University of Massachusetts - Amherst
ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst

Landscape Architecture & Regional Planning Faculty Publication Series | Landscape Architecture & Regional Planning

1981

# The Impact of National Socialist Policies upon Local City Planning in Pre-war Germany (1933-1939): The Rhetoric and the Reality

John Mullin
*University of Massachusetts - Amherst*, jmullin@provost.umass.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.umass.edu/larp_faculty_pubs

Part of the Urban, Community and Regional Planning Commons, and the Urban Studies and Planning Commons

Mullin, John, "The Impact of National Socialist Policies upon Local City Planning in Pre-war Germany (1933-1939): The Rhetoric and the Reality" (1981). *Landscape Architecture & Regional Planning Faculty Publication Series*. Paper 44.
http://scholarworks.umass.edu/larp_faculty_pubs/44

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Landscape Architecture & Regional Planning at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Landscape Architecture & Regional Planning Faculty Publication Series by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

**The Impact of National Socialist Policies upon Local City Planning in Pre-war Germany (1933-1939): The Rhetoric and the Reality**

John Robert Mullin

This paper is a review and analysis of the influence of the national government upon local city planning during the pre-war years of National Socialism (1933-1939). The paper begins with a brief overview of the critical aspects of city planning during both the Wilhelmian years (1871-1918) and the Weimar era (1918-1932). These aspects are reviewed in the context of their contributions to the city planning profession in general and to the German experience in particular. The paper then reviews the influence of ideology on city planning activities and follows with an explanation of the "state of the city" at the time the NSDAP came to power. The section on ideology precedes the "state of the city" section because most of the National Socialist (NSDAP) ideological stances were developed before the government came to power. A description and analysis of the bureaucratic framework and the city planning aspects of both the Recovery Years (1933-1936) and the NSDAP First Four Year Plan (1936-1939) is then presented. Finally, the paper concludes with an analysis and summary of the impact over time of the NSDAP supported city planning experience.

The coming to power of the National Socialist German Workers Party (NSDAP) in Germany in 1933 resulted in a radical shift in the direction, approaches, and concepts used in city planning activities across the German nation. The ability of each city to define and solve its own planning problems was significantly lessened. In effect, city planning was reduced to pat formulas and standards, and became subject to the imposition of national ideology and national government control.[1] The net result of these changes was that localized city planning increasingly became subject to national goals, needs, and programs. This article describes, analyzes, and interprets the impact of this shift on city planning activities and examines the nationally supported theories, principles, concepts, and enactments imposed between 1933 and 1939. There are two basic premises to the article. First, that despite the shift in policies and standards, the results of National Socialist city planning activities were not significantly different from those of the Weimar era (1918-1933). Second, that economic needs and military requirements in the city took precedence over both the NSDAP platform and nationally supported ideologies. In time these contributed to the inability of local city planners to meet the needs of their client citizens.

The article begins with a brief overview of the critical aspects of city planning during the Weimar era. The "state of the city" at the time that the NSDAP came to power is then summarized. Following this, the article focuses upon the immediate measures taken by the new government to overcome the extreme economic and social problems that were inherited from the Weimar Government. This section includes a review of both the pragmatic actions and the theoretical – ideological basis for them. A description and analysis of the bureaucratic framework and the city planning aspects of both the Recovery Years (1933-1936) and the First Four Year Plan (1936-1940) is then presented.[2] Finally, the investigation concludes with an analysis and summary of the impact over time of the NSDAP supported city planning experience.

**Antecedents – the Weimar Republic (1918-1933)**

German city planning during the years of the Weimar Republic has been considered by historians and practitioners as making a major contribution to the evolution of modern city planning in the western world.[3] In a city planning context, the Weimar years can be subdivided into three distinct periods. The first, 1918-1924, was marked by political revolution, social unrest, and economic chaos. While it was a period of extensive cultural ferment and utopian thought, little city planning was actually undertaken.[4] Priorities centered instead upon providing basic shelter, food, and jobs. The second period, 1924-1929, however, saw extensive innovative city planning activity as many of the theoretical ideas developed during the early 1920s began to be applied. In particular, new concepts concerning urban decentralization, socialized housing, regionalization, and urban design were integrated into planning efforts.[5]

These years saw a greater involvement by the Weimar government in city planning matters than in the period 1918-1924. In particular, the nationally sponsored house mortgage revaluation program (the Hauszinssteuer) provided the funding necessary to undertake city planning activities. Further, the national government approved of the creation of regional planning agencies and created a housing/city planning research institute. Still, it would be a mistake to assume that the problems of the city were a high priority for the national government. They simply were not. The net result was that the cities continued to plan for themselves without significant national input. The national government only began to focus on urban problems when the cities became virtually bankrupt during the depths of the Depression.

The third period, 1928-1933, saw the collapse of the Republic. City planning, as a major governmental activity, became virtually non-existent. Continually expanding unemployment and welfare roles, ruinous taxation, fixed capital costs, and little private investment were crucial causes.[6] The soup kitchens and the fop houses of the immediate post World War I era again became commonplace. Further, the increasingly conservative political climate of city chambers brought dramatic changes to city planning activities. Key members of the avant-garde, including the city planners Ernst May (Frankfurt), Martin Wagner (Berlin), and Bruno Taut (Magdeburg), left the country.[7] Soon after, most of their colleagues were forced to resign and were replaced by more conservative and more politically acceptable planners.

The major planning projects supported by the Weimar Government that were undertaken during the early 1930s centered upon three objectives: (1) expansion of the food supply; (2) expansion of inexpensive housing; and (3) assistance to urban residents so they could become increasingly self sufficient. These projects had many elements in common with the settlement ideas of the increasingly powerful NSDAP. Among these were the emphasis upon non-urban settlements, "man and nature", increased agricultural production, and economic self sufficiency. Yet, these projects were scorned by the NSDAP. How, asked the Party, could people find work in a decentralized locality with little money and with farm lots that could result in personal food stuffs and little else? Some of this criticism was well founded. In fact, the program was greatly revised when the new government came to power.

In sum, city planning during the Weimar Republic was largely a localized activity. The national government provided essential enabling legislation and a funding

mechanism but little else. The theories and ideologies that formed the basis for the planning activities were largely created by organizations and people outside of the national government. The application of the ideas and concepts was dependent upon the innovativeness, skill, interest, and political strength of city-based administrators. The ability of these administrators to take independent action, a long standing tradition in Germany, was significantly curtailed with the formation of the Third Reich.

