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Introduction

The symposium engages with the pedagogical concept and praxis of Hannes Meyer, which he developed and subsequently pursued as a teacher and director of the Bauhaus Dessau from 1927 to 1930. Hannes Meyer significantly altered and restructured the educational programme of the Bauhaus, established by Walter Gropius and the masters he appointed (1919–1927/28). Not only did he found the architecture department at the behest of Gropius and introduce scientific studies into the design process. In the lessons, he also successfully realised construction projects with the students (the Houses with Balcony Access, the Nolden House) and industrial production projects (the Kandem lamps and Bauhaus wallpapers with the Rasch Brothers & Co.). By appointing new teachers he founded the urban planning department (Hilberseimer) and the photography workshop (Peterhans) and introduced important new scientific fields into the teaching by means of guest lectures. The three-day symposium focuses on three subject areas:

1. Pedagogical concept

Day one of the symposium presents the pedagogics of Hannes Meyer in relation to the architectural education of the 1920s in general and the Bauhaus pedagogy of the Gropius era (Gropius/Moholy-Nagy), focusing on the conceptual underlying ideas. These find their continuation and further development through Meyer’s later activities in Mexico and through the praxis of the Ulm School of Design (HfG Ulm) from 1956. A particular focus will be placed on the practical aspect of the teaching and on the question of how Hannes Meyer put his pedagogical idea into spatial practice in his buildings for educational institutions (Mümliswil, Bernau).

2. (New) teachers at the Bauhaus under director Hannes Meyer

Hannes Meyer implemented his pedagogical concept not least through his programmatic selection of staff, which was often accompanied by structural
changes. Thus, the metal, cabinet-making and wall painting workshops were merged to form the interior design workshop, a new photography workshop was established and an urban planning class introduced. A female master – Gunta Stölzl – was also appointed. Guest lecturers and numerous guest lectures enriched the curriculum and enhanced its programmatic character. Day two of the symposium introduces a selection of the teachers who were most important to the Hannes Meyer era and pinpoints their conceptual approaches, theoretical positions and design methodologies, in which the re-orientation of education at the Bauhaus is manifested introduces.

3. Bauhaus students of the Hannes Meyer era

Based on the teaching of architecture under Hannes Meyer, the focus is on tracing the effect of his pedagogy on the next generation of designers. Of relevance here is that owing to the political upheavals of the time, the students were active in a wide range of societal constellations, for instance in the Stalinist Soviet Union, in Germany under National Socialism and in the Cold War era, after the foundation of the State of Israel, in Western Europe or South America. The critical question is whether the influences of the Bauhaus under Meyer and others really had a significant co-determining effect on the positions of the Bauhaus students, and how these were appropriated, further developed and altered.
Conference program

Thursday, 15 th of March 2018

10:00
Philipp Oswalt
Welcome speech and introduction

1. Pedagogical concept

Pedagogy in context

10:30
Dara Kiese
Holistic Education in Hannes Meyer’s Bauhaus: 1927–1930 *

11:00
Anthony Fontenot
The Battle over Bauhaus Design: Hannes Meyer versus László Moholy-Nagy *

11:30
Peter Bernhard
Meyers Program of visiting lecture

12:00
Julia Witt
Architecture or art of construction? - The profile of architecture classes at the German art academies in the 1920s

12:30
Discussion (Moderation: Thomas Will)

13:30
Lunch break

Pedagogy after the bauhaus

14:30
Tatiana Efrussi
Professor Hannes Meyer at the Moscow ASI *
14:45

**Raquel Franklin**
The Institute for Planning and Urbanism: Hannes Meyer’s failed attempt at education in the Mexican milieu *

15:15

**Simone Hain**
What will become different in architectural education? Quarrel at the school in East Germany after 1945

15:45

**Gui Bonsiepe**
Convergences / Divergences – Hannes Meyer and the hfg ulm

16:15

**Discussion (Moderation: Philipp Oswalt)**

17:15

Coffee break

**Pedagogical Practices**

17:30

**Anne Stengel**
Baupraxis Teaching Building through Praxis: Planning and Construction of the Houses with Balcony Access 1929 / 1930

18:00

**Andreas Vass**
Children’s Home in Mümliswill / ADGB Trade Union School in Bernau – Pedagogics in the Architecture of Hannes Meyers

18:30

**Sibylle Hoiman**
Hannes Meyer as a teacher at the Bauhaus – the pupil’s perspective

19:00

**Discussion (Moderation: Andreas Schwarting)**
Friday, 16th of March 2018

2. (New) teachers at the Bauhaus under director Hannes Meyer

Architecture

09:30
Anna Stuhlpfarrer
Anton Brenner - Building for the subsitance level

10:00
Espen Johnsen
Inspiration, criticism and admiration. Edvard Heiberg, Bauhaus and Hannes Meyer’s re-orientation*

10:30
Werner Möller
Design for the Volkswohnung. The Bauhaus production under Hannes Meyer, 1927–1930

11:00
Friederike Zimmermann
Humans in space – The whole from a divergent point of view: Oskar Schlemmer and Hannes Meyer

11:30
Discussion (Moderation: Andreas Schwarting)

12:30
Lunch break

Workshops

13:30
Brenda Danilowitz
A New Direction: The Role of Josef Albers in the Bauhaus Workshops 1928–1930 *

14:00
Ingrid Radewaldt
A woman as master–Gunta Stölzl and the Bauhaus weaving mill
14:30
Rainer K. Wick
Walter Peterhans, his Photographic Aesthetics and his Photography Instruction at the Bauhaus

15:00
Ute Brüning
Joost Schmidt: Pictorial Statistics and advertising

15:30
Discussion (Werner Möller and Philipp Oswalt)

16:30
Coffee break

Urban Planning and Theory

17:00
Philipp Oswalt
Ludwig Hilberseimer (Urban Planning)

17:30
Gregory Grämiger
Agriculture and Settlements: The Doctrine of Konrad von Meyenburg at the Bauhaus

18:00
Martin Kipp
Labour psychologist and Labour pedagogue Johannes Riedel

18:30
Simone Hain
Karel in the eye of the volcano. Turning point 1930.

19:00
Discussion (Moderation: Thomas Will)
Saturday, 17th of March 2018

3. Bauhaus students of the Hannes Meyer era
Socialist International

09:30
Tatiana Efrussi
Bauhaus experience not applicable *

10:00
Daniel Talesnik
Tibor Weiner: From the Soviet Union to South America *

10:30
Eran Neuman
Sachlichkeit to Brutalism: Sharon Overplays Meyer in Israel *

11:00
Discussion (Moderation: Andreas Schwarting)

12:00
Lunch break

GDR

13:00
Norbert Korrek
Konrad Püschel – University of Architecture and Civil Engineering Weimar

13:30
Folke Dietzsch
Reinhold Rossig – From KPD to the Bauakademie in the GDR

14:00
Discussion (Moderation: Thomas Flierl)

15:00
Coffee break
Western Europe

15:30

**Adina Seeger**
Fritz Ertl – Master builder in Auschwitz

16:00

**Sebastian Holzhausen**
Architecture as a social act. Hans Fischli’s Children’s Village Pestalozzi in Trogen, 1946–1948

16:30

**Hanneke Oosterhof**
Lotte Stam-Beese: From Bauhaus to urban planning in Rotterdam *

17:00

Discussion (Moderation: Philipp Oswalt)

18:00

Break

Today

18:30

**Gregor Harbusch**
Ludwig Leo – a virtual pupil?

* these lectures will be held in English
VENUE

Universität Kassel
Universitätsplatz 9, Building ASL 1, Room 0106
34127 Kassel
Abstracts 1st Day

Pedagogical concept
Holistic Education in Hannes Meyer’s Bauhaus: 1927–1930

Thu., 10:30 a.m.

