architects have not created homes for workers and clerks, but for architects, who, at the present time, cannot afford a larger apartment.²⁹

Need, however, was not biologically based. Kaufmann defined the satisfaction of need as a fulfillment of "intellectual interests and desires":

[The intellectuals] can gladly spend a few hours between glass, steel and exact cubic cabinets. The worker, whose powers of fantasy remain completely unused in the factory, would go psychologically hungry in the same living environment. His self-defense exists in the "beautification" of the apartment by his own hand, thus opening the door to kitsch.³⁰

Kaufmann did not only hold onto a nineteenth century notion of the domestic interior because it was literally an objectification of the residents' desires. For him, the interior of the home was the direct opposite of the workplace. It was where workers could escape a day — and a life — spent engaged in a physical routine over which they had no influence. The units in "The Dwelling of Our Time", according to Kaufmann, offered nothing beyond accommodation of basic functional needs; similar to the workplace, they denied any opportunity for self-definition — real or unreal. Only those who had another way to exercise their own personality could survive there.

Like Kaufmann, Hans Nowak of *This Week* suggested that places of dwelling and work were completely opposed.

Does one want to accept the modernity of the workplace - that one cannot control — into the home? Or should the home remain a place of fantasy, where one chooses the epoch that would surround one's private life?³¹

In "The Dwelling of Our Time," however, Mies, might have been trying to redefine the oppositional relationship between the home and the workplace that was part of a nineteenth century vision of society. His design for the architecture section suggested that the dwelling was a place to reconsider the habitual activities of the everyday not escape them. Objects that symbolized personalities were not simply missing but, in this reading, would have been replaced with the residents themselves, reviewing their actions and encounters with the world as they moved through the units or read through a book.

Kaufmann justified his charge that the units excluded blue-collar workers by citing their formal resemblance to places of white-collar work. But, for those who defined social roles not only by work, as did Kaufmann, but also by leisure occupation, the forms of the houses might have been understood in a very different way. For those who believed that public education was a significant leisure-time activity during which everyone could become a thinker and, moreover an intellectual co-worker and critic of the world around them, as was common among the liberals of the time, the units' resemblance to sites of reflective work — or *Kopfarbeit* as the Germans called it — might have been quite appropriate for residents of any class. As a reporter from the *Werkbund* journal remarked,

Whoever asks for the client of these houses and sees him as the real incarnation of a type from a particular class, understands this exhibition incorrectly: the client is nothing but the new man. Mies' house signifies a pure intellectual/spiritual [geistige] goal, not only for housing but for modern built form in general.³²

As a presentation of dwelling as the mechanism for developing a new perspective on the routine activity of daily life and of work, "The Dwelling of Our Time" was compatible with the cultural atmosphere that sponsored Bertolt Brecht and his ambition to transform "the familiar into the recognized."³³ While Brecht's ambition, however political and instrumental, was not to be realized outside the walls of the theater, Mies' project moved beyond a purely cultural context and directly inserted itself into the life that was its focus. Reflection became the daily counterpart to the routine of work and domestic chores.³⁴ Now the spaces of the house, rather than the auditorium, "was the scene of action."³⁵

One might thus understand Mies' "The Dwelling of Our Time" as part of an attempt to locate German consciousness in production. The 1931 Building Exhibition in Berlin let all Germans consider who they were by watching themselves and the consequences of their actions. While Otto Bartning, the first director of the architecture section, used it to establish eternal qualities of architecture, Mies justified his work in terms of the "problems of living," which, perhaps, could be understood as having a scope that extended beyond architecture.³⁶ As Hans Nowak observed in his review of "The Dwelling of Our Time", the public had a choice as to whether or not they accepted this new building strategy. "The decision about it is much more than a question of taste; it depends on our perspective of the epoch as a whole."³⁷

The opportunity for reflection did not end as one left Hall II for the rest of the exhibition grounds where, as Kracauer excitedly pointed out, the impression is that the entire environment is an exhibition: "even the streets are for looking at, not simply for walking," he said.³⁸ But, it was "The Dwelling of Our Time" itself that might have increased the possibility for awareness and reflection beyond the exhibition's borders. Presentation, contemplation, and, potentially, criticism and change were to be necessary activities in the production of the everyday.

