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Summary

This first English biography of Hermann Mattern (1902–1971) discusses in depth the contribution by one of Germany’s principal 20th-century landscape architects to the development of his profession. It is complemented with an introduction to the two personalities he is most associated with: the landscape architect Herta Hammerbacher (1900–1985) and the horticulturist Karl Foerster (1874–1970). The main theme of the thesis are design ideals and approaches rather than realised works. In addition to this, two temporal foci have been set. One focus lies on the early influences during the inter-war period. This includes Mattern’s unique role as an agent of Bauhaus concepts in landscape architecture. A second focus lies on criticism of his work during the National-Socialist dictatorship, providing new insights into the way the concept of ‘degenerate art’ was applied to garden design. By taking an interpretative perspective that considers form-historical tradition lines along with specific biographical influences, a better understanding of garden modernism is aimed at. As point of departure serves the dualism ‘architectonic vs. landscape mode’. Research was conducted mainly in form of text analysis. It is based in great parts on private correspondence kept at different German archives.

Mattern’s fundamental questioning of traditional notions can be deduced from his identification with parts of the avant-garde. As a representative of organic functionalism, he was critical of pure rationalism, often producing experimental, even playful solutions. This contrasts sharply with his ambiguous career during the war. Setting this into perspective means considering how the technological modernism of the Nazi realm fascinated Modernist designers, and that it also entailed certain aspects of aesthetic modernism. Mattern’s aestheticism and his pride made him underestimate the ethical dimension of becoming part of one of the Nazi state’s power centres, the Organisation Todt. After the war Mattern continued to challenge the mainstream in several regards. Firstly, pioneering a particular kind of ecological
thinking, he forcefully criticised bad planning legislation and practice from an unusually positivist perspective. Secondly, he initiated a unique course of landscape architecture at an art academy, which linked to his early exposure to reformist concepts in artistic education. The exposition of contradicting facets of Mattern's personality facilitates a more comprehensive interpretation of his design work. It also demonstrates the diversity of modern garden culture, both with regard to philosophy as well as formal expression.
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I. a Introduction

Research background

Hermann Mattern belongs to the few old familiar names in 20th-century German landscape architecture, and to a modest extent has also become known internationally. With many hundreds of projects on different scales, his standing as a leading garden designer is undisputed. On the other hand, he is not acknowledged as an influential thinker. His holistic perspective, typical for a designer, and the idiosyncratic language he used have never been compliant to the conventions of academic writing. This may have caused him to be considered an intuitive artist rather than a scholar, despite a substantial written legacy. Yet his writings are very perceptive and with hindsight can now be judged as decades ahead of their time.1

With his teaching involvement between 1947 and 1961 Mattern has influenced generations of landscape architects, who are today almost all retired.2 His enormous catalogue of projects, his writings and his role as a teacher make Mattern one of the pivotal figures of 20th-century landscape architecture.3

The common knowledge about Mattern is usually subsumed with the term Bornimer Schule — 'Bornim School' —, meaning a group of landscape architects and horticulturists active in Bornim near Potsdam, who were particularly influential around 1930.4 The following aspects are widely considered as facts: an 'organic'

---


2 For example: Gerd Aufmkolk, Heinz Hallmann, Gustav Lange, Günter Nagel, Donatha Valentien, Jürgen Klahn and Ulrich Singer.

3 On an international level, in the UNESCO World Heritage Papers Marc Treib has named Mattern’s projects as key works of garden Modernism (5, 2003, p. 136).

4 See glossary for a definition of ‘Bornim School’. More about this in chapter II-e.
(curvilinear) formal language under extensive application of mounts for space-making, usually referred to with the same breath as a preference for hollows of his first wife Herta Hammerbacher (1900–1985); informal, vegetation-based design concepts, inspired by the breeding achievements of his business partner Karl Foerster (1874–1970); a liberal standing, opposed to the Nazi regime; progressive concepts for landscape planning; and formative personal connections with the architect Hans Scharoun (1893–1972). This canon has been repeatedly referred to and often disseminated without the consultation of primary sources, which led to a perpetuation of certain characteristics and to a broad-brush image of Mattern and the Bornimers. This, and the view of Mattern as ‘artist without a theory’, has distracted from a differentiated analysis of his contribution to the development of his profession.

In 1982 Mattern was one of the first garden designers to have an exhibition dedicated solely to his work. Held at the Akademie der Künste Berlin, Germany’s national arts council, it paid tribute to the wide scope of his work and his thinking. The exhibition was accompanied by a catalogue entitled *Hermann Mattern: Gärten, Gartenlandschaften, Häuser*, which for thirty years remained the only monograph about Mattern. It was intended as an initial recollection of memories and comprised a tentative approach to reviewing his central ideas, without academic pretensions. A special situation emerges from the fact that a great share of the biographic writing about Mattern has been produced by one person, Vroni Heinrich, who also worked on the mentioned exhibition and catalogue. During the 1960s, Heinrich was a student and employee of Mattern and later in charge of his former chair’s little library. Since the mid-1990s a small number of papers and academic theses has further explored aspects of Mattern’s life and work, often with a focus on his ideological standing.
Significance and research questions

For a long time modernism has been widely underrepresented in garden history research. It was only during the 1980s that research intensified. Internationally, since the 1990s, an increasing number of monographs has been produced about significant personalities of 20th-century landscape architecture. Yet there is a much-lamented delay in comprehensive research about German garden Modernism; this has commonly been tied to the field’s entanglement with Blood and Soil ideology. After Hitler’s downfall, despite the attempted denazification, known Nazi followers gained many of the available academic posts. For decades, to look into the past was a taboo. Mattern was a part of this generation and had been professionally active throughout the ‘Third Reich’. He had also been sympathetic, though, to the left-wing social reform movement and to modernist art, and he was personally opposed to National Socialist ideology. In his concepts völkisch thinking is absent. After more information emerged about his involvement with the


6 Ibid. For a brief overview in English on the topic of landscape architecture during the Nazi regime, see: Gert Gröning, ‘Teutonic Myth, Rubble, and Recovery: Landscape Architecture in Germany’, in The Architecture of Landscape, 1940-1960, ed. by Marc Treib (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), pp. 120-53 (120-3). Contrary to this general perception of a delay, Wimmer (2004) has shown that the 20th century is in fact very well represented in research publications. See: Clemens Alexander Wimmer, ‘Trends in the Choice of Topics in the Field of Garden History and Garden Conservation since 1987’, in Historic gardens today, ed. by Michael Rohde (Edition Leipzig: Leipzig, 2004), pp. 30-7. However, there are very few published monographs about the German generation born around 1900, while internationally the number of book publications about Modernists has increased rapidly since about 1990.
regime, in particular with the Organisation Todt (OT), the civil and military engineering group that represented one of the power centres of the Nazi state, the feeling grew that there was more to discover.7 This did not so much affect his ideological standing, which had been convincingly analysed and generally found to be firmly non-Nazi. Instead, a clarification of Mattern's actual relationship with the regime was sought in functional terms.

Another research question regards the generally vague idea about the nature of garden Modernism, which is believed to be a mere 'side-track' of 20th-century landscape architecture.8 It has even been stated that '[i]t is commonly held that there was no modernist movement in German landscape architecture'.9 How did rationalism, functionalism and the artistic avant-garde find expression in domestic and public garden design? Although a series of examples has been presented in garden history, today the search for a modern garden style in the sense of a 'new building style', as proclaimed for example in 1927 by Walter Curt Behrendt, seems anachronistic.10 Some truly avant-gardist projects that have been discussed in the last years, but these were often non-built conceptual studies.11 Also with regard to

7 The first paper clearly addressing Mattern's willingness to cooperate with the OT was: Charlotte Reitsam, 'Der Landschaftsanwalt Hermann Mattern: Aufgaben und Konflikte', Stadt+Grün, 03 (2003), 20–4.


rationalism, apart from the settlers’ projects with their self-sufficiency gardens of the immediate post-WWI time – the now well-researched work of Leberecht Migge in particular —, few examples have been found. In the context of these questions, the Bornimers with their perceived romanticism are observed sceptically, sometimes referred to as middle-of-the-road Modernists. One aim of this thesis therefore is a clarification of the question about Modernism in garden art, asked in a fundamental way. Connected to this is the question about the progressiveness of Mattern’s work and thinking. Form, that is design vocabulary, and idea are mutually dependent. The significance of a designer can only be evaluated appropriately when considering an artefact as the formal expression of an idea. With this qualification, a formal analysis of a work for biographical research is meaningful.

Another desiderate has been identified in the field of the history of the profession, notably its education. While the chronology is fairly clear, and the beginnings of the university curriculum for landscape architects in 1929 at the Agricultural College Berlin, as well as the foundation dates of other colleges after the war, can be found in literature, the teaching content has not yet been investigated. As a teacher at two of the few postwar university-level courses for landscape architecture, Mattern had a very prominent role in this field. On top of this, he was also responsible for the establishment of the only course of study ever to be taught at a German art college, namely at Kassel, immediately after the war. This fact gains a particular significance through Mattern’s introduction of the teaching concepts of the

---


13 See for example the following popular monograph: Günther Mader, Gartenkunst des 20. Jahrhunderts: Garten- und Landschaftsarchitektur in Deutschland (Suttgart: DVA, 1999), 102–5. (see chapter heading on p. 100).
Weimar Bauhaus into the sphere of landscape architecture, which has never been clearly illuminated.\textsuperscript{14}

The central research questions can be summarised as follows (in no particular order):

\begin{itemize}
\item[a.] How can Mattern’s relation to the National-Socialist state be defined and how did his career develop until 1945?
\item[b.] What were the important artistic influences on Mattern’s work?
\item[c.] How can Mattern’s designs be evaluated in view of innovation and a contribution to the modern tradition of landscape architecture?
\item[d.] With regard to his thoughts committed to paper and his teaching philosophy, what defines Mattern’s contribution to the development of the profession?
\end{itemize}

\textbf{A literature overview}

Mostly with the help of his second wife Beate zur Nedden, Mattern wrote the following three monographs: \textit{Freiheit in Grenzen} (1938), \textit{Gärten und Gartenlandschaften} (1960) and \textit{Gras darf nicht mehr wachsen} (1964). His edited book \textit{Die Wohnlandschaft} (1950) contains an seminal essay by him, and his lecture \textit{Flurlandschaft} was published together with Ernst May’s lecture \textit{Stadtlandschaft} (1964).\textsuperscript{15} Besides this he wrote a vast number of more or less significant articles and book contributions. Prior to 1945 he published predominantly in the journals \textit{Gartenkunst} and \textit{Die Gartenschönheit}, after 1945 in the journals \textit{baukunst und werkform} (in the first editions he is listed as advisor to the editor Alfons Leitl),


\textsuperscript{15} Ernst May and Hermann Mattern, \textit{Stadtlandschaft – Flurlandschaft} (Wiesbaden: Arbeitsgemeinschaft zur Verbesserung der Agrarstruktur in Hessen, 1964)
Garten+Landschaft and Pflanze und Garten (as its co-publisher, since 1970 Grün).

The reception of Mattern’s work can be reviewed in several articles by other authors, above all in the same journals. Contemporary secondary literature that influenced Mattern has been identified through his correspondence, as discussed mainly in chapter II-d.

The greatest share of modern literature about Mattern can be roughly divided into three groups. The first ‘group’, more than others concerned with Mattern’s biography, is formed by the output of Vroni Heinrich. Thanks to her friendship with Mattern’s widow, Heinrich has not only been handed over many private documents, parts of which are still in her private archive. For a long time she has also been more or less alone in propagating new knowledge about Mattern. In her writing, Heinrich relies heavily on Mattern’s widow Beate zur Nedden’s accounts. While a surprisingly large part of this information has now been verified through archival material, the present text takes a different path regarding the evaluation of such personally shared ‘facts’. Heinrich’s first-hand informations also brought the disadvantage that, for much of her writing, she quotes no source. An asset of her writing is her dealing with zur Nedden’s achievements which would otherwise be concealed. Additionally, a deep understanding of Mattern’s design intentions can be felt in her writing. However, in her perspective as a post-war witness and admirer of her former teacher, a subtle apologetic bias is perceptible and critical questions are not asked. Mattern’s membership in the National Socialist German Worker’s Party (NSDAP), amongst other things, is not mentioned in any of her publications. While

---

16 Cf: Vroni Heinrich, Hermann Mattern: Gärten – Landschaften – Bauten – Lehre. Leben und Werk (Berlin: Verlag der Technischen Universität Berlin, 2013, 2nd rev. edn), p. 10–1. Zur Nedden, Beate’s maiden name, will be used to refer to her, as she changed names in the course of times, occasionally using her maiden name in combination with her husbands’ names Mattern or Maltusch (from her second marriage after Mattern’s death).

17 NSDAP file (index MFOK O 0044), file card Hermann Mattern, membership no. 7409839, applied for membership 02/12/1939, granted 01/01/1940, Barch.
her personal perspective may be understandable, it is nonetheless a disadvantage for the academic engagement with the phenomenon ‘Mattern’. Heinrich’s long-awaited monograph on Mattern has been published in December 2012 (revised edition 2013). Her writings include an entry in the Chicago Botanic Garden’s *Encyclopedia of Gardens*, which was to date the only general introduction to Mattern in English.

The second group of writings, relating indirectly to Mattern, takes a look at his generation, and has to be seen in connection with the work of Gert Gröning and his students, first of all Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn. These scholars have originally defined themselves with a ‘social science-oriented approach to open space planning’ (‘sozialwissenschaftliche Freiraumplanung’), which has to be seen in the context of Gröning’s academic initiation during the late 1970s, when sociology was a new and

---


19 *The Encyclopedia of Gardens: History and Design*, ed. by Candice A. Shoemaker (London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 859–62. There is also an entry in *The Oxford Companion to the Garden*, ed. by Patrick Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 301–2. In order to get a better idea of the context of Mattern’s work, the reader without knowledge of the German language is also advised to take a look at the entries for Karl Foerster and Herta Hammerbacher in *The Oxford Companion to the Garden* (pp. 165 and 208, both written by Sonja Dümpelmann) and for Herta Hammerbacher in *The Encyclopedia of Gardens* (pp. 559–62, written by Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn).

upcoming discipline, upon which many hopes were set.\textsuperscript{21} When Gröning was a student at Hanover, a re-discovery of the recently deceased founder of the school Friedrich Heinrich Wiepking’s past as a Nazi demagogue by a new, critical generation of students shocked the professional world. Gröning was a pioneer in discussing retrogressive ideological tradition lines in connection with the racist notion of a special nature relationship of the Nordic peoples. He and Wolschke-Bulmahn drew attention to edited-out anti-democratic historical traditions of fashionable, allegedly new concepts such as the ‘\textit{Naturgarten}’ of the 1980s and to the profession’s interconnection with the NS system of power. At times, their perspective appears to be influenced by historiographical materialism, with a focus on social context. Their work has become widely known through publications in English and other languages.\textsuperscript{22} With their concentration on morally weak spots in the curriculums of celebrated (both male and female) father figures of German landscape architecture, their work and that of their disciples has occasionally caused irritation and it has also been criticised for a selective view.\textsuperscript{23} However, both Gröning’s and

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{22} Cf. the publication list of Gröning’s at: http://www.udk-berlin.de/sites/igtg/content/mitglieder/prof_dr_gert_groening/schriftenverzeichnis_gert_groening/index_ge.html (accessed 09/09/2014). Cf. the publication list of Wolschke-Bulmahn’s at: http://www.ila.uni-hannover.de/wolschke-bulmahn.html?&no_cache=1&tx_tkinstpersonen_pi1fshowUid1=18&tx_tkinstpersonen_pi1fpublikationen1=1 (accessed 09/09/2014).

\textsuperscript{23} Some have been complaining about their detective’s keenness to find signs for anti-Semitism amongst the garden designers and artists around Karl Foerster, who are generally presented as Humanists. In a different context the environmental historian Frank Uekötter forcefully claimed a selective view of Gröning and Wolschke-Bulmahn, see: Frank Uekötter, \textit{Umweltgeschichte im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert} (= Encyclopädie deutscher Geschichte, vol. 81) (München: Oldenbourg, 2007), p. 70; F. Uekötter, \textit{The Green and the Brown: a History of Conservation in Nazi Germany} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 211–2. A research collaborator of Gröning’s, on the other hand, has shown considerable combativeyness when accusing other scholars (such as
\end{footnotesize}
Wolschke-Bulmahn’s writings have considerably widened the perspective of garden history research in Germany and drawn attention to a wealth of historical sources. Thus they have actively catered to a higher public awareness of aspects of garden culture. While this has also contributed to the scope of the present text, in the light of Mattern’s role for the profession, they have conspicuously underrepresented him in their writing.24 The reason may lie in difficulties pinning down Mattern with the authors’ categories of progressive vs. conservative, as well as in their general suspicion towards a search for landscape-relatedness. Wolschke-Bulmahn in particular has repeatedly critically referred to modern man’s longing for the traditional image of a harmonic landscape.25

Charlotte Reitsam, Stefan Körner and generally the ‘Eisel-Trepl-School’, referred to below) of downplaying the responsibility of actors in the Nazi state, see: Uwe Schneider, review of Charlotte Reitsam, *Das Konzept der ’bodenständigen Gartenkunst’ Alwin Seiferts: Fachliche Hintergründe und Reception bis in die Nachkriegszeit* (Frankfurt am Main et. al.: Peter Lang Verlag, 2001), Gartenkunst, 1 (2002) and Reitsam’s answer to this in *Gartenkunst*, 2 (2002). For another insight into these conflicts from Wolschke-Bulmahn’s position, see: Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn, ‘Naturschutz und Nationalsozialismus: Darstellungen im Spannungsfeld von Verdrängung, Verharmlosung und Interpretation’, in *Erfolgsgeschichte Bundesrepublik?: die Nachkriegsgesellschaft im langen Schatten des Nationalsozialismus*, ed. by Stephan Alexander Glienke (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2008), pp. 53–84. The author feels his perspective is located somewhere between the two positions.

24 This becomes particularly obvious in the following contribution, in which Mattern is hardly mentioned, and two photos of his seminal Killesberg park design of 1939 are the only illustrations in the chapter which are lacking attribution: G. Gröning, ‘Teutonic Myth, Rubble and Recovery’, in *The Architecture of Landscape 1940–1960*, ed. by M. Treib (2002), pp. 120–153. At the same time the role (and progressivism) of Georg Béla Pniower appears to be over-emphasised. It has to be noted though that Gröning himself emphasises the character of his contribution as ‘fairly selective’ (p. 145), pointing at the desiderate for comprehensive research on the historical phase it addresses.

Another circle in which important research has been completed, is associated with Ulrich Eisel (formerly Technische Universität Berlin) and Ludwig Trepl (Technische Universität München). These scholars stand for a – in a historiographical sense – functionalist and discourse-analytical approach and were rather influential as teachers, research supervisors and editors. In Germany they are sometimes referred to as of the ‘Eisel-Trepl-School’. A typical proponent is Stefan Körner (University of Kassel), whose doctoral dissertation as well as his habilitation thesis engaged intensely with Mattern. Körner has produced the most complex (and complicated) analysis of Mattern’s thinking with regard to history of ideas; he prepared a more accessible summary of his findings for *Stadt+Grün* (03/2003). With his elucidating interpretations of Mattern’s vocabulary, Körner’s writings were an important source for the present text. Another publication with a similar approach was produced some years earlier by Dorothea Hokema in form of her comparative Diplom thesis (roughly equivalent of an English MA thesis) on Mattern, Paul Schultze-Naumburg and Willy Lange. The publications associated with the ‘Eisel-Trepl-School’ are focussed on the history of ideas rather than on contemporary history. They are not dealing with questions of space and only to a limited extent with garden design proper or form-historical traditions.

---


Apart from the three mentioned types of literature, several monographs about other 20\textsuperscript{th}-century garden designers also include a few lines about Mattern, usually in the context of his working relationship with Karl Foerster’s nursery firm.

Particularly relevant information is contained in a doctoral dissertation on the landscape architect Herta Hammerbacher, who was married to Mattern between 1928 and 1935. Also the published theses on Mattern’s colleagues Walter Funke, Hermann Göritz, and Alwin Seifert offer some insights, although mainly restricted to the Nazi years.\textsuperscript{30} Several theses have been dedicated to landscape aspects of the autobahn projects of the 1930s, in which Mattern appears as one of the so-called landscape advocates (\textit{Landschaftsanwälte}), hired for developing planting schemes for the roadway banks and adjacent strips of land to aesthetically bed the autobahn into the landscape.\textsuperscript{31} Last but not least, Duthweiler’s comprehensive study on trends


of plant use in Germany between 1900 and 1945 has revealed some important characteristics of the Mattern’s firm’s planting style, although it seems impossible to assess how much of this is personally due to Mattern.\textsuperscript{32} The above-mentioned March 2003 edition of \textit{Stadt+Grün} should also be referred to, dedicated to the 100th anniversaries of Mattern and his contemporary Reinhold Lingner, as it contains some well-researched short articles on Mattern, including a comparative overview of the two personalities’ careers.\textsuperscript{33}

Shortly before the deadline for the present text the author obtained an unpublished Diplom thesis that deals with the collaboration between Mattern and Scharoun and the development of Mattern’s design language.\textsuperscript{34} While not being comparable in academic rigour to other mentioned research theses, it is impressively detailed. Herein it is concluded that, despite a certain personal style, Mattern had not made a truly original contribution to modern garden design, as slightly older colleagues like Wilhelm Hübotter or Otto Valentien had defined the standard years before. The blind spot of this reasoning will be commented on indirectly by trying to elaborate on the specifics of Mattern’s approach.

\textsuperscript{32} Swantje Duthweiler, \textit{Neue Pflanzen für neue Gärten: Entwicklung des Farbsortiments von Stauden und Blumenzwiebeln und ihre Verwendung in Gartenanlagen zwischen 1900 und 1945 in Deutschland}, series Grüne Reihe (Quellen und Forschungen zur Gartenkunst), 31 (Worms: Wernersche Verlagsanstalt, 2011). Wimmer’s similar monograph was published shortly before the final submission of this text, and could only be taken into account marginally: Clemens Alexander Wimmer, \textit{Lustwald, Beet und Rosenhügel: Geschichte der Pflanzenverwendung in der Gartenkunst} (Weimar: Verlag und Datenbank für Geisteswissenschaften, 2014).


Generally in view of the relationship between landscape architecture and architectural history it can be observed that the landscape profession’s contribution is not always appropriately valued. Many monographs about architects who collaborated with Mattern do not mention him appropriately, occasionally he is referred to as ‘architect’. A noteworthy exception have been the writings about Hans Scharoun (1893–1972) by Peter Blundell-Jones, who even suggested a fundamental influence Mattern may have had on the development of the architect’s organic architecture, in particular in view of the consideration of a site’s givens.35 Other authors have dismissed Mattern’s role too easily.36

Two publications must be noted because of the insights the author owes to them: first of all, Heinrich’s biography has provided rich material, as well as a catalogue raisonné, which helped evaluate the author’s own findings. In this regard, the above-mentioned weak points of Heinrich’s perspective are somewhat relativised by the sheer amount of obscure primary sources such as unpublished lecture manuscripts from her possession, provided in excerpts in her book. It was published during the final phase of writing the present thesis, for which reason only a small part of its content could be considered. The second publication to be gratefully referred to is the doctoral dissertation thesis by Jeong-Hi Go on Herta Hammerbacher, published in


36 An example is a recently completed doctoral dissertation thesis on Fehling and Gogel, the architects of the seminal Studentendorf (‘Students’ Village’) at Berlin-Schlachtensee, completed in 1959. The author concludes that Mattern was probably not responsible for the characteristic diagonal network of paths, as he was commissioned in 1959, while the crucial changes must have been drawn between April and December 1958. However, drawings at the Mattern estate with a diagonal path system date from 01/10/1958. The author emphasises the role of Frank Lloyd Wright as influence on the design as on the architects’ prior work, while forgetting to consider that Mattern, too, may have been influenced by Wright. Gunnar Klack, ‘Gebaute Landschaften. Fehling+Gogel und die organische Architektur: Landschaft und Bewegung als Natur-Narrative’ (unpublished doct. thesis, Technische Universität Berlin, 2014), pp. 93, 397–8.
2001. It drew the author’s attention to some sources essential for understanding the Bornim School and helped contrast Mattern’s standing with that of his first wife.

**Methodology**

This research project applied chiefly qualitative methods, predominantly by means of text analysis. The original intention had been to provide illumination on Hermann Mattern’s design philosophy by an analysis conducted on three parallel levels: oral history, his writings, and his work (both on paper and surviving realised projects). Of all literature available the most important was expected to be published texts written by Mattern himself. Another important source was expected to be found in historical photographs. It soon became obvious that the archival material presented a much richer source than initially expected. Even at a very late stage crucial new material was found. In particular this concerned correspondence from the times of the ‘Third Reich’, disclosing debates behind the scenes that explained aspects of the profession’s history as yet not so clearly understood. Literature, too, held more references than known, and through the continually advancing digitisation of printed books, internet searches at later stages of the research project produced references previously not found. As a result the focus shifted correspondingly, in a number of different ways. This not only affected the intended structure of the thesis but also the methodology presented in early proposals. The case studies, which were thought to take up around half of the final text, stepped into the background. Similarly, the findings from oral history lost relevance, as they paled in contrast to the significance of the archival material.

Over the years, former Mattern students have occasionally presented their own memory of Mattern to an audience, and more were interviewed with a standardised oral history methodology. This way, previously unrecorded information has been attained, and the author is very grateful for the trust granted by those who shared their memories. Oral history, as valuable a material as it is for complementing a
document-based historical inquiry, has its known limits. In the current case the main
disadvantage of this material is that it is based on experience exclusively from
postwar times. However, it certainly complemented the author’s image of Mattern’s
ccharacteR, in particular regarding his role as a teacher.

The main thesis now consists in great parts as an analysis of textual material,
both from archive documents as well as from literature. Another change in focus was
due to the time of origin of this unexpected material, which stemmed mostly from the
‘Third Reich’. Correspondingly, a temporal focus emerged with spotlights on the
Nazi years, which weakened the attention on the postwar period. The judgement of
inspiration from the youth as formative for Mattern’s development added a second
emphasis on the first half of Mattern’s life. The material analysed has brought to
light a wealth of detail for certain occurrences and periods that should encourage
future researchers to look further into other specific aspects, and in more detail.

Sources and aspects of source criticism
Almost all of Mattern’s known articles can be found in the University Libraries and
The German Horticultural Library in Berlin. Additionally, all Mattern’s books could
be purchased second-hand. The great advantage that this project had in comparison to
earlier ones lies in the timing, as in recent years the striking digitalisation of our
world has made accessible material otherwise difficult to find. During the process of
writing the thesis for example, all drawings and photographs in the Museum of
Architecture of the Technische Universität Berlin, a department of the university
library, have been digitised and became available online.

Mattern’s estate is distributed in different locations. Firstly, there is his work –
drawings as well as photographs of projects –, which is kept at the mentioned
Museum of Architecture at Berlin, fittingly located in a Scharoun-designed university
building at Ernst-Reuter-Platz. There are over 650 projects listed for Mattern,
comprising well over 6,500 single documents.\textsuperscript{37} In comparison, the estate of Mattern's colleague Walter Rossow at the Akademie der Künste, which has been called extensive, consists of 2,500 plan drawings. Secondly, the property of his university chair went into the possession of the University Archive, also a department of the library of the Technische Universität Berlin, but kept in a different building. This part of the estate was organised for the first time during the research project, so references mostly refer to documents without inventory numbers (e.g. 'folder 1'). A part of his private and professional legacy his widow handed over to Vroni Heinrich some three or four decades ago.\textsuperscript{38} Naturally, Heinrich personally selected the excerpts published in her book. In the interest of further research, access to her property would be welcomed; this would allow for different perspectives on the rich material. Finally, Mattern's daughter also kept parts of his property when she took over his Bavarian house, where for example his private book collection remains unchanged.\textsuperscript{39}

The estate of Hans Scharoun unexpectedly contained little correspondence; Mattern and Scharoun must have communicated either more directly, or the letters are lost.

The main body of sources for the time of Mattern's youth and the start of his professional life during the Weimar Republic were found in the estate of Herta Hammerbacher. This main body of sources is represented by a shoebox filled with hundreds of letters written between October 1926 and July 1927, and their discovery represented the find of a biographic historian's holy grail.\textsuperscript{40} Mattern wrote these letters during his first employment, at the municipal parks and gardens department of

\textsuperscript{37} Altogether the Museum of Architecture keeps well over 6500 files tagged with 'Hermann Mattern'.

\textsuperscript{38} Heinrich refers to her collection as Archiv Vroni Heinrich. V. Heinrich, \textit{Hermann Mattern} (2013), p. 471.

\textsuperscript{39} Merete unexpectedly passed away in 2007, aged 77 [?], shortly before a planned meeting with the author.

\textsuperscript{40} The letters were handed to the archive by Heinrich, who seems to keep more material privately: While the correspondence in the archive material breaks off 28/07/1927, Heinrich quotes from letters that represent the direct continuation, see: V. Heinrich, \textit{Hermann Mattern} (2013), pp. 21–2.
the city of Magdeburg. At this time he and Hammerbacher were a couple writing on a
daily basis, occasionally even two letters in a single day. As they are written in
confidence and love, these documents represent an inestimable source for insight
deep into the mind of the young Mattern prior to entering the Foerster business. Their
transcription took far longer than any other research work. 41 The sources used for the
chapters dealing with the 'Third Reich' emerged in the main from three different
locations. The first and main part originates in the estate of the architect and garden
designer Alwin Seifert (1890–1972) at the Technische Universität München. Seifert,
after Mattern's entry into the circle of landscape advocates, could be called Mattern's
mentor. As shown in chapters II-g to II-i, Mattern owed his stabilising repute of
irreproachability to Seifert's feisty interventions for his benefit. The private
communication between Seifert and Mattern, as well as the circulars of the
Landscape Advocates, provided details about his occupation during these years. 42
Secondly, there are momentous new details referred to that arise from letters which
have only been made accessible recently, in the form of excerpts that Heinrich, who
kept the documents privately, quoted in her monograph. Thirdly, crucial insights have
been gained from looking at correspondence kept in the estate of landscape architect
Heinrich Friedrich Wiepking in the Lower-Saxon State Archive at Osnabrück. Limits
were set by the deadline of the doctoral dissertation and by the financial resources of
the doctoral student.

With the intention to get first-hand impressions and to document surviving
projects, a series of field trips have been made. Apart from sites at Berlin and
Potsdam, travels included sites in Cologne, Étampes (France), Graimharting (the
family property), Helmstedt, Hofgeismar and surroundings, Kassel, Magdeburg, Paris

41 Heinrich in her recently published monograph quotes from these letters extensively.

42 A part of these sources has already been quoted in the mentioned paper by Reitsam: Ch. Reitsam,
'Der Landschaftsanwalt Hermann Mattern', Stadt+Grün, 03 (2003), 20–4. Heinrich's mentioned
monograph also partly refers to the same documents.
and Stuttgart. Material was not always found, and often, projects had not survived. Apart from local archives at Berlin, further archives at Freising, Munich, Osnabrück, Stuttgart, Wiesbaden and Magdeburg have been visited.

The analysis of archival documents has provided insight in two ways. Firstly, several claims about the person of Mattem and his merits, which have repeatedly been publicised without the support of evidence, have finally been verified with written sources. In some cases, a single sentence in a letter was enough to change the entire image that existed of Mattem. In other cases however, the reviewing of sources already analysed by other authors led to the suggestion of alternative possible interpretations than those presented as unequivocal in the literature. Criticism could be levelled that a study of Mattern’s works has been neglected in the interest of a more detailed discussion of political hostilities. However, the analysis of private correspondence allowed for a better understanding of design choices and the pressures of the times. The insight gained through this material has been classed as highly relevant.

Source criticism has to be kept in mind when conclusions are made purely on the basis of documents. After the downfall of the Hitler dictatorship, many Germans had good reasons to clean their attics. After Mattem’s death in 1971, his widow would not have missed the opportunity to go through her husband’s estate in order to decide which letters to give to the archive and which to destroy. The same will be true for the estates of others in which personal correspondence has been viewed. We simply cannot say how objective even the material kept in the public archives is. Good reputations want to be kept untarnished and the lack of material has as much potential to mislead an interpretation as has manipulated material. The latter has to be considered as well, for in times of active censorship even private letters had to be worded carefully – in particular if surveillance was highly probable, as after a police

43 Projects that have not survived include the Kraiger garden at Helmstedt (1928) and the garden for the German House in the Cité Universitaire at Paris (1957);
investigation like in Mattern’s case. In addition to this, in Mattern we are also
dealing with a person of both considerable pride and considerable wit, so particular
precaution is advised.

With these restrictions in mind, any judgement made below will be
substantiated not merely with an extract from a document securely stored in an
archive, but also with a certain degree of hermeneutical reasoning. In any case, a
considerable part of such conclusions are suggestions that may or may not be
confounded by future research. In the end, to quote a famous line from
historiography, ‘History is the only science enjoying the ambiguous fortune of
being required to be at the same time an art’.44

Questions of language

One peculiarity of the present text is its dealing with entirely German sources, and
this not merely in a philological sense, but also culturally. Secondly, despite the
strong international exchange in garden design, key terms with a decidedly national
context do exist. It is necessary therefore to present the most important expressions
in German and explain how they have been translated into English – or the reasons
for not doing so. A glossary has been compiled, preceding the bibliography, on pages
451 to 461.

The term Landschaft has been discussed on many occasions, this applies very
much for the academic sphere of the landscape professions in Germany in recent
years. Without going into detail, it shall be mentioned that the author’s own studies
were strongly defined by this discourse and the debate between proponents of a
cultural-historical (landscape as culturally defined and aesthetically experienced), a
sociological-materialist (landscape experience defined by social factors and as
politically employed term) and a scientistic materialist perspective (landscape as

44 This line by Johann Gustav Droysen (1808–1884) is quoted in: Richard Evans: In Defence of
measurable biologic environment). The term 'landscape' is often used in the latter sense, for example when the morphological definition of a landscape during the Ice-Age or the geological (both chemical and structural) conditions for its vegetation are addressed. It must however be stressed that a modern perspective cannot detach 'landscape' from its cultural and aesthetic semantic field; in everyday language as much as in the sphere of landscape architecture the term landschaftlich is strongly connected with this, as briefly delineated in the glossary on pages 458–9. This complains why the term landschaftlich is often not translated in the following text.

For the Bornimers, their designs respected as much as the character of the grown landscape as they expressed man's inner nature. It was one of the main incentives for this research project to understand Hammerbacher's and Mattern's personal employment of the term.

Structure of the thesis

The thesis is split into two volumes, the first, text, and a second with illustrations. All other quotes from German sources translated by the author are given in footnotes, unless shorter than a full sentence. The original German text has been kept in the traditional German spelling (e.g. 'daß' instead of 'dass'). German language sentences - Mattern's in particular - can be extremely long; in the interest of legibility the longest sentences have been split. If not stated otherwise, means of emphasis in quotes are not from the author but maintained from the original.

The thesis starts with an introduction into the garden historical context of Mattern's and the Bornimers' way of designing gardens. It opens with the reforms that were triggered by the fundamental changes in society towards the end of the 19th century and leads up to the 1930s, until the war.

The text deals with questions of ideology but tries to focus more strongly on questions of form development, as these are believed to be underrepresented in the literature. Due to the limited availability of literature about garden Modernism, the
introduction draws in great parts on primary literature, namely Gartenkunst as the most important organ for practicing landscape architects. Gartenkunst was edited by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Gartenkunst e.V. (German Society for Garden Art, DGfG), and unlike today, was the journal focussed on all matters of the profession, including garden history, questions of urban planning and contemporary garden design. This part of the thesis comprises a classification of Mattern's and Hammerbacher's early work in form-historical terms. The time frame is chosen to look at tendencies during the time in which Mattern's design approach was defined and to understand the prevailing geometrical approaches. The changes taking place in 1933 and beyond will be briefly delineated, but the Nazi era will then be dealt with in greater detail in the respective chapter of the biography.

The main body of the thesis is represented by the historical-biographical chapters, structured chronologically. Thematic excursions are incorporated into the chronology where they seemed necessary, or when they play a role for discourses taken up in later chapters. For different chapters different approaches have consciously been chosen. There is an alternation of explorative chapters (chapter II-d), more straight-forward historical descriptions (chapter II-b or II-j) and detailed studies of occurrences (chapter II-i), as well as hybrids of the above. In the interest of avoiding over-interpretation, the historiography is complemented by the occasional use of summarising case-studies that focus on characteristic means of space making and typical stylistic aspects, including the use of plants. The images referred to should be understood as a separate important layer of meaning, not always entirely translated into text.

45 During the 1920s, the title was Gartenkunst, Monatsschrift für Gartenkunst und verwandte Gebiete ('Garden Art, monthly for garden art and related fields'). In the 1930s the name changed to Gartenkunst, Zeitschrift für das gesamte Garten- und Siedlungswesen, Landschaftsgestaltung, Friedhofskultur, Gartentechnik ('Garden Art, journal for the entire field of settlement, landscape design, cemetery culture and garden technics'). At the end of the 1930er its subtitle was once more changed slightly, and it was now officially the 'journal of the association of garden designers in the Reich Chamber for Fine Arts', still edited by the DGG.
As the recently published Mattern biography is easily available online, it has further been refrained from collecting another complete list of works.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ V. Heinrich, *Hermann Mattern* (2013), available for download at: http://opus4.kobv.de/opus4-berlin/frontdoor/index/index/docId/3835 (accessed 09/09/2014)
I. c   Tendencies in modern garden art c. 1895–1939: the architectonic and the landscape mode

If the tendency, to make the garden a naturally seeming landscape scenery, represents an artistic derailment in itself, the unease grows upon learning about man’s desire to express with this arranged nature certain ideas and sentiments.47

(August Grisebach, 1910)

The landscape garden signifies, seen from the perspective of historiography of ideas, not disintegration and neglect, but a further development, i. e. the turning away from the I to the cosmos. The clear “ratio” of the symmetric gardens, which are strange to our nature, is here opposed to the ancient “irratio” of the Germanic soul, the limitedness and the formalism to the idea of infinity.48

(Gerhard Hinz, 1937)

While the time around 1900 is well researched, there is only limited literature available about garden Modernism in the 1920s. For those years, it is best to look at primary literature to get a nuanced impression, namely the journal Gartenkunst as the most important organ for practicing landscape architects. The debates on form lead therein – in those days still centre stage – help to classify Mattern’s and Hammerbacher’s early work in form-historical terms. The changing dynamics at the end of the 1920s did not just spring from what is today generally considered the Modernist movement and its social agenda; fundamental reforms of garden design


had already been triggered at the end of the 19th century. These defined essential points valid for the coming decades.

At the turn of the 19th to the 20th century, within few decades, garden design underwent radical changes of style accompanied by fundamental discussions about its social mission. During the Industrial Revolution, the landscape garden, once a representation of enlightenment, became almost the opposite: a symbol of wealth and social hierarchy. The smaller plots available in urbanised areas resulted in a miniaturisation and stereotyping of the original concept. The landscape gardeners with their poor aesthetic education were seen as the guilty ones, but even renowned landscape architects contributed to the bad design practice. Carl Hampel (1848–1930), Berlin’s municipal Chief Gardener and later Garden Director at Leipzig, in 1894 produced a garden design book that presented one hundred standard patterns for small gardens, which was republished as extended edition in 1902 (125 patterns) and


1905 (150 patterns), with a 6th edition produced as late as 1921.\textsuperscript{52} Such stencil books were popular to allow everyone with a little patch of land to install the infamous Brezelwege – a derogatory term for the omnipresent entwined footpaths in the shape of a southern German pretzel. The ‘gemischter Stil’ (‘Mixed Style’) associated with the Royal Prussian Garden Director-Generals Peter Joseph Lenné (1789–1866) and his successor Gustav Meyer (1816–1877) – also known as the ‘Lenné-Meyer-School’ –, had not only become a formal stereotype, but gardens had also become an anachronism in terms of their social function.\textsuperscript{53} Lawns were still not supposed to be used, and parks were generally intended for promenading and for the visual enjoyment of the ‘calm’ and ‘harmonic’ sceneries. Attractions were provided for the distraction and ‘sedation’ of the lower classes, and to foster patriotic sentiments.\textsuperscript{54} Common equipment included romantic features such as fake ruins, rustic oakwood cabins, fences and bridges, grottoes, and monuments such as Bismarck towers or other memorial buildings.\textsuperscript{55} The sceneries were sometimes designed to mimic radically downscaled existing landscapes. For example, a shrunken version of the outlines of Lake Lucerne (German: Vierwaldstätter See) were a stereotypical model for a pond. Seemingly at random, carpet beds were inserted as decorative elements. The many path crossings were covered up by clumps of trees. The sample books like Hampel’s showed endless variations on the same theme, copied over and over again (Fig. 01).


\textsuperscript{53} This topic has been covered extensively, see e.g.: D. H. Haney, \textit{When Modern Was Green} (2010), pp. 11–85 (= chapter 1, ‘The architectonic garden; 1900–1913’), and references in fn 45.


\textsuperscript{55} Ibid.
During the early 1900s, inspired by different publications and an influx of the ideals of the Arts and Crafts movement, a new type of public open space was sought after that corresponded with the changing demands of a healthy life as postulated by the life-reform movement. The *landschaftliche* design principle started to be rejected in favour of the clear and monumentalising geometries of the *architektonische*, or the architectonic principle. In those days battle lines were drawn that remained valid well into the 1920s and beyond. Although a more detailed look will reveal very different approaches between examples of historicism and those of an early Modernism, both of which were combined under this garden-historical label, in the interest of brevity, ‘Architectonic Garden’ is used here as an established term. The dichotomy of two modes, *architektonisch* and *landschaftlich*, has also dominated garden historiography, and contributed to clouding the sight on progressive design concepts not so easily categorised. For Mattern, the conceptual pair ‘architectonic-*landschaftlich*’ was less important than the differentiation between a geometrical – especially symmetrical – preconceived formal idea that was imposed on a site, versus an organic idea that responded to the site’s characteristics and spatial configuration.

While the Bornimers were arguably not the only ones claiming such a design aim, they were the ones realising it more consistently than others.

When the term ‘organic’ is applied to the Bornimers, once more misconceptions arise. ‘Organic’ is often equated with ‘curvilinear’ and ‘naturalistic’. As the opposite the ‘architectonic principle’ is identified. Such perspective ignores that an architectonic (geometrical) design can be conceived in an organic way, the same way a garden in the landscape mode can be the opposite of organic when it relies on formal stereotypes without reacting to the characteristics of the site. In this context it

---

56 Freytag for example names Migge, who is usually counted as a proponent of the architectonic, an opponent of such, and refers to a ‘turn’ (‘Wende’) towards a more functional and vegetation-oriented style taking place around 1912 and 1914: Anette Freytag, ‘Der Garten des Palais Stoclet in Brüssel. Joseph Hoffmanns “chef d’œuvre inconnu”’, *Die Gartenkunst*, 20, 1 (2008), 1-46 (41).
has to be seen that the Bornimers were not blind to the achievements of the earlier reformists who propagandised the Architectonic Garden. Now it is true, that for the latter a symmetrical layout was the absolute rule, as monumentality was the artistic paradigm of the decades around 1900.\textsuperscript{57} To this, not to geometry \textit{per se}, the Bornimers considered their idea of the modern garden a contraposition. The disengagement from formalist concepts of space and from symbols of representation was the chief aim of progressives, as Mattern and Hammerbacher expressed lucidly in one of their rare jointly written articles in 1933:

\begin{quote}
\textit{...} the will to clarity of the lines is always essential, it is not crucial, though, if a garden is arranged in the so-called architectonic or in the landscape style. Crucial is, if it was designed or not, if lines, even if curved, were consciously set or not.\textsuperscript{58}
\end{quote}

\textit{The assertion of the reformists}

With regard to garden design, around 1900 the traditionalists still considered the ideal of the landscape garden the only acceptable model for the garden as an art form. In reference to its origins in England during the first half of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, it could still be seen as expression of liberalism and of an emancipation of the individual. But a critical discussion about the prevailing style had already started within the professional circles of landscape architects.\textsuperscript{59} The counter-party


associated the same emancipation and 'enlightenment' with the general life reform and rejected the landscape garden as symbol for an upper-class craving for representation or as anachronistic romanticism. This impulse came above all from the Kunstgewerbe (applied arts) movement, which, under reception of the English Arts and Crafts movement, aimed at an education in matters of design in all areas of the applied arts. This included garden design, which was then still referred to as a fine art, Gartenkunst. As one of the most active propagandists in the field of architecture and design, Hermann Muthesius (1861–1927) introduced the ideas of the Arts and Crafts movement into Germany and triggered widely published first experiments by architects for thoroughly architectonic gardens. As attaché to the German embassy in London he had been commissioned by the government of the Kaiserreich to study England's successful industrial and social modernisation.\footnote{Muthesius' influence on the garden reform has been exposed in detail in: Uwe Schneider, Hermann Muthesius und die Reformdiskussion in der Gartenarchitektur des frühen 20. Jahrhunderts (Worms: Wenersche Verlaganstalt, 2000). For an English discussion of these occurrences see: U. Schneider, 'Hermann Muthesius', Garden History, 28, 1 (2001), 57–72.}

The ideas of the Arts and Crafts movement also found their way to Germany through the work of architects and artists influenced by Otto Wagner and others associated with the Vienna Secession and the Wiener Werkstätte, founded in 1903.\footnote{Lux illustrated his book on reform garden art with many Austrian examples from this sphere of...}
surrounding outdoor space naturally brought in its wake a new interest in the historical gardens from times before the triumph of the English landscape style, ranging from the Renaissance to Biedermeier. 63 Twenty years earlier, the influential art historian and educator Alfred Lichtwark (1852–1914) had published an article ‘Moderne Gartenkunst’ (1885) addressing the perceived reform gridlock in the field, followed in 1892 by the text ‘Makartbouquet und Blumenstrauß’ (‘Makart-Bouquet and Posy’). 64 Thanks to the clout and the public recognition of these publications, Lichtwark became a much sought-after advisor on the design of new gardens. 65 In his view, the aim to ‘simulate infinity’ was against the essence of art, ‘[... ] which wants to build space and wants to establish monumentality through

influence: Joseph August Lux, Schöne Gartenkunst, series Führer zur Kunst, 8 (Esslingen: Paul Neff, 1908). Wolfgang Sörrensen, one of the few art historians specialised in garden art, bought this book in 1924 for his library in Berlin (see signed copy in the Gartenbaubücherei Berlin, signature 2.8.1 8BF 547). See also the discussion of Joseph Hoffmann’s design concepts with regard to garden design, and their origins: A. Freytag, ‘Der Garten des Palais Stoclet’, Die Gartenkunst, 20, 1 (2008), 1–46 (21–3; 38–42).


64 First published in 1892 for the Hamburger Weihnachtsbuch, then reaching a wider public when republished as 64-pages booklet in 1894 through Bruckmanns Verlagsanstalt in Munich. A second edition was published in 1903/05 by Bruno Cassirer in Berlin. See: H. Junge-Gent, Alfred Lichtwark (2012), pp. 266–73; 659. Virtually all mentioned publications dealing with the topic of garden reform mention Lichtwark.