**The New Government – The NSDAP Comes to Power**

The turmoil of the early 1930s had certain parallels with the Germany of 1919. In both cases, the various governmental institutions failed to meet the fundamental needs of the public or to prevent a collapse of the national economy. The responses to these problems by the two governments were, however, quite different. The Weimar Government, beset by revolution from within and international economic sanctions from without, was forced to look primarily to its own survival and to attempting to restore order. Solving the problems of human needs became, by default, the responsibility of the cities. Only once a sense of order was restored did the national government become a critical participant in local matters. Even then, the expansion of national policies and laws was oriented more to expanding local powers than to the direct participation of the national government.

The coming to power of the NSDAP in January 1933 resulted in a radically different approach. The NSDAP, from its first day in power, began to respond to the basic economic problems facing the nation. The two key approaches focused upon the need to redefine the role of governmental institutions and to provide a national planning system and programs to meet the needs of the state as defined by the NSDAP.

Foremost among the governmental revisions was the consolidation of decision making power at the highest possible level (the Leadership Principle). Under this consolidation, the municipalities were forced to share many of the strong local powers that they had held from the time of the Stein reforms (1807) and the Prussian "City Freedom" Act of 1819. They became direct outlets for national policy and, in effect, "trustees of the national community."[8] Local autonomy, innovation, initiative, and experimentation all became subsidiary to national direction, national goals, and national controls.

Concerning city planning, the municipality still held the power to plan for housing, recreation, transportation, and land use needs as long as the municipal approaches were not in contradiction with national, state, or regional needs.[9] The rationale for the forced realigning (Gleichschaltuung) of government powers was not simply for efficiency or the meeting of national needs. There was also a major economic motive; many cities across the nation were bordering on bankruptcy. In fact, the municipal financial plight was the critical point in the new government's justification for its control of local functions.[10] The NSDAP leaders argued that the municipalities had not made adequate provisions for meeting local needs and that their priorities were not in order. More succinctly, it was stated that local municipalities had been taking a "political and financial flight from reality". This castigation of the state of local affairs was coupled with the wholesale replacement of 99 percent of all municipal officials and fifty-one of fifty-five large city mayors.[11] The net result of the NSDAP control over local

politics was sarcastically noted in a headline of the Muncih newspaper Neueste Nachrichten: “City Council Meetings Public Again – Throngs Rush to City Hall.”[12]

**Ideological Perspectives**

The state of the German city during the Weimar years and the responses designed to overcome urban problems were the subjects of regular NSDAP sponsored diatribes. The behavior of the “democratic mob”, the ineffectiveness of the “city based” Weimar government, the art of the urban oriented avant-garde, the modernist architecture and urban design of the Bauhaus, and the international character of the German city were all condemned.[13]

The writings of the romantic ideologists of the nineteenth century provided the antecedents for much of the anti-urban stance of the National Socialists. These writings appear to have had particular influence upon the thoughts of Gottfried Feder and Walther Darré, the two leading “settlement” ideologists of the Third Reich. Both men advocated the dissolution of the industrial city and the promotion of the rural Volk as being key steps in the creation of a truly “National-Socialist” state. Feder was quite influential in the development of the NSDAP platform on economic, spatial, and settlement questions prior to the Party’s assumption of power. Later, shortly after the NSDAP came to power in 1933, he became director of the Reich Settlement Office. Through this organization he proposed concepts that were to guide the de-urbanization of the nation. More specifically, he advocated: (1) the halting of urban growth; (2) the dispersion of industry away from the cities; (3) the reduction in population of urban areas; and (4) the subjugation of all local, regional, and state planning to national needs.[14]

His ideas generated significant controversy. Planners saw merit in lowering the density of urban centers and developing an alternative to the crowded rental blocks (Mietskasernen) that blanketed the large cities. The militarists saw the ideas as helping to neutralize the impact of enemy bombing. Others, such as Gauleiter Erich Koch of East Prussia saw the ideas as leading to economic growth in the Prussian East.[15] Ideologists perceived them as contributing to the other hand, big business and agriculturalists, fearing a decrease in production, objected to the ideas. Further, there was little support for the ideas from the citizenry.

Feder enjoyed a brief period of national governmental support for his ideas at the start of the Third Reich. However, they proved so unworkable that they were quickly abandoned. He was removed from his position in less than one year. His ideas were considered to be so medieval, so economically disruptive, and so unpopular with industrialists and policy makers that Economic Minister Hjalmar Schacht removed him from office. He was replaced by Wilhelm Ludovici, who continued to develop the new settlement ideas but without the strident call for the elimination of urban systems and infrastructure.

Feder’s position as the leading settlement ideologist was assumed by Walther Darré. Darré was equally as anti-urban as Feder and argued for the strengthening of the rural peasant at the expense of the city. However, unlike Feder, he continued to be a powerful party and governmental official throughout the 1930s.

Neither Feder nor Darré were able to develop effective steps designed to stop the growth and expansion of the cities. However, it should be pointed out that anti-urbanism

still remained as a critical ideological consideration in government policy. In fact, intentional anti-urbanism was a significant ideological input in the goals of the Recovery Years. This input could be particularly noted in settlement, agricultural expansion, and regionalization policies.

## Planning in the Recovery Years

The Beginning

The first governmental effort to stimulate an economic revival focused upon the need to create jobs and to expand the supply of housing. The primary legislative enactment was the Law for the Reduction of Unemployment (June 1933). This act was comprehensive and included several elements that related to municipal planning, including the building of 7000 kilometers of national highways (*Autobahnen*) and the financing of small-scale municipally sponsored public improvement projects. (These were cynically referred to as *Pyramidenbau* – the building of pyramids, or, less euphemistically, "make work" jobs). Among these improvements were repairs to private houses; the building of new houses; agricultural resettlement; and highway, subway, river, rail, and road transportation improvements.[16]

Two other acts were also crucial in the formation of the national government's policies toward German cities and towns. The first was the Hereditary Farm Law of 1033. The act was intended to be the cornerstone of the creation of a permanent peasant class. It was designed to stabilize the family farm, contribute to the creation of a strongly nationalistic peasantry, and promote national autarchy. It also prohibited owners from disposing of their property and restricted the inheritance of the farm to the first born son. The second was the Act to Layout Areas for Residential Settlements (hereafter referred to as the settlement act). This act was designed to control urban expansion, stop real estate speculation, and expand the housing supply.[17]

The lack of housing represented the most critical city planning problem of the early 1930s. Throughout the Weimar period the German cities were unable to match housing demand, supply, and the ability of the dweller to obtain housing financing. By 1932, this problem became so severe that hundreds of thousands of units were vacant while thousands of people were living in shacks or with extended families.[18] The average amount of housing built per year during the Weimar era was approximately 200,000 units. In the first four years of the Third Reich (1933-1936) housing supply increased to an average of 300,000 units per year. Yet due to increased marriages, pent-up demand, and growing families, supply still did not keep up with demand. By the start of the first Four Year Plan, for example, demand had reached 350,000 units per year.