NOTES

- ¹ Otto Ernst Sutter, "Berlin als Fremdenstadt," lecture in the series "Berlin" Berlin, Staatliche Kunstbibliothek, 1929, published in *Das neue Berlin*, vol.1, no.5 (May 1929), p. 90.
- ² Ibid.
- ³ Martin Wagner, "Die Reichsausstellungsstadt Berlin," *Das neue Berlin*, vol.1, no.1 (January 1929), p. 7.
- ⁴ Sutter, p. 90.
- ⁵ Paul Mayer, "Spazieren in Berlin," review of Franz Hessel's book of the same name (Leipzig and Vienna: Epstein, 1930), in *Die Weltbühne*, vol.26,1, no. 3 (January 14, 1930), p. 113.
- ⁶ Tilmann Buddensieg, "Aesthetic Opposition and International Style," *Berlin 1910-1933* (New York: Cooper-Hewitt Museum, 1987), p. 29.
- ⁷ "For the people of our epoch, work - very intensive work - is the key to the essence of our time." Sutter, p. 90.
- ⁸ For a discussion of the concept of Beruf, please see: Konrad Jarausch, "The German Professions in History and Theory," in Cocks, Geoffrey and Konrad H. Jarausch, *German Professions, 1800-1950* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 9, Gordon Craig, *The Germans* (London: Penguin, 1991), p. 113. For a discussion of the significance of Beruf in the conflict between craft and technology, see Alan Colquhoun, "German Modernism," Manuscript, October 1993, p. 14-15 who refers extensively to Adolf Behne, "Kunst, Handwerk, Technik," *Die neue Rundschau*, vol.33, no.10 (October 1922), p. 1021-1037.
- ⁹ Behne, "Kunst, Handwerk, Technik," p. 1031. There was concrete evidence to support Behne's argument: he showed that the modern sublimation of the individual was not simply an ideal notion, but had been institutionalized in the labor advisory councils, founded in the early 1920s. Now workers helped to direct factory policy; consequently, an overview of the production process was their major responsibility.
- ¹⁰ Ausstellungs-, Messe- und Fremdenverkehrsamt der Stadt Berlin, *Bauausstellungs-Bild-Berichte* (illustrated insert), (Berlin: 1931), p.2.
- ¹¹ Ibid.
- ¹² A.N., "Was die Ausstellung will und was sie bedeutet," *Berliner Morgenpost* (May 10, 1931).
- ¹³ "The exhibition is directed at all of the German people, whom it wants to inform about the profess in all areas of building." "Die Dauer-Bauausstellung Berlin 1930," *Zentralblatt für das Deutsche Baugewerbe*, vol.24, no.15 (August 1, 1927), p. 202.
- ¹⁴ Bartschat, "Richtlinien für eine Bauausstellung 1930," *Deutsche Bauzeitung (Bauwirtschaft und Baurecht)*, vol.60, no.22 (November 10, 1926), p. 113.
- ¹⁵ For a description of the Stuttgart exhibitions see Johannes Cramer, and Niels Gutschow, *Bauausstellungen. Eine Architekturgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1984), p. 112-114.
- ¹⁶ "The declared intent of the undertaking, to reach and instruct the general public, remained unfulfilled. Gräff [the director of public relations] elicited an enthusiastic embrace of Weissenhof from a small segment of the press in a campaign of confirmation among the already converted. The mass audience of the lower and working classes was not touched by the architecture put on display during the summer of 1927." Richard Pommer and Christian Otto, *Weissenhof 1927 and the Modern Movement in Architecture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), p. 138.
- ¹⁷ Results of the competition, justification for selection of winners, and alternative proposals can be found in: Martin Kremmer, "Der Wettbewerb für die Ausgestaltung des Messegeländes," *Bauwelt* vol.16, no.52 (December 24, 1925), pp. 1245-1247.
- ¹⁸ "Die Deutsche Bauausstellung 1930," *Zentralblatt für das Deutsche Baugewerbe*, vol.25, no.23 (December 1, 1928), pp.