65 Amongst projects built under Lichtwark’s consultancy were gardens for his friend the painter Leopold Graf von Kalckreuth (Eddelsen, 1906), for the progressive educator Heinrich Wolgast (Hamburg-Borstel, 1907), for the painter Max Liebermann (Berlin-Wannsee, 1909), for Liebermann’s neighbours, the chemist and founder of Agfa, Franz Oppenheim and his wife Margarete (Berlin-Wannsee, 1911), for the jurist Paul Ostermann von Roth (Darmstadt, 1909), as well as the for the public Rhine Promenade in Bad Godesberg (1909). In 1886 Lichtwark had become the first director of the Kunsthalle Hamburg. For a comprehensive introduction to Lichtwark see most recently: Henrike Junge-Gent, Alfred Lichtwark: zwischen den Zeiten (Berlin and München: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2012), About gardens see the subchapter ‘Gärten’, pp. 658–65 (esp. 659–60; 662–4).
proportion and rhythm.66 Through various publications, Lichtwark championed new aesthetics as well as utilitarian considerations:

A landscape park with many paths, inclined lawns and shrubbery is definitely impractical, as it only serves one purpose, the strolling, and as it only has one success, which is to herd the visitors as swiftly as possible into the large beer hall.67

With the thoughts expressed in ‘Makartbouquet und Blumenstrauß’, Lichtwark fundamentally influenced Mattern’s first employer Karl Foerster.68 The noteworthy personal connections that existed between the reformist circles and the Bornimers have not been addressed in the literature about them. Lichtwark also contributed to the discussion about urban planning policies in his hometown of Hamburg, partly though his contributions in the weekly journal Der Lotse, which was co-published by the liberal jurists and writers Carl Mönckeberg and Siegfried Heckscher.69 Like Karl Foerster’s youngest brother Ernst, beginning in 1912, Heckscher was member of the board of directors of the Hamburg America Line (HAPAG, Hamburg-Amerikanische Packetfahrt-Actien-Gesellschaft), responsible for the ‘socio-political department’, and through his political commitment for the left-liberal Freisinnige Vereinigung and the Fortschrittliche Volkspartei respectively, he was at least spiritually connected to the prominent national-liberal politician Theodor Heuss (and his mentor Friedrich Naumann), who again was personally known to Mattern through the Werkbund, at least

---


after WWII.70 Furthermore, Heckscher was the husband of Karl Foerster's older sister Hulda.71 In Hamburg, Lichtwark's ideas were taken up by Jacob Ochs, who had founded his influential garden design office in 1896, and above all by his famous collaborator, the influential progressive landscape architect Leberecht Migge (1881–1935), who was employed there between 1902 and 1913.72 Thus, several indirect connections to Karl Foerster and Mattern emerge, which, like single pieces of a jigsaw, may contribute to a better understanding of the Bornimers; while they clearly opposed the quasi-consensus about the architectonic style, they nonetheless shared essential ideas with the reformers.

Apart from Lichtwark, another important protagonist in the garden reform was the poet Ferdinand Avenarius (1856–1923), who was involved in several reformist projects associated with the Lebensreform (life reform) movement.73 He had also received attention following his speech to the youth groups that had assembled on Hoher Meißner in 1913, where Mattern was present. His most-cited critique in this

---


71 A personal connection between Lichtwark and Foerster through his sister is possible, as Junge-Gent also assumes, see: H. Junge-Gent, Alfred Lichtwark (2012), p. 273, fn 607.


73 Avenarius was founder-editor of the widely read art journal Der Kunstwart ('The Art Warden'), co-founder of the arts and crafts organisation Dürerbund, member of the directorate of the German Garden City Association (Deutsche Gartenstadt-Gesellschaft), and member of the Werkbund. For a concise introduction to his role for the life reform, see: Gerhard Kratsch, 'Ferdinand Avenarius und die Bewegung für eine ethische Kultur', in: Kai Buchholz, Rita Latscha, Hille Peckmann and Klaus Wolbert (eds), Die Lebensreform: Entwürfe zur Neugestaltung von Leben und Kunst um 1900, 2 vols, I (Darmstadt: Häusser, 2001), pp. 97–102. About the extraordinary influence of Der Kunstwart, see: Theodor Heuss, Erinnerungen 1903–1933, 2nd edn (Frankfurt a.M. and Hamburg: Fischer, 1965) p. 17–8.
context was an ironic article in the art journal that he edited, *Der Kunstwart*, in which he ridiculed the present garden style and its ‘pretzel paths’ in a way reminiscent of Gustave Flaubert’s satirical *Bouvard und Pécuchet*.74

Another ‘deciding contribution to overcoming the historicist landscape garden’ has been credited to the architect Paul Schultze-Naumburg (1869–1949), who wrote for Avenarius’ widely read *Der Kunstwart* and published about various matters of life reform, before he turned to ‘raciology’ (‘*Rassenkunde*’) and developed into the apologist of the concept of ‘degenerate art’.75 As one of the first reformers he ‘introduced functionality and simplicity into garden art’.76 His series of publications under the title ‘*Kulturarbeiten*’, conceived for a popular readership, became widely known and sold in large numbers.77 In these books he contrasted the fake ruins and miniaturised Lake Lucernes with the sobriety of the traditional farmer’s garden and simple neoclassicist equipment (Figures 2, 3). Schultze-Naumburg also had


considerable knowledge about landscape, ‘about that, which we nowadays call ecology’. In the garden journals he was regularly referred to. Mattern owned a copy of his Das bürgerliche Haus (1926). The painter Ludwig Bartning, brother of Foerster’s friend Otto Bartning, had been a student of Schultze-Naumburg’s at Mannheim and published a monograph about him in 1929.

During the first decade of the 20th century, several reform-oriented architects showed corresponding design ideas for gardens at exhibitions (Figures 4–8). In particular Laeuger’s garden at Mannheim 1907 can be called a ‘turning point in the history of garden art’; it was still referred to decades later (see p. 305). A now-legendary design competition for domestic gardens, arranged by the weekly Die Woche and published in two special volumes in 1907 and 1908, also became associated with the reform of the domestic garden (Hausgartenreform). The progressiveness of the winning entries corresponded to the jury’s exclusive composition of reformers, which included the landscape architects Fritz Encke.

79 Paul Schultze-Naumburg, Das bürgerliche Haus (Frankfurt a. M.: Bechhold, 1926). The title can be found on a document from 1944, listing books that were deposited in the basement of Mattern’s Bornim home, see: folder 3, EHM.
80 Ludwig Bartning, Paul Schultze-Naumburg: Ein Pionier deutscher Kulturarbeit (München: Callwey, 1929). Bartning emphasised the somewhat forgotten credentials of Schultze-Naumburg’s while at the same time clearly distancing himself from his former teacher’s new racist reasoning (pp. 20–4).
82 Sommer- und Ferienhäuser aus dem Wettbewerb der “Woche”, (Berlin: Scherl, 1907); Hausgärten: Skizzen und Entwürfe aus dem Wettbewerb der Woche, series Sonderheft der Woche, 3 (Berlin: Scherl, 1908), IX-XI; Sommer- und Ferienhäuser der “Woche”: die im Wettbewerb preisgekrönten Entwürfe, sowie Abbildungen und Beschreibungen der ausgeführten Häuser, rev. and extd edn (Berlin: Scherl, 1911).
(1961–1931) and Walter Baron von Engelhardt (1964–1940), and the architects Muthesius and Schultze-Naumburg.  

The geometric and austere ‘architectonic’ exhibition gardens divided the profession. The more open-minded cheered the advent of a new style for a new time. Migge, for example, during the second decade of the 20th century was one of the Architectonic Garden’s most enthusiastic propagators. He revered Laeuger, whose gardens he studied and who he visited in his studio in Karlsruhe, while the traditionalists criticised the geometric layouts as unnatural. The sparse use of plants stood in the shadow of architectural means of space making, like walls or trellises, which was seen as an affront. It was feared that this rendered the profession of garden designers, with their special knowledge of plants, dispensable. Indeed, photographs of the exhibition gardens, taken immediately after completion, showed sober, rectangular rooms with some shy strips of decorative plantings and rows of standard


shrubs. In this regard, Migge, too, was critical, and he suggested to enrich the garden with vegetation and even to break with the strict symmetry to really profit from ‘the inherent freedom of the garden-architectonic’. These worries at first seemed reasonable, as many new commissions were not given to landscape architects, but to architects and designers associated with the field of Kunstgewerbe – the decorative arts and product design. Also, contrary to criticism, landscape gardeners of Victorian England had already turned towards more ‘formal’ designs of the grounds near the house, and the same was true for Germany. The most vociferously expressed criticism by Muthesius and his English role models such as Reginald Bloomfield was based on a misconception due to selective examination of the available garden literature. In Germany, Oscar Teichert as early as 1856 wrote a book that is considered the first garden-historiographical publication to concentrate on the architectonic styles that were formerly considered unworthy. In the course of historicism, at least with Hermann von Pückler-Muskau’s Andeutungen über Landschaftsgärtnerei (1834), and then with Gustav Meyer’s Lehrbuch der schönen Gartenkunst (1860), the integration of regular elements near the buildings had become a common trait of gardens, in the sense of Lenné’s ‘zoned garden’ at


88 Apart from the well-known cases of Peter Behrens, Max Laeuger and Joseph Maria Obirlich, the literature mentions Paul Bonatz, Albert Gessner, Josef Hoffmann, Friedrich Ostendorf, Bruno Paul, Bruno Schmitz, and Heinrich Tessenow. U. Schneider, Hermann Muthesius (2000), p. 7.


Sanssouci. Understandably, many landscape architects felt betrayed and misunderstood. This situation also fuelled demands for the introduction of an academic course of garden architecture, partially to improve the profession's competitiveness with that of architects.

Before WWI, the design competitions began to show an assertion of the architectonic principle. Beginning around 1905, amongst the younger generation organised in the DGfG, Avenarius, Lichtwark, Muthesius, and Schultze-Naumburg were taken very seriously as masterminds of a modern garden style. In 1908, Lichtwark, the impressionist artist Max Liebermann, and Schultze-Naumburg were members of the jury that decided over the Schillerpark (Nordpark) in Berlin-Wedding, which went down in history as Berlin’s first true Volkspark (People’s Park, designed by Friedrich Bauer of Magdeburg), and one of the first in Germany generally. While the early examples had been concentrating on aesthetics, for larger public spaces, social considerations now took centre stage (Fig. 9).

---


were also emerging alternative approaches in search for a modern landscape garden, the late-19th-century landscape style was soon to be almost unanimously declared an outmoded concept.95

New publication underpinned the inspiration from Garden history with knowledge that was previously hidden in specialist literature or primary sources. Renaissance and Baroque gardens were inspiring for their tectonic spatial concepts that could be used to create a usable succession of garden rooms, closely linked with a building's internal structure (Figures 10–12). It must have helped the promoters of these design principles that Neo-Baroque and Neo-Renaissance were the styles in which the Kaiserreich preferred to represent itself with its public buildings. At the same time, historicism did not correspond conceptually to the mindset of the progressives promoting the Architectonic Garden.96 If the architectonic gardens were reminiscent of classical forms, this was considered a by-product of it being 'practical', i.e, in the language of the times, functional. It was believed that functionality in the garden was made possible by the architectonic style in the first place.

Schwarzkopf, Der Wettbewerb in der Gartenarchitektur (2006), pp. 115–6, 145–6; H. Junge-Gent, Alfred Lichtwark (2012), pp. 680–9 (subchapter 'Der Hamburger Stadtpark'). About another example, the large park for the jubilee exhibition at Altona in 1914 by Garden Director-General von Tutenberg, see: Gartenbauausstellung Altona 1914, ed. by H. Koch and Stadt Altona (special edn of Baurundschau) (Hamburg: Hanf, 1914)

95 For a contemporary overview of the different positions see: Richard Hoemann, 'Neuzeitliche Bestrebungen auf dem Gebiete der Garten-Gestaltung (Deutschland)', Der Städtebau, 4, 6 (1907), 71–4.

The ‘form garden’ in historiography: the pervasiveness of the architectonic

Contemporary garden history literature reflects the new interest for the architectonic period (in particular the Renaissance) and for the new ‘organic’-geometric gardens of the Arts and Crafts movement. A third model, apart from high garden art, was seen in the allegedly typically German farmer’s garden, and countless references attest to this widespread view (Fig. 13). At the same time distinct reservations were expressed against the English landscape garden. This perspective was very pronounced for example in Joseph August Lux’s *Schöne Gartenkunst* (1907), Christian Ranck’s *Geschichte der Gartenkunst* (1909), August Grisebach’s *Der Garten* (1910), as well as Marie Luise Gothein’s monumental *Geschichte der Gartenkunst* (1914). None of the authors had a horticultural background: Lux and Gothein were art journalists and writers, Grisebach an art historian, and Ranck a building official (*Regierungsbaumeister*). This must have been the literature that defined the historical knowledge about gardens of the generation of Mattern. The titles can be found in the former library of art historian Wolfgang Sörrensen, now incorporated into the German Horticultural Library (*Bücherei des Deutschen Gartenbaus*) at Berlin. Sörrensen held popular lectures about garden history at the *Vereinigte Staatsschulen für freie und angewandte Kunst* (literally ‘United State Schools for Liberal and Applied Arts’), predecessor of today’s University of the Arts) at Berlin-Charlottenburg, and documents suggest that Mattern and Hammerbacher frequented

---


these. It is not said, however, that Sørrensen promoted the extreme architectonic dogma of the mentioned authors. Ranck devoted only sixteen of 100 pages in his ‘History of Garden Art’ (1909) to the landscape garden, most of which were filled with patronising criticism of an alleged monotony, erroneous naturalism, or overabundance of romantic features. Even Grisebach, a student of the eminent Swiss art historian Heinrich Wölfflin, called the landscape garden ‘artistic derailment’. And Lux, a co-founder of the Werkbund and founder-editor (from 1904) of the Viennese journal Hohe Warte, sacrificed a mere four and a half pages of text in his widely read 64-pages booklet of 1907 to this topic. Here he wrote, with a today incomprehensible disdain, that the reaction against the architectonic garden in England, that was brought into action during the 18th century, ‘[gave cause] to the extreme of the landscape garden, which almost led to the annihilation of garden art.’ Unmistakably, Lux and Ranck did not consider the ‘natural’ garden a work of art – both used the term in inverted commas to signal their considering them a misconception. Quite the contrary:

The gushing nature poetries by Pope and Addison [...] glorified the idyll of the open landscape, which step by step suppressed the rigorous horticultural art. The fallacy [Irrtum] of the landscape garden, through imitation of the randomness of the the freely growing nature, arise from this.

99 Mattern in a letter of 1927 referred to ‘the time of Sorensen’s [sic] lectures’ (‘[...] zur Zeit der Vorträge Sörensens [sic] [...]’). Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.), 10/02/1927, EHH.

100 Ch. Ranck, Geschichte der Gartenkunst (1909), pp. 52–68.


104 Ibid.
Thus, by 1914 the opposition of the geometric Architectonic Garden versus an allegedly romantic and old-fashioned landscape garden was more or less decided in favour of the first. During the first phase of the Weimar Republic, axial symmetry and linear formal definition were the garden design mainstream (Fig. 14). As a matter of fact, regarding layout and spatial concept, many gardens of the later 1920s still looked very similar to those first Architectonic Gardens that Behrens, Laeuger and others created about twenty years earlier. The accompanying commentaries spoke volumes about the aesthetic frameworks some designers were still caught in, which in effect limited their way of expression considerably. A typical example is a text by Heinz Wichmann, who was extremely progressive in regard to the abstraction of his design vocabulary, but at the same time held the widespread reductionist views on past garden art. As a former Bauhaus student, who had also worked as a free-lancer in the office of Gropius, Wichmann was one of the landscape architects most connected to the Bauhaus – both in his way of designing as well as personally. He caused considerable interest with his austere garden designs of the late 1920s, which in contrast to the vast majority were non-symmetrical. In the context of his 'Special Rose Garden' for the momentous Dresden Horticultural Jubilee Exhibition of 1926 he exposed his inspiration from Renaissance garden art, in which he saw the first expression of a 'higher volition' (Figures 15, 16). In Baroque garden art he saw this too, despite the grandeur and symmetry that he considered strange to

---


modern man. His dealing with the landscape garden was particularly telling with regard to many designers' view of naturalist form:

The Baroque was succeeded by the English garden, initially a misunderstood copy of the Chinese garden, later, thanks to several great people, it gains a certain European independence, only to then sink entirely into wrong romanticism and sentimentality [...].

At that time, nobody questioned the regular ideal. Even landscape architects like Rudolf Bergfeld (1883-1943) and Willy Lange (1864–1941), who stood for a more vegetation-focussed landscape approach, and saw in 'pictures of nature' ('Naturbilder') a great potential of enhancement of the regular garden, did not question the basic validity of the architectonic means for connecting the building with the exterior spaces.

The Nordic position: 'images from nature' and the apotheosis of the native

A wider review of naturalism in garden design began not before the later 1920s, but, at least in Gartenkunst, the change of perspective happened surprisingly quickly. In 1927, the art historian Franz Hallbaum's doctoral dissertation on Friedrich Ludwig von Sckell and the (English) landscape garden was published as a large-format monograph. It heralded the re-evaluation of the landscape tradition. In 1927, Hallbaum started to work in the office of the DGfG, and from 1930 to 1933 he was

---


chief editor of *Gartenkunst*—which could be interpreted as a sign of the times.

Hallbaum's book of 1927 was followed ten years later by the first major monograph on Peter Josef Lenné by Gerhard Hinz, assistant to Heinrich Friedrich Wiepking (1891–1973), professor on Germany's sole university chair for landscape architecture at the University of Berlin. While these publications seemed to inspire a wider public review of the historical art of the landscape garden, in the garden journals the slowly emerging new examples of gardens designed in a new landscape mode were considered under 'biological' rather than aesthetic auspices. This had to do with the triumph of the 'objective' and the general rejection of romanticism. The new landscape style was seemingly not as much connected with aesthetics as with science.

The landscape architect Willy Lange, who was the Royal Garden Director at Wannsee beginning in 1911 and gave lectures at the Royal Horticultural College at Berlin-Dahlem from 1903 to 1915, played a particular role in this discourse. Lange's

---


110 Cf., e.g.: Otto Völckers, 'Jubiläums-Gartenbau-Ausstellung Dresden 1926', *Gartenkunst*, 39, 11 (1926), 161–76 (163). About the Dresden Garden Exhibition Völckers concludes that '[...] tellingly, there was lacking an effort for a purely biological-*landschaftliches* design'.
version of the ‘wild garden’ as promoted by William Robinson (1838–1935) was determined by a confusing theoretical argument that integrated modern phytosociology (plant sociology), aesthetics, racial ideology and different cultural-philosophical and scientific references. It was ridiculed by those who rejected his narrow-minded ethno-nationalism, most notoriously Migge, but with the rise of the reactionary political ideologies came back into fashion.¹¹¹ Lange was far from the only one associating the Architectonic Garden with the Roman-Latin peoples of the south. John Ruskin had deployed these terms in his thoughts on ‘The Nature of Gothic’, and similar ideas had already been expressed by Alexander von Humboldt, by whom Lange was inspired, decades before.¹¹² Also, in the first German historiography of the garden of 1856, the Breslau Botanist Ferdinand Julius Cohn (1828–1898) had already presented the landscape garden as the expression of a specifically Germanic sense of nature.¹¹³


¹¹³ S. Schweizer, *Die Erfindung der Gartenkunst* (2013), pp. 34–7; Ferdinand Cohn, *Die Geschichte der
With respect to their scientistic aspects, Lange's writings were progressive — phytosociology was a very young discipline. But his theories were boosted by the increasing power of the National Socialists, who welcomed his “scientific” justification of racism in the field of garden design. Probably Lange's most aggressive polemic can be found in the cultural propaganda periodical Deutsche Kultur-Wacht (German Cultural Guard), the organ of Alfred Rosenberg's 'Militant League for German Culture' (Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur, KfdK):

[...] The mainly intellectually orientated sense of the Roman civilization, with a nearly complete lack of fantasy and emotional art of poetry, never got beyond the geometrical-architectonic way of designing. The herein achieved clarity of design principles spread with the Latin civilization in the Roman Empire and later with its successor, the Catholic church, [...] also across the countries north of the Alps [...]. The German culture [...] has repeatedly in history tried to show to advantage the relationship of race to nature. To think about nature is Northern-Alpine-“Nordic”, the architectonic idea of the garden is Southern-Alpine-“un-Nordic”. Only a future time will understand, that the “international” spirit, which keeps flowing from the Southern-Alpine impure well of peoples — which is in reality an anti-German spirit — that this spirit for centuries used a talk about culture to paralyse the Nordic race-spirit in Germany with the tried and tested means of intellectual influence through anti-German “art” and to hinder its own-blooded development [...].

---

Out of this thinking he deduced his call for a Nature Garden with plantings oriented by natural plant communities. The 1912 edition of his best-seller Gartengestaltung der Neuzeit, (Leipzig: J.J. Weber, 1912, 3rd extended and revised edn), first published in 1907, seems to still be free of völkisch reasoning. But in a lecture held at the in the City Planning seminar at the Technische Hochschule Charlottenburg (Charlottenburg Institute of Technology, the predecessor to Technische Universität Berlin) in 1912, he had already displayed a peculiar nationalism and a subtle bias against a flat-roofed mediterranean ‘cave house type’, at the same time making the beauty of classical art a nordic achievement by declaring ancient Greek architecture as influenced by the nordic ‘hut type’. Ten years later, in his monograph Gartenbilder (1922), he agreed with a mixture of races under supremacy of the Nordic. With Lange’s hostility to the ‘deceptive light’ of the metropolis, already in the foreword the cultural criticism of his agenda becomes clear. However, in some of Lange’s books from before WWI the racism was relatively subdued and the aesthetic dimension of Lange’s writings was momentous. His aesthetic considerations, still fascinating today, had exerted their influence for many years. Lange had taken up aspects of Humboldtian thinking that also influenced Foerster. He focussed on intuitive aesthetic associations to a plant’s physiognomy as expression of their habitat. Similar to what Mattern and above all


118 Ibid. He uses the phrase “‘Untergang am Abend’” (“decline at evening”), especially since it is set in quotation marks, is probably a reference to Oswald Spengler’s Der Untergang des Abendlandes of 1918).

Hammerbacher later called their aim, Lange intended not to imitate nature but to advance ‘its intent’.\textsuperscript{120} He was not the first to promote this kind of naturalism, some prominent authors, such as Ruskin and later Robinson, and in 1858 the influential German writer on garden design Hermann Jäger (1815–1890), had already demanded the appreciation of the individual plant and the aesthetics of ‘naturalness’ many decades earlier.\textsuperscript{121} Alexander von Humboldt expressed similar thoughts in his famous publication *Kosmos* of 1847.\textsuperscript{122} Later writers, connected to Mattern’s and Foerster’s circles personally, were the horticulturists and dendrologists Ernst Count Silva Tarouca (1860–1936, Austro-Hungarian), Camillo Karl Schneider (1876–1951), and the head of the Botanic Gardens at Berlin-Dahlem, Constantin Rudolf Jelitto (1892–1978).\textsuperscript{123} However, Lange’s concept was more elaborate as a complete, practical and philosophical framework for garden design and it was particular in the way it combined Botany with Aesthetics. Also with regard to form, Lange expressed original thoughts that seem to resonate not only in Mattern’s and Hammerbacher’s designs, but also in their writings. Firstly, he separated between the basic dichotomy

\textsuperscript{120} E.g.: W. Lange, *Gartengestaltung* (1922), p. 27, 163.


\textsuperscript{123} C.A. Wimmer, *Lustwald, Beet und Rosenhügel* (2014), p. 356, 357–8, 361. Jelitto and his brother, also a botanist, were friends of Mattern’s. Schneider, a prolific writer on garden design, was amongst others closely connected to Migge and Foerster. About Count Silva Tarouca, see also Schneider’s obituary: Camillo Schneider, ‘Ernst Graf Silva Tarouca’, *Die Gartenschönheit* 17, 11 (1936), 247-9.
of architectonic or regular and landschaftlich. The former he referred to as ‘design after building-thoughts’ (‘nach Baugedanken’); within this category making further distinctions between the simple form of the ‘farmer’s garden’, the geometric garden and the architectonic garden. The latter was presented as the most expensive, as it was adapted to the “spirit of the house” with architectural means such as terraces and walls. The ‘design after nature-thoughts’ (‘nach Naturgedanken’), which he also referred to as ‘nature garden’ and ‘biological garden design’, stood for ‘human, free creations’ after the human notion of what nature intended. The same material was used as in the ‘garden after building-thoughts’, but this time ‘aligned’ with the ‘will of nature’, always enhancing its expression and stylising it by reducing the natural image to the physiognomic aspects of plant communities. His ideal of the modern garden, however, was a synthesis of all different historically developed means of garden design, now used with modern consciousness about beauty and utility and with the intent of elevating the modern garden above the existing models.

In purely form-related matters, with regard to the different possible forms of a garden, he was notably undogmatic. Politically, with his frequent references to cultural critics like Oswald Spengler and ‘raciologists’ like Houston Steward Chamberlain and Hans F. K. Günther, Lange was clearly reactionary. He used to critically refer to an ‘asphalt civilisation’ and praised the ‘master races’, and on the aesthetic field he displayed a general tendency towards the picturesque and the

124 W. Lange, Gartengestaltung (1922), pp. 21-7.
125 W. Lange, Gartengestaltung (1922), p. 25.
126 W. Lange, Gartengestaltung (1922), p. 27.
127 Ibid.
nostalgic. But he was also well-read on the field of art and capable of reasonably modern aesthetic judgements, calling for restraint of romantic longings, for ‘tact’ and a ‘sensitive’ judgement.

Lange’s speciality was the creation of ‘physiognomic’ images. He promoted the combination of plants that expressed certain living conditions, for example by shape of their leaves: small sparse leaves were associated with dry and sunny habitats, the sword-shaped leaves of calamus or iris with water, even if the particular species was drought-resistant (Figures 17, 18). Different of such ‘images’ as related to plant habitats such as dune, mixed woodland or even the vicinity of a well, he described in great detail:

The named groups of plants thrive in places that are not really humid. But their aesthetic impression causes a perception of humidity in that place; these combinations eventually provide us with a means to place, e.g. in the lower spots of a slightly uneven terrain [...], an overall “humid” physiognomy right beside a surrounding “dry” one.

This way he was able to create a nuanced, seemingly natural situation which however represented a concentrated combination of plants that commented on the site by means of their physiognomy, emphasising its characteristics. As we can deduce from their articles quoted below, during the 1930s the Bornimers worked in a very similar way. Lange’s books contained lists of plants according to habitat and also descriptions of desirable physiognomic images with suggestions of suitable plants combinations.

129 W. Lange, Gartengestaltung (1922), pp. xi (preface), 4, 18, 30.
130 W. Lange, Gartengestaltung (1922), pp. xi (preface), 30.
131 Ibid.; W. Lange, Gartenbilder (1922), e.g. about ‘physiognomies of humidity’ (‘Feuchtigkeitphysiognomie’) pp. 184, 190.
In the historiography of the modern garden, the spreading dismissal during these years of allegedly Roman, rational and geometric (garden) culture has caused much interest. The new organic-biological thinking has been described as part of a vulgarised form of philosophical vitalism or Lebensphilosophie (philosophy of life), with roots in German Romanticism. Unfortunately for Mattern and the Bornimers, the organic style of those years is in retrospect often principally associated with a thinking along racist lines. Without adopting the same outlook, Mattern and Hammerbacher with their organic ideal were certainly influenced by this. In this context it strikes one as peculiar that none of the Bornimers, or others associated with them, has ever distanced him- or herself from Lange’s aggressive racism. In view of Mattern’s silence on Lange, one might be tempted to assume that Lange’s influence has been overestimated, but in retrospect Hammerbacher named him as a key influence in the genesis of the later so-called Bornim School. He is said to have been a frequent guest in the house of Karl Foerster, whose famous sunken garden he probably designed, until, so it is believed, his Racism was considered unbearable.


134 Interesting in this context is a review of Modernism in garden design of 1995, which shows many but almost exclusively geometrical examples. The author hints at a possible Modernist motivation for naturalism in a few lines, continuing to discuss the connection to racist ideology, see: B. Bacher, ‘Auf der Suche nach dem neuen Garten’, Gartenkunst, 7, 2 (1995), 282–90.

135 Herta Hammerbacher, ‘Die Hausgärten’, in Berlin und seine Bauten, ed. by Architekten- und Ingenieurverein zu Berlin (AIV) (Berlin et. al.: Wilhelm Ernst & Sohn, 1972), pt 4 (‘Wohnungsbau’), vol. C (‘Die Wohngebäude – Einfamilienhäuser’), pp. 293–416 (314–5). A case where Mattern himself referred to Lange’s writings is not known. In view of his use of plant material in fact he avoided such reference and instead seemed to prefer being associated with the scientifically renowned pioneer in the field of plant sociology Reinhold Tüxen, whom he knew from his work for roadway projects before the war. He also visited Tüxen with his students: Vroni Heinrich, personal communication, 22/02/2007.

136 Vroni Heinrich (personal communication, 22/02/2007) believes that from some time in the nineteen-thirties on Willy Lange was no longer welcomed at Foerster’s house. It is also generally believed that the famous sunken garden at Foerster’s home was originally designed by Lange, although no
Axis fracture: dissolution of symmetries during the later 1920s

During the 1920s, the term ‘zeitgemäßer Formgarten’ (‘modern form garden’) was in use for what was considered ‘zeitgemäß’, i.e. in keeping with the times. ‘Formal’ is generally a much mis-used term in German, as it implies that organic outlines are not defining a form. Hallbaum, since 1927 a regular contributor to Gartenkunst, seems to have felt the need to explain the term: ‘[the] formal garden, i.e. the regular, geometric or architectonic way of designing’. It was primarily defined by insensate building materials and space-defining orthogonal elements such as paved paths and terraces, walls, stairs, pergolas, and banks. It also referred to planting, for example as clipped hedge or square beds. ‘Formal’ in this context and at this stage did not refer to flowing shapes and spaces and an organic system of visual relations, but rather to static spatial perspectives or sequences of distinct spaces with clearly delineated thresholds, as well as to ‘rhythm’ and ‘monumentality’. At the same time, by the 1920s, ‘Formgarten’ did not mean a purely architectonic creation like the early-20th-century exhibition gardens. Regular examples could be very plant-focussed, as the much-published examples by Harry Maasz (1880–1946) show (Figures 19, 20, cf. 26–28). Strikingly, those gardens presented as modern during the mid-1920s hardly resemble the abstract constructivism we can at this stage find in avant-garde architecture. A free compositional treatment of form was extremely rare even in the early second half of the 1920s. In this context, the exact date of when a particular garden design was conceived seems crucial for the evaluation of its artistic progressiveness. Within months a fundamental step could have been made, be it

---


through an influential publication or the dissemination of a ground-breaking garden design in the the journals. In Gartenkunst the first modernist example aesthetically and formally along these lines can be found in 1924, when Michael Mappes (*1898), the future editor-in-chief, was presented on the generous space of four pages with perspective views of a garden project. His unusually puristic line drawings of relatively homogenous flower beds and almost geometrical tree and shrub shapes were considered ‘peculiar’ (Fig. 21). At that time, the most progressive realised gardens presented in the same journal were still much indebted to what may be considered the effect of ‘Expressionism’ in garden design. Structurally though there are less parallels to Expressionist art than to the French gardens shown at the Exposition International des Arts Décoratifs et Industriels at Paris in 1925 (Fig. 22). This influence expressed itself as a still very decorative trend. Respective gardens were defined by zig-zag and trapezium outlines, but still organised – at least within compartments – by a central axis of symmetry (Figures 23, 24). Due to their representative and ornamental character, from today’s perspective these ‘form gardens’ of the earlier 1920s seem to contradict modernist ambitions of adapting the spaces to contemporary notions of dwelling. They were not yet really detached from the broderies and pleasure grounds of earlier periods. To be sure, this process

139 ‘Es ist das erste Mal, daß dieser in der Stille herangereifte Gartengestalter mit einigen Arbeiten an die Öffentlichkeit tritt, und zwar mit Arbeiten, die unbedingt durch ihre Eigenart Beachtung erheischen.’ (‘It is the first time, that this secretly matured garden designer goes public, namely with work that demand the observer’s attention with their peculiarity.’) ‘Gärten von Michael Mappes, Prag’, Gartenkunst, vol. 38 (1925), 17-21 (17).

140 Cf.: Dorothée Imbert, The Modernist garden in France (Yale: Yale University Press, 1993). The Exposition had a crucial influence on the development of a modernist design vocabulary in American garden design. Eckbo for example used formal elements from these gardens and incorporated them into his abstract compositions, see: Marc Treib, Garrett Eckbo: Modern Landscapes for Living (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), pp. 21-4.

corresponded to the developments in town planning and architecture. Otto Haesler’s Caciliengärten estate was completed in 1924, with gardens designed by Migge. The first major modernist housing exhibition, the Weißenhof estate, was organised by the Werkbund and opened in 1926. The first social housing estate of the ‘New Frankfurt’, planned under building councillor Ernst May, was completed in 1927 (the Bruchfeldstraße estate).\footnote{Cf. the page about the Bruchfeldstraße estate on the website of the ernst-may-gesellschaft e.v., \url{http://ernst-may-gesellschaft.de/wohnsiedlungen/siedlung-bruchfeldstrasse.html} (accessed 10/10/2014).}

Regarding the professional debates within landscape architecture, the year 1926 seems to have been a key year for the development of Modernism, as in Gartenkunst some impressive papers contributed to the debate about form.\footnote{Interesting in this context is the following judgement of these years in a political pamphlet of 1935: ‘The times (c. 1925–1926) when that number [of Gartenkunst] was considered particularly valuable, to which an city planner of a foreign race or a foreign garden architect contributed, are over once and for all.’ (‘Die Zeiten etwa (etwa 1925–1926), da man die Nummer der “Gartenkunst” für besonders wertvoll hielt, zu der ein fremdässiger Städtebauer oder ein ausländischer Gartenarchitekt Beiträge lieferte, sind endgültig vorbei.’) O. Langerhand (the newly appointed president of Deutsche Gesellschaft für Gartenkunst e.V.), ‘Aufruf’, Gartenkunst, 48, 2 (1935), 17.} These came from the most different parties: some promoted a more traditional architectonic style, some a purist Modernism and others a more picturesque or naturalistic garden design. Just two opposing examples shall be referred to here. Bergfeld, who already in 1912 had published a theoretical treatise as a booklet under the title \emph{About the natural form garden as a means of picturesque garden design}, wrote a long article about the welcome effects of naturalistic scenes contrasting geometric elements (Fig. 25).\footnote{R. Bergfeld, \textit{Der Naturformgarten} (1912); R. Bergfeld, ‘Arbeiten und Studien’, Gartenkunst, 39, 1 (1926), 4–12.} In contrast to this, the Swiss landscape architect Gustav Ammann (1885–1955) wrote in favour of the architectonic garden, arguing against what he considered ‘romanticism’ – according to him propagated in Karl Foerster’s journal \textit{Die Gartenschönheit} –, and against the new trend of installing natural form for nature’s own sake, as recently
suggested in a publication by Maasz (Figures 26–28).  

1927 saw the publication of Hugo Koch’s *Der Garten. Wege zu seiner Gestaltung* (‘The Garden. Ways to its design’), a heavyweight book on modern gardens which presented a collection of partly groundbreaking designs. It was positively reviewed in *Gartenkunst* by Hallbaum. The same year, like a thunderbolt, Germany experienced the presentation of the building exhibition of the Weißenhof Estate. The trend that was termed with ‘new building style’ (‘*Der Neue Baustil*’), or ‘the new habitation and its garden’, provoked controversial and passionate reactions. Hallbaum discussed the Weißenhof Estate enthusiastically and in reference to Walter Curt Behrendt’s *Der Sieg des Neuen Baustils* (‘The Victory of the New Building Style’, 1927). He suggested – a view that was popularised in those days – that the vegetation complemented the new, ornament-free type of buildings: ‘[...] yet from the garden accrues something like ornament to [the new architecture]’. Mattern and Hammerbacher planned to travel to Stuttgart to see the building exhibition with their own eyes: ‘Especially us, we will gain more from the Werkbund exhibition than the “Gugali” [garden show at Liegnitz]’. These years saw an increasing number of great national garden shows such as at Dresden 1926 and at Liegnitz 1927, both

---


designed by Gustav Allinger. Ideas were exchanged and disseminated through plan exhibitions (*Planschauen*). The latter were shown at the occasion of the great exhibitions, or at the ‘Jury-free Art Shows’ (*Juryfreie Kunstschau*), e.g. at Berlin in 1925, and some of these drawings were published.\(^{149}\) In retrospect, Hammerbacher ascribed considerable importance to these exhibitions of drawings, where the juniors could get inspiration and study trends proposed by young professionals.\(^{150}\) In particular the Jury-free Art Show presented unrealised avant-garde examples that must have had a thought-provoking effect (Fig. 29).\(^{151}\) Another striking and influential example must have been the garden of Ernst May, designed by Migge (Figure 30–32). It was presented in *Gartenkunst* in the November edition of 1928, a year when in the journal a design language devoid of historicism finally prevailed amongst the discussed projects.\(^{152}\) An extract from an article by the architect Hermann Heuss shall serve as an example for the respective thinking:

> Life is becoming freer from chains of convention, the body vigorously moves in play and sports and dance, the house is not any longer a closely shrouding shell, but it opens up. The tightness of the nordic cosiness yields southern joy of the corporeal in all forms of being.\(^{153}\)

---


153 ‘Das Leben wird befreiter von Fesseln der Konvention, der Körper regt sich kräftig in Spiel und Sport
Theodor Heuss’ younger brother, who is not known as a regular contributor to the debate about gardens but had written the preface to Maasz’ book *Kleine und große Gärten* (1926), appeared to be an observer capable of summarising for us the developments of his times. In 1927 he described the progressive contemporary garden as an intermediate form between the axial, regular garden of the 18th century, and the “*landschaftliche*” arbitrariness. The garden was ‘released out of its rigidity’, toward freedom of form, based on a ‘more intimate relationship with nature’. The “*forcing house culture*” took a back seat in favour of perennials, old farmhouse garden flowers and enduring plants newly introduced.

Taste has become “more natural”, more primitive, less constrained so to speak, and the joy and love is directed equally at the small, low-growing, mat forming, as at the proud blossoms and panicles of the high perennials. Here too, the direction towards the healthy, the humanly-close. The frugality of the architecture, its seemingly very “technical” character, in the end emanates from today’s feeling for cleanliness and tautness (in the current condition of course a transitional phenomenon); the subdued lushness of the garden forms an appropriate opposite to it and is even enhanced in its appeal by the

---


156 Ibid.

157 Ibid.
austerity of the built.\textsuperscript{158}

Heuss’ text won Hallbaum’s emphatic affirmation, who claimed that it showed that the view towards modern architecture was not a mere fashion, as critics claimed, but a healthy and logical development.\textsuperscript{159}

Over the coming months a discussion of questions of design and ‘zeitgemäße’ forms of the garden was pursued uninterruptedly. Authors reacted to colleagues’ texts, rejecting or taking up reasonings expressed elsewhere before, some with fierce contributions and other with mediating ones. One of the phrases that had gained currency in these years was for example ‘the coming garden’ (‘kommender Garten’), which was later connected to the call for the native.\textsuperscript{160} There was an atmosphere of generally constructive debate, and the editors gave space to very different positions, allowing for a differentiated discussion that about six years and a half later was to become impossible. A broad consensus only appeared to exist on two matters: ‘romantic’ as applied to contemporary designs was used as a derogative term, and ‘Expressionism’ was criticised as a superficial term. Progressives seemed to have the

\textsuperscript{158} ‘Der Geschmack ist “natürlicher” geworden, primitiver, ungezwungener sozusagen, und die Freude und Liebe gilt ebenso dem Kleinen, Niedrigwachsenden, Polsternden, wie den stolzen Kronen und Ripsen der hohen Stauden. Auch hier die Richtung auf das Gesunde, Menschlich-Nahe. Die Kargheit der Architektur, ihn scheinbar so sehr “technisches” Gepräge entspringt schließlich dem heutigen Gefühl für Reinlichkeit und Straffheit (im jetzigen Zustand natürlich Durchgangerscheinung); die gebändigte Üppigkeit des Gartens bildet den gegebenen Gegensatz dazu und wird durch das Herbe des Baulichen noch in der Wirkung gesteigert.’ Ibíd.

\textsuperscript{159} Ibíd.

upper hand when for example Friedrich Last, director of gardens at Aachen and member of the Werkbund, criticised the use of a modern style as a ‘cloak’ for retrogressive ideas:

With a tendency for the past and an ever so slight aversion against the present and the future, even in the newest fashion outfit the movement is easier backwards than forward.\(^{161}\)

Also conservatives constructively made their contribution, such as Alwin Seifert with his thoughts on ‘bodenständige Gartenkunst’ – ‘garden design rooted in the soil’. Seifert’s comments have been interpreted – and reasonably so – as forerunners of later, more openly völkisch design motives, but, especially during the times here under consideration, he cannot be accused of unrestrained polemics. His positions on the one hand expressed the widespread discomfort with the modernisation of society and the loss of traditional values, but on the other hand some of his thinking on functionality and organic form also overlapped with the Bornimers’ idea of a garden for dwelling, an outside living room under consideration of a certain longing for visual and spiritual stimulation. In his rejection of a pastiche of historic decorative garden motifs Seifert agreed with modern design where it was context-oriented and functional. In this respect, and in view of his commitment to the Heimatschutz, he could be called a reactionary modernist.\(^{162}\) In his critique of the garden accompanying the house by Le Corbusier at the Weißenhof Estate of 1926, originally published in the conservative architectural journal *Der Baumeister*, Seifert discussed


Le Corbusier's ideal of an untouched nature, contrasting “the crystalline forms of concrete thinking” (quoting Alfred Roth, employee of Le Corbusier's) that defined the architecture. With his underlying racist outlook, Seifert associated with Le Corbusier a 'Latin relationship' to gardening. In his eyes, the Swiss architect's house at the Weißenhof building exhibition was surrounded by a garden that was not allowing for the needs of modern man. With the same breath, Seifert criticised French '[public grounds] where still today [...] the beds are enclosed in tree trunks of cast concrete'. 'False cement tree trunks' is a connotation for the use of rustic ornament, as was fashionable during the late 19th century, and, long before Seifert, criticised by reformers such as Schultze-Naumburg (Fig. 02). Much like Heuss' above-quoted words, Le Corbusier's Weißenhof project pointed at the general thinking amongst modernist architects who preferred the garden to form a pastoral backdrop for their buildings. To many modernist architects the garden now seemed to have symbolised nature in the sense of natura naturans in contrast to the natura naturata of man's inner self as represented by the house. Mattern, years later, proclaimed self-confidently the man-made quality of all landscape — and this was in fact self-confidence because he considered the shaping of all landscape the task of


164 Ibid. according to Wolschke-Bulmahn, that with his critique Seifert 'emphatically criticised avant-garde French garden design'. However, in the cited text, Seifert explicitly referred to traditionalist 'public grounds', trying to comprehend Le Corbusier's decision to surround his house with an 'non-designed' garden, which Seifert criticised as not usable. Cf.: J. Wolschke-Bulmahn, 'The Avantgarde and Garden Architecture', in Gartenarchitektur und Moderne, ed. by CGL (2006), pp. 9–26 (19–22)


167 Cf., e.g.: Jan Woudstra, 'The Corbusian Landscape: Arcadia or No Man's Land?', Garden History, 28, 1 (Summer 2000) 135-51.
his profession. Accordingly he appropriated the garden more to the realm of the dwelling than to the natural realm.

*Modernised garden tradition: “decorative Modernism” vs. dwelling garden*

While generally French examples were little received in the German press, for known reasons, there was however at least one discussion of Gabriel Guévrekian’s Villa Noailles in the June-1929 edition of *Gartenschönheit*. It was presented in large photographs on two pages, accompanied with an affirmative text by Leopold Zahn, and a short text by the architect himself.\(^{168}\) Those gardens today referred to as Art Déco, after the *Exposition Internationale des Arts Décoratifs et Industriels Modernes* held in Paris in 1925, where only rarely discussed in Germany.\(^{169}\) Cultural, like political relations between Germany and France where tense; French garden design was thought to be lagging behind. The American park systems were still remembered as pioneering, as disseminated years earlier by the influential urban planner Werner Hegemann and by Migge.\(^{170}\) Nonetheless, if we look for example at Hirsch’s private garden at Wiesbaden, the modernized classicism as presented with several examples at Paris in 1925 seems to strongly – if late – have influenced the evolution of a modern garden design language in Germany. This was never acknowledged. Zahn’s mentioned article in *Die Gartenschönheit* in 1929 was clearly an exception. If French Modernism was discussed, it was controversially so, as in the case of a design by André Lurçat in *Gartenkunst* in 1930. Several landscape architects reacted with protest to Lurçat’s

\(^{168}\) Leopold Zahn (Gabriel Guevrékian),’Ein geometrischer Garten an der Riviera’, *Die Gartenschönheit*, 06 (1929), 222–3.

\(^{169}\) See: D. Imbert, *The Modernist garden in France* (1993). The term Art Déco was introduced retrospectively in the 1960s. In contrast to this, a seminal influence has been proven for the United States, where Garrett Eckbo for example used formal elements from these gardens and incorporated them into his abstract compositions, see: Marc Treib, *Garrett Eckbo: Modern Landscapes for Living* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), pp. 21-4.

formalist garden and the informal one accompanying Le Corbusier’s Weißenhof house. The harsh adverse comments by the young landscape architects Wilhelm Hübotter (1895–1976) and Otto Valentien (1897–1987) have been linked to upcoming Nazism:171

The outcome of both design principles remain alien to us; the result is not a garden, but instead either a piece of decoration or a formless assortment of plants and paths.172

A modern functional garden in tune with modern living conditions and needs had only just asserted itself. Calling Lurçat’s garden a ‘piece of decoration’ and Le Corbusier’s at the Weißenhof estate a ‘formless assortment of plants and paths’ may not be polite, but these words indirectly illustrate the objectives the Bornimers had in mind for their functional dwelling gardens. Combative expressions were common in matters of art, and while he occasionally expressed considerable conservatism, here Valentien’s words were compliant with a modernist standing towards design. The character of the French examples that reached the German press was indeed chiefly ornamental, apparently designed with the decorative visual impression in mind that was most effective standing at the upper windows of the villa looking down (Fig. 33). While stylistically exploring new paths, Lurçat used plants in a traditional, non-sustainable way, resulting in a high-maintenance ornamental garden. Valentien, Hübotter and Seifert may not have been representing the garden avant-garde in an artistic sense, but their thinking expressed in

171 Wolschke-Bulmahn evaluates Valentien’s and Hübotter’s positions towards Lurçat’s garden as conservative. In particular the expression ‘the result is not a garden, but [...]’ (‘Das Resultat ist kein Garten, sondern [... ’) he sees in connection with the ‘depraved art’ of the ‘Third Reich’, and to support this perspective he chooses to translate the respective phrase as ‘the result is an “un-garden”, or rather [...]’, which makes Valentien’s critique even more severe than it is, see: J. Wolschke-Bulmahn, ‘The Avantgarde and Garden Architecture’, in Gartenarchitektur und Moderne, ed. by CGL (2006), pp. 9–26 (19–22).

the quotes was not representing a conservative position either. A differentiation between
'stylistically modern' and 'structurally modern' might help to evaluate the different
examples. Also, any example under consideration may exhibit both some progressive as
well some conservative characteristics. In Germany there were many cases in which the
rationalism of the building stood in stark contrast to the representative disposition of its
garden, as much as there were examples where the opposite is true (Fig. 34). A focus on
decorativeness contradicted the demand for a garden as an outdoor extension of the
living room, which does not mean that the modern gardens were ignoring aesthetics. In
the works that Mattern chose for a presentation in Gartenschönheit of those involved in the
Killesberg project of 1939, his notion of function can be deduced. The evident
compositional ease, thanks to an eschewal of symmetry, is understood as emblematic for
the Wohngarten type, the 'inhabitable garden' or 'dwelling garden', as it signalled the
rejection of representational aims and enabled a more useful, site-related zoning. Aiming
for dwelling meant providing space with regard to modern demands for living: for healthy
exercise, relaxation and play. It meant a closer contact with nature as expressed in the
Modernist dictum 'light and air for everyone'. The notion of the garden as extension to
the habitation, and even the term Wohngarten, had already been used since about 1905, for
example by Encke. The dwelling gardens of the later 1920s represented the further
elaboration of premisses of the life reform that the older generation, landscape architects
such as Encke, Maasz and Migge, had introduced. These spaces usually provided a

173 Hermann Mattern, 'Vorbetrachtungen zu der Reichsgartenschau Stuttgart', Gartenschönheit, 20, 3
(1939), 86-98.

174Compare the exhibition 'Sonne, Luft und Haus für alle' ('Sun, air and house for everybody'),
presented by the City Commissioner for Building Martin Wagner in 1932 on the exhibition grounds
at the Berlin Broadcasting Tower (for Mattern's involvement cf. p. 264). Examples were published
in: Fischer, "Sonne, Luft und Haus für alle". Berliner Sommerschau 1932, Gartenkunst, 45, 7
(1932), 106-11. Generally on health and modernist culture, see: Christopher Wilk, 'The Healthy

vegetable plot, a central lawn for sports and play and a generous terrace as extension to the house’s clean and dry floor surface. Characteristic was the reduction of paved surfaces as pathways, in order to suggest freer movements and in the interest of economics (Fig. 35). Not least, it was aimed at a picturesque impression under use of – compared to earlier times – relatively low-maintenance perennial plantings.

