docomomo International is a non-profit organization dedicated to the documentation and conservation of buildings, sites and neighborhoods of the Modern Movement. It aims at:

• Bringing the significance of the architecture of the Modern Movement to the attention of the public, the public authorities, the professionals and the educational community.
• Identifying and promoting the surveying of the Modern Movement's works.
• Fostering and disseminating the development of appropriate techniques and methods of conservation.
• Opposing destruction and disfigurement of significant works.
• Gathering funds for documentation and conservation.
• Exploring and developing knowledge of the Modern Movement.

docomomo International wishes to extend its field of actions to new territories, establish new partnerships with institutions, organizations and NGOs active in the area of modern architecture, develop and publish the international register, and enlarge the scope of its activities in the realm of research, documentation and education.
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The theme of this docomomo Journal is that reuse is a key for both a sustainable future and for education. This issue also celebrates the Bauhaus centenary (1919–2019) and tackles the physical and ideological legacy of the German school while confronting it with the challenges we face today and the role that education might play in this fight to value Modern Movement architecture and to pursue its longevity.

The Bauhaus had a pioneering influence on design worldwide which still endures today; through education, experimentation and materialization, a revolution took place in architecture, urbanism and design for mass production. In 1918, during the immediate post-war period, Walter Gropius (1883–1969) achieved a fusion between the Kunstgewerbeschule and the Hochschule für Bildende Kunst in Weimar, with the creation of an interdisciplinary school of design and crafts. In April 1919, he was elected director of the school which was by then called the Staatliches Bauhaus. He also published the Bauhaus Manifesto, which remains as a pioneering moment in history, with irreversible consequences at a global scale. The Bauhaus as a school, as a method of experimentation, education, and research, embodies the idea of science applied in service, poetry with utility, Neue Sachlichkeit with creation and freedom. Its premises continue to be relevant today with the great issues of sustainability and democracy needing to be addressed through art and technology.

Aware of these concerns, the 14th International docomomo Conference, held in Lisbon in 2016 under the theme “Adaptive Reuse”, summoned up the pertinence and urgency of education for reuse as the key for a sustainable future, recalling the Seoul-Eindhoven statement on the worldwide offer of educational programs and the cross-fertilization of subjects that education and reuse of Modern Movement architecture raises, worldwide: from Brazil to the Netherlands, Israel to Germany, USA to Switzerland.

Barry Bergdoll’s essay, which illustrates the backstage and preparation of the 1938 exhibition Bauhaus 1919-1928 at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, allows us to analyze and understand how the main figures of the Bauhaus wished to present the school and its vision to the world. Jasmine Benyamin analyzes the educational program Gropius envisioned and developed at the Bauhaus, and the principles it ended up passing on to its students and followers. The impact of his ideas on theory and education, aiming for the unity of all arts, would take over the historiography of architecture, design and urbanism and still lingers to this day. Marina Epstein-Plouchetch and Talia Abramovich elaborate on the de-mystification of Tel’Aviv as the mythical White City, presenting the real effect the Bauhaus had on the city. The Documentation Issue chapter presents an inspiring essay by Dietrich Neumann who generously shares with docomomo his recent research on the beginnings of the Bauhaus.

Other contributions document reuse projects whose main goal was to create new lives in architectural structures or public spaces, such as Renato Anelli’s essay on SESC Pompeia (Lisa Bo Bardi, 1961) in São Paulo or Vincent Ligtelijn’s essay on the Amsterdam Playgrounds (Van Eyck, 1945+), contributing to the debate on sustainability. In a thoughtful pause, Robert Huber’s essay allows one to reflect on architecture production talking about the different forces that could be involved in a process of preservation and how to find the balance between them while presenting the bauhaus reuse project. The topic of education for the reuse of buildings is deepened through the best practices reports on education conducted in two leading European architectural schools: EPFL by Franz Graf and TU Delft by Nicholas Clarke, Hielkje Zijlstra and Wessel De Jonge.

Finally, docomomo Journal is grateful to David Chipperfield and Wiel Arets for having provided the basis for two fruitful discussions on modernity and modern heritage, economy and sustainability, addressing the social mission and the responsibility of architects towards the future.

I wish to thank Michel Melenhorst who accepted the challenge to work as guest editor of this “Education for Reuse” issue. His commitment and perseverance were shared by the authors’ who collaborated generously with their knowledge and dedicated work. A large variety of approaches and points of view are presented, showing the cross-fertilization of subjects that education and reuse of Modern Movement architecture raises, worldwide: from Brazil to the Netherlands, Israel to Germany, USA to Switzerland.
INTRODUCTION

Reuse of Modernist Buildings

BY MICHEL MELENHORST

In his keynote lecture “When the oppressive new and the vulnerable old meet”, at the 13th docomomo Conference in Seoul 2014, Hubert-Jan Henket (1940–) made a passionate plea for “Sustainable Modernity”. Hubert-Jan Henket quotes John Allen: “the conditions of our time have surely taught us that progress must now consist in learning how to renew the world with things that exist already”. In docomomo Journal 52, an invitation to join this plea was published and a list of questions as input for more discussion on the subject accompanied this invitation:

- Do sustainability and Modernity really form a paradox? How could they strengthen each other?
- At a historical level: how did the idea of the Enlightenment and the free market economy merge into the devotion to the “constant new”, which is dominating our behavior today?
- At a cultural level: what are the effects of loss of tradition?
- At a social level: how do sense of community and solidarity survive in our ever more plural societies?
- How could we translate our conclusions into practical information for sustainable architecture and urban design fitting specific local requirements? How could we benefit from practical and physical environments and traditions we represent?
- How could we benefit from embodied energy in obsolete materials?

Hubert-Jan Henket also spoke of a wish to change the curricula at all schools of architecture and include the history of modernity as well as the conservation and adaptive reuse of what is there already as a standard part of the education.

Since then, and even before 2014, a lot has happened in exploring the further potential of reusing Modern Movement Architecture. In 2016 the project “RMB Reuse of Modernist Buildings” started. For the RMB project docomomo International and the University of Antwerp, Belgium; the University of Coimbra and the Instituto Superior Técnico – University of Lisboa, both from Portugal; Istanbul Technical University, from Turkey and TH-OWL, Detmold School of Architecture and Interior Architecture from Detmold, Germany, came together to prepare a master course, addressing the subjects as formulated in 2014 by Hubert Jan Henket and docomomo.

In March 2019, RMB, in cooperation with docomomo, Germany, organized a conference in Berlin on the occasion of 100 years of the Bauhaus. This Bauhaus anniversary was a great opportunity to evaluate what is the actual situation, and to find out what new directions can be detected in these explorations in Reuse, Heritage and Sustainability and Education in relation to Modern Movement Architecture. Moreover, invitations were sent out to write an essay for this journal and add to the conference results, broadening the scope of the docomomo Journal 61.

We start at where it all began in the first three essays: how did and how do we conceive the Bauhaus.

To better understand the image that we have of the Bauhaus two writers, Barry Bergdoll (1955–) and Jasmine Benyamin show how the perception of the Bauhaus that many have, or at least had for a long time, was actively formed and manipulated by some Bauhäuslers, Walter Gropius (1883–1969) in particular.

In his essay “Memento Mori or eternal Modernism? The Bauhaus at Moma 1938”, Barry Bergdoll describes the genesis of the 1938 Bauhaus exhibition in New York and how deliberately, but also accidentally, and due to the global political situation of the time, parts of the Bauhaus history, its artistic production, educational legacy and people were omitted from this exhibition. The exhibition and accompanying catalog were to shape the general view on the Bauhaus for decades.

Jasmine Benyamin’s essay “Walter Gropius and Operative History: an architectural Palimpsest” shows how Walter Gropius retroactively manipulated architectural history in his education of architects and continuously reframed his own work, eliminating unwelcome aspects of it, thus designing an oeuvre that fitted the image of modernism he wanted to communicate. Fake news is nothing new!

“From ‘White City’ to ‘Bauhaus City’ — Tel Aviv’s urban and architectural resilience” is the title of the essay by Marina Epstein-Pliouchtch and Talia Abramovich. How “Bauhaus City”, became the epithet for Tel Aviv shows the omnipresence of the brand “Bauhaus”, despite all specialist objections to the misuse of the term Bauhaus in general speech.

Contextualizing Modernism

Contextualism has become a keyword for all architectural assignments and reuse assignments in particular. An understanding of the values of places and buildings should always take the context, in all of its diverse components, as reference. Two essays show early examples of adaptive reuse by
two distinct architects. Both Aldo van Eyck (1918–1999) and Lina Bo Bardi (1914–1992) had an extraordinarily sensitive approach towards contextual qualities and towards design with the role of the user in mind. Vincent Ligtelijn, author and editor of the 1999 book “Aldo van Eyck Works”, writes about Aldo van Eyck’s Amsterdam playgrounds, realized between 1947 and 1978, on vacant lots and urban wastes. From the often small “injections” gradually a “network of public places” grew together. By close reading of the designs for various playgrounds, Ligtelijn shows the beautiful dynamics of space, movement and contextuality in Aldo van Eyck’s designs and criticizes the short-sighted, brusque attitude of the officials in Town Administration and Heritage Agency towards Aldo van Eyck’s oeuvre.