The settlement act was a major program in the effort to overcome the housing problems. Over 65,000 settler homes were built under this program in the first four years of the Third Reich. These settlements were designed to have a strong folkish orientation and were to create an alternative to the dank, overcrowded tenement blocks. This program included three primary settlement types: (1) the "house with farm" where the dweller could work in both field and factory (Nebensiedlung), (2) the privately owned home with a few acres to grow produce for personal consumption (Kleinsiedlung), and (3) the privately owned home and garden on the urban fringe (Heimstätte). The settlement act represented a policy extension of the Unemployment Act in that it stressed

self-help, self sufficiency, and job-creation. There was a distinct fear that the economic depression would not be overcome and that industrial production would not return to the levels of either the pre-war or the mid-Weimar era. Therefore, it was essential that the state and its citizens develop their own autarchic system. This program was also intended to reduce pressures on the city so that slum removal could be undertaken.

Both the Hereditary Farm Law and the settlement act underscored the startling fact that a new approach to city planning was in operation. In both cases there was little discussion of local needs and desires, little concern for local priorities, and little involvement with traditional city planners. These two acts were designed by and for the national government. National ideology, national settlement policies, national defense policy, and the national response to the Depression were the key elements that contributed to their implementation. Further, they were part of a national population policy (Bevolkerungspolitik) that might be labeled “Imperialism by Demography”. Included within this policy were the following: urban decentralization, resettlement of German speaking people in newly occupied land, the solution to the living space (Lebensraum) problem, expansion of farm production to attain increased agricultural self sufficiency, and finally, the creation of a buffer zone for military defense purposes between the German nation and its neighbors.[19]

The design and the site planning of housing also reflected national ideological characteristics. To the party ideologists, housing was critically important as a culture building agent. (It should be noted that Weimar planners often held a similar view). By meeting the housing demand and providing the proper design ethos, the ideologists perceived that a positive sense of Heimat could be created.[20] This, in turn, would provide a powerful motivation toward and reinforcement of the cultural attributes being developed by the NSDAP. Thus, the party propaganda office developed a large scale “selling effort”. Phrases such as “settler joy” (Siedlerfreuden), “settler prosperity” (Siedlergluck), the “beauty of homesteading” (Schönheit des Siedelns), and folk community (Volksgemeinschaft) became common in the popular press of the day. Articles and photographs showing beautiful maidens working in the fields adjacent to the new settlements or walking along rustic streets with new housing in the background appeared with regularity.[21]

The most commonly perceived house design of the period was the “Hansel and Gretel Candy Covered Cottage” type. Thousands of units were built in this image as well as the more simple Heimatstil, Fachwerk, and Tyrolean designs.[22] Exposed timbers, exterior privies, stables, and peaked roofs were common design elements. The intention in these designs was to create a feeling for the spirit of the past and to contribute to an enhancement of Erman culture while meeting current shelter needs. Simplicity, tradition, permanence, unity with land, and Heimat are descriptive terms that could apply to the intent of these designs.[23] At the same time that these designs were being advocated, there was also a move to discredit the modernist design concepts of the Weimar period. The stark facades, the flat roofs and the small scale of the living units were all condemned. Yet the intentions and the results do not totally match. Thousands of housing units were built that reflected the technological and design advances that were developed during the Weimar years. In fact, once the rhetoric of both the avant-garde of the 1920s and the NSDAP arbiters of culture in the 1930s is removed, there are significant design similarities between the two periods.

The small settlement structures were to be sited differently, in theory, from the regular orthogonal layout that had become common during the Weimar years. The orthogonal plan was to be conceptually replaced by the circle. Only through such an organically derived shape, it was felt, could a sense of community be derived. The intent was to "unite people in a readiness to help and participate in community life", and to stimulate the feeling of the organic character of man in nature.[24] This concept was a repudiation of the rationally derived row-on-row (Zeilenbau) designs of the Weimar era planners.[25] Indeed, the National Socialist theorists perceived that the Zeilenbau treatment oriented man toward himself, while circular designs (Kreisbildendes Prinzip), helped to create a sense of community. In essence the circle was used to reflect the medieval village (Burg) rather than the Castrum-like Civitas,[26] and to help overcome mental urbanization (Seelische Verstädterung). The concept was at least partially applied in many settlements across the nation. However, as with the architectural designs, there were also many more settlements which were based upon site planning principles that had evolved during the Weimar years.

In sum, the ideological emphasis upon settlement design patterns generally stressed the following points: the need for unity through building (Einigung), romanticism, medieval settlement patterns, and the community as an arm of the state. These characteristics were not always present. In fact, there was extensive diversity in design concepts, site planning, and architectural styles.

**The Performance**

The Hereditary Farm Law accomplished little in terms of creating a permanent peasant class. There were several reasons for this. The inability of the owners to dispose of the land restricted the ability to mortgage it and, in turn, to buy equipment and supplies. The lack of available land for those dispossessed by the law meant more people were forced to move to the city for work. The farm land not covered by the act, and hence available for sale, was too expensive for the dispossessed. Also, NSDAP members had first priority in buying this land. Lastly, the large *Junker* estates were exempt from the act and were kept in their current ownership. The net result was that the farmer did not become more rooted to the soil and the ruralite movement to the city continued with little impediment.

The settlement act was not as extensive a failure as the Hereditary Farm Law but it, too, did not meet expectations. In particular, it accomplished little in stopping the migration of residents to the city. Only in the university cities of Heidelberg, Münster, and Bonn was there a net decline in urban population.[27] In effect, by 1934, there was an urban population boom that came close to matching the record of the 1890s. The government, noting its inability to influence where growth would occur, began to reconsider its position as a subsidizer of small settlements. In 1935, it decided to stop subsidizing these programs altogether.[28]

The settlement act did result in the building of thousands of dwelling units during the Recovery Years. In this regard, it could be considered as being successful. It also could be considered successful in that it established a three-tiered land planning system that integrated local, regional, and national planning goals. However, upon further analysis, the system was not as simple as it first appeared. At the national level, decision-

making was spread among the Ministries of Labor (settlement planning), Agriculture (rural settlement planning), and Economics (small settlements). It was not until 1935 that land use planning began to function in a coordinated and effective manner. At that time, land use was consolidated under the National Bureau of Spatial Planning.[29] With control over national, regional, and local land use plans, its key responsibilities included population resettlement, industrial location, the planning of transportation networks, soil improvements, and defense preparedness.