- 297-8 and "Bauausstellung Berlin 1930," *Zentralblatt der Bauverwaltung* (Ausstellungen, Verbände), vol.49, no.2 (January 9, 1929), p. 30.
- ¹⁹ Berliner Herold (May 31, 1931): 3rd section, p. 3; *Rote Fahne* (May 26, 1931).
- ²⁰ Dr. Fritz Coerper, "Berliner Ausstellungsstadt?" *Bauwirtschaft und Baurecht; Ausstellungen und Messen*, weekly supplement to the *Deutsche Bauzeitung*, no.15 (April 25, 1928), p. 57.
- ²¹ The caption for the drawing explains the appearance of the Congress Hall with the remark "Iron Skeleton for the unfinished building" in parentheses. The drawing itself, however, shows the exhibition ground in full swing with lights on the two towers - also shown as a structural skeleton - that are part of the Congress Hall complex. The skeleton seems to be an accepted part of the exhibition experience. Martin Wagner, "Die Reichsausstellungsstadt Berlin," *Das neue Berlin* vol.1, no.1 (January 1929), after 16.
- ²² Mies van der Rohe, description of "The Dwelling of Our Time", quoted in Wilhelm Lotz, "Die Halle II auf der Bauausstellung," *Die Form* vol.6, no.7 (July 15, 1931), p. 241.
- ²³ Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, "Objects of Ethnography," *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, ed. Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine, (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991), p. 410.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 409.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 410.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 409.
- ²⁷ Translation partially mine. From page 22 of Mies' notebook (possibly from 1927) in Fritz Neumeyer, *The Artless Word* (Mies Van der Rohe. *Das kunstlose Wort. Gedanken zur Baukunst*), trans. Mark Jarzombek (Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1991 (Berlin: Siedler, 1986)), p. 274.
- ²⁸ For the Hilberseimer image, see H.H., "'Die Wohnung unserer Zeit' auf der Deutschen Bauausstellung Berlin 1931," *Moderne Bauformen* vol.30, no.7 (July 1931), p. 343; for the Breuer image, see Herbert Hoffmann, "'Die Wohnung unserer Zeit' auf der Deutschen Bauausstellung Berlin 1931," *Moderne Bauformen* vol.30, no.8 (August 1931), p. 378.
- ²⁹ G.K. [Georg Kaufmann], "Die Wohnung unserer Zeit," *Wohnungswirtschaft*, vol.8, no.11/12 (June 15, 1931), p. 205.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*
- ³¹ Hans Nowak, "Was ist Neues Bauen. Zur Eröffnung der Berliner Bauausstellung," *Die Woche*, vol.33, no.19 (May 9, 1931), pp. 592-6.
- ³² Wilhelm Lotz, "Die Halle II auf der Bauausstellung," p. 247.
- ³³ Bertolt Brecht, "Thesen über die Aufgabe," in "Kritik der Einfühlung," *Schriften zum Theater, 1933-1947*, ed. Werner Hecht, (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1963 (around 1938)), vol.3, p. 30.
- ³⁴ In Mies' scheme, the private home became the site of leisure activities; in the schemes of Gropius and Le Corbusier, whose apartment towers were also on display here in model form, the size of the private home was minimized in favor of separate areas dedicated to leisure activities.
- ³⁵ C.D.Innes, *Erwin Piscator's Political Theatre. The Development of Modern German Drama*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), p. 150.
- ³⁶ Bartning's architecture section would have showed the evolution of architectural form from the past, characterized as ideal and illustrated with custom designs, to the present, a consequence of taste and mass production, to the future, which would, again, have been cast as ideal as it would have responded to individual needs rather than the artificial restrictions set by taste or production. Mies' section emphasized various lifestyles as the consequence of architectural decisions.
- ³⁷ Nowak, p. 596.
- ³⁸ Siegfried Kracauer, "Deutsche Bauausstellung. Vorläufige Bemerkungen," *Frankfurter Zeitung* (May 11, 1931, evening edition), p. 2.