



Monika Wolting*

Hellerau – a road to the future or a model of urban planning from the beginning of the 20th century?

Life Reform

At the beginning of the 20th century, an important project of reforms was born in Germany and Switzerland which originated from a profound intellectual and cultural movement that affected the conservative elites as well as the artistic avant-garde and groups of workers inspired by socialism. What united them all was the idea of creating a different and better society, even though to many the roads leading to a goal formulated in such a way seemed controversial. The modern design released the social potential of energy and the will to renew, modernize and improve social relations which were a legacy of the 19th century. An attempt was made to resolve the growing conflicts which were brought about by modern currents and to connect the emerging systems with the uncompromising nature of the experience of the traditional world. The idea, utopias, and designs as well as implemented projects whose origins date back to the early 20th century can provide a variety of answers to the questions arising also today which regard the social future of the community, the forms of concentrating in urban centers, the form of educating the youth for the future global village, the social responsibility for transforming the natural environment, the care for solidary human coexistence and maintaining physical health. These collective hopes which were voiced out loud at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries create the topos of a “new man” and it seems that also today the desires and needs of social individuals are the same and that today the life reform movement can give the world a lot of impulses and solutions for a better future life in a world threatened by urbanization and alternative forms of organization of social life. In 1913, Georg Simmel declared that: *Our awareness should become*

a specific wholeness and uniformity, surpassing all fundamentality and not limited to single meanings and that would not be their mechanical composition. [3, p.75]

According to the poetics of numerical definitions, in his contribution to life reform in the volume of *Dzieje kultury niemieckiej*, Orłowski lists the following projects of new forms of life: youth movements (Jugendbewegung, Wandervogel), the concept of regional arts movement (Heimatkunstbewegung), garden city movements (Gartenstadtbewegung), Nordic movement, neo-Pagan and neo-Germanic groups, theosophy, anthroposophy, project of urbanization “for life” and ecological building as well as art colonies and art estates, rural communes and residential projects, animal protection, projects of reformed pedagogy, natural body cult and physical fitness, knowledge and acceptance of body, ecological nudism and naturism, sexual reform, visual literacy (Lichtwark), project of general social hygiene, marriage and education reform, tamed Nietzscheanism, project of religiousness reform, anti-civilization reactions, life guidance projects [5]. The projects listed above belong to social utopias of the beginning of the 20th century; they represent an objection of social individuals to the universal quality of life generated by the existing capitalist system. They originate from the imaginary world of an alternative society. The history of German culture indicates numerous attempts at creating models of utopian societies both in literature and in reality such as: the Idea Tower Society, Goethe’s Pedagogic Province, Hermann Hesse’s Castalia, Rilke’s and Heidegger’s idea of religion without God, the Folkwang idea, Waldorff’s villages, reverence communities – Herrenhuter Gemeinschaft, Gottes Acker as well as the freemasonry movement.

* University of Wrocław

The life reform movement was based on criticism of industrialization, materialism and urbanization. Rousseau's slogan – “return to nature” – was the motto of the members of the movement. Actually, the scientists even today cannot unambiguously identify the direction of that movement. In literature on the subject, they talk about modernist and anti-modernist as well as reactionary groups. The characteristic features of that period included the formation of hostility among bourgeois, intellectual, romantic and agrarian communities against huge cities, which resulted in the members of that social group escaping to the village, which was in line with the movement's guiding principle. Some of them felt satisfied with establishing allotment gardens which complied with the ideas of the Allotment Society (Schrebergärten-Verein) which operated already since the middle of the 19th century, whereas others moved to newly built and often architecturally sophisticated housing developments – garden cities, mansion districts, garden suburbs. Still others founded communes or shared ownership communities in the country which were economically self-sufficient and highly ideological. This way new communities were established with the same ideology, following the autarkic and autonomous lifestyle. The communities living in the first such estates shared a certain guiding principle; it could be the Folkwang idea (Hellerau garden city near Dresden; Hohenhagen, Mathildenhöhe in Darmstadt, art village Worpswede near Bremen), common form of life (vegetarian village Eden near Oranienburg), anarchism, socialism, anti-urbanism (Monte Verità near Ascona) or the idea of homeland (Heimland.) Ulrich Linse, a Marxist writer, drew the conclusion that the formation of shared ownership communities was an anti-urban revolution of progressive intelligentsia living in the city. This phenomenon can be described as the cult of village or agrarian utopia of urban writers. Linse sees a form of escapism in that movement. The idea of an art village – a garden city – is undoubtedly a result of such a position of progressive intellectualists in Germany and Switzerland. Although the idea, or rather the notion of a garden city, originated in England where it was estab-