The responsibilities of the bureau were carried out within a strong ideological framework. In fact, the head of the organization, Minister Hans Kerrl, included the "increase of the biological folkish-strength" as being one of its aims.[30] Inherent in the mandate of this organization were the concepts of Lebensraum and Geopolitik.[31] Fritz Schumacher, former city planning director of Hamburg, saw these ideas as being the result of a new conceptualization of space that had been stimulated by both technological advances and by the national border constrictions imposed upon the nation by the Treaty of Versailles.[32] Space had become a weapon in the struggle for national existence. It was interpreted in terms of spirituality, nature, land, settlement, and community. Space determination was to be the overriding means of creating a sense of national unity and community.[33]

The next level below the National Bureau of Spatial Organization consisted of twenty-three regional planning organizations that covered the entire nation. Modeled after the much-heralded Ruhr Regional District, these organizations were responsible for developing the plans that evolved from national policies and directives. Beneath these organizations were the local municipal planning agencies which implemented the plans and administered controls within their own boundaries. Their responses, in turn, were closely monitored and tightly controlled by both the regional agencies and the Bureau.

**National Involvement in Municipal Planning**

The city proper was not initially a direct focus of national government attention during the recovery years. However, as the period moved toward its end, the national government began increasingly to focus upon urban revitalization activities. In fact, there was an apparent correlation between the relative prosperity of the nation and the national government's interest in urban centers; as the nation prospered and the need for consumer goods and industrial production rose, the city became increasingly more important to the national government.

The national leadership saw the city as having both economic and symbolic functions. The economic functions included job creation and the financial spin-off that could be gained from the new structures. In terms of serving a symbolic function, the city was to be the place where the true glory of the new state could be found. The new structures – in combination with the flags, sculptures, music, and masses of people – were to contribute to the reinforcement of a new national spirit.[34] This spirit, in turn, was to serve as the basis for the formation of a "community of the people". In one sense, from a national perspective, the city was viewed as an inanimate architectural space that was to be a crucible in which support for the state was nurtured.[35] This perspective becomes clear when one examines the plans that were designed under National Socialist auspices. The greatest emphasis was upon the construction of urban squares, plazas,

monuments, and public buildings. Largely emphasizing neoclassical designs, these structures were designed to reflect such feelings as awe, permanence, and strength. These designs emerged as a result of the party leadership's belief that the lack of monumentality in civic structures was symptomatic of the cultural debasement of the nation: "stone monuments", based upon the party's ideological stances, were to contribute toward correcting the problem.[36]

Nowhere was monumentality as important as in Nürnberg and Berlin. In Nürnberg, the "city of the party rallies", extensive planning effort was placed on creating spaces that would allow for the magnanimity of the party events to emerge.[37] It was to create a setting where the nation (and the world) could perceive the political, communal, and military strength of the nation. Rhetorical descriptions of the period included such phrases as "proof of German strength and will", "a shrine for the nation", and "on these grounds, the communal experience of the unity of *Führer* and *Volk* was possible".[38]

The plan for Berlin was intended to serve as the guide for the creation of the capital of the new Empire (Reichshauptstadt).[39] The monumental scale that was being built into Nürnberg was surpassed in Berlin. The Great Hall, the Arch of Triumph, the Soldiers Hall, and the North and South Railroad Stations, among others, were to be some of the most massive structures in the world to that time. To illustrate the scale, St. Peter's Cathedral would have fit several times over into the proposed Great Hall. Further, the Arch of Triumph was to be forty-nine times larger than the Arc de Triomphe in Paris. The planning for Berlin was entrusted by Hitler to the architect Albert Speer. He reported directly to Hitler and was given extensive funds and staff to accomplish his tasks. The planning of Berlin, as with Nürnberg, was mainly carried out during the First Four Year Plan.

It is interesting to note how the national government was able to gain the power to supersede the local plans of both Nürnberg and Berlin. In the Nürnberg case, in 1935, Hitler expressed grave concern for the people of Nürnberg – particularly because his plan required the relocation of the city zoo. He therefore asked Mayor Willi Liebel for his support and volunteered to pay all relocation costs. Speer analyzed Hitler's approach as follows:

> Two years later Hitler would come directly to the point in dealing with a mayor:
> Here is the Party Rally Area; this is how we're going to do it. But at that time, in 1935, he did not yet feel so completely in command and so spent almost an hour on prefatory explanations before he placed any sketch on the table.[40]

By 1936, Hitler had begun to take action independently of the local city's position. Such was the case with the planning of Berlin. Throughout most of the Recovery Years, the planning for Berlin was controlled by the city administration. During that period, Hitler presented several ideas to Mayor Julius Lippert concerning the remaking of the city into the Reichshauptstadt. Lippert was not overly enthusiastic about Hitler's plans. Hitler first threatened to relocate the capital and then simply decided to by-pass all government agencies and turn the planning over to Albert Speer, his new General Building Inspector. His actions in this case illustrate the power of the leadership principle. When the city was not supportive of national needs or policies, its freedom to act or react on planning matters was simply removed. In this case, the national government stripped the Mayor of Berlin, the Berlin City Council, the Governor of Greater Berlin, and the national Ministry of the Interior of all planning powers concerning the capital, and turned the power over to the General Building Inspection Office.

Nürnberg and Berlin were not the only cities scheduled to receive extensive planning assistance from the national government. Among others, Munich (the capital of the movement), Hamburg (the city of foreign trade), and Linz were also programmed to be the recipients of extensive national planning assistance. Labeled as "reconstruction cities", each was to house national government and party offices and institutions.[41] Further, each was to have its core area substantially changed to reflect the ideologies of the new order.[42]

Few of the proposed structures were actually built during the recovery years. Yet those that were built constituted dramatic announcements that the new design approaches and ideological concepts were being applied. This could be particularly noted in the designs for Nürnberg's Zeppelinfeld and Congress Hall, Munich's House of German Art, and Berlin's Olympic Stadium.[43] These design and planning concepts captured the imagination of governor (Gaulieter) after governor who, in time, attempted to apply them in their own cities. In time, the plans proposed for Berlin came to be rigid models for cities across the nation.[44] In sum, the cities became more and more important to the nation-state as the Recovery Years came to a close.