Towards 1933: artistic tendencies and ideological dynamics

For a few years organic designs in the landscape tradition – which until then had still been represented at least as traditionalist or outsider positions – were more or less absent from Gartenkunst. Shown were either purely architectonic flower gardens, or functionalist gardens with extensive lawns for play and sports, and relatively large regular layouts of crop plantations. Towards the end of the 1920s we can observe again changing dynamics. It seemed that for the younger generation born around 1900 the form question was less ideologically charged than for the ‘generation of 1914’. The two poles of the organic, allegedly romantic (‘Nordic’) versus the geometric, allegedly functional (‘Latin’) were treated more rationally, and as two coordinates defining a wide field of possible solutions. During the same period one can also find designs that are more neu-sachlich, as related to New Objectivity, than ever before (Fig. 35). Questions of functionality and appropriateness, of Materialgerechtigkeit (‘truth to material’) and Zeitgemäßheit (‘fitness for the times’) defined the discussions, corresponding to the growing implementation of examples for Neues Bauen, and to the terminology used by the reform movements such as the

176 For examples for the dwelling garden see the contemporary garden monographs such as: Guido Harbers, Der Wohngarten: Seine Raum- und Bauelemente, 1st edn (München: Callwey, 1933); Otto Valentien, Zeitgemässe Wohn-Gärten: eine Sammlung alter und neuer Hausgärten (München: Bruckmann, 1932). The Wohngarten will be dealt with more in chapter II.f.

Deutsche Werkbund. But the questions of ideology that were connected to form obviously resurfaced more fiercely than before when the Nazis rose to power.

The landscape architect and artist Otto Valentien was one of the most direct influences on the Bornim School. In July 1925 he graduated from the horticultural college at Dahlem, becoming the head designer at the prestigious Spaeth nursery in Baumschulenweg near Berlin, leaving in 1928 to start working for the municipal administration at Frankfurt, where he was involved in planning the Nidda valley estates with Ernst May. He left Frankfurt the following year to take over his deceased friend Karl Luz's garden construction and planning business at Stuttgart. His career as an artist developed in opposite direction to that as a landscape architect. His artistic work often displayed motives from nature, his techniques included water colour painting, linoleum monotype and abstract collage. After the 1960s he turned increasingly abstract.

In a way more neutral than many others, Valentien stressed the value of the natural elements of a landscape, such as clumps of trees or shrubs, which should be integrated into a garden design. He also emphasised the beauty of native species. Formally, contrary to the Bornimers, he was interested in an underlying rectilinear spatial structure which took in the freely growing shrubs and the mixed perennial beds. Valentien even embraced romanticism – a rare confession in those days – which should, however, join in after the 'objective' demands had been fulfilled. In the title of his article here referred to, the noun 'das „Landschaftliche”' is put in quotation marks, hinting at the complexity of the discussion and at the varying perspectives different designers had on landschaftliches design. Over Valentien

---


179 Otto Valentien, 'Das „Landschaftliche” in der Gartengestaltung', Gartenkunst, 46, 01 (1933) 9–11.
hardly any literature exists, and all the documents of his work as landscape architect have been destroyed, due to several relocations of the office and Valentien's abandonment of it when he decided to concentrate on a career as an artist, probably during the 1960s.\textsuperscript{180} His publications contain some detailed plans, including planting schemes. Although today less known than some of his contemporaries, Valentien was probably the most-published German landscape architect of the 1920s and 1930s, both domestically and internationally. With his strong presence in, for example, The Studio, he represented the modern German Wohngarten to an international public.\textsuperscript{181}

In Landscape for Living (1950), Garrett Eckbo referred to Valentien's pre-war work, in one breath with the Austrian Albert Esch, as representative of European modern 'free' design.\textsuperscript{182}

Valentien's ideological standing is somewhat difficult to discern. On the one hand with his sober, yet inviting designs and the emotive, expressionistic stroke of his characteristic illustrations he was the idol of the younger; but he became more conservative with age, adopting an anti-urban attitude and rejecting the use of foreign plants.\textsuperscript{183} But his point of view, that in a garden the use of native plants found

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{181} See the editions of 1934 and 1936 to 1939 of Gardens and Gardening (= The Studio Garden Annual), ed. by F. A. Mercer (London/New York: The Studio). Oswald Woelke (Düsseldorf) and above all Otto Valentien are strongly over-represented. Valentien's designs represented Germany in the 1934 edition, and the 1936 to 1939 editions, in the latter his opinion on modern garden design was printed as part of an international survey amongst prominent garden architects (J. E. Grant White, George Dillistone, T Adams, Pietro Porcinai, Jean Charles Moreux, René Pechère, Garrett Eckbo). An exception is the 1935 edition, in which all German examples spring from Georg Béla Pniower's work, with rather unassuming photographs. The 1933 edition shows a 'garden designed by Herta Mathern-Förster [sic!], Bornim, near Potsdam' (p. 36).
\item \textsuperscript{182} Garrett Eckbo, Landscape for Living (New York: F.W. Dodge Cooperation, 1950), p. 23.
\item \textsuperscript{183} See Valentien's contribution to a survey amongst prominent landscape architects in: Gardens and Gardening (1939), 15-6. See also Wimmer's assessment in: C.A. Wimmer, Lustwald, Beet und
in the surrounding landscape was always advisable, was explicitly taken by Hammerbacher too. Valentien may have influenced her in this when she had worked under his supervision in the Spaeth nursery’s design department from September 1926 till autumn 1928. Native plants were here promoted in the interest of an undisturbed, organic visual coherence between a garden and the surrounding landscape.

Towards 1933 the discussion was more and more centring on the organic in a völkisch sense. A contribution by Max Karl Schwarz shall illustrate this. Schwarz was a pioneer of bio-dynamic gardening at Migge’s settler school at Worpswede who also contributed to Mattern’s *Die Wohnlandschaft* of 1950. This quote followed a reference to Rudolf Steiner:

Yet on all sides echo the cry for a strong peasantry, for an intimate connection of blood and soil as the essential demand for the eagerly longed for nationwide reconstruction. Everywhere one can feel a disengagement from obsolete views, methods, from a way of designing that was concentrating far too much on the surface, on the constructed, and valued far too much the conspicuous. The tensed up, ‘so-called objective’, rigorously and violently forced into a form, bursts in the general pursuit of biological insights.

---


In May 1933 the Nazis took power, including control of all cultural organisations. Gustav Allinger, for example, appeared at the annual meeting of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Gartenkunst (DGfG) in the uniform of the SA (Sturmabteilung) and, 'carrying a revolver', replaced Hermann Kube who was ousted from office.\textsuperscript{187} With the \textit{Gleichschaltung} (‘forcible-coordination’) of the professional bodies the first persecutions began. Hammerbacher spoke of defamation for stylistic reasons, but a closer look reveals that the controversy was not so much about the dichotomy of geometric and organic.\textsuperscript{188} Instead, the frontier ran simply between Nazi and non-Nazi, which turned out to be very difficult to define in artistic terms (compare chapters II-g and h). The crucial new valuation standard revolved around the Nazi’s rejection of anything deemed too ‘individualist’, or too ‘international’. What was considered modernist expression was called ‘unhealthy’, as it was associated with internationalism, Judaism, and Socialism; and accordingly meant a lack of connection to the German people’s soul, culminating in the branding as ‘cultural Bolshevist’.\textsuperscript{189} The people’s soul was seen in its ‘blood bonds’ with the landscape and thus to the soil. Blood-and-Soil was intrinsic to the official ideology of the ‘Third Reich’, the words being inscribed into the logo of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, the \textit{Reichsnährstand} which organised the great garden shows.\textsuperscript{190} Many landscape architects, Mattem amongst them, worked with Gartenorganismus. Grundsätzliches zum “Kommenden Garten”, \textit{Gartenschönheit}, (1933), 236–9 (236). Schwarz’ reference to Steiner once more illustrates the much-discussed connection between supporters of Anthroposophy and Nazi ideology, which however should be differentiated from Rudolf Steiner and Anthroposophical philosophy as such.


\textsuperscript{188} Herta Hammerbacher ‘Eine Engegnung’, \textit{Bauwelt}, 68, 28 (1977), 963–4.

\textsuperscript{189} For a very brief summary of the Nazis’ concepts of their enemies, see: Jost Hermand, \textit{Kultur in finsteren Zeiten: Nazifaschismus, Innere Emigration, Exil} (Berlin et. al.: Böhlau, 2010), pp. 15–25.

the Reichsnährstand during the war. ‘Blood-and-Soil’ meant believing in the (hereditary) farmer as the carrier of culture and as the ‘blood-line’ of the German people.\(^{191}\) The internationalist impetus of the modern movement clearly contradicted such concentration on the local. The official aesthetics of the Reich, in the fields that were not to represent the state internationally, corresponded to Blood-and-Soil. The ‘aesthetics of simplicity’ of the crafts as popularised by the Dürerbund and the Heimatbund, early reform associations founded during the late 19th century, as well as the ‘good form’ of the Werkbund, were shown as beautiful examples to strive for in design.\(^{192}\) In this regard, the idea of a ‘vernacular modernism’ and of the architecture movement ‘Um 1800’ of Muthesius, Schultze-Naumburg and others went aesthetically congruent with the mainstream aesthetics of a more regressive Heimatschutz and finally with many of the projects for residential architecture under the Nazi regime.\(^{193}\) Excepted from this was a great part of the representative public projects, where a grave, sharp-edged and keenly hierarchical neo-classicism was Hitler’s style of choice. It had already asserted itself in a less martial variant during the late Weimar Republic, with its epitome being Hans Poelzig’s headquarters for IG Farben in Frankfurt of 1929, a project in which Matten


192 Sabine Zentek, Designer im Dritten Reich: Gute Formen sind eine Frage der richtigen Haltung (Dortmund: Lelesken, 2009).

was involved.\textsuperscript{194} To a certain extent, modernist expression lived on in the field of industrial architecture.\textsuperscript{195}

It has become widely known since the late 1980s that former Bauhaus students and teachers and other modernists creatives did not shy away from working for the ‘Third Reich’: quite the contrary. Architects as renowned as Egon Eiermann, Walter Gropius, Gustav Hassenpflug, Lilly Reich or Ludwig Mies van der Rohe were successfully soliciting assignments during the first years of Hitler’s reign (Figures 185, 186).\textsuperscript{196} Bauhaus graphic designers like Herbert Bayer, Kurt Kranz or Joost Schmidt were highly successful, employing their art for the propaganda of the state. Motives are often difficult to judge, seeing that many lost their jobs and were struggling to make a living. Hinnerk Scheper for example, who had to feed a family of five, made wall paintings in different ministries, buildings of the Wehrmacht, embassies, churches and other buildings and was commissioned by Göring for his Karinhall country estate.\textsuperscript{197}

In landscape architecture, as Darwinist-biologicistic reasoning was on the forerun, there were positions, which were to become pervasive, that turned the ‘scientific’ upside down. These were connected to another facet of the dichotomy, represented by


the historical differentiation into a Nordic and a Latin cultural sphere. In this context calls for a ‘natural’ garden became stronger, as landscape-relatedness was considered beneficial for the promotion of the German race.\textsuperscript{198} The Blood-and-Soil perspective took over the prerogative of interpretation. In 1936, Mappes, who the same year had been appointed editor-in-chief of \textit{Gartenkunst}, emphasised, that progressives would distinguish carefully between an anachronistic, ‘old term “\textit{landschaftlich}” and the new term “\textit{natürlich}” [“natural”].\textsuperscript{199} The old way was considered contrived and oversophisticated, as it allegedly forced the vegetation into a fixed form and focussed on a


\textsuperscript{199} Michael Mappes, ‘Konstruktion oder Organismus’. \textit{Gartenkunst}, 49, 6 (1936), 95–9 (96–7).
mise-en-scène of static views, while the new ideal was presented as ‘natural’. With a perspective clearly from within a Blood-and-Soil framework, referring to the paradigm of harmonious relationship between landscape and Volk, Mappes illustrated his article with ‘organic’ landscapes: drawings based on works by Rembrandt and Albrecht Dürer. At the occasion of the 1st Reichsgartenschau, held the same year at Dresden, this tendency became for the first time evident in considerable segments of a large garden exhibition. In a contemporary discussion of its design, the responsible landscape architect, the municipal Garden Director Balke, emphasised the reorientation of the attention in garden design away from the effect of great masses and towards the single plant. This he interpreted as proof that National Socialism had ‘aroused the Germans’ sense for nature-bound forms and designs’. He closed with a sentence that referred to the Lebensraum (habitat, literally ‘space for living’) discourse by invoking a characteristically German ‘sense of nature’, which provided comprehension for the ‘great tasks that are to be accomplished for the designing of the German Lebensraum’. The decorative monumental mass plantings of

200 Ibid.


earlier exhibitions Balke indirectly judged as not typically German. To the conservatives, turing toward ‘naturalness’ signified a turning towards the sources of racial character, which were believed to have emerged from the primordial landscape. In 1937 Hinz, in his monograph on Lenné, mentioned ‘the high reverence of all Nordic peoples for the single tree and the forest’ as conducive to the development of the English landscape garden, and referred to ‘the myth of the Ygdrasil, the world ash, the holy woods and groves of the Germanic, the oaks of the gods and Vehmic lindens’. But Hinz’s way of reasoning could also seen in a cultural studies context. The new interest for naturalism, which also brought along a new appreciation of the aesthetic value of a single plant’s habit, was not triggered by the Blood-and-Soil philosophy alone, though their proponents took it as their subject.

And it was not a German phenomenon either, but developed in many countries during the 1930s, in particular in the neighbouring countries of the Netherlands and Sweden. The exchange of ideas was particularly intense with the Scandinavian

---


205 G. Hinz, Peter Josef Lenné (1937), p. 201. Hinz may have included this rather untypical paragraph to please his teacher Wiepking, who constantly employed such rhetorics.

countries, were Mattern later cultivated many contacts personally, for example with Sven A. Hermelin or C. Th. Sørensen. The Dane Gudmund Nyeland Brandt, who also pioneered naturalism in the domestic garden, was very active in Germany during the 1930s and Foerster was known in Scandinavia. Erik Glemme's Stockholm park system is a particularly impressive example of an assertion of an abstract naturalism during these years.207 In the United States, early in the 20th century, an interest in developing a regionalist naturalism had emerged; Jens Jenssen (1860-1951) is probably the best-known proponent of the American 'Prairie Style' that developed especially during the second decade of the 20th century and more than before considered native species.208 In Britain, during the early 1930s, in the context of a rediscovery of the romantic tradition, many artist and writers drew the attention to the landscape and a regionalism that led to more pluralism in modernist expression.209 In 1938 Germany hosted the International Horticultural Congress, which was an occasion of intense exchange in this regard, with lectures by Achille Duchêne, Hermelin, J. Richardson from the Manchester Parks and Cemeteries Department, or the Swiss Walter Mertens. In his section 'garden design', Jensen held the 'special lecture', speaking in favour of regionalism and a use of native plants, and also addressing the 'Nordic'.210


Organic modernism: naturalism and the new vision of the plant

To explain the dynamics during these years along ideological lines is not the only way to write a history of German inter-war garden design. The changes towards naturalism have to be seen in a more general context of tendencies in different fields; and can be observed internationally. At least in the case of Mattern and his circle, this naturalism neither represents artistic realism, nor those social organicist ideals that have generally been associated with anti-modern reaction.\textsuperscript{211}

Recently, new terms have been suggested to define what Hammerbacher has called the ‘New Landschaftlichkeit’.\textsuperscript{212} In a comparative study of design competitions in landscape architecture between 1871 and 1945, the general ‘turn towards nature’ around 1930 has been termed ‘New Naturalness’, while specifically with regard to urban functional open spaces in this context the same author has introduced the term ‘Disciplined Landscape Mode’ (‘Disziplinierte Landschaftlichkeit’), an interesting suggestion that has yet to be discussed in relation to the Bornimmers.\textsuperscript{213}

Towards the end of the 1920s, the mood amongst modernist architects also changed. No few started to doubt the appropriateness of the thoroughly rationalised living environments and the aesthetics of objectification that they themselves had promoted for several years. Pioneers of Neues Bauen discovered an interest in organic design principles. An important proponent of this turn is Alvar Aalto (1898–1976), who, after his earlier purist-functionalist designs until the famous Paimio Sanatorium of 1932, started to develop a critical regionalism that connected to the tradition of Nordic romanticism.\textsuperscript{214} Even Le Corbusier, with his worship of pure

\textsuperscript{211} See glossary for the semantic field of the term ‘naturalism’ as it is used in this text.


geometry, turned towards a new humanism and the proportions of traditional architecture, as he became critical of the ‘minimum dwelling’ credo. Particularly close in thinking to Mattern were architects like Hans Poelzig, Hugo Häring and Hans Scharoun, who from an early stage of their career focussed on organically oriented design strategies; later opposing the widely known geometric dogma of Le Corbusier. Their site-related concept of ‘form finding’ (*Formfindung*) as opposed to ‘form giving’ — the idea that the design had to arise from characteristics intrinsic to the given site — has been seen as an outsider position and for a long time not acknowledged for the influence it had.

These tendencies have to be kept in mind when assessing garden design in the 1930s. Völkisch concepts of landscape were prominent, but not all designers who adopted a völkisch perspective necessarily held the view of the Nordic being ‘racially’ superior. While some proponents were adherents of one of the different strands of ‘raciology’, believing in cultural differences defined by geography and climate did not necessarily mean believing that this entered the blood. The ‘*Bodenständigkeit*’ (rootedness) paradigm, the promotion of plants in the garden that grow naturally under given conditions or are native, has to be looked at carefully, as different proponents interpreted the concept differently. Apart from the said, in academia a cultural psychology-related (*völkerpsychologische*) view on art was not only in Germany pervasive; as Ruskin’s reasoning in the context of the Gothic revival shows. This was often strongly nationally biased and boosted during the 20th century by the hostilities that lead to WWI. On the other hand, for example, the art historian Wilhelm Worringer’s influential ‘psychology of style’


(‘Stilpsychologie’) which extensively dealt with cultures, apparently tried to – not always successfully – avoid racist reasoning.\textsuperscript{217} The psychologist Wilhelm Wundt and the historian Karl Lamprecht, one of the founders of Cultural History, also spoke of a people’s ‘mentality’ that was immanent in the cultural production of individuals.\textsuperscript{218} The notion of a ‘gothic’ or ‘Nordic spirit’ comprising a special sense of nature was widely held. With the ever-increasing popularity of photography as artistic medium, bestselling volumes reminiscent of Ernst Haeckel’s \textit{Kunstformen der Natur} (1899–1904) fuelled the interest visually.\textsuperscript{219} The Architectonic Garden was increasingly considered too rigid, extravagant and high-maintenance for modern man’s need for flexibility and efficiency, and it did not allow for the now fashionable, perceived aura of objectivity that surrounded plants in organic settings. Accordingly, apart from the above-mentioned characteristics of the dwelling garden, the most essential, and as yet little discussed change took place in the way plants were arranged.

Acknowledging the changed relationship of man to plant is central to understanding Mattern’s and his contemporaries’ artistic and social consciousness and indeed conscience. As will be shown, Foerster’s publications played no little role in this.

Since the beginning of the century – for example with Joseph Maria Olbrich’s colour gardens at the Horticultural Exhibition at Darmstadt in 1905 – the attention


had been on the effect of colour. The large ornamental beds that Allinger designed at Dresden in 1926 are a late example, often classed as colour expressionism. At that time, the dominant guiding principle had still been monumentality, which implied the merging of the single plant into the crowd (Figures 114, 115). During the following years, a change of perspective lead away from the colour effects of homogenous masses, towards an appreciation of the individual appearance; the habit of the single species.\textsuperscript{220} At the most frequented and most exposed areas, such as the immediate vicinity of the terrace and the garden access, gardens now focussed on the personal experience of the individual plant (Figures 139, 147).\textsuperscript{221} Also, the plant was more than ever admired in context: Camillo Schneider and Karl Foerster, in the first German language book about the relatively new fashionable garden plant *Dahlia*, which they published in 1927, advised the reader against considering the flowers merely as collector’s item. The reader was urged not to ‘[line them up] like butterflies in a box’, but instead, by combining them with other plants, to consider the ‘charms’ of their ‘connectedness with the world’.\textsuperscript{222} With regard to the general zeitgeist, new research has also pointed at those loosening tendencies which, beginning in 1929, lead to sprawling drifts of tulips and summer flowers that adorned – amongst others – the lawns and meadows at the first Gruga (Große Ruhrländische


\textsuperscript{222} Karl Foerster and Camillo Schneider, *Das Dahlienbuch*, series Bücher der Gartenschönheit, 5 (Berlin-Westend: Verlag der Gartenschönheit, 1927), p. 76.
Gartenausstellung, Great Ruhr-area Garden Show) at Essen in 1929 as well as at the 1st Reichsgartenschau at Dresden in 1936 (Figures 38a+b).  

The aesthetics of plant use is one of the major fields of garden design that has attracted little attention from art historians. From the perspective of art theory, historically, the discipline’s being bound to nature has posed a problem for categorising the garden as a work of art, as ‘[b]eside the artist, a second creative agency, nature, is active […]’ The plant, as a living, growing and expiring being, is not merely a material, subject to the artist’s intentions. Instead, it virtually “expresses itself”. It is exactly this creative power immanent in nature that the Bornimers consciously deployed; and this with artistic aspirations. In these years, garden designers were increasingly inspired in their design decisions by biological and phytosociological (dealing with plant sociology) literature. Gone were the days when the site had to be completely adapted to cater for exotic and high-maintenance ornamental plantings. Time-efficiency and economics had become a matter of high priority, as the garden was not only a luxury that presupposed that a gardener be part of the domestic staff. Even during the economic crisis the dwelling garden was common to the middle class household. Economics were not merely a matter of making the garden affordable; it was also part of the ethics of modern life (Fig. 35). Many garden designers of Mattern’s generation had developed their design approach during the 1920s in the context of private domestic gardens. This was later transferred to larger public projects. Mattern saw the art of garden making in the creation of optimal conditions for a specific, desired composition of the vegetation – without trying to fundamentally change


224 In the field of garden history we have now at least two comprehensive monographs in German, the first focussing entirely on the German situation: S. Duthweiler, *Neue Pflanzen für neue Gärten* (2011); C.A. Wimmer, *Lustwald, Beet und Rosenhügel* (2014). Due to it’s recent release the latter could only be taken into account cursorily.


the given conditions. Around 1930, the focus on small but effective interventions that would be conducive to what today is referred to as ecological balance was also obvious in his publications:

Those fields of drifting sand of our Mark [of Brandenburg], which are supposed to turn into gardens, cry out for being recognised with their essence. [...] Sand, sand [sic] and bad drifting sand provide hardly any nutrients, even for pine trees. A perennial garden, saviour in all difficult and seemingly insoluble situations, had been chosen to arise. [...] The planting scheme was defined by the quality of the ground: sparse wayside perennials, drought-resistant grasses, plants that almost tend to run riot under extremely dry conditions, [...] formed a ground cover. These undemanding small plants create, apart from their abundant flowers, the preconditions for even the most demanding garden selections. From thick herb layers, retentive of moisture, undemanding Aster amellus, as well as park roses, delphiniums and anemones are thriving with richly ramified shoots.27

In 1935 Mattern, together with the architect Gerhard Graubner, won the competition for the exhausted sandstone quarry at the Killesberg Stuttgart which was to be transformed into a public park and zoological garden respectively. Under Mattern’s artistic direction, the Killesberg park was realised as the 3rd Reichsgartenschau of 1939. It became an epitome of modern organic landscape architecture, as for the first time in Germany a new kind of naturalism was realised on the scale of a large urban green space. The Reichsgartenschau of 1939 was the last garden show under the

reign of National Socialism. After WWII, the new naturalism of the 1930s was carried into the Federal Republic, now understood as a sign of the new-won liberty. At the occasion of the Gruga 1952 at Essen, the changes in garden design taking place between the first GRUGA of 1929, which had been designed in a rigorous geometric way, was now presented as a liberation on a spiritual level:

While in 1929 the abundance of flowering nature was set into the rigour of vertical and horizontal lines, and into joined-together squares and oblongs, now [1952] it was allowed to radiate itself freely with the sweep of the undulating landscape image.228

Those liberal-minded landscape architects, who had developed this new naturalism about two decades before and thus freed 20th-century garden design from the dogma of symmetry, must have experienced with satisfaction that their design vocabulary was now connected with liberation, almost echoing the discourse surrounding the birth of the English landscape garden during the early 18th century. At the same time it may have been frustrating for them that they could not claim credit officially, as a positive reference to the 1930s was a taboo. Around 1970, with her late publications Hammerbacher tried to put this development into perspective – naturally in a way governed by her own personal blinders.

Modernism’s natures: Mattern and the Bornimers in context

Nature as a progressive point of reference in design has been discussed rarely in the historiography of the modern garden in Germany. Generally in historiography, the main thrust of Modernism has been seen as ‘antithetical to nature’, blind to the environmental crisis which the developing biological sciences were however able to describe with increasing accuracy.229 This view on the Modernists is in the process of

---

The idea that the Modernists were generally blind to man's dependency on the natural world brought them blame, 'having merely been a part of the problem and never of its possible solutions'.

Existing nature-centric ideologies, mainly born with the fin-de-siècle context and often related to the neo-vitalist re-engagement with Romantic thought - have been largely ignored by the historiography of Modernism. Usually, the 'anti-natural, so-called “mechanistic” aspects' have been emphasised and indeed there was strong movement of nature-philosophical, anti-modernist criticism during the late 19th century that wanted to fight the deterministic and mechanistic views that spread with the rise of the empirical sciences, and made nature 'a new field of class struggle'.

---


'Naturalness' was seen as a way out of societal conditions perceived as morbid and decadent; a new spirituality was pitted against the materialism of the late 19th century. Because of this, a new sensitivity towards the animate and the inorganic nature has indirectly been classed with the anti-enlightenment opposite pole of Modernism. Turning away from this – from anti-modernist romanticisms and traditional social points of reference –, parts of the modernist avant-garde in architecture and design took up the cause of overcoming irrationalism, grown tradition and hierarchical social orders. They rejected, so the theory goes, 'Nature' as a representation of these aspects.233 But after a long period of reductionism in Modernism literature, the view has spread that ‘[…] even at the heart of high Modernism, reference to nature was never absent […]’.234 Even from the Bauhaus, usually cited as a guarantor of polished objectivity, came corresponding contributions. One of the most important is Paul Klee’s essay ‘ways of studying nature’ (‘Wege des Naturstudiums’), published in the catalogue of the Bauhaus Week 1923, in which the master states the ‘sine qua non’ of all artistic work.235 Another Bauhaus-affiliated person who is also associated with Matterns social environment, the Hungarian journalist and art critic Ernst (Ernő) Källai introduced the term ‘Bioromanticism’ (‘Bioromantik’) around 1930. In Sozialistische Monatshefte he described a ‘visionary internalisation of the image of nature’, which he believed led several contemporary artists to 'pictorial primordial signs of life' – between ‘cheerful’, ‘picturesque arabesques’ and a ‘chaotic rootling in the earthly intestines’.236 Internationally, in these years a tendency towards biomorphic art and


design can be observed that would continue all the way into the 1960s.\(^{237}\) Countless artists express it as their main motivation to create their work 'as a fruit' out of their inner self (Hans Arp); the way nature creates things out of given principles, in order to have them develop a life of their own as 'spiritually breathing beings' (Kandinsky); contributing to the ever lasting 'stream of life' (Malevitch).\(^{238}\) This is the line of thinking the Bornimers can be associated with.

When Matter and Hammerbacher graduated from the horticultural college at Berlin-Dahlem in 1926, the consensus prevalent amongst the leading landscape architects about the modern architectonic design principle was about to break up. However, the standard of axial symmetry and straight formal definition in garden design, fully established since the last decade of the Wilhelmine Empire, was still the rule. In the professional journals the debate about style can be traced all the way through to the mid-1920s. Even in recent accounts of Modernist landscape architecture, designers of asymmetrical organic gardens lacking the surprising immediate visual impact of the architectonic styles are often left out completely or counted as 'moderate moderns', praised for the usability of their designs but from an aesthetic point of view considered conservative.\(^{239}\) The Bornimers' self-conception contrasted radically with such an evaluation. As late as 1936, Hammerbacher described the asymmetrical layouts, as championed by them, as 'something new and


237 Wünsche has pointed at this in the quoted text, referring to several publications such as exhibition catalogs: I. Wünsche: ‘Life into Art’, in: P. Cowther and I. Wünsche (eds), *Meanings of Abstract Art* (2012), pp. 9–29 (9).


different'. As an example she referred to a garden by Hübotter designed for the Reichsgartenschau Dresden of that year. Hammerbacher might be exaggerating; during the years after 1926 can be observed an increasing implementation of modernist garden expression with free composition. Yet, while one of the key characteristics of Modernism is the break with historicism, some of the gardens presented in contemporary as well as in today's publications as avant-garde examples show a rigid classicist structure and symmetry. Their designers tried of course to translate classicisms into a contemporary language – stripped of appliquéd ornament and expressing modern ideas about the use of colour; but the consideration of non-geometrical designs is sometimes missing in publications in this field. Mattern's first known work, the garden at Helmstedt for the Kraigers of 1926 discussed later on, gains a special significance considering how radical such a free approach to form in garden design still was at that time (Figures 36a+b). Already some years before, though, the most progressives like Maasz or Migge, for whom Mattern briefly worked at the beginning of his professional career, and later Valentien and Hübotter, critically developed the Architectonic Garden into a generously structured social space, embracing the breakaway from the traditional forms and turning towards a pragmatic functionalism that allowed for a wide range of uses. Valentien for example, however, preferred to organise the space with the help of subtle suggestions of central axes under denotation of centre points by positioning of steps, set-up areas for seating or other built elements. The Bornimers in contrast produced free arrangements. In direct comparison, their gardens display the greater step towards abstraction (Figures 39a+b). Maasz' combination of the new taste for naturalism with

---


a rigid geometrical general layout illustrates another point where the Bornimers chose a different path.²⁴²

Despite their rejection of geometry, the early reformists' endeavours still resonate in Mattern's and Hammerbacher's work. Migge, for example, had pointed at the problem of disconnection between outside and inside rooms, due to the popular raised ground floors of historicist villas and a lack of larger openings. The sphere of dwelling was further distanced from the garden by terraces and monumental stairs.²⁴³ As we will see, these were issues explicitly addressed both by the new architecture and by Mattern (Fig. 40). Their variant of the dwelling garden was their contribution to garden modernism.

²⁴² See his monograph of 1926: H. Maasz, Kleine und grosse Gärten (1926). Cf. Gustav Amman's protest against these ideas as mentioned below.

II. a Learning to see: A Wandervogel youth in the land of fables

 [...] it is not essential to convey a specific theoretical knowledge, nor to enable the hand to perform certain external manipulations. But it is essential to train the artistic sensitivity, to make the hand and the eye a servant to the fantasy.244

(Konrad Lange, 1901)

Mattern was born the 27 of November 1902 as the sixth out of eight children.245 He grew up in Hofgeismar, a Northern Hessian town, Protestant in character, in the Prussian Province of Hesse-Nassau, which until the annexation in 1866 was the independent Landgraviate of Hesse-Cassel. Hofgeismar until today is imbedded in a scenic landscape, rich in both wooded and extensively cultivated land, surrounded by the low, forested mountains of Teutoburger Wald (Teutoburg Forest), Egge Hills, Habichtswald and Reinhardswald. It is a mystical landscape famously steeped in history and folk mythology. Not far from Hofgeismar, near Detmold, stands the Hermannsdenkmal, a site of romantic-nationalist worship and memorial to the Battle of the Teutoburg Forest (Varusschlacht) in which united Germanic tribes destroyed three


Roman legions led by the general Varus. Northern Hesse is also connected to the folk- and fairy tales written down by the brothers Grimm who lived in Kassel, a historically important city some 25 kilometres south of Hofgeismar. Mattern's feeling for the (material) landscape and his ecological conscience were based on the given beauties of his picturesque home region. Thanks to his many expeditions with the local group of the youth movement, Mattern was extremely familiar with the detailed characteristics of this landscape: years later, when he applied for a job in the road-planning project, he claimed to know Lower Hesse, Upper Hesse, the Harz area, the Rhön area, and Westphalia 'completely' and 'seen from the country road'.

Another probable influence is his Protestant mother's lovingly cared-for vegetable and flower garden. His serious father, an armourer and devout Catholic, had worked hard to reach a position in the local post administration to earn his family a decent living, but always felt slightly humiliated by his wife's Protestant background. The horrifying reports by Mattern's second-oldest brother Hans, who volunteered in the First World War, set the basis for Hermann Mattern's pacifism.

One particular feature of Mattern's youth mentioned in one of his first publications as well as in his last published curriculum vitae is the influence of classes from his

246 ‘[...] sind Gebiete, die ich wirklich von der Landstraße her vollständig kenne. Ich habe die freie Zeit meiner Jugend wandernd dort verbracht.’ See the application letter to Seifert, 09/06/1934, as shown in: Charlotte Reitsam, ‘Der Landschaftsanwalt Hermann Mattern: Aufgaben und Konflikte’, Stadt+Grün, 03 (2003), 20–24 (21) (the text is illustrated with Mattern's original application letter).

247 Fabian Zimmermann (Mattern's grandson), personal communication, 10/01/2008.

248 Ibid.

art teacher Adolf Faust (1882–1945) at the Hofgeismar Gymnasium (Fig. 41). Mattern kept in touch with the Faust family even after his teacher’s death, and one of his first documented design sketches for a garden was for his teacher, somewhat reminiscent of Migge’s May garden and probably the only perfectly axisymmetrical design Mattern ever produced (Fig. 42; cf. 30–32).

**Under the auspices of a ‘true artist’**

Some details of Faust’s tuition are documented and his grandson attests to their focus on ‘learning to see’. In the morning, at the beginning of his class, Faust used to ask the pupils what they had seen on their way to school. His grandson speculatively mimicked his grandfather with the words: ‘You surely did not come here blindly, you must have seen something!’ Or Faust entered the room covering his mouth asking if he had a beard or not. When the answer to such ‘tests’ came wrong, he urged the class to pay more attention to the details of their everyday environment. Thus he made clear that ‘to see’ does not always have the same meaning, and that seeing

---


253 Ibid.

254 If not stated otherwise, all details after the memory of Klaus Vondermühl, personal communication, 02/03/2012.
consciously should be trained. To teach young people to perceive and to respect humans was the most cherished objective of his task as a teacher.

Faust came from the Saarland and following his father’s example, he went to Kassel to attend the art college\textsuperscript{255} from 1908 till 1911 to train as an artist and gain a certificate to qualify as a teacher for secondary schools.\textsuperscript{256} His own artistic work was not fixed to one particular style. Instead, he seemed to have been receiving a scope of influences from Romantic landscape painting over the Nazarene movement (or the Pre-Raphaelites) and Impressionism to Expressionism.\textsuperscript{257} He revered Caspar David Friedrich and intensely engaged with Expressionists like Ludwig Meidner (1884–1966) and the Austrian illustrator Alfred Kubin (1877–1959), and with the Impressionist Max Slevogt (1868–1932). Also New Objectivity seems to resonate in his later work. Widely known in his home region are Faust’s wood-cuts of rural scenes and more detailed nature studies of pieces of coarse wood debris or groups of old trees and similar, reproduced in the periodical of the local history society until today (Fig. 43). Some of them resemble medieval block book illustrations, others show a more impressionistic manner. Faust was acquainted with the former military painter Theodor Rocholl, an influential professor at the Düsseldorf Art Academy, who in Northern Hesse is remembered for saving the nearby Hutewald around the Sababurg – a type of anthropogenic forest shaped by its former used as a wood pasture –, which through his initiative in 1907 became one of Germany’s first nature reserves. This illustrates how special the regional woodland surrounding Hofgeismar was already considered in the period of Mattern’s youth, rich in ancient trees and

\textsuperscript{255} \textit{Kunstgewerbeschule}, which is not equivalent to the Kassel Art Academy mentioned in chapter II-j.


atmospheric sites. One was the castle Sababurg, known as the setting of the bothers Grimm's fairytale 'Little Briar Rose' (English version 'Sleeping Beauty'), and another was Beberbeck, one of the five Prussian state stud farms. The nearby Reinhardswald is still one of Germany's most expansive and least populated wooded landscapes, home of a varied and elsewhere extinct flora and fauna including the Wildcat (*Felis sylvestris sylvestris*), the Black Stork (*Ciconia nigra*) and the Red Kite (*Milvus milvus*). Ancient trees, as in the unique Hutewald with today 450 trees, bear witness to traditional forestry techniques and other cultural uses. For Faust, however, retreating into a provincial country town also meant keeping aloof from the artistic avant-garde in the bigger cities.

Faust never became a famous artist, and exhibitions of his work received mixed reviews, but amongst his students were a number of creatives of considerable importance. Besides Mattern, there was the ceramicist Theodor Bogler, his younger brother Friedrich Wilhelm, a painter who did not survive the war, and the renowned glass painter Hans-Gottfried von Stockhausen, as well as several artists and architects of lesser importance known on a regional level. In the former district administration town of Hofgeismar, now incorporated into the district of Kassel, Faust's role as artist and teacher for arts education – music, theatre and fine arts – was momentous enough for two commemorative events. The first was an exhibition of his work on the occasion of the opening of the new school building in 1953 at the edge of town, now named Albert-Schweitzer School. At that time, Mattern was commissioned to design the entire school grounds, but that project has disappeared almost completely under another extension of the school campus some 50 years later. At the first commemoration day, a handwritten note from Faust's sketchbooks was presented as a Leitmotif of his career: 'The school is a living piece of homeland


259 Ibid.
[Heimat], no coincidental background, in front of which school life takes place. This sentence speaks clearly of the responsibility Faust strove to fulfil in his educational work. If descriptions of Faust’s work sound euphoric, his career as an artist was compromised by his dedication to teaching, to his engagement with the youth movement, to conducting several choirs, and to his function as church organist. The modesty of his artistic career should be seen in this context, which limited his opportunity to elaborate a personal style. For an art educator artistic maturity could have been seen as ossification. He was rewarded with the title of Studienrat, but the he struggled all his life with the conflict between his artistic and his pedagogical careers. Nonetheless, by the end he had compiled an oeuvre vast enough to contain some paintings considered masterly, and which led to the last exhibition that he experienced himself, 30/07-30/08/1944 in Wilhemshöhe castle’s ballroom building.

At the second commemoration event, on the occasion of the new school’s 50th anniversary, a leaflet was produced containing insightful recollections of former students of Faust’s. They reported that he had focussed on having the students develop their own talents, while earlier teachers had merely let them copy by drawing. Under Faust they learned to use their senses critically:

He taught us to truly listen and to use our eyes for concentrated, corporeal and colour-oriented seeing. The world of the third dimension was opened up to us. With devotion we


264 The architect Edelhard Theil, in the exhibition leaflet Adolf Faust (2003).
drew isometrically and we foreshortened. Often singing at the same time.

We learned to take in, to invent and to develop spatial and colour compositions.265

Faust taught his students various etching, drawing and painting techniques. The classes were often held outside at the Sababurg or in the villages, where the traditional Lower-Saxon half-timbered houses provided colourful motifs.266 'He also respected all those farmerly handcrafted shapes in the household and the building, as long as they spoke of a pure sentiment and or displayed a werkstoffgerechte (true to the material) kind of individual Gestalt.'267 Such objects, which he had found in old attics or farm houses, Faust used as models for his drawing classes.268

Faust's own notes, kept by his family, enable us to reconstruct his teaching programme in considerable detail:

I. Free creative production269

a) Objectification of an idea
b) Free rhythmic creative production with line and plane
c) Free learning with volumes


268 Peter Andrae in the exhibition leaflet Adolf Faust (2003).

269 Art terms are generally difficult to translate. ‘Freies Gestalten’: There is no exact equivalent for the German verb ‘gestalten’ in English. The closest to its meaning is ‘to design’, but here it includes drawing and other techniques that are usually not called design in English. Kandinsky’s ‘Fläche’ is commonly translated with ‘plane’, although ‘area’ might be even more correct as ‘plane’ implies a third dimension, while the German ‘Fläche’ in a painting could just as well mean simply an area filled with colour.
d) Linoleum cut

II. Training of the faculty of imagination

The form elements will be sought in nature. Structuring of the landscape by paths; space, village and house.

The human body with its proportions and means of expression. Machines, inoperative and in movement, buildings and parts of buildings, household appliances and furniture.

III. Training of the faculty to observe

The Lower-Saxon farmhouse (house gable, beam order, gate, door, window, roof, wood carvings, interior spaces, vestibule, staircase, railing). Parts of the landscape (bridge, clump of trees, bank border, stone quarry, sunken lane, avenues)

IV. Drawing from the microscope. Symmetrical representation. Light and shade. Intersections and foreshortenings.

Still life: The objects will be assembled following certain laws, and the student searches to find these laws and to represent them.

Man, animal, machine.

While drawing, the colours of the appearance will be sought.

V. Type-font after own re-creation, under particular consideration of its significance as surface decoration and its use for book printing and in advertising. Decorative work.

VI. Reflection on art

Architecture: basic forms and particulars of the building: column, plinth, frieze.

Arrangement of the windows, the moulding, door and gate, bay and balcony, profiles, column shaft and capital, the round arch and the cross vault, pointed arch and buttress, transept, crossing and cupola/ground plan.\textsuperscript{270}

\textsuperscript{270} Facsimile reprint of the handwritten notes and transcription in the exhibition leaflet \textit{Adolf Faust} (2003).
The study of real and natural objects had been an essential part of any reformist art pedagogue since around 1900. While the artistic means of expression in school classes were, until the 1920s, still focused almost exclusively on drawing, progressive tendencies moved towards a 'close connection with nature' and consideration of an 'artistic individuality'.\textsuperscript{271} Well into the 20th century, the copying of classical ornamentation – above all elements from renaissance decorative art – and, before that, formalist, mathematically-based drawing exercises, had represented the standard curriculum of art education for children in Germany.\textsuperscript{272} So, while not extraordinary in light of the reform discussion since the turn of the century, Faust's systematic listing of landscape elements and treatment of type fonts was unusual in a curriculum for a provincial early-20th-century Gymnasium.

The pedagogical principle of 'Sehen lernen' – teaching the capacity to see – emerged around 1890 and developed with the reformist writings of authors from different fields of different ideological standing, such as Georg Hirth (writer), August Julius Langbehn (philosopher), and the art historians Konrad Lange, Alfred Lichtwark, and Adalbert Matthaei. The new theories of perception by psychologists such as Ernst Mach, Christian von Ehrenfels (Gestalt theory) and Hans Cornelius were instrumental in this.\textsuperscript{273} Triggered by the German Empire's embarrassingly poor performance at the World Exhibitions during the second half of the 19th century, such as in Paris (1867) or Chicago (1893), a reform of art education was officially launched. This led to the establishment of 'didactic' museums after the model of the South Kensington Museum in London, opened in 1857 to teach the people in


aesthetic matters. Vienna’s Kunstgewerbemuseum was founded in 1863, that of Berlin in 1868. Towards the end of the 19th century, probably also as a result of this advance, drawing classes became regarded as fundamental parts of a modern education for children. At the beginning of the 20th century, such classes were referred to as ‘art teaching’ (‘Kunstunterricht’ instead of ‘drawing lessons’), which attributed to them a new significance. The importance of individual expression was widely acknowledged, and classes passing beyond the copying of picture books with classical ornaments became standard at Gymnasiums throughout the German Empire.

It seems likely that Faust was influenced by the discussions at the so-called ‘Kunsterziehertage’, the ‘Art Teachers Days’ organised in 1901, 1903, and 1905, which introduced ‘an impressionistic type of naturalism’ as the prevailing doctrine. It emphasised the ‘receptive’ aspect in the appreciation of art ‘as well as the pragmatic dimension of drawing after nature, after “forms of life” and objects’.274 When the Expressionists, with their rejection of the entire bourgeois tradition in art, questioned the impressionistic drawing of natural elements, they demanded a fundamental reorientation of the drawing classes. Then, during the 1920s the ideal of a holistic artistic (‘musische’) education at schools emerged and was promoted by artists connected with the Bauhaus, such as Walter Gropius, Johannes Itten, Wassily Kandinsky and Paul Klee.276 Highly influential was a reassessment of childish creativity, such as by Gustav Friedrich Hartlaub (1884–1963), from 1923 an important museum director at Mannheim, who published annotated photographs of


children’s drawings in his book *Der Genius im Kinde* (‘The genius inside the child’, 1922). The year 1924 is named in the literature as crucial, as ‘substantial numbers of drawing teachers’ now received ‘Expressionism and Hartlaub’s phenomenology’, though under ‘specifically petty-bourgeois narrowed-down auspices’. Lebenschosophie and the citation of ‘spirit’ exerted a strong influence under an enthusiastic reception of cultural critics like Ludwig Klages, Paul de Lagarde, Julius Langbehn and Oswald Spengler.

In the light of these developments – if we assume his quoted curriculum was still applied unchanged in the second decade of the century and beyond – Faust’s teachings may not have been exceptionally progressive. On the other hand, singing while drawing, exploring the countryside and experiencing different visual as well as performing arts by turns appears to reflect the more holistic education of the reform schools. The reason for the special impact of Faust’s teachings and for the lasting impression he made on the pupils of the Hofgeismar Gymnasium, however, lay in his personal design of the classes. His memory is cherished like the memory of family; one of his former pupils has described him as a ‘fatherly friend’. With his talent to recognise and to further artistic predispositions in his pupils, Faust’s merit was acknowledged already in the 1920s. For this legacy he is remembered.


279 Ibid.


The Wandervogel and the youth movement of the German Empire

A significant move of Faust was his foundation of a local Wandervogel group.282 The Wandervogel youth movement was founded in Berlin but soon spread through, mainly protestant Germany, with Northern Hesse a core area for its proliferation. Faust established the Wandervogel in Hofgeismar in 1913, the year of the famous meeting on the Hohe Meißner mountain, not far from Hofgeismar (Figures 44, 45). Accompanied on the guitar by Faust, his students enthusiastically sang the songs of the youth movement, which reflected the general rediscovery of a forgotten folklore heritage.283

The German youth movement was significant for many 20th-century landscape architects born around 1900.284 Virtually all the noted ones from Mattern’s generation have mentioned its influence not merely on their professional development, but also as moulding their vision of life in general.285 In the milieu of the Landschaftsanwälte (Landscape Advocates), to be discussed in chapter II-h below, membership in a youth


285 Wolschke-Bulmahn has investigated the membership in the youth movement amongst landscape architects, finding the following personalities, including influential regional planners (brackets state the respective youth group): Jürgen Barth (Dj 1.11), Josef Breloer (Wandervogel), Konrad Buchwald (Jugendsehaft der Deutschen Freischar), Walter Christaller (Wandervogel), Gerd Däumel (Dj 1.11), Hermann Göritz (Wandervogel), Gerda Gollwitzer (Deutsch-Nationaler Jugendbund), Gerhard Hinz (Stettiner Wandervogel, Neupfadfinder), Wilhelm Hübotter (Wandervogel), Gert Kragh (Jugendsehaft der Deutschen Freischar), Reinhold Lingner (group of membership unclear), Erhard Mading (Jugenddeutscher Orden), Hermann Mattern (Wandervogel), Konrad Meyer (Wandervogel), Max Müller (Wandervogel), Theodor Nietzsche (Jugenddeutscher Orden), Ernst Preising (Wandervogel, Deutsche Freischar), Wilhelm Rademacher (Wandervogel), Alwin Seifert (Wandervogel), Josef Umlauf (Sudetendeutscher Wandervogel, Sudetendeutsche Freischar). J. Wolschke-Bulmahn, Auf der Suche nach Arkadien (1990), pp. 259–60.
group was seen as a useful prerequisite for successful work, almost sufficient to guarantee a qualification for the job. Mattern considered his membership in the Wandervogel significant enough to mention it in his letter to Seifert when he applied for a position as Landscape Advocate. Amongst the group of Landscape Advocates, roughly one third had been members of the Wandervogel.