lished by Sir Ebenezer Howard. However, the form in which it appeared in Germany was dominated by the idealistic, anarchic, reactionary and progressive ideas. The German idea of the garden city fits in between utopian life – connecting culture, education, artistic activity, and everyday life – and a reactive ideology of nationalists as well as a pragmatic attempt to implement social, ownership, and land reforms. In Germany, it was initiated by writers and artists gathered around Friedrichshagener Dichterkreis and Neue Gemeinschaft. The proclaimers of that movement included brothers Heinrich and Julius Hart as well as Bernhard and Paul Kampfmeier. The members of the German Garden City Association (Deutsche Gartenstadt-gesellschaft) included e.g. Wilhelm Bölsche (died in Szklarska Poręba) and Fidus (painter). Architects, sculptors, people connected with applied art, industrialists, social politicians, members of administration and cooperative management boards joined the Association only later. This group was not a building society but it was an organization aiming at disseminating the ideas of garden cities. Its members claimed that *We, the Germans, follow the principle: first the theory and then the practice. And that method shall bring us success!* [2, p.25].

Aimed at reason, but at the same time the bright, austere, and sensation-oriented world of the passing 19th century was to be replaced with a new world which would be simple, close to nature and paying attention to details. The new objective of a work of art was to express the human soul. Art, as a guardian of senses, was to occupy the center of life of each individual, wrote Emile Jaques-Dalcroze, director of the Institute of Rhythmic Gymnastics in Hellerau. Furthermore, the experience of home and safety, as noted by Ferdinand Avenarius, editor of *Kunstwart* who came from Prague, should be adamantly searched for. A gray city was confronted with a blooming city, the garden city [3, p. 22]. The motto of the flourishing reform movements was filled with zeal: culture instead of civilization. The reformers were going to resolve the hot burning social issues with the use of educational means and social esthetics.

Garden City and Art Colony

It was already in the 19th century that the first villa colonies (Villenkolonie) were designed in Germany in city suburbs. This architectural thought was adopted by the rich bourgeoisie. The typical model residential estates include Lichterfelde West and Grunewald in Berlin. They are exceptional on the European scale in respect of exquisitely rich and varied architecture and gardens. Their residents cultivated a kind of utopian form of existence, based on social and cultural practices, on staging their own lives, on imaginary, happy, and reasonable life in safety, health, and social harmony surrounded by culture and morality. These estates were occupied by representatives of the upper social class, wealthy bourgeoisie and recognized artists. The turn of

the centuries brought about a variety of movements and anti-urban projects which can be seen, as Orłowski put it, as a kind of “anti-civilization syndrome.” [5, p. 398]. The Los-von-Berlin-Bewegung movement, which was growing at that time, was a reaction to metropolis, urbanized centers, poverty, dirt and diseases and the wish to find ecological niches can be explained by aversion to technical discoveries and to industrialization of the world. Regardless of the patterns suggested by Howard in his *Garden Cities of To-morrow*, it is Adolf Damaschke and Theodor Fritsch who should be considered the originators of the concept of alternative forms of social life in the German culture. Orłowski wrote: *The German version of the implementation of that concept of*

green estates with gardens surrounding mansions-villas became something special. In the designs which were never executed, such as for instance Fidus's, the «temples» and other architecturally separate spaces served as sacred places. On the other hand, some of the garden districts, which were often inhabited by artists, became famous for being spaciouly innovative and artistically charming architectural complexes.[5, p.398].

However, garden cities were designed not only in cities. Groups of city artists ventured some more drastic changes in the conditions of their life and work. This was the genesis of art colonies, most of which still exist today. The main objective of their founders was the desire to escape from the dystopia of the city to the utopia of the village, the formation of communities and the need to work creatively in the open air. In Germany, there exist estates closely combining the idea of an art village with the classic Howardian idea of the garden city. These estates provided a specific counterpoint to the strongly industrialized region and the realization of the idea of Gesamtkunstwerk and Folkwang, which indicates the legacy of idealism as well as classicism and romanticism.