## Other Activities

The emphasis upon solving the problems of housing overshadowed all other traditional planning activities during the Recovery Years. Relatively few cultural or recreational facilities were built. Industrial and commercial activities were rarely expanded due to existing excess capacity. While long range planning activities addressed these functions, they were low priorities until the First Four Year Plan. Concerning highways, as mentioned earlier, extensive work was undertaken during the Recovery Years. The national highway system (Autobahnen), proposed since the early 1920s, was planned and implemented. This system represented the most significant technological advance of the period, and it fulfilled several needs. First, it provided a psychological and functional connection among the nation's large cities. Secondly, it expanded the commuting catchment area. In essence, the city and its Hinterland became more closely bound. This then enabled a feasible expansion of the previously mentioned Heimstätte concept. Thirdly, it provided thousands of jobs for formerly unemployed laborers. Lastly, and perhaps of the greatest national significance, it served a military objective by providing a means of rapid deployment to the potential fronts surrounding the nation.

## The Recovery Years in Perspective

City planning during the recovery years was marked by several unique characteristics. The leadership principle, "imperialism by demography", and the anti-urban ideologies stimulated a refocusing of objectives, priorities, and methods. At the same time, these changes co-existed with a strong sense of pragmatism which emphasized an economic revival and an expansion of the housing supply. It is clear that the end results of these nationally imposed policies were not totally dissimilar to those of the previous period. In fact, in terms of the implementation of city plans, whenever ideology and economic pragmatism were in conflict, the latter appears to have taken precedence as a controlling influence.

**Planning in the First Four Year Plan (1935-1940)**
**Where Fits the City?**

If the recovery years can be considered the "time of ideological ruralization" then the First Four Year Plan must be considered the "time of the city".[45]

The most significant stimulus toward a shift to urban concerns came from the military. In fact, a concern for military power was inherent in most major policy decisions affecting Germany. As early as 1935 one could begin to note the change. In that year, an act was passed giving the military the right to expropriate any land that it needed.[46] At the same time, an increasingly large share of the Gross National Product (GNP) was shifted to military needs. (The economist Guillebaud labeled the shift as being "guns instead of houses").[47]

The results of this shift were felt in virtually all sectors of German life, including city planning. It could be noted in several ways. First, the military required large masses of land for training bases. This land was primarily agricultural. The net result was that gross farm acreage began to decline. Second, the military needed large supplies of technical material and manufactured goods. The places where they could be produced were in the industrial districts of the cities. This caused a large influx of people to these areas seeking defense-related employment. The net result of this shift in priorities was that rural residents were moving to the city at a rate of 2.5 percent per year. (This compares with 1.5 percent during the Weimar years). While the existence of these jobs was a strong pull, it should also be pointed out that the typical urban worker earned 50 percent more in wages than his rural counterpart.[48] Lastly, the shift to a military focus caused the national government to make housing a lower priority. This shift, in turn, resulted in an extensive ripple effect that spread throughout the nation. On a primary level, it meant continued dependence on the over-crowded center cities which meant that slum removal had to be delayed.[49] Several developments point out the severity of the impact of the decision to shift away from housing: (1) housing became a black market item, (2) one million slum units continued to exist in the central core, (3) 35 percent of all families lacked suitable housing, and (4) housing construction fell increasingly short of the needed supply.[50]

The change in priorities also resulted in a shift away from ruralization. How could the government support a ruralization policy when industrial, technical, transportation, and military needs had precedence? The net result was that the NSDAP rural policies of the recovery years were virtually ignored. More farms were established during the Weimar years of 1925-32 than under National Socialist rule between 1932 and 1939. Further, the farm population had become so depleted by 1939 that an agricultural mobilization program had to be developed.[51]

**The Urban Core**

Three phenomena emerge from the national government's influence on core area city planning during the First Four Year Plan. First, in the center cities, housing and recreation/culture – two of the key basic city planning functions noted in the Athens Charter of 1933 – were of little direct interest to the national leaders. (Interestingly, as previously noted, there was national interest for housing outside the core city). Secondly,

for a nation that stressed its rootedness in the soil, it seemed quite strange that nationally supported projects in the city placed virtually no emphasis upon greenery. In fact, nature (trees, shrubs, grass) was removed from Munich's Königsplatx, Berlin's Lustgarten facing Schinkel's Museum, and the square in front of the Berlin Technical University in order to enhance a feeling of "community".[52] Similar squares were to be placed in cities across the nation. Thirdly, the concept of symbolism in design continued to thrive despite a general decline in the importance of ideology. Regardless of its size, each community was to have a central structural focal point (Stadtkrone) that was designed to enhance the state. While many plans were created, very few were implemented. They were costly and required scarce building resources and manpower skills. The planning of core area projects virtually ceased in late 1939. At that time the shift to a wartime economy forced the implementation program to be delayed.

**New Towns: Practice and Theory**

There was also a national effort to create new towns during the First Four Year Plan. These towns were primarily intended to aid in enlarging the resource extraction base of the nation, to expand its industrial capability, and to stimulate economic growth in "backwater" areas. Only two were actually started. These were the "Town of the Hermann Goering–Werke" at Salzgitter and the "Strength Through Joy Automobile Town" at Wolfsburg.

The Goering-Werke was to be an ideal, highly structured National Socialist community. Proposed ultimately to house 300,000 people, it was originally designed with an elaborate Stadtkrone at its center. Housing was located in satellite areas and was to be connected to work places by high-speed autobahns. It was never fully implemented but was, in part, adapted to postwar conditions. Now called Salzgitter, it houses over 30,000 people.[53]

The other totally new effort was the "Strength Through Joy Automobile Town". Hitler, very early in his regime, became enamored with the idea of a "people's" car. He commissioned the automotive engineer Ferdinand Porsche to develop this vehicle and in 1934 the basic design was ready. Hitler then decreed that a new plant and city be built in the underpopulated, underdeveloped, northern hinterland. Declaring that the city would be "one of the happiest and most beautiful in the world", he laid the cornerstone in 1939 of what was to be another model for a fascist new town. Under the planning direction of Peter Kolb and advisorship of Albert Speer, the design was dramatically imperialist in scope. It was to have been dominated by an acropolis consisting of party buildings, theater, great hall, and cultural center. This complex was never built. The town did begin to take shape during the Third Reich, but the makeshift housing and barracks-like atmosphere did not meet the expectations of the master plan. The original plan was modified in the postwar period, and only then did the Volkswagen city of Wolfsburg, as it is now called, take form.[54]

