

Winfried Nerdinger in an Interview
with Andrea Bärnreuther

resolving social issues
through architecture

Andrea Bärnreuther:

Anh-Linh Ngo says that you can't fling social issues at architects and designers and expect them to solve them, which is a statement I find surprising in view of our subject matter—Bauhaus and Modernism—because it sounds like an unreasonable demand and a mistaken aspiration. I would like to ask you, as an architectural historian in whose work an engagement with the self-image of the architect throughout the ages emerges as a recurrent theme, culminating in the opus magnum of your farewell exhibitions *Der Architekt—Geschichte und Gegenwart eines Berufsstandes* and *L'architecture engagée—Manifeste zur Veränderung der Gesellschaft*,⁵ if you could briefly sketch out the self-image of Modernist architects in this context and also shed some light on how much leeway architects have when it comes to shaping social policy?

social and political
commitment

history of architecture
as history of power/capital

Winfried Nerdinger

Social commitment, or rather resolving social issues through architecture, is not one of the characteristic traits of the architectural profession. On the contrary, looking back at history it repeatedly becomes clear that for long periods architects were simply acting as vicarious agents for those in power, those who rule and those who own property, as is still the case today. In the nineteenth century, there were only a handful of architects with social or political commitment, the great exceptions in this context being Gottfried Semper, William Morris and Tony Garnier with the *Cité Industrielle* of 1901.

modern architecture vs.
historicizing architecture

It was only indirectly, if at all, that what we call modern architecture nowadays arose as an architectural response to social questions. The main focus was on engaging with 19th-century historicist «style-driven architecture», which was to be replaced by a new style based on structural concerns and function. The land reform and garden city movement, which aimed to attain cooperative lifestyles and housing, showed social commitment, but scarcely any of its plans could be realized before the First World War.

social impact of architecture

The idea that «bare», unadorned buildings and open spaces would create a new hygienic, healthy city for the masses was only picked up by a handful of architects as a result of the political system-change in 1918/19 and the social obligations arising from land ownership laid down in the Weimar Constitution, as well as

- [1] What can we learn from the history of the Bauhaus and Modernism when facing current issues? And how can this enable us to gain new insights into the past?

modern architecture
and design as a response
to social modernization

with state intervention in housing construction. One could even say that the Weimar Republic was the first era in which a larger number of architects took up the challenge of having a social impact with their designs. The guiding concepts of light, air, sun and «liberated living» had been dictated by urban hygiene in the 19th century, but now architects such as Bruno Taut, Ernst May, as well as Walter Gropius were on the lookout for architectural forms that would make healthy living possible. In addition, they sought in their designs to respond to social developments such as the breakdown of the traditional family, the emergence of the nuclear family with wives taking on an independent role, and new forms of shared living. Taut in Magdeburg and Berlin, May in Frankfurt/Main and Gustav Oelsner in Altona, in particular, engaged with these issues in the sense of directly influencing, through architecture, the ways in which people can live together. The Bauhaus did not play a significant role in this context except for the period when it was directed by Hannes Meyer.

Andrea Bärnreuther

bauhaus as a call for change

learning to live differently
in the world

new building of the future
new everyday environment

interdisciplinary approach
collective living and working

social-utopian aspirations

- [1] Essayist, researcher and exhibition curator Thierry Fabre, currently director of the Méditerranée programme at IMéRA, Marseille, considers the Bauhaus to be a model for the present in view of the urgent need to change the ways we live and to inhabit the world differently, namely with an awareness of limits and a sense of proportion—«un art d’habiter le monde autrement». ⁶ He associates a visionary élan with the Bauhaus, the aspiration to redesign the future, the invention of the unknown, the reinvention of the everyday, interdisciplinary forms of artistic design and collective forms of production. Taking as our point of departure the utopian ideas or rather the verbal and aesthetic articulations of the Bauhaus’ founding phase, in which the Bauhaus’ founder and his colleagues also worked through their war experiences, can we derive a kind of wisdom about life, survival and coexistence that could be helpful to us in the face of the challenges of our time—from climate change to the coronavirus/COVID-19 crisis—and to which we could attribute a certain genuine historical efficacy, even if all the aspirations were not satisfied?

lessons from the Bauhaus

Winfried Nerdinger

If one reduces the Bauhaus to the way in which myriad experiments moving in all directions were conducted after the First World War, seeking to give shape to future forms of life and inspired

- [O] What is the significance and relevance of the Bauhaus and Modernism today—a historical phenomenon or a resource for the present? And what, if anything, constitutes their current relevance?

by the sense that this was a political turning point, then perhaps we could in principle learn something from it. What I think would be counterproductive would be to want to re-start the Bauhaus as a kind of historical dynamo, because the issues that are pressing for us today, such as climate change, sustainability, resource conservation, globalization etc., were not yet present at the Bauhaus at all—the Bauhaus was based on a completely intact faith in progress.

faith in progress

- [O] be counterproductive would be to want to re-start the Bauhaus as a kind of historical dynamo, because the issues that are pressing for us today, such as climate change, sustainability, resource conservation, globalization etc., were not yet present at the Bauhaus at all—the Bauhaus was based on a completely intact faith in progress.

If we look at it from this angle, the experimental work at the Bauhaus would have to be pursued as processes and not as form-finding. Frei Otto, the most important German architect of the post-war period internationally, advocated precisely that at the opening of the Bauhaus-Archiv in Berlin in December 1979, in a speech that remains relevant today: «The idea of the Bauhaus is not necessarily in my view, and I do emphasize that this is my view, something that can be depicted in images. The Bauhaus itself was not a style, but a goal, a distant goal. The Bauhaus did not have a method for dealing with what was static, but for development, for the process driven. It was a far-reaching method.»⁷

bauhaus' process-driven approach

Forty years ago, Frei Otto radically opposed German post-war architecture and its senescence in the wake of the Bauhaus, and, in a brilliant speech, he appealed clearly to the conscience of the assembled German architectural celebrities. He described the historical Bauhaus as a method that liberated, expanded and opened up new possibilities, but for him the Bauhaus-Archiv was only a place where one could now view «the dreams of our grandfathers and great-grandfathers». He no longer considered the Bauhaus itself to be having any impact, in contrast to the Ulm Hochschule für Gestaltung (HfG) [Ulm School of Design], which had closed ten years earlier.

hfg ulm's criticism of the bauhaus

According to Frei Otto, contemporary architects only concealed the unresolved problems of the time behind «artificial facades». This was how he aptly characterized the entire Postmodern movement and its successors. Two years earlier, he had already opposed the architectural community in a tirade during a speech to mark the Schinkel Award, declaring «You have to finally stop building architecture that is so contrary to nature!»⁸ In Berlin, he demanded that building should at last be treated as a field for experimentation, because «opportunities and possibilities are reflected in questions». He went on to cite a whole series of challenges, such as fair use of the Earth's surface, more communication with less traffic, building without money, participatory planning, building with as little material as possible, adaptable building,

building as a field for experimentation

- [O] What is the significance and relevance of the Bauhaus and Modernism today—a historical phenomenon or a resource for the present? And what, if anything, constitutes their current relevance?

problems of habitat

self-sufficient housing without external energy sources—and, last but not least, «reflecting on the problems of habitat in all countries, in Europe too, without wanting to export solutions from here to there». His appeal to the architectural community met with practically no response, and the Bauhaus did not pick up on any of his points either, although Frei Otto recalled that Walter Gropius had visited his «Entwicklungsstätte für den Leichtbau» [Development Center for Lightweight Construction] in Berlin-Zehlendorf in the early 1960s and had apparently been impressed by the interdisciplinary research work conducted there.

interdisciplinary approach

Lessons could still be learned from Frei Otto's tirade today, for his diagnosis of the architectural scene and his criticism of «artificial facades» are not outdated. His reference to the plight of the competition system, where architects «sit in authoritarian judgement [over colleagues] on democratically packaged competitions», was also apt. That means that if the Bauhaus were treated as a place where questions are asked of the present and solutions are sought, it could still have an invigorating effect today; however, in today's investor-driven billion-dollar construction industry, asking questions while at the same time fundamentally questioning the architectural business seems to be possible only in very restricted areas, if at all. Incidentally, Frei Otto experienced this first-hand, for he was never able to gain a foothold in the German architecture scene and always remained an outsider. Modern architecture, which once set out to improve life by building, has largely—exceptions confirm the rule—degenerated into corporate modernism, a hollow shell and embellishment of capital interests.

[O]

refusing architectural
business-as-usual

modern architecture

loss of emancipatory promise

Andrea Bärnreuther

relationship to history

In the case of Walter Gropius, utopian thinking is combined with a difficult relationship to history. How should we imagine Walter Gropius' relationship to history, what were his ideas on how to deal with it and on tradition and continuity in architecture? Gropius, this architect who—to coin a phrase—invokes the Gothic cathedral and the medieval masons' lodges and guilds of skilled craftsmen while standing amidst the ruins of the First World War, who creates a collection (of glass slides) showing modern architecture together with so-called «world architecture», who wants to create a new style and then wants to establish a new ultimate tradition independent of time and place, when he realizes that in so doing he could risk losing his role as an innovator. Is Gropius' attitude comparable to that of Jean Jaurès, who once declared that

the right way to deal with the past or tradition is to carry over into the future the vibrant forces that have been at play in the past—or, roughly translated into English, «tradition means to keep the fire alive and not to admire the ashes»?

Winfried Nerdinger

Although Gropius repeatedly invoked Gothic cathedrals and masons' lodges, and hung a copy of a Gothic plan of Ulm Minster in his study even in the USA, Gothic was not a historical architectural reference point for him, but only a term that referenced an erstwhile cultural unity, legible in a unified work of architecture created jointly by craftsmen and artists. Analogously, he wanted, in the spirit of the Deutscher Werkbund, to give unified expression to the technical and economic forces of the day aiming at creating a unified culture again and ultimately finding a modern style. Since technology and industry do not stop at national borders, he advocated «international architecture» that would stand out from all historical, nationally influenced forms. He fought against and denigrated 19th-century historicism, i.e. the use of historical forms, as a weak «pseudo-tradition», asserting that design should be grounded solely in the spirit of the present. Other modern architects, such as Otto Wagner, Adolf Loos or Henry van de Velde, also lambasted historical references but Gropius was the most dogmatic propagandist in disseminating this way of thinking, which has shaped many architects to this day. In his lectures and writings, he rigorously proclaimed that every era should express itself in keeping with its times and to that end should, if necessary, eliminate the defunct past. This attitude led him to justify the demolition of New York's Penn Station, one of the most important historical buildings in the USA, claiming it was only «superficial fake art». He did not have the slightest understanding of the historical growth and the fusion of forms. Space should and must be made for the new. In his lectures on «Tradition and Continuity in Architecture», he repeatedly emphasized that the architect must educate the average citizen, who still clung to the past, to grasp today's parameters for determining value, without ever reflecting that these alleged parameters were for the most part merely a reflection of economic conditions and interests, and that his reference to the supposedly imperative forces of the present—in this he thinks like Jean Jaurès—was pure ideology, because the exigencies of the present cannot, on the one hand, be separated from history at will and, on the other hand, cannot be defined according to

international architecture
and global world economy

modern architecture vs.
historicizing architecture

modern movement
relationship to history

postmodern attack
on modernism

claim to universal validity

relationship to traditions
and cultures

cultural imperialism

modernist imperatives

demand to decentralize
the bauhaus

demand to decolonize design

relationship to traditions
and cultures

architects' actual ideas. Gropius' role as a self-appointed educator for architecture directed against history and tradition meant that in the 1950s architects from the younger generation, such as Aldo van Eyck or Ernesto Rogers, were already turning against the modern movement's hostility to history. For advocates of Postmodernism, the Bauhaus directors Gropius and Mies van der Rohe then became figures of hatred and the Bauhaus became a negative foil against which to define building as a dialogue with history.

Andrea Bärnreuther

Mr Nerdinger, you have just explained Gropius' relationship to history. There is another component of the Bauhaus idea too: it claims international or cross-cultural validity. In your lecture, you mentioned that Alfred Barr, Director of MoMA, criticized Gropius' glorification of the Bauhaus and his ignorance of artistic and educational achievements in the USA—«the Bauhaus ideas should not be imposed upon American schools. The tyranny of the Paris Beaux-Arts tradition which until recently dominated our architectural schools is a warning.»⁹ In your intellectual Gropius biography, you refer to Gropius' claims to priority as a GSD teacher at Harvard vis-à-vis the Dean, Joseph Hudnut.

Olaf Scholz addressed the authoritarian-seeming imperious stance of modernist utopian thinking in his lecture that partly appears strange today, and sought to change society, indeed the whole world, and create a «New Man». As an exponent of the Modernism complex, the Bauhaus today increasingly faces accusations of colonialism as well as of hegemonic and colonial thinking, combined with demands to decentralize the Bauhaus and decolonize design.

Do you also understand Gropius' attitude here to be more or less a monolithic block—like his approach to history—or can we also identify a learning curve, such as we see for example with Arie Sharon and his design for the University of Ife in Ile-Ife, Nigeria, which responds to the country's climate and reflects local cultural traditions aesthetically? Gropius seems, at least on an ad hoc basis, to have argued in favour of reflecting traditional values—for example with reference to one of the first projects from his architectural office TAC (The Architects Collaborative), founded in 1946, namely his former student I. M. Pei's design for Hua Tung University, Shanghai. Should this be viewed as an exception, or are there further examples in this vein of Gropius revising his architectural or urban planning ideas in the light of an appreciation of other cultures?

international architecture
and global world economy

relationship to history

relationship to traditions
and cultures

Winfried Nerdinger

The «international architecture» represented by Gropius originates from the nexus of ideas associated with the Deutscher Werkbund and, like it, also has colonialist traits; it reflects a development urging forward the move to a global world economy and takes no account of national or regional traditions. References to place and history can only be described as marginal for Gropius throughout his life; he ultimately lacked a historical awareness of traditional values. When he emigrated to England in 1934, he planned a contrasting modern new building in the midst of the time-honoured University of Cambridge, declaring that the best way to establish a link to the historical buildings was to use the same material for the facades; he completely rejected any kind of formal adaptation or adjustment to the historical ensemble. He took the same approach when it came to building his own house in New England; this new-build house has nothing to do with the region's architectural tradition apart from its use of wood and white paint. Gropius was hardly involved with the aforementioned design for Hua Tung University, but when planning the Graduate Center in Harvard with his architectural firm TAC, he stated that the tradition of the university campus lay in a succession of yards, the open courtyards. That structure was the only element that he picked up on, but it did not give rise to any dialogue with the surrounding buildings and the Graduate Center remained a foreign body. Even when he planned the huge university in Baghdad with TAC, there was no engagement whatsoever with the country's building tradition; it was only a matter of using concrete structures to get to grips with the local climate. In contrast to Le Corbusier and Frank Lloyd Wright, who in their late work engaged intensively with various building traditions and with each specific location, Gropius, or rather his studio, TAC, ultimately—to put it in drastic terms—transplanted buildings as if they were off-the-shelf refrigerators that you can put in place and plug in wherever you want. In this respect, he is comparable to Mies van der Rohe, whose buildings are at least of high aesthetic quality.

reconstruction as
a controversial area

production of history
and identity

Andrea Bärnreuther

Mr Nerdinger, perhaps you would like to comment from an architectural historian's perspective on Philipp Oswalt's question about the reconstruction projects and their production of history and identity? I would also be interested to hear how you see the connection in the present day between the longing for reconstruction

[A] Can we see in the Bauhaus as a whole—despite its apparent heterogeneity—a uniform stance or even something like the epitome of a social attitude?

reconstruction and anniversary culture

paradigm shift from the future to the past as resource for renewal

politics of memory

and the anniversary culture, where, it seems to me, the paradigm shift from the future to the past as an «inexhaustible resource for renewal and change», as noted by Aleida Assmann, is expressed in a similarly excessive way in both cases. As far as I can see, both are about a new—often also short-circuiting—construction of history, as well as relating to identity formation, with both reconstruction and anniversary culture located in the realm of a culture or politics of remembrance.

Winfried Nerdinger

I do not view the relatively few reconstructions of the past decades as having been driven forward by Social Democrats, as Mr Oswalt believes. The Berlin City Palace is a national project, democratically legitimized by the Bundestag and approved in the light of political interests, so I shall not consider it for now, but if you take a look at the history of the reconstructions in Hildesheim, Dresden, Wesel, Potsdam or Frankfurt, it's clear that citizens' initiatives were the driving force. I find it completely absurd to discredit these democratically legitimized initiatives or even to defame them as right-wing. Civic engagement was first and foremost aimed, entirely legitimately, at recovering or reiterating a public space that had been shaped by history, in other words at a kind of liveability that modern architecture had in many cases not created and which was lacking, precisely because there is a historical dimension to being human. If it is about identity at all, then it is a matter of finding regional identity by references back to the history where one lives, and it is not about national identity construction. The real problem is how unwelcoming our rebuilt cities are, with historical references that have often been driven out almost as if they were being exorcised.

identity formation

reconstruction and anniversary culture

As to the connection between the motivation for reconstruction and activation of the Bauhaus, you could perhaps actually say that these are of two sides of the same coin. There is a search for renewal by looking to the past and projecting this into the future.

Andrea Bärnreuther

[A] I understood from your lecture that you would like, albeit not unreservedly but to some degree, to associate the «social attitude» that is often applied as a generalizing label to the Bauhaus in the anniversary context with Hannes Meyer's admittedly brief and unsuccessful impact at the Bauhaus, his struggle against the

bauhaus as a social attitude

- [M] What are the criteria for being included in history or excluded from it, and for historical relevance? What kinds of stand do they reveal, and which blind spots and cognitive shortcomings do they generate?

bauhaus historiography

processes of oblivion
and repression

bauhaus centenary

interpretative power of
the bauhaus' founder

Bauhaus style and efforts to promote the social relevance of design and teaching. Approximately thirty years before Hannes Meyer's rediscovery in the Bauhaus anniversary context, you have drawn attention to this «repressed chapter of architectural history» under the title «Anstößiges Rot. Hannes Meyer und der linke Baufunktionalismus».¹⁰

Would you have wished the Bauhaus centenary to challenge Gropius' interpretative power more vigorously than it did and to shed new light on this chapter, ensuring it has a broader impact? Considering an object that has become a screen for projections to the degree that the Bauhaus has, with such a complex entangled history, is it at all possible to question, supplement or even replace a relatively entrenched dominant image in the context of an anniversary which, although the initial conceptual focuses were sparked by the Bauhaus institutions that hold collections, is actually configured in a participatory vein? And if you think it would be possible to do so, how should we imagine this?

Winfried Nerdinger

I would have hoped that in the course of the anniversary, in other words, a hundred years after the Bauhaus was founded and eighty-six years after it was closed down, it would have been possible to gain a more acute grasp of the Bauhaus' contradictory phases and to weigh these up against each other, in order to arrive at a fitting historical appraisal of the significance of this multifaceted construct, the «Bauhaus». Johannes Itten has long been over-emphasized and the colourful, esoterically overstated Itten Bauhaus received a great deal of attention—far too much, as a matter of fact, because it was only a preparation phase of fermentation; practically nothing remained of Itten after 1922.

heterogeneity of
the bauhaus

different bauhaus versions

- [M] Too little attention is still being paid to the socially committed Bauhaus under Hannes Meyer, although we could learn the most from it today. I have repeatedly emphasized the repressed «left-wing architectural Functionalism» of Karel Teige, Jiří Kroha, Hannes Meyer and others and explored this in greater depth again in the exhibition *L'architecture engagée*.¹¹ There was an incomparable combination here of social, political and architectural commitment, but these ideas and concepts were not taken any further. For the first time, Meyer developed an architecture and design training grounded in social relevance. From the first semester on, students were trained to work cooperatively, to develop objects cost-effectively and to design for the masses. Under Meyer,

social and political
commitment

left-wing architectural
functionalism

architecture engagée

social relevance of design
and teaching

co-op design

interpretative power of
the bauhaus' founder

a completely different Bauhaus would have emerged, with a social approach that could still be a source of inspiration today—perhaps especially in training architects, who are still largely educated today as pragmatic proxies of the market. Instead of emphasizing the significance of Meyer's Bauhaus, however, the interpretation given by Gropius held sway for long periods. As was already the case back in 1968 at the anniversary exhibition in Stuttgart, the founding father continues to dominate and directs the gaze to «his» Bauhaus.

Andrea Bärnreuther

self-image of the historian
and researcher

What is your attitude or your understanding of yourself, the world, and history as an architectural historian and art historian, and what has shaped this? As the long-standing director of the Architekturmuseum der TU München,¹² as well as initiator and founding director of the NS-Dokumentationszentrum München [Munich Documentation Centre for the History of National Socialism], you have made an outstanding contribution to raising public awareness of the importance of architecture and to a critical historical consciousness. Do you see yourself as a historian who wants to initiate processes of change in the present?

Winfried Nerdinger

I don't see the historian's role as involving a desire to change social conditions, but rather as providing fact-based information on both historical and current issues, taking a stand against dogmas and entrenched opinions, and in the process having the courage to articulate and represent truths publicly, including uncomfortable truths. In my lectures, publications and exhibitions, I have always been concerned with providing architects and the general public alike with food for thought through facts, in order to initiate a critical historical awareness not only about architecture but also about its connection with society. This also includes the recognition that our concepts and judgments have taken shape over time.

value judgments

Johann Gustav Droysen already offered this fundamental insight to historians and it also encompasses a central aspect of the architectural historian's role, as architects usually do not reflect on their value judgments as having been shaped by history and determined by the particular era in question. Rigid dogmatic standpoints and conceptually deadlocked discussions about reconstruction provide a striking example of this. I presented comprehensive historical information on this topic in an exhibition¹³ and

history as perpetual reshaping
contemporaneity of history

- [L] How did widespread ideas about the Bauhaus evolve? How do they relate to historical facts and which stances, interests and mechanisms do they reveal?
- [N] How do our own cultural, social, and political beliefs and stances affect our understanding of the Bauhaus, Modernism, and modernity?

questioning entrenched
value judgments

have received broad public support. For architects, however, being nudged towards development of critical awareness often merely triggered polemical debates. Questioning entrenched value judgments, especially when these are paired with economic interests, is a lengthy process.

history as perpetual reshaping

contemporaneity of history

- [L] I have always attempted to grasp problems and themes in a way that moves beyond simply addressing their historical genesis, so that gradually emerging interpretations and conceptual formations, which in turn are guided by interests and patterns of interpretation, become comprehensible in a kind of double reflection. Max Weber described this entanglement as a process of reshaping—by means of the terms and interpretations we use, history is continuously «reshaped» or constructed. Architectural history is also a constant process of reshaping; the point is to call into question the emergence of interpretations, terms, and values, to go against the grain in interpreting history. Over the years, I have repeatedly opposed pre-determined patterns of thought, constructed hate figures and the ways in which history is repressed. Taking that approach entails being at odds with entrenched views and ways of thinking, or rather ideologies, and means you make enemies or are treated as an adversary.

questioning modern design's
power of resistance

self-image of the historian
and researcher

- For example, presenting the activities of former Bauhaus teachers and students in the National Socialist era in the context of a symposium at the Bauhaus-Archiv / Museum für Gestaltung led to a legal controversy and to fierce attacks directed at the organisers, because legends about the Bauhaus were thus called into question. Similar phenomena can be seen not only in the context of references to the National Socialist era, but also when historical myths, such as the alleged patronage of Ludwig I., were queried in an exhibition. The role of the historian is not to seek to change anything but instead to analyse historical and current contexts and concepts, as well as insisting, even in the face of entrenched dogmas, that concepts and judgments are historically determined constructions. Seeing oneself, with one's own judgments and evaluations, as part of a historical process: that kind of historical consciousness ought to help against dogmatism and tenets of faith—and I view conveying this insight as one of the historian's central roles.
- [N]

Notes

- 1 See Standpunkt/Opinion: Dietrich Erben, «Haltung»—zu Karriere und Kritik eines Begriffs in der Architektursprache. «Haltung»—a critical analysis of the career of a term and its use in architectural language», in: *Jahrbuch 2014. Fakultät für Architektur Technische Universität München*, Munich, <https://www.ar.tum.de/ltg/mitarbeiter/prof-dr-phil-habil-dietrich-erben/schriften/> (Consulted March 12, 2019).
- 2 See also: «Rechte Räume. Bericht einer Europareise», in: *ARCH+*, Vol. 52, May 2019.
- 3 Hans-Jochen Vogel, *Mehr Gerechtigkeit! Wir brauchen eine neue Bodenordnung—nur dann wird auch Wohnen wieder bezahlbar*, Freiburg i. Br. 2019.
- 4 The appointment caused a great deal of controversy, which led to legal actions against the procedure, and, in the end, to Florian Pronold's decision in March 2020 that he would not take up the post.
- 5 Winfried Nerdinger (ed.), *Der Architekt. Geschichte und Gegenwart eines Berufsstandes*, 2 vol., Munich 2012; Winfried Nerdinger (ed.), *L'architecture engagée—Manifeste zur Veränderung der Gesellschaft*, Munich 2012.
- 6 See his contribution «Bauhaus-Méditerranée. The Art of Dwelling Differently in the World» in this publication.
- 7 Frei Otto, «Chancen (1980). Festrede zur Eröffnung des Bauhaus-Archivs Berlin», in: *Frei Otto. Schriften und Reden 1951–1983*, (ed.) Berthold Burkhardt, Braunschweig/Wiesbaden 1984, pp. 188–195.
- 8 Op. cit., pp. 140–149.
- 9 Cf. Winfried Nerdinger, *Walter Gropius. Architekt der Moderne 1883–1969*, München: C.H. Beck 2019, p. 296.
- 10 Winfried Nerdinger, «Anstößiges Rot»: Hannes Meyer und der linke Baufunktionalismus. Ein verdrängtes Kapitel Architekturgeschichte, in: *Hannes Meyer 1889–1954: Architekt, Urbanist, Lehrer*, (ed.) Bauhaus-Archiv and Deutsches Architekturmuseum in conjunction with Institut für Geschichte und Theorie d. Architektur an der ETH Zürich, Berlin 1989, pp. 12–29; in: id., *Geschichte, Macht, Architektur*, Munich 2012, pp. 129–148.
- 11 Nerdinger 2012, *L'architecture engagée* (as Note 5).
- 12 See Winfried Nerdinger, *Architektur ausstellen 1977–2012*, Vol. I–III, München: Architekturmuseum der TU München 2011.
- 13 Winfried Nerdinger, Markus Eisen, Hilde Strobl (ed.), *Geschichte der Rekonstruktion—Konstruktion der Geschichte*, Munich: Prestel 2010.