Vistiting Assisstant Prof. Phd. Dara Kiese

Hannes Meyer gave the Bauhaus the final push needed to leave its 19th-century Arts and Crafts roots behind, reconfiguring design education to reflect a burgeoning professionalization of the fields of industrial, interior and graphic design, as well as advertising and architecture. However, professionalization did not mean technocratic utilitarianism, as Meyer’s critics alleged. A close reading of his writing and lectures reveals that his approach at the Bauhaus was just as critical of technologically-driven architecture and design as he was of aesthetics—Gropius’ 1923 dictum to unite arts and technology. As director, Meyer changed the parameters of the discussion: How to humanize design? The answer was radical: Start with the user, not with the methods to ease production. Meyer’s focus on specific circumstances of the client—as an individual, a family, a neighborhood or a city—was based on a social and philosophical outlook grounded in the holistic impulses of the late 19th century that Meyer fused into interdisciplinary systematic analysis—Lebensphilosophie, cooperativism, Gestalt principles and empirical design research methods borrowed from the social sciences. These underpinnings permeated Meyer’s directorship on every conceptual and practical level—from establishing design teams, to general education in the humanities and social sciences, to architectural studies as dynamic and sustainable interactive design—pedagogies and practices that became commonplace decades later.

Dara Kiese (PhD) teaches at Pratt Institute and Parsons in New York and was on the curatorial team for MoMA’s Bauhaus 1919-33: Workshops for Modernity
The Battle over Bauhaus Design: Hannes Meyer versus László Moholy-Nagy

Thu., 11:00 a.m.

Prof. Phd. Anthony Fontenot

From the early 1920s to 1927, the Hungarian artist and designer László Moholy-Nagy (1895 – 1946) and the Swiss architect Hannes Meyer (1889 – 1954) shared many common interests and concerns. Both were committed socialists and sympathized with the communist cause yet neither joined the Communist Party; both firmly believed in collective action and thought that designers had a social responsibility. Before joining the Bauhaus, like many of his Hungarian colleagues, Moholy-Nagy placed much emphasis on collective work, as did Meyer. They were adherents to Soviet Constructivism and in the early 1920s both were acutely interested in theater, photography, and technology. They were inspired by the biocentric theories of the Austro-Hungarian botanist Raoul Francé (1874-1943) and have both been regarded by historians as participants in “Biocentric Constructivism.” In addition, they were impressed with the philosophical work of the Logical Positivism of the Vienna Circle. In contrast to these key similarities, after 1928 several striking differences emerged in their philosophical outlook. Their views on design became so oppositional that it caused Moholy-Nagy to resign from the Bauhaus in protest of Meyer’s approach. What was ultimately at stake was two radically different approaches to design: one associated with an extreme “functionalism” that looked to science for its basis and the other as an integrative design approach that sought a balance between art, science, and technology. These two protagonists represented the most extreme clash in the ultimate struggle over Bauhaus design.

Anthony Fontenot is an architectural historian and Professor at Woodbury University School of Architecture in Los Angeles. He holds a Ph.D. in the history and theory of architecture from Princeton University. He is the author of New Orleans Under Reconstruction: The Crisis of Planning (Verso, 2014), Non-Design and the Non-Planned City (University of Chicago Press, 2018), and Gregory Ain: Low-Cost Modern Housing and the Construction of a Social Landscape (UR Books, 2018).
Meyer’s Program of Guest Lectures

Thu., 11:30 a.m.

Prof. Dr. Peter Bernhard

Meyer’s intention to make the Bauhaus curriculum more scientific is displayed nowhere as clearly as in his program of guest lectures. Not only were the largest number of guest lectures given under his directorship – ca. 100, in comparison with ca. 70 under Gropius and ca. 60 under Mies van der Rohe – Meyer was also the first to integrate the lecture program systematically in the curriculum. Where the first Dessau Plan (Gropius) of 1925 had, in the category “supplementary subject areas”, only the 1919 Bauhaus program’s almost identical passage “lectures from areas of science and art”, under Meyer these two areas were divided into a total of 18 subject areas, so that art contains (1) philosophy, (2) psychology, (3) film and theater, (4) music, (5) painting and sculpture, (6) art history, and (7) literature, while science includes (1) advertising theory, (2) hygiene, (3) anatomy, (4) room acoustics, (5) color theory, (6) lighting technology, (7) physics and chemistry, (8) science of management, (9) psychotechnics, (10) biology, and (11) sociology. The people Meyer invited to speak on the individual subjects exhibit a network, on the one hand, and provide information about his understanding of science, on the other. The lecture provides an overview of this ambitious program.

Studied in Frankfurt am Main, doctorate and habilitation in Philosophy in Erlangen, currently Research Associate at the Bauhaus Dessau Foundation; research emphases: history of the ideas of the artistic avant-garde, history of logic and science; numerous publications on these subjects; most recently Bauhausvorträge. Gastredner am Weimarer Bauhaus 1919–1925 (Bauhaus lectures: guest lectures at the Weimar Bauhaus, Gebr. Mann 2017).
Architecture or Construction Art? On the Profile of Architecture Classes at German Art Academies in the 1920s

Thu., 12:00 p.m.

M.A., Dipl.-Museol. (FH) Julia Witt

In the time of the Weimar Republic, there were a number of ways of becoming a professional architect. A common path was to complete a course of study in Architecture at a technical college. But the foundation could also be a trade apprenticeship in a construction profession, followed by attending a building trades school or a school of arts and crafts. Someone who took the latter path could subsequently continue his education at an art academy. Five art academies in the German Empire offered instruction in Architecture. Since there were no state-mandated curricula for art academies, their architecture instructors worked as they saw fit and thereby gave their instruction a personal stamp. Accordingly different were the profiles of the individual Architecture classes. This lecture will shine a spotlight on some individual teacher personalities and their teaching concepts, thereby providing a glimpse of architecture instruction at German art academies.

For several years after Hannes Meyer’s arrival in the USSR, teaching remained one of his many activities. However, it could be hardly comparable to his experience at the Bauhaus Dessau. The Moscow institute of architecture and construction (ASI, 1930-1933) had quite a special aim of a rapid education of a huge mass of “proletarian engineer-architects”. The political and economical agenda of a period called “Stalin’s revolution” demanded an army of architects of proletarian origin, perfectly trained in political science of Marxism-Leninism (it occupied 30% of the curriculum), narrow experts in one of four fields (industrial architecture, agroindustrial, town planning, housing and public buildings). The revolutionary ambitions of the school could not but fascinate Meyer:

“alles, was im Bauhaus verpönt war, wird hier zum pflicht”, he admitted in a 1931 letter to a “bauhaeuslerin” Lisbeth Österreicher. On the other hand its mindless and pragmatic functionalism as well as formal bureaucratic atmosphere made him suggest improvements that do remind the Dessau principles.
Hannes Meyer’s chances to succeed in the different initiatives he undertook throughout his life were unavoidably linked to the political circumstances that surrounded him, as well as to his own Weltanschauung. The fate of the Institute for Planning and Urbanism he founded in Mexico in 1939 was not an exception.