**The End**

The remilitarization of the Rhineland, the annexation of Austria, and the seizure of Czechoslovakia called for the supremacy of military needs above all else. Thus, the

capital improvement projects were placed in abeyance. Housing, more than any other city planning program, was the greatest victim of military domination. In fact, housing starts had declined to 138,000 units by 1940. In order to quiet growing concern over the lack of housing, the government announced a comprehensive housing program that would start upon the end of the war. The houses were to be “airy, sun-filled and set in gardens”. This program was greeted with great cynicism by the populace. A sarcastic observation concerning this announcement, made by Germans who had been victimized by bombing, concluded, “Well, now we really have houses with plenty of light, air and sunshine”.[55]

**Summary**

The National Socialist government was an active participant in local city planning. The bureaucratic relationships were restructured so that the cities came increasingly under national government domination. National planning efforts initially focused upon resettlement concepts within a strong anti-urban context, and were intended to halt urban growth and decentralize the population. These efforts stressed the development of small family farm settlements and emphasized self-sufficiency. Initially, the designs reflected folkish beliefs but they rapidly moved to a wider selection of approaches.

The most extensive community assistance efforts were made during the recovery years. The heavy welfare burden, unemployment, and lack of housing inherited by the National Socialist government prompted swift action. The First Four Year Plan reflected the rising spectre of militarism. Public services and funds were regularly placed second to defense considerations. In spite of this, city planning efforts were still undertaken to create cultural, governmental, and political structures and spaces. These reflected the ideological values of glorification of the state, cultural permanence, and strength. Efforts were also undertaken to create new communities. In summary, however, city planning became less and less important to the national government as the decade came to a close.

Comparisons of the Weimar Republic era with the National Socialist times often characterize the former as being urban oriented while the latter is characterized as rural oriented. Although, as noted above, there was an overt anti-urban stance taken by the National Socialist theorists, the stances of planning theorists during Weimar times are less clear. Sibyl Moholy-Nagy has labeled the theorists as focusing upon a *Weichbild* or “grey area” that was neither urban nor rural.[56] The historian Manfredo Tafuri, on the other hand, considers the Weimar theorists as being anti-urban.[57]

It is clear that none of the Weimar city planners focused upon the city as an ideal form. Rather, they emphasized escapist, small scale, limited size, balanced communities that were placed in a green belt. These theorists felt that the city was too complex, too disorderly, too traditional, and too unchangeable. For these reasons they advocated a new form of community. This new form, in theory, would simplify the complexity of the community experience, bring order to the community form, and reflect a new Gesamtkultur or Wohnkultur.

The conceptualization of new community forms by the Weimar theorists did not reflect an overt dislike or hatred of cities. Neither did it ascribe medieval characteristics to the people who were to reside in the new communities. However, the theorists did see

the need to decentralize, to recognize, and to create new non-urban communities. To this end, the greatest emphasis of the Weimar era theorists lay in alternatives to the overcrowded, Mietskasernen dominated, center city. Eventually, similar views were advocated by the NSDAP theorists as well.

The National Socialist theorists took on extremely anti-urban stances during the recovery years. They argued for the rejection of urban life and the creation of the ordered city of the middle ages. Yet once the rhetoric is removed, the approaches advocated by NSDAP theorists do not differ strongly from those of the Weimar era. Both called for small settlements, for alternatives to urban living, for settlements that offered "field and factory", and for the use of designs and site plans as symbols for the new era. The key difference lay in the fact that the National Socialists advocated these changes as part of a nationally controlled program designed to further the objectives of the nation-state. Local autonomy, innovation, experimentation, and cultural views were not tolerated as much as they were during the Weimar period.

The central cities were of secondary importance both to the Weimar governments and to the National Socialist government through the recovery years. In both cases, the emphasis was upon developing the urban fringe. Only after the housing shortages were overcome was attention to be focused upon the center cities. Since neither the Weimar nor NSDAP governments met this goal, the urban centers remained ignored except for some transportation changes, some efforts to protect the medieval character of existing cities, and some selected model urban renewal projects.[58] The military and employment requirements that surfaced in the First Four Year Plan brought a refocusing of objectives on the part of the NSDAP to an urban orientation. Once this happened, extensive plans were developed for selected cities. However, few of these were ever implemented.

National efforts under the NSDAP to stimulate, guide, and control urban planning have had a long term impact upon city planning in West Germany. On the positive side, the decentralization of cities, the idea of building controlled settlements within agricultural areas, and the creation of the Autobahnen are all considered to have been quite beneficial. The negative aspects are more indirect. In fact, they relate more to the question of planning itself as opposed to what planning does. For example, Hans Arndt has written that the bitter memory of the national planning effort undertaken by the National Socialists is so vivid as to make the very idea of national planning an anathema.[59] The architectural historian Wolfgang Pehnt has reinforced this view: "Any planning measure is regarded with distrust …." Instead of democratizing the planning procedures and replacing poor with better planning, it is planning as such that is condemned.[60] This negative feeling presently exists. A concern over national usurpation of local powers and initiative is still strong at all levels of government. One net result of this is that the experience of nationally guided planning will not likely be repeated again in Germany.

Author's note
Research for this paper was made possible by a German Academic Exchange Research Grant. Special thanks must be given to Ms. Amy Jaffe and Ms. Patricia Jablonski for their research and editorial assistance.