The idea of creating an art colony in Hellerau, which today is a district of Dresden, is based on the utopian ideas of Folkwang – a combination of everyday life, social life, and work with art. In 1909, Karl Schmidt, a furniture factory owner, decided to build a garden city

with an applied art workshop as its integral part. He wanted to create an atmosphere of coexistence of residence, work, culture and education. He encouraged the cooperation of such architects as Professor Richard Riemerschmid or Hermann Muthesius. In 1911, Muthesius wrote that *Hellerau is the first and fundamental example of a model estate in Germany which was created by an artistic thought and in compliance with the land reform* [3, p.2]. Hellerau was a place of work and residence for such cultural life figures as Emil Nolde, George Bernard Shaw, Max Reinhardt, Franz Kafka, Oskar Kokoschka, Henry van den Velde, Paul Claudel, Stefan Zweig, Constantin Sergejevich Stanislavski, Upton Sinclair, Leopold Jassner. The colony also inspired the growth of the bourgeois reform movements of the 1920s. In compliance with the idea of their proclaimers, all arts should be reformed and transformed into one all-inclusive art. Fricke wrote in the context of Hellerau about a *significant social and cultural experiment* [4, p. 7]. Karl Schmidt, the founder of German Workshops (Deutsche Werkstätte), a sophisticated style furniture factory, enchanted the eminent architects of those times with his ideas, and they would happily visit Hellerau to create an estate for workers and artists based on a concept of a cooperative. A few years later they built a theater – Festspielhaus – whose grand opening took place in the fall 1913 with a play by Paul Claudel titled “L'annonce faite à Marie.”

Urbanized City

The garden city of Hellerau was a model reform triggered by crisis of the city during the first period of industrialization. Along with the design of Hellerau an attempt was made to build a city where the place of work and residence would be located close to each other and its residents would live in harmony with nature. According to one of its main precepts: social life should be organized around cultural events. Consequently, the theater building offered the estate residents a number of possibilities for artistic activities. Karl Schmidt provided the workers of his furniture factory with a possibility to actively participate in the process of development of residential districts: active participation in creating their own living space, implementing their own architectural designs of households and organizing spaces for social meetings.

The evident problems of the city arise also today; the question of the future of the city seems to remain unanswered, whereas the idea of the garden city addresses a number of issues faced by the residents of the city as well as industrial or post-industrial districts. The most important ones surely include the following: Can working and living take place in the same space?, How can life in the city be connected with the natural environment, its use and protection at the same time?, Is the threat of dividing public space in the city real? When the Athens Charter became effective in 1933 the idea of the garden city was squandered, the city was divided into

industrial and residential sections, and the two were to be connected by the city transportation system. Extreme examples of such cities appeared in Germany in the 1970s. This contributed to the expansion of individual means of transportation as well as formation of “bedroom suburbs” and “commuter towns.” Such trends of growth result in overpopulated cities, trying to cope with transportation problems and social inadequacies of whole districts. City spaces nowadays serve primarily transportation and consumption, whereas people meet in public places, on city squares, and streets only sporadically. The city is threatened with the loss of its integration as well as social and creative functions. Los Angeles is an extreme case of a city whose growth was generated by these trends. It is breaking into a number of “bedroom suburbs” interconnected by highways, with no specific center which would facilitate social contacts. Telecommunications and individual transport are the fundamental pillars of such urban clusters. The garden city of Hellerau provides today a possibility to admire a piece of work which demonstrates historic value, both artistic and ideological, on the one hand, and the phenomena, guaranteeing the creation of connections between the place of work, residence and social life, on the other hand, which can provide a significant impulse in the process of reurbanization and restructuring of existing cities. Architects would like to consider Hellerau a laboratory of architectural possibilities.

History of Hellerau and the Idea of the Garden City

The objective of the design of Hellerau was to formulate new theses in urban architecture. The basic intention of its originators was the coherence of the place of work, residence and life as well as a skilful use of the resources of the natural environment whose first stage of degradation became evident already at the beginning of the 20th century. The structure of the city of Hellerau was supposed to provide an answer to the question of integration of an industrialized society with ecological responsibility of architects, factory owners and city planners.