Established as part of the Superior School of Engineering and Architecture in the newly founded Polytechnic Institute, Meyer’s program attempted at training professionals according to the educational principles he had held since his Bauhaus times: to work as close as possible to real projects and collective work in brigades. However, he encountered immediate opposition from within the institute to his ideas regarding the functioning of the Institute and his political orientation as a Stalinist, and even his capacity as a foreigner to teach without any knowledge of the language was questioned. Intrigues, bureaucracy, perceived or real xenophobia, inefficiency, and a deep change in policy, especially in the field of education, prevented the Institute from succeeding. Just after a year of operation, it was closed under direct orders from President Ávila Camacho.
What will become different in architectural education?
Quarrel at the school in East Germany after 1945

Thu., 3:15 p.m.

Prof. Dr. Simone Hain

The departure into a „new building for a completely new life“ in the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany and later the GDR was determined by the fundamental question of university policy, who may call themselves an architect qualified by the state in the future, and what competences they would need to gain for the new society.

This turning point in the matrix of the modern movement is, under the leadership of Gerhard Strauss, highly reflected and discussed. Mart Stam, who was first appointed to Dresden and later to the Weissensee Art School in Berlin, was able to engrave the development most sustainably with his specific reception of the Bauhaus pedagogy of the Meyer era.

The profile of the schools he lead is based on a decidedly practice-related, politically activistic and theoretically widely contextualised architectural concept, close to the Frankfurt School, which is just as virulent as during the Dresden period, an anthropologically colored image of man. This contribution analyses Stams university pedagogy in Dresden and his vehement Industry Research.

In Berlin he got the bauhausian Selman Selmanagić as head of the Building Department. The Bosnian developed an own curriculum over the years concerning the question how the Bauhaus masters taught architecture, which at the end surprised himself, because of its universalistic range of subjects. One can assume with his biographer Aida Abadžić Hodžić that Selmanagić is the prototype of the Meyer era Bauhaus student.

Without having become a Bauhausian as a forerunner of the Meyer era, the highly professionally trained joiner Selmanagić on the one hand has taken up the essence of the Meyerian paradigm of „people´s needs“ in the furniture workshop, but on the other hand implemented, above all, the continuation of the essence of empirical social science contextual planning method of the Hilberseimer group for the Dessau Junckers settlement.

In analytic deepening, no other student proves to be so completely „impregnated“ with the Teige theory of poetology for all senses on the one hand,
and on the other side with that transcendal-philosophical program which his friend Hubert Hoffmann in an article in „Neues Deutschland“ in 1947 should call “the second face“. That search for the metaphysical meaning of things. This is Teige at both times, exactly at the phenomenological turning point of its theory formation from elementary empirical analysis of the elements of new design to the urgent philosophical and existential „questions of meaning of modern design“. 

Architectural and Planning Historian, Publicist, Curator and University Professor in Berlin, Hamburg, Weimar and Graz; Founder of the scientific collections about the Building History of the GDR at the IRS in Erkner. She examines historical forms of movement in the modern era since the end of the 18th century and reconstructs the case-related “imaginary orders” which motivated architects to take alternative intervening actions as social ideologists while designing the built environment at different times. It focuses on the planned action and reproductive editing of the landscape conditions of modern societies, mirrored in the disciplinary self-image of the architect. Special interest lies in societies that assumes a universal planetary settlement without an organization formed by private property and rejects the personal possession of land as well as the possession of humans or elementary natural resources.
The discussion about the influence of Hannes Meyer on the HfG Ulm started due to an article by Tomás Maldonado published 1963 in the Journal of the HfG Ulm. Between Hannes Meyers pedagogical concept characterized by inserting scientific disciplines in the syllabus and the programmatic ideas of Tomás Maldonado existed affinities. Maldonado on his side made a cut with the Bauhaus terminology in the midst of 1957. The structure of the Bauhaus is compared with the structure of the HfG Ulm and the different functions of the workshops are explained. Likewise are shown the conflicts that arose both at the Bauhaus (1929) and at the HfG (1962) when students of the first year or basic course protested at the Bauhaus against formal exercises separated from practical issues, and against the methodology fetishism prevailing during a certain period at the HfG Ulm. Parallels are shown concerning the political resistances and attacks directed against the Bauhaus during its three phases of existence, and the HfG Ulm. Concerning the political dimension the antifascism of Hannes Meyer coincided with the attitude of the HfG Ulm taking into account that for understanding the history of this outsider institution the context of the Cold War has to be kept in mind.

Gui Bonsiepe, Studied at the HfG Ulm (information design). Teaching and professional activity at the HfG Ulm until the closure of the HfG. Since 1968 design and consultancy activities in the area of industrialization policy in Latin America. 1987-1989 Interface designer in a software house in Berkeley. 1993 - 2103 professor for interface design at the University of Applied Sciences Köln. Published books on design theory, new media, design education and the role of design in peripheral countries. He is living as independent researcher in Argentina and Brazil. Blog: www.guibonsiepe.com
Building practice as a lesson: Planning and construction of the “Laubenganghäuser” 1929/30

Thu., 5:30 p.m.

Mag. Kunstg., M.Sc. Anne Stengel

The curriculum at Bauhaus Dessau was gradually restructured and given new thematic priority during the time of Hannes Meyer. This lecture focuses on the practice oriented education at Bauhaus Dessau under Hannes Meyer and deals with the question of how construction projects were realized as a part of the curriculum at Bauhaus under Meyer. Three realized projects will be emphasized in the lecture: The “Laubenganghäuser” in Dessau-Törten, “Haus Nolden” in Mayen/Eifel and the federal school of the german trade unions “ADGB” in Bernau near Berlin. These examples shall illustrate how the Bauhaus students during the time of Hannes Meyer, were integrated in the realization of projects and the building process. Furthermore there will be an analysis of how the different workshops at Bauhaus would interact with each other.

Anne Stengel, Magistra Artium Art History, Msc Building and Conservation, 1999-2005 studies in art history, recent and contemporary history and sociology, HU Berlin; 2008-2012 studies in building and conservation alongside professional commitments, BTU Cottbus. Since 2005 occupation in several architecture offices and restoration studios with a focus on historical preservation. Since 2016 research assistant and doctoral student at the chair of Univ.-Prof. Dipl.-Ing. Philipp Oswalt, University of Kassel. University field of architectural theory and design.
Pedagogical concept

Children’s Home in Mümliswil / ADGB Trade Union School in Bernau – Pedagogics in the Architecture of Hannes Meyers

Thu., 6:00 p.m.