[1] For a description of how the new system worked, see Arthur Schweitzer, *Big Business in the Third Reich* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1964), p. 25. Also see Franz Neumann, *Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National Socialism 1933-1944* (New York: Octagon, 1963), pp. 51ff.
[2] The term "Recovery Years" is used to describe the planning activities of the national government during the 1933-1936 period. A Four Year Plan was developed at the national level for this period but it proved immediately unworkable. For this reason the term "First Four Year Plan" is commonly used for the 1936-1940 period. See Bernice A. Carroll, *Design for Total War: Arms and Economics in the Third Reich* (Paris: Mouton, 1968), p. 128.
[3] For overviews of the accomplishments of the Weimar era planners, see Joan Campbell, *The German Werkbund* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978); Barbara Miller Lane, *Architecture and Politics in Germany 1918-1945* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968); and Manfredo Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development* (Cambridge: The MIUT Press, 1976). Also see the catalog of the 15 Europäische Kunstausstellung entitled *Tendenzen der Zwanziger Jahre* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1977).
[4] For an outstanding summary of this ferment see Ulrich Conrads, *Programs and Manifestoes on Twentieth Century Architecture* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1970).
[5] Among the most innovative of these experiences was the Frankfurt city planning effort under the direction of Mayor Ludwig Landmann and City Planner Ernst May. See Nicholas Bullock, "Housing in Frankfurt (1925-1931) and the New Wohnkultur", *Architectural Review*, Vol. 163, No. 976 (June, 1978), pp. 335-342. Also see Dieter Rebentisch, *Ludwig Landmann, Frankfurter Oberbürgermeister der Weimarer Republik* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1978) and Ruth Diehl, *Die Tätigkeit Ernst Mays in den Jahren 1925-1930* (Frankfurt: Goethe University, 1976).
[6] For a summary of the impact of the Depression on one city, see the permanent exhibit in the Frankfurt Historisches Museum entitled "Frankfurter Wohnungsbau in der Weimarer Republik". In particular, see the section entitled "Siedlungsbau in der Weltwirtschaftskrise".
[7] May moved to Moscow and then to Kenya. Taut moved to Turkey. Wagner ultimately became a professor at Harvard University.
[8] Fritz M. Marx, *Government in the Third Reich* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1937), p. 141.
[9] For an overview of the powers of municipal government, see Roger Wells, "Municipal Government in National Socialist Germany", *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 29, No. 4 (August 1935) pp. 652-658.
[10] Bruno Schwan, Städtebau und Wohnungswesen der Welt (Berlin: Verlag Wasmuth, 1935), p. 133.
[11] Wells, "Municipal", p. 653. Also see William Ebenstein, *The German Record: A Political Portrait* (Toronto: Farrar, 1945), p. 52.
[12] Quoted by Fritz Marx, "Germany", in William Anderson, editor, *Local Government in Europe* (New York: D. Appleton Century, 1939), p. 247.
[13] There are many books which focus on the influence of ideology upon German culture, society, and politics. Among the most important are George Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1964); Fritz Stern, *The Politics of Cultural Despair* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961); Robert W Lougee, *Paul LaGarde 1827-1891: A Study of Radicalo Conservatism in Germany* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962); Klaus Bergmann, *Agrarromantik und Grosstadtfeindschaft* (Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Heim, 1970); and Mechthild Schump, *Städtebau-Utopien und Gesellschaft* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1972). For a discussion and analysis of the response of the National Socialist views toward the city planning and architecture of the 1920s see Lane, *Architecture and Politics*. Also see Anna Teut, editor, *Architektur im Dritten Reich 1933-1945* (Berlin: Ullstein, 1967); Josef Wulf, *Die Bildenden Künste im Dritten Reich: Eine Dokumentation* (Gütersloh: Sigbert Mohn, 1963); and Robert R. Taylor, *The Word in Stone: The Role of Architecture in the National Socialist Ideology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974).
[14] Feder was an active member of the NSDAP almost from its beginning. For an example of his early ideas on the dissolution of German cities see Gottfried Feder, "Das deutsche Siedlungswerk: Rede von Gottfried Feder", *Bauwelt*, vol. 19 (1934) as reprinted in Teut, *Architektur*, 311-315. Also see "Kundgebung des Reichsiedlungkommissars", *Deutsches Handwerksblatt* (June 15, 1934), pp. 236-240. Darré, a professional agronomist, was the key proponent of ruralism, mysticism, and the Nordic ideal. See, for example Walter

Darré, *Neuadel aus Blut und Boden* (Munich: Lehmann, 1935). For a review of the influence of Feder and Darré among other early ideologists, see Barbara Miller Lane and Leila J. Rupp, editors, *Nazi Ideology Before 1933: A Documentation* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978).

[15] "Recent Notes." *Town and Country Planning,* Vol. 2 No. 8 (September 1934), p. 157. Also see Robert L. Koehl, *RKFDV: German Resettlement and Population Policy 1939-1945* (Cambridge University Press, 1957).

[16] C.W. Guillebaud, *The Economic Recovery of Germany 1933-1936* (London: MacMillan, 1939), pp. 38-39. Also see Arthur Schweitzer, *Big Business in Third Reich*, p. 298.

[17] For a discussion of te basis for te act see Robert Brady, *The Spirit and Structure of German Facism* (London: Victor Gollancz: 1937), pp. 245-263. Also see Frieda Wunderlich, *Farm Labor in Germany 1910-1945* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1961), pp. 159-203.

[18] William Harlan Hale, "From the Heart of Germany", *The Nation*, Vol. 83, No. 3463 (November 18, 1931), p. 555. Also the *Hauszinssteuer* revenue for housing had virtually ceased to exist by late 1932. See Walter Fey, "Die Leistungen im Deutscher Wohnungs-und Siedlungsbau", *Sonderhefte des Institut für Kon-junkturforschung*, vols. 40-45, No. 42 (August 5, 1936), p. 12.

[19] Robert L. Koehl, RKFDV, p. 1. Also see Karl Otto, "Luftkrieg und Städtebau", *Raumforschung und Raumordnung*, Vol. 4, No. 9 (September, 1940), pp. 341-344.

[20] The idiom Heimat is difficult to translate. In one sense it means home, homeland, and a sense of "turf". In a more ideological sense, the idiom ties environment (topography, climate, and vegetation) to culture (religion, folk beliefs, speech patterns, literature, and politics and nationalism). See Peter H. Nash, *From Heimatkunde to Ekistic Grid: Attitudinal Polarities* (Kingston: Curriculum in Community Planning, University of Rhode Island, 1967), p. 2. For an outstanding analysis of the concept see "Home: A Symbolic Attachment to Place" in F. Lenz-Romeiss, *City: New Town or Home Town* (London: Pall Mall, 1973), pp. 17-45.

[21] The Historisches Museum in Frankfurt has created a permanent exhibit which summarizes the propaganda efforts. See "Die Propagandistische Aufwertung der NS-Siedlugen", Exhibit cards 53.04-53.05, Historisches Museum, Frankfurt.

[22] For a comprehensive overview of the various medieval house types see Werner Lindner, editor, *Das Dorf: Seine Pflege und Gestaltung* (Munich: Callwey, 1938).

[23] See *Lane, Architecture and Politics,* pp. 197-198. These traits formed an "archaistic" approach toward the viewing of future community form. See Carl Schorske, "The Idea of the City in European Thought", in Oscar Handlin and John Burchard, editors, *The Historian and the City* (Cambridge: the MIT Press, 1963), pp. 106-109ff.

[24] Heinz Killus, "*Der Totalitätsgedanke im Neuen Städtebau", Monatshefte für Baukunst und Städtebau*, Vol. 32, No. 4 (April 1940), p. 85. Also see Christian F. Otto, "City Planning Theory in National Socialist Germany", *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, Vol. 24, No. 1 (March 1965), p. 72.