The history of Hellerau began in 1898, when the German Workshops Hellerau GmbH (Deutsche Werkstätte Hellerau GmbH) still existing today under the same name, were founded in Dresden-Laubegast. [4, p. 25] The company was set up by the 25-year-old apprentice, Karl Schmidt (born in 1873, died in 1948 in Hellerau), who gained his experience from two a little less successful enterprises and drew from the reform ideas of the 19th century which became more and more popular among progressive youth.

The idea of integrating the economic goals with ideology was the guideline for the activities of the originators of Hellerau: Karl Schmidt and Wolf Dohrn. They both realized that the plan which was based only on idealistic beliefs would not survive the clash with reality, as an enterprise which is oriented only to economic success is not worth commitment and support. Such virtues as entrepreneurship, social responsibility, artistic diligence or technical perfection were supposed to be fused in people willing to cooperate. Was it an evident indication of the birth of another social utopia originated by Iambulus in *Islands of the Sun* and continued by Thomas More in *Utopia* (1516), or the core of the idea of fourmieriism of the beginning of the 19th century? Undoubtedly, that position determined the reform initiated in Wilhelminian Germany which did not induce pragmatically in individual enterprises but addressed the total holistic life changes.

Jugendstil, the German style of art, which is considered to belong to modernism, that was named after the journal published in Munich "Die Jugend" which advocated separating art from historical imitation and repetition of styles from the *Gründerzeit* period. The periodical encouraged the cooperation of many outstanding graphic artists and painters such as Bruno Paul, Olaf Gulbransson, Ernst Barlach and Lyonel Feininger. Jugendstil regards architecture of interiors as well as applied art, graphic arts, and painting in their broad meanings. Its objective was a synthetic style equating "pure art" with applied art. The German version of Art Nouveau was surely a comprehensive attempt at providing an answer to the "cookie cutter" and reproducible "trash" in the area of objects of everyday life. Heinrich Vogeler, an artist creating also in Hellerau, the founder of Worpswede art colony, described that phenomenon as follows: *What was formed unintentionally was an art of imagination without content, purely formal, distant from reality. It was a kind of romantic escape from reality and maybe that is why for bourgeois man it was desired drawing attention away from the growing problems of the present* [6, p. 154]. It was

because of such periodicals as Friedrich Averius's "Kunstwart", Alexander Koch's "Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration" or "Dekorative Kunst" and Friedrich Naumann's "Hilfe" that the reformatory circles gained the cultural forum, the aesthetic forum as well as the economic and political forum. The English Arts-and-Crafts movement, established in 1888 by Walter Crane and C.R. Ashbee under the leadership of William Morris, became one of the most important sources of the European precursory and progressive aesthetic thought. The movement was inspired by the ideas of English writer John Ruskin. The most important postulate of Arts-and-Crafts was the slogan to create applied and functional art, however, not at the cost of its aesthetic values. That is why the artists who gathered around Morris objected to mechanical and industrial production and advocated the revival of manual art. Although during his apprenticeship trips Karl Schmidt visited England, he did not have direct contacts with the Arts-and-Crafts circles, which is often wrongly assumed, and instead he learned more about cheap mass production. After establishing his enterprise, Karl Schmidt invited to cooperation such painters and architects as Johann Vincenz Cissarz, Heinrich Vogeler or Ernst Hermann Walter. Schmidt, who did not have sufficient capital, intended to develop a financial plan which would not require huge expenditure and at the same time would facilitate the execution of his economic venture, and so he introduced innovative ideas and offered his colleagues a share in profits of the factory. The quality of manufactured products became their greatest benefit, which referred to Ruskin's and Morris' ideas. Schmidt resigned, however, from manual manufacture and managed to integrate craftsmanship with machine production. Thus, he preceded such contemporary socialists as Ruskin and Morris, but he remained faithful to his own socialist ideas. In 1916, he admitted that he "supported the state socialism" and in the 1930s he cared about the membership of his employees in trade unions [4, p. 26]. Schmidt used modern production solutions which are noticeable even today in the structure of some factory buildings. Soon after opening the factory, together with Richard Riemerschmid – a young Jugendstil painter from Munich – he found the first aesthetic answer to the growth of technology: machine furniture (die Maschienenmöbel): designed by the leading artists of those times, made of the best raw materials and manufactured with machine technology. The Schmidt's Workshop grew fast as was the demand for the furniture made in Hellerau. It was the period when the construction of new factory halls developed very intensively; numerous new factories were built in the first decade for instance the Turbine Hall in Berlin by the leading architect Peter Behrens or Alfelder Fagus-Werke designed by Walter Gropius, founder of the famous Bauhaus.