Mag. Arch. Andreas Vass

That Hannes Meyer’s most important realized projects are underpinned with pedagogical goals is already impossible to overlook in his detailed construction descriptions and has been frequently emphasized. Meyer’s writings on Freidorf near Basel, the ADGB school in Bernau near Berlin, and especially his “last realized construction”, the children’s home in Mümliswil are based on the social organization of the collective that developed the respective project. But this functionalistically composed program first becomes architectonically effective in that this organization is not understood simply as a given that the architecture must respond to; rather, it is seen as an educational goal toward whose realization architecture can make an important contribution through its aesthetic appeal. This lecture pursues the questions of the pedagogical approaches Meyer thereby takes and how he uses architecture to bring them to expression.

Architect in Vienna. Since 1988 professional partnership with Erich Hubmann (Hubmann • Vass, Architekten ZT) focusing on conversion, urban space, and landscape. Research activity and publications in the field of pioneers of Modernism, monument preservation, and landscape theory. Senior Lecturer at the Academy of Fine Arts, Vienna. Lecturing and teaching at several European and non-European universities, including visiting professorships at the University of Ferrara, the Technical University Graz, and the Federal Polytechnic School (EPF) at Lausanne. Founding member of the International Architecture Union and board member of the Austrian Society for Architecture since 2006.
Hannes Meyer as a teacher at the Bauhaus – the pupil’s perspective

Thu., 6:30 p.m.

Dr. Sybille Hoiman

A man with a plan to improve the world, or a wolf in sheep’s clothing?

Hannes Meyer as a teacher at the Bauhaus from the perspective of the students.

How was Hannes Meyer perceived as a teacher and as Director of the Bauhaus in Dessau? This lecture attempts to critically juxtapose the statements of students of that time, other persons close to the Bauhaus, and retrospective documents.

The following themes are thereby examined: to what degree was the perception of Meyer’s teaching practice influenced in comparison with or in demarcation from his predecessor Walter Gropius? In what way was the question whether Meyer was a communist relevant in the students’ assessment of him as a teacher? In the students’ view, how did the change in the curriculum affect the learning process?

The fragmentary state of the sources permits no more than an approach to answering these questions, but provides the occasion to sketch a methodological prospect.

Art historian; since Nov. 2010, Research Assistant at the Bauhaus Archive/Museum for Design, Berlin; earlier career stages include the ETH Zurich, the German Forum for Art History in Paris, the Berlin-Brandenburg Prussian Palaces and Gardens, and the Technical University Braunschweig; research and publications on the history and theory of garden art and architecture in the 18th to 20th centuries and on the history of the Bauhaus.
Abstracts 2nd Day

(New) teachers at the Bauhaus under director Hannes Meyer
Anton Brenner - Building for the subsitance level

Fr., 9:30 a.m.

Mag. Dr. Anna Stuhlpfarrer

This lecture addresses the residential building projects of the Viennese architect Anton Brenner (1896–1957) with an emphasis on his early public housing for “Red Vienna” and an exploration of the gallery-access construction type, in which Brenner saw the respective advantages of many-storey buildings and one-storey housing developments best combined to create affordable, high-quality housing for the lowest-income stratum of the population in times of the greatest housing shortage. In the middle of the 1920s, Ernst May appointed Anton Brenner, along with Franz Schuster and Margarete Schütte-Lihotzky, to Frankfurt’s Construction Office. In 1929, he accepted an invitation from Hannes Meyer to be a Guest Lecturer at the Bauhaus Dessau. Decisive for Brenner’s appointment was his international recognition as a specialist in the construction of small and very small apartments, which he had gained not least with his gallery-access buildings in the Praunheim Settlement in Frankfurt and in Berlin’s Steglitz district.

Anna Stuhlpfarrer, art and architecture historian, works as a researcher, freelance curator, author, and teacher in the fields of 20th-century art and architecture and of contemporary photography. She has carried out research projects on dealings with Vienna’s imperial legacy in the years of Austrofascism and National Socialism, has developed and organized art projects, and has curated numerous exhibitions (including on the oeuvre of Oskar Kokoschka).
Inspiration, criticism and admiration. Edvard Heiberg, Bauhaus and Hannes Meyer’s re-orientation

Fr., 10:00 a.m.

Prof. Espen Johnsen

The paper presents and discusses the relationship of Danish-Norwegian architect Edvard Heiberg to the Bauhaus and Hannes Meyer (1923–30). Heiberg holds a special position regarding modernism’s breakthrough in Scandinavia, however, more as a writer and theorist than as an architect. In 1923 he introduced Le Corbusier’s work to Scandinavian architects, visited the Bauhaus exhibition and designed his Own house (1923–24) with references to Maison Citrohan and Haus am Horn.

In 1926–28 Heiberg became more engaged in the social role of architecture. When Hannes Meyer lectured in Copenhagen in 1927, he was met with criticism in a meeting with the editorial board of Kritisk Revy. Did this meeting contribute, as Heiberg has written, to Meyer becoming more engaged in seeing architecture as a social phenomenon? When Meyer in 1928 was appointed director, Heiberg visited the Bauhaus and the two now seemed to be ideologically closer, both focusing on functional analysis, rationality and a critical attitude towards art. From May 1930, Heiberg was employed as «Meister für Architektur». The paper will discuss Heiberg’s reflections on Meyer’s teaching methods and the collaboration between professors and students. It will also address Heiberg’s involvement in Meyer’s projects at the Bauhaus, including the furniture designed for the Bundesschule des ADGB and the townhouses in Dessau Törten. In reverse, it will discuss Meyer’s possible impact on contemporary architecture in Denmark and Heiberg’s projects.

Espen Johnsen is Professor in history of architecture and design at the department of Art History at the University of Oslo. His fields of research are Scandinavian and Norwegian modernism and avant-garde, as well as the architecture of the welfare state and contemporary design. He directed the research project Brytninger. Norsk arkitektur 1945–65 (2008–2011). Forthcoming publications: Erling Viksjø (Pax 2018), PAGON: Scandinavian Avant-Garde (Bloomsbury 2019).
Design for the Volkswohnung. The Bauhaus production under Hannes Meyer, 1927–1930
Fr., 10:30 a.m.

Dr. Werner Möller

This presentation is divided into four chapters. As an Introduction to the topic, the first chapter underscores the differences and similarities between the workshop models of Walter Gropius and Hannes Meyer at the Bauhaus in Dessau. The workshops were not only the central sites of instruction and production at the Bauhaus; as reflected in their products, they were also the yardstick of continuity and change in the idea of the Bauhaus under its first two directors.

The second chapter, Context and Method, uses examples of the Bauhaus’ production under the directorship of Hannes Meyer to show how the Dessau College for Design’s design methodology and planning reflected societal and contemporary historical contexts. The following chapter, Production and Test in Practice, investigates the question of the innovative and ideal content of the products of the Bauhaus for the “People’s Home”, on the one hand. On the other, as the result of an empirical examination by the Bauhaus Dessau Foundation in cooperation with the Apprentices Workshop of the German Workshops Hellerau, it asks about the relevance of these products for the present day.

The Conclusion sets the above in connection with Hannes Meyer himself and his own process of seeking a “New World” at the Bauhaus.