The Wandervogel was the first group of what later became the association of youth organisations generally referred to as Free Youth Movement. It had officially been established in 1901 in the Berlin district of Steglitz by a small group around the authoritarian but charismatic young Karl Fischer (born 1881). Its origins lay in a study circle founded some years earlier, in 1896, at the Steglitz Grammar School by the student Hermann Hoffmann. Despite the relatively small number of members – at the cusp of its popularity probably below 60,000 – it became a highly influential nation-wide organisation. Its geographical distribution reflected its strongly Lutheran Protestant character, for it reached the strongest following in the Berlin-Brandenburg metropolitan region, in Lower Saxony and North Rhine Westphalia, while in the Catholic regions it was almost absent. The region where Northern

---

286 As translation for the term Landschaftsanwalt (plural: Landschaftsanwälte) Gröning suggests 'landscape director', 'state landscape office' and 'attorney at landscape'. Here, the literal translation 'landscape advocate' is used as it expresses the landscape architects' task of advocating 'the interests of the landscape', cf.: Gert Gröning, 'Teutonic Myth, Rubble, and Recovery: Landscape Architecture in Germany', in The Architecture of Landscape, 1940–1960, ed. by Marc Treib (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), pp. 120–53 (121).

287 See the application letter to Seifert, 09/06/1934, as shown in: Charlotte Reitsam, 'Der Landschaftsanwalt Hermann Mattern: Aufgaben und Konflikte', Stadt+Grün, 03 (2003), 20–4 (21).

288 Charlotte Reitsam, Reichsautobahn im Spannungsfeld von Natur und Technik: Internationale und interdisziplinäre Verflechtungen (Saarbrücken: VDM, 2009), p. 78. For the complex topic of Alwin Seifert's preference of Wandervogel members see the same publication.


Hesse, Lower Saxony and Thuringia met could be considered its 'heartland'. It was not far from here that Mattern grew up, and his hometown Hofgeismar is mentioned as one of its 'geographical landmarks', and a centre of a socialist circle within the Wandervogel.\textsuperscript{292} The motivation for the foundation of the Wandervogel was 'an unpolitical form of opposition to a civilization that had little to offer the young generation, a protest against its lack of vitality, warmth, emotion, and ideals'.\textsuperscript{293} The movement sprung from a widespread, generally anti-urban pre-First-World-War zeitgeist felt largely within the protestant bourgeois milieu. Due to this background, it amounted to an indirect cultural criticism of the recent transformations of modern, increasingly materialist society and its industrialisation processes. As a result the cultural landscape that had been for centuries unchanged was rediscovered through hikes and celebrated as a symbol of the harmonic unity between man and nature in a pre-democratic society. Basically, the membership in the youth movement seems to have awakened these young men and women to the impact of continuing industrialisation on the cultural landscape of their home region. Their key concern was a predominantly romantic re-engagement with the grown, as well as the traditional cultural landscape. The expeditions ('Fahrten') of the Wandervogel were celebrated as the movement's 'lifeblood'.

[...][This] provided the movement with its own means of identity, for it captured the quintessence of the Wandervogel's emancipatory dynamic and constituted the foundation of its collectivist experience.\textsuperscript{294}


Apart from that, the *Fahrten* were also the original contribution by the Wandervogel to the Lebensreform movement, the life reform in general.\textsuperscript{295} In contrast to the 'escapist, "back to Nature" movement' with which it is sometimes characterised, the Wandervogel comprised a 'definite reformist-cultural constituent', which attracted reformists and inspired above all a reform of the school system in Germany - another contribution to the general life-reform movement.\textsuperscript{296}

Officially, independence of politics was one of its highest paradigms. This was provoked on the one hand by the extreme political turbulences of the time, and on the other hand by its affiliation with a sophisticated but apolitical median bourgeoisie.\textsuperscript{297} The Wandervogel recruited its members almost exclusively from this class. On a social level in the beginning this movement was progressive, creating a space of freedom for young pupils between the age of 6 and 11 in a society defined by conventions and the rituals of the chauvinist Kaiserreich.\textsuperscript{298} At the same time its apolitical demeanour has been denounced for 'prevent[ing] the development of any concrete belief in freedom amongst the sons and daughters of what should have been the Weimar establishment'.\textsuperscript{299} Thus indirectly it 'greatly assisted the Nazis in their seizure of power'.\textsuperscript{300} On the one hand it was 'hostile to the hurrah patriotism of the beer halls, the


\textsuperscript{295} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{297} Peter D. Stachura, *The German Youth Movement 1900—1945: An Interpretative and Documentary History* (London: Macmillan, 1981), p. 20–21. The working class youth tended not to have the time and money to join the rather elitist Wandervogel. 'Lower middle-class youths usually joined paramilitary, nationalist, sports or confessional organisations (ibid.).


\textsuperscript{300} Ibid.
nationalist swagger and pomposities of official Germany'. On the other hand, as Walter Laqueur has pointed out, its members also lived and thus indirectly 'accepted as articles of faith' parts of the doctrine to which they were exposed by their parents and school teachers: 'The German youth movement talked politics, as M. Jourdain talked prose, without being aware of it'. The historical importance of the youth movement as a German phenomenon should not be underestimated. Prominent figures from all areas of German public life 'who were born between, roughly, 1890 and 1920' have referred to their experiences in a youth group as fundamental 'for the later shaping of their personal, social and political attitudes'. This applies to liberals as well as conservatives, and even to parts of the Nazi elite.

The Wandervogel of the early phase, like other branches of the youth organisations referred to as Free Youth Movement, was not attached to any confession or political party. It has been called 'a special and quite unique German phenomenon [...]—a movement of youth, by youth and for youth'. It was therefore different from the scout movements in other European countries. Unofficially, many groups had right-wing conservative and völkisch bearing—while at the same time loudly claiming their detachment from politics. A reverence for the 'Nordic spirit' was prevalent throughout the movement. This was reflected in the literature popular among the youth movement, which on the one hand was characterised by the

303 '[...] and even notorious National Socialists such as Rudolf Hess, Commandant of Auschwitz; Heinrich Himmler, Reichsführer of the SS; Adolf Eichmann, who was responsible for the deportation of hundreds of thousands of Jews to extermination camps; and Baldur von Schirrach, head of the Hitler Youth'. P. D. Stachura, The German Youth Movement (1981), p. 3.
304 Ibid.
promotion of abstinence from alcohol and premature sexual intercourse, and on the other promoting a pathetic nationalist dream about ‘Germany’s re-awakening’ to long lost glory. After WWI the youth movement became increasingly politicised, finally representing a wide variety of political views, from extreme left to extreme right.\(^{307}\)

The group which Mattern frequented in his youth was non-political. Adolf Faust, the founder and leader is said to have been politically naïve and, despite later joining the NSDAP, seems to not have identified with Nazi ideology, as a former Jewish student of his has testified.\(^{308}\) A reference made in the course of the investigation into Mattern’s political past conducted by the Nazi authorities claims that Mattern had indeed been a member of ‘the apolitical scout movement’\(^{309}\).

In some respects the spirit of the times underlying the youth movement also resonated in the art movement Expressionism. After the WWI, Expressionism in Literature – with authors such as Stefan George, Hermann Hesse, Hugo von Hoffmannsthal, Rainer Maria Rilke, Carl Friedrich Georg Spitteler, Georg Trakl – also found entry into the Wandervogel. This was the result of former members of youth movement groups becoming organised into student unions, which were associated with the youth movement after the establishment of the Free German Youth in 1913.\(^ {310}\) 1913 was the year of the most spectacular single event of the Youth Movement: the First Free-German Youth Day (Erster Freideutscher Jugendtag), which took place the 11\(^{th}\) and 12\(^{th}\) of October near Kassel. Mattern’s attendance at this seems certain; for together with his colleague Hübott he was involved in organising remembrance celebrations on the occasion of the meeting’s 50th


\(^{309}\) (Mattern file, BAB, R 4606/221). The concerning statement was made by an unknown Kreisleiter (of Potsdam) under Wilhelm Kube (Gauleiter of Mark Brandenburg from 1933 until 1936) speaking out in Mattern’s defence. It is not know whether this politician was a personal friend trying to help.

anniversary—probably on the level of a meeting of old friends—at the original scene on Hoher Meißner, ‘on which in 1913 the youth was searching for the “Blue Flower”’. Over several years around 1960 (c. 1952–1964) Mattern fought emphatically, but without success, against the destruction of the characteristic mountain shape by mining. This wooded mountain lies approximately 60 kilometres linear distance South-East of Mattern’s hometown Hofgeismar. The First Free-German Youth Day had as its motto the right of self-determination in an oppressively authoritarian society. Here the educational reformer Gustav Wyneken, the writer Ferdinand Avenarius and the 25-year-old Knut Ahlborn of the Deutsche Akademische Freischar (‘German Academic Voluntary Corps’) spoke to some 3000 assembled people (Fig. 44). They demanded the freedom for German youth to live the life they wanted to live. The different groups behind this meeting came together in a federation called Freideutsche Jugend (Free-German Youth). They published a statement known as the Meissner Formula, attributed to Avenarius (the last two sentences were ancillary and not signed by all groups):

Free German Youth, on their own initiative, under their own responsibility, and with deep sincerity, are determined independently to shape their own lives.

For the sake of this inner freedom, they will take united action under any and all circumstances. All meetings of Free German Youth are free of alcohol and smoking.

---


313 This translated version is quoted in: P. D. Stachura, The German Youth Movement (1981), pp. 32–33.
This paragraph, however short and general, was a striking provocation against the traditional educational concepts of the German Empire. The meeting was organised to show the solidarity between a variety of different youth-oriented movements for the reformation of society, education and life style. It went down in history as a protest against the chauvinist-patriotic festivities of the Empire held during the same weekend near Leipzig, on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of the Battle of the Nations and the completion of its memorial, the gigantic Völkerschlachtdenkmal (Fig. 46).314

However important the experience of the Youth Movement was for Mattern, he never shared the uncritical reverence widespread amongst its members. By the mid-1920s, under the influence of the Werkbund, the rationalism of the Bauhaus under Gropius, and other progressive reformist ideas like the Allotment Garden Movement (Kleingartenbewegung) as promoted by Leberecht Migge, Mattern was at least showing subtle signs of self-critical reflection in regard to the romanticism of his youth. This self-reflection took the form of ironic references to the tendency for an alleged 'cosiness'—‘Behaglichkeit’—in his earliest garden designs.315 This appreciation sets him apart from those contemporaries who would glorify the Youth Movement and their memories of it as the reminders of a 'better time'. At the same time, his concrete memories are ineradicable pictures sitting in his soul, caused by a deeply, almost religiously felt unity of his body with the fabric of surrounding nature.

This morning it was marvellous—very strong, heavy fog drew downwards, which drenched you when riding through. Memories of trips arose. How one awoke early in the open under the soaked flysheet, then began to shiver with cold yet being so blissfully happy, as one was closely connected with all that was alive out there. As one stepped out of the wet enclosure, the air was warm and only the dew on the ground cooled, and then it was a

315 Letter by Mattern to Hammerbacher, without no., 10/12/1926, EHH.
barefoot race through the high grass.

Listen, I always have to think of a house, out in the forest or at a lake—out of which we
would sneak early at sunrise—hand in hand. You know, I believe we’d feel well with that.316

The role played by the Youth Movement for Mattern personally stems from its early
period around the meeting on Hoher Meißner. Growing up in a rural, in parts almost
primordial seeming district, Mattern would not have shared the longing for lost
nature that might have motivated city dwellers to join the youth movement.317 This
becomes evident in his later distance to the conservative tradition of nature
conservation and in his decidedly rational reasoning in connection to landscape
planning, as discussed in chapter II-k. Generally, the references he made to his
experiences with the Wandervogel were revolving around his individual and sensory
experience of natural forces and a fascination for the emotional experience of unity
with nature. Even specifically with regard to his design approach to gardens, he
reflected in quite a personal way:

How does that, which is moved by [experience of] youth,318 express itself. That the spaces are
not yet machines? Through the sentimentality of the intended homeliness? I suspect that some
of it is influenced by the colours. The difference lies above all in the fact, that I want to allow

316 ‘Heut früh war es wundervoll – ganz starker, schwerer Nebel zog zur Erde, der einen beim
durchfahren ganz durchnästete. Fahrtenerinnerungen stiegen auf. Wie man früh im Freien unter der
durchfeuchten Zeltplane wach wurde, an zu frösteln fing und doch so selig glücklich war, da man
mit dem draußen Lebendigen eng verknüpft war. Stieg man aus der nassen Umhüllung so war die
Luft warm nur der Tau auf dem Boden kühlte und sausend ging’s barfuß durch’s hohe Gras. Du ich
muß immer an ein Haus denken, draußen im Wald oder am See – aus dem wir uns früh morgens mit
Sonnenaufgang herausschleichen – Hand in Hand. Du ich glaube es wäre uns wohl dabei.’ Mattern
in a letter to Herta Hammerbacher, without no., 16/06/1926, EHH.

317 Wolschke-Bulmahn’s seminal study has linked membership in the Youth Movement with

318 ‘[...] das Jugend bewegte [...]’ This is an idiosyncratic way of referring to the youth movement,
interpreting the term ‘movement’ literally as ‘moving the youth’.
for a certain flexibility in space. [...] In addition to this the fact, that I proceed step-by-step depending on how I can myself process building materials, I cannot determine a construction without being convinced of its stability and usefulness. Theoretically I am a tinkerer.\textsuperscript{319}

It is not always easy to understand fully the very personal messages Mattern shared with his loved one, the landscape architect Herta Hammerbacher (1900–1984), in his early letters. What seems clear is that he was self-reflective and critical, and this alone was a basis for his progressive development: he tried to understand the influences he received while being open to the influx of new ones. His self-characterisation as a tinkerer expresses this openness for experimentations, and we shall return to it at a later stage.

II. b Becoming a landscape architect in Germany in the 1920s

The differentiation between utilitarian garden and pleasure garden [...] is a purely subjective and time-bound one, it has nothing to do with art or economy, it is the result of the changing social and aesthetic attitudes of the garden maker.320

(Leberecht Migge, 1925)

From the time of Mattern's apprenticeship in tree and perennial nurseries not much is known.321 Starting on the 21st of April 1922, his first experiences were with the firm of Conrad Ullrich at Kassel Wilhelmshöhe, a landscape gardening business that also included a tree nursery.322 He went on to work in the orchards and vegetable gardens of Rittergut Kalbsburg, a manor in Northern Hesse,323 moving on to Goos & Koenemann in Niederwalluf at the river Rhine in Hesse, a nursery for trees, shrubs and perennials internationally renowned for their many Iris hybrids.324 Until 5th of September 1924 Mattern learned and worked at the Victor Teschendorff tree and rose

320 'Die Unterscheidung von Nutz- und Lustgärten [...] ist eine rein subjektive und zeitgebundene, sie hat mit Kunst oder Wirtschaft an sich nichts zu tun, sie ist Ergebnis der wechselnden sozialen oder ästhetischen Grundeinstellung der jeweiligen Gartenmenschen.' Leberecht Migge, 'Gartentechnik und Gartenkunst', Gartenschönheit, (1925) 68–69 (69). In the original, instead of 'garden maker' Migge used the peculiar term 'garden person' ('Gartenmensch'), possibly to express the central role of garden culture in a future society.

321 However, the beginning and end dates of his work experience are recorded in a document in the estate, including the names of all the enterprises he worked at: Typewriter-written document, EHM, folder 1 (no date, no file no. as read before the estate’s systematisation).


nursery in Cossebaude, now a district of Dresden. Teschendorff, too, was important then as one of the most notable German rose breeders.325 Here Mattern trained with an English gardener.326 Horticultural training was a precondition for being accepted at a school for garden design. In 1924 Mattern entered the famous and tradition-conscious horticultural college in Berlin, which had been named Lehr- und Forschungsanstalt für Gartenbau the previous year (Institute for Teaching and Research in Horticulture, know as LuFA). He completed the course in garden design two years later.

**Lenné's school: at the horticultural college of Berlin-Dahlem**

There were four horticultural colleges at this level in Germany by that time: the Royal Prussian Institute for Fruit- and Wine Growing at Geisenheim (Königlich Preußische Lehranstalt für Garten- und Weinbau Geisenheim, today in Hesse, founded the 19th October 1872),327 the Higher State Institute for Horticulture in Pillnitz (Höhere Staatslehranstalt für Gartenbau, near Dresden in Saxony, founded in 1922),328 the Horticultural College Weihenstephan (Staatliche Lehr- und


326 Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, 06/02/1927), EHH. He calls this Englishman ‘Grieme’ (possibly a German way of spelling ‘Greame’).

327 See the website of Geisenheim University: [www.hs-geisenheim.de/hochschule/geschichtezahlen.html](http://www.hs-geisenheim.de/hochschule/geschichtezahlen.html) (accessed 16/04/2013). The university was formed in 2013 as a merger of the venerable Geisenheim Grape Breeding Institute and the former Geisenheim Faculty of Viticulture, Oenology, Horticulture, Beverage Technology and Landscape Architecture of Rheinmain University of Applied Sciences Wiesbaden Rüsselsheim. This represented a return to the institutions origins, as research and teaching had been separated with the foundation of the Fachhochschule Rhein Main (predecessor to the Rheinmain University of Applied Science) in 1972. See also in detail: Gerd Däumel, ‘Hundert Jahre Gartenarchitektur und Landschaftspflege, Geisenheim 1872-1972’, Das Gartenamt, 8, 1972, 451-460, and Das Gartenamt, 9, 1972, 523-31.

328 [www.dresden-pilnitzer.de/7.html](http://www.dresden-pilnitzer.de/7.html) (accessed 16/04/2013). Its predecessor institute was the Gartenbauschule des Gartenbauverbandes für das Königreich Sachsen (Horticultural College of the
Forschungsanstalt für Gartenbau, in Freising, Bavaria, founded in 1923), and the LuFA in Berlin-Dahlem. All these institutions awarded the title ‘Staatlich geprüfter Gartentechniker’ (‘certified garden technician’) after a two-year course of study.

These colleges had originated in older institutions that were established towards the end of the 19th century, which can be traced back to earlier agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, orcharding or forestry schools. The relocation of the education of garden artists from the court gardens to educational institutions occurred during the period of transition from the architectonic baroque garden to the landscape garden, which brought new challenges. The school in Dahlem is known as the first college for the education of garden designers of its kind in Germany, founded after the model of the gardeners’ school at the Jardin des Plantes in Paris. The initiative for its establishment came from the first Prussian cultural minister, Karl Sigmund Franz Freiherr vom Stein zum Altenstein (1770–1840), supported by the Royal Prussian Garden Director-General, Peter-Joseph Lenné. In 1823 an official order by king

Association for Horticulture for the Kingdom of Saxony, founded in 1892, ibid.

329 It was based on a college that came into existence in 1852 as a merger of the Electoral Central Tree Nursery and an agricultural school. Both today’s Hochschule Weihenstephan University of Applied Science as well as the respective chairs at the Technische Universität München (Fruit Growing, Landscape Architecture, etc.) have their origin in this historical school. Website of the Chair of Fruit Growing (Fachgebiet Obstbau) at the Wissenschaftszentrum Weihenstephan für Ernährung, Landnutzung und Umwelt, a department of Technische Universität München: http://www.wzw.tum.de/ob/index.php?id=25 (accessed 16/04/2013); Fachhochschule Weihenstephan, Jubiläumsschrift zum 175-jährigen Bestehen der Fachhochschule mit Versuchsanstalt Weihenstephan, 1804-1979, ed. by Josef Völk (München: Obst- u. Gartenbauverlag, 1979).


332 Before the findings of a recently completed, seminal research project, Lenné has been credited with the initiative for the school, see: B. Brüsch, ‘Entwürfe zur Errichtung einer großen Gärtner-Schule’, Gartenkunst, 20, 01 (2008), 83–104 (83). About the context of the school’s foundation see, in great
Frederick II was released, resulting in the foundation of the Royal Prussian Horticultural College with a four-year curriculum in Potsdam-Wildpark the next year. It has been referred to as the mother of all horticultural colleges and its history has been proudly told many times.\footnote{333} Although some authors assume this institution was the first of its kind in Germany, in Europe, or even the oldest worldwide, it has yet to be verified.\footnote{334}

\footnote{333}{

\footnote{334}{
That legal act founded the first school that was dedicated not only to orcharding and similar, but explicitly allowed for an artistic design of gardens. This was for example emphasised in 1872 on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Verein zur Beförderung des Gartenbaus (‘Association for the Furthering of Horticulture’), when the then Royal Prussian Director-General of Gardens, Ferdinand Jühlke (1815–1893), quoted Lenné’s original intention:

a) with respect to the perfection of fruit-growing;
b) to the wakening of the senses to these branches of culture by connection of the useful with the beautiful
c) that with regard to the teaching [...] young future gardeners should be offered the the opportunity to educate themselves in the aesthetic art of the garden.335

Around 1900 the college was moved to Dahlem where it was conveniently located between the Botanical Gardens at Schöneberg (today’s Kleistpark) near the city centre, and the Royal Prussian Gardens at Potsdam. However, the Botanic Gardens were also moved to Dahlem between 1897 and 1910. The grounds used for the establishment of these and several other educational and research institutes had been part of the Royal Domain of Dahlem, a former Manor bought in 1841 by the Prussian state and partitioned in 1916 to provide for a new high-class residential district with streets, gardens and squares, including several research institutions such as the Materials

---

335 'a) in Bezug auf Vervollkommnung des Obstbaues; b) auf die Erweckung des Sinnes für diese Culturzweige in Verbindung des Nützlichen mit dem Schönen und c) dass in Beziehung auf den Unterricht darauf Bedacht genommen werden möge, jungen angehenden Gärtnern eine Gelegenheit zu eröffnen, sich in der ästhetischen Gartenkunst auszubilden.' Ferdinand Jühlke, Die Königliche Landesbaumschule (1872), p. 27.

---
Testing Office (Materialprüfungsamt) or the Astronomical Calculation Institute (Astronomisches Recheninstitut), the Secret State Archive, churches, schools, the Ethnological Museum, and spaces for the Horticultural College as well as the neighbouring new Botanical Gardens.\footnote{M. Klein, \textit{Die ehemalige Königliche Gärtner-Lehranstalt} (1994), p. 5. Decades later, the establishment of West Berlin’s Free University in this area would strongly infringe on the grounds of the older institutions. See source quoted, p. 10.} In 1919, with its translocation near the premises of the Agricultural College (Landwirtschaftliche Hochschule, at the academic level of a university), the Prussian Agricultural Minister declared that it was planned to merge the two institutions. The first step was taken five years later, when the head of the horticultural college, Theodor Echtermeyer, was appointed honorary professor at the Agricultural College. For the students, however, nothing changed. Only in was 1929 the step was taken to introduce the academic curriculum at the Agricultural College ‘under partial incorporation of the Dahlem institute’.\footnote{E. Kemmer, ‘Geleitwort’, in \textit{Festschrift zur 50. Wiederkehr der Verlegung}, ed. by TU Berlin (1953), pp. 3–5 (5).}

Considering the relative youth of the profession as a discipline with an institutionalised education, it is understandable that many of its central aspects were still being negotiated in the early twentieth century – aspects long taken for granted in other, closely related fields, such as architecture. Discussions raged over questions of the professional formation of gardeners and landscape architects, about the terms and titles used for graduation degrees and professional societies, even about the central tasks the profession was confronted with.\footnote{G. Däumel, ‘Zur Terminologie’, \textit{Das Gartenamt}, 18 (1969), 204–7 (206); D. Hennebo, ‘Gartenkünstler – Gartenarchitekt – Landschaftsarchitekt’, in \textit{Der Landschafts-Architekt}, ed. by. BDLA (1973) pp. 7–21 (11–2).} These debates were fuelled by the effects of rapid growth of urbanised areas during industrialisation, and thus by new demands created by the changing living conditions of the urban population. Connected to this was the growing involvement of municipal garden departments in efforts to improve
living conditions in the cities. Other arguments revolved around the content of
courses of instruction at horticultural colleges. With respect to Mattern's times, the
world had changed radically since those schools had been established; so an
adaptation of the curricula to these new realities was overdue. In the discussion,
carried out at society sessions, in student association meetings, and in magazine
articles, controversial positions opposed each other. Mattern and his friends Adolf
Haag, Herta Hammerbacher and Ulrich Wolf formed a group of students at the LuFA
who were promoting an academic curriculum for landscape architects.

A general conflict existed between those demanding and those opposing an
academic solution. The more traditionally-minded gardeners and landscape architects
feared a lack of orientation to practice and a sacrifice of the accumulated traditional
knowledge about plant propagation and maintenance, while the more progressive forces
deplored the shortcoming of traditional teaching in relation to the challenging planning
tasks of a modernised urban environment. Within the second group, however, different
positions could be differentiated. One group argued in favour of the installation of
courses in art academies, another preferred the Technische Hochschulen, the institutes
of technology, or the engineering colleges, while a third party suggested agricultural
colleges as the right place for a horticultural curriculum. A strong point in this
discussion was, that due to a lack of an academic degree for landscape architects, those
employed in municipal departments had to live with lower wages and less influence
compared with their colleagues in the building departments, who looked down on their

Dietmar Land and Jürgen Wenzel, Heimat, Natur und Weltstadt. Leben und Werk des

340 Herta Hammebacher, 'Frühe Arbeitsjahre Hermann Mattorns von 1926 bis ca. 1939', in Hermann
Mattern 1902–1971: Gärten, Gartenlandschaften, Häuser, ed. by Akademie der Künste, series
Akademie-Katalog, 135 (Berlin: Akademie der Künste/Technische Universität Berlin, 1982), pp. 21–3
(2)).

gardener colleagues for having no formal education in a university or engineering college.\textsuperscript{342} This situation was a central reason for landscape architects working in the public sector to demand the introduction of an academic solution at the Technische Hochschulen. At the Technische Hochschule Charlottenburg, Mattem had experienced the lectures of Heinrich Tessenow – and probably also of Hans Poelzig. He had met architecture students like Albert Speer and dreamed of an academic curriculum for landscape architects on a par with university courses in architecture.\textsuperscript{343}

During the 1920s, Mattem's school was still headed by a conservative proponent of the Lenné-Meyer-School, Theodor Echtermeyer (1863–1932). He had been the school's chief inspector since 1894 and steered a strongly horticulture-oriented course.\textsuperscript{344} Only few years before Mattem's studies the college had focused on decorative pattern design for the infamous flower carpets of the Gründerzeit, and it was still promoting the formal language of the 19th century, as if Jugendstil and the foundation of the Werkbund had never happened.\textsuperscript{345} Since 1854 the original, enlightenment-inspired concept of two different curriculums – garden design and horticulture – had been given up by order of the king, also as a result of the attempted revolution of 1848. Since then the school had suffered a continuous loss of reputation, which the establishment of a teaching post explicitly dedicated to garden


design (‘Gartenkunst’) in 1890 could only partly rehabilitate. For this teaching position the highly regarded progressive Fritz Encke (1961–1931) was engaged, later famous as garden director at Cologne. Encke had to fight against a strong conservative fraction represented by Echtermeyer, who blocked reforms. The historicist late 19th-century landscape garden was still unquestioned, and Gustav Meyer’s Lehrbuch der Schönen Gartenkunst of 1860 was the traditionalists’ bible.

By the time Mattern started his studies at the LuFA, the Architectonic Garden of the reform movement was by many considered another transient historical style. A modernised landscape garden style in the tradition of the Lenné-Meyer-School was there still held high. Willy Lange, from 1903 to 1915 lecturer for horticulture at the LuFA, promoted his ideal of a Nordic garden, teaching plant sociology with an aesthetic focus. His type of ‘nature images’ formed the ‘nature-al’ (‘natürlich’) garden — he rejected the terms ‘natural’ and ‘nature garden’ in this context — he considered suitable for the sensitive poet’s soul of the German people. In some of

351 Ibid.
his books from before WWI the racism was still relatively subdued, and his contribution is generally considered an important one and from an aesthetic point of view inspirational. As mentioned in the introduction, Hammerbacher has professed to an influence of Lange’s on the Bornim School.

Mattern’s teachers were not all reactionary: Fritz Zahn (1872–1942), who since 1903 taught garden design after Encke’s departure to Cologne, continued the reformist endeavours of his predecessor. As municipal garden director of Steglitz (later a district of Berlin) he was familiar with the challenges of planning green spaces in a modern metropolis. Zahn was only succeeded in 1938, at a time when Wiepking headed the parallel course at the university, by Hans Schiller. There is no literature about Zahn, and, apart from chronologies and lists of names, the history of early 20th-century garden design teaching institutions remains relatively obscure. However, from Mattern’s comments we can deduce that he perceived his college as an ivory tower, and with his interest in architecture, urban planning and communication design, he sought inspiration instead in Heinrich Tessenow’s lectures at the Charlottenburg Institute of Technology. Why he preferred Tessenow’s to Poelzig’s lectures is unrecorded. At the same time, Hammerbacher, probably together with Haag and Wolf, frequented the garden design class of the architect Franz Seeck (1874–1944) at Berlin’s Academy of Fine Arts. Also the garden history lectures of art historian Wolfgang Sörrensen (1882–1965) appear in Mattern’s letters, which were initially held at the educational institute of the museum of decorative arts. As a couple Hammerbacher and Mattern discussed

---


355 In 1924, this was merged with the Academy of Fine Arts (Hochschule der Bildenden Künste) into a new art college, the Vereinigte Staatsschulen für freie und angewandte Kunst, today’s University of
questions this new knowledge prompted for them, sharing their insights. With their interest in Berlin's extraordinarily progressive art scene, they were intellectualised enough to realise how much they would gain from seeking inspiration outside the LuFA. Mattern decided to look for creative input even further and started travelling to Weimar to—without formal enrolment—attend lectures at the Bauhaus school where two of his closest friends from school had gone to study (see chapter II-d). This was a crucial decision for his life, affecting his whole approach to design. In fact—as the design of gardens was the only major artistic discipline not taught as an independent class at the Bauhaus—Mattern is probably the only trained landscape architect who ever attended its classes. The other landscape architect strongly associated with the Bauhaus, Heinz Wichmann, as far as is known had no formative background in horticulture but had studied architecture at the Bauhaus. What this meant for the modern education of landscape architects when Mattern became a teacher himself will be discussed at a later stage. Ideas developed by the Bauhaus, its pedagogics and its protagonists, deeply influenced Mattern both in his professional and his private life. In his houses this is partly still evident today in the displayed works of art, the colourful painted walls, the modernist and traditional hand crafted furniture, and the love for practical but individual detail.

Hammerbacher, his great love, with whom he exchanged letters on a daily basis—sometimes two a day—, was naturally amongst his closest friends during the mid-1920s (Figures 47, 48). The two were to remain confidants all their life, which also applied to Kurt Lorenzen (†1969) with whom Mattern had studied at the horticultural

---

the Arts, where Sörrensen then taught garden history also to architecture students, see: D. Land and J. Wenzel, Heimat, Natur und Weltstadt (2005), p. 430. This chair at the Vereinigte Staatsschulen represents the origin of the later chair of Gert Gröning, which since Gröning's retirement in 2010 remains vacant.


college. After a short employment at the Nürnberg department of gardens in 1926, he would start to work in Mattern’s office a decade later, from autumn 1936. Other former fellow students mentioned are Adolf Haag, Reinhold Lingner, Otto Valentien, and Ulrich Wolf. With the exception of Lorenzen, six became prominent landscape architects. Hammerbacher, Lingner, and Wolf – like Mattern himself – also became teachers, at the department of architecture of the University of Technology (Hammerbacher), at the renowned college at Weihenstephan (Wolf), and Lingner succeeded Pniower at the Humboldt University of East Berlin. Wolf was later the Director of Gardens at Düsseldorf. Lingner became probably the most important landscape architect in East Germany, as he had a great influence through his conceptual work, for example as co-author of the ‘Kollektivplan’ that was conceived immediately after the war to reorganise the ravaged Berlin by the Planungskollektiv Berlin under Hans Scharoun as Planning Councillor. Adolf Haag became known above all for his skilfully designed private gardens and was an important artistic influence, as Mattern and Hammerbacher independently stated. It was also thanks to Haag’s contacts with builders experienced in dry stone wall building for the Swabian vineyards that Mattern was able to realise the much-praised stonemasonry at Stuttgart Killesberg in 1939. Walter Rossow (1910–1992), later a colleague in the Werkbund, studied at Dahlem from 1930 to 1932.

---

358 At least that was planned by Mattern in July 1936, see: Letter from Mattern to Seifert, Flb/137, 01/07/1936, EAS. His employment at Nürnberg is mentioned in the letters from Mattern to Hammerbacher, Nov. 26-13, 20/11/1926 and (without no.) 23/05/1927, EHH.

359 Although Valentien completed his main studies already 1919 to 1921, he received a degree as ‘staatlich geprüfter Garteninspektor’ in 1925, see: G. Gröning and J. Wolschke-Bulmahn, Grüne Biographien (1997), p. 396.


362 Recently, a monograph has been published about Rossow that could not be considered for the
fundamental new challenges to offer well-educated professionals in the field of
landscape architecture, and the horticultural college in Dahlem produced a great and
influential share of them amongst this generation in Germany.363

**Haughty role model: the influence of Georg Béla Pniower**

Specific influences on Mattern’s professional development have rarely been
recorded, but he spoke of well-known architects such as Häring, Poelzig, or Scharoun
as being inspirational. Early surviving correspondence with Hammerbacher provides
a valuable insight, particularly as all comments were related to her in confidence; yet
these letters also are proof of the influence she exerted on Mattern. The latter was
however never acknowledged by him, and it is even possible that he was not even
fully conscious himself of her seminal role.

Beside Hammerbacher, whose thinking will be explored in the next chapter,
Mattern learned much from Georg Béla Pniower, in whose office he worked at the time of
his college studies.364 Pniower had started his career working for the City Garden

---

363 Another friend Mattern mentioned was Jelitto; it is not clear which, as there are two brothers of this
name, Constantin Rudolf and Leo, who both were committed to Botany and Horticulture and
published in horticulture and garden design journals. The following titles by the Jelittos are listed in
_Schöne Steingärten für wenig Geld_ (Frankfurt an der Oder and Berlin: Trowitzsch, 1937, 4th rev.
den); Leo Jelitto, ‘Prof. Hermann Mattern 65 Jahre’, _Süddeutscher Erwerbsgärtner_, 49 (1967), 21;

by Institut für Landschaftsarchitektur, series Schriftenreihe des Institutes für Landschaftsarchitektur,
vol. 3 (Dresden: Technische Universität Dresden, 2005); Joachim Wolschke-Bulmann and Peter
Fibich, *Vom Sonnenrund zur Beispiellandschaft: Entwicklungslinien der Landschaftsarchitektur in Deutschland, dargestellt am Werk von Georg Pniower (1896 – 1960)*, ed. by Institut für
Grünplanung und Gartenarchitektur, series Beiträge zur räumlichen Planung, vol. 73 (Hannover:
University of Hannover, 2004); Peter Fibich, *Georg Pniower (1896–1960): Ein Vertreter der*
Office at Hannover. He later joined the office of Joseph Buerbaum in Düsseldorf, moving on in September 1922 to Berlin-Baumschulenweg to become head of the design section at the Spaeth tree nursery (as one of Valentien's predecessors). Already in May 1924 he progressed to work at Hermann Rothe, another renowned tree nursery in Berlin Zehlendorf, before establishing his own business in May 1925. At that point Pniower offered work placements to garden design students, Mattern among them.\textsuperscript{365} Pniower belonged to the minority of garden designers that embraced Modernism enthusiastically, and strongly promoted social aspects as a basis for the design of open spaces. He later pioneered a new profile of the profession of landscape architecture, which dealt increasingly with questions of town and landscape planning. During the Weimar Republic he occupied himself primarily with private gardens in which he sought new means of expression in close contact with modern art (Fig. 49).\textsuperscript{366} In his work, the geometry of the Architectonic Garden made way for a free arrangement of elements within a functional overall design. Pniower championed this new stylistic freedom and became one of the most influential innovators during the years of the republic. He integrated the formal features of the Architectonic Garden as well as new tendencies towards increased plasticity with a combination of plants inspired by nature.\textsuperscript{367} "For the inventive and experimental Pniower there was no recurring scheme, no fixed abiding by rules".\textsuperscript{368} His designs were described as examples of Neue Sachlichkeit (New Objectivity), with his own garden a celebrated example (Figures 50, 51). There were few such experimental


examples by other landscape architects.\textsuperscript{369} Hammerbacher saw the special appeal of Pniower’s work in the contrast between the rigid architectural framework and ‘the free rhythm of vegetal growth and the human pace that is made visible in a pattern of stepping stones’.\textsuperscript{370} One of Pniower’s biographers made out a ‘[…] compactness of the project, in which the various details are associated and integrate themselves seemingly naturally, and unalterable […] into the overall conception’.\textsuperscript{371}

When the Nazis came to power Pniower’s promising career ended as a result of his being categorised as a ‘Half-Jew’. For a while he was able to continue as an employee of his own firm registered under his wife’s name, but soon he also lost this loophole, ending up as a forced labourer in a spinning factory in the Berlin district of Zehlendorf.\textsuperscript{372} He was fully reinstated after the war and succeeded Wiepking in the chair of landscape architecture at Berlin University, but under the complex political circumstances in Berlin he opted for the East and transferred his chair to East Berlin, from where it was later moved to Dresden Technische Universität.\textsuperscript{373}


and until new research cast light on his legacy, he remained largely forgotten in the West. \(^{374}\) Ironically, while Pniower suffered persecution by the Nazis, Mattern’s career progressed steadily – later provoking Pniower to taint Mattern with the same brush as his racist contemporaries Wiepking and Seifert, all being accused of Blood-and-Soil ideology. \(^{375}\)

With the exception of Migge, Mattern only rarely acknowledged the influence of other landscape architects, but Pniower’s work he almost seemed to propagandise. About his colleague Paula von Zelewski he happily reported that Pniower’s style quickly ‘took effect’ with her: ‘she now wants to abandon the linear’. \(^{376}\) This comment not only hints at the originality and cogency of Pniower’s approach. It is also evidence of Pniower’s influence on Mattern and thereby on the Bornim School, which might put into perspective its sacrosanct status. Like that of Pniower, the style of the Bornimers usually displayed an organic plasticity and a naturalistic use of plants while retaining a modernist abstractness.

Besides acknowledging his role as an influence, Mattern also believed Pniower to be able to understand his designs better than others, and he valued his feedback, even travelling from Magdeburg. However, he was also critical, considering Pniower quite high-handed \(^{377}\) and feeling that he had surpassed the older man:

---


\(^{376}\) EHH, letter Mattern to Hammerbacher, 12/1926 (exact date unknown). Mattern speaks of designs that Pniower had created in the Hermann Rothe tree nursery, where he led the design department from spring 1924 until May 1925. See: J. Wolschke-Bulmahn and P. Fibich, *Vom Sonnenrund zur Beispiellandschaft*, p. 15–6. Paula von Zelewski was one of the few independently working female landscape architects; her name appears in the membership lists of the VdG (Verein deutscher Gartenarchitekten, 1914–1933) as one of three women amongst the 98 registered names. See: Katharina Homann and Maria Spithöver, ‘Freiraum- und Landschaftsplanerinnen: Ein Beitrag zur Disziplingeschichte von 1900 bis 1945’, *Stadt+Grün*, 12 (2007), 32.

\(^{377}\) ‘Hast Du Pniower angerufen? Er wird bestimmt ablehnen, da er ziemlich selbstherrlich ist.’ Letter
Terribly naïve is he, though I believe that he cannot go much further. My Sun Farmyard was an advancement of his [ideas], which he could no longer entirely understand himself. Admittedly, he was the only one able to penetrate it quickly.378

Mattem felt part of a new generation and started his career with an enormous confidence whilst remaining aware that he had been fortunate enough to gain experience under the progressive Pniower. In the 1920s, a symmetrical style associated with Viennese-style Jugendstil neo-classicism was still perceived as modern. At that time, garden designers only rarely identified with the constructivist geometries of Modernist architecture, and it was considered ‘wise’ to abide by symmetry.379 While his design ideology belonged to the sphere of Neues Bauen, Pniower’s more experimental formal language has been associated with Expressionism; in fact he contributed to the debate about the role of Expressionism within garden design during the 1920s.380 In the context of the literature on that debate, too, it has been suggested that Pniower had an important role anticipating the

378 "Von Pniower hab ich viel gelernt und täglich geht mir mehr von ihm auf. Schrecklich naiv ist er, allerdings glaub ich, daß er schon nicht mehr viel weiter kann. Mein Sonnenhof war eine Übersteigerung und Fortsetzung von ihm, die er selbst nicht ganz verstand. Allerdings war er der einzige [sic] der schnell rein kam." Letter from Mattem to Hammerbacher (no. 26-3), 02/09/1926, EHH. It is worth noting that Leberecht Migge's Worpswede colony home was also called Sonnenhof.


work of the Bornim School during the 1930s. While this might be a defensible argument from the evidence presented here, it was never so explicitly acknowledged as in Mattern's private letters to Hammerbacher:

'I have learned a lot from Pniower, and each day I see more of that [...] Had I fallen into somebody else's hands, surely I would not have been where I am today until much later.'

**Garden Technician with the Magdeburg municipality**

On the 9th of September 1926 Mattern started his first employment as Garden Technician (Gartentechniker) with the municipality of Magdeburg. He was employed there until the 31 November 1927, when he was taken on at the famous Leberecht Migge firm in Worpswede, where he had long aspired to work. The capital of the Province of Saxony was one of Germany's more progressive municipalities, with housing estates designed by Bruno Taut, Stadtbaurat from 1921, and a Department for Urban Development under the direction of the Modernist town planner and architect Johannes Göderitz. In 1927 the German Theatre Exhibition was staged in newly constructed spaces with extensive publicity, absolutely state of the art in its

---


382 'Von Pniower hab ich viel gelernt und täglich geht mir mehr von ihm auf. [...] Wär ich einem andern in die Hände gefallen, wär sicher das heutige bei mir später gekommen.' Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, no. 26-7, 08/11/1926, EHH.

383 Source for the dates is a typewriter-written document, EHM, folder 1 (no date, no file no. – read before the estate's systematisation) (cf. fn 265).

384 Göderitz is today above all known for his book Die gegliederte und aufgelockerte Stadt, written together with Roland Rainer and Hubert Hoffmann (Berlin: Verlag Ernst Wasmuth, 1957). However, Mattern does not mention Göderitz as his superior but the municipal director of gardens, Wilhelm Lincke, who discussed projects directly with the mayor of Magdeburg. An entry for Lincke can be found in: G. Gröning and J. Wolschke-Bulmahn, Grüne Biographien (1997), p. 228.
style of advertisement and presentation, attracting international attention.\textsuperscript{385}

Mattern's superior, the municipal Director of Gardens Wilhelm Lincke, while (at least in Mattern's view) producing rather unspectacular traditional designs, seemed to have been relatively tolerant in matters of style.\textsuperscript{386}

Mattern's stay in this city fell into the period that is usually referred to as the stabilisation phase of the Weimar Republic, following a phase of economically damaging, confrontational foreign policy.\textsuperscript{387} Many had emigrated, and Mattern too had considered leaving for the United States, but Hammerbacher's refusal frustrated this idea:

Although it would by now be completely impossible to go over there alone, a fusion of us in this respect would still open the greatest opportunities for me. Your aversion for America was almost difficult for me for a while.\textsuperscript{388}

\textsuperscript{385} American News, Ceske Slovo (Prague), The Chicago Evening Post, the Parisian Comoedia, the London Daily Telegraph, The New York Times, and Politiken (Copenhagen) reported enthusiastically. See: Friedemann Krusche, Theater in Magdeburg, 2 vols (Halle: Mitteldeutscher Verlag, 1995), II, pp. 41-2. Hammerbacher wrote that Mattern produced designs for this avant-garde event. These projects have not yet been identified, as Mattern as a young draftsman designed anonymously for the authorities and not under his own name: H. Hammerbacher, 'Frühe Arbeitsjahre', in Hermann Mattern, ed. by AdK (1982), p. 21.


\textsuperscript{387} For the historical information contained in this and the following paragraphs compare for example chapters six and seven in: Hans Mommsen, The Rise and Fall of Weimar Democracy (Chapel Hill & London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996; 1st German edn 1989).

\textsuperscript{388} 'Obwohl ich jetzt allein ganz unmöglich rüber gehen könnte, so würde auch hier ein Zusammengehen das weiteste sich mir eröffnen, was ich kaum erhofft hatte. Deine Abneigung gegen Amerika war für mich eine Zeit lang fast schwer.' This he wrote later, in 1927, and he asked about 'Grosz': 'Tell me girl, where does Grosz go and how does he get over there, through whom and under what conditions?' ('Sag Mädel, wohin geht Grosz und wie kommt er rüber, durch wen und zu
The new moderate governments that had come to power by 1924 in Great Britain and France eased conditions in regard to both the reparation payments and the French occupation of the Ruhr area. Developments induced by the acceptance of the Dawes Plan helped stabilise the economy, though major social and political problems persisted. The struggling old middle class did not gain any ground, and the political situation on the national level remained chaotic. Germany was governed mostly by centre-rightwing coalitions, forming vulnerable minority cabinets barely tolerated by the opposition of enfeebled Social Democrats. The relatively stable social-democratic government under Otto Braun in the state of Prussia between 1921 and 1932 was an exception. However, as a result of the foreign policy of Stresemann, the relationship with the international community improved. With the cessation of street fights and a slightly stabilising economy, Mattern's generation experienced the years 1924–1929 as time of unprecedented peace.\footnote{Sebastian Haffner, \textit{Defying Hitler: A memoir} (London: Phoenix, 2003) p. 56.} The acceptance into the League of Nations in 1926 marked a significant step towards normalisation. Internally, though, the state was an ‘unloved republic’. Reactionary Modernists such as Oswald Spengler, whose book \textit{Decline of the West} was widely read (in Mattern's and Hammerbacher's property there are early editions), were rattling their sabres constantly.\footnote{Cf.: Jeffrey Herf, \textit{Reactionary Modernism} (Cambridge/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1984). Spengler's theory was exceptionally pervasive and widely known, which is once more confirmed by the fact that it was the only literature the landscape architect Otto Valentien referred to in part two (p. 48) of his famous essay ‘Gartenkunst und Expressionismus’ in \textit{Gartenkunst} (03, 1924, p. 46–8).} The after-effects of the Great War could still be felt in everyday life, particularly the extreme poverty. Mattern occasionally supervised gangs of impoverished workmen, experiencing their hardship and having to settle violent disputes between them.\footnote{Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.), 29/06/1927.} He showed strong
empathy and a distinct social conscience, which becomes evident in his correspondence. For example, he was determined to help a talented but destitute artist with money needed to buy the material to produce durable castings from his finished, brittle clay moulds – money that Mattern did not have himself but intended to get together somehow: 'You know, merely with sympathy and the will to play one's part one can help inexpressibly.'\(^{392}\) Confronted with the general socio-economic reality of interwar Germany, he understood how much he was privileged through his employment. But the widespread suffering did not prevent these years being remembered as the Golden Twenties, and – albeit mainly from a cultural point of view – the most productive phase of the first German democracy.

Mattern worked in Magdeburg little more than one year (9 September 1926 to 1 December 1927), during which parts of the city's medieval fortifications were redesigned into People’s Parks (Volksparke). Also, a variety of cultural and sports facilities was planned by the city administration. Mattern's work on these projects included the entrance area to an open-air stage and a sports stadium. In other parts of the city he had to design extensions to existing open spaces, such as a cemetery, as well as to develop recreational areas such as lakeshore parkland, or to design details such as seats, gates and fountains for various projects.\(^{393}\) Despite the brevity of this employment he gained considerable experience in practical matters relating to all aspects of landscape design, whilst also pursuing academic interest by researching for a paper on the historical development of parks of Magdeburg. However, the wide scope of his occupations could not prevent him from quickly becoming frustrated with bureaucracy. After his experience of the unconventional atmosphere in the office of Pniower, and hearing about the nature of Hammerbacher's job with the

\(^{392}\) 'Du man kann allein durch Teilnahme und mittragen wollen so unsaglich viel helfen.' Ibid.

\(^{393}\) Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, no. 'H. 1', 01/10/1926, EHH.
Spaeth firm, he became disillusioned with his position in Magdeburg, tired of an atmosphere that he perceived as inefficient and two-faced:

Girl, [...] I'm sure you have to work harder at Spaeth than us here. People here try to impress one another, they envelop themselves in a pathos of importance - there are only very urgent matters, if possible to be accomplished yesterday. And then they rest for eight to fourteen days, or are not needed. It is indeed the same here whether one has any skills or not. Rhetoric and subservience are the preconditions for acceptance.394

As a result Mattern was not content to serve his 'regular eight hours'. His new work environment in a public administration contrasted considerably with experience in the private practice of Pniower in Berlin. Rather than the time spent, it was the boredom of the daily routine that started to reduce his motivation.395 In reference to Hammerbacher's more challenging job in the Spaeth nursery, he added: 'How envious I am of the position at Spaeth's - here with us everything is such a bore that one becomes a bore oneself.'396 Colleagues and supervisors respected Mattern, and he enjoyed a relative freedom to design; most of his proposals appear to have been accepted, sometimes only with minor corrections. During these months Mattern got the opportunity to realise his first own project. It is of high significance for it was

394 'Mädel, [...] Du hast bei Spaeth sicher mehr zu leisten, als wir hier. Man will sich gegenseitig verblüffen umhüllt sich in einen Pathos von Wichtigkeit - es gibt nur sehr eilige Vorgänge - möglichst noch gestern zu erledigen - und dann liegen sie 8-14 Tage, oder werden nicht gebraucht —, [...] Es ist hier tatsächlich gleich, ob man etwas kann oder nicht, das Mundwerk und ein krummes Kreuz ist Vorbedingung für Anerkennung.' Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, no. 26-21, 29/11/1926, EHH.

395 Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, no. 26-14, without date (written between 17/10 or 20/10/1926), EHH.

396 Ibid.
conceived before the immediate personal influence of Foerster and has, until recently, not been listed in the literature.397

In early November 1926, Lincke asked Mattern — even though this was explicitly forbidden in his working contract — to design a private garden in Helmstedt, a town halfway between Magdeburg and Braunschweig, for Dr. Carl Kraiger, General Executive Director of the Brunswick Coal Mining Company (Figures 36a–37b).398 In a later published article — his first one —, with a strong vitalistic character perceptible in his wording, Mattern explained the design motive. Open with the rhetorical question, 'Is there need to justify and expound why and wherefore?,' he explained that two garden plots with different owners had ‘decided’ to merge; ‘they became one’, although the one metre difference in levels ‘emotionally kept up the old limitations’.399 Mattern used a brick-lined water channel as a means to achieve ‘utmost fusion’; this started from a bird font, transforming into a stepped fountain mediating between the upper and the lower garden level, and finally ‘provide[d] a generous supply’ to the children’s paddling pool.400

When looking at the layout drawing, which has only survived as part of the aforementioned publication, the close-knit layout of the orthogonal composition appears complex enough to create an interesting tension between different parts of the garden. These parts are connected by a circuit that allows the garden visitor to experience a

397 The project has not been discussed in Mattern’s known catalogue raisonné until Heinrich’s biography, who presents it through primary sources, discussing the design only marginally: V. Heinrich, Hermann Mattern (2013), pp. 77–8, 81, 93–97. The author has had the opportunity to discuss the project for the first time in detail, see: Lars Hopstock, ‘The Kraiger garden at Helmstedt in Germany: the first private garden commission for landscape architect Hermann Mattern (1902–1971)’, Garden History, 42, 2 (2014), 215–33.

398 Petra Maushake (Stadtarchiv Helmstedt), personal information (1 December 2009).


sequence of spaces, all different in character. Seen from the main lawn, these are visually linked by higher plants like standard rose bushes (wished for by the client) in the background, peeking over the separating low boxwood hedges and over lower perennial plantings. The design could be interpreted as expression of a dichotomy that characterises its designer, and which only fully reveals itself in surviving photographs: an abstract form composition in the lower garden meets lush, naturalist perennial borders in the higher part.

Mattern spoke respectfully of the ‘biological’ use of plants like Berthold Körting (1883–1930), a locally famous landscape architect associated with Foerster, had shown so impressively in his design for the prominent cultural politician Edwin Redslob (Figures 112, 113). At the same time Mattern emphasised that for plants the same formal-spatial criteria were valid as for the built inanimate elements of a garden.401 A quote from a letter written a few months earlier illuminates his interest in artistic plant compositions:

Not dissolution and merging of nature and manmade; rather exaggeration, juxtaposition, possible through the use of a graduated kind of composition and similar. In the ‘plant garden’ in contrast to this a laisser-faire, a huddling of plants against each other, left to randomness and to themselves, while the selection is calculated for a specific area, the way the Japanese treat it in their gardens in contrast with the Chinese. Here, too, no imitated nature but man’s hand perceivable in the selection and combination. You speak nicely about the formal [tonal?] approaching the absolute; this has to act itself out to the extreme in the garden generally.402

---

401 Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, no. 26-17 (24 November 1926).

The general layout of the Kraiger garden appears in parts traditionalist at first look, but it reveals subtle perturbations in details. Axes are not aligned, squares not centred, and an imaginary diagonal line connects different angle points along the zig-zag of the channel to create the impression of organic coherence – despite the almost entirely rectangular composition. The different spaces allow for different uses. The large lawn may provide space for exercise, the rose garden is dedicated to the client’s wife’s passion for roses, there is a playground as well as more serene corners with benches overlooking perennial plantings. All in all, not a bad opus one for a 25-year-old.

In Magdeburg Mattern realised how much the profession had developed over a very short period of time, and how conservative were the majority of his potential supervisors in smaller communal garden department offices. Looking at the newer practices such as that of Erwin Barth (1880–1933), the progressive Garden Director at Berlin, his job and the conservatism of his superiors left him feeling unsatisfied.403 One day, coming home from an after-work social with his department, he wrote to Hammerbacher: ‘Now it’s clear to me that we are truly an entirely new generation […] Magdeburg is far, far behind’404.

403 About Barth, garden director of Berlin and probably the first landscape architect on a university chair for landscape architecture in Europe, and about his considerable contribution to the development of the profession, see: D. Land and J. Wenzel, Heimat, Natur und Weltstadt (2005).

404 Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, no. 26-4, 03/10/1926, EHH.
II. c Old flame, competitor, counterpart: soulmate always

Herta Hammerbacher

For a long time I have known that I could only love a woman who really intensely creates something her own and who really achieves something.405

(Mattern in a letter to Hammerbacher, November 1926)

Not many influences on Mattern’s professional development are known. Apart from publicly attributing major importance to his art teacher Faust, only very rarely did he mention role models. All of these were world-renowned personalities such as Häring, Migge, Poelzig, Rading, Scharoun or Schlemmer, all of whom he knew personally.

The early correspondence with Hammerbacher is thus an even more valuable historic document, as it helps to disclose a wider variety of cultural and personal influences. The insights thereby gained feed the different chapters of the present text. Of course, as his beloved one she was also his confidant. Consequently, raiding the treasure of the shoebox with the label ‘Mattern Briefe’ in her estate allows for inestimable insights. Hammerbacher exerted an influence that was decisive in many ways, yet he never acknowledged it publicly. She has long been recognised as an important landscape architect, above all due to her collaboration with Mattern and Foerster as co-creator of the so-called Bornim School, i.e. as co-inventor of the ‘garden in the Bornim style’.406 In fact, along with Gerda Gollwitzer, she was the most influential German woman of her generation in a professional world dominated by men.407

405 EHH, letter Mattern to Hammerbacher (no. 26-13), 20/11/1926


407 In 2006 a doctoral dissertation thesis cast some light on Hammerbacher’s true contribution to
Moreover, due to her courteous modesty in contrast with Mattern's proud ego, defined by her noble family background, her true contribution to the Bornim School has probably been underestimated in the past. The same could well be the true for the impact of her intellect and artistic sensitivity on Mattern's work. However, while she stressed the significance of her ex-husband's designing prowess, she was self-confident enough to present, and justifiably so, her own contribution as significant in the context of 20th-century landscape architecture. Referring to the joint venture Foerster-Mattern-Hammerbacher, she wrote:

In the course of their activities, this joint venture of landscape architects (amongst them above all Hermann Mattern) exerted a determining influence on the creation of gardens of the times. It initiated a type of garden in which the relation of the garden to the architecture, despite free and landscape-related organisation — in particular if this was architecture by an architect like Hans Scharoun — in a spiritual sense represented an integration of building with garden elements.

modern landscape architecture: Jeong-Hi Go, Herta Hammerbacher (1900–1985): Virtuosit der Neuen Landschaftlichkeit — Der Garten als Paradigma, series Landschaftsentwicklung und Umweltforschung, S18 (Berlin: Technische Universität Berlin, 2006). Gerda Gollwitzer (1907–1996) is the only other similarly influential female German landscape architect of that generation. Gollwitzer was editor in chief of Garten+Landschaft, and from 1945 until 1956 she taught garden history at the renowned course for landscape architecture at the horticultural college (later polytechnical school) of München-Weihenstephan (http://archiv.pressestelle.tu-berlin.de/tui/96jul/gollw.htm, accessed 04/02/2010).

Hammerbacher's mother's family was old Bavarian aristocracy, her grandfather a General Major and head of the Corps of Gendarmerie of Munich. Compare: Jeong-Hi Go, Herta Hammerbacher (1900–1985): Virtuosit der Neuen Landschaftlichkeit — Der Garten als Paradigma, (Berlin: Technische Universität Berlin, 2003), p. 16. Her mother had been a waiting maid at the Bavarian court (Fabian Zimmermann, personal communication, 10/01/2008). Go's mentioned dissertation has changed this perception.

*Diese Arbeitsgemeinschaft von Gartenarchitekten (unter ihnen vor allem Hermann Mattern) übte im Verlauf ihrer Tätigkeit einen maßgeblichen Einfluß auf das Gartenschaffen der Zeit aus. Es wurde ein Gartentyp geprägt, in dem die Beziehung des Gartens zur Architektur trotz freier und der Landschaft verpflichteter Organisation — besonders, wenn es sich zum Beispiel um die Architektur eines Hans Scharoun handelte — im geistigen Sinne als die Integration von den Elementen des Baues
Of many modernist landscape architects it could be said that their achievements are not appropriately recognised, seeing how little research has been completed in this field – Otto Valentien springs to mind. In the case of Hammerbacher the underestimation lies in her sharp, if tendentious intellect, in her special relationship with Foerster, Mattern, Scharoun and others, in her role in bringing people together (it was she who met Scharoun first, not Mattern), and in the fact that as a woman she had to struggle with obstacles unknown to her male colleagues. For example, her application to work under Alwin Seifert as a Landscape Advocate (Landschaftsanwältin) for the Organisation Todt was declined with the argument that ‘the collaboration of women with administrative works is being rejected’.410 Her mere gender was also held against her application for appointment at the Berlin University in 1946. The chair concerned a profession ‘that is at least 90 percent conducted by men’ and a woman could be appointed ‘only in case of pre-eminent distinction’.411 This meant that in a case of equal qualification a man was preferred. In this case Georg Béla Pniower got the post, whose credentials could arguably be called greater than hers.

Hammerbacher had strong principles. More than Mattern she sought for scientific legitimation of her designs – both in a classical as well as in a wider, spiritual sense.412 On the occasion of her 75th birthday, her academic collaborators at the


412 In her dissertation Jeong-Hi Go vividly describes Hammerbacher’s character, see e.g. pp. 59–70: J.-
Berlin University of Technology stressed the influence of Hammerbacher’s father, engineer of the first German railway line between Nuremberg and Fürth, which they considered partly responsible for her ‘tendency towards perfection, the demanding of precise representation and content, that excludes every half measure [...].’ Another crucial influence to understand Hammerbacher is the Swiss philosopher Jean Gebser, whose theories of ‘aperspectivity’ also fostered the use of given landscape elements in the design of Scharoun’s organic architecture. Indirect reference to him can be found in zur Nedden’s description of the contemporary garden:

‘[...] a new garden style evolves in small and smallest extensions, which is more individual than the large solutions for green spaces: the space garden with aperspective. These gardens are laid out both sculpturally and spatially and stay in close connection to today’s architectural, pictorial and sculptural forms of expression.’


415 ‘[...] entwickelt sich in kleinen und kleinsten Ausmaßen ein neuer Gartenstil, der individueller als die großen Lösungen für Grünanlagen ist: der Raumgarten mit Aperspektive. Diese Gärten werden sowohl plastisch wie räumlich angelegt und stehen in enger Verbindung mit der architektonischen, malerischen und plastischen Ausdrucksform der Gegenwart.’ Beate zu Nedden, ‘Gärten im Wandel der Zeiten’, Euroga, 8 (1954), pp. 42–5 (45) (a photocopy of this article, illustrated with examples from historical garden design and from Mattern’s work, can be found in the estate with a handwritten note ‘Euroga Aug. 1954’, but a printed source with this title has not be found), EHM.
Correspondingly, with Scharoun Hammerbacher was connected through ‘a strongly spiritual aspect, which also finds expression in her works [...]’.\(^{416}\) However, even though it might have corresponded much with her views, the influence of Gebser’s work seems less immediate in the light of the claim that Hammerbacher only first became aware of the philosopher’s writings as late as in 1962 (zur Nedden seems to be influenced by Gebser already ten years earlier).\(^{417}\) She is said to have had another important exchange of thoughts with the architect Richard Neutra, with whom she discussed ‘biologically correct building’, in reference to Karl Foerster and the findings of Wilhelm Wundt about the influence of the environment on ‘the human physis and psyche, mediated by the senses’ (Fig. 52).\(^{418}\) In Richard and Dion’s, his son’s, monograph of 1974, Hammerbacher is mentioned as advisor to the editors over questions of garden design.\(^{419}\)

The relationship between Mattern and Hammerbacher had started passionately during their studies at the horticultural college, but at a crucial point their views and expectations collided: Mattern wanted children, many children, while Hammerbacher –

\(^{416}\) Preface by the editors in: Jacobshagen and Sommer-Kempf (eds), *Beiträge zur Problematik der Beziehung zwischen Freiraum und Bauwerk [...]* (Berlin, 1975), pp. 9–18 (10).


\(^{419}\) *Richard und Dion Neutra: Pflanzen Wasser Steine Licht*, ed. by H. Exner and D. Neutra (1974), p. 2. In a note by the editor, Hammerbacher is thanked for having made available ‘[her rich experience] for the interpretation of the images’ (p. 4). Dion Neutra, however, does not remember Hammerbacher or a connection of his father with her or Mattern: Dion Neutra in an email to the author, 13/01/2014.
who as a young girl had dreamt of devoting her life to science like Marie Curie — did not.420 Their daughter Merete (1930–2007) must have been the result of a compromise. Shortly later the couple separated. From Hammerbacher’s perspective, Mattern had become selfish. She felt not accepted as equal, hampered in her creative urge and narrowed down to a role as mother, which she had never intended to fill.421 One day Eva Foerster found Mattern crying in the garden — the only time he has been crying ever reported: ‘Herta wants to leave me!’422 The divorce became legally valid on 19 January 1935.423 It has been reported that they separated on good terms, and that on the very same day they went happily arm in arm to celebrate their new lives with some drinks in a bar.424 The different accounts here do not seen to match well. Like many anecdotes told later the main source was Mattern’s second wife. She may have preferred to de-dramatised the emotional weight of the separation; the relationship between the two women was defined by a certain aloofness.425

During the same year that Hammerbacher divorced Mattern, she had joined her friend Elsbeth Heddenhausen (1897–1969) and Heddenhausen’s sister to form a residential community. Heddenhausen was a successful photographer and picture editor, head of the famous Ullstein photographic studios, where amongst others Marianne Breslauer had been employed (1930–32).426 The architect Werner Kratz, head of the

425 Ibid.
'Residential Teaching Department' ("Wohnungs-Lehrabteilung") in the Deutsche Arbeitsfront (German Labor Front, DAF) under Schulte-Frohlinde, designed the house in close collaboration with Hammerbacher. It was ready for occupancy in 1936. Its clean, traditional appearance may be due also to the changed political conditions, but it might also reflect the more sober character of Hammerbacher. A special type of documentation of this building exists in book form: Das Buch vom eigenen Haus ("The book of one's own house"). It was published in 1937 by the noted architectural journalist and architect Alfons Leitl (1905–1975) together with the designing architect, illustrated with photos by Heddenhausen. In text and image it gives an impressively detailed explanation of the design, showing the garden, the building and many internal elements like kitchenware, fittings and other details (Figures 53–55). The same drawings and photos were also presented in Der Osten (1940), a heavy propaganda book and building manual published by Schulte-Frohlinde and the DAF. In it, Hammerbacher’s home served as a role model for the ‘Germanisation’ of the East. Naturally, compared to Scharoun’s design for Mattern and Hammerbacher at Bornim, Hammerbacher’s home appears decidedly conservative – both in respect to its outside and the internal decoration. The illustrations of her garden design in Leitl’s book are amongst the most


428 At least four photos shown in the book are today still owned by the 'ullstein bild' photographic archive of the Axel Springer Syndication GmbH, see results for search item 'Hammerbacher' at https://www.ullsteinbild.de/ullstein-webshop/start.html (accessed 10/01/2014).

429 Alfons Leitl (text), Werner Kratz (drawings), E. M. Heddenhausen (photographs), Das Buch vom eigenen Haus (Berlin: Bauwelt-Verlag, 1937).

430 Die landschaftlichen Grundlagen des deutschen Bauschaffens, ed. by Deutsche Arbeitsfront et. al. (1940), pp. 191–203. Der Osten was produced under consultancy of several others like Paul Mebes, Paul Emmerich and Heinrich Tessenow. It was intended to serve as a guideline for architecture in the new territories in the East (as connected to the Lebensraum policy), which was believed to have been neglected by the Slavic peoples. Walter Kratz works take in a great share of the settlement plans and houses represented in the book.
telling to show her striving for a connection between house, garden and landscape, as typical for the Bornim school (Fig. 56).

Still in 1935, Mattern married his second wife, the young photographer Beate zur Nedden (1911–1998), daughter of the energy economist Franz zur Nedden and his esoteric wife Emmy Rösecke (Fig. 57). At that time, zur Nedden was working at the Foerster firm to document the finalised projects. Mattern fell in love with her probably without knowing that she, too, would not fulfil his wish for children. All this resulted in quite complex family constellations and they were at times difficult to deal with. Zur Nedden had the psychologically demanding task of bringing up her husband’s first wife’s daughter, whom he loved more than anything, while she remained childless her entire life. Also, when this daughter Merete grew older, she became estranged, rebinding with her biological mother. In 1951 finally Mattern had a son with the landscape architect Brita Follin (1920–2005), whom he had met in Hammerbacher’s office. The situation became even more complicated and this child was never officially acknowledged during Mattern’s lifetime – a trauma at least for the son, if not for the father as well. Living in this psychological minefield, zur Nedden had always had her own ways to keep the relationship together and to maintain for the outside world the image of a perfect couple. These conditions suggest many hidden tensions below the surface. Through all of this Hammerbacher remained Mattern’s confidante.


432 For allowing me these intimate insights I wish to thank Mattern’s son Peter Follin, personal communication, 02/08/2009, and Fabian Zimmermann, personal communication, 10/01/2008.
The origin showing through – finding the human nature

Hammerbacher was essentially more conservative than Mattern\(^{433}\). The ideal for form she thought would be found in a universal ‘origin’, which was to define any present design. These original sources were to be unlocked through a type of cognition only modern man was competent to have.\(^{434}\) As the necessity to dominate over nature was not given any more, modern man gained the possibility to seek harmony with nature and to re-relate to the original human nature: ‘Man of today stands on the step of harmonising between himself and nature.’\(^{435}\)

The ‘origin’ within the ideal modern consciousness, which Hammerbacher’s design philosophy was based on, she saw as the essence of human nature. This primal nature existed in the orbits of the stars, the laws of vegetative growth, or the regularities of the human walking cycle. Hammerbacher must have considered it her task as a landscape architect to re-install the lost connection of man to this human nature, to provide for the design that allowed for a new kind of cognition. This insight seems to explain her intense study of paths and human movement through space.\(^{436}\) By eavesdropping on nature, the garden designer was able to gain such cognition and produce a corresponding design. Such a landscape, thoroughly elaborated in its form, revealed in its outward appearance its inner laws. With this in mind, Hammerbacher wanted to create something ‘that is nothing less […] than nature’.\(^{437}\)

\(^{433}\) Wimmer even categorises her, like Foerster, in the chapter on neo-romanticism as an opponent of modernism in garden design, while Mattern’s work is dealt with in the chapter on modernism: Clemens Alexander Wimmer, Lustwald, Beet und Rosenhügel: Geschichte der Pflanzenverwendung in der Gartenkunst (Weimar: Verlag und Datenbank für Geisteswissenschaften, 2014), pp. 363–4, 371.


\(^{436}\) Herta Hammerbacher, ‘Der Weg als organischer Bestandteil des Gartens’, Garten+Landschaft, 01 (1953), 6–7, 10–1.

In a way these ideas pointed at a Hegelian, purposive concept of history, clearly reflecting a teleology of human development typical for Hammerbacher’s generation; many of her central references in philosophical and architecture-theoretical literature such as Jean Gebser or Hugo Häring corresponded to a teleological view of world history. Less so the cyclically arguing Oswald Spengler, whose *The Decline of the West (Der Untergang des Abendlandes, 1918–22)* Hammerbacher had adored in her youth, and which must have influenced her – like many others – strongly.\(^{438}\)

One garden exemplifies Hammerbacher’s idea of the ‘origin showing through’ and foreshadows Gebser’s concept of time.\(^{439}\) It was ‘The Garden of the Blue Progress’ (‘Garten des blauen Fortschritts’) at the Reich Garden Show Dresden 1936, showing mainly *Delphinium* selections produced by Foerster. This garden summarised many aspects of the Bornim spirit and prompts association from the blue flower of Novalis, Tieck and other Romantics to Romantic painting and the Wandervogel youth movement, representing the general, strongly spiritual grounding of all Hammerbacher’s designs. With its almost literal translation of a theoretical model into space, ‘the Garden of the Blue Progress’ is far from typical for Hammerbacher. Rarely did she abandon practical consideration of use as in this case, where the spatial-visual experience took centre stage (Figures 58–60). Parallel rooms were separated by strung-out tufts of head-high delphiniums. The flower beds acted as semi-transparent room dividers. In a look across the rooms the flowers were superimposed and blended into one image; the ‘origin’ was ‘showing through’ like the past being present in the present. Exactly ten years before, at the ground-breaking Dresden Horticultural Jubilee Exhibition of 1926 built under the artistic direction of Gustav Allinger, there had been another delphinium garden, which Mattern had also


addressed in one of his letters.\textsuperscript{440} That time it had been designed by Allinger, and like Hammerbacher’s it also presented Karl Foerster as exhibitor of the Garden show.\textsuperscript{441} Back then, the head-high selections had not yet been as windproof as Foerster’s modern ones (see his breeding aims as presented in chapter II-e), so Allinger had designed a system of mounts in a fashionable zig-zag composition (Fig. 61, 62). Lower delphiniums were planted on top in order to reach the desired impressive height. Another contrast was that at the 1926 exhibition visitors were kept outside the planted area. The garden had been purely for visual attraction, devoid of the spatial impact of Hammerbacher’s proposal. These differences between the two delphinium gardens exemplify both Foerster’s horticultural achievements and the Bornimers’ new way of considering space, which always aimed at an immediate interaction between human being and plant.

The relation between human body movements and the idea of a spiritual origin in Hammerbacher’s thinking elucidates how spirit and nature, philosophy and science in her weltanschauung were not really separated. Insights from biology, botany, ecology, phytosociology, historical science, and cultural history, for Hammerbacher led to a ‘biological wholeness’ instead of the garden being a mere ‘container for plants’.\textsuperscript{442} Garden making was connected to culture more than was house building, which she considered a biological procedure, as it satisfied the biological need for shelter and protection. Garden building in contrast satisfied cultural demands.

\textsuperscript{440} Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, Nov. 26-15, 21711/1926, EHH. Mattern agreed with Schneider’s judgment, that due to the poor performance of the delphinium (apparently Foerster’s mistake) and the stronger effect of the additionally planted Rudbeckias, the garden was better as a Rudbeckia garden, cf.: Camillo Schneider, ‘Dresdens Gartenschau: Ein Rückblick’, \textit{Die Gartenschönheit}, 7, 11 (1926), 290–3.


Organic form in architecture she considered in principle as the ideal form,\textsuperscript{443} and the Mattern house at Potsdam seems to have been her favourite example for an ideal connection between house and garden as described below.\textsuperscript{444}

In the case of the majority of garden owners, Hammerbacher believed they were only able to perceive her intended connection between original human nature and present life subconsciously.\textsuperscript{445} Like Mattern she held the elitist view of 'true dwelling' as something not everyone was capable of. For example, in Mattern's writings 'the boundary' was a recurrent topic, and the wish for its unnecessary accentuation stood for the 'lack of experience in living'.\textsuperscript{446} The rejoicing in one's own property together with the wish to protect fosterlings - respectively repel the neighbours' ones - according to Mattern resulted in an exaggeration of boundaries, which added to the strangeness of a settlement in relation to the natural landscape.\textsuperscript{447} Hammerbacher acknowledged that, for most people, the organic connection to the metaphysical aims that a garden allowed for lay merely in the enjoyment of flowers.\textsuperscript{448} However, for her the value was very concrete. It also was present in the occupation of gardening as 'balancing manual and creative activity'.\textsuperscript{449}

With regard to form, she considered the '\textit{Landschaftliche} Garden of the 20\textsuperscript{th} Century', the New \textit{Landschaftlichkeit}, as the essential strand of modern garden


\textsuperscript{446} '[...]

\textsuperscript{447} Ibid.


design. A crucial part of the meaning carried by this phrase was the idea of a review of the English landscape garden, so that it could be translated into a 'new landscape mode'. Since the revival of the architectonic garden around 1900, *Landschaftlichkeit* and the landscape garden had unjustly been pushed into the background. This perspective of hers was probably further consolidated by the symbolism of power in the representative Nazi architecture. In the case of the Reich Chancellery she saw in the accompanying green spaces 'strong representation in the emphasis of the axiaility as expression of cold'. Her rejection of geometry was radical, she described rectangularity as 'repressive' and thus antidemocratic. To her, axial alignment and geometry in garden design meant 'hegemony over nature', which 'always runs parallel with the repression of humans'. After the war she would reapply this criticism to the late modernist 'international grid architecture' and accompanying formalist open spaces as 'expression of today's technocracy' (Fig. 63). It almost seemed as if her landscape architectural mission was to fight for the legitimate prevalence of the organic.

---


452 Ibid.

Living on the wood glade – the form of the garden

On her quest to arrive at ‘the origin’ through cognition in the integral conscious mind, Hammerbacher seemed to be strongly influenced by her longing for the Arcadian utopia. Nonetheless she stressed the role sciences played in today’s landscape garden, including human ecology, pedology and geomorphology. It shared the expression of ‘political freedom of thought and tolerance’ with the historical landscape garden, but ‘applied’ this ‘democratic mindset’ to ‘the living environment’. The most important aspects that Hammerbacher had defined early as characteristics of the modern garden were: habitability (‘just like the room of a house’), non-representative form, and seven seasons of bloom, as promoted by Foerster. From around 1938 a new, fourth point was added to these: garden and house shall form an organic unity, which itself shall function as a basic unit (‘Urzelle’ = ‘primordial cell’) of an organic city, woven into the fabric of the surrounding landscape and dovetailed with the greened space of the streets.

Defined by these characteristics was her idea of the ideal-typical form of dwelling: the detached single-family house Hammerbacher saw as the quintessential source of well-being. She preferred it with the widest-possible bearing to allow for greatest possible contact to the ground – vaguely related to Seifert’s idea of ‘Bodenständigkeit’ or ‘rootedness’ – , with its form relating proportionally to the outlines of the plot.

456 Ibid.
From the mid-1930s all the way to her last designs of 1981/82 Hammerbacher’s style remained relatively homogenous. It can be compared with the form of a wood clearing, belted by vegetation after the model of a forest edge, evoking the variety and visual richness of an ecotone.\textsuperscript{460} A naturalistic use of grasses in combination with her preferred means of space-making, hollows, – which earned her the nickname ‘\textit{Mulden-Herta}, ‘Herta of hollows’ – characterises a great part of her garden creations. What is more, the chosen plant communities should ‘wear the face of the surrounding landscape’, composed according to Foerster’s concept of ‘seven seasons’.\textsuperscript{461} Here, too, the concept of ‘\textit{Bodenständigkeit}’ comes to mind, as the plant communities were to be brought from the landscape into the garden.\textsuperscript{462} Generally, she wanted the forms of the landscape to leap over the borders of the garden:

\begin{quote}
With natural abundance the plants are surging up against the building, they continue beyond the borders of the plot, they mediate between house and landscape – the landscape flows with them into the plot.\textsuperscript{463}
\end{quote}

As mentioned above, central to Hammerbacher was the human movement through space. Related to this was an important characteristic of her designs: an elaborate compound of terraces, steps, paths and water basins.\textsuperscript{464} Her engagement with an organic guidance of route and formation of steps in the garden, and between house

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}
and garden, should be considered as a potentially fundamental contribution by Hammerbacher to the Bornim school.

In respect to buildings, until the 1950s she seemed to have felt more drawn to a sober classicism like that of Heinrich Tessenow’s, but at some stage she must have made her peace with modernist architecture. During the 1950s her design language changed to agree more with purist international modernist expression. She adapted to the postwar style and developed an artful use of free angles as abstractions of the crystalline forms found in the stratifications and dislocations of natural rock formations. For her, the use of these linear but never rectangular shapes represented a further development of the ‘Landschaftlichen Garden of the 20th Century’ (Fig. 64).

Concealed fronts – landschaftlich vs. architectonic

In regard to form, Hammerbacher was downright dogmatic. This may have cost her a more pervasive influence, and also beyond her lifetime. Graphic planting design elements like linear cut hedges were entirely alien to her universe. The subliminal conflict between the landscape school and ‘architectonic’ school within the garden design profession can be felt constantly, but it was never argued out officially; perhaps because a public dispute would have included a reference to National Socialism, which was taboo. The architectonic, Hammerbacher saw as directly linked to anti-libertarian views. With a biting critique of two regular examples by Carl Kempkes and Gustav Allinger, both political reactionaries, she tried to demonstrate both the functional and the ‘moral’ inferiority of an architectonic solution:

> From these gardens [...] we can understand, that the ‘dwelling’ in the garden equals


approximately the use of patios at meal times or to hold a cosy little chat with someone, above all, that the circumferential path has been allocated great significance as promenade. The habitation is predefined in the firmly cemented form of the garden; garden life there has to happen according to ‘instructions’ given by the landscape architect.  

One of her most cherished ideals – the organic connection between house and garden – she considered could only be provided with a *landschaftlichen* garden. She proclaimed this ideal under a complete ignorance towards the contribution of Art-and-Crafts architects and the reformers who around 1900 provoked with their polemics a reform of the domestic garden in Germany (see introduction). Hammerbacher positioned herself as clearly opposed to Wiepking, whom she thought to have institutionalised the architectonic garden (between 1933 and 1945 through his function as the discipline’s sole university professor). In the design language developed by Mattern she saw an expression of artistic tendencies as much as, connected to this, of the ‘political and spiritual occurrences, the democratisation of society in the Germany of the 1920s’.

With regard to these fronts within the profession, Hammerbacher later spoke of defamation of the Bornimers during the ‘Third Reich’ for stylistic reasons. In contrast we know today that the cruel “logics” of NS politics hit modernists and traditionalists alike. Whether they were

---


politically (as in the cases of Lingner or Funcke), racially (as in the cases of Lesser, Pepinski and Pniower) unwanted, or persecuted for unknown reasons (e.g. Hellmuth Spaeth of the Spaeth nursery, who was shot in 1945), the Nazis found a way of presenting their work and character as cultural-Bolshevistic or degenerate. Much research conducted in recent years about the art and culture of the ‘Third Reich’ has substantiated this convincingly. All the same, at the same time a discussion about style was indeed led. Admittedly, it was neither completely detached from those political motivations nor did it accord much to the rules of logic. This will be looked at in the chapter II-i below. In 1977, Jürgen Zilling, a former university assistant of Mattern and employed in his office, wrote an article about the Bornim gardens for Bauwelt, in which he challenged the widespread opinion that the Bornimers’ organic way of designing was opposed to the ‘official’ way of designing open spaces. This was one of the first efforts at reviewing garden design in the “Third Reich”.

Hammerbacher reacted with an angry letter to the editor that was published in a following number. She referred to the architectonic garden accompanying the Reich Chancellory and cited defamatory comments by colleagues. This quite frank verbal exchange has raised questions, answers to which are only today slowly becoming clearer. One of Hammerbacher’s grandsons, who knew her well, suggested politics were a sore topic for her.

---


474 Fabian Zimmermann, personal communication, 10/01/2008.
persecuted for his homosexuality, and the older one, who became a devoted and high-ranking Nazi, but whom she nonetheless loved dearly. Her personal distance from Nazi ideology was a taboo within the family, which must have meant an immense strain psychologically.

As described above in connection to her stylistic preferences, ideologically Hammerbacher could be acrid, and she left a naïve impression politically. For example, in her obituary of Hübotter in word and image she presented without the slightest qualm the Sachsenhain, a site of völkisch worship, as his most typical work and as a great achievement (Figures 65, 66). In the same article she discussed humaneness, friendship and common higher aims, referring to her entire career. The time addressed spans between 1926, when she first encountered drawings by Hübotter in the plan exhibition at the First Reichsgartenschau Dresden, and his death in 1976. Yet, in her text not even a hint of the shadow of National Socialism can be found, as if the 20th century had just smoothly produced one beautiful garden design after the other. To give another example: she would only discuss the effects of the war on a superficial level. Like many modernist town planners she blamed the densely grown cities as entailing the risk of much destruction in case of hostilities:

The city and in particular the metropolis with their conglomeration of masses of stone are biological nonsense, if we do not want to condemn them in even stronger terms.

Aerial warfare has shown that the great density of dwellings represents an incredible danger for man.

---


479 ‘Die Stadt und besonders die Großstadt sind in ihrer Anbahnung der Steinmassen ein biologischer Unsinn, wenn man nicht noch stärkere Worte dagegen anwenden will. Der Luftkrieg hat gezeigt,
She saw the loss of human contact with nature as a cause of the perils of the 20th century. With her focus on the primordial, spiritual ‘origin’ she neglected contemporary influences and for years after the war she did not develop truly forward-looking concepts in tune with her times. For example, in contrast with Mattern, who accepted the necessity of multi-storey building, Hammerbacher adhered to the single-family detached house with garden as the ideal form of dwelling.480

The direct influence exerted by Hammerbacher on Mattern’s professional development can only be called considerable. In conclusion, the following quote must serve as evidence. It may be taken from a sentimental love letter, but the words point at a never appreciated authority of hers:

At the difficult corner, on top, where the two parts collide at the garden, you helped me. If only I could discuss each design with you in advance, or at least have a look at the plot with you together, I would be much more certain about what to do with it – not only that, but surely to make something good, too. [...] You confirm, you inspire, and by hinting at something you create through me. When we spoke about spaces on Sunday, at that very moment you showed me so much that was new to me, so that I could have started on the spot. You witch, you really perform magic, here I believe in you completely and then I believe in us, that we can create together, that we keep each other alive, that we are true to each other, that we can, without self-abandonment, be one.481

---


The way Mattern tells her how she appeared to him in the early phase of their relationship also reveals some of his own self-image. Crucially, in contrast to her he saw himself as more epicurean and intuitive:

You are governed by an affirmation of the tragic, as you don’t want the relish, the pleasure or the happiness, but the performance, the intellect and the work [das Werk].

Their nicknames are more than a silly play on words; they squint towards both the conflicts and the magnetism that existed between the two. ‘Hilly Hermann’ and ‘Herta Hollow’ may have been the most eccentric couple in German garden history.

haltet, daß wir uns ganz wahr sind, daß wir, ohne uns uns selbst aufzugeben Eins sein können.’
EHH, letter Mattern to Hammerbacher (no. 26-11), 15/11/1926.

482 ‘Du stehst unter deutlicher Bejahung des Tragischen in dem Du nicht den Genüß, das Vergnügen oder das Glücks[betragen?] willst sondern die Leistung, den Geist und das Werk.’ Ibid.
II. d  Bauhaus, Expressionism, and the empathic: early influences and the Golden Twenties

In the final analysis it is not the work of art which is important, but the process which leads to it, i.e. the significance that the artistic act has in the life of a people, due to the necessity for which a presence arises, to become passion toward an artistic birth as profit, discharge, protest, bewitchment, regulation.483

(Karl With, 1922)

This chapter provides an orientation to those aspects of Weimar cultural life that the author identified as particularly meaningful to Mattern’s professional development, or that were discussed amongst landscape architects in his environment. These paragraphs provide spotlights on the time; a complete review of interwar culture in Germany is not

---

intended. Until 1929, landscape architecture was a profession without a university-level curriculum, and thus rather under-theorised. In contrast Mattern's own references to contemporary art and literature were rich and omnipresent in his letters. Again, essential evidence can be found in the letters written to Hammerbacher during his stay at Magdeburg, between October 1926 and July 1927.

In recent years, garden historians have drawn the attention of a wider audience to formerly little noticed discussions in the garden journals of the time, which dealt explicitly with the question of how garden art could engage with modern art. Most significant for this chapter is the debate about the possibilities of transferring Expressionism into the field of garden art, fuelled by a polemic published by Otto Valentien in 1924. Apart from these public debates, aspects of Mattern's biography were conducive to forging a close relationship with the arts. Two childhood friends, Friedrich Wilhelm Bogler (1902-1945) and Theodor Bogler (1897-1968) appeared

---


485 See glossary ('Gartenarchitekt') on page 453 for the historical terms.

often in his letters (Fig. 67). All three had frequented the same school in Hofgeismar influenced by their art teacher Faust. They saw each other regularly until around 1929, when both Boglers moved away. While Mattern studied at the Dahlem horticultural college, both Bogler brothers studied at the Bauhaus at Weimar, Theodor starting as early as in 1919. They played a pivotal role by providing easy access to the Bauhaus and forging Mattern’s amalgamation with the school’s concepts. Apart from this, the Boglers’ grandfather Wilhelm Bogler, an architect of villas at Wiesbaden, in 1905 had published a book about the reform of garden design, which may have influenced Mattern in his career choice.

Mattern took very seriously an appeal by Valentien in his above-mentioned article, to try to understand the ‘culture and art of [...] [their] times’. Mattern’s reception of high culture was astonishing. He visited exhibitions in museums and galleries, watched operas, went to theatre and orchestra performances or attended lectures – sometimes several events in a single week. Not only during his stays at Berlin, but also at provincial Magdeburg, in the context of the German Theatre Exhibition 1927, he gained access to high-profile events, for example orchestra performances conducted by Dresden’s Fritz Busch, or opera performances in stage designs by Oskar Schlemmer. Apart from that, the constant reading of prose and


490 Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.), 01/06/1927, EHH. ‘[Christoph Willibald Gluck’s “Don Juan” was enacted under supervision of Schlemmer’ (‘Der “Don Juan” war unter Beratung Schlemmers inszeniert.’), letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.), 11/06/1927, EHH.
philosophical as well as technical literature filled out much of his free time. He also took life drawing classes, self-critically discussing the results with Hammerbacher in their daily letters. To be sure, he also allowed himself time to relax. He went swimming, raced around on his bike, undertook daylong strolls through the parks and woods of Magdeburg, and rested in cafés, perceiving everything and everyone around him with a sharp eye. His interest in art reflects his own creative will, including his ideal for the presentation of his ideas, reflected in the graphic style of his plan drawings:

My striving for restraint concerning representation originates in my view on art generally, an [...] abstraction carried to the extreme (as opposed to pure [?] constructivism) is the zenith. I would like to “believe“ that, despite this, a richness, nay exaggeration is possible, which surely is restrained in itself.

[...] You should always consider that all I want and can in regard to representation is technique.

The impeccability of the drawings seem to matter from the very beginning. He could be extremely pedantic, and drawings from all decades of his career are relatively elaborate. In the 1920s the field of graphic design experienced an exciting transformation as extreme as architecture. The status of advertising generally rose steadily. The German Theatre Exhibition 1927 was planned by committee of advisors


492 Detailed descriptions can be found in his letters, including witty characterisations of people he observed: Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.), 23/01/1927, EHH.

493 ‘Mein Suchen nach Zurückhaltung in der Darstellung entspringt aus meiner Ansicht über Kunst überhaupt eine [...] zum äußersten gehende Abstraktion (als Gegensatz reinen [?] Konstruktivismus) ist der Gipfel. Daß trotzdem eine Reichhaltigkeit, ja Überreibung möglich ist, die in sich wohl zurückgesetzt ist, möchte ich “glauben“. [...] Du mußt immer bedenken, daß ich weiter nichts will und kann in der Darstellung [...] als Technik.’ Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (no. 26-7), 08/11/1926, EHH.
and theatre specialists, amongst them the councillor for urban development Johannes Göderitz. They included the work of progressive architects, designers and graphic artists. Albin Müller (1871-1941, known as Albinmüller), before the war associated with the Darmstadt Artists’ Colony (Mathildenhöhe), was responsible for representative architecture (Fig. 68). Avant-garde graphic artists were invited to produced proposals for the design of the official poster, amongst them César Klein (1876-1954) of the Novembergruppe and the Werkbund and Lyonel Feininger (1871-1956) of the Bauhaus Dessau. Finally commissioned was Karl Schulpig (1884-1948) with a visually stunning design (Fig. 69). During the preparatory stage of the event a theatre magazine was designed by a pioneer of corporate design, Wilhelm Deffke (1887-1950), head of the local School for Applied Arts and Crafts (Fig. 70). Looking at graphic design journals, Mattern concluded that modern graphic design should be taught at the horticultural college, as he considered this knowledge important for the profession: ‘During the fourth semester in Dahlem it should be one of the most important tasks to occupy oneself with graphics – not with theory.’

Knowing that the German Theatre Exhibition was about to be held, Mattern decided that it could be useful to stay in Magdeburg at least until it was over, as it ‘surely brings in it’s train a series of things that one can draw from’. And indeed, according to Hammerbacher, he was entrusted with the design of urban parks and


497 Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.), 03/12/1926, EHH.

498 Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.), 16/01/1927, EHH.
other green spaces for the event. He was also still open to a new orientation of his career, as progressive urban planning and architecture provoked his keen interest. In confidence he told Hammerbacher about his plans:

Tonight I thought about concentrating systematically on the history of urban development. Maybe I will for one or two semesters touch upon urban design and history and economic sectors, in order to improve my “vantage point”. Garden – architect – settlement – country – cities – organisation. Because, if you look at the managers of the land settlement societies you can find: worn out officers, Studienräte, social-democrat delegates (cobblers-tailors) [or personalities of the names Schuster and Schneider] or pure architects, respectively pure economists (jurists, merchants etc.). How I can get access to such things, or where to steal the semesters, time will have to tell, possibly through Migge – Bogler – Gropius – C.


Although he occasionally took the opportunity to see the emergence of inspiring new architecture as part of his job – for example Göderitz’s Magdeburg town hall –, he also went in his free time to see new urban development projects by progressive architects (Fig. 71). His by no means random appreciation again reflects his displeasure at the reactionary. Anything ‘Prussian’ (meaning the militarist tradition of

---


the empire) he despised.\textsuperscript{501} He equally rejected the Germanic pathos as represented by the Wagner cult,\textsuperscript{502} but he retained at the same time an affinity to the Romantic and Neo-Romantic. He identified with it, emphasising the empathic and he remained critical when confronted with anti-enlightenment irrationalism. Despite this sensitivity he considered himself a more sanguine, if slightly melancholic character, in contrast to Hammerbacher, who was clearly more drawn to the ‘tragic’.\textsuperscript{503} The melancholic part of his personality however he almost did not dare to admit, and only now and then referred to it with irony; it did not seem to fit his self-image as a confident, decisive creative. On that note he identified himself more with the optimism of the modern movement, the new rationalist tendencies and social-reformist urban planning. This was what he observed attentively and at the same time critically. Yet Mattern was drawn to the emotive, too, if more generally as part of formal creation: ‘[…] [Each] shape immediately makes a rapport with me, and

\textsuperscript{501} ‘Späth’s hyper-Prussianness in [their competition entry for the Sports Park at] Tilsit is downright bad’ (‘Die Prussiererei Späths in Tilsit ist geradezu schlimm.’), letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, (without no.), 10/05/1927, EHH.

\textsuperscript{502} ‘The stage design of Munich’s Passetti – a really wonderful Wartburg image, likewise the autumn landscape, emphasised by seven vertical elements, which were reenforced by the long white gown of Elisabeth, this all bound together in the lower third by slightly crossed-over curves of hills. Splendid in its colours, the single tones well adjusted though not corny, as the lighting created wonderful transitions. The cast and the direction were outstanding – with the one qualification to everything – Wagner.’ (‘Die Bühnenbilder vom Münchener Passetti – ganz herrlich Wartburgbild, ebenso die Herbstlandschaft letztere betont von 7 Vertikalen, diese unterstützt im langen weißen Gewandt der Elisabeth, das Ganze im unteren Drittel gebunden durch leicht überkreuzte Hügelkurven. Farbig famos, wohl geschlossen in den einzelnen Tönen aber nicht kitschig, da die Beleuchtung wunderbare Übergänge aufkommen ließ. Die Besetzung und Regie waren hervorragend – mir der Einschränkung zu allem – Wagner.’), letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.), 27/05/1927, EHH. ‘On Wednesday the concert [directed by Fritz] Busch was lovely, i.e. [Beethoven’s] 5th. A set of pieces including Strauß and Wagner was dire – purely programmatic.’ (‘Am Mittwoch das Busch Konzert war fein, d.h. die V. Schlimm war eine Folge mit Strauß und Wagner – rein programatisch.’), letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.), 04/06/1927, EHH.

\textsuperscript{503} Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, no. 26-7, 08/11/1926, EHH.
depending on the standpoint penetrates us less or more strongly'. During these times Mattern was highly sensitised to aesthetic matters, also due to the feelings he had for Hammerbacher. However, the empathetic approach to aesthetics, which speaks out of phrases like this, also resonates with thinking in German theory of art that can be traced back to early writings on the psychology of perception that emerged in the late 19th century. This formed a basis for early twentieth-century writings on abstract tendencies in modernist art, such as Wilhelm Worringer's highly influential *Abstraktion und Einfühlung (Abstraction and Empathy, 1907)* or Kandinsky's and Klee's writing on form and artistic expression. Findings in Chemistry and Physics questioned traditional notions of the material world, while psychology and psychology-inspired art theory drew attention to the 'internal necessity to express' oneself. As long-believed certainties about the material basis of our external world were put into question, the artist's attention turned inward. The term 'the internal' was first introduced by Conrad Fiedler (1841–1895), when the notion emerged that the essence of art should not primarily be depiction, nor a narrative representation of ideals, but a relation between artist and viewer of a painting or sculpture on a more personal level through an engagement with emotions.

---

504 Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, no. 26-7, 08/11/1926, EHH.


506 Wilhelm Worringer, *Abstraktion und Einfühlung: Ein Beitrag zur Stilpsychologie*, doctoral diss. (Bern, 1907), (Munich: Piper, 1908); Wassily Kandinsky, *Über das Geistige in der Kunst, insbesondere in der Malerei* (Munich: Piper, 1912); Paul Klee, *Pädagogisches Skizzenbuch*, ed. by Walter Gropius and Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, series Bauhausbücher, 2 (Munich: Albert Langen, 1925). Especially the titles by Worringer and Kandinsky quickly sold out and were printed in numerous editions over the years, until today. While there is no definite proof, Mattern was close enough to the Bauhaus and people connected to Klee and Kandinsky that a reception is highly probable.

Artistic activity begins when man, driven by an internal necessity, grasps with the power of his mind the entangled multiplicity of appearances and develops it into configured visual existence.508

Artists were also strongly inspired by developments in psychology. The Apollonian and the Dionysian – many theoreticians who prepared Expressionism such as Nietzsche or Worringer referred to it –, that is the ‘undifferentiated feeling’ and the ‘differentiated thinking’, found together in Expressionism as one dialectic expression.509

‘The internal necessity’ gained a more prominent position in the ideas of Kandinsky and Klee. The complex concepts of Kandinsky were widely known. His Concerning the Spiritual in Art was an ‘epoch-making work’ that came into the book shops in December 1911 and went like hot cakes. Much-quoted but not always properly understood, all three editions of the book from 1911/12 were quickly sold out, and ‘it became a mythos’.510 Most Modernist designers were familiar with Kandinsky’s Point and Line to Plane (Punkt und Linie zu Fläche), published in 1926 and continuing the train of thought of his first book. Admittedly a clear definition for ‘internal necessity’ was missing, but he related indirectly to a discussion that emerged at the same time in different places.511 Much points to an influence on


511 Despite using the concerned expression until the end of his life, he never gave a definition of it. Jelena Hahl-Fontaine, ‘Die vielfältigen Varianten der Schrift “Über das Geistige in der Kunst”’, commentary accompanying the revised new edition of W. Kandinsky, Über das Geistige in der
Mattern by these writings, and at least post-war editions, for example of Kandinsky's and Klee's works, can be found in his book collection.

Kandinsky in *Concerning the Spiritual in Art*, in the chapter B. (Painting) V: *The Effect of Colour*, compared the effect of colours on the human soul with images from music. Kandinsky used to explain the different arts in comparison with each other:

Most artists – for example Debussy in music – while including considerable expression of their ‘internal necessity’, in parts, still resorted to conventional notions of beauty, to superficial attraction, with their work irritantly swinging between the two. Schönberg was Kandinsky’s example for the ultimate avant-garde in music, representing artistic principles as explored in painting most convincingly to date by Matisse in regard to the use of colour, and by Picasso as related to painterly form. The next step of evolution he saw in the complete freedom from depiction, his observations about the emotional effect of colours being the basis. It did not suffice alone to merely expose these effects (bright yellow as sour and shrill, dark ultramarine as smooth and velvety etc.). They had to be exploited by the free artist in a purposive way:

> Colour is the keyboard, the eyes are the hammers, the soul is the piano with many strings.
> The artist is the hand that plays, touching one key or another purposively, to create vibrations of the soul.
> It is evident therefore that color harmony must rest ultimately on purposive playing upon the human soul; this is one of the guiding principles of internal necessity.512

The other key concept is 'the new'. Both terms, 'the internal' and 'the new', constantly appear in Mattern’s letters of that time when it comes to questions of form and design motivation. In this context they represent Mattern’s freedom from

---

formalisms. Also in relation to his love or even to rather general memories of his personal life these terms are always present:

Your prose letter today moved me. Although I am untraditionally minded, it grips me when I think back to ‘our’ first days, and pitted against that I always feel the coming new. We will always be new and fresh, if we continue to work and thus ensure that our internal [drive] does not peter out.513

_Early connection to the Bauhaus: The Bogler brothers_

The two aforementioned Bogler brothers deserve a closer look for the role they played in Mattern’s life. The carpenter and artist Friedrich Wilhelm Bogler (1902–1945) belonged to Oskar Schlemmer’s theatre class. His older, politically ambiguous brother Theodor (1897–1968) became famous as the Bauhaus’ most important ceramicist after Otto Lindig, and later as the Prior of the Benedictine abbey Maria Laach, the entrance yard of which Mattern redesigned in 1955 (Fig. 72).514 Theodor Bogler’s notable career included briefly administrating the Bauhaus ceramics workshop (probably 1924–1925), becoming executive director of the workshops at the earthenware factories in Velten-Vordamm in 1925, occasionally working for the Hedwig Bollhagen workshops in Marwitz near Velten during the 1930s, heading the abbey Maria Laach’s workshop from 1948, and producing designs for the company Staatliche Majolika Manufaktur Karlsruhe (State Manufacture of Maiolica) after the


war. Following the suicide of his wife in 1925 he became a Catholic. In 1927 he chose a life as a monk when he joined Maria Laach, where he was ordained in 1931. In 1939 he was appointed Prior. Bogler may well have been the most right-wing of all of Mattern’s close friends. He is a prime example for how modernism and right-wing thinking were not mutually exclusive, for how an artist could produce works that found entry into the MoMA collection and at the same time write books, like his Briefe an einen jungen Soldaten (Letters to a young soldier) of 1939, which contains a lot of war rhetoric and aggressive anti-Judaism (uncommon for religious literature even in those days). At the same time Bogler’s books have been interpreted as efforts to save the abbey from being disbanded like many others (Fig. 73).

However, Maria Laach had already been known during the Weimar Republic as a retreat of monarchist and right-wing Catholics. In 1933, in opposition to the majority of German bishops, the monks enthusiastically affirmed the new regime. New research, in which Bogler features prominently, has proven the Abbey’s leaders’ hope for a new Holy Roman Reich under Hitler, and the generally nationalist orientation of the monks, which may be the reason why it was the only Benedictine abbey in the Rhineland not closed down by the Nazis. Being a member of the ‘generation of

---

515 His political position has been judged as ‘corresponding’ with National Socialism, on the ‘extreme right’: Marcel Albert, Die Benediktinerabtei Maria Laach und der Nationalsozialismus (Paderborn: Schöningh Verlag, 2004), p. 159.


519 Ibid.
1914", Th. Bogler has been characterised above all as a former soldier: a text in 
memoriam accredits to him (with sympathy) a ‘soldierly character’;\textsuperscript{520} and the title of 
his book \textit{Soldat und Mönch} (‘Soldier and Monk’, 1937) cemented this connection. It 
was a best-seller, with five editions until 1939.\textsuperscript{521} He continued with his ceramic craft 
after the war and established the abbey’s own art publishing house \textit{ars liturgica}. 
Bogler died in 1968. 

In 1926, Bogler produced putti for at least one public project which Mattern 
designed in Magdeburg, so there was also some professional collaboration between 
them.\textsuperscript{522} In this documented case, Mattern suggested Bogler and pressured his boss 
Linke to agree on a commission, although the result with its anatomical distortions 
disappointed everyone (including Mattern), an embarrassing experience for 
Mattern.\textsuperscript{523} On other occasions Mattern tried to convince a city to buy his friend’s 
vases, which were ‘terribly cheap’.\textsuperscript{524} Also for Mattern’s first project, the Kraiger 
garden at Helmstedt (1927), he intended to obtain two Bogler-made vases from 
Velten-Vordamm.\textsuperscript{525} For the seminal Dresden Horticultural Jubilee Exhibition of 

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{520} Pater Dr. Emmanuel v. Severus OSB: ‘P. Theodor Bogler (1897–1968) Maria Laach gedenkt eines großen 
\item \textsuperscript{521} Theodor Bogler, \textit{Soldat und Mönch: Ein Bekenntnisbuch} (Köln: 1937). Cf.: M. Albert, \textit{Die 
\item \textsuperscript{522} Letters from Mattern to Hammerbacher, EHH: (26-4), 03/10/1926; (26-8), 09/11/1926; (without no.), 
08/12/1926.
\item \textsuperscript{523} Letters from Mattern to Hammerbacher, EHH: (without no.), 16/06/1927; (without no.), 26/06/1927.
\item \textsuperscript{524} Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no./n.d., prob. 19/02/1927), EHH.
\item \textsuperscript{525} Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.), 06/03/1927 (written on the ‘train Helmstedt– 
Magdeburg’), EHH.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
1926, too, Bogler produced pieces of pottery which were published in journals.526 Hammerbacher also later came to know him in Berlin.527

Theodor's younger brother Friedrich Wilhelm's talent was for a while swinging between carpentry, clothes making, theatre and painting (Fig. 74).528 His interest in theatre and costumes had led him, in the early 1920s, to the decision to establish a custom tailoring service. After 1925, when he had completed his studies at the Bauhaus, F.W. Bogler lived in Berlin and in Caputh, south of Potsdam. During Mattern's occupation at Magdeburg, they occasionally visited each other, going out to drink and dance the Charleston, F.W. Bogler irritating bystanders with his wild dancing and his Russian shirt.529 Later Hammerbacher also went to dance the Charleston with F.W. Bogler and other friends in Berlin, while Mattern had to stay in Magdeburg.530 Only around 1926 did the younger Bogler decide to concentrate on a career as painter.531 In 1929 he retreated onto the Knüll Mountain in Western Hesse, where he joined the Willingshausen Painters' Colony, spending his full time painting

---

526 'In the November issue of Keramische Zeitung there is an article about gardens etc. with Bogler's works at Dresden.' ('Im Novemberheft der keramischen Zeitung ist ein Aufsatz über Gärten u.s.f. mit Boglers Arbeiten in Dresden') Letter Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.), 13/12/1926, EHH.

527 Letters from Mattern to Hammerbacher, EHH: (without no.), 26/01/1927; (without no.), 05/04/1927.

528 If not stated otherwise, as reference for the information on F. W. Bogler see: G. Meißner et. al. (eds), AKL (1995) vol. 12, p. 259.

529 Like other Bauhaus artists, Bogler was known to wear the traditional Russian Kosovorotka, see: EHH, letter Mattern to Hammerbacher (no no.), 27/12/1926 (postal stamp). Cf.: Friedrich Wilhelm Bogler. Ein Künstlerleben zwischen Bauhaus und Neuer Sachlichkeit, ed. by Städtische Wessenberg Galerie Konstanz, exhibition catalogue (12th of October until the 24th of November 2002), p. 11.

530 EHH, letter Mattern to Hammerbacher (no no.), 10/02/1927.

531 'Today, Bogler wrote me his first letter for a long time - he now properly feels entirely a painter - he starts his first properly commissioned portrait - continues to paint water and anything he encounters. You have to get to know him better - to see what the chap is capable of.' ('Bogler schrieb mir heute seit langem den ersten Brief - er fühlt sich jetzt ganz richtig als Maler - er beginnt jetzt sein erstes richtig bestelltes Portrait - malt weiter Wasser und alles was ihm begegnet. Du mußt ihn auch noch genauer kennen lernen - um mal zu sehen was der Kerl kann.') Letter Mattern to Hammerbacher (no. 26-4), 05/11/1926, EHH.
the surrounding countryside. His style has been described – also by Mattern himself – as halfway between Expressionism and Neue Sachlichkeit (New Objectivity). In Mattern’s Bavarian farmhouse there is a painted wardrobe – in a traditional form, with doors depicting two single standing people, a man and a woman dressed in simple colourful worker’s clothes – as well as at least one water colour painting from 1940 (Fig. 75). Although his painting has not yet reached a wider audience, F.W. Bogler’s involvement in the Bauhaus theatre has secured him a little place in art history: he is recognised as the maker (though not the designer) of the unusual costumes for the famous ‘Mechanical Ballet’ by Kurt Schmidt -, and he is often mentioned as member of Schlemmer’s theatre class, having produced his own piece Rakokokokotte (‘Rococo Coquette’) in 1924 (Fig. 76). He was conscripted in 1940 and later wounded, then died of pneumonia in 1945 in a military hospital at the Austrian town Zell am See. To Mattern he meant a lot; admired for his skills and his extravagant character. Also, Mattern’s love of art resonated in his perception of the friend’s work. At the end of 1926 he wrote to Hammerbacher:

[…] I was surprised, the lad has found to himself now and he will surely make it. You have to get to know each other now, but most importantly I want you to judge his work. I believe he is amongst the best painters at this moment – yes, just you laugh about my optimism – it is surprising indeed. Objective – but not [Otto] Dix – with the machine-likeness rather similar to one of the old Italians, with the superiority over that which stands behind it (the face).

532 A first retrospective of his life and work has been shown by the Städtische Wessenberg Galerie Konstanz at the end of 2002, see fn 527.

533 The costumes were geometric shapes cut out of cardboard, painted in basic colours, and joined by flexible hinges, which were to cover the performers’ bodies. Josef Straßer, 50 Bauhaus icons you should know (Munich/New York: Prestel, 2009), p. 67 [?]. Compare: G. Meißner et. al. (eds), AKL (1995) vol. 12, p. 259.

534 ‘[…] ich hab gestaunt, der Junge hat sich nun gefunden und er schafft’s bestimmt. Ihr müßt Euch nun kennen lernen, am meisten liegt mir daran, daß Du seine Arbeiten beurteilst. Ich glaub er ist
The Boglers provided Mattern with a direct, early connection to the art world. In letters Mattern mentioned wanting to ask them more questions about the Bauhaus, but their role was merely to cement an affinity that had been there long before, and which Mattern cherished by different means.

**Gropius, Schlemmer and the Weimar Bauhaus: Far East vs. America**

The most recognisable consequence of Mattern's personal experience of, and identification with, the Bauhaus may be found less in his design practice than in his teaching (compare chapter II-I). Relevant for the biographical part, from information handed down from visits to the Bauhaus, has been the meeting with Walter Gropius, who offered Mattern a job in his office for architecture. When Mattern demurred he had not yet finished his formal education, Gropius played down the young man's lack of experience, arguing that the design of gardens did not necessarily require a specific education at a college. Mattern, who with others fought for the introduction of an academic curriculum for his discipline at University level, was so annoyed by Gropius's apparent lack of respect for Mattern's profession that he rejected the job offer - so the hard to verify anecdote goes.535 Mattern was interested in Gropius' thinking and discussed this with Hammerbacher, but he also ridiculed the architect's ways:

> i will now write everything in lower case like gropius, dessau. 'we cannot speak in

---

Capitals, thus we cannot write in Capitals either — ways to the new objectivity.'

Apart from Gropius, the other Bauhaus influence came from Oskar Schlemmer, whose theatre class Mattern attended — at a rehearsal getting the chance to cover for a student who had fallen sick (Fig. 77). Mattern’s love for the theatre lasted his entire life, and in his student days in Berlin he had worked as an extra on film or theatre sets (not specified). The affinities between Mattern and Schlemmer must have been strong, for in Mattern's private estate is a undated handwritten, very personal poem written by the artist, entitled Der Verrückte ('The Madman'), in which he gave expression to an alarmingly depressed mind. The wall painting in Mattern's house originated in 1937, when Schlemmer's work was already proscribed by the National Socialists as ‘degenerate art’. Mattern’s private collection of Schlemmer paintings, prints and books suggests that he really identified with the artist’s work.

Schlemmer represents a peculiarity in Modernist German art, which may shed light on Mattern’s oscillating standing towards the modern movement, too. With his figurative motives, his search for a ‘new classicism’ and through his strong involvement with the third dimension Schlemmer stood somewhat outside the general artistic trends. Space was addressed less through sculpture than through theatre design, theatre script

536 ‘werde jetzt mal alles klein schreiben wie gropius, dessau. “wir können nicht Groß sprechen, können also auch nicht Groß schreiben – wege zur neuen sachlichkeit.”’ Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, 26/2, 30/09/1926, EHH.

537 Raimund Harms, personal communication, 26/02/2007.

538 Ibid.; Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.), 09/05/1927, EHH.

539 Zur Nedden (then under the nam Maltusch) told a journalist years later, that Hans Scharoun had asked them if they could do something to help the artist. He then was asked to create a work in their house at Potddam-Bornim — since 2007 restored family property. It still exists and is one of Schlemmer’s last artistic works. (Beate Maltusch in an interview with the Mannheimer Morgenpost [?], 24/11/1988).

writing, and wall painting (Fig. 78). In particular his Bauhaus ballets and his wall paintings are his original contribution to the modernist art of the 1920s, despite his painterly oeuvre being rather under-explored and under-received.\textsuperscript{541} Schlemmer’s published letters to his best friend, the Swiss abstract painter Otto Meyer-Amden, allow for a deep insight into the atmosphere at the Bauhaus and Weimar Germany generally:

\[\ldots\] Johannes] Itten wants the talent, which is formed in the quiet, Gropius the character in the stream of the world (and the talent as well).

The result of the first is that little remains visible \[\ldots\], in addition a lot of talk about the work and its preconditions. The result of the second, superficiality, business absorbing even those few things of the quiet that have come into view. This duality seems a very fundamental thing in the Germany of today. On the one hand the invasion of Eastern culture, the India cult, also the back-to-nature of the Wandervogel movement and others: settlement, vegetarianism, tolstoyism, reaction to war – on the other hand americanism, progress, engineering marvels and invention, metropolis. Gropius and Itten are the typical representatives, and I have to say I find myself happily-sad halfway between. I affirm both or I wish the interpenetration of one with the other. Or are progress (expansion) and self-fulfilment (concentration) really two different directions, which practically exclude one another, and are thus not possible at the same time?\textsuperscript{542}

\textsuperscript{541} This is due to a legal fight between the heirs to his œuvre, which was more or less resolved only recently. Due to a statute of limitation that granted the heirs the publication rights, little substantial research has been published in recent years. The first mayor exhibition of Schlemmer works will be staged on the occasion of the Large State Exhibition 2014 at the Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, 21/11/2014–06/04/2015. http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-56756392.html (last accessed 18/07/2014); http://www.staatsgalerie.de/ausstellung_e/vorabinfo.php?id=106 (last accessed 18/07/2014).

Did Mattern identify with Schlemmer, because he felt the same? In him, too, we find both tendencies united. Apart from the obvious (Wandervogel, spirituality), Mattern also was fascinated with Far-Eastern culture. During his stay at Magdeburg, he referred several times to a book on Balinese traditions (Figures 79–81), which highly inspired him:543

I would almost like to claim that the purely artistic does not express that which is comprehensible on a purely sensory level. At the moment the sacrificial offerings of the Bali people (in the Bali book) come to mind, which present such challenges to the internal (of the the observer) without telling him anything. This way partly Klee, and more so Kandinsky become clear to me, at least in their ways (without meaning to present them as examples).

All the rest today may be applied arts [or: commercial].544

He also was keen to get hold of Marie-Luise Gothein's book on Indian gardens as soon as it was published in 1926, and at least in the 1930s he read classic Chinese
novels, such as *The Dream of the Red Chamber* (Cáo Xuêqín, first printed in 1791), which dealt amongst other things with the creation of a garden.\(^{545}\) Häring's and Scharoun's interest in Chinese architecture has to be considered, inspired by the research of Ernst Boerschmann (1873–1949), on whose famous book on China of 1922 Kandinsky drew when devising exercises for his Bauhaus classes.\(^{546}\) Migge drew from traditional Chinese agriculture the use of human faeces for fertilisation, inspired by his friend Camillo Schneider's travel reports from China – who was also close to Foerster.\(^{547}\) In later decades, Mattem's interest in Japan grew. In 1952 he wrote an article about the new edition of the seminal book on Japanese architecture by Tetsuro Yoshida (1894–1956), first published in 1935, concluding that in Japanese architecture 'the functionalist steps in front of the formal, the everyday in front of the monumental' (Fig. 82).\(^{548}\) In 1956 his wife wrote an extensive comparative review of Yoshida's *Das Japanische Wohnhaus* (1\(^{\text{st}}\) edn 1935 by Wasmuth, Berlin), 'which had


for 10 years been out of stock', and Robert Winkler's *Das Haus des Architekten*, discussing images from Yoshida’s book and Japanese and Japanese-inspired architecture from Winkler's, such as Kenzo Tange’s private house of 1953.\(^{549}\) The key concept of zur Nedden’s article was ‘interpenetration’ (*Durchdringung*) – ‘of the landscape with the garden, garden with house, the rooms with each other and in many cases the floors one above the other’.\(^{550}\) For a journal focusing in great parts on garden plants such contributions strike the reader as peculiar. During the 1960s Mattern and his daughter Merete also worked on projects with the Chinese architect Chen Kuen Lee (1915–2003), who had collaborated with Poelzig, Häring, Boerschmann and Scharoun, amongst other in the context of the projected establishment of a Chinese Werkbund.\(^{551}\) During that decade Mattern was also once more inspired by Japan, when in 1965 he travelled there and held lectures at the universities of Kyoto and Tokyo. The same year he held several lectures in Germany about Zen-Buddhism, Japanese Art and the tea ceremony;\(^{552}\) and in 1966 he spoke about Japanese gardens at the University of Newcastle, where he was invited by Brian Hackett.\(^{553}\) Mattern invited three Japanese garden design academics to Berlin as visiting professors: Seihei Kato (University of Tokyo, 1962), Ayaakira Okazaki (Kyoto, 1964), and Mitsuo Yokohama (University of Tokyo, 1965).\(^{554}\) To be sure, Bali, China, and Japan should not be painted with the same brush, and nor do the


\(^{550}\) B. zur Nedden, ‘Von der Kunst zu Wohnen’, *Pflanze und Garten*, 7 (1956), 140–3 (140).


\(^{553}\) An excerpt of the lecture manuscript is presented in: V. Heinrich, *Hermann Mattern* (2013), pp. 91–2.

\(^{554}\) See the guest book of his professorial chair at the University Archive of Technische Universität Berlin, EHM.
mentioned references all represent Eastern mysticism and inward-focusing 'self-fulfilment', as referred to by Schlemmer. However, the way Mattern referred to them shows his search for symbolism, performative qualities and 'content' through rituals in architecture as opposed to 'pure' form and construction, as well as his general interest in other cultures' life forms.

Mattern was also open to American culture, enjoying his nights out dancing the Charleston. He seriously considered emigrating to the States in the early 1920s, but with his strong progressivist sense he became estranged by what in an exhibition at Magdeburg in 1926 he perceived as a superficial and consumerist culture:

Yesterday I went to see the America exhibition — what they are building nowadays is simply enough to make one p... From the first moment I felt completely freed from [the interest in] America, as even their best [architects] are below our average ones, Wright is a fantasist, but a bad one. His objectivity is almost bluff — at first I was furious, and then I found Ehrhardt [his colleague], and together with him I was able to have a decent laugh. The only thing behind it is technology and money — and because [money] stands behind it, the people don't succeed in gathering their wits, they don't achieve clarity. Everyone is stuck in their romantic travel memories or the heritage of their homeland, which they don't know how to translate clearly enough into their situation.555

555 'Gestern war ich in der Amerikaschau — einfach zum k... ist das Zeug was die heute bauen, ich glaubte mich im ersten Augenblick ganz von Amerika befreit, denn selbst die Besten stehen unter unserem Durchschnitt, Wright ein Phantast, aber ein schlechter. Seine Sachlichkeit ist fast Bluff — zuerst hatte ich Wut und dann fand ich Ehrhardt, mit hab ich noch tüchtig lachen können. Das einzige ist Technik und Geld was dahinter sitzt — und weil es [an arrow indicates that 'Geld' is meant] dahinter sitzt, kommen die Menschen nicht zur Besinnung, zur Klarheit. Ein jeder steckt in seinen romantischen Reiseerinnerungen oder heimatlichen Vererbungen, die sie nicht in ihre Verhältnisse klar genug übersetzen können.' Ibid. Soon later he wrote: 'What you hinted at today concerning [the architect Adolf] Rading will surely be to my liking, and should be close to anyone who truly lives in our times. At the same time one should not blindly accept everything as good. I think especially of Wright, who is almost presented as the father figure of our building, while in my view he is far away from that, as I find he is straining a lot after effect.' ('Was Du heut von Rading andeutetest liegt mir sicher und müßte ja einem jeden in unserer Zeit voll lebenden nahe liegen. Dabei darf man auch nicht blind alles für gut hinnehmen. Da denk ich besonders an Wright, den
Such confessions, together with his distance from pure constructivism and his striving for the organic, may help to locate Mattern's position within the modern movement (in later decades he would change his mind about Wright, who became one of his favourite architects). Schlemmer's wall painting at Mattern's Bornim home, coincidently or not, corresponded to thoughts that Mattern himself had pondered over in one of the letters some ten years earlier, with regard to his creative work: 'Spirit as the synthesis of feeling and reason? I see it as a third, which can join with each, and which each can lack.' Schlemmer's mural depicts three overlaid human figures representing the body, the soul/spirit (emotion) and the mind (reason/cognition) (Figures 83, 84).

Modern and romantic: Mattern's reception of literature and art

Mattern read much and consumed books quickly. Reading meant so much to him that he would read a book twice if it inspired him, or if he did not understand it well and had the feeling there was more to get out of it. His choice of authors reflects a taste that may show why he later moved so close to Karl Foerster. Amongst the works he enjoyed he mentioned Gogol's *Taras Bulba* ("[...] it is one of the few books that I was occupied with as a boy") – the edition was illustrated with woodblock prints by Karl Rössing (1897–1987), which he admired greatly. He also read novels by Gustav Meyrinck, Jean Paul, Marcel Proust, Stendhal and August Strindberg. One of his most cherished possessions was Frans Masereel's graphic novel *Mein man fast als den Vater unseres bauens hinstellt, dabei steht er meiner Ansicht nach weit davon ab, da er mir sehr effekthaschend vorkommt.") Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, (without no., 15/02/1927, EHH.

556 Ibid., p. 23


558 Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (no. 26-19), 27/11/1926, EHH.
Stundenbuch (‘My Book of Hours’, 1st edn 1919, published in Germany 1920, then followed in 1926 by an edition with an introduction by Thomas Mann), which once more points to his strong reception of woodblock prints and their possible influence on his postwar, angular, almost woodcut-like design vocabulary (Figures 85, 86). At the suggestion of Hammerbacher he also read Honoré de Balzac, Stefan George and Luigi Pirandello. He did not merely mention books, but discussed sophisticatedly a writer’s style. Jean Paul’s *Hesperus oder 45 Hundposttag* (1795), which he read in those days, is one of the most emotive novels, abstrusely varied and seemingly disjointed, written in a language that today appears grotesquely sentimental, but considered a work of great literary art.\(^{559}\) Contemporary critics were mainly enraptured; Johann Gottfried Herder, after reading some pages of it, claimed to be incapable of work for two days. The writing of Jean Paul (born Johann Paul Friedrich Richter) – to whom Mattern claimed to be ‘fleeing’ from ‘her’ Stefan George – thus can be seen as representing Mattern’s most romantic side. He loved the writer ‘for his richness, his exaggeratedness’, and he explained, probably in response to a critique by Hammerbacher: ‘Not exorbitance and wealth of variants, but introspective fullness I see in his tapeworm-long sentences.’\(^{560}\) He then drew a line to questions of

\(^{559}\) Letters from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.), 31/01/1927 and 07/02/1927, EHH. Jean Paul is the pen name of Johann Paul Friedrich Richter (1763–1825), one of the most famous German enlightenment authors, who is known for his romantic, diffident style and labyrinthine, richly ironic plots, cf.: *Encyclopedia of the romantic era: 1760–1850*, ed. by Christopher John Murray, 2 vols (New York and London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2004), II, pp. 853–4. Jean Paul’s *Hesperus, oder 45 Hundposttag: Eine Biographie* (Berlin: 1795) was the romantic author’s most sentimental story and the most celebrated novel since Goethe’s Werther of 1774, adored by Herder and respected by Schiller and Goethe. Stefan George in 1896 wrote a hymn to the then forgotten Jean Paul (*Lobrede auf Jean Paul*) inspired by this very novel, see: Walter Killy, *Killy Literaturlexikon: Autoren und Werke deutscher Sprache* (vol. 9 ‘Ore–Roq’) (Gütersloh et. al.: Bertelsmann-Lexikon-Verlag, 1991), p. 4409.

\(^{560}\) Letters from Mattern to Hammerbacher, without no./no date (written between 12/11/ and 14/11/1926), EHH.
design, transferring stylistic characteristics he observed in literature to visual aesthetic categories:

With [Adolf] Haag’s emphasis I say ‘I love him’ because of his fullness and the richness of his exaggeratedness. Here, too, it is the opposites, which you already alleged in relation to painting. [...] The whole thing can only speak through the individual, and come into being through the individual. When this individual possesses a conciseness and definition, and if it is essential, then even if many elements are strung together or intertwined – it creates an entity. In another case it may stand alone (the individual) and still be an entity. [This is] still not very clear, but maybe you can imagine how I mean it [...]. With this I wanted to say that good multiplicity and good simplicity are not far apart.561

Beside his interest in literature and great love for nature, Mattern was passionate about modern art. Through the Bogler brothers and later through his friendship with the families of Oskar Moll, Ferdinand Möller and others he had some contact with the art scene, and it is probable that he had met Kandinsky, Klee and other teachers in person when he visited the Bauhaus in the early 1920s.562 Then there were the less innovative painters surrounding Karl Foerster, such as Sigward Sprotte (1913–2004), Ludwig Bartning (1869–1956, older brother of the architect Otto) and Mattern’s brother-in-law Henner Röse (Fig. 87).


562 Mattern’s connections to the art scene will be illustrated further in the following chapters, in particular II-f.
One of Mattern's favourite pastimes was to visit art exhibitions. While little impressed by absolute geometrical abstraction, he identified himself more with naturalistic sculpture (Kurt Harald Isenstein is noted), and above all with the emotive earlier Expressionism of Die Brücke and other German painters and sculptors, who stood under the influence of the Fauves, Art Nouveau and African and South Sea sculpture. They sought for models of 'original' artistic expression in 'primitive art', and Mattern's occupation with Karl With's writing on Balinese art, for example, corresponded directly to the interest of the Expressionists some fifteen years earlier. Mattern's letters suggest an intensive preoccupation with this current in art. In particular he liked the nature celebrating watercolours in Erich Heckel's work and woodblock prints, for example those by Ernst Ludwig Kirchner and Masereel. An important connection between Mattern and Expressionist art is personified in his friend Ferdinand Möller, one of the most important promoters of Expressionism. Comparisons between Expressionist paintings and Mattern's work indeed reveal some commonalities. Accordingly, for an understanding of Mattern's œuvre a look at the phenomenon described as Expressionism is vital. But we will steer clear of so-called Expressionist architecture, as the application of the term to architecture raises difficulties, and, the way it has been used for the organic functionalists (in particular


Scharoun) has contributed to persisting misconceptions.\textsuperscript{566} Often it has been discussed as an architectural style, while Expressionism in art cannot be narrowed down to a style.

With its complete disconnection from traditional forms of representation as practised in the academic art in Western culture, Expressionism was one of the greatest ruptures of modern art. For some it marked the true departure of Modernism. Despite occasional claims of Expressionism being the one original German contribution in art to classical Modernism, there were strong international influences, for example from Van Gogh, Edvard Munch or the Nabis.\textsuperscript{567} Characteristic was the break with the securely established Impressionism – especially with regard to its widely commissioned tame Prussian variant –, in favour of a further abstraction to engage with ‘those who enjoy art’ individually, on a foremost ‘internal’, emotional channel of communication – including the dark, negative, ugly aspects of war and the modernised society.\textsuperscript{568} Thanks to its interrelation with the youth cult of the anti-authoritarian cultural reform movements, it shaped the language, the thinking and thus the creative production of many of those who grew up in the first two decades of the 20th Century. As with the French Cubists and Fauves, the common aim of German Expressionist art was the destruction of form. The specific aspect of German


art has been presented as aiming for ‘strong emotive and mystical distortions’. To contrast this with an alleged more ‘logical’ orientation of the Roman-influenced world and a French focus on formal rather than psychological distortions may represent an outdated perspective, but that position resonates with the contemporary self-conception of German art as connected to irrationality, the ‘internal’, and the subconscious. These qualities were not only relevant within an artistic field, as a quote by Walther Schoenichen, a pioneer in nature conservation with a völkisch outlook, makes clear: according to him, nature reserves were necessary ‘in order to keep alive and effective for our nation the emanation of irrational powers that well up from our virgin home soil.’

The beginning of Expressionism is usually seen in the founding date of the artists association Brücke (‘Bridge’), in 1905, at Dresden by the architectural students Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, Fritz Bleyl, Erich Heckel and Karl Schmidt-Rottluff. After the disbandment of the group in 1913, most of its former members enjoyed immense attention with their solo careers until the Nazis ostracised them as ‘degenerate art’ (entartete Kunst). Another, more loosely associated group of artists at the core of this movement was Der Blaue Reiter (The Blue Rider), which emerged in Munich a few


570 Cf. Ibid.


years before WWI. In Germany those associated with it (Lyonel Feininger, Alexej von Jawlensky, Wassilij Kandinsky, Paul Klee, August Macke, Franz Marc, Gabriele Münter and Marianne von Werefkin) belong to the most revered artists of the 20th century. There were connections amongst different artist groups and associated sympathisers like the composer Arnold Schönberg, and there were highly influential independents such as Oskar Kokoschka, Otto Pankok, or Christian Rohlfs, and the sculptors Ernst Barlach, Rudolf Belling and Wilhelm Lehbruck (Fig. 88).

Expressionism started out during the late Wilhelmine era, 'as a rebellion against the fraudulent representational art' of its time, and 'also against Impressionism's ethical "Neutralism"', which was 'considered insufficient'. Soon the vivid life of Berlin began to play a central role in the expressionist movement, when in 1911 the Brücke moved here. Artists' associations formed in connection with art journals, especially Der Sturm ('The Storm') of Herwarth Walden and Die Aktion ('The Action') of Franz Pfempfert, and 'the intense exchange between plastic artists and authors' added to the capital's significance in matters of contemporary art. Besides the striving for new forms of artistic expression, the Brücke is known for their pioneering idea of a new way of life that included the practice of shared creative production under exposure to the forces of nature. They spent much time outdoors, for example at Dangast on the Baltic Sea coast, and later passed days together with their models at lakes near Dresden, painting their companions naked in the natural surroundings - provocative behaviour for those conservative times (Fig. 89, 90).


575 Ibid.

their search for a self-determined and ‘natural’ life, and this is a point where Mattern’s affinity towards their art becomes particularly comprehensible, especially considering the obvious parallels with the Youth Movement. After all, Mattern was a trained gardener, a hiker, and a passionate nature enthusiast. He could marvel about a bunch of blue Irises on his table and meditate about the seemingly incidental, spontaneous beauty of Heckel’s flickering watercolours, suffused in light and colour:

Heckel is exhibiting here at the moment, I went to see it. Watercolours I love so much that...

it made me shudder on entering the hall. People at the sea, in the forest, the more fragmented the more finely were the lines restrained. Water, stones, glass – empathetic in such a humanly affected way, as one can only be if one is completely modest. That’s why I love these things so much – because they bring no reproach – seemingly so sketchy, that one thinks one could immediately start in a similar way. There was a vase with snapdragons in pen and ink. With Rolfs’ flowers – the most beautiful I have seen so far.577

Also his stressing of the necessity to create unaffected, ‘genuine’ designs was probably directly influenced by Expressionism, not only in painting but also in literature. The following description of a design of his illustrates the parallels:

It interlaces, bends, slots together, flows calmly, breaks off, translates itself and halts. At one moment it converges smoothly, only to spill over vociferously at another. And yet [it

---

is] lucid, self-evident, clear, distributed, equated, and still vividly new.578

Affinities to Expressionism were widespread amongst those who did not identify with the old hierarchical society of the Kaiserreich. The much-quoted manifesto of the Brücke read:

Believing in development and in a new generation both of those who create and of those who enjoy, we call all young people together, and as young people who carry the future in us we want to wrest freedom for our gestures and for our lives from the older, comfortably established forces. We claim as our own everyone who reproduces directly and without falsification whatever it is that drives him to create.579

Twenty years after the founding of the Brücke, Mattern felt still very connected to this art, and the same is known of the slightly older generation of landscape architects, such as Otto Valentien and Gustav Allinger. Mattern was also connected personally to some artists related with Expressionism and his house holds some interesting post-war works, for example by Otto Pankok (with a personal dedication to ‘Prof. Mattern’) and by Theodor Werner.

Expressionism did not convey a specific political message and has never been politically clear: the expressionist grandmaster Emil Nolde for example – an occasional guest at Möller's580 –, with his Nordic mysticism and staunch Anti-

578 ‘Es schachtelt, winkelt, flügt sich, fließt ruhig weiter, bricht ab, übersetzt sich und mach Halt. Geht einmal ruhig ineinander, um mit Getöse ins andre überzulaufen. Und doch klar, selbstverständlich übersichtlich, verteilt, gleichgestellt und doch lebhaft neu.’ Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, no. 26-9 (11 November 1926), EHH. About stylistic characteristics of literary Expressionism such as strings of words, personification and objectification, see: Silvio Vietta and Hans-Georg Kemper, Expressionismus, series Deutsche Literatur im 20. Jahrhundert, 3 (München: Fink, 1975), esp. pp. 30–81 (chapter 2.1 and 2.2).


580 Eberhard Roters, Galerie Ferdinand Möller: Die Geschichte einer Galerie für Moderne Kunst in
Semitism, embraced National Socialism before realising that the Nazis did not appreciate his art.581 At the end of WWI however Expressionism stood, as with the early youth movement, mainly for a liberal weltanschauung and a criticism of the Empire's chauvinism.582 Also, the history of the reception of Expressionism is complex and includes a period of uncritical reverence as 'anti-Nazi' art in both German states after WWII. Some ambiguous facts have long been overlooked, such as the rigorous self-advertisement of the Brücke in strategically swinging away from reference to South Sea and African art, when they felt this non-German connection represented an impediment to their commercial success. They replaced this reference with alleged new-found connection to Germanic tradition, namely medieval ('Gothic') woodblock printing.583 In connection to this, Expressionism was at the centre of a debate on German Modernism and was for a short while recruited as representing völkisch values. In spring 1933, when the faction of influential Nazi ideologue Alfred Rosenberg tried to gain power over Goebbels in the field of cultural politics, young Nazis in Berlin protested against the reactionary positions that now gained the upper hand. Expressionism was seen by many as an original German contribution to art, and Theodor Heuss, for example, hoped, that these young who 'did not want reaction', would prevail in the struggle within the Nazi party.584 The

_Deutschland 1917-1956_, (Berlin: Gebrüder Mann, 1984), p. 84.


583 In an open lecture about Expressionism by art historian Magdalena Bushart, a specialist on Expressionism. Briefly, about the (un)political ambitions of Expressionist artist, see also: Peter Gay, _Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider_ (1968), pp. 102–6.

National-Socialist Students' League (Nationalsozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund) had organised an exhibition of thirty Expressionists to be shown in the Galerie Ferdinand Möller. The accompanying catalogue described Möller as 'for more than 20 years consequent protagonist of exclusively German art'.

The main activists in this initiative were Fritz Hippler, then a functionary in the NS Students' League and later known for his aggressively antisemitic propaganda film 'Der Ewige Jude' ('The Eternal Jew', 1940), and the artist Hans Weidemann, 'a protégé of Goebbels'. Goebbels' love of Expressionists like Edvard Munch and Nolde was no secret. As we know, the reactionaries won this conflict, as a result of which the Expressionists, like many other modernist artists who had tried to sell their art as 'essentially German', such as Schlemmer, were outlawed.

Expressionism had met its heyday before 1918, and afterwards experienced inflation, although its influence on the development of German art was pervasive. During the Weimar Republic the former protagonists of the movement developed a more personal manner or changed their style. With teachers like Klee and Kandinsky, the programme of the Blauer Reiter found its way into the artistic education at the Bauhaus. Mattern's preference for this current in art in the mid-1920s could be seen as already behind its time, as it had become part of the art establishment, and a new

---

585 Ibid.
586 Ibid.
587 Ibid.
avant-garde had emerged known as Neue Sachlichkeit (New Objectivity). It is not clear whether Mattern disliked the latter or whether Expressionism just offered him more in regard to a possible transfer of ideas to the design of gardens. According to Hartlaub, a campaigner of both Expressionism and Neue Sachlichkeit, Expressionism stood for an atmosphere of hope and exuberance, in contrast to the resignation and cynicism of the naturalism of Neue Sachlichkeit. For these reasons Expressionism must have been much more natural for Mattern with his rather optimistic outlook. He saw abstraction and appeal to the emotions as one of the highest qualities to aim for in art; and abstraction for him stood in opposition to pure constructivism (see below). Mattern generally showed enthusiasm and a high spirit as a young professional in view of the decrepit structures of the ‘garden art’ of the older generation. In this light, the boisterous, contrasty works of the Expressionists seem much more compliant with his character than Neue Sachlichkeit with its cynical undertone and its association with sobriety and disillusionment during the stabilisation phase of the Weimar Republic (Fig. 91). Also, formal abstraction for Mattern seemed to be especially attractive when it depicted either an individual’s existence confronted with life in the modern city, as in Masereel’s Stundenbuch, or, and above all, nature – the central subject of many Expressionist works. While it usually invites criticism as anachronistic to reduce a current in art to formal characteristics, some fascinating stylistic parallels can be drawn with regard to Mattern’s postwar work, as a side-by-side of a still from Robert Wiene’s style-forming film Das Kabinett des Dr. Caligari (The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari, 1922) and the square at the Federal Garden Exhibition 1955 at Kassel suggests (Figures 92, 93). This must suffice to illustrate a probable influence on Mattern’s personal use of forms by the art he had cherished as a young man during the Weimar years.


Expressionism and garden art: a contemporary debate

In landscape architecture Expressionism was discussed intensely, at least after an essay by Valentien had been published in Gartenkunst, in the March and April issues of 1924. As mentioned in the introduction, Valentien was a prominent alumnus of the horticultural college in Dahlem and, being only three years older, acted as Hammebacher's superior at the Spaeth nursery's design department. He was highly regarded by colleagues and fellow students as an innovator. He was known for his personal design style, which Mattern half respectfully, half ironically referred to as 'Valentienoid'. Later in life Valentien gave up garden design completely to concentrate on painting. While they were probably not close friends, a life-long connection is documented by personal correspondence.

Valentien's text appeared in two parts. The second was accompanied by little unframed sketches of garden scenes, subtitled 'Concerning the question "garden art and graphics", studies by Gustav Allinger' (Fig. 94). These at first glance entertaining drawings by one of the successful landscape architects of that time were rather disappointing as unimaginative and populist imitations. Allinger combined the agitated, crystalline composition style of the Brücke (especially Heckel and Kirchner) with shading in the manner of Jawlensky's zigzag line (Fig. 95). These naïve illustrations were much criticised as mere reproduction of an established style, and that style was precisely what Valentien was dismissing in his article as not part of 'the new', of Expressionism. In Expressionism, for the first time in art, style was rejected so that the personal could step into the foreground.

592 O. Valentien, 'Expressionismus und Gartenkunst', Gartenkunst, 37, 2 (1924), 17–9 (part I) and 37, 3 (1924), 46–8 (part II).


594 O. Valentien, 'Expressionismus und Gartenkunst', Gartenkunst, 37, 3 (1924), 46–8 (46); O. Valentien, 'Expressionismus und Gartenkunst', Gartenkunst, 37, 2 (1924), 17–9 (18).
One of Valentien’s key terms was ‘the internal’ (‘das Innere’), which was to be given expression – the central concept of Expressionism. Amongst the published essays in a garden journals of that time Valentien’s was exceptional, in that it dealt on a relatively high intellectual level (considering the focus group of garden designers) and with a purely theoretical matter, something in those days referred to as ‘vergeistigt’, ‘spiritualised’ (or ‘metaphysical’). This was again a sign of the times, but Valentien also included some biting criticism and exposed a true artistic open-mindedness. His pleadings are well written, with the exception of one clumsily worded sentence, in which he equated the word Expressionism with ‘the New’, in order to ‘protect us from complicated auxiliary explanations’ when trying to find a German equivalent.595 He chose the term ‘the New’ because it represented for him the key characteristic of Expressionism: a significant break with historical styles and traditional compositional techniques. Only complete artistic freedom could create important works of garden design. He acknowledged the fact that other trends, such as Cubism, Futurism, and Dadaism, had at present taken over the lead in the visual arts, but Expressionism he considered as a kind of superordinate term; the movement had paved the way for all other Modernist ways of expression. At the same time, Valentien admitted that an Expressionist style as known in painting, had not asserted itself in the field of garden design – which he saw as due to it being an applied art; the freedom to develop a purely aesthetic solution could not be the same. However, the scale on which to measure ‘can and must only be the depth and honesty of the creative’.596 According to Valentien, it was the creative process that had changed, and ‘the actual value lies in the process of formation of a work, not anymore in the latter


The present is always free of a style. Style is history and thus dead. And no lively period understood its style as it happened. The artist works only according to internal principles, and he leaves the question of the style to the art historian or the museum conservator.\textsuperscript{598}

These words were contrasted with the rather sober claim that traditional forms which had proved useful could be integrated into a new rhythm, as all design built on forms of the past. And in fact, while being perfectly appropriate for the demands of modern dwelling, Valentien's own designs showed little in the way of new formal modes of expression. Tellingly, he himself thought that contemporary garden design showed very little that was truly new, but still did belong to the present as it carried the new within it. This was seen by all those, who did actually live in a true connection to their own time.\textsuperscript{599} His concluding demand was correspondingly and consequently a call for 'a profound and lasting contact [\textit{Fühlungnahme}] with the contemporary volition of all free arts [.\ldots].'\textsuperscript{600} The final sentence of the essay reflects something that has been bemoaned in many different periods, and almost seems to invite the notion of a hidden blow at Allinger's illustrative efforts:

Only if we understand the culture and art of our times we will be able to grasp and fulfil the present time's demands on the design of its gardens. As long as we do not accomplish

\textsuperscript{597} O. Valentien, 'Expressionismus und Gartenkunst', \textit{Gartenkunst}, 37, 2 (1924), 17–9 (18).


\textsuperscript{599} O. Valentien, 'Expressionismus und Gartenkunst', \textit{Gartenkunst}, 37, 3 (1924), 46–8 (47).

\textsuperscript{600} O. Valentien, 'Expressionismus und Gartenkunst', \textit{Gartenkunst}, 37, 3 (1924), 46–8 (48).
this contact, we will only be imitators (and often late ones) of the appropriately modern spatio-artistic ideas of the architects.\textsuperscript{601}

In one of her few writings, a chapter about private gardens in volume IV of the comprehensive publication \textit{Berlin und seine Bauten}, Herta Hammerbacher presented the Buchthal garden from 1922 by Eryk Pepinski in Berlin-Westend as a truly Expressionist example and also named objects realised on the occasion of Allinger’s influential ‘Flora’ garden exhibition of 1926 in Dresden, amongst these the ‘Green Cathedral’ (‘Grüner Dom’), a kind of plant-clad tower serving as focal point, which in contrast to common opinion was not designed by Allinger (Figures 96, 97).\textsuperscript{602}

Above all others she named Allinger’s famous ‘\textit{Kommenden Garten}’ – ‘The Future Garden’ (literally: ‘Coming Garden’) – realised for the same Dresden garden show.

This showed some similarities to Mattern’s first garden design, the Kraiger garden at Helmstedt designed the same year (Figures 98, 99, cf. 36b). Hammerbacher’s reasons for this classification of ‘The Future Garden’ are not obvious, and her judgement has indeed been questioned.\textsuperscript{603} It can only be assumed that she wanted to stress the importance of the named work without paying too much attention to a careful definition – atypical for her, known as a model of intellectual discipline. However, her lines show how omnipresent the term Expressionism was during the mid-1920s, and Allinger was for a while one of the few at the centre of this debate.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{601} ‘Nur wenn wir die Kultur und Kunst unserer Zeit verstehen, werden wir die Forderungen, die diese Zeit an die Gestaltung ihrer Gärten stellt, begreifen und erfüllen lernen. Solange wir aber diesen Kontakt nicht gewinnen, werden wir nur Nachahmer (und sehr oft verspätete) der zeitgemäßen raumkünstlerischen Ideen der Architekten sein.’ Ibid.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{603} J. Wolschke-Bulmahn and P. Fibich, “‘Garden Expressionism’”, \textit{Garden History}, 33, 1 (2005), 106–17 (108).
\end{flushleft}
Apart from Valentien, who was himself sceptical, also several historians have concluded that Expressionism did not find entry into the design of gardens with the exception of a few singular examples and maybe a phase in the oeuvre of Georg Bela Pniower.\textsuperscript{604} If one is seeking a clearly recognisable Expressionist style, this statement can hardly be refuted. From today's view, when the notion of style in art history has stepped into the background, this is a natural observation that does not speak against the existence of Expressionist garden art. Correspondingly, it can arguably be claimed that Expressionism exerted a considerable influence on the design process of many landscape architects' work during the Weimar Republic. In Mattern's case, Pniower was a model in this regard.

The rational and the irrational Mattern

The mid-twenties and in particular the year 1926, when Mattern started his first professional occupation in Magdeburg, saw the publication of several sensational books in the field of modern architecture, art, and design. Above all, Kandinsky's highly anticipated \textit{Punkt und Linie zu Fläche} (\textit{Point and Line to Plane}) came into the book shops, one of the most influential books on the psychology of shape, as well as the German translation of Le Corbusier's \textit{Vers une architecture} (\textit{Towards a new architecture}, 1923) under the title \textit{Kommende Baukunst}. Mattern often read books sent by Hammerbacher, and one day she sent him Le Corbusier's book, which he read with mixed feelings.\textsuperscript{605} His judgement gives us insight into his intellectual maturity at the age of twenty-four:


\textsuperscript{605} Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (no. 26-10), without date (between 12/11/ and 14/11/1926), EHH. An copy from the original edition of 1926 can be found in Hammerbacher's private book collection, which is kept by her grandson.
I almost don’t want to continue reading Le Corbusier. So much of what he already says and his phrases I can hardly utter. And yet to me he is a reassurance. The wording I don’t dare, because a lot I see as a matter of course, and form already brings along rigidity. This does not have to apply to him, but those who want to use his words as paragraphs, guidelines for building, can only deliver something rigid and thus also imitated.

The process of implementation has to be a slow one, the surfacing of the same theses at different locations is already enough proof of their viability. Not the addiction to the new, but organic understanding out of the surroundings I want to nurture in myself. Especially here [in Magdeburg] I can watch every day flowers that “want-to-be-Modernist” fruits. Not that the people are stupid, no, [they are] overhasty, it is like proselytising a Hindu without knowing his religion and his way of living.606

While this quote shows his acceptance of Modernist thinking, it at the same time expressed an important qualification: the devotion to the organic. This confession contradicted Le Corbusier’s sermon about classical mathematical laws of proportion, such as the important role of the right angle in façade elevations. His thinking also shows how determined he was already at the very beginning of his career, and his later affinity to the organic functionalism of Häring becomes comprehensible. At other times his simultaneous enthusiasm for rationalist mass production of housing structures, not much different from the corresponding ideas presented in Le Corbusier’s chapter

---

'Mass-production houses' became obvious, too. Examples of such objects, designed under the pressures of the difficult economic situation in the early years of the republic, were presented in journals and also as real models on the occasion of the German Theatre Exhibition in Magdeburg 1927. At some stage Mattern described a little Göderitz-designed prefabricated house to Hammerbacher, which he actually even dreamt of acquiring for their common future (Fig. 100). However, as we know, far better times lay ahead of them and their second home was to be an exceptional building designed for (and together with) them by Hans Scharoun.

As became clear in the quote about Le Corbusier, Mattern embraced Modernism in the interest of a combination of social function with logical formal expression – as zeitgemäß (appropriate for the present times). In this context he would even discuss with Hammerbacher in detail the pros and cons of technical details in a self-retaining modern façade by Gropius:

At the Bauhaus we spoke about the visibility of the floors and the beams. Now I tell myself that it is indeed correct and good that one must not conceal the supporting structure. If I let a window run though, I must not be solicitous about trying to hide the floor, the ceiling respectively, or whatever lies in between. Were I now inclined to install a cladding, I would have to ask myself if I should let the window run through in the first place. Furthermore [...] I don’t see what kind of disadvantage would occur if the glass only reached from ceiling to floor, and the intermediate space showed itself in the facade as separating strip. In this respect, I now consider that glass wall with the background structures (at the Bauhaus) as solved.

---

607 Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.), 04/07/1927, EHH.

Also the role of Migge’s social reformism, whose publications Mattern read, can hardly be overestimated. But in relation to the Modernist movement in general, we should recognise that the other, ‘metaphysical’ Mattern was always there, too. His selection of writers, and also some of his self-reflecting remarks, hint at a Neo-romanticism in his aesthetic preferences. The language of his letters in the early years of his career was steeped in the life reform, even in vitalist wording. In his later life he studied Georg Simmel and was indirectly connected to the thinking of Helmut Plessner through his son in law, a student of the philosopher and later himself professor of philosophy. So, in view of his affinity to Lebensphilosophie, before the experience of the Nazis’ worst crimes in the name of ‘German spirit’, Mattern like many others may have embraced the growing invocation of the ‘intuitive’ and the ‘uncontrived’ as typically German values. His social environment was not all liberal and leftist, as sometimes suggested. Spengler’s work The decline of the West (Der Untergang des Abendlandes, 1918–22), one of the best selling books of the mid-1920s, Hammerbacher had been receiving enthusiastically, and in his collection, too, can be found an early edition. The right-wing philosopher is also the only author cited in Valentien’s above-mentioned article. Also Schlemmer’s or Gerhard Marcks’ search for a truly German art has to be mentioned, as Mattern’s artistic taste seems to lean towards artists like these rather than internationalist abstracts. The ambiguity of the ostracised Marcks, for example, included völkisch, nationalist, and anti-Jewish remarks at least in reference to a ‘jewish art mafia’, which allegedly ruled the American Art world, and under which one could only succeed as an ‘emigrant and

_Fußboden geht und der Zwischenraum als Trennungsstreifen sich in der Fassade zeigen würde. Insofern sehe ich jetzt diese Glaswand mit Hintergründen (am Bauhaus) als gelöst an.’ Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.), 07/01/1927, EHH.


Jewish [Jüdling]', as he wrote to Schlemmer in 1938.\textsuperscript{611} This field is complex and shall only be hinted at here. In this light it becomes more comprehensible that Mattern received ideas from different ideological backgrounds. He would not have hesitated to adopt single aspects of conservative philosophy, if these could be integrated into his on balance more progressivist views. Somewhere in this grey area may lie a point of compliance with reactionary modernists like Alwin Seifert and Fritz Todt, and it may explain Mattern's willingness to commit himself to the aims of the Organisation Todt during the later 1930s and 1940s. Foerster's rejection of rationalism and his affinities to German Romanticism came close to a worship of the 'German soul', and his mild nationalism has been addressed in the literature.\textsuperscript{612}

Beside the assumed general inspirations from the arts and literature on art for more naturalism, which suggests itself for the early years of Mattern's career, another determinant must have sprung from the exposure to a particular, spiritually tinged fin-de-siècle discourse that culminated in the theories of Rudolf Steiner, later entitled Anthroposophy.\textsuperscript{613} Anthroposophy represented an effort to combine 19th-century


\textsuperscript{613} As regarding Kandinsky and Klee, Mattern mentions in 1926, that in the context of reading a text by the art historian Karl With (in: Gregor Krause, \textit{Bali}, 2nd edn [München: G. Müller, 1926]), '[...] partly Klee, and more so Kandinsky become clear to me [...] ' ('[...] Mir wird so teilweise Klee, noch stärker Kandinsky klar [...].' Letter by Mattern to Hammerbacher, no. 26/4, 03/10/1926 (written at 6 a.m.), EHH. For a short introduction to that early 20th-century spiritualistic view on natural
emancipism with, amongst others, alchemy, German mysticism, and theosophy with the aim of achieving a synthesis between scientific rationality and these fields. It fundamentally influenced several prominent German landscape architects in Mattern’s context such as Max Schwarz and Alwin Seifert. Migge may have rejected Steiner’s theories, not least because they explicitly contradicted several of his methods such as the use of human feces, but this most influential amongst the German garden modernists was at least indirectly influenced through the polymath Ernst Fuhrmann (1886–1956) and his ‘Biosophy’ (‘Biosophie’), whom like Steiner can be placed into the philosophical category of spiritually informed research into nature. Mattern was surprisingly open-minded towards spiritual and religious matters – he did consider aspects of Christian thought, and he attended Anthroposophist and religious lectures. On 26 January 1926 he attended a lecture about ‘matrimony and eros’ (‘Ehe und Eros’) by the theologian Helmut Fahsel, a touring Catholic mystic from Berlin of great popular fame. Eventually he judged it pathetic and full of typical Catholic rigidity, but he did not disagree fundamentally with the underlying ideas. Mattern also enjoyed reading Rudolf Steiner on architecture.

617 In a letter with the postal stamp from the 21 January 1927, he mentions a lecture at the Anthroposophical Society that he visited the day before with his colleague Ehrhardt. Despite judging the said ‘sensible’, in the end he describes the speaker as narrow-minded for claiming only Anthroposophy allowed for the insights he had lectured about, see: Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.), 21/01/1927, EHH.
618 Letters from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.), 21/01/1927 and 27/01/1927, EHH.
619 He admitted reading Wege zu einem neuen Baustil (Ways to a New Style in Architecture) despite reservations about Anthroposophy, see: Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.),
Yesterday I started reading Steiner’s *Weg zu einem neuen Baustiel* [*Ways to a New Style in Architecture*, 1914]. [...] In the first lecture he says objectively valuable things about the emergence of the Acanthus leaf as an ornament and he says fine things about the emergence of the original artistic [principle]. Generally [these are] rationally clear things, merely “spiritualised” by him. [...] The lectures proper I enjoy reading, as much that is fundamental and general is being said well.620

At the same time Mattern considered the Anthroposophists too much focused on externals, often using phrases and idioms from Steiner’s writing literally, which he considered a superficial reception of the theoretician’s work.621 At least during his time in Magdeburg, Mattern was strongly exposed to Anthroposophy through an enthusiastically anthroposophist colleague Ehrhardt (only his first name is mentioned). In this context it is interesting to know that Mattern’s second wife Beate zur Nedden, like her more extremely esoteric mother, was a committed member of the Theosophical Society, as correspondence in her private property shows.622 Mattern remained critical, Ehrhardt on the other hand claimed that Mattern was actually more Anthroposophist than he himself realised.623


621 Difficult to translate is the following quote, which expresses the mentioned criticism: ‘Klar ist mir weder wie sehr wirklich die Anhänger Steiners ihn selbst als [...] [Anthroposophen] weitergeben. Heut früh sagt ich dies, auf die Äußerlichkeiten der Anhänger hinweisend. Zum großen Teil gab er zu. Merkwürdig und somit bezeichnend ist die Wiedergabe buchstäblicher Redewendungen und Satzstellungen [...]’ Ibid.


623 Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (without no.), 21/01/1927, EHH.
The enchanted nature boy

The work of the Mattern and Hammerbacher could be looked at as a reengagement with romantic aesthetics — especially as in today's reception it is so strongly associated with Karl Foerster and his romanticism. The paragraphs above have cast some light on sources of Mattern's work in 20th-century culture that complemented this. Mattern generally affirmed both cultural modernism and technological development. He was fascinated by new rationalist building technology and later in his life used to emphasise the necessity of exploiting nature, albeit warning of the limits that had to be respected. With his idea of a modern cultural landscape, in the sense of a thoroughly planned and partly constructed landscape for dwelling, Mattern's postwar attitude towards landscape matters was comparably progressive for his times (see chapter II-k). Obviously, however, romanticism and emotiveness — and these were essential constituents of Foerster's world view, too — were very present in Mattern's personality. He accepted these his propensities with a healthy degree of self-irony. At the same time he rejoiced in his reverence for natural beauty, and valued his childhood memories of the Wandervogel expeditions, on which he spent much time discovering great parts of Northern Hesse, Lower Saxony and Thuringia:

Forests and gardens are certainly the most beautiful at night or early in the morning. Is it not peculiar that amongst all the early trips I remember exactly those which included night hikes, and I can recall almost every detail of the path, the plantings, and the houses. Not because of the fact that they were something special — one had by then already become used to it — but rather because in the dark one is twice as awake, and characteristics are boosted by sentiments which influence and impress the senses more than at daytime.624

624 'Wälder und Gärten sind in der Nacht oder am frühen Morgen bestimmt am Schönsten. Ist es doch merkwürdig, daß ich von allen frühen Fahrten all die mit Nachtmärschen ganz genau behalten habe und mich fast jeder Einzelheit des Weges, der Pflanzungen und Häuser erinnere. Nicht deshalb weil es etwas Besonderes war, denn es war schon Gewohnheit geworden, sondern, weil man im Halbdunkel doppelt wach ist und Merkmale mit Empfindungen sich verstärken, die mehr die Sinn beeinflussen und beeindrucken als am Tage.' Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher (no. 26-3),
This was written to Hammerbacher in confidence in 1926. Looking at his works as a whole, in questions of design such reminiscing rarely overpowered Mattern's superordinate functional and social aims – strong though the emotions were that the evoked atmospheres and images aroused in him. To say that a garden design expressed 'romanticism' was an omnipresent criticism in the garden journals of the late 1920s, when 'objectivity' was high on the agenda. However, despite his demonstrative stressing of rational determinants, every now and then Mattern admitted that '[a]part from the utilitarian, applied motivations [...] also purposeless considerations as part of a garden project lead to spatial composition.' Many years later Mattern declared that his generation 'saw their intellectual starting point [...] in the late 19th century'. The multiplicity of the influences explored above illustrate how limited our view on the Modernists was in the past, or rather how limited the image was that the famous pamphlets of the constructivist and rationalist extremists conveyed. Not least, Mattern went on to work with a great Romantic, the nurseryman Karl Foerster.

02/09/1926, EHH.


II. e  Tête-à-tête with Flora: Karl Foerster and the new take on plants

It would not, I imagine, be very bold to maintain that there are not any more or less intelligent beings, but a scattered, general intelligence, a sort of universal fluid that penetrates diversely the organisms which it encounters, according to whether they are good or bad conductors of the understanding.627

(Maurice Maeterlinck, The intelligence of the flowers, 1907)

(Fig. 101) Foerster is one of the most peculiar phenomena in German garden history. On the one hand he is respected as a breeder of valuable hybrids. His work is seen as a point of reference in German 20th-century perennial breeding.628 His successes include, just to name the seven most diverse varieties, Phlox paniculata (83 new varieties, Fig. 102), Delphinium (72), Helenium (38), Aster novi-belgii (20), Chrysanthemum indicum (20), Lupinus polyphyllus (17), and Aster amellus (15 new varieties).629 On the other hand, his publications stand out from the common horticultural literature due to several unusual qualities. Firstly, even those of his writings that explicitly deal with garden plants are distinguished by a highly mystical tone, secondly, his books contain thoughts about colour on a philosophical level unseen in garden literature, and, finally, the breeding methods expounded therein do not correspond to standard horticultural practice.


Another aspects of his legacy is the advancement of the horticultural profession, which he was highly, if not always successfully, dedicated to. In this respect, three of his aims stand out in their importance: The establishment of a European network of presentation gardens — *Sichtungsgärten* — for the presentation of new perennial varieties, the preparation of an international list of perennial breeders together with a regular publication of their selections, and the preparation of a standardised colour book for horticulture after the model of the chemist and Nobel Prize laureate (1909) Wilhelm Ostwald, whom Foerster knew through his father and with whom he corresponded on this issue.630

Several of his books deal only peripherally with horticultural matters. Under titles like *Glücklich durchbrochenes Schweigen — Betroffene Gedanken über das Häufigste, Flüchtige, Seltene* (‘Joyfully interrupted silence — Concerned thoughts about the most frequent, the fleeting, the rare’631 1937), *Warnung und Ermutigung* (‘Warning and encouragement’, 1959) or *Ferien vom Ach* (which could freely be translated with ‘Taking a break from “Alas!”’, 1962) Foerster dedicated himself entirely to allegorical or simply meditative descriptions of landscapes, the weather, specific spots in his gardens, travel experiences, or descriptions of individual plants and their ‘reactions’ to visits by insects or to the changing light. Some of these books saw several re-editions during Foerster’s life, and some are still available, partly as facsimile print. As unusual as they were, Foerster’s publications found an echo with a very wide readership. At times he gave the impression of being some plant god’s ambassador to the human world who enjoyed the immunity of a messenger, but he was also criticised. Especially

630 Sonja Dümpelmann, *Karl Foerster: vom großen Welt- und Gartenspiel*, ed. by Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, exhibition catalogue (Berlin: SBB – PK, 2001), pp. 50–2. Dümpelmann’s publication, a small booklet, which was the result of a short research project conducted on the occasion of the Bundesgartenschau (Federal Garden Show) 2001 in Potsdam, is the only scholarly monograph about Karl Foerster to date. It served as an important reference for this chapter.

around 1926, when the veneration of 'objectivity' peaked, some considered Foerster a hopeless romantic who promoted a congestion of gardens with flowers, and whose public success even impeded the development of a truly modern garden. From 1925 Harry Maasz campaigned against him in *Die Gartenwelt*, in 1926 Gustav Amman expressed disapproval of the romanticism spread by Foerster’s journal *Gartenschönheit*, and in his seminal garden anthology of 1927, Hugo Koch sarcastically called Foerster’s publications ‘lyrical outpourings’.632 All the same, Foerster was respected by people with a wide array of political standings, from the most conservative, even right-wing extremists, to the left field. A key date for Foerster’s later fame was the year 1917, when his book *Vom Blütenstern der Zukunft* (‘About the Future Blossom Garden’) was commissioned by ‘Deutscher Studentendienst von 1914’ (‘German Student Service of 1914’), an association that was looking after the interest of the German students in the field.633 It was sent out in order to present the young war-worn students with the idea of an idyllic, peaceful private life by drawing the image of horticulture as the saviour of Germany. It developed an almost legendary reputation amongst its readers, reaching an audience far beyond the typical

---


633 Karl Foerster, *Vom Blütenstern der Zukunft: das neue Zeitalter des Gartens und das Geheimnis der veredelten winterfesten Dauerpflanzen; Erfahrungen und Bilder* (Berlin: Furche, 1917). The ‘Deutscher Studentendienst von 1914’ was a predecessor of the ‘Wirtschaftshilfe der Deutschen Studentenschaft e.V.’, since 1929 ‘Deutsches Studentenwerk e.V.’. This association was intensely committed to the supply of the conscribed students with books and information as well as the general care of injured student soldiers in the field hospitals. Until the end of 1915 more than 200,000 single consignments were delivered to over 38,000 different addresses at the front. Field libraries were established, soldier centres with dining, reading and writing rooms, washing facilities and more were installed. A respective information service under the auspice of a theologian was also established. See: *Hochschulpolitik im Föderalismus: Die Hochschulkonferenzen der deutschen Bundesstaaten und Österreichs 1898 bis 1918* (Protokolle), ed. by Bernhard vom Brocke and Peter Kräger (Akademieverlag: Oldenbourg, 1995), p. 324.
reader of gardening books. Its reception was stated by several personalities, amongst them Wiepking, as a key experience of their life.634

As with Mattern, when we try to understand Foerster we meet an obstacle in his language. A man who gives his books titles like ‘Blue treasure of gardens: Coming friendship of the garden people with the new sphere of garden colours, the blue bloom of the months from pre-spring to autumn’ is easily dismissed as irrational.635 It would need an entire research project dedicated to an analysis of his publications and private letters in order to illuminate the full meaning behind such words. In a study about Hermann Mattern however, at least a brief look at Foerster’s legacy is indispensable. It was in cooperation – and at times confrontation – with Foerster that Mattern fully developed his popular garden style of around 1930.

The mystic turned gardener

Both Foerster’s father and his older brother were ethicists of some historical significance. The three stood in close and loving dialogue with each other.636 The ethical-moral outlook of his family consistently informed Karl Foerster’s writings, which only at first glance had horticultural matters as their main topic. In front of confidants Foerster called himself a mystic: ‘My regular occupation is mystic, and I


was able to express a part of this through [horticulture].  

Anyone meeting him must have felt this. Thus, the influential plant breeder was also widely known as someone to speak to in search of advice. His personality had such magnetism that a circle of very different people orbited him and his house in the Bornim neighbourhood of Potsdam, creating a universe usually referred to as the Bornim Circle. Birthday congratulations from personalities like Hermann Hesse, Wilhelm Furtwängler, Wilhelm Kempff, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, C. Th. Sørensen bear witness of the reverence he enjoyed even in post-war times, when he was living, somewhat isolated from friends in the west, in the GDR. Within these circles, no critical word was ever uttered about Foerster, except by his own wife. It has been reported that Eva Foerster furiously threw his manuscripts, that he had asked her to proofread, onto the floor before his feet. His pathos and romanticism was too much to bear for this somewhat more rational professional singer. It cannot be doubted however, that he hit a note with many. Today it is difficult to take seriously his contemplations about nature, homeland and plant life, for it seems written in a language from another age. Actually that was already the case at the time when he wrote his atmospherically titled books. He must have seemed like a man of the late 18th century, somehow floating above the reality of his times. Considering the effectiveness and success of his breeding efforts, though, behind the seeming naivety of his outpourings must have lain a particular knowledge about living things – one of the reasons for the reverence he enjoyed from gardeners and landscape architects.


638 Käte Kollwitz, Die Tagebücher (Berlin, Siedler, 1989) p. 529.


640 Vroni Heinrich, personal communication, 22/02/2007.
This obvious, yet hard to determine knowledge concerned Botany, the life cycles of plants, as well as the influence of colours and structures of plants, on the human soul. Foerster did not merely propagate and select plants. Instead, he appeared to be leading a secret dialogue with Flora. He associated delphiniums with the mystic blue flower, a central symbol in German literature first used by Novalis (1772–1801) in his unfinished *Heinrich von Ofterdingen*. The highly evocative names given by Foerster his plant selections sound as if they sprung from a romantic novel: ‘Azure Butterfly’ (‘Azurfalter’), ‘Cheering Call’ (‘Jubelruf’), ‘Morning Ray’ (‘Morgenstrahl’), ‘Mother of Pearl Tree’ (‘Perlmutterbaum’), ‘Temple Gong’ (‘Tempelgong’). He spoke about them – when he did not speak to them – like a caring mother speaks about her children. In a letter to the architect Otto Bartning, a close friend, reference to whom can be found in several of Foerster’s publications, he admitted to his ‘fantasy’ in an apparently self-ironic tone:

We just had to give a meter-high, redish golden mass of blossoms [...] a name. We arrived at the word ‘Red Deer’. I would have preferred the name ‘Stag emerging in the evening sun shine from the edge of the woods’. But to be sure that does not fit into the catalogue and onto the label. And in the catalogue the fantasy and romanticism has to be sufficiently restrained and abbreviated.

641 Novalis was the pseudonym of Gorg Philip Friedrich Freiherr von Hardenberg.


Amongst Foerster’s friends this exuberance was accepted as typically Foerster, and anyway most of those around him were receptive to his romanticisms. Even Mattern with his generally rational outlook on landscape architecture is not known to ever have openly ridiculed Foerster’s ways. Quite the contrary, he praised him as ‘someone who managed early to turn his knowledge into wisdom’ and oversaw the publishing of articles on the occasion of many of Foerster’s birthdays, throughout his life. As yet no comprehensive research has been conducted to better understand Foerster’s theories – an urgent desiderate in garden-historical research.

Pacifist romantics in bellicose times

To clarify some fundamental aspects about Foerster’s influential thinking, it is necessary to take a look at his family background. His family tree included personalities respected across the political spectrum. Both parents belonged to the enlightened Berlin bourgeoisie. His father was the internationally respected astronomer at the Royal Astronomic Observatory in Berlin, Wilhelm Julius Foerster (1832–1921), known also for his involvement in the determination of standard metric measurement (Fig. 103). His mother Ina (born Paschen), related to the von Moltkes, instead of the


645 At Technische Universität Berlin, Alexandra Musiolek is close to completing her doctoral dissertation thesis on Foerster with focus on his colour concepts for plant use.

bible read to her children from Homer's *Iliads*, German sagas and from Goethe's, Schiller's and Herder's works.647 Foerster had two brothers and two sisters. All three brothers reached influential positions in their respective fields. His younger brother Ernst (1876–1955) became naval engineer for the Blohm & Voss shipyard, where he was superintendent of the Hamburg-America-Line, and editor of a naval magazine. The older brother Friedrich Wilhelm (1869–1966), in contrast to his entire family deeply religious, studied philosophy, economy, ethics and social sciences in Freiburg (Breisgau) and Berlin. He early started to fight German militarism and became one of the Nazi's fiercest critics long before they came to power.648

Amongst his father's acquaintances and friends were influential people like Alexander von Humboldt, Adolf Menzel, Werner von Siemens and crown prince Friedrich Wilhelm.649 He had contacts with Ernst Haeckel (1834–1919), Wilhelm Ostwald and the Monist League.650 Correspondingly, there are are many connections between Karl Foerster and Humboldt's theories on plant geography and the thinking of Haeckel – who coined the term 'ecology' ('*Oekologie*') – including the holistic, anti-


religious movement of Monism.651 The empire had been founded in 1871, only three years before Foerster's birth, and nationalism was a pervasive ideology in everyday life. His parents' house held an outsider position in the bellicose 19th century. In 1892 Wilhelm Julius Foerster assisted in founding both the German Peace Society (Deutsche Friedensgesellschaft) and the German Society for Ethical Culture (Deutsche Gesellschaft für ethische Kultur). He was invited to join the Prussian Academy of Sciences, but rejected, in order to keep his independence.652 When he refused the instruction to name the Cassiopeia constellation, as it resembles the letter 'W', after Kaiser Wilhelm, he fell out of favour with the imperial family, he was considered suspect for 'the neglect of Prussian interests in the starry sky'.653 With his involvement in founding the Society for Ethical Culture he was finally seen as an atheist with anarchistic leaning.654 The artist Adolf Menzel also quit his friendship with the scholar for his unconventional behaviour.655 With his protest against militarist propaganda, for example in the context of the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine in 1871, Wilhelm Julius Foerster stood out as one of the very few known personalities who openly held anti-nationalist views.656 He also defended his pacifism amidst a consensus of war endorsement amongst German intellectuals in 1914. He is remembered as one out of the four signatories – together with the physicist Albert Einstein and the philosopher


652 Renate Feyl, 'Wilhelm Foerster', in: 3 x Foerster, ed. by M. Iven (1995), pp. 46–55 (52). Excerpt from a text originally published as: Renate Feyl, Bilder ohne Rahmen, (Rudolfstadt: Greifenverlag, 1977). Please note that this is not a scholarly source and it was published in the GDR under the respective conditions (censorship).


655 Ibid.

Otto Bueck – of the ‘Aufruf an die Europäer’, the ‘Appeal to the Europeans’, which called for an immediate end of the hostilities of 1914. The physiologist Georg Friedrich Nicolai wrote it as a reaction to the so-called ‘Manifesto of the Ninety-Three’, which had been signed by 93 intellectuals and artists, amongst them also Wilhelm Julius Foerster himself,657 in support of the German military actions in October 1914. By acting the way he did, he put himself and his family at considerable risk, as the disciplinary proceedings, that he and his son Friedrich Wilhelm were involved in, clearly show. After the emperor had raged against the Social Democrats at the Day of Sedan festivities in 1895, the elder son Friedrich Wilhelm criticised this speech in a publication. A trial for lèse majesté followed by three months fortress detention was the consequence.658 For many years Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster publicly warned about Hitler, who in return hated Foerster blazingly and chose him to be on the first list of Germans to be expatriated.659 After teaching at Zurich and living in Vienna between 1916 and 1918 as counsellor to emperor Karl, he became professor at the Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich. As an outspoken – and extremely rare – critical voice against the war and the politics of Bismarck, he put himself into much trouble. He left Germany in a hurry already in 1922, when a high-ranking officer friend informed him about a plot laid against him by nationalist political forces; he was to be

657 Some of the 93 had signed, like Foerster, without knowing the exact wording, see: Jürgen von Ungern-Sternberg and Wolfgang von Ungern-Sternberg, Der Aufruf ‘An die Kulturwelt!’: Das Manifest der 93 und die Anfänge der Kriegspropaganda im Ersten Weltkrieg. Mit einer Dokumentation, series Historische Mitteilungen der Ranke-Gesellschaft (HMRG), supplement 18 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996), pp. 13, 64.


one of the next victims of the politically motivated so-called Feme murders, in which
many liberal intellectuals were killed such as the politicians Matthias Erzberger (in
1921) and Walther Rathenau. Until 1926 he lived in Switzerland, then in Paris, but
he had to flee once more in 1940, when the Germans marched into Paris. During the
years in France Foerster invested great efforts in informing Europe’s political scene
about the growing German threat to world peace. After the German occupation he
had to flee the Gestapo, the German Secret State Police, to Switzerland, where because
of his just rewarded French citizenship asylum was not granted. Consequently he had
to manage a daring escape via Lisbon to the United States, where he lived until 1963.
He died in 1966 in a sanatorium near Zurich. With regard to Foerster’s life on the run,
the brothers had little chance to see each other, and whatever contact they had in later
years must have been severely restricted by the political conditions of their time – with
Karl living in East Germany and Friedrich Wilhelm in the United States.

In early summer of 1933, particularly the 10th of May, the students’ association
Deutsche Studentenschaft staged the Burnings of the Books. On the occasion of this
‘settlement day of barbarism’, as the writer and literary scientist Alfred Kantorowicz
has called it, the administration published a guideline describing the desired course of
action. This publication contained nine “chants” to be called out at the event. The
first was directed against the political theorists Karl Marx and Karl Kautsky, the
second against the ‘decadent’ literates Heinrich Mann, Ernst Glaeser and Erich

143–72 (150).

661 Ibid.

143–72 (150–60).

pp. 143–72 (160).

Kästner. The third was dedicated to Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster with the words:

"Against unprincipled thinking and political treason; for dedication to Volk and state! I commit to the flames the writings of Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster." Foerster's complete works were on the black list of books to be eliminated.

The fact that generally speaking this Foerster is today less known than his relatively innocuous horticulturist brother is characteristic for Germany's reluctant memory when it comes to devoted opponents of the regime. The importance of Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster as pedagogue and political person has not been much addressed in Germany, while he has received considerably more attention in other countries.

The well-informed innocent

There is no reason for concluding that Karl Foerster had the same comprehension of the political situation in Germany. However, the two brothers were deeply connected, which must have meant that at least until 1922 they stood in regular exchange. Another conclusion suggesting itself is, that Karl Foerster initially must have been under suspicious surveillance by the Nazi police, even though the alleged 'innocence' of his profession might have made the authorities decide that he posed no political threat. However, these are unverified suggestions. In view of Mattern's pacifism, the Foersters' outspokenness in view of injustice or perceived wrongdoing as well as their deep pacifism, must have created immediate sympathy between them. So far no

665 See the translation by Dr. Roland Richter on the web exhibition 'When Books Burn' on the website of the University of Arizona: http://www.library.arizona.edu/exhibits/bumedbooks/goebbels.htm (accessed 09/10/2014). Note that this page contains spelling mistakes and is not professionally designed with major displaying errors.


evidence of exposure of Mattern to the writings of the Catholic pacifist Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster has been found, but the prominence of the latter must have affected Foerster’s circle of close confidents, to which Mattern belonged from 1928.

The Foerster business seemed to have employed convinced Nazis as well as opponents of the regime. In 1940, the National Socialist Karl Wagner became editor in chief of the journal *Gartenschönheit*, whose publishers were Karl Foerster, Camillo Schneider and Oskar Kühl. From the late 1930s the Foerster business was led by Nikolaus Hoeck, who some sources call a ‘convinced National Socialist’, while other believed him to have joined the party only in order to protect the business and its employees from persecution.668 Foerster himself joined the party in 1940.669 However, Foerster did not always bow to official doctrine. Quite the contrary, he actually dared some rather outspoken criticism, at least within his own professional field. In an introductory text to his nursery’s flower bulbs catalogue of 1939 Karl Foerster ridiculed all calls for the exclusive application of native plant material in German gardens. He pointed out that most of the ‘fearful souls who fear foreign infiltration’ were not aware of the fact that, amongst those allegedly ‘German’ plants, ‘which arouse their sense of home’, nine out of ten originated in a ‘most foreign world remoteness’.670 To word such critical irony at a stage when the racist regime had risen to the climax of its power certainly meant a risk for Foerster’s business and the security of his family. It probably also presented an obstacle for the career of his


670 ‘Auch die Feststellung mag hier wiederholt werden, wie wenig mancherlei ängstliche Gemüter, welche Überfremdung fürchten, davon ahnen, daß neun Zehntel der Pflanzen in Deutschland, die ihr Heimatgefühl erregen, fremdster Weltferne entstammen.’ This was not the only time he expressed his criticism: Karl Foerster, ‘Bodenständige Pflanzen. Schlichtende Gedanken zu diesem Begriff’, *Die Gartenschönheit*, 22, 06 (1941), 128.
collaborators. The Foerster nursery had a reputation for being left-wing and this had consequences in some specific cases (see chapter II-g). 671

Very prominent acquaintances of Foerster's – for example the conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler (1886–1954, the architect Mies van der Rohe (1886–1969) and the writer and physician Gottfried Benn (1886–1956) – had signed officially published lists pledging allegiance to the Führer. 672 In the liberal-conservative milieu of Bildungsbürgertum, the educated middle-class, which was so much indebted to German Romanticism and thus not always embracing modern society with all its fast transformations, an initial enthusiasm in view of certain aspects of National Socialism was not uncommon. The promise to make a clean sweep of mindless consumerism and 'debauchery' and reverse the lamented decline of culture, combined with a widespread Anti-Americanism and the never-forgotten humiliation caused by the Treaty of Versailles, created a morale that tempted even the most cultivated, essentially liberal citizens to be captivated by the Nazis' successful reconciliation of 'German Innerlichkeit and modern technology'. 673 Other friends of Foerster's however were fierce opponents of the Nazis. Through his older brother Friedrich Wilhelm, the comparatively naive, peace loving 'flower man' was bizarrely probably one of the civilians in Germany most able to get a clear view behind the facades of Hitler's ...
political theatre. Hammerbacher went on record as saying that the people around Foerster knew about the Concentration Camps and with this knowledge were working for the regime. However, for Foerster, his family background must have been mainly a disadvantage during the 'Third Reich'.

Pantheism and the cult of beauty

Despite the enlightened family background, with his 'transcendent' poetical writing style and the deep spirituality of his cult of beauty, Karl Foerster was popular amongst theologians too, both Evangelical and Catholic. It is difficult to precisely locate Foerster ideologically. He developed a radically idealist, ambiguous form of monism. This included pantheist ideas which he took already from his parents, and he developed them further into a cult of beauty influenced by classicist and symbolist writing. Foerster's own emphasis on the individual correlated with that of the Symbolists, and generally with the Fin de siècle, which was characterised by industrialisation and produced an atmosphere of cultural alienation. At the same time that he declared beauty as 'a home of the soul', he also warned of an exaggerated aestheticism and of human idolisation of beauty. With Jean Paul and Maurice Maeterlinck (1862–1949) Foerster and Mattern had some commonalities

with regard to their literary tastes, but Foerster's fascination for the beautiful was much more pronounced. It was actually a beauty cult, while Mattern's taste comprised a much less traditional aesthetic sense, beyond the ideal of beauty. In architectural matters Foerster was relatively conservative. Even the architecture of his friend Otto Bartning – while he admired his literary production – seemed strange to him. Only hesitantly and probably through the influence of Mattern and Hammerbacher he seems to have warmed to the potentials that modern architecture offered to the development of garden design: 'Foerster realised the appeal of the casting of trees' and shrubs' shadows onto the smooth, white walls of functional buildings [...]'.

Foerster was against the mechanisation of everyday life and criticised the big cities' distance from nature, but he was no classical representative of *Kulturkritik* in the Nietzschean sense. He believed in the coming of a harmonious future, when wars and animosities would be overcome through the healing powers of nature's beauty. A revelation for him were the naturalist writings of Ellen Key (1849–1926), a Swedish cultural critic and early feminist, who became also known for her progressive, child-centred educational views. Recalling the ideas of the garden city movement, Foerster's writings invoked a world in which the disadvantages of countryside and city would be balanced out with their respective benefits to create a better future for all.

---


681 Ibid.
Today it is mainly his achievement with the selection of perennials that Foerster is known for. His first nursery he had already established in 1903. With the father's retirement, the Foersters' had to leave the astronomical observatory. They moved to Westend, west of Charlottenburg, where Foerster laid out his plantations behind the new home.\textsuperscript{682} 1907 appeared the first catalogue. In 1908 his mother died of influenza. 1910/11 the nursery was moved to Bornim, when the land in Westend was taken in by the town expansion. Together with his ageing father and his youngest daughter Martha, Karl moved into the new house at Bornim in 1912, where Martha ran the household. She later married Oskar Kühl, with whom Foerster in 1920 would found a publishing company and the journal \textit{Die Gartenschönheit}. The first book \textit{Winterharte Blütenstauden und Sträucher der Neuzeit} ('Hardy flowering perennials and shrubs of the modern times') was already published in 1911 (Leipzig: J.J. Weber). The nursery developed quickly, even during the war. Foerster started to hold lectures and frequently travelled to garden exhibitions, botanic gardens and other nurseries all over Europe. His first known success in breeding was with \textit{Delphinium elatum}, the selection called 'Berghimmel' of 1920, and this species he is most associated with today. But Foerster did not always like to be asked solely about delphiniums, as he could as well have chosen a different species had the soil and climate in Potsdam Bornim been different.\textsuperscript{683} However, \textit{Delphinium} rather than the other 'Foersterian species' \textit{Phlox}, is the first thing referred to when his legacy is discussed.

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{683} V. Heinrich, \textit{Hermann Mattern} (2012), p. 29.
\end{itemize}
Looking only at garden design, Foerster rendered several prime services. Most renownedly, he provided hardy and low-maintenance perennials, making gardening less work-intensive and costly. He extended the repertory of usable garden plants, also introducing new species, notably grasses and ferns, thus opening up a scope for design. Less known but no less significantly, he promoted and aimed at pure colour tones in his selection work, which allowed for more precise colour effects. And last but not least, he strove for a relatively ‘close to nature’ plant physiognomy, resulting in ‘legible’ plant individuals full of character for the creation of atmospheric spaces. This all helped to popularise the more natural garden style that became a prominent trend around 1930. Mattern, in characteristically endless sentences and – maybe due to the growing anti-consumerism – with more cultural criticism than usual, explained Foerster’s achievements in 1968 as follows:

In this century, which seems to be a slave to rationalising technology and the exact sciences, Karl Foerster has made [...] wild perennials acceptable. Moreover, the flowering herbs, which disappear on their autochthonal habitats [...] due to the usability compulsion to use the ground for the food production and for profit, he has, in refined and more resistant form, given a new home.

In Germany, a country easily impressed by developments abroad, which had since 1871 until the First World War been taken in by English garden culture, would never have developed an independent and original idea of the dwelling garden, the peoples’ park, the urban green, neither would the allotment garden movement have been able to develop and spread worldwide, had one been further depending on plant selections from the mild oceanic climates of the British Isles.685


685 ‘Karl Foerster hat in diesem Jahrhundert, das der rationalisierenden Technik und der exakten Naturwissenschaft gänzlich verfallen zu sein scheint, die [...] Wildstaude salonfähig gemacht. [...]’
So according to Mattern it was Foerster’s achievement to develop —, over many years of observing and selecting — plants for the harsher German climate.

Garden art had since the mid-19th century stood under strong influence of exoticism. The ‘gardenesque’ orientation of historicist garden art with its focus on homogeneous, colourful plantations in carpet beds shaped in ornamental outlines, corresponding with the style in which the adjacent building was designed, developed in different phases. After the foundation of the German Empire a new generation of wealthy industrialists, tradesmen and bankers became an important group of clients for the garden artists.686 But also the public buildings of the proud new nation were accompanied by representational gardens, in addition to the new squares and gardens in the continuously growing and prospering cities.687 Correspondingly, classes of garden art at the horticultural schools were dealing with the specific field of ornamental bedding. When the Royal Horticultural College in Potsdam Wildpark was translocated to new grounds in Dahlem around 1900, the grounds were designed by the college’s headmaster Theodor Echtermeyer in the ‘Mixed Style’ (‘Gemischter


Stil') of the Lenné-Meyer school, including carpet bedding, different historicist elements and curved pathways (Fig. 104). By 1890, perennials had all but disappeared from plant nursery catalogues, as the profit was made with the production of plants used for the omnipresent carpet beds. Perennials were seen as 'rural' and 'rustic', and during the 1870s and 1880s the attention had been on exotic Schmuckblatt pflanzen – plants grown for the decorative leaves – introduced from the colonies. Many old perennials were almost forgotten, only surviving in old pastor and farmer gardens, which were kept in a more traditional way. Only during the 1890s did flowering plants become the preferred material for the ornamental beds.

Here, higher clumps of banana plants, palms, Canna indica, Cannabis sativa, large-leaved exotics like Heracleum lanatum, Gunnera tinctoria or Rheum, and ornamental grasses like Arundo donax, Pennisetum, Cortaderia selloana or Miscanthus x giganteus, were used together with Pelargonia, Begonia x tuberhybrida, Fuchsia, or Heliotropium in bright tropical colours for temporary summer decorations, evoking the atmosphere of far-away places. With Jugendstil the focus shifted to other flowers again – tropical flowers, flowering shrubs and bulbous plants –, that were used in monochromatic mass plantations for their strong visual effects also from a distance. The forcing of bulbous ornamental plants such as tulips, crocuses and especially hyacinths during the late 19th century had become an important part of the horticultural business, and around 1900 also low perennial species of Adonis, Arabis, Iris, Phlox or Primula in fashionable pure colours were discovered for the use in the


modern variant of carpet beds. This was what Hermann Heuss referred to with the expression 'forcing house culture' (see p. 61). However, few species in fashionable colours, such as fiery red *Pelargonium zonale* and (for less sunny places) *Begonia x tuberhybrida*, were omnipresent and represented the main material for ornamental garden parts. Bright colours were sought after, as pastel shades were sometimes even considered unattractive in bright day light. So only a few perennials, above all *Phlox paniculata*, were considered apt for the use in combination with the powerful red of the pelargoniums and begonias. After 1900, progressive landscape architects in the sphere of the reform movement (Alfred Lichtwark et. al.), like the famous garden director general of Hanover, Julius Trip, promoted the use of perennials, amongst others *Aster* hybrids, *Delphinium*, *Helenium*, *Helianthus*, and *Rudbeckia*. For the traditionalist these ideas opposed the good practice of the 'forefathers' of the Lenné-Meyer school of the 19th century, who, as Ludwig Möller, the influential perennials promoting editor of *Möller's Deutsche Gärtner Zeitung*, pointed out, had not been in the position to foresee developments in the field of perennial selection.

A strong influence on the changing taste came from the field of floristics – prominent landscape architects such as Willy Lange had published in this field, and also Alfred Lichtwark even before writing about garden design. The seminal contribution to this discussion, which had a fundamental effect on garden reform as

---


referred to in the introduction, was Lichtwark's article 'Makartbouquet und Blumenstrauß' ('Makart bouquet and posie', 1892), published as a booklet in several editions.701 Until the foundation of the Empire in 1871, French style bouquets, which were very short, wired and tightly bound into circular plates, had prevailed in the market. From then on newer trends in French floristics became an influence and a typically German style evolved. The fashion went towards loosely bound, long wild flower bunches, with – in contrast with the English style of loose, freely combined bunches – attention to the artistic combination and arrangement of the flowers.

Through these trends in posy fashion, 'as a kind of trojan horse', perennials gained renewed attention and their propagation became an attractive field for market gardeners again, who started to produce them in ever greater numbers – after decades of neglecting them.702 Foerster's aesthetic aims have to be seen in this context, and the direct influence by Lichtwark has been proven.703

Foerster's intention of emphasising and elevating the natural character of a plant recalls Mattern's intention of elevating the natural characteristics of a given site. An abstraction of significant traits, not imitation of nature, was the intention of both men in aesthetic matters. Foerster did not like the huge double Californian delphiniums, nor was he interested in the much-discussed efforts for breeding a brick-red variant. He wanted to keep the original 'alpine character' of the plant, which was lost with double flowers, and he saw blue as the colour that best fitted the plant's character.704

Hammerbacher explained this lucidly:
Karl Foerster wanted to grasp, exaggerate and embellish the characteristics of a plant, but he did not want to change the essence of its nature. [He] always kept the natural form in mind, the delphinium as the mountain forest perennial; it still had to have in it something of the mountain sphere, the elongated, intrinsically graceful. It was the essence of his selections that they were still very close to nature.705

Foerster did not want to ‘merely throw plants onto the market, but [he wanted] to chase them through the ‘disappointment filter’ of the five-years-long long-term observation of non-transplanted stocks.706 The time span of fourteen years between his first own selection ‘Arnold Böcklin’ (1912, probably a Delphinium belladonna variety, pure enzian blue, now lost) and the first high D. elatum hybrid ‘Berghimmel’ (‘mountain sky’, 1926) shows how demanding Foerster was of his plants. He sold the plants he bred constantly, but only if they satisfied his high expectations did he give them a name. As he had prepared a wide array of different breeding aims during these years, the number of new varieties rose quickly from the second half of the 1920s onwards. From 1926 until 1930 he released thirteen new selections, and by 1935 the number rose to all-in-all twenty-nine Foerster delphiniums.707 In 1926 Foerster stated twelve criteria for his breeding efforts amongst which pure colours (in contrast to multi-coloured blossoms) and habitus and shape were named first.708 In his book Der neue Rittersporn. Geschichte einer Leidenschaft in Bildern und


Erfahrungen (‘The new delphinium. Story of a passion in images and experiences’),
published in 1929, Foerster listed possible faults:

Bad colours, wind breakage of the plant at the ankle, knee or neck, infestation with white mildew, not sufficiently multi-stemmed, dropping of the lowest flowers, before the raceme has blossomed entirely, breaking of racemes that have filled themselves up in the rain, susceptibility to sun scald of the southern side of the raceme under heavy sun, decreasing of the blossom beauty by rain, sudden withering of the black-blue varieties through circulatory disorder in excessive heat, decline of the blossom beauty and vegetational development of the plant at the same place already after few years, which necessitates an early transplantation.709

Aesthetic considerations and colour philosophy

The same book contained about two pages full of text about ‘garden-artistic experiences’. Foerster cherished the potential of these ‘blue mountain and summer beacons’ to chase away the bad mood of rainy days, while in blistering summer heat their bright shades of blue had a ‘downright thirst-quenching’ effect.710 Foerster was able to judge in a masterly way the consonance of colour tones, and in regard to design this was the topic he knew best to write about in his books. Equally perceptive was his judgment of the psychological effect of colours: ‘In smaller and more naïve plantations, in between pure and clear colours, sometimes, as a stirrer, other risky tones are needed.’711 A great part of his aesthetical considerations concerned colour psychology. His respective thoughts probably added to the appeal his books had to garden lovers and professionals alike:

710 Ibid.
711 ‘[...] Hecht im Karpfenteich [...]’ K. Foerster, Der neue Rittersporn (1929), p. 41.
'Blue is a strange different something. It is the point in the colour realm, at which the entire colourful earth prison is bursting. [...] 

Sometimes gardens in their blue blaze or their beauty of ether can enter into such traffic with sky and light, as if heaven and earth were striking new sparks between each other, disclosing new relationships between them.  

In contrast with Mattern, who found inspiration in modern abstract art, Foerster had problems even comprehending it and still clung to Impressionist ideals. He admitted this lack of appreciation, for example in letters to his trusted friend Elisabeth Koch, a niece of Karl Scheffler (1869–1951), the influential art journalist who also preferred Impressionism to more abstract tendencies.  

Beside the special role of colour, the 'character' of the plant stood at the centre of his ideas about the design of flowerbeds. Foerster compared delphiniums with the 'church in the village', as their structure had more than any other plant 'the role of a peaking summary of other flowers'. The perfect match for delphiniums he saw in roses, especially ramblers, as 'the two illuminate each other at the most beautiful. To leave a rosarium without Delphinium is a deadly sin'.  

When Foerster wrote about spatial matters this was mostly in regard to a plant's spatial qualities – be it as individual or in groups, in front of a neutral background or in comparison with other perennials. In Einzug der Gräser und Farne in die Gärten ('Entry of the grasses and ferns into the gardens') of 1957 for example, the first German garden book about ferns and grasses, he described the role of grasses as

713 Lee Sorensen, 'Scheffler, Karl', in Dictionary of Art Historians.  
715 K. Foerster, Der neue Rittersporn (1929), p. 41.
'organisers of their surroundings'. A garden without them seemed 'as if an orchestra had been bereaved of its conductor'. And, effusive as usual, he translated the visual effect of the plants he described into terms related to atmosphere and emotion:

The great transmission of the grass realm in human life is analogous to an epos, while against this the assisting role of the fern realm in the course of this century is analogous to a drama. But also the drama eventually has the mission to serve and to discharge into higher modes of being. However, we still are caught in the great fern drama and nourish smilingly our knowing thoughts, which are already rushing faithfully ahead, when we surround ourselves in gardens with the decorative splendour of the fern realm.

In the books about his own varieties, Foerster usually gave an insight into his breeding practice. This was also in the interest of explaining the patience and hard work necessary to arrive at a new variety that satisfied all demands.

Characteristically, these horticultural matters were interwoven with questions of human existence. In Der neue Rittersporn (1929) for example he spoke about the role of chance in a typical Foerster way of expression. This exemplified the advisory element, in an almost therapeutic sense, of his writing about gardening. According to Foerster, chance should not be seen as being entirely beyond human control:

He who wants to steer nature and fate according to his wishes, has to allow them to express themselves freely in time and space and has to give them inexhaustible opportunities for this. [...] Chance, too, is God's thumbprint [...]. One has to play the chance-instrument with virtuosity in order to be raised towards ever more refined chances.

717 Ibid.
719 K. Foerster, Der neue Rittersporn (1929), p. 18.
These thoughts about chance corresponded to Foerster’s very uncommon breeding practice; he did not use the conventional means of isolation of an individual plant’s pollen, and he used neither brush nor tweezers.\textsuperscript{720} This quite eccentric working manner resulted in an extremely inefficient selection process. Foerster had to work with a vast mass of seedlings in order to achieve what other successful breeders achieved with a carefully controlled pollination in much less space. On his grounds Foerster planted clusters of varieties in close proximity to each other and hoped for a successful natural pollination, ‘what moths take care of sufficiently in the morning and evening. ... Nature’s fantasy will soon expose its superiority over ours in this field, too.’\textsuperscript{721} He warned of giving up too easily; too many abandoned a project when they met the first lame duck:

Humans with their scepticism about fortune only sweep a segment of the circle and resign prematurely, while twice the endurance inevitably would have led them to the winners integrated into the full circle.... ‘Destiny grants us our wishes, but in its own way, in order to give us something beyond our wishes’ (Goethe).

In the jumble of less characterful shapes [\textit{Gestalten}] already well-rounded flowering plant individuals appear, in immediate emergence out of their environment, like German geniuses come from villages, strangely exalted and in their enhancement.\textsuperscript{722}

And thus his emotive descriptions constantly echoed his ideal, the incarnation through beauty.

Mattem owed much to Foerster and he knew it. Professionally, Foerster was no rival. Despite the sensitivity to form that spoke out of his words, he is said to have not had sufficient design knowledge in order to design gardens – and he probably had


\textsuperscript{721} Karl Foerster quoted in: Ibid.

\textsuperscript{722} Ibid.
no intention to do so. He needed the cooperation of landscape architects such as Willy Lange or Wiepking, with whom he cooperated before he established a design studio within his own firm. Hermann Mattern and Herta Hammerbacher, who were employed to establish this design studio, by all accounts were allowed to develop their ideas quite freely. Foerster trusted their design capabilities.

On the other hand, some of Foerster’s writings bore witness of a fine sensitivity for questions of space, usually in connection to a plant’s figure, for example the specific structural characteristics of a particular variety. Occasionally though, he even discussed spatial questions and questions of shape more generally:

The new standard lamp in the farmer’s room above the little table in front of the wide corner bench, or the illumination of the floor through the rhythmically patterned straw carpet – all this produces unforeseen spatial forces from the room and every evening creates reading places encouraging the most beautiful contemplation powers. If the table was a little higher or lower, smaller or larger, a strange space disenchantment would probably occur.

Glücklich durchbrochenes Schweigen (1937) contains a short chapter ‘Zauberkraft der Form’ (‘Magic power of form’), in which on two pages the relationship between shape and idea, form and content was discussed. Herein Foerster explained that the long-distance effect of a form is a sign for design quality: ‘Lack of form means lack of content or wasting of content [...]’ Considering also his reverence of Arnold Böcklin and the German impressionists, his words seem to hint at an anti-classicist,
impressionist ideal: 'The hunter of forms only hits his game if he does not search for a tame animal. He has to hunt in the dark forest and scent a secret lustre.'

For Mattern, Foerster was clearly a figure that complemented and inspired his own ideas about planting. Foerster’s delicate sensitivity for the individual plant’s spatial agency and symbolic associative potential were echoed by in Mattern’s increasingly mature implementation of the plant material. Comparing designs from the 1950s with his very first garden commission, the Kraiger garden of 1926, it becomes clear that Foerster must have opened his eyes to these compositional questions. Of course, the team involved also played a role; often Mattern let others with a greater botanical knowledge, e.g. Hammerbacher, Göritz or Lorenzen, elaborate the planting schemes, sometimes he confidently put his signature under designs others had produced. He must have felt himself to be the mastermind of the Bornim School, which was one reason for the growing distance between him and Hammerbacher during their marriage.

One more of Foerster’s ideas illustrates the value of the new garden for everyday life: the Garden of Seven Seasons. He wrote about it in his books on rockery gardens, and with it was connected Foerster’s term ‘world garden’ (‘Weltgarten’). The expression ‘world garden’ was also used by the Bornimers in the context of Mattern’s Killesberg park project, on the occasion of the Reich Garden Show 1939.

726 Ibid.
Foerster's use of the term has not yet been analysed in detail, but it may refer to the enrichment of the garden by bringing together plants from all over the world.\(^{730}\)

Hammerbacher was sceptical whether a 'garden of seven seasons' had ever been achieved; the aim to elaborate a planting scheme that accomplished a constant bloom through all the year (except deep winter) seemed extremely difficult to attain.\(^{731}\) In order to find the right words to summarise the chapter, many of Mattern's words about Foerster would serve well. The following were published in his last year, Foerster had died shortly before:

This year Karl Foerster would have turned 97, thus would have reached the same age as his beloved brother, the social pedagogue Friedrich-Wilhelm Foerster. [...] Who has the will to shape things – and both brothers had it in their own ways –, has to retain all his life the zeal and insistence of a child. And who wants to become, be and remain a good gardener, has to make himself aware of the zeal and insistence of a childlike belief inside himself, the belief that the world with its kingdoms of nature evolves perpetually, and that man, as the most intelligent being on earth, can, indeed must, contribute to it.

Karl Foerster, the gardener, did not think much of the so-called phytosociology, at least when it manifested itself as conservative, static doctrine; to him world history as a process was not completed. It is coherent, but proceeds slowly, and it offers enough opportunities for acceleration through culture work. And this work should not be confined to the vegetational alone.\(^{732}\)

---

730 He used the expression for example as title of a two-volume publication: Karl Foerster, *Unendliche Heimat*, (= vol 1 of *Der Weltgarten*) (Berlin-Westend: Verlag der Gartenschönheit, 1925); Fritz von Oheimb, *Gartenglück von heute* (= vol 2 of *Der Weltgarten*) (Berlin-Westend: Verlag der Gartenschönheit, 1926).


732 'Karl Foerster wäre in diesem März 97 Jahre als geworden und hätte damit das gleiche Lebensalter erreicht wie sein von ihm sehr geliebter Bruder, der Sozialpädagoge Friedrich-Wilhelm Foerster. [...] Wer formen will – und das wollten beide Brüder auf ihre Art –, muß die Unbedingtheit und den Eifer eines Kindes durch sein ganzes Leben bewahren – und wer ein guter Gärtner werden, sein und
Foerster’s words about Mattern’s art, too, are essential for understanding their relationship:

Destroyed landscapes, which sank beneath a jagged massif of rocks, were turned into unforgettable climes, Here the delphinium conceived his primordial places together with a mighty growth of shrub roses (Stuttgart-Killesberg). For me, the image of the truly magnificent design with flowering annuals (Kassel) is the clear document of one of the most ingenious garden ideas! A breath of freedom waft across all these designs!

But with many of the pictures, one cannot immediately tell by looking at them what risks were taken and won in the selection and combination of plants. [...] To all these designs belongs a knowledge about the high qualities of plants - because only through these alone the new venture becomes plausible! [...] We see bold movements of the ground both on the large and small scale, which already had a pioneering effect near and far. 733

bleiben will, muß zu Eifer und Unbedingtheit den Kinderglauben in sich bewusst machen, daß die Welt und alle ihr zugehörigen Naturreiche sich unentwegt in der Höherentwicklung befinden und daß der Mensch, als das intelligente Erdenwesen, das Seine dazu beitragen kann, ja beitragen muß. Für die sogenannte Pflanzensoziologie, soweit sie sich als konservative, statische Lehrmeinung gibt, hatte der Gärtner Karl Foerster nicht viel übrig, denn ihm ist ja die Weltgeschichte als Entwicklungsvorgang nicht abgeschlossen. Sie ist folgerichtig, nur eben in zu zähem Gang, und sie bietet genug Gelegenheit, sie anzutreiben durch Kulturarbeit, die sich auf das Vegetative nicht allein beschränkt. [...]’ Hermann Mattern, ‘Rundum ein Gärtner (Ansprache von Prof. Hermann Mattern bei der Verleihung der Karl-Foerster-Anerkennung),’ Garten+Landschaft, 3 (1971), 80.

While still a Garden Technician at Magdeburg, in September 1927 Mattern finally received the news he had for a while been waiting for: Leberecht Migge responded to a long sent job application and invited Mattern for an interview, which went successfully. The 23 October 1927 Mattern asked Lincke for the termination of his contract, which became effective the 1 December.735 Despite considering Migge’s character ‘mean’ and not being sure what to think of him, Mattern was deeply fascinated: ‘The way of his management alone impresses me [...]. His aestheticism shines out of each of his deeds and all his written work.’736 What also attracted Mattern was his aversion to the traditionalism that Migge rejected, too – ‘as I reject the opposite’ –, while he emphasised that at the same time he was not at all d’accord with all that Migge stood for. Mattern was finally offered a chance to join Migge’s design office at Worpswede.737


735 Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, 23/10/1927, VH, as quoted in: V. Heinrich, Hermann Mattern (2013), p. 22. It seems that the author has kept a part of Mattern’s letters in her private collection, while giving another part into the Hammerbacher estate at the University Archive of the Technische Universität Berlin.

736 ‘[...] man kann ja noch nicht viel sagen – seine Art der Geschäftsführung allein imponiert mir [...]. Sein Ästhetentum leuchtet aus jeder Tat und jedem Niedergeschriebenen heraus.’ Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, 25/10/1927, VH, as quoted in: ibid.

He hoped to be able to persuade Migge later to entrust him with the management of the Berlin branch of the firm.\footnote{V. Heinrich, *Hermann Mattern* (2013), p. 28.} A union with Hammerbacher – who was disappointed over Mattern’s transferral to Worpswede – and to start a family in Berlin was on his mind all the time. Despite his desire to work for the famous reformer, even before leaving Magdeburg, he confessed to her that he would accept any job in Berlin just to be with her.\footnote{Ibid.} Probably some months earlier, Mattern had answered an anonymous and slightly quirky, today almost iconic advert by Foerster published in *Gartenschönheit*, which read as follows:

Professional with exceeding general and specialist knowledge wanted by landscape architects for relief, possibly for the heading of a branch. After an appropriate probation period, permanent collaboration will follow in one way or another. Demanded is either an entirely first-class practitioner in the field of calculation and tendering of new projects, adroitness when communicating with clients, or prime artistic expert, good illustrator.\footnote{‘Fachmann mit hervorragender Allgemein- und Fachbildung von Gartenarchitekten zur Entlastung, eventuell zur Führung eines Zweigbüros gesucht. Nach entsprechender Probezeit wird sich dauernde Mitarbeit in irgend einer Form ergeben. Verlangt wird entweder ganz erstklassiger Praktiker in Kalkulation und Ausführung von Neuanlagen, Gewandheit im Verkehr mit Auftraggebern, oder erste künstlerische Kraft, guter Darsteller. […]’ *Gartenschönheit*, 06 (1927) (unpaginated).}

In November 1927 Mattern received a telegram from Bornim with the invitation for an interview. Foerster accepted, allegedly with the dictum: ‘Youth does not protect from maturity’.\footnote{Quoted in: V. Heinrich, *Hermann Mattern* (2013), p. 28 (According to Beate zur Nedden, Mattern’s widow).} This was before Mattern started to work with Migge, who insisted on the six weeks notice period.\footnote{Ibid.} So Mattern’s first act at Worpswede in December 1927 was to cancel his contract, and accordingly a mere six weeks was the duration of Mattern’s
experience with Migge – an experience he would occasionally refer to in his later life in the context of allotment garden projects. He was working on plans for a Worpswede Settler School (Siedlerschule Worpswede) located in the Saarland, a project that was built c. 1932 but given up after Migge’s death in 1935.743

In mid-January 1928 Mattem took up his new position in Foerster’s firm at Bornim. Soon the 25-year-old was to become one of the region’s most-demanded garden designers, profiting from the fine-sounding name of the famous horticulturist and from Foerster’s personal network. Mattem and Hammerbacher – who left Spaeth to join Foerster’s firm the same year – married in December 1928. 1928 can thus be considered the birth-year of the ‘Bornim School’, which according to Hammerbacher had developed by 1929/30.744

The young couple moved into a small house designed by Heinrich Tessenow at 2, Am Fischtal, in the Onkel-Tom estate at Berlin-Zehlendorf, where in 1930 their only daughter Merete was born.745 The garden was designed by Mattem and Hammerbacher, and descriptions with photos of it were published over the coming years (Fig. 105a).746 The same year Mattem joined the Deutschen Werkbund.747

743 Ibid.


745 V. Heinrich, Hermann Mattern (2013), p. 33. Three photos of the garden, taken by Hammerbacher, exist at the Architekturmuseum of the Technische Universität Berlin.


About the Bornim firm

Bornim itself is not an exceptionally illustrious name, but with the beauty of its cultural landscape often credited to Lenné as ‘Lenné'sche Feldflur’ (‘Lennéan Fields’), it somewhat shares the idyllic as well as regal aura of neighbouring Bornstedt. The latter is the location of the former Prussian crown estate, just bordering onto the royal gardens of Sanssouci at Potsdam. From Foerster's nursery it was a mere 1.5 miles (2.3 km), i.e. roughly a 30-minutes walk, to reach Sanssouci castle and gardens. In 1833 Lenné had designed his Verschönerungsplan für die Umgebung von Potsdam (‘Beautification Plan for the Surroundings of Potsdam’). It was re-organised in the 1840s by Lenné and, in the case of Bornim, by the royal court gardener Hermann Sello. Still today, naming a North-Western part of Potsdam evokes the image of an agrarian-oriented, well-laid-out and -maintained territory that surrounds these parts of the town. For Mattern, who cherished the achievements of Lenné highly, the shape of this country must have been an inspiration. Hammerbacher mentioned Lenné as creator of the surroundings of the Foerster business, so it seems that she intended to suggest that for Foerster this fact also played a role in choosing the location of his company when he moved here in 1912 from his old home borough of Berlin-Westend.


Formally there were two registered businesses: the ‘Gärtnerei Karl Foerster’ ('Karl Foerster Plant Nursery') and the ‘Karl Foerster [& Co.] Gartengestaltung’ ('Karl Foerster & Co. Garden Design'). For his work – designs, advisory tasks, trips – Mattem had an agreement with Foerster’s firms to charge fees, on account of the two businesses’ clients or on account of the businesses themselves. But, as Mattem explained in 1935:

The project team of the garden designers “K[arl] F[oerster], H[ermann] M[attern] and H[erta] H[ammerbacher]” is no commercial venture but a working cooperative for the sake of common garden interests.

This claim corresponds with the reputation of a “spiritual companionship” that the the three names carry until today.

At the time Mattem was taken on by Foerster, bankruptcy was threatening the survival of the prestigious perennials nursery. Wages could only be paid because Hammerbacher provided her private inheritance. Mattem had to take over the management of the garden design department as a condition for a bank credit, that was granted thanks to the good will of banker Jakob Goldschmidt. In 1935 he explained: ‘I have for a period of time represented [the firm] Gartengestaltung K[arl] F[oerster] legally, in order to help K[arl] F[oerster] in a difficult situation.’ Foerster had

---

751 Letter from Mattem to Seifert, Fia, 26/01/1935, EAS.

752 'Die Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Gartengestalter "K.F., H.M. und H. M.-H." ist kein geschäftliches Unternehmen, sondern eine Arbeitsgemeinschaft um gemeinsame Garteninteressen.' Ibid.


755 EAS, letter Mattem to Seifert, Fia, 26/01/1935.
hopelessly overspent, using credits for personal trips. Between trusting economically unqualified artists with the management of his firms – the writer Max Mezger and the cabaret artist Werner Finck – Foerster had also lost money when falling for an impostor.\textsuperscript{756} Mattern's success as a designer in combination with his commitment to the business side of things – his apparent communication skills were of help here – brought the business out of its debts. In the following years his and Hammerbacher's art made Bornim become associated with a new type of private garden. Soon 'Bornim' started to be used like a label. Through the publication not only in the popular Foerster nursery catalogues and leading garden journals, but also in architecture journals, the organic Bornim style became widely known.

By taking – more or less jointly with Hammerbacher – a central position in the professional scene, Mattern must have caused resentment amongst those who had until then cooperated with the Foerster nursery. Well-connected as he was, Foerster used to be approached with garden design projects that he handed on to landscape architects. He was not able to produce designs himself. He expected to gain assignments for providing plants from his nursery in return, but the landscape architects taking over would not always choose to buy from his stock, deciding in their own interest for the one that offered the higher commission.\textsuperscript{757} The establishment of a design department within Foerster's nursery firm opened the way for an independent success; cooperating partners were no longer needed. In the case of Wiepking, this has been suggested as a reason for the beginning of animosities between him and the younger upcoming colleague Mattern, whom Rossow would name in his memoirs as Wiepking's direct competitor: by the mid-1930s, '[Mattern], Ms Hammerbacher, and Wiepking were


\textsuperscript{757} V. Heinrich, \textit{Hermann Mattern} (2013), p. 29.
[...] the most important freelance landscape architects in Berlin'.<sup>758</sup> Mattern commented on this in 1935 in a letter to Seifert:

[...] for years I have been attacked by Berlin landscape architects or architects who in the past strove for a similar working cooperative with K. F. but never attained the end they had in view.<sup>759</sup>

Inspired by Foerster the young couple developed a new organic garden style, a New <em>Landschaftlichkeit</em>, that became very popular, above all amongst Berlin’s liberal-conservative cultural and academic elite. Their creations were soon commonly referred to as ‘Bomim Gardens’, and their way of designing as ‘Bomim School’.<sup>760</sup> Foerster as one of the most influential German 20<sup>th</sup>-century plant breeders might be the more famous name, today as it was in his times,<sup>761</sup> but from 1928 all (published) gardens of the Foerster company were designed by Mattern and Hammerbacher. This means that the Bomim style was defined more by their approach to design than by the plant use Foerster promoted and allowed for with his breeding efforts. Asked in an interview whether she and Mattern at the beginning had felt they gave expression to Foerster’s artistic ideas, Hammerbacher vehemently objected:

---


<sup>759</sup> ‘[...] da ich seit Jahren von Berliner Gartengestaltern oder Architekten, die früher eine ähnliche Arbeitsgemeinschaft mit K.F. Anstreiben, aber nicht zum Ziele kamen, angegriffen werde.’ Letter from Mattern to Seifert, F1b/137, 26/01/1935, EAS.

<sup>760</sup> As an early reference serves a letter from Mattern to the Foerster business, in which Mattern claims co-authorship for the now popular ‘Bomim garden’. It dealt with a dispute over the payments and competence for a certain clients commission. See: Letter from Mattern to the other members of the <em>Arbeitsgemeinschaft</em> (i.e. Karl Foerster and Herta Hammerbacher), re: ‘Zum Schreiben vom 04/03/1937, Angelegenheit Voss-Bley’, no date, EMG.

<sup>761</sup> In Käthe Kollwitz’ diaries Foerster is addressed as ‘famous’ in 1920 (p. 475), although Kollwitz herself seemed to have get to know him personally only in April 1922: <em>Käthe Kollwitz: Die Tagebücher</em>, ed. by Jutta Bohnke-Kollwitz (Berlin: Siedler, 1989), pp. 475, 529.
No, fundamentally no! Absolutely out of the question! Completely different! We, Mattern and I, accepted his views and we saw him as school or as grand master and then we created our own things, which we believed were in accordance with Karl Foerster. We always were personal creators of our works, but in accordance with his ideas.762

In 1937 Mattern himself had claimed: ‘[…] requests by people wanting a Bornim Garden, at least with 50% mean also me myself’.763 Often people asked specifically for a design by Mattern.764 At this point the importance of Herta Hammerbacher should be


763 ‘Bei dieser Gelegenheit muss ein für alle Mal festgestellt werden, dass seit 1928 alle Gärten, die publiziert worden sind, von Frau Hammerbacher und mir entworfen und ausgeführt worden sind, ferner dass ich mich [sic!] Jahrelang ganz intensiv mit meiner Persönlichkeit und meiner Gartenauffassung für den Begriff des Bornimer Gartens gearbeitet habe, und dass diese Arbeit jetzt noch, oder sogar jetzt erst richtig wirbt, dass also Anfragen von Menschen, die eben einen Bornimer Garten haben wollen, zumindest auch 50% mich meinen. Dass dies der Fall ist, ist einmal ersichtlich aus den täglichen Anfragen, die mich direkt erreichen, wo die Menschen eben mich haben wollen, und aus den weiteren tägliche Anfragen […]. Bei der weiteren Unterhaltung bitte ich freundlichst, diese meine Auffassung, und die Tatsachen, aus denen diese meine Auffassung abzuleiten ist, nicht zu vergessen. Nicht nur mit deutschen, sondern auch mit freundlichen Grüßen.’ (‘On this occasion it has to be clarified once and for all that from 1928 all published gardens were designed and realised by me and Frau Hammerbacher, furthermore, that for years I have intensely, with my personality and my notion of the garden, committed myself to the idea of the Bornim Garden, and that my advertising is still, or now more than ever, effective. Accordingly, requests by people who want a Bornim Garden at least with 50 % mean also me myself. That this is the case can be understood from the daily enquiries that are directed to me personally because people want a design by me, and from the other daily inquiries that reach the joint venture. In the further course of this correspondence I kindly ask you not to forget my point of view and the facts from which this point of view is delineated. Not only with German, but also with kind regards […]’ Letter by Mattern to the other members of the joint venture (i.e. to Karl Foerster and Herta Hammerbacher), re: ‘Zum Schreiben vom 04/03/1937, Angelegenheit Voss-Bley’, no date, EMG.

764 Ibid.
re-emphasised, as the remaining 50% of the merits – and this was Mattern’s conviction, too – were due to her contribution. Her approach, which was significantly different from Mattern’s but led to a similar formal language, gained her an overall importance relatively close to that of her colleague and earlier partner. And Mattern’s claim also expressed that he considered the ‘Bornim School’ not Foerster’s achievement. All gardens published since 1928 ‘[...] were designed and realised by Frau Hammerbacher and me [...]’, and the Bornim label he claimed was the result of his advertisement over the course of many years.765 In 1971 he even declared that, despite great love for the environment, Foerster had not engaged with it ‘in regard to form’.766 In search for more space for displaying flowers, Foerster had arrived at an amphitheatre-like, ‘stagey’ garden type, which was a cause for ‘bitter altercations’ between the two; their collaboration was not always without conflict.767

A few lines deserves the social environment of these years, as it suggests that many contacts with clients emerged through word-of-mouth recommendation. At Zehlendorf, Mattern and Hammerbacher belonged to a group of like-minded people who lived ‘around the corner’ from them, so that their neighbourhood became ‘a meeting point for friends’, all architects: they met at Fred Forbat’s place with Hubert Hoffmann, who would later work at the Potsdam municipal building department, Marcel Breuer, Gustav Hassenpflug and Erich Kühn.768 One of Ferdinand Möller’s daughters also remembered regular meetings:

765 Ibid.


767 Ibid.

The Matterns used to give very nice garden parties, in the evening outside in the garden. On the floor little incense candles were burning, to keep the mosquitos off our legs. Many people were sitting on the floor in a circle around Frau Mattern.\footnote{Eberhard Roters, \textit{Galerie Ferdinand Möller: Die Geschichte einer Galerie für Moderne Kunst in Deutschland 1917–1956}, (Berlin: Gebrüder Mann, 1984), p. 86.}

As Möller had many acquaintances in the art scene – the painters Kandinsky, Klee and Nolde, the sculptor Richard Scheibe – this is a possible point of contact between Mattern and artists, too.\footnote{E. Roters, \textit{Galerie Ferdinand Möller}, (1984), p. 84.} At the time of Schlemmer’s mural for Mattern (despite a long-standing friendship between the two), the artist communicated with his client through Möller.\footnote{E. Roters, \textit{Galerie Ferdinand Möller}, (1984), pp. 282-3.} The gallery owner often received visits from the Hungarian art journalist Ernst Kállai, in 1928 and 1929 editor-in-chief of the Bauhaus magazine, the art historian Will Grohmann and the architects Hans Poelzig and Otto von Estorff.\footnote{E. Roters, \textit{Galerie Ferdinand Möller}, (1984), pp. 84-6.} The architectural office Estorff und Winkler designed many country houses in and around Potsdam, and the accompanying gardens were often designed by Foerster-Hammerbacher-Mattern.\footnote{Cf.: V. Heinrich, \textit{Hermann Mattern} (2013), pp. 389–410 (the catalogue raisonné).} Through Mattern, Möller became a close friend of Karl Foerster’s, with whom he shared the love of flowers.\footnote{E. Roters, \textit{Galerie Ferdinand Möller}, (1984), p. 177.} Then Möller got to know Scharoun, who built his summer house at Lake Zermützel in 1937,\footnote{The summer house was recently restored and is used by the Ferdinand Möller Foundation, see: Ilka Ruby and Andreas Ruby, \textit{Hans Scharoun: Haus Möller} (Köln: König, 2004). Cf.: Peter Blundell-Jones, \textit{Hans Scharoun} (London: Phaidon, 1995), p. 93} after an unbuilt...
project for a house in 1931. Several projects on which Scharoun collaborated with Mattern, occasionally with Hammerbacher, emerged from these social networks, for example Marg and Oskar Moll (1937), head of Breslau’s art academy, Fritz Endell (1939), the son of August Endell (Moll’s predecessor at Breslau), and the Mohrmanns (1939), relations of Scharoun’s.

The name ‘Bomim Circle’, that is the social sphere of Foerster, is surrounded by a considerable amount of stage smoke. It seems clear though that by the early 1930s the Bomim School of garden design had become something of a trademark. In this context it has been noted that archived student designs from the only university course for landscape architects, under professor Erwin Barth, show how pervasive the new landscape style in residential gardens was already before 1933. It is rather improbable, however, that this was due to Mattern, as his works could not have immediately wielded such influence, even before being published. Until the mid-1930s, the most prominent clients of Foerster’s design office were the film director Fritz Lang and his wife, the script writer Thea von Harbou (1929, Berlin-Dahlem, architects: Wassili und Hans Luckhardt), the painter and journalist Kurt Szafranski (1930), the architects Hans and Marlene Poelzig (1931, Berlin-Charlottenburg, architect: Marlene Poelzig), the pianist Wilhelm Kempff (1931, Potsdam, architects: Otto von Estorff and Gerhard Winkler), the actor and director Erik Charell (1931, Potsdam-Sacrow, architect: Moritz Ernst Lesser), Graf von Faber-Castell (1933, Stein near Nuremberg), Fritz Schopohl (1934, the house designed by the architect himself),


Albert Speer (1935, Berlin-Zehlendorf, the house designed by the architect himself), the musicologist Anthony Hoboken (1935, Grinzing near Vienna), and Robert Ley, head of the German Labour Front (Bad Saarow, 1937).  

The early projects: some notes on sources of inspiration

As the early letters to Hammerbacher testify, Mattern developed his formal-spatial approach under engagement with the ideas of Hammerbacher and Pniower. Mattern's ignorance of Lange is conspicuous – though it might have been inspired by Migge's aversion to Lange –, but is part of his general silence in regard to influences from other garden designers.  

His appreciation of Pniower's influence on his artistic development for example is disclosed here for the first time thanks to aforementioned short but significant quote from a private letter. It was probably his enormous pride that stood in the way of clarifying historical traditions in modern garden design by disclosing influences he received from older professionals such as – this list is partly speculative – Allinger, Hübottet, Körtig, Lange, Maasz, Migge, Pniower, Valentien, or Wiepking. It is worth noting that it is also thanks to Hammerbacher having committed herself to writing a historical treatise, that we gain more insight into influences on Mattern and her; in history some coherences become clearer from the distance. Her chapter Die Wohngärten was published in 1972 as one of the first texts on 20th-century garden design; Mattern had died only shortly before. Her later discussed elucidations aside, publications of the young landscape architects spoke of a strong assurance and a will to provide new, unconventional solutions.

780 V. Heinrich, Hermann Mattern (2013), pp. 390–2 (the catalogue raisonné). The German Labour Front (Deutsche Arbeitsfront, DAF) was the organisation that replaced all unions when these were dissolved on 02 May 1922: Martin Broszat, Der Staat Hitlers: Grundlegung und Entwicklung seiner inneren Verfassung, 1926-1989, 6th edn (München: DTV, 1986), pp. 183–4.

781 For the Migge's rejection of Lange's, see: David H. Haney, When Modern was Green: Life and Work of Landscape Architect Leberecht Migge (London and New York: Routledge, 2010), pp. 37–9.
Apart from the garden for Bergius at Heidelberg, amongst the first projects Mattern
designed in the new cooperative was a garden at Potsdam for Leo van den Bergh,
photos of which were occasionally published over the coming years (Figures 105b+c). It
shows how every design decision was thought through. They had not developed their
skills in a vacuum, but preconceived ideas about the typical garden were rather
irrelevant in light of the creative will of the young landscape architects:

Such a planter does not stand on a sustaining wall, on the lawn or next to the playground for
purely formal reasons; it is a part of a plant bed that is replanted several times a year and can
change its place frequently. A garden should allow us to play [...] – already at the design
stage the choice of material often induces us to play; it is no coincidence if the path of stone
slabs, like a change of step, continues in the form of a brick path. In connection with the
changing, more detailed plantings the pace is supposed to slow down. Apart from that, the
brick is laid in a pattern. I often noticed, that a person’s pace changes depending on the
firmness and the character of the material that constitutes the way. 782

Evident in the photos is, despite the abstract sense of form, a rather romantic and
picturesque opulence. This uninhibited plant growth that was even allowed between
the pavement slabs of terraces and paths had become a trend by the mid-1920s.
Photos from these early projects, with their rough-hewn stones, recall similar
projects from other landscape architects (Figures 27, 28). The client seemed to like a
mixture of old and new, as the van den Bergh garden featured topiary and even one
of the much-maligned benches made from tree branches.

According to Hammerbacher, the true Bornim Garden fully emerged one year later;
with hindsight, she presented her’s and Mattern’s and her garden at their first home at
Zehlendorf as the first example for the amalgamation of Foerster’s long-established

782 Hermann Mattern and Herta Mattern-Hammerbacher, ‘Aus Hausgärten’, Monatshefte für Baukunst
und Städtebau, 17 (1933), 202–9 (202).
ideas with the new, the independent '[...] views of young landscape architects, who kept up with the times.' Hammerbacher stressed the new treatment of plants as individuals, with special flowers such as Columbine (Aquilegia), Bellflower (Campanula) or lilies being given prominence by underplanting them with different levels of a 'background' plantation, as found on natural wood edges. Foerster’s breeding achievements provided new animate building material, through which a merging of the architectonic mode and the landscape mode became easier; indeed, a true amalgamation was intended. This contrasted the side-by-side of architectonic and naturalistic parts in the older garden design concepts of Lange or Bergfeld. Foerster himself wrote already in his *Vom Blütengarten der Zukunft* (‘Of the Future Blossom Garden’, 1917):

> The new plant world not only helped and allowed for a deepening of the regular and the natural style of the gardens, but also to unite both, often within the same garden, each in the part that befitted it, indeed often to interpenetrate both with each other.

The first garden the young couple designed for themselves – built between 1929 and 1930, Am Fischtal – is notable for two reasons: It shows the young couple’s unconventional treatment of space, and it served as a field of experimentation for their use of perennials. Judging from Mattern’s article about their ‘garden without

---


woody plants’, it was a conscious decision to do without shrubs or trees in order to be able to see what kinds of visual developments could be observed when other means of design did not ‘absorb the effect’. For screening against the street, along two sides of the plot, Mattern used soil from the garden to create a 50-centimetre-high dam with a wide crest. On top of this, reed mats served as a fence and as a neutral background to the colours of the plants in the foreground. At the same time, a 2-metre wide ditch was created along the dam; it ended in a low, round pan that created a liaison with the lawn. Perennials were planted in the ditch. A two-layer sandstone step had the effect of a ‘regulatory line’ between the freely growing perennials and the central lawn (Fig. 105a). Mattern described the planting scheme in a rather abstract way. Next to the tiny creeping thyme, medium height perennials appeared like head-high bushes, while delphiniums became ‘mammoth trees’, and giant hogweed ‘forest giants hardly graspable at a glance’.

Large areas of low mat-forming plants surround solitary plants with a high and grotesque habit. These are formal plantings, not geometrical ones. There is a lot of potential between architectonic and landschaftliche solutions for gardens. For me actual designing begins when it moves between these two poles.

Over the course of the year, the character of the plant border changed. Starting ‘well-behaved’ with tiny Eranthis and Scilla, tulips soon started to set the surface into

---


788 Ibid.

789 ‘Große Flächen niederer Polsterpflanzen umstellen Einzelpläntchen hohen grotesken Wuchses, es sind formale Pflanzungen und nicht geometrische. Viel liegt zwischen Gartenlösungen im architektonischen und landschaftlichen Gepräge. Von mir aus beginnt die Gestaltung dort, wo sie sich zwischen diesen beiden Formulierungen bewegen kann’. Ibid.
motion. Along with the plant growth, 'landscapes' grew 'into chains of hills' finally becoming thickets and 'mountain ranges'.\textsuperscript{790} Despite Mattern being officially the author of these elaborate thoughts, Hammerbacher listed herself as the designer of the planting scheme, while she credited Mattern with the spatial layout of the garden.\textsuperscript{791} Apart from being a design project that was important to them personally, the garden also represented self-fulfilment, as it '[-] [-] served the life with family and friends free from social restraints [...]'.\textsuperscript{792}

If we compare these artistic ideas to Foerster's, we can imagine how the influence was mutual. In his descriptions of plants he used a similarly picturesque language, but his artistic taste was more conservative. With his initial affinity for the 'wild garden' in the mould of Robinson, during the 1920s Foerster had opened up to architectonic designs as they had been promoted since the turn of the century.\textsuperscript{793} Eventually he preferred a garden that incorporated both the architectonic and the naturalist ideal. Mattern and Hammerbacher, with their organic-modernist ideal, moved Foerster away from his more conservative taste, eventually also accustoming him to modernist architecture and free geometric composition.\textsuperscript{794} However, for an understanding of the main influences on Mattern and Hammerbacher the previous chapters have to be considered together. As mentioned, apart from the indirect connections to Monism and the plant-geographical inspiration referred to in the chapter on Foerster, the Bornim School may be associated with the nature garden of

\textsuperscript{790} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{794} S. Dümpelmann, Karl Foerster (2001), pp. 23–4.
Willy Lange. Hammerbacher placed Lange into the tradition of the landscape garden. In her view, he enlarged upon that tradition, inspired by plant-scientific studies (Botany, Plant Ecology and Plant Geography), ‘as well as in his connectedness with the artistic endeavours of his times (Naturalism, later Expressionism)’.  

Hammerbacher credited Lange with taking the necessary ‘fighting position against the promoters of the architectonic garden (Muthesius, Olbrich, Behrens)’, albeit with the qualification that his concepts focussed disproportionately on the plant compositions, neglecting ‘today important functions of the garden’.

Another artistic influence from Foerster’s circle is the landscape architect Berthold (Lui Oskar) Körting. Hammerbacher was a great admirer of Körting, and she was not the only one. People as different as Wiepking, Peter Behrens and Karl Foerster revered his delicate naturalistic plant compositions. In 1919, together with a friend, Körting had founded an architectural office in Neu-Babelsberg (later incorporated as a district into the city of Potsdam), in which he focussed on garden design. In 1921 he had completed a house for his family in the same town. In 1923/24, Körting bought shares of the Douglas Hill pottery kiln at Oranienburg (Oranienburger Werkstätten), where his wife became managing director. He himself became a noted designer of outdoor ceramics. In August 1930 his wife left him unexpectedly, and a few days later


Körting committed suicide. After that he became something of a local garden design legend. In accordance with Körting’s preferred style, Hammerbacher preached the use of grasses and was probably influenced by the soft modulation of the ground in his more naturalistic gardens (Fig. 106, 107, 112, 113). But Körting’s work was very heterogenous. His two most famous projects were almost diametrically opposed to each other: the Redslob garden (1924) had as its main attraction naturalistic plantings on naturalistically shaped ground, the other one, for the publisher Julius Springer Jr. (1925), was a perfectly axisymmetrical masonry composition overlaid with lush plant growth (Figures 108a, 108b). With some legitimation, Hammerbacher has suggested the influence of the second example, the garden on two of Mattern’s earliest designs, the gardens for the chemist and Nobel laureate Friedrich Bergius (Heidelberg, 1929, Figures 109, 110) and for Weishaupt (Berlin, 1929, Fig. 111). As in other cases, such comparisons point at commonalities as much as at differences: Körting’s rigid symmetries are dissolved in Mattern’s designs. Unlike Körting, he was not interested in hierarchical geometries. Instead, he focussed on merging house and garden into one space, striving for a more organic composition. The Bergius garden is one of the most extravagant projects Mattern realised in his early years. The existence of a drawing is not known, so the general layout can only be reconstructed indirectly by looking at the surviving photographs. The garden lay partly on a steep slope, which was negotiated by use of walls, terraces and stairs. This construction in dry stone walls connected the modernist villa (architect Edmund Körner) and the lower garden spaces. Apart from a water cascade, it included several water basins and stone terraces. In photographs,


the most conspicuous aspect is the contrast between the stone and the diverse, lush plantings, with the latter hanging over the walls like a romantic veil. While the design approach was less monumentalist, this stylistic device as well as the material character indeed reminded of Körtng's Springer garden. The contrast between the white building and the more traditional masonry is also striking, but was common in those days. The formal approach behind the free, 'cubic' composition may have been inspired by tendencies in art and has been linked to Cubism, but a means of abstraction in painting cannot easily be transferred to applied spatial design so a labelling as 'Cubist' appears questionable. Yet, if we reduce for example the main published drawing for the Weishaupt garden to a two-dimensional composition of lines, we can see why a connection to abstract painting was drawn (Fig. 111).

Körtng's entirely different design for the Redslob garden, published in Die Gartenschönheit in 1926, was discussed by Mattern and Hammerbacher in letters between Magdeburg and Berlin. Mattern was intrigued and yet remained sceptical:

'Reading makes me feel warm all over, and I realise the beauty of such a garden. Yet, in the end, as a designer I felt I was opposed to that approach.'  

It provoked him to think about experimenting with vegetation-focussed design, albeit in a more integral way than Körtng's, which he criticised for laying unrelated beside the house (Figures 112, 113). The concept of the plantings could be 'biological', but it always should correspond with the 'laws' of the building or the plot.

---

801 'Beim Lesen wird einem etwas warm, und die Schönheit eines solchen Garten geht mit auf und doch stand ich beim Schluß dieser Auffassung als Gestalter ablehnend gegenüber.' Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, Nov. 26–15 (21/11/1926), EHH.

802 Ibid.
The New Landscape Mode: gardens for dwelling

Generally speaking, amongst the rather few progressive powers in this profession, 20th-century modernism in garden design at first resulted in architectural-geometrical form. This is especially obvious for the period of Jugendstil and far into the nineteen-twenties. In the later 1920s, Mattern and some others in his generation developed the architectonic reform garden of the older generation further. They reconsidered the picturesque element of the 18th and 19th century without loosing sight of the garden’s function as outside living room. At the same time, when calls for a ‘natural’ garden were increasingly connected with racial thinking, the Bornimers stayed firmly on their path. In retrospect, in modern garden historiography, the organic tradition seems to have been dominated by conservative thinking. The fact that the Bornimers enjoyed continuing success while other progressives suffered oppression by the NS rule has somewhat distracted from the genesis of their new landscape mode and complicated its evaluation. However, there are other possible motives for the disengagement with the prevailing architectonic way of designing gardens in this period than the general trend towards a xenophobic search for a ‘truly German’ garden style. Mattern’s work is one distinctive example.

As will have become clear by now, Mattern and Hammerbacher rejected geometry as design guideline. At the same time imitation of nature was not their aim either. The ‘virgin’ landscape that Le Corbusier envisioned to set off his buildings was totally removed from Mattern’s intentions. He had little time for an emulation of natural

803 Cf. introduction.


habitats with their specific plant communities, as became increasingly mainstream in European garden design, and declared at the very beginnings of his career, that to him ‘architectonic criteria’ – by this meaning not the Architectonic Garden style, but a conscious spatial thinking –, were not only valid for space-making generally but also for planting concepts. Mattern’s way of designing with plants was not fixed to a single approach such as Lange’s intuitive aesthetic associations to a plant’s physiognomy. Nor was Mattern abiding by the phytosociological guidelines of scientists like Reinhold Tüxen, even though these influenced him and represented valid knowledge in his work for the autobahn projects – in which Tüxen was involved as a specialist advisor – or the waterways directorate during the 1930s and 1940s. While his and in particular Hammerbacher’s botanical knowledge was a precondition for his creations, concerning the use of plants Mattern was as experimental as with regard to space making generally. The expression of scientific guidelines in the following quote is a typical sign for Hammerbacher’s influence, but these were always put under aesthetic auspices:

Concerning an artefact, the material of which [...] originates in the realm of the organic, to work rationally surely means to work in a biological sense. Today [...] one understands as biological planting not merely the combination of plant associations. From this perspective, beside the grouping of plants, there have to be considered the soil conditions, the interrelation between water, air, the bacteria of the ground, the plant to wood to stone ratio. The knowledge to create the best conditions for growth will define the selection of [...] the plants, and it has a deeper meaning if one perceives the used stone in a garden [...] as beautiful.

To work in a biological sense does not mean however, to renounce a conscious design

that springs from man. In my eyes to build the garden of today means: to design from the clear structure of the garden’s framework all the way through to the last oscillation of the plant growth; to design in a way that the built and the planted form a unity.807

The trend towards more naturalism in garden design around 1930 was also the expression of a new stylistic open-mindedness. It meant a shift in focus away from representative aesthetics, towards the aesthetic enjoyment of the garden owner – both visual and performative in the act of gardening – rather than aesthetic representation of the garden to a visitor or passerby:

That a garden can be made to blossom as early as in February, that in December still much can be in bloom, that one almost does not need any paths, that a garden can be lived in like a room, that the things that fill it do not have to be arranged in a way that they are awestruck out of self-reverence; all these are questions of experience, of proportion, and they are questions of tact.808


808 ‘[…] Daß man den Garten schon im Februar zum Blühen bringen kann, daß im Dezember noch vieles blühen kann, daß man fast keine Wege haben muss, daß man einen Garten bewohnen kann wie ein Zimmer, daß die Dinge, die den Garten füllen, nicht so untergebracht werden, daß sie aus Ehrfurcht vor sich selbst erstarren, sind Fragen der Erfahrung, der Proportion, und sind Fragen des Taktes.’ H. Mattem and H. Hammerbacher, ‘Aus Hausgärten’, Monatshefte für Baukunst und Städtebau, 17 (1933), 202–8 (202). Please note that in German ‘Takt’ can mean both ‘cadence’/‘beat’ as well as ‘tact’/‘discretion’, but the idiomatic phrase ‘eine Frage des Taktes’ suggests that the moral
The idea of blooming in February and December related to Foerster's idea of the 'garden of seven seasons'.\textsuperscript{809} It has often been claimed that the Bornimers' work was underlaid with a knowledge of the new science of phytosociology, but above all, it was characterised by a particular perspective on the plant's spatially effective capacities, its structural impression, and the psychological aspects of its colours. In this regard, Mattern's and Hammerbacher's perspective must have been influenced by Foerster's. Connections have been drawn to a Japanese way of seeing a plant, which the Bornimers considered more than ever with the psychological-emotional associations to the growth form, the habit, of the particular species or variety.\textsuperscript{810} This contrasted with the concentration on colour in the traditional view of the decorative capacities of bedding plants of the 1920s, like the 'Millefleur-style' or the monochromatic application on larger beds as shown impressively by Allinger at the Dresden garden show of 1926 (Figures 114, 115).\textsuperscript{811} It almost seems as though the Bornimer way of applying plants harked back to the reform garden of the late empire, with its inspiration from the Arts and Crafts movement and Lichtwark's promotion of the naïvety of the traditional, happily and randomly mixed flower beds of the

---


idealised farmer’s garden.\textsuperscript{812} But in contrast Mattern’s beds where compositional in regard to habit, texture and colour, as the quoted elucidations about his own garden at the Fischtalgrund showed. During the times of their collaboration it is difficult though to attribute this to Mattern, as Hammerbacher often was responsible for the planting schemes. In later years, Mattern’s gardens exhibit a more experimental, abstract use of plants in unusual combinations, which focussed even more than before on form rather than biology (Figures 116, 117).

\textit{The wider public establishment of the Bornim School}

The 1930s was arguably a great decade for Foerster-Mattern-Hammerbacher. Mattern’s involvement in the design of the oval space at the Funkturm, commonly referred to as the ‘Egg at the Broadcasting Tower’, together with Hans Poelzig and Ernst Wagner, is little known, as the terraced gardens were re-designed and drawn up for tendering by Ludwig and Richard Lesser (Figures 118, 119).\textsuperscript{813} The first widely recognised contribution by Foerster-Mattern-Hammerbacher under the new government was their winning competition entry to the competition ‘\textit{Jahresschau Garten und Heim}’ as part of the ‘\textit{Deutsche Siedlungsausstellung München 1934}’ (‘German Settlement Exhibition 1934’), often referred to as ‘\textit{Siedlungsschau}

\textsuperscript{812} Alfred Lichtwark, \textit{Makartbouquet und Blumenstrauß}, 2nd edn (Berlin: Cassirer, 1905),


\textsuperscript{813} The general layout of the gardens were designed by Ludwig and Richard Lesser, on the basis of a concept by Hans Poelzig and Martin Wagner. Thanks to his connection with Poelzig, Mattern had been involved in the original design competition: ‘I don’t know if you still remember that, as a young beginner, I have been smuggled into your Berlin districts (the egg at the Broadcasting Tower) by Pölzig [sic!], and that I was even allowed to produce a (even paid) counterproposal to Migge’s and Wiebking’s [sic!]’. EHM, letter Mattern to Martin Wagner (Cambridge, MA), file 02, 05/07/1950. Cf.: Katrin Lesser-Sayrac, \textit{Ludwig Lesser (1869–1957), Erster freischaffender Gartenarchitekt in Berlin und seine Werke im Bezirk Reinickendorf}, series Beiträge zur Denkmalpflege in Berlin, 4 (Berlin: Kulturbuch-Verlag, 1995), pp. 85–6 (Lesser does not mention Mattern, nor May or Poelzig).
Comparing the known competition entries, the contrast of the Bornimers' design vocabulary to the mainstream becomes clear. Most contributions are rather compartmentalised and geometric, those by Max Kämpfer and Theo Nußbaum also relying on a dominant central axis.

Hübottter's complex design (no illustration) appeared the least clear, while Friedrich Heiler, together with the architect Otto Maurer, suggested the clearest design: a series of rooms divided by hedges (or trees) and containing one or several smaller gardens. Karl Plomin's entry, placed second in the competition, showed an attractively varied overall composition, well-balanced and with an interesting guiding of route. The winning design by the Bornimers was the only one to suggest a peripheral main service route as a spine to the plot. It was lined to the north by a narrow strip with the exhibition stands of the garden nurseries. These were separated from the northern street only by a thin fringe of trees. Attached to the inner side of

---

814 Schwarzkopf has analysed this competiton as one of his case studies in his published doctoral dissertation on design competitors in garden architecture between 1871 and 1945: Johannes Schwarzkopf, Der Wettbewerb in der Gartenarchitektur: Vergleichbarkeit als Chance (Berlin: Leue Verlag, 2006), pp. 250–60; Harbers was head of the city of Munich’s habitation division at that time, see ibid. (p. 250). About the exhibition, see: Guido Harbers, “Wettbewerb "Jahresschau Garten und Heim" innerhalb der “Deutschen Siedlungsausstellung München 1934””, Baumeister, IV (1934), 134–41.

815 Oswald Langerhans, “Wettbewerb “Jahresschau Garten und Heim” in der deutschen Siedlungsausstellung München 1934”, Gartenkunst, 47, 3 (1934), 37–42. Langerhans was member of the competition jury, which was presided over by Gustav Allinger (ibid.).

816 Theo Nußbaum (1885–1956) was building councillor at Cologne (1926–45) where he amongst other redesigned the Rheinpark. Before he had been working there under Fritz Encke, see: Gert Gröning and Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn, Grüne Biographien: biographisches Handbuch zur Landschaftsarchitektur des 20. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland (Berlin: Patzer, 1997), p. 278.

817 For the name Friedrich Heiler there are two entries in Grüne Biographien, see: G.Gröning and J. Wolschke-Bulmahn, Grüne Biographien (1997), p. 136.

818 Karl Plomin (1904–1986) is known above all for his many designs for the area of Alsterpark and ‘Planten un Bloomen’ in Hamburg since 1935, cf. the page dedicated to Plomin on the website of Hamburgisches Architekturarchiv, including biographical sources: http://www.architekturarchiv-web.de/portraits/o-z/plomin/index.html (accessed 19/09/2014).
the main route lay the series of exhibition gardens, varying in size and internal
structure. Beyond these gardens lay a large park meadow. This was the only proposal
that concentrated the exhibition gardens in a way that left space for a generous open
parklike area. It was delineated to the south by a footpath, which, seen together with
the main route, allowed for a wide circular route containing all gardens. South of the
path lay in a line the premises for the detached houses of the Settlement Exhibition, a
precondition for all designs. Interposed between these and the exhibition gardens, the
parklike open space appeared to lie centrally in the plot. It was unobtrusively
structured by clumps of trees and traversed by a swinging footpath, reminiscent of
some of Migge’s proposals for public parks from over two decades ago (Fig. 124).

In comparison the proposal by Foerster-Mattern-Hammerbacher appeared modest,
guiding attention to a “democratic” space at the centre. Their arrangement of the
exhibition gardens avoided both