In Renato Anelli’s essay, “Bauhaus and Lina Bo Bardi: from the modern factory to the Pompeia leisure center”, we can read how Lina Bo Bardi’s relation with the Modern Movement and the Bauhaus changed over the years, especially after coming to Brazil. Being one of the pioneers that sought to faithfully reinterpret the agenda of the early Bauhaus to local conditions and new times, she is one of the architects that stand at the start of a contextualized, empathic architecture. An attitude towards the profession that is essential to every diligent work of restoration and adaptive reuse. I, personally, think that the legacy of these two architects has been, and should be, very influential in the conception of all university education programs on the preservation, restoration and reuse of modern movement heritage.

**Education and reuse**

The two most important university programs in Europe are the Section for Heritage and Architecture (HA) at the TU Delft and, the courses and studios on the themes of “Techniques and Preservation of Modern Architecture (TSAM)” at the École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne. Over the years they have built up an enormous repertoire of knowledge, methodologies and educational “cases” of Modernist Architecture.

One of the challenges in both examples is the fact that students are free to move between courses and that it is difficult, if not impossible, to make sure students have a certain level of knowledge on reuse and modernism or can acquire this in the shortest time when entering a class or design studio.

In “Education For Adaptive Reuse — The TU Delft Heritage and Architecture Experience”, Nicholas Clarke, Hielkje Zijlstra and Wessel de Jonge describe the development of conservation education at the TU Delft from a classical architectural maintenance practice to one of addressing conservation through adaptive reuse as a valid and proven method, paralleled by an attention shift to the built legacy of the 20th century. At the HA in Delft, a scientific approach was also developed to achieve a controllable, traceable and repeatable methodology in reuse and design of 20th century architecture.

Franz Graf sketches out the history and aims of TSAM, which started in 2007 and has, since 2012, been under his direction. Franz Graf addresses the importance of a scientific approach to reuse education to overcome the subjective feelings and formalistic emotions that inevitably accompany every project dealing with “the existing”.

A new experimental platform in the educational landscape is “Bauhaus reuse (BHR)” in Berlin. In Robert Huber’s essay “Modern reuse” we read about a shift in how we can access our built legacy. Robert Huber addresses some exciting notions on modernism, legacy, heritage and reuse and links them to contemporary questions of a circular economy, building lifecycle and their possible confronting principles with modernist ideology. Modernist concepts of the ready-made, transplantation, alienation, modernism in a postmodernist society and the notion of substance and truth versus mass production and repetition are part of his contemplations. The article offers new concepts and food for thought in the development of methodologies in the triangle of modernism, reuse and education.

**Practice**

At the 100 years Bauhaus Conference, there were three keynote speakers: David Chipperfield, Wiel Arets and Fernando Romero. David Chipperfield did not only present his restoration project for Mies van der Rohe’s Neue Nationalgalerie but also reflected on his practice as an architect and the difficulties he faces in the preservation of “everyday modernism”. Wiel Arets in his keynote shared his thoughts and images on what he thinks modernism actually is and, by the example of his restoration of Fritz Peutz’ (1896–1914) Glass Palace in Heerlen, showed his ideas on restoration and reuse. After their talks both Ana Tostões and I had a strong wish to further explore these subjects with the two architects. The transcripts of the conversations we had with them in Berlin and Amsterdam – more casual conversations rather than actual interviews - are the last two contributions in this collection of inputs on the Bauhaus, the Modern Movement, adaptive reuse and education.

**RMB**

All in all, this docomomo journal presents an extensive, up-to-date overview of positions and opinions in adaptive reuse of modern buildings, allowing one to verify the role of reuse can take, both on the level ideas as well as substance and spaces, in dealing with issues such as sustainability, resilience, climate change, demographic challenges, digitalization and changing conceptions of space, time and reality.

Of course, the master program and methodology is traceable and repeatable methodology in reuse and design of 20th century architecture.
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based on existing and new RMB research, educational practices and reference projects. RMB offers a study program, combining the local and the international. This international focus, its interdisciplinarity character and its dedication to the reuse of modernist buildings turns this program into a unique case.

The connection between academia, education and practice on an international level is perceived as an asset for the future profession of the graduates who learn not only to collaborate in international teams but also find out about various attitudes in dealing with modernist heritage based on culture, climate, politics and legislation, thus broadening their view. RMB is open for students with different professional backgrounds such as heritage, architecture, interior architecture and construction who will work in interdisciplinary groups. Students will benefit, and so will the building industry. Urgent European topics on human habitat and climate goals will thus find better solutions and the still-vulnerable position of many modern movement buildings and public spaces will have a real chance of being improved.

From all the contributions gathered in this issue of the docomomo Journal, the analysis of what are the values of the objects under examination is one of the most important things students can and should learn. One should know and understand what is the value if one wants to use it, maintain it, and be able to keep on living, liking and loving it in the future. I want to add and finish this introduction by describing some more poetic experiments we are doing at the THOWL and in RMB to achieve this deep understanding.

We will use Paolo Portoghesi’s Historical Method, in its essence formulated as criticism on the functionalist or naive modernism, but which is an excellent tool to place the architecture of different eras in a continuum of historical development and interaction. Or as Argan wrote on Portoghesi’s method,

“Portoghesi’s historical method does not consist in the relatively easy task of discovering Palladio in Aalto, or Borromini in Wright, but in the inverse and more difficult operation of discovering Aalto in Palladio and Wright in Borromini...”

This opened potentially endless fields of experimentation exploited by the masters of modern architecture, Rietveld, Mies, Wright, Poelzig and Aalto. Portoghesi took a path, based on the concept of “contamination” of historical sources, convinced that each form of architecture is generated by other architectures “by a not-so-fortuitous convergence among precedents combined together by the imagination”.

We use art to get to the essence of what modern movement architecture is about, for instance, quoting John Baldessari (1931–), to understand the difference between subject, object matter and meaning.

We did and will continue to organize workshops in Detmold with Jurriaan Molenaar, an Amsterdam-based painter who made architecture and, especially, modern movement architecture, the topic of his works. In these workshops, we focus on aspects of modernism, especially modernist architecture. By transferring the concepts of architecture to painting and by focusing on one aspect, for example, the window, the corner solution, the column, the power of modernist concepts becomes evident. By understanding these concepts on intellectual, conceptual, haptic, tangible and poetic emotional levels, the object of research becomes precious and worth preserving.

Studying user behavior in buildings in use and studying use methodologies developed in sociology like photo-elicitation helps us to understand buildings, neighborhoods and free-space better. From this deeper understanding, students can develop tactics, processes and designs that are not general but as specific as they can be.

Perhaps the attitude we ask of our students is best illustrated by the text of the Dutch architect John Habraken (1928–) “Towards an architecture of the field”, showing the mindset needed for all designing with the existing:

Study the built field:
It will be there without you,
But you can contribute to it.

Study the field as a living organism.
It has no form, but it has structure.
Find its structure and form will come.

The field has continuity,
merge with it and others will join you.
Because the field has continuity no job is large or small; all you do is adding to the field

Nobody builds alone:
When you do something large, leave the small to others
When you do something small, enhance the large.

Respond to those before you:
When you find structure, inhabit it;
When you find type, play with it;
When you find patterns, seek to continue them.

Be hospitable to those after you:
give structure as well as form.

The more you seek to continue what was done by others already, the more you will be recognized for it, the more others will continue what you did.

Cooperate;
When you can borrow from others borrow, and praise them for it.
When you can steal from others steal, and admit it freely.
No matter what you do, your work will be your own.

Avoid style: Leave it to the critics and historians.
Choose method: It is what you share with your peers.
Forget self-expression: It is a delusion.
Whatever you do will be recognized by others as your expression; don’t give it a thought.
Do what the field needs.

Notes
3 Giancarlo Priori, Paolo Portoghesi, Bologna, Zanichelli, 1985, 16.
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Memento mori or eternal Modernism?
The Bauhaus at MoMA, 1938

BY BARRY BERGDOLL

On the occasion of the exhibition which I co-curated at New York’s Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) with Leah Dickerman in 2009 for the 90th anniversary of the founding of the Bauhaus (and the 80th anniversary of the founding of the museum), I delved into the museum’s archives to shed light on the political context as well as the complex logistics of the museum’s earlier Bauhaus exhibition staged in 1938. The museum’s 1938 book that accompanied that important episode in the early reception of the Bauhaus in America remained the standard work on the school and its art philosophy in the English-speaking world until the publication of the English translation of Hans Maria Wingler’s monumental Bauhaus in 1969. This essay, addressing the exhibition staged in New York and the misconceptions about the Bauhaus it set in motion for many years, is based on a lecture I gave at the exhibition symposium; a version of that text was published for the first time in a book of essays published in honor of one of my professors at the University of Cambridge, Jean Michel Massing, in 2016.1 This is a slightly modified version for the 100th anniversary of the Bauhaus, a decade later.

The Museum of Modern Art’s founding director Alfred H. Barr, Jr. (1902–1981) wrote to Walter Gropius (1883–1969) on 15 September 1938, in the lead-up to the museum’s planned exhibition on the now defunct school that Walter Gropius had founded at Weimar nineteen years earlier: “I regard the three days which I spent at the [Dessau] Bauhaus in 1927 as one of the important incidents in my own education”.2 Indeed, as has often been pointed out, the Bauhaus had had a profound influence on Alfred H. Barr’s draft plans in 1929 for the structure of an unprecedented American museum of “the art of our time”,3 with proposed departments of architecture, industrial art, photography, theater and film. It also influenced Alfred H. Barr’s famous mapping of the evolution of modern art movements, cogently diagrammed on the famous cover of the 1936 Cubism and Abstract Art catalog. There, the Bauhaus was positioned as the synthesis of Expressionism, De Stijl and Neoplasticism, and the flow of Cubism into Suprematism and Constructivism. Remarkably, however, its only outlet into the decade of the 1930s and the future — to judge from the diagram — seems to have been into “Modern Architecture”, which Alfred H. Barr’s chart would have consolidated at the very place where French Purism, Dutch De Stijl and the German experimental school intersected to form into a coherent architectural movement at the center of his timeline. But, of course, by the time this chart was drawn up, the Bauhaus itself was no more, having lived a tumultuous history, forced to move and then closed by the rising force of National Socialism, and largely erased from the German art scene, it was, as a school, dead.

Within a year of the publication of Alfred H. Barr’s diagram, plans were afoot at the young New York museum for staging a major Bauhaus exhibition, catalyzed by two interlinked events of 1937. The first was the escalation of the German artistic and intellectual exodus, changing the face of American art and architectural education with the arrival, notably, of Walter Gropius at Harvard. He was one of many émigrés from Adolf Hitler’s Germany who made the eight-year-old MoMA an early port of call upon arrival in the new world. A single page alone of the Museum of Modern Art guest book for 1937 is revelatory, with its close juxtaposition of the signatures of László Moholy-Nagy (1895–1946), Marcel Breuer (1902–1981), Herbert Bayer (1900–1985) and Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (1886–1969). Simultaneously the controversy on the other side of the Atlantic generated by the Nazi’s Entartete Kunst (Degenerate Art) exhibition, staged in the newly completed Haus der Kunst, Munich, a design by Hitler’s favored architect Paul Troost (1878–1934), was the clearest state celebration of the official dismantling of the Bauhaus project. The Museum of Modern Art’s purpose-built home, designed the following year and opened on the museum’s 10th birthday in 1939 (it had been a nomad for that first decade) would indeed pay homage to the building that Walter Gropius had designed to accommodate the Bauhaus in its second home city of Dessau, after it had been forced to leave Weimar in 1926. MoMA’s new building was a veritable counter model to the neo-classical architecture of Hitler’s museum or, for that matter, John Russell Pope’s contemporary National Gallery of Art in Washington (1938–1941). By the time the Museum of

From here onwards, a critical re-assessment will be offered of the central role the founding members of the Bauhaus played in shaping the discourse and subsequent historization of architectural modernism. More specifically, proposing the use of Walter Gropius’ views on history as a snapshot of operativity in historical accounts and their resultant teleological narratives. In *Theories and History of Architecture*, Italian historian Manfredo Tafuri (1935–1994) defined operative criticism as a mode of writing that self-reflexively consolidates the history leading up to the Modern Movement in order to present the latter as a definitive “break” from the past. Such a short-circuiting required an unbroken linear genealogy for the movement, in part by simplifying the historical tendencies in opposition to it. This criticism was in turn tied to the so-called “pioneers” of modern architecture, among whom Walter Gropius (1883–1969) assumed a central position. Manfredo Tafuri identified these figures not only with their practices, but also in the way they crafted their stories alongside and often in concert with, the discipline of architectural history.

Post-war historians such as Nikolaus Pevsner (1902–1983) and Sigfried Giedion (1888–1968) self reflexively consolidated the history leading up to the Modern Movement in order to present the latter as a unified amalgam of practices and outcomes. Such a consolidation required a selective historical reading that delineated a clear genealogy for the movement, in part by simplifying the historical tendencies in opposition to it: the battle of styles in the 19th century and its resultant era of eclecticism. Historians in this category believed it a mandate of their discipline to re-read the past through the lens of the present and retained only those aspects of the former they deemed “still vital.”

**Walter Gropius and History**

In his pre-Bauhaus years and as a young member of the Werkbund, Walter Gropius understood the power of media manipulation to exert control over the narrative of architecture within a larger arc of history. His early interactions with Karl Ernst Osthaus (1874–1921) and the Deutsches Museum — in particular his role in coordinating and curating that institution’s substantial photography collection — helped shape his later activist attitudes. Through the vehicle of the museum’s traveling exhibitions, and his own burgeoning collection of photographs, Walter Gropius exploited the value of architectural images to polemically craft readings of the built environment. In fact, by the time of the relocation of the Bauhaus to Dessau, he had already begun curating the visual output and dissemination of his own projects. As the historian Winfried Nerdinger (1944—) has noted, Bruno Zevi (1918–2000), a former student of Walter Gropius at the Harvard Graduate School of Design, indicted the elder for his “reactionary and biased concept of history.” This statement was based on the fact that art and architectural history at the Bauhaus was never taught regularly as required courses. In fact, even as Hannes Meyer (1889–1954) formally initiated an architectural curriculum in 1927, history was left out.

In an essay entitled “My Conception of the Bauhaus Idea” (1937), Walter Gropius elucidated the core principles of his pedagogical approach. Central to this was his

Arieh Sharon, Ohel Theatre, Tel Aviv, Israel, 1937-1939 © Azrieli Architectural Archive, The Arieh Sharon Collection, 1950s.
ESSAYS

From “White City” to “Bauhaus City” — Tel Aviv’s urban and architectural resilience

BY MARINA EPSTEIN-PLIOUCHTCH AND TALIA ABRAMOVICH

In the early 1930s, Modernism became the normative style of architecture in Tel Aviv. This was due to the architects who operated in Tel Aviv, from all over Europe, including architects who studied at the Bauhaus. This essay will discuss how Modernist Tel Aviv evolved from the “White City” (UNESCO World Heritage Site) to the “Bauhaus City”, and how these myths, constantly being reinvented, have contributed to the city’s resilience, which has enabled urban and architectural conservation.

Introduction

Tel Aviv’s so-called White City, built in the 1930s, was declared a UNESCO World Cultural Heritage Site in 2003. It has since become recognized as a landmark of the Modern Movement, an early and singularly authentic example of an urban environment, a new town realized consistently in the Modernist idiom. Established in 1909 as a suburb of Jaffa, within two decades, Tel Aviv — the “first Jewish city” — had a well-thought-out town plan and a coherent architectural character. By 1925, first, Richard Kauffmann (1887–1958), the German architect and town planner (in 1921), and then Patrick Geddes (1854–1932), the British modern town planner, had devised the city’s plan for the area between the older neighborhoods in the south up to the Yarkon River, further north. The site for conservation, considered the world’s largest concentration of early Modernist buildings, was planned by architects who had received most of their professional education in Europe.

Six architects who worked in Palestine in the 1930s had been students at the Bauhaus. Four left Palestine to study architecture in Germany; two others came to the Bauhaus from Poland. After their Bauhaus studies, they returned to Palestine, settling in Tel Aviv, Haifa, or in the rural settlements, just as rising waves of immigrants from Nazi Germany were giving new impetus to the country’s development and construction.

In this essay, we will examine one of the prevailing myths of Tel Aviv — the “Bauhaus City”. Generally speaking, architectural knowledge rarely crosses the boundaries of the profession and does not attain the level of a public asset, so we must ask how and why Tel Aviv achieved its “design” title. We will discuss the nature of the definition of Tel Aviv as the “Bauhaus City” and how “Tel Aviv Bauhaus” contributes to the city’s urban and architectural resilience. We will also examine the preservation challenges facing Modernist Tel Aviv in the second decade of the 21st century.

Transfer of modernity, ideas and people

The late 1920s saw economic slowdown and serious local crises in Palestine, and particularly Tel Aviv. Consequently, a handful of young people headed to Europe to pursue studies in the arts, architecture, graphics and more. Nineteen of them spent time at the Bauhaus before returning to Palestine, among them six architects: Arieh Sharon (1900–1984), Chanan Frenkel (1905–1957), Shlomo Bernstein (1907–1969), Shmuel Mestechkin (1908–2004), Munio Gitai (Weinraub) (1909–1970), and Edgar Hed (Hecht) (1904–1956).

The most prominent of these were Arieh Sharon, Shmuel Mestechkin and Munio Gitai-Weinraub; the most influential was the first. Born in Poland in 1900, Arieh Sharon immigrated to Palestine in 1922 and settled in kibbutz Gan Shmuel. In 1926 he enrolled at the Bauhaus school under the direction of Walter Gropius (1883–1969). In 1928, he traveled with Hannes Meyer (1889–1954) to Moscow, where they presented the Bauhaus’s ideas. On completion of his studies in 1929, he worked in Meyer’s office in Berlin. Turning down an invitation to join a second delegation to Moscow in 1931, he chose to return to Palestine and establish his own office, where he eventually planned hundreds of public and residential buildings, from workers’ housing to a theater in Tel Aviv. In the 1940s he focused his planning on rural settlements, mainly the kibbutz. After the State was established, Prime Minister Ben-Gurion recruited Arieh Sharon to lead the drafting of the national plan (1951).

Shmuel Mestechkin immigrated from Ukraine to Palestine with his family in 1923 and settled in Tel Aviv. In 1931 he began studying at the Bauhaus in Dessau, under the direction of Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (1886–1969); his teachers included Wassily Kandinsky (1866–1944), Josef Albers (1888–1976), and Ludwig Hilbersheimer (1885–1967). After his graduation in 1933, Shmuel Mestechkin returned to Palestine, where he later founded his own firm.
Aldo van Eyck design experiences engendered the development of broader architectural concepts, many of which he further developed in his writings. Aldo van Eyck used various forums to attack an impoverished functionalism that was devoid of qualities such as ambiguity and reversibility. In the history of architecture, it is rare for architects to reflect on their own work, but design and research, writing and building were intrinsic to Aldo van Eyck. He kept on looking for a formal vocabulary to bring the multiple and the general into order and harmony through his architectural assignments. When he set to work at the Amsterdam public works department the opportunity to regenerate the vacant urban spaces in the city arose through the design of an intricate network of playgrounds. This essay will focus on the architectural qualities of these playgrounds.

Just as one places a bench because one wants to sit, a lamppost because one wants to light the street, a newsstand because one wants to buy newspapers, I am putting a play dome there because children want to play.

Just as Aldo van Eyck (1918–1999) — nestor of Dutch postwar architecture — viewed the specific and the general in each other’s light, his design experiences engendered the development of more general architectural concepts, many of which, including “twin phenomena”, “place” and “in-between”, he elaborated poetically in his writing. A gifted rhetorician, he used various forums to attack an impoverished functionalism that was devoid of qualities such as ambiguity, reciprocity and reversibility.

In the history of architecture, it is rare for architects to reflect on their own work, but design and research, writing and building were twin phenomena that were perfectly natural to Aldo van Eyck.

The most pressing problem he saw himself facing as an architect, in an age poorly equipped to address it, was that of “the great number”. Since he did not receive any assignments for urban expansion — projects concerned par excellence with the visual arrangement of great numbers — he had to explore this subject in his architectural assignments. Wherever it made sense, Aldo van Eyck was looking for a formal vocabulary to bring the multiple and the general into order and harmony — something which he thought the classical syntax was not capable of, as it was aimed at the single and the special. He felt himself supported by the “aesthetic meaning of number”, which he recognized in the work of Piet Mondrian (1872–1944), Georges Vantongerloo (1886–1965), Sophie Taeuber (1889–1943) and Richard Paul Lohse (1902–1988), and in the artifacts of tribal “primitive” people whose capacities he described lyrically in the catalog for the exhibition of his work in Rotterdam in 1989:

“They alone, the world over, excelled in repetition and variation of element and theme, in serial composition, counterpoint, syncopa-
tion, shifting symmetry, multi-centrality and, perhaps most rele-
vant for us today, in the ability to deal with form and counterform as equivalents and, above all, to open the center by avoiding a single or central dominant. Nor are geometric and non-geometric design ever separate categories.”

From the outset, Aldo van Eyck strove to enconce the ideas of the avant-garde at the heart of a contemporary architecture by confronting them with tradition which, despite the tabula rasa of the avant-gardists, retained its value as an expression of a constant human identity that had manifested itself differently across times and cultures.

This perspective emerged in Zürich, where Aldo van Eyck studied and then stayed until after the war. Carola Giedion-Welcker (1893–1979), the protagonist of modern art, introduced him to the art world, bringing him into contact with artists of the ilk of James Joyce (1882–1941), Hans Arp (1886–1966), Constantin Brancusi (1876–1957), Max Ernst (1891–1976), Paul Klee (1879–1940), Richard Paul Lohse and Kurt Schwitters (1887–1948), giving him first-hand insight into their philosophies. Aldo van Eyck became increasingly convinced that the various “isms” in contemporary culture were expressions of one and the same new reality — that of relativity — within which things came to cohesion through mutual relationships thanks to their equality and relative autonomy. This thus brought an end to subservience to a single central hierarchical principal, creating space for polycentric constellations. The new

View of the sesc – Fábrica de Pompeia’s hangar of general activities. Figure 04ARQf1202. Photo: Sérgio Gicovate. © Instituto Bardi / Casa de Vidro.
Bringing the work of Lina Bo Bardi (1914–1992) into the reflections on the centenary of Bauhaus offers an interesting opportunity to meditate on the process of cultural and productive modernization of a country like Brazil, relatively remote from the European avant-garde — “remote” in the sense of spatially away from the leading centers of production of the avant-garde: France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the Soviet Union. As a consequence, Brazilian modernists started defining their agenda in 1922, searching the native roots and the colonial past for a way to construct a form of art that would be modern and national. Such remoteness of Brazilian art resembled which Italy faced in the years of Lina Bo Bardi’s education in Rome on the eve of WWII, under the fascist rule of Benito Mussolini (1883–1945).

The Bauhaus in the Italian background of Lina Bo Bardi

After the closure of the first futuristic avant-garde, Italian culture also searched its past, in this case the classical Roman tradition, for the specifics for a modern and national project. With the rise of Benito Mussolini in 1922, the modern Italian field saw in it the possibility of the modernization of Italy. This project was to be made explicit by Pietro Maria Bardi (1900–1999) in 1931, when he publicly proposed to the Duce that art and architecture should be the official styles of the fascist state.

Between 1931 and 1937, despite all the mishaps concerning disputes with the establishment of architecture, Italian rationalists gained a prominent position in the production of public buildings. It was only after 1937, during the production of the E-42, that Mussolini decided he would no longer accept the rationalists in representing the fascist state, then transformed into an empire and ally of Germany under Nazi rule. The appropriated architecture was classic monumentality, discreetly modernized by Marcello Piacentini (1888–1966) and his followers.

Lina Bo Bardi studied at the School of Architecture of Rome [Facoltà de Architettura di Roma] between 1934 and 1939, where teachers discouraged students from adopting the avant-garde architecture of countries beyond the Alps. Thus, she became acquainted with the art and architecture of the European avant-garde through the magazines Casabella (Giuseppe Pagano/Edoardo Persico), Quadrante (Pietro Maria Bardi and Massimo Bontempelli) and Domus (Giò Ponti). While Casabella was more aligned with the Bauhaus and the German New Objectivity, Quadrante was directly affiliated with Le Corbusier (1887–1965), and Domus remained equidistant, focused on the modernization of decorative arts in the new architecture.

After graduation, she worked for Giò Ponti (1881–1979) between 1941 and 1943, in his new magazine Lo Stile — nella casa e nell'arredamento, a magazine dedicated to the refinement of the fine and applied arts, where architecture was also one of the topics addressed. In this and other magazines, Lina Bo Bardi worked as an illustrator and interior designer, planning decorations and furniture. Her companion and partner in those years, architect Carlo Pagani (1913–1999), was invited to direct Domus in June 1943, where he takes her as a co-director.

The resumption of the modern and national project in Italy took place in the last years of the war, anticipating the reconstruction process that would follow after the conflict ended. There the architect participated in a cultural environment rich in debates about proposals for reconstruction. Beyond the resumption of pre-war rationalism, architecture gave new importance to popular culture, a direct consequence of the Resistance’s role in the defeat of Nazi-fascism.
John and Phyllis Murphy, Kevin Borland and Peter McIntrye Architects, Melbourne Olympic Pool, Victoria, 1953—1956.

© Photographer Wolfgang Sievers, State Library of Victoria.


bhr ox bauhaus reuse
From mid 2019, on the occasion of 100 years of the Bauhaus, the bauhaus reuse (bhr) project has been established as a public center and urban lab for transdisciplinary education, research and participation in Berlin. For the upcoming years it is located in the middle of the roundabout of the Ernst-Reuter-Platz, itself a protected monument of modern landscape architecture designed by Werner Düttmann (1921–1983), realized in 1959–1960. In a diverse program based on discursive, practical and performative formats, the center called bhr ox will work on the topics of modern societies, politics and Baukultur, sustainable urban development and circular society — as well as the future of education and labor.

The transparent pavilion, bauhaus reuse, is built with reused façade elements from the north façade and the atelier house of the famous Bauhaus in Dessau, originating from its postwar refurbishment in 1976. For the 50th anniversary year of the Bauhaus in Dessau, the badly damaged and, over decades, neglected building was renovated in the former German Democratic Republic (GDR). The same year the foundation stone of the Bauhaus Archive was laid in West Berlin, after controversies about the building’s location, which was originally planned for Darmstadt, finally coming to Berlin through Gropius’s own intervention.

For three years the bauhaus reuse project had been located at the Bauhaus Archive when, in 2018, it was dismantled and reassembled for its current, second time of reuse; on both occasions as a practical vocational education project — “Bauplatz” — involving around 100 students.

The bhr ox initiates an intense collaboration with the district council of Berlin-Charlottenburg and public, professional and academic institutions. The on-site cooperation with two universities — the Technical University of Berlin and the Berlin University of the Arts — establishes a pilot-platform for the realization of a number of transdisciplinary projects which will take place in dialog with the public. Furthermore an important topic is the development of the site, the perception and appreciation of the place, which is examined and conveyed with various public formats under the title “Conglomerate of Modernity — Ernst-Reuter-Platz”. The temporary symbiosis of the bauhaus reuse with the square offers a site-specific starting point; among others: an information center about the urban history of the square and the refurbishment of the urban furniture to a heritage-protected state — again as a vocational education project.

The name bauhaus reuse is based on the material act of reuse but indicates on this haptic basis a much larger frame of reference. The concept of bauhaus reuse stands for a material, societal and cultural approach on innovative methods of interpretation and dealing with the heritage, general principles and narratives of modernism.

The deeper meaning of this concept of modern reuse is to question what kind of cultural techniques can be developed within the legacy of modernism. Considering modernism is our most recent past and how we deal with this heritage, in comparison to how other epochs were dealing with its past — in a culturally holistic way — will ultimately define our future; more than in any other era before.

In this respect it is fundamental to retrace and question significant narratives and developments of modernism, in terms of its built environment and its material world of modern industrial production, to examine systems of values and socio-cultural interrelations — this article reveals an excerpt from an ongoing research work.

Material and information

The modern legacy and future, in transition from an industrial, raw material-based society to a knowledge-based
More than a decade ago the Tsam addressed the question of teaching the preservation of modern and contemporary buildings as a new discipline, specifically and radically different from that of new architecture, both in terms of theoretical courses and the contemporary architecture project. It has established a methodology and a practice based on its research that embrace the whole of polytechnic or university education, whether basic or advanced. Finally, the Tsam affirms the richness and the educational power of preservation and its project, and, beyond the subjective feelings and formalistic emotions, base them on an objective and multidisciplinary argumentation combining fine observation of materiality, essential theoretical knowledge and thoughtful creativity.

Projects dealing with existing buildings and structures are major issue in the development of the city in the 21st century and the quality of the environment of its users. The preservation project and the project dealing with the existing are part of an established cultural discipline that expands the contemporary architectural project. Projects dealing with the existing built environment are by no means a new phenomenon. But what makes it a contemporary attitude is the type of theoretical and practical questions about the architectural object regardless its scales, as well as the close look at the materiality of the building that gives birth to the project. The Laboratory of the Techniques and Preservation of Modern Architecture (Tsam), founded in 2007, produces and develops knowledge of techniques and the preservation of modern and contemporary architecture. This knowledge is multidisciplinary and calls for historical reflection as well as material techniques and their implementation as economic and environmental data. It also involves the exercise of specific project strategies (maintenance, preservation, restoration, rehabilitation, restructuring, reuse and extension) combining theoretical knowledge and technical know-how. Tsam’s main objectives are teaching, research and the development of services related to its skills. This essay will be mainly about teaching.

The “Preservation” orientation, under my direction at the EPFL since 2012, organizes this scientific competence, both at the level of studio teaching as well as lecture courses at the Bachelor’s and Master’s level as well as Master’s projects and PhD work.

Seventy percent of the activities of architectural practices in Switzerland concern projects on existing buildings. The course “Designing in the built environment: tools and methods”, under the responsibility of Giulia Marino, seeks to give students the basic theoretical and practical tools to undertake projects on existing structures, on the current ubiquitous built heritage but also on that with a monumental character. This course is in the last semester of the Bachelor’s degree, hence it should be considered a basic educational course in the teaching of architecture.

Indeed, the project in the existing environment is a very broad discipline that calls for many forms of knowledge, a hybrid scientific rigour and prospective imagination. The cultures of history and those of technology intersect and are layered in a creative process that rests on an investigation of the building and continues throughout the process of conception. This intellectual journey is based on the meticulous knowledge of the built work, its observation and physical analysis, by the intersection of history and technology, and the synthesis of the most diverse skills, both theoretical and operational. The principal objective of the course is to identify this complex process. First of all, it is necessary to explain the cultural reasons and the fields of application of the project of preservation and restoration, in support of some theoretical and legislative concepts, as well as an introduction to the knowledge of the current tools of inventory and prior definition of the heritage value of buildings. This historical-critical introduction continues by taking into account the methodological issues of the preservation project, from the first phase of knowledge and analysis, to the development of the most appropriate project strategy, then its management and implementation.

Hence the essential tools of the project in existing structures are approached systematically. An understanding of the constructional specifics of the built heritage and their
Education for Adaptive Reuse —
The 

BY NICHOLAS CLARKE, HIELKJE ZIJLSTRA AND WESSEL DE JONGE

The Section for Heritage and Architecture of the Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment at the Delft University of Technology specializes in architectural education for adaptive reuse of heritage buildings, with a specific focus on the built heritage of the 20th century. Our approach combines architectural design and technological knowledge with an approach that places values as central informants. Here we present our approach, explore the past and project a future evolution of our educational methodology. Finally, we reflect on the lasting relevance of the tangible and intangible heritage of the recent past as aim and source of our educational practice.

Introduction

Educating future architects for the preservation and adaptive reuse of, especially, the built legacy of the 20th century, is different in essence from what Franz Graf (1954–) calls the “chronological process of genesis” in which “new construction begins with programmatic goals and ends with a finished object...”. In contrast, adaptive reuse requires that “...we start from the existing object in order to arrive at a mode of existence that is in keeping with that object”.1

This challenge of education for preservation and adaptive reuse, especially for the built legacy of the 20th century, has been explored at various International docomomo conferences, the last being the “Educating for Preservation and Reuse” session of docomomo 2018 held in Ljubljana, Slovenia. Despite decades of exploration, the challenge remains:

After three decades since the founding of docomomo, education continues to be an essential matter when thinking about the future of modern heritage, but today it requires a critical reflection on the conceptual and methodological changes we need to face in the present context of complexity.3

The challenge of educating for the preservation and adaptive reuse of the built legacy of the 20th century is compounded by the integrated nature of these buildings: conceived as composed of inseparable components. To add to the complexity, technology itself was often chosen for what it represented. These buildings therefore often have a preprogramed message that goes beyond architectural form. Understanding the way that technology is integrated with architecture is often essential to discovering this essence. The built legacy of the Modern Movement presents us with an architecture of matter intertwined with meaning for which an integrated approach is needed.

In education this calls for incrementally developing the capabilities of students within the strictures and limitations of an institutional program. The adaptive reuse of built heritage requires an understanding of both the ideas that generated the built fabric as well as the values that have accrued over time. At the same time students need to be able to make sometimes difficult decisions regarding where and how to intervene in the physical built fabric and spatial structures. These decisions need to be taken in a complex environment where the focus on sustainability and energy use reduction is becoming increasingly urgent, with the danger that if the built heritage cannot answer to ever-increasing demands, they will be sacrificed for new construction.

The Section for Heritage and Architecture (HA) of the Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment, Delft University of Technology has taken on the challenge for education for adaptive reuse and maintains a continued focus on the challenge of preservation and adaptive reuse of Modern architecture. In this article we will outline the history of the development of our educational program, the process we have evolved, outline its main steps and features and reflect on the lacunae that need to be addressed.

The Section for Heritage and Architecture (HA)

Conservation requires the ability to observe, analyze and synthesize.3

Current conservation education at the TU Delft flows from long tradition. It evolved from addressing traditional architectural restoration practice (the maintenance of the status quo through the classical restoration and maintenance
Students investigating the unique windows of the former US Embassy in The Hague, the Netherlands, by Marcel Breuer (1959). These kinds of engagement often challenge students’ pre-existing positions on, for instance, material authenticity and present the dilemmas of preservation and re-use. © Nicholas Clarke.
INTERVIEWS

David Chipperfield

On the 4th March 2019, at his Berlin Office, DJ (Ana Tostões, editor, and Michel Melenhorst, guest editor) interviewed David Chipperfield, an internationally renowned architect, founder of David Chipperfield Architects (1985) whose work is recognized with important awards such as the Stirling Prize, the European Union Prize for Contemporary Architecture [Mies van der Rohe Award] and the Deutscher Architekturpreis.

DJ  The lecture you presented at the 100 Anniversary was very thought-provoking because you addressed what drives docomomo, its ambitions, aspirations, purposes and inspirations: the meaning of today's architectural discipline in connection with memory, future and collectivism. We share the belief that buildings deserve to defy time, earn to be used, deserve to be transformed keeping their character and its construction system. It is amazing to realize that you approached your very particular education assuming a search for the idea of pre-existence.

DC I was at college in the mid-1970s, at a time when modernism was in many ways collapsing. There was an emotional and intellectual reconsideration of the modern movement taking place and, as a consequence of that, a complementary reinterest in history. In architectural terms, it was called post-modernism, which was a strange title in a way because it wasn't very poetic. It was a rather literal idea compared to post-modernism in literature and philosophy. The mid-1970s was a very interesting period in which the heroes were being re-evaluated. So, the first part of my education was Le Corbusier (1887-1965), Alvar Aalto (1898-1976) and Mies van der Rohe (1886-1969) then, all of the sudden, new heroes were brought to the fore like Gunnar Asplund (1885-1942) and Edwin Lutyens (1869-1944). Everyone was talking about Beaux-arts and Charles Rennie Mackintosh (1868-1928), architects that were a little bit unfashionable to the mainstream modernist education from before. There was an understanding of why the collapse of modernism as an ideology was occurring. Suddenly in England, it was very difficult to argue against the criticism that modern buildings were awful. Modernism had not refreshed itself, it was just using up that last energy of what started off as a very visionary series of ideas. Eventually the ideology disappeared and just became a loose style. Moreover, in the hands of developers and bad architects it became an excuse to build something without much thought. So, the rethinking and the re-energising of the architectural debate through a desire to look for something richer was needed. As modernism had lost its physical strength, buildings from the 19th century were being re-evaluated and people like Henri Labrouste (1801-1875) were being studied. The Smithsons gave a lecture at the Architectural Association School of Architecture (AA), on Labrouste, and Henry Russel Hitchcock (1923-1987) came to the Beaux-arts Exhibition in London, which previously had been at MoMA. So, you had Henry Russell Hitchcock, who in a way invented the “International Style” at the Museum of Modern Art, in a conference about the Beaux-arts. Full circle.

DJ Incredible. It is interesting because in different parts of Europe the situation was not completely the same, for instance in Delft ten years later it was still pretty much modernist, and certain things, like what was going on in Italy, la Tendenza, was just not spoken of.

DC I think that modernism was more societally embedded in the Netherlands whereas in England we had so much bad modern developers’ architecture in the 1970s and 1980s. If you went to Sheffield, for example, and you asked people what they thought about modern architecture they would say they hated it. Taking into consideration the modernist housing projects, now we have a bit more objective distance to them, both in terms of their architecture and their social weaknesses or strengths, which allows us to think and debate whether these were good options or not. But, I would say that at the time there was a very sentimental emphasis in Britain about a past time, and an architecture which was richer and stronger. And there were two things happening at the same time; a re-interest in history and a re-interest in the city, intellectually allied with the Italian position of Rossi and others. Of course, they were both coming from the same core anxieties. One of those concerns was slightly more emotional and the other was slightly more intellectual ... one was a little bit more humanist and one was more about the fabric of architecture. I think it was a very interesting period. It wasn't only about killing modernism, but it was a critique.

DJ Would you say that, at that time, what society expected of architects was clearer than it is nowadays? If we read the introduction of your 2018 book “David Chipperfield Architects” you
On the 27th August 2019, at his Amsterdam office, DJ (Ana Tostões, editor, and Michel Melenhorst, guest editor) interviewed Wiel Arets, an internationally renowned architect, and the founder of Wiel Arets Architects (1983). He has since taught at several universities worldwide, having also been Dean of the Berlage Institute in Rotterdam (1995–2001) and Dean of the College of Architecture (CoA) at the Illinois Institute of Technology (iit) in Chicago (2012–2017).

Wiel Arets

I'll start with when I was born; my background. I was born in Heerlen. It was a miner's town. So, what I've learned from the Heerlen mining was that as they started to explore for coal, the city grew, in 25 years, into one of the most important cities in the Netherlands. Heerlen became a very entrepreneurial city where they were focused on finding new opportunities. Before Heerlen, they would simply demolish buildings, but now they seemed to be using a different approach. You would agree with that, or would you say you had the same attitude towards the Antwerp Tower (2017–) and the Glaspaleis (1998–2004), both refurbishment projects that are quite different from one another. So, perhaps you can take us on a tour from the late-1980s, like the Beltgens Fashion Shop in Maastricht you intervened on, to the projects you are working on now, and how you have changed in your own attitude, approach, and design strategies.

“Here is a human being and, as a human being, you can walk through that mountain without there being any hole in it”. He believed we all are in a certain frequency; “There's a frequency A, a frequency B... And the only thing you need to do is to sync into the right frequency, and you would be able to walk through the mountain without making a hole”, and that certainly caught my attention.

For me there were two main aspects of my life, which start here. There is the ziel (soul), and the mind; body, and soul. And ziel is something you can't define. For me this is extremely important. When we talk about periods such as the Renaissance, the Baroque, Gothic, until the Modern Movement, and today; I still believe that we, intrinsically, talk about these two ideas, of body and soul. For example, before the machine age, there's the mind and the body; god and soul. There's the idea that we won't die, the soul will always be alive, only the body dies. Then in the 20th century we get the machine. The machine makes the statement “god is dead”, now the machine doesn't die, the machine can repeat, and “live” on.

Now to answer your question, about my start in architecture... In 1977 I started to study, graduating in 1983. On the 23rd of June I got my diploma from the Technical University of Eindhoven and on the 24th I went to Japan. Every year I undertook an intense trip which I always prepared months in advance, with a lot of literature and much writing. I traveled to Italy, to Paris to study Le Corbusier (1887–1965), and as a 2nd year student, in 1979, I traveled to Russia to see all the Konstantin Melnikov (1890–1974) projects. Before I visited Japan, I prepared for the trip. I wanted to go to Japan to understand who Kazuo Shinohara (1925–2006) was; who Tadao Ando (1941–) was, who Fumihiko Maki (1928–) was. These three were extremely important for me and also three completely different architects. So, I went to Japan and spent about five weeks there. There were two more important trips for me in this period. One was Mexico, which was important for Luis Barragán (1902–1988) and the local 19th and 20th century architecture, as well as for the cultures of the Aztecs, Toltecs, and Olmecs.

The other extremely important moment is when I first discovered Malaparte (1898–1957), the man and the villa. I discovered Malaparte's writings, Casa come me, the house as...
How did the Bauhaus get its name?

BY DIETRICH NEUMANN

Historians have always assumed that Walter Gropius (1883-1969) invented the name Das Bauhaus (somewhat inadequately translated as “house for building”) for the school he founded in Weimar in 1919. Often, critics have noted the brilliance of this “unique creation”, as it announced the radical change have noted the brilliance of this “unique creation”, as it announced the radical change in the context of the contemporary art scene. The “Grand Ducal Saxon School of Arts and Crafts” was transformed into a new institution that was going to be more accessible, grounded and humble. It promised both a new beginning and a connection to builders’ guilds of the medieval past.

However, when Walter Gropius founded his school in April 1919, a Das Bauhaus G.m.b.H. had already existed in Berlin for four years (G.m.b.H. is the German acronym for a company with limited liability). Founder and owner was the prominent architect and developer Albert Gessner (1868 – 1953). In 1909, he had published a substantial volume on apartment houses and had built several large, middle-class apartment blocks himself. His buildings found a very positive reception, in particular due to their sophisticated arrangement, their colorful façades and the spatial sequences inside. Historian and critic Julius Posener (1924-1996) considered Albert Gessner “the most important reformer of the apartment building.” His best known housing estate was the “Sophie – Charlottenpark” at the corner of Bismarck- and Grolmanstrasse in Berlin’s Charlottenburg section, built 1905-1907 and destroyed in WWII. Julius Gessner himself lived there with his family and his office was located there as well.

The unusual corner arrangement at this housing estate was often noted with great admiration – instead of the usual solution with badly lit rooms at the interior angles, Julius Gessner opened the corner up and created a communal garden, shielded from the street on the first floor by a low structure for a café. The resulting clash of gables above provides a dramatic, provocative outline. The resulting loss of rentable space was partially remedied by better lit interiors.

Julius Gessner and Walter Gropius knew each other from the German Werkhund, that important organization of artists, architects and industrialists, which had been founded in 1907. Julius Gessner had been one of the first members and instrumental in formulating its concept. Five years earlier, he had founded an artist society called Werkring, which had the architects Alfred Grenander (1861-1931), August Endell (1871-1925) and Bruno Möhring (1863-1929) among its members, as well as several sculptors and painters. The group participated in numerous exhibitions and countered the predominant Art Nouveau style of the time with a simpler and more functional approach to spatial and structural design.

This Werking was one of the inspirations for the German Werkhund and was absorbed into it at its founding. Both terms Werkhund and Werkring mean essentially the same thing – an association for the creation of works – implicitly assuming works of craft or design.

Two years after the Werkhund founding, Gessner himself created a new company, called “Das Werkhaus G.m.b.H.” – an institution for the creation of furniture, furnishing and works of applied arts. It was quite successful for a number of years, and by 1914 operated four stores in Berlin, which sold furniture, tableware, lamps, metal fittings etc. that Gessner had designed. “The Werkhaus sees its task in lending all furnishings of a building that are commercially available a unified artistic character...” Gessner wrote in one of his sales brochures. Albert Gessner’s undertaking was not unique. Since 1879, there had been Hermann Hirschwald’s store for applied arts in Berlin – renamed “Henzoltern Kunstgewerbehaus” in 1892, to acknowledge the crown prince’s (of the Henzoltern dynasty) interest in good design. At the start of WWI, Albert Gessner (1868-1915) faced economic difficulties and closed it due to the economic hardships of the war. Albert Gessner, meanwhile, tried to attract new customers for large architectural projects. Since architects were not allowed to advertise in Germany, he founded a separate company in 1915, through which he could promote his work. It was clearly meant as a counterpart to his former Werkhaus and called Das Bauhaus G. m. b. H. Instead of furniture and furnishings, one now could commission or acquire entire buildings.

In Berlin’s address book of 1915 advertised: “Execution of houses of all kinds, from the smallest vacation home to the richest residential palace, as well as entire housing estates, designed by Albert Gessner and other artists. Managing Director: architect Richard Friebel”. This Bauhaus was located at the above mentioned “Sophie – Charlottenpark”, housing estate at Grolmanstrasse 1/2, in close vicinity to Albert Gessner’s apartment. It is mentioned in all Berlin address books from 1915 to 1925. Albert Gessner closed his Bauhaus G.m.b.H. in 1920 – there was little building activity, due to a major economic crisis after the war and the Versailles Treaty. Albert Gessner himself noted that his architectural career lost its dynamic in the following years. He became engaged in local politics, accepted a professorship at the Charlottenburg University and was elected into the Academy of Arts Albert Gessner feared that German architecture was losing its local relevance under the onslaught of internationalism. Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Walter Gropius, Erich Mendelsohn (1887-1953) and other modernists had, in 1926, founded an association called Der Ring. In opposition, Albert Gessner formed a group called Der Block (the meaning of ring and block is very similar in English) in 1928, together with conservative architects Paul Schulz-Neaumburg (1869-1949), Paul Bonatz (1877-1951), Paul Schmitthenner (1884-1972) and others, who were vehemently opposed to the ideas of the Dessau Bauhaus and argued for a conservative regional architecture. Paul Schulz-Neaumburg was a key figure in the expulsion of the Bauhaus from Dessau. Albert Gessner enthusiastically joined the NSDAP in 1932, and the Nazis closed the Berlin Bauhaus in 1933.

It is certainly possible that Walter Gropius found the name Bauhaus independently and did not know about Albert Gessner’s enterprise. After all, during the war Walter Gropius was rarely in Berlin, as he used his occasional furloughs from the front to visit his wife Alma and their daughter Manon in Vienna. New compound words employing the word Bau were not uncommon at the time: In 1902 the architectural magazine Bauwelten (building world) began to appear, in 1918 the magazine Bauhütte (building hut) followed, and in 1919 Martin Wagner (1885-1957) founded, simultaneous with the Bauhaus, a socialist building society, called Bauhütte (literally: building hut — the
A step towards education for reuse

From 6 to 9 September 2016, the major event concerning the discussion on the reuse of Modern Movement buildings and sites occurred in Lisbon: the 14th International docomomo Conference. More than 500 people from five continents came together, around keynote and paper sessions, round-tables, tours and workshops, to discuss the subject “Adaptive reuse. The Modern Movement towards the future”. It not only gave rise to the most up-to-date scientific result on the topic—the homonymous proceedings—, as many other strengths and initiatives were driven from that moment on. The research project RMB - Reuse of Modernist Buildings was born from this gathering, in parallel to the first paper session in docomomo conferences specifically dedicated to “Education for Reuse”.

The premise was simple: it is urgent to introduce the topic of reuse in the basic educational programs training architects. As docomomo has been stating in past years, the preservation and transformation of modern architecture and urbanism will be the main field of activity for architects all over the world, and it demands specific knowledge. As reuse – and even rehabilitation – is usually absent from architectural education which is mainly focused on the artistic and technical formation of the architect, a group of docomomo members came together to apply for an EU Erasmus+ research project. Its main goal was to draft a joint masters degree course on the reuse of modern buildings.

To that end, the project developed seven main outputs:

- A curriculum, with course descriptions.
- A methodology.
- The infrastructure necessary to implement the master, intended to be virtual utilizing digital tools.
- Teaching material, ranging from traditional texts and PowerPoint presentations, to filmed conferences and audio interviews.
- Scientific papers in the field of investigation undertaken by the project researchers.
- E-learning tools and content.
- A case study handbook, with examples of best practices, working cases and theoretical practices.

Parallel to this production, international conferences with published proceedings and student workshops have been set up. Conferences promoting exchange of knowledge in the field and workshops putting words and thoughts into action. The latter turned out to be the best active products of the main goals and research undertaken for the project.

Intended to test the joint master curriculum and methods defined along the way, workshops were opened to students from the RMB university partners, simulating what could happen in the real masters degree course where student exchange between countries should take place every semester.

Housing was the typology given primacy in the four workshops organized. The first one (2017) took place in Marl, Germany, under the theme “An experimental development of new residential and working environments and typologies in large-scale housing projects of the post-war era in Marl”. The second one (2018) was held in Coimbra, Portugal, dedicated to “Coimbra modern city today – from functional buildings to community spaces”. “Renewals and interrelations for 1960s cooperative houses in Istanbul” was the subject of the third workshop (2018), held in Istanbul, Turkey, while “After the military has gone” was the topic of the fourth and last one (2019), held in Detmold, Germany.

All the workshops were focused on specific case studies from the sites where they were held, so that students could undertake visits, physical and social surveys, understand the surrounding context, and develop their own interpretation of the place. In different ways, all the case studies suffered a change of political, economic, and social paradigm, having become in need of a re-evaluation able to understand if an adaptation to current demands would be possible. Most of them were in bad condition, abandoned or planned for demolition. Architectural design projects, proposing sustainable reuse projects, that might allow contemporary forms of living and dwelling, were the intended result.

The diversity of proposals and the trial of different approaches, methods and tools, necessarily based on interdisciplinary research, ranging from technical to social knowledge, from economics to politics, was symptomatic of the pertinence and urgency of such education for reuse as the basis for a sustainable future of our cities. The strong involvement of inhabitants, institutions and the press in the workshops was the ultimate confirmation of the relevance of architecture and reuse for our society, testifying the relevance of docomomo’s efforts. Finally, it proved the importance of empirical knowledge, through the direct contact with case studies – from the object to the city – and of the face-to-face discussion with local entities and our pairs of students, as a complement to the masters degree course which is designed to be assigned online.
**BOOK REVIEWS**

**Bauhaus Imaginista: A School in the World**
Author: Marion von Osten, Grant Watson
Publisher: Thames & Hudson Ltd
ISBN: 9780500021934
Language: English
Year: 2019

In the past 100 years, there have been very rare educational institutions that can produce such far-reaching, complex, and even controversial influences as the Bauhaus. Do we still need the Bauhaus nowadays? Do we still need its zeitgeist? Having begun in 2016, an exhibition called *Bauhaus Imaginista* will tour around eight places through four continents to answer the question of the relationship between Bauhaus production and the world. This book, also the portrait of the exhibition, focuses on the cultural exchange between the Bauhaus with different geographies at different periods. Marion von Osten and Grant Watson, authors of the book as well as curators of the exhibition, are dedicated to the openness and experimentation of modernism itself, especially the changes that global circulation brings to the idea we have of the Bauhaus. It makes this book, not a classical history writing on how periphery arts borrow lessons from Bauhaus thoughts and then transform them, but one returns to the Bauhaus school itself. Based on mapping, the whole book is divided into four chapters, including "Corresponding with", "Learning From", "Moving Away" and "Still Undead". Together, they historically display how a global network produced the Bauhaus concepts, which were not only applied throughout the world but also at the same time affected by these applications.

Yunlong YU

**Bauhaus goes West. Modern Art and Design in Britain and America**
Author: Alan Powers
Publisher: Thames and Hudson Ltd
ISBN: 9780500519929
Language: English
Year: 2019

*Bauhaus Goes West* tells the fascinating story of the journey taken by the Bauhaus – both the concept behind the school and some of the individuals who represented it – from Germany to Britain and the United States. It is, therefore, a story of cultural exchange, not only between the Bauhaus émigrés and the countries to which they moved, but also in the other direction, focusing in particular on Britain. Most significantly, perhaps, it considers in detail the presence in the UK during the 1930s of three of the school’s most important figures – Walter Gropius (1883-1969), Marcel Breuer (1902-1981) and László Moholy-Nagy (1895-) – using meticulous research to tell, for the first time, the stories of their British experiences in parallel. After considering some of the lesser-known Bauhäusler who stayed in Britain for life, the book concludes by returning to the lives of the main protagonists and their continuation of the Bauhaus ideals in America.

Taking as its starting point the cultural connection between Britain and Germany in the early part of the 20th century, *Bauhaus Goes West* offers a timely re-evaluation of the school’s influence on and relationship with modern art and design, offering fresh insights and challenging assumptions along the way.

From the publisher

**Bauhaus 100 Sites of Modernism**
Authors: Werner Durth and Wolfgang Pehnt
Publisher: Hatje Cantz
ISBN: 9783775746144
Language: English
Year: 2019

The Bauhaus is not to be found only in Berlin, Dessau, or Weimar; there are outstanding Bauhaus and modernist sites all over Germany trailblazing architecture that has left a lasting mark on our understanding of life, work, education and living.

Through more than 100 structures, most of which are open to tourists, this volume makes it possible to experience the historical and architectural vestiges of the “New Architecture.” Besides the famous buildings, *Bauhaus 100* presents insider tips for sites to visit throughout Germany, along with a wealth of visual material, essays and practical advice. This book is an invitation to rediscover 20th century architecture and track its enduring developments.

From the publisher
BOOK REVIEWS

Bauhaus Women: A Global Perspective
Author: Elizabeth Otto and Patrick Rössler
Publisher: Herbert Press
ISBN: 978 1 912217 96 0
Language: English
Year: 2019

This book presents forty-five women, in different ways associated with the Bauhaus between 1919 and 1932, who fought for dreams usually socially predetermined as masculine. At the same time, Bauhaus Women: A Global Perspective attempts to understand the importance of these women in global history. Presenting their different native lands and their places of influence, it is possible to dive straight into the art of the continents of Africa, America, Asia and Europe, and Oceania, and the important legacy that these women left in the world.

The publication is significant and relevant in uncovering a substantial part of this school, cataloging and synthesizing each one of them in two to six pages, complemented with personal images and those of their work. With this short book, Bauhaus history is changed and the authors, Elizabeth Otto and Patrick Rössler, take us out of the shadows of a masculinized artistic society, highlighting a hidden part of the radical experiments in Bauhaus art.

First warning: This is not a book from or about women. This is a book for and about the Bauhaus school and art in the world.

Second warning: This is not a book about all the women who studied at the Bauhaus, as the book presents only ten percent of them: 462 women attended the Bauhaus (Weimar, Dessau and Berlin) between 1919 and 1932.

From the publisher

Author: Various authors
Publisher: Lars Müller Publishers in collaboration with Bauhaus-Archiv/ Museum für Gestaltung, Berlin
ISBN: 978 3 03778 588 1
Language: English/German
Year: 2019

One hundred years after the founding of Bauhaus, it’s time to revisit the bauhaus journal as a significant written testimony of this iconic movement of modern art. In this journal, published periodically from 1926 to 1931, the most important voices of the movement are heard: masters of the Bauhaus, among others, Josef Albers, Walter Gropius, Wassily Kandinsky, Paul Klee, László Moholy-Nagy, and Oskar Schlemmer, as well as Herbert Bayer, Marcel Breuer, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Gerrit Rietveld, and many more.

They address the developments in and around the Bauhaus, the methods and focal points of their own teaching, and current projects of students and masters. At the time primarily addressed to the members of the “circle of friends of the bauhaus”, the journal published by Gropius and Moholy-Nagy makes tangible the authentic voice of this mouthpiece of the avant-garde. The facsimile reprint is intended to give new impetus to international discussion and research on the Bauhaus, its theories and designs.

The publication is significant and relevant in uncovering a substantial part of this school, cataloging and synthesizing each one of them in two to six pages, complemented with personal images and those of their work. With this short book, Bauhaus history is changed and the authors, Elizabeth Otto and Patrick Rössler, take us out of the shadows of a masculinized artistic society, highlighting a hidden part of the radical experiments in Bauhaus art.

First warning: This is not a book from or about women. This is a book for and about the Bauhaus school and art in the world.

Second warning: This is not a book about all the women who studied at the Bauhaus, as the book presents only ten percent of them: 462 women attended the Bauhaus (Weimar, Dessau and Berlin) between 1919 and 1932.

From the publisher

Bauhaus Architecture 1919–1933
Photographs by Hans Engels,
Texts by Axel Tilch
Publisher: Prestel
ISBN: 9783791384818
Language: English
Year: 2018


The publication opens with “A new perspective”, a brief introduction which provides a concise overview of the founding principles of the Bauhaus and the circumstances that affected its evolution and, eventually led to its close.

The collection of photographs follows, introducing the 60 cases, displayed in chronological order, from 1921 to 1933, covering only European examples. The selected buildings, ranging from renowned to not-so-well-known projects, vary in typology and just skim the surface of the very prolific body of work that was produced by the masters, the teachers and students, during the short time the school remained open. In the majority, the buildings are presented through exterior photographs, however, in some cases the reader gets a glimpse of the interiors and the remaining charm of the spaces.

The photographs are shown alongside brief descriptions that, in several cases, reveal thoughts and opinions from architects of the time. The writings also allow a confrontation with the current state of the properties and their uses.

This publication intends to briefly register, through a present-day lens, a small part of the built legacy left by the Bauhaus, while imprinting on the reader the need to visit and to know more about this legacy.

Beatriz Agostinho
BOOK REVIEWS

Bauhaus Travel Book
Author: Bauhaus Kooperation Berlin Dessau
Weimar gGmbH
Publisher: Prestel
ISBN: 978 3 7913 8244 9
Language: English
Year: 2017

A comprehensive travel guide dedicated to Germany's Bauhaus architecture, this book takes an in-depth look at over 100 locations that can still be visited today. Established in 1919 in Weimar, the Bauhaus college for design influenced one of the world's most important Modernist movements. Divided into three geographic sections that follow the locations of the school – Weimar (1919–25), Dessau (1925–33), and Berlin (1933) – this unique travel guide leads readers through the most important Bauhaus structures in Germany. Each section features important sites that are given historical background. These entries are illustrated with historic and contemporary photography, and are accompanied by up-to-date tourist information. Throughout the book short essays highlight significant events and figures of the Bauhaus movement. This guidebook is an indispensable reference for anyone traveling to Germany's greatest extant Bauhaus structures.

From the publisher

Detmold Conference Week 2017
Authors: M. Melenhorst, U. Pottgiesser, C. Naumann, T. Kellner. (Eds.)
Publisher: Hochschule OWL (University of Applied Sciences)
ISBN: 978 1 939349 27 3
Language: English
Year: 2017

This publication is the result of the cooperation between ConstructionLab and the Project Consortium of RMB (Reuse of Modernist Buildings) which offered two joint and thematically linked conferences: “RMB – Reuse of Modernist Buildings” (coincident with the 3rd RMB and 16th Portucan Conference) – the “RMB – Reuse of Modernist Buildings” conference proceedings contain the discussion of new design and educational concepts for the reuse of modern postwar buildings from “resilient neighborhoods” to “resilient building skins” and the education for reuse.

At the “Facade2017 – Resilience” the focus was on how the building envelope has been affected by the current demands of climate change and safety and security requirements.

Since the Detmold Conference Week in 2017, the RMB has held two more conferences – the 2nd RMB Conference, in Coimbra, Portugal (2018) and the 3rd RMB and 16th docomomo Germany Conference, in Berlin, Germany (2019). Similar to this publication, the proceedings of these conferences are available online at http://www.rmb-eu.com/publications/.

Carolina Chaves

BAUHAUS 1919–1933: Workshops for Modernity
Authors: Barry Bergdoll, Leah Dickerman
Publisher: The Museum of Modern Art
ISBN: 9780870707582
Language: English
Year: 2009

The Bauhaus started out as a school and later became a massive cultural “movement” that changed deeply the way we understand artistic education and even the way we experience the world. This catalog, published as a supplement to the homonymous exhibition organized by The Museum of Modern Art (Nov. 8, 2009 – Jan. 25, 2010), curated by Barry Bergdoll and Leah Dickerman, gathers manifestos and works in a well-illustrated manner and succeeds in creating the general image of what “BAUHAUS” means. All the information presented follows a chronological thread that allows the reader to simultaneously understand the social, economic and political context that influenced the events described.

Based on a collaboration with three Bauhaus collections in Germany – the Bauhaus-Archive Berlin, the Klassik Stiftung Weimar and the Stiftung Bauhaus Dessau - the publication is completed with exemplary illustrations, allowing a better understanding of the written content. Moreover, the main characters and their personalities are also examined and depicted so as to relate them to the role each played in the Bauhaus “movement”. The final part of the book – “14 years Bauhaus: a chronicle” – resumes the main historical events and facts of the 14 years of the school’s existence, arranged according to its academic calendar, re-calling issues such as the number and gender of the students and contemporary political events of the time.

All in all, the publication covers all the great accomplishments and the basic information that one should know about the Bauhaus, outlining the Modern Movement and the struggle the school faced regarding the political context of that time.

Minodora Toma
The relevance of the Bauhaus on design and architecture and its vast legacy resulted in an extensive collection of works documenting the intricacies of the school’s philosophy and production, but few have taken the immersive approach this record dared to take.

By interpolating recordings of the actual members of the school, such as Walter Gropius, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe and Josef Albers, with roughly contemporary pieces by composers somehow linked to the school, such as Josef Matthias Hauer, Stefan Wolpe, George Antheil, Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt and Arnold Schoenberg, this CD successfully paints a vivid picture of the spirit of the times in which modernism developed greatly both in design and in music.

While the Bauhaus never formalized a music department, in its ambition to unite all the arts, music permeated the premises and collaborations between composers and teachers of the school weren’t unheard of. For example, Josef Matthias Hauer, the composer of the opening piece of this recording, met with Johannes Itten with whom he worked on synesthetic theories in which the correspondence between colors and musical notes was studied. The inclusion of music in a work about the Bauhaus is perfectly justified and hasn’t been widely explored apart from a 1976 essay, “Music at the Bauhaus”, by Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt, featured in this compilation with his “Marsch Alexander des Grossen”.

By associating seminal speeches by some of the most important members of the Bauhaus, with the music that figuratively and literally echoed throughout the halls of the school, this CD presents us with a tour de force of easy-listening learning experience about one of the most influential moments of the 20th century.

Sandra Vaz Costa

Leandro Arez