Werner Möller has been a Research Associate at the Bauhaus Dessau Foundation since 1991. His research interests are in Concept, Concrete, and Constructive Art, as well as Modernist Architecture and Design Theory. His work emphases are at the interfaces of scientific, design, and curatorial practice. In 2015, he co-curated and designed the exhibition “the coop principle – Hannes Meyer and the idea of a collective designing” at the Bauhaus Dessau. In 2016, he and partners in Rotterdam developed the exhibition project “Simultaneity of Modernism – the Van Nelle Factory in Rotterdam and the Bauhaus in Dessau”.
Humans in space – The whole from a divergent point of view: Oskar Schlemmer and Hannes Meyer

Fr., 11:00 a.m.

Dr. Friederike Zimmermann

When Oskar Schlemmer first met the architect Hannes Meyer from Basel at the ceremonial Bauhaus reopening in Dessau in December 1926, he was most pleased by the “definiteness of his views”. Meyer had obviously made an impression even on “the principal Bauhaus people”, despite expressing rather critical views about the prevailing Bauhaus maxims. People certainly sensed the new impetus the new master of the previously missing architecture department was going to add to the Bauhaus – a drawback no one had felt more intensely than Oskar Schlemmer, who was the Bauhaus master to have given most consideration to the Bauhaus objectives.

For the first few months, Meyer was staying with Schlemmer, who described this phase as his “most pleasurable time at the Bauhaus”. The two friends cultivated a lively intellectual exchange. They both pursued concepts of wholeness that saw man at the centre of everything, a fact that provided for a deep mutual sympathy at first. In April 1928, when Meyer succeeded Gropius, Schlemmer could still see some positive aspects despite all the criticism, for example the reorganisation of the curriculum, which had put him down not only for the stage workshop, but also for the comprehensive “Course: the human being”.

With great commitment, he worked on all topics in some way related with “the human being as a whole”: philosophy, anatomy, psychology…; hence, areas Schlemmer had not or hardly addressed so far, which had long been an integral part of Meyer’s architectural concepts, though. And yet, their concepts could not have been more different.

The lecture “Man in Space – Wholeness from a Divergent Point of View: Oskar Schlemmer and Hannes Meyer” examines both the initial alleged consensus and the fundamental differences in the doctrines of Oskar Schlemmer and Hannes Meyer. The latter not only stand for the division between the two Bauhaus masters but can also be considered as symptomatic of the complete rift between Meyer, the Bauhaus and the public, which has only recently started to challenge this relationship.
Dr. Friederike Zimmermann (born in 1963), a graduated Germanist and art historian, is a freelance journalist, PR consultant and exhibition curator living in Merzhausen near Freiburg/Breisgau. Since 2009, she has been self-employed under her own “Kunst & Kommunikation” label. Since 2014, she has been first chairwoman and (concert) promoter for the artisse e.V. cultural association at Forum Merzhausen. Her book „Mensch und Kunstfigur: Oskar Schlemmers intermediale Programmatik“ was published by the Rombach Verlag publishing house in Freiburg in 2007 (second edition in 2014).
A New Direction: The Role of Josef Albers in the Bauhaus Workshops 1928–1930

Fr., 1:30 p.m.

Brenda Danilowitz

In 1920 Josef Albers had arrived at the Bauhaus in Weimar determined to become an artist in glass. Three years later he became the reluctant instructor of the Vorkurs – which remained the focus of his teaching until the Bauhaus closed in 1933. My paper will investigate the continuity and/or change in Albers’s Vorkurs after Hannes Meyer became director, and how Albers managed the leadership of the furniture and wall paper workshops while continuing his own work in glass and especially his commissions for extensive architectural glass installations in Berlin and Leipzig. I will discuss the roots of Albers’s underlying philosophy of education and suggest how this allowed him to negotiate the political climate at the Bauhaus of the period. I will also discuss Anni Albers’s important wallcovering installed as a soundproofing material on the walls of the auditorium of Meyer’s ADGB Building. Albers was awarded her Bauhaus Diploma for this work and it was published along with a detailed presentation of the building in 1931.

Brenda Danilowitz, is chief curator at the Josef and Anni Albers Foundation. She received her MA in Art History from the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, where she taught art history before relocating to the US. She has taught at Yale University, and the Universities of Hartford and Connecticut and is the author and editor of numerous books and essays on the work of Josef and Anni Albers. She has organized exhibitions of their work in the US, Europe, New Zealand, Mexico, and Latin America.
A woman as master – Gunta Stölzl and the Bauhaus weaving mill

Fr., 2:00 p.m.

Prof. em. Ingrid Radewaldt

“That we speak of Bauhaus textiles is thanks to her” we read in the Bauhaus magazine in 1931 on the occasion of the farewell of Gunta Stölzl, who had headed the weaving workshop for many years.

For almost 13 years, she was a member of the Bauhaus, initially as a student and journeywoman in Weimar, then as a master in Dessau. She designed and wove a wealth of impressive room textiles and developed innovative textiles for the modern interior that could also be industrially manufactured.

Her work in Dessau under Hannes Meyer increasingly focused on functional fabrics. Gunta Stölzl established a new course of studies leading to a journeyman examination and to a Bauhaus diploma. She was one of the first of a new generation of women who took on leading positions at institutions of higher education.

Not only through creativity, but also through diligence and tenacity, Gunta Stölzl and her students were able to turn out high-quality products that enjoyed broad recognition. The collective work in her workshop was long characterized by great solidarity, until the influence of the National Socialists on the Bauhaus forced her to resign.

All her life, including after her emigration to Switzerland in 1931, she remained a strong-willed, creative personality. In diverse products from her hand-weaving workshop in Zurich, she continued the work of the Bauhaus in a contemporary form.

Ingrid Radewaldt studied Art History in Hamburg. (Dissertation Theme: Bauhaus Textiles 1919-1933). She got her degree in Hamburg in 1986. Until 2005 she has been Professor at the Technical College Hamburg, Design Department. Before (1997/98) she was Curator of an exhibition at the Bauhaus Dessau on the theme: Gunta Stölzl. Master at the Bauhaus Dessau. She made an elaboration of an extensive catalog. Additional stations of the exhibition were in Chemnitz and Hamburg.

2009 Six portraits of Bauhaus weavers, including Gunta Stölzl, published in: Ulrike Müller, Bauhausfrauen (Bauhaus women), Munich 2009

2016 Wrote the biography: Gunta Stölzl – Pionierin der Bauhausweberei (pioneer of Bauhaus weaving).
Walter Peterhans, his Photographic Aesthetics and his Photography Instruction at the Bauhaus

Sa., 2:30 p.m.

Prof. i.R. Dr. Rainer K. Wick

In the context of the readjustment of the Bauhaus curriculum under Hannes Meyer, the 1929 appointment of Walter Peterhans as Instructor for Photography played a crucial role. From the beginning, Gropius had used photography to document the school’s achievements and convey them in the media (including with Lucia Moholy and Erich Consemüller); and with László Moholy-Nagy, the Bauhaus had one of the central protagonists of the New Seeing movement in photography. But the professional photographer Peterhans was the first to give photography its systematic place in the Bauhaus curriculum. It was placed in the context of the advertising workshop, which meant that the point was not instructing the students in free artistic, much less experimental photographic practice, but – in accordance with Hannes Meyer’s program – professionalizing them in applied fields like the photography of products and objects. The goal of the lecture is to sketch Peterhans’ own photographic oeuvre, which was related to the New Objectivity movement, but was sometimes also reminiscent of Surrealism, and to present his photography instruction at the Bauhaus, based on selected works by his pupils.
Joost Schmidt: Advertising and Pictorial Statistics

Fr., 3:00 p.m.