[25] For a discussion of the Zeilenbau concept see John Robert Mullin, German City Planning in the 1920's: A North American Perspective of the Frankfurt Experience (Waterloo, Ontario: University of Waterloo, a Ph.D. Dissertation, 1975), pp. 184-195.

[26] For an explanation of the Burg/Castrum dichotomy see Karl Gruber, *Die Gestalt der Deutschen Stadt* (Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut, 1939), pp. 9-24.

[27] Rudolf Heberle and Fritz Meyer, *Die Grosstädte in Ströme der Binnenwanderung* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1937), p. 169.

[28] Friedrich Schmidt, "Subsistance Homesteads", International Housing Association, editors, Umsiedlung (Stuttgart: Verlag Julius Hoffman, 1935), p. 16.

[29] "Reichsstelle für Raumordnung", *Deutsche Volkswirt*, No. 44 (August 2, 1935), p. 2056. Also see Heide Berndt, *Das Gesellschaftsbild bei Stadtplanern* (Stuttgart: Karl Kramer Verlag, 1968), pp. 21-23.

[30] Wunderlich, *Farm Labor*, p. 175.

[31] The term *Geopolitik*, like the term *Heimat*, is difficult to translate. In one sense, it means geographic politics or policy. In a more ideological sense, as applied by the National Socialist theorists, it meant the application of racial, economic, social, and cultural pressures to gain popular support for spatial expansion.

[32] Teut, *Architektur*, p. 309.

[33] For a discussion of the importance of the concept of space in German planning see the section entitled "Städtebau, Reichsund Landesplanung" in Teut, *Architektur*, pp. 308-341.

[34] This point is one of the focuses of George L. Mosse's *Nationalization of the Masses* (New York: Howard Fertig, 1975).
[35] This view is reinforced in Joachim *Petsch, Baukunst und Stadtplanung im Dritten Reich* (Munich: Hanser Verlag, 1976) and Hildegard Brenner*, Die Kunstpolitik des Nationalsozialismus* (Hamburg: Taschenbuch Verlag, 1963).
[36] Robert R. Taylor, *The Word in Stone*. See Chapter Seven: "Architecture Representative of the New Germany", pp. 126-156. Also see Albert Speer, Karl Arndt, Georg F. Loch, and Lars Olof Larsson, *Albert Speer Architektur: Arbeiten 1933-1942* (Frankfurt: Verlag Ullstein, 1978).
[37] The rallies are described in Hamilton T. Burton, *The Nuremburg Party Rallies* (New York: Praeger, 1967).
[38] Taylor, *The Word in Stone*, pp. 168ff.
[39] The best text to date on the *Reichshauptstadt* is Lars Olof Larsson, *Die Neugestaltung der Reichshauptstadt* (Stockholm: Almgvist and Wiksell, 1978).
[40] Albert Speer, *Inside the Third Reich* (New York: MacMillan 1970), p. 66.
[41] For a review of the planning proposals for these cities see Jost Dülffer, Jochen Thies, and Josef Henke, *Hitlers Städte: Baupolitik im Dritten Reich* (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 1978).
[42] Gregor Janssen, *Das Ministerium Speer: Deutschlands Rustung im Krieg* (Berlin: Ullstein, 1961), p. 349.
[43] These structures are reviewed and analyzed in Albert Speer, *Inside the Third Reich*; Robert R. Taylor, *The Word in Stone*; and Barbara Miller Lane, *Architecture and Politics*. Also see Werner Rittich, *Architektur und Bauplastik der Gegenwart* (Berlin: Rembrandt Verlag, 1938).
[44] Albert Speer, Inside the Third Reich, pp. 142-143. Also see Jochen Thies, *Architekt der Weltherrsschaft*: *Die "Endziele" Hitlers* (Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1976).
[45] "Neure Grosssiedlungen wollen versorgt sein", *Völkischer Beobachter* (July 26, 1939) as quoted in David Schoenbaum, *Hitler's Social Revolution: Class and Society in Nazi Germany 1933-1939* (Garden City: Anchor, 1967), p. 195.
[46] Wunderlich, *Farm Labor*, p. 177.
[47] Guillebaud, *Economic Recovery*, p. 111.
[48] Richard Grunberger, *A Social History of the Third Reich* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1971), pp. 216, 159.
[49] George H. Gray, *Housing and Citizenship* (New York: Reinhold, 1946), pp. 96-97. Also see Werner Lindner and Erich Boeckler, *Die Stadt: Ihre Pflege und Gestaltung* (Munich: Callwey, 1939), pp. 192ff.
[50] See Helwing Stern, *Die Bedeutung des Wohnungsbaues in ersten Vierjahresplan* (Wurzburg: Triltsch, 1940), p. 30. Also see Hilde Oppenheimer-Blum, *The Standard of Living under Nazi Rule* (New York: New School for Social Research, 1943), p. 49.
[51] Schoenbaum, *Hitler's Social Revolution*, p. 174. Also see Wunderlich, Farm Labor, pp. 187-192.
[52] Robert R. Taylor, *The World in Stone*, p. 179ff.
[53] See "Town of the Hermann Goering-Werke", *Journal of the Town Planning Institute*, Vol. 26, No. 1 (January-February, 1940), pp. 36-39.
[54] The creation of this town is described in detail in K. B. Hopfinger, *Beyond Expectation: The Volkswagen Story* (London: G. T. Foulis, 1962). Also see Jan C. Rowan, "New German Town", *Progressive Architecture*, Vol. 42, No. 12 (December 1961), pp. 132-137.
[55] Richard Grunberger, *A Social History of the Th8ird Reich*, p. 219.
[56] Sibyl Moholy-Nagy, *The Matrix of Man* (New York: Praeger 1968), p. 241.
[57] Manfredo Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1976), pp. 117-124. Also see Harold L. Poor "City Versus Country: Anti-urbanism in the Weimar Republic", *Societas – A Review of Social History*, Vol. 6 (1976), p. 177.
[58] The concept of the "ordered city" was also common in city planning in Fascist Italy. For example, the principle of *Gerarchia* (hierarchy) was used in regulating each person's place in society and defining where societal functions would be located. See Diane Yvonne Ghirardo, "Italian Architects and Fascist Politics: An Evaluation of the Rationalist's Role in Regime Building", *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, Vol. 39, No. 2 (May, 1980), pp. 121-125.
[59] Hans Arndt, *West Germany: The Politics of Non-Planning* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1966), p. xx.
[60] Wolfgang Pehnt, *German Architecture 1960-1970* (New York: Praeger, 1970), pp. 10-11.