The first city whose architectural structure complied with all ideas of the garden city as designed by Ebenezer Howard was built around Schmidt's Furniture Workshops. The most important elements distinguishing them from other cities included the exclusion of the city area from the speculation with building plots, combining the place

of residence, work, culture and nature into one space, which was supposed to guarantee better social conditions, closer relations between people and convenient social development of the estate. Similarly to Deutsche Werkstätte, this newly designed city was a practical-social-reformatory reaction to industrialization and it addressed the issue of growing problems of housing economy. Already in 1901, in his proposal of displaying artistic crafts at the German Art Exhibition in Dresden, Schmidt mentioned a need to build a small city or a small colony of villas. Remaining faithful to the ideals of new artistic crafts, in accordance with which one should create a “uniform general impression” – a “uniform atmosphere” and not “just furnished apartments”, Schmidt asked Riemerschmid and Wilhelm Kreis, who cooperated with his Workshops, to prepare architectural master plans.

Le Corbusier, or actually Charles-Edouard Jeanneret, visiting his brother Albert Jeanneret, a co-founder of the School of Rhythmic Gymnastics in Hellerau, had an opportunity to meet the most bizarre group of prewar intellectualists in Germany such as artists, architects, musicians and people of the theater who gathered around the project of the first German garden city. The enthusiastic atmosphere among the group of young people passionate about discovering new areas greatly impressed Le Corbusier. In a letter to his parents he wrote that he “loved those who search.” [1, p. 35] In Hellerau, he familiarized himself with architectural works by Theodor Fischer, Muthesius and Baillie Scott from England as well as Riemerschmid. However, he was not enchanted by the neo-Biedermeier overtones and fondness for the Picturesque of the latter as he wrote in his log that “Riemerschmid did not delight me with his Hellerau.” In a sense Le Corbusier saw Hellerau in the context of the disputes in the German debate on modern style. On the one hand, Alfred Messel, Bruno Paul and Peter Behrens followed the road leading from the neo-Classical inclinations of Schinkel’s, through the Empire style, the classical architecture to the archaic motifs of the Corinthian order, whereas their opponents, opting for already declining Jugendstil style, such as Albin Müller and Riemerschmid, worked diligently on developing new forms and drew on pure joy of forms, on the other hand. However, already during his second visit in Hellerau, Le Corbusier revised his position. The reason for that was a personnel change which took place at that time in Hellerau. The city found a new, young architect, an indisputable protagonist of Heinrich Tessenow. In 1912, Le Corbusier wrote in *Etude sur Le Mouvement d’Art Décoratif en Allemagne* about an “outstanding city of Hellerau” that was “designed by the greatest German artists.”

Hellerau should not be confused with a regular residential district or a simple company housing estate known already in the 19th century as the garden city society, which was established especially for that purpose, was the owner of the building plots, which complied with the ideas presented by Howard in his work on the garden city. The objective was to provide the future residents with a guarantee of participation in the growing capital of the estate as a result of the growth of the Workshops and

expansion of the estate as well as to secure the place of residence in case of losing job in the Workshops. The future residents were also offered a possibility to realize their own architectural ideas or functional solutions. In Germany, unlike in Northern Europe or in the United States of North America, no houses were built of timber. Schmidt fought with the designs supported in Hellerau against the existing dislike and superstitions about this form of building. Today, it turns out and it is confirmed by the ecological summits in Rio and Berlin that it is necessary to enter into discussion on ecological architecture from renewable sources.