Ute Brüning

Having worked at the Bauhaus for 9 years, Joost Schmidt has many skills at his command, and occupies a broad teaching field under Hannes Meyer’s directorship. With Herbert Bayer leaving the Bauhaus Schmidt inherits the advertising department, and the printing workshop in addition to the plastic departement he already directed. He keeps leading the lettering courses, but teaches sometimes further graphic courses. In a different way from Herbert Bayer, Schmidts advertising workshop does not contribute to the Bauhaus Corporate Identity, but creates standardized and systematized forms for teaching and public use, what doesn’t catch anyone’s eyes. Among them all of a sudden “The Vienna Method of Pictorial Statistics” appears in an elaborated form, and up-to-date to the works of the Vienna Gesellschafts- und Wirtschaftsmuseum. As soon as it had turned up, it disappeared from the Bauhaus.

Meyer’s reorganization of the Bauhaus work seems to have created conditions, which triggered a rather thorough examination of the visual education method developed and used by the economist and philosopher Otto Neurath from the “Wiener Kreis”. But how does Neurath’s pictorial education fit in Joost Schmidt’s Bauhaus education at the advertising departement in particular as social and political aims à la Neurath are being missing?

Ute Brüning, born in 1944. Ute Brüning was originally an art teacher. She later studied Art History, Social and Economic History, and Dutch Philology in Marburg. She works on topics from the beginnings of graphic design and, since 2002, also as a freelance web designer and online editor and writer in Berlin.
Ludwig Hilberseimer (Urban Planning)

Fr., 5:00 p.m.

Prof. Philipp Oswalt

Ludwig Hilberseimer was hired by Hannes Meyer in 1929 and stayed until the closure of the Bauhaus in 1933. The talk wants to address three questions: (a) why was Meyer choosing Hilberseimer as a teacher for architecture and urbanism at the Bauhaus? (b) how was Hilberseimer teaching? (c) how did his own thinking develop in those years? The last question is particularly important as Hilberseimer's concept of "Mischbebauung" (mixed housing development) seems to be the blueprint of the extension of Törten Housing estate with Deck-Access-Buildings in 1930 by Hannes Meyer and the building department of the Bauhaus.

Agriculture and Settlements: The Doctrine of Konrad von Meyenburg at the Bauhaus

Fr., 5:30 p.m.

Dr. Gregory Grämiger

One of the lecturers who Hannes Meyer brought to Dessau was the Swiss engineer Konrad von Meyenburg (1870-1952). The relationship between the two dates back to the time of the Siedlung Freidorf. Von Meyenburg’s most important invention, the rotary tiller, was used during its ground-breaking ceremony. With this new type of agricultural machinery, he wanted nothing less than to secure the world’s food situation. Like Meyer, he was well acquainted with the central figures of the cooperative movement in Basel. His interests were wide-ranging: in addition to the rationalisation and mechanisation of agriculture, he devoted himself to questions concerning housing and settlements, as well labour research. He found the principles of all aspects of life in biological processes, which he declared—enriched with social and aesthetic ideals—to be all-encompassing laws of nature. These discovered purpose-oriented and economic principles were later translated by Hannes Meyer into a new form of rational architecture, as Von Meyenburg explained in his immodest manner.

Gregory Grämiger studied architecture at the ETH Zurich and received his doctorate in 2014. Since 2008 he has been doing research and teaching at the Institute for History and Theory (gta) of the ETH Zurich. From 2015 to 2017, he also worked at the chair of Annette Gigon and Mike Guyer on a publication on public library buildings. In his non-university works, he explored the influence of building laws on architecture and the life and work of the Swiss architect Ernest Brantschen.
Labor Psychologist and Labor Pedagogue Johannes Riedel
Fr., 6:00 p.m.

Prof. em. Dr. Martin Kipp

Johannes Riedel (1889-1971) offered courses and lectures on issues of labor rationalization, Taylorism, and Fordism, time and motion studies, psychotechnics and business organization at the Bauhaus Dessau from 1929 to 1931. He was thereby one of the teachers representing areas of knowledge not previously customary in the Bauhaus curriculum. This lecture is devoted to his professional career; it also considers Riedel’s many years as a scout leader and author of books for young people and of soldier and wanderer songs, as well as his willingness to adapt his politics in order to promote his career. As a civil engineer who in 1919 already presented his dissertation on “Foundations of Labor Organization in Companies, with Special Attention to Traffic Technology”, Riedel was a specialist in labor organization and labor pedagogy until the end of his professional career: initially in the (socialist) State Office for the Public Sector in Saxony, then in the (reactionary) German Institute for Technical Labor Education, and in the Nazi period in the Occupational Educational Office and in the Labor-Scientific Institute of the German Labor Front and in the business management of the Reich Group Industry and, after World War II, as Director of the Labor Office for Commercial Occupational Education and as Professor for Occupational Pedagogy at Hamburg University.

Karel in the eye of the volcano. Turning point 1930.

Fr., 6:30 p.m.

Prof. Dr. Simone Hain

Teige has sharply criticized the Bauhaus in Weimar since its beginnings, because of its romantic atavisms, it was possible for him to change it when he was finally personally invited to participate? Since no concrete record of the contents of Teiges lectures at the Bauhaus have emerged so far, my contribution tries to define the spectrum of potential influences on the schools development by the Czech art and architecture critic and practical typographer.

Teige, who has been unconditionally accepted in his early years by the later internationally acclaimed writers, filmmakers, and architects of the Czech avant-garde and formally worshiped as their „schwarzes Jesulein“, as the childlike Messiah of modernism, stands systematically and historically as a catalyst in the midst of the conflicting and learning structure of the anti-bourgeois / capitalism-critical modernity. Even before the concept of critical theory established itself (and historically until the time, a critical anthropology and philosophical ideology criticism profiled in humanities as an academic system), Karel Teige courageously occupied the obvious void of the art-political theory formation of the revolutionary left - and this because of his comprehensive education and perfect embedding in an envied collective movement, which was from the beginning with pan-European relevance. After the 18 year old who celebrates his meteoric appearance in the sky of art criticism with the fact that art has yet to find its Marx, Teige constantly develops the European art production in the first years by dissecting political criteria for a, as it was said at that time, „proletarian art and architecture“.

For architecture, he provides safe value judgments, which literally tear his contemporaries out of his hands, because they far exceed the „usual building criticism“ (Hannes Meyer), and which, according to my own experience, are still sustainable as a critical instrument.

In the twenties, he was more influenced by an analytical and constructivist theorizing, for which he developed the thesis of „building and poetry“, a bipolar aesthetic concept of Constructivism in which the utilitarian side of architecture was connected with the poetology of art phenomena in a complex dialectical linkage.
At the time of the Bauhaus lectures Karel Teige designs nothing less than a communist theory of behavior in relation to object, space and a synaesthetically unfolded sensuality. This is the urgently needed theory on „need for the people“ and at the same time a rough draft for the design of the Trade Union School in Bernau, whose assignment the Bauhaus owes to the close Teige colleague Adolf Behne as construction consultant of the ADGB.

At the same time, Teige’s examination of Le Corbusier’s Mundaneum design culminates in the „struggle for functionalism“, and there is much to suggest that Teige’s own dialectical turn towards metaphysical qualities and the meaningful questions of modern design, in turn received an impulse from the contemporary Bauhaus, which will be part of my second talk on the scholastic succession of the Meyer era in the early GDR. Teige will almost completely withdraw himself from the architectural debate in the thirties.

The extent to which this is related to the formation of a from Roman Jacobson originating structuralistic aesthetic, and whether a scientific professionalization has occurred, and whether the social development in the Soviet Union, Germany and Italy has not just broken Teige’s heart, is not sufficiently discussed.
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Bauhaus experience not applicable

Sa., 9:30 a.m.

Tatiana Efrussi

In my talk I am going to focus the brief history of the Moscow Giprovtuz institute for design and construction of higher and secondary technical schools (1930-1933). Not anyhow glorious as such, it would by completely forgotten by now if it was not there, at the Giprovtuz office, that Hannes Meyer and seven of his former Bauhaus students (René Mensch, Klaus Meumann, Konrad Püschel, Philipp Tölziner, Béla Scheffler, Antonin Urban, Tibor Weiner) were employed.

As well as other foreign specialists at the period of the first Five-year plan, Meyer, as the chief architect of the Giprovtuz, was expected to find some panacea that would immediately make the institute’s production effective – rational, cheap and speedy. The Bauhaus graduates lived through the routine of this “factory of plans”: along with their young Soviet colleagues, they had to anonymously elaborate standard designs for school construction in various regions of the USSR, of which they had only a vague idea. Did in that reality the “Bauhaus-brigade” signify anything other than a group of friends? Did the Dessau experience had any influence on the work of the Giprovtuz? And, in the end, what role did the engagement at this institution play in their individual fates? These are the main questions that I want to raise.
Tibor Weiner: From the Soviet Union to South America

Sa., 10:00 a.m.

Assistant Prof. Dr. Daniel Talesnik

In the winter of 1929 Tibor Weiner joined the Bauhaus and he already had an architecture diploma from a Hungarian technical university. He was a post-graduate student at the Bauhaus. After being enrolled for one year, he was expelled from the school and with six classmates followed their teacher Hannes Meyer—who had been expelled before them—to the Soviet Union. The first years they were part of a Trust for the construction of educational facilities, and later, Weiner and part of the group went to work for Hans Schmidt and Mart Stam (who eventually left the job) in the design of Orsk. Following his sojourn in the Soviet Union, he worked in France and Chile. Weiner is exemplary for having translated aspects of Meyer’s pedagogical ideas to a South American context; the most interesting aspect of Weiner’s time in Chile is the impact that Meyer’s analytical architectural approach had on the curriculum that Weiner helped to develop for the University of Chile in Santiago. Towards the end of the 1940s he returned to his native Hungary where he subsequently worked as an urban planner and teacher. In Weiner’s case, architectural issues of organization and social awareness can be followed as constant interests as he moved around the globe, but the reasons for his movements were mainly related to the constant political turn of events of the period.

Daniel Talesnik is a trained architect specializing in modern and contemporary architecture and urbanism, with a particular focus on architectural pedagogy and relationships between architecture and political ideologies. He was awarded a PhD by Columbia University in 2016 with the dissertation The Itinerant Red Bauhaus, or the Third Emigration. He has published articles and book chapters, and has taught at Columbia University, Universidad Católica of Chile, and the Illinois Institute of Technology. He currently teaches at the TU München.
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Sachlichkeit to Brutalism: Sharon Overplays Meyer in Israel

Sa., 10:30 a.m.

Dr. Eran Neuman

-
Konrad Püschel – University of Architecture and Civil Engineering Weimar

Sa., 1:00 p.m.

Dr. Norbert Korrek

Konrad Püschel studied at the Bauhaus Dessau under Walter Gropius and Hannes Meyer. Ludwig Hilbersheimer and Mies van der Rohe signed his diploma. Meyer fostered him in the construction department of the Bauhaus: he completed an internship on the construction site of the Federal School of the ADGB in Bernau before being construction boss for one of the gallery-access buildings in Dessau-Törten. In 1930, he followed Meyer to the Soviet Union. After Meyer separated from his brigade, Püschel worked under Hans Schmidt in the construction of the city of Orsk. Returning to Germany, he was construction manager for industrial buildings important to the war effort, finally in the office of the Bauhaus architect Rudolf Arndt.

The emphasis of this lecture is a critical appreciation of Konrad Püschel’s work after his release from a Russian prisoner-of-war camp. In 1948, the Bauhaus architect Gustav Hassenpflug hired him for the state advisory office for city planning in Thuringia, which was affiliated with Hassenpflug’s Chair for City Planning at the Bauhaus University Weimar. Püschel carried out primarily practical tasks in city and village planning. In the middle of the 1950s, he was delegated to go to North Korea as head of the City Planning Agency to organize the rebuilding of the cities Hamhung and Hungnam, which had been destroyed in the Korean War. Along with theoretical knowledge of city planning, Püschel also had the necessary practical professional experience and understood the Russian language. After his work in Korea, the Bauhaus University Weimar gave him the opportunity to set up East Germany’s only Chair for Village Planning.

After his retirement, Püschel supported the reconstruction of the Dessau Bauhaus building, to which he had dedicated himself since 1949. The publication of the writings of Hannes Meyer, a significant contribution to the reception of the Bauhaus in East Germany, would not have been possible without his contact to Léna Meyer-Bergner.
Reinhold Rossig - from the KPD to the Deutsche Bauakademie
Sa., 1:30 p.m.

Dr. Folke Dietzsch

Reinhold Rossig – the member of the KPD (later SED), the architect, the agitator, artist and the human being – who was he, how was he and what did he want?

The course of life of Reinhold Rossig, who ranks among the quieter and less known students of Bauhaus, showcases aspects that can be deemed representative for his generation in terms of professional work as well as artistic production.

Politically, r. r. – as he always signed –, was a straightforward personality constantly coming into conflict with the ruling political systems. Professionally, he had to adapt in many different ways in order to make a living. He gained recognition only late. In the end, he retired into private life.

The presentation will introduce the life and work of Reinhold Rossig in the context of the social conditions throughout the 20th century and will attempt an evaluation.

Based on selected and previously unpublished sketches, drawings, pictures and quotations by r.r., his professional and personal life will be illustrated and documented in brief.

Dr. Folke Dietzsch is a freelance architect since 1991, architectural practice with Dr. Bärbel Angermann in Ebeleben (North Thuringia); In 1991 he got his PhD in architecture on the topic “The students at the Bauhaus”. Between 1987 and 1990 he did post-graduate studies at Hochschule für Architektur und Bauwesen Weimar (HAB Weimar) - today Bauhaus-Universität Weimar. From 1985 to 1987 he has bee research associate at Bauhaus Dessau – Zentrum für Gestaltung. Before (1983-1987) he was research student at the HAB Weimar. He got his diploma in 1983 and the UIA Students Prize in 1984. While he studied architecture at HAB Weimar between 1978 and 1983, he was an Intern at WKZ Bauhaus Dessau.
Fritz Ertl – Master builder in Auschwitz

Sa., 3:30 p.m.

Mag.a. phil. Adina Seeger

At the center of this lecture stands the career of Fritz Ertl in two seemingly diametrically opposed contexts: the Bauhaus, on the one hand, and National Socialism, on the other.

Ertl, born in 1908 in Linz, studied at the Dessau Bauhaus from 1928 to 1931 and graduated with a diploma in Architecture. In 1938, he joined the NSDAP and the SS. Starting in 1940, he was a member of the construction directorship in Auschwitz. Ertl designed, among other things, the first plan of Birkenau Camp (which, at the time of the planning, was still envisioned as a prisoner-of-war camp) and took an essential part in its construction and expansion as a Death Camp (from 1942 on). After 1945, Ertl worked as an architect in Linz. In 1972, he was charged in the Vienna Auschwitz trial – and acquitted.

Ertl’s time as a student at the Bauhaus is traced based on original sources (especially Ertl’s estate), and his career in the Nazi era and his life after 1945 are outlined. The example of his career is used to ask about the connections and relationship between the Bauhaus and National Socialism.

Mag.a. phil. Adina Seeger, historian and curator; studied History and Philosophy at Vienna University (Master’s thesis on the Bauhaus student and master architect of Auschwitz, Fritz Ertl); 2008/09 collaboration on the exhibition “Franz Ehrlich. A Bauhaus artist in resistance and concentration camp” at the Buchenwald Memorial; together with Philipp Rohrbach, head of the oral history project “Austrian Heritage Archive” (www.austrianheritagearchive.at); since 2015, Assistant Curator at the Jewish Museum Vienna.
Architecture as a social act. Hans Fischli‘s Children‘s Village Pestalozzi in Trogen, 1946–1948

Sa., 4:00 p.m.

Sebastian Holzhausen

Swiss architect Hans Fischli (1909-1989) spent the academic year 1928-1929 as a first year student at the Bauhaus in Dessau, just as Hannes Meyer became it’s new director. Although Fischli only visited the preparatory class of Josef Albers and the wallpainting workshop of Hinnerk Scheper, the new pedagogic concept had a deep impact on his further career as an architect. Especially Josef Albers rejection of classic art education, rather achieving a learning through thoughtful experience of making and cognition of material, was a lasting inspiration. Albers principle of „making something out of nothing“, as Fischli puts it, should remain a leading principle for his future work.

Nonetheless Hannes Meyers concept of architecture as a collective achievement didn’t pass Fischli unnoticed. Through conferences, public lectures and few personal contacts with Meyer, Fischli learned to recognize architecture as a social act in the conception as well as in the realization of a building, rather than being the work of an individual genius. The idea of a small social „cell“ as the basis of a creative development to the benefit and progress of the bigger community and society guided Fischli through many of his later projects.

As a perfect example, the Pestalozzi Childrens Village in Trogen, Switzerland, shows how Hans Fischli used Albers economy of means and material to create, through the help of society, a village for European children war victims as an interdependable social community.

Sebastian Holzhausen (1974) is an architect in Zurich. Studying architecture in Dortmund, Aachen and New York, he received his architecture diploma in 2005. Works as architect in different offices in Zurich. In 2010 he achieves his MAS in History and Theory of Architecture at the ETH in Zurich. Today he’s partner of Holzhausen Zweifel Architekten in Zurich and Bern. He voluntarily engages on the board of the Zurich Built Heritage Foundation and as president of a small Zurich housing cooperative.
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Lotte Stam-Beese: From Bauhaus to urban planning in Rotterdam

Sa., 4:30 p.m.

Hanneke Oosterhof

From the autumn of 1926 to January 1929 Lotte Beese studied at the Bauhaus in Dessau. She was the first female student to take Hannes Meyer’s neue baulehre course. She was very much drawn to Meyer’s Marxist approach based on the future residents’ and users’ biological, mental and physical needs – but she had to leave the Bauhaus prematurely, because she was having an affair with him.

In 1932, after working as an architect at Meyer’s and Hugo Häring’s firms in Berlin and Bohuslav Fuchs’s firm in the Czechoslovak city of Brno, she set off alone and on her own initiative for the Ukrainian city of Kharkov. There she produced designs for the sotsgorod KhTZ (a housing estate for workers at the Kharkiv Tractor Factory). In Kharkov she met the Dutch architect Mart Stam, who was a member of the May Brigade. She and Stam worked together in Orsk. In late 1934 they were forced to leave the Soviet Union. After marrying Stam, Lotte Beese moved to the Netherlands, and they set up their firm Stam en Beese Architecten in Amsterdam.

Never having graduated, she completed her architectural training in Amsterdam. After divorcing Stam she was appointed as an urban-planning architect for Rotterdam, where she designed Modernist housing estates. She remained an adept of Functionalist architecture, with which she had become acquainted in Meyer’s neue baulehre course and her subsequent architectural practice. Yet her urban designs had a socially progressive and innovative slant of their own.

Hanneke Oosterhof is a cultural historian. Since 2014 she is related as an external PhD Candidate in Architectural History and Theory at University of Technology Eindhoven (NL). Her research focuses on the subject of an interdisciplinary biography (architecture, history, gender) of the female German-Dutch urban-planning architect Lotte Stam-Beese (1903-1988). She worked for over thirty years in the museum sector, both as a manager and as a curator and has published in the field of social history, woman history and culture history.
Ludwig Leo – a virtual pupil?

Sa., 6:30 p.m.

Dr. Gregor Harbusch

Ludwig Leo (1924–2012) was one of the most exceptional German archi-
tects in the second half of the 20th century. He was mainly active in West
Berlin, and the «long 1960s» were his most prolific period. Two of his buil-
dings – the Umlauftank 2 and the DLRG-Zentrale, both designed in 1967 –
became internationally acclaimed, enduring icons of a technology-oriented,
post-war architecture.

He refrained from establishing a recognizable formal style, but designed
conceptually and brought various influences to play in his own work. With
his architectural work, Leo aimed to find a functionally convincing and ar-
chitecturally remarkable solution for each individual design task. Particular
attention was paid to social exchange between the future users and the
communicative potential of space.

There are certain parallels between Leo’s and Hannes Meyer’s architectural
approach. However, there is only one proof that Leo was interested in Meyer:
In the mid 60s, Leo designed his bed according to the bed in the famous Co-
op Interieur. My paper takes this as a starting point to think about parallels
and differences between two unconventional modernist architects.

Dr. Gregor Harbusch is an art historian and journalist with a focus on modern architecture and
urbanism, based in Berlin. In 2016 he completed his PhD at the ETH Zurich about architect
Ludwig Leo’s work in the 1960s. In 2007–13 he was a researcher at gta Archives at ETH Zu-
rich, where he co-edited Sigfried Giedion und die Fotografie (2010) and Atlas of the Functional
City. CIAM 4 and Comparative Urban Analysis (2014). Together with BARarchitekten he curated
the exhibition Ludwig Leo Ausschnitt, which was first shown in fall 2013 in Berlin and then in
Stuttgart and London.