Already the first drafts made by Schmidt with architect Riemerschmid in the summer 1906 demonstrated a clear division of the city into 4 zones: industrial zone, residential zone for poorer people, a zone of social institutions and a zone of villas and single family houses. All the zones were strongly connected with one another with cultural and social institutions in the center, industrial section – the Furniture Workshops – were within walking distance. Such a design of the garden city demonstrates a necessity to prevent the spiritual unrest in a broad sense and social dissatisfaction which resulted from the quick growth of industry and industrialization of urban centers in Germany at the end of the 19th century. This atmosphere contributed to the development of a multilayer and diverse life reform movement. An attempt at reviving human existence through growth and practical implementation of a culturally changed system of values in life was the movement’s characteristic element. It was a task of every individual to submit to self-reform, rejecting artificial life in a big city and finding the original forces of nature, rejecting the authoritarian and hierarchical, social, and professional structures, resigning from poisoning the body with alcohol, tobacco, medicines and animal products. Two elements are combined in the garden city design: 1. life reform and 2. city reform. The attempt at developing a concept of the garden city as a place of cultural revival of Germany was accompanied from the very beginning by the processes of implementation of the Howardian ideas in this area. The garden city of Hellerau was supposed to become a new “German Olympia”, a national center of culture, theater, music, and sport. Its objective was not only to break the internal barriers between different forms of expression but also existing as an integral part of everyday life, folk festivities as well as lifelong national community education. A project of music education of the community of Hellerau was developed in connection with such a broadly drafted plan of reforms. Its final point was the transfer of Emil Jaques Dalcroze’s Rhythmic School from Geneva to Hellerau as well as building of the imposing Institute of Education designed by Tessenow in 1911.

The key note in the vision of creating Hellerau was played by the need to build a new, organic life, filling the place and its residents with harmony through rhythm that would affect the creation of moral and aesthetic architecture. The new, holistic style was supposed to pave the way of life where the feelings and soul of the residents could find their reflection.

Such a view, namely a biased and erroneous judgment of the specificity and partiality of every premise of the

reform as well as distorting its substance in a sense of global efficiency is typical of the reform attempts at the turn of the centuries. The land reform, re-agrarization of lands by cooperative estates and garden cities, resignation from the use of paper money or even vegetarian food were already contemplated and propagated as unprecedented and miraculous panacea for all social ills. Not much later than in Germany and Switzerland, that idea of hope for creation of “man of the future” became popular in Soviet Russia and fascist Italy. That instrumentation of social curing means was supposed to be extended in Hellerau to include new therapies based on rhythmic gymnastics.

And what did the city of the beginning of the 21st century look like? The classic means integrating urban communities began to disappear from the city. Trade is moved to the city outskirts to huge shopping centers, offering primarily mass products. Cultural institutions receive financial subsidies provided they are profitable. The number of workplaces on the market decrease drastically along with accumulation of production in industrial parks and as a result of rationalization of services. The space of social activities which are available to every resident is replaced with privately controlled galleries and shopping malls. The loss of the structural elements raises questions about the legitimacy of the existence of the European model of the city. The city center comprises only two to three percent of the whole city. The city outskirts grow quickly, preventing, however, the development of urban relations there. Furthermore, the city center lost its character, bonding the urban community and market squares no longer serve as space for public meetings, fairs or political disputes [4, p. 43]. The diversity of the media which we confront every day enables the residents of urban agglomerations to create their own virtual cities.

The Athens Charter (1931) provided a leading model for modern movement. Apart from the division of central functions of the city, it also defined the technical capabilities of the cities. Along with modernization the cities opened all doors to the destruction of their structure. A divided and flexible city encouraged attempts at combining functionalities, on the one hand, and transparency, on the other hand. Probably only few architects of those times realized that such activities would result in the growing control of the city and people as well as in an order which in Germany facilitated the growth of National Socialism. Furthermore, the architects of post-modern cities falsely assumed that the free choice of lifestyles, which is so broadly promoted today by the media and culture-forming individuals, affect the contemporary view of urbanized centers.

The changing policy of urbanization of cities often seems to refer largely to the forgotten ideas of the “city renewers” from the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. It assumes changes in compliance with ecological, economic and social ideas. The newly built residential districts and new forms of use of post-industrial or post-military areas often submit to ecological guidelines which only a few years ago were not taken into account at all. New strategies for city building were presented at the International Building Exhibition Emscher Park (1989 until 1999). The

objective of the Exhibition was to show new ideas and designs in the area of social, cultural, and ecological changes for post-industrial regions with the example of the northern part of Ruhr region. The objectives of the organizers of the exhibition included 1. development of new infrastructure: connecting empty spaces, 2. maintaining the history of the region, including its previously unnoticed traces and industrial past, 3. supporting the decentralized structures of the region which, without the classic centralization features, could provide better conditions for growth of modern models of cities, 4. indicating endogenous possibilities, local economies and abundance of productive ideas of the region, 5. developing projects in compliance with pointillistic strategy, with no top-down imposition of plans, 6. supporting ecological, economic and social values, exerting less pressure on spatial plan.

The idea of garden cities, especially their German versions, is a holistic idea that from the very beginning combined the social, urban, and ecological necessities. It was an answer to existential ills caused by intense industrialization, speculation with earthly goods, housing problems, and poverty. It was not only an urban reform but it was the most important component part of the life reform movement.

The idea of the garden city as designed by Ebenezer Howard complied well with the significant principles of life reform: ideal residential conditions, improvement of the quality of life in general, popularization of the idea of community, joint decision-making of the residential community about the future of the estates, solidary model of cooperative operations, resignation from private property as well as the disappearance of differences between advantages of cities and villages which was provided in “Garden Cities of To-morrow.” It appears that the last chapters of the book by Howard are read less attentively. There, the author presents not so much a model of the garden city which turned out to be so important for the development of the first estates of that type. The garden city is also a model for the cities which await structural changes, primarily those polluted with industrialization. Howard presented his idea with an example of London destroyed by industry. The garden city is an indicator for structural remodeling of London. However, before such a great goal could be achieved, Howard recommends building smaller units which would provide experience and become a “working model.” Consequently, Howard goes beyond the images of garden cities known to us; he is preoccupied by the process of learning, collecting experiences that might contribute to restructuring of already existing cities. If then the biggest credit of Howard’s is that “working model”, it means the necessity of continual development of the notion of the garden city. Can the idea of the garden city become an answer to today’s questions? Can we expect the processes of decentralization, greater independence, self-government, autarky, getting closer to nature? Wouldn’t the unity of the place of work, residence, and life provide an ideal of life for many city residents? Wouldn’t the new forms of transportation result in a rejection of old means of communication between individuals? Shouldn’t we forget the idea of a

single family house with a garden, beautiful estates surrounded by green belts and develop an urban concept which provides answers to the hot burning issues of restructuring of post-industrial cities of the 21st century? Looking at Hellerau not as a museum but as a model of

a city of the future, as a “Laboratoire d’une humanité nouvelle” (Paul Claudel about Hellerau), one can recognize the center of a city of the future: a workshop where work is done on sustainable development of the city and its community.

References

- [1] De Michelis M., *Gesamtkunstwerk Hellerau*, [in:] Durth W., *Entwurf zur Moderne. Hellerau: Stand Ort Bestimmung*, Stuttgart 1996.
- [2] Dohrn W., *Die Gartenstadt Hellerau*, Dresden 1992.
- [3] Durth W., *Entwurf zur Moderne. Hellerau: Stand Ort Bestimmung*, Stuttgart 1996.
- [4] Fricke W., *Die Zukunft der Stadt. Spurensuche in Dresden-Hellerau*, Bonn 1995.
- [5] Orłowski H., Karolak C., Kunicki W., *Dzieje kultury niemieckiej*, Warszawa 2006.
- [6] Shmidt P., *Heinrich Vogeler, Biographie*, Dresden 1984.

Hellerau – droga ku przyszłości czy model urbanistyczny początku XX wieku?

Zmieniająca się polityka urbanizacyjna miast zdaje się często odwoływać w dużej mierze do zapomnianych postulatów „odnowicieli miast” z przełomu XIX i XX wieku. Jej założenia zmierzają w kierunku zmian zgodnych z ideą ekologiczną, ekonomiczną i socjalną. Pomysł miasta-ogrodu, zwłaszcza w wydaniu niemieckim, jest ideą holistyczną, która od samego początku

łączyła potrzeby socjalne, urbanistyczne i ekologiczne. Była odpowiedzią na bolączki egzystencjalne, spowodowane intensywną industrializacją, spekulacją dobrami ziemskimi, problemami mieszkaniowymi i biedą. Nie stanowiła ona jedynie urbanistycznej reformy, ale była najważniejszą częścią składową ruchu reformy życia.

Key words: urbanization, garden city, life reform, Hellerau, green town, restructuring of post-industrial cities

Słowa kluczowe: urbanizacja, miasto ogród, reformy życia, Hellerau, zielone miasto, restrukturyzacja miast post-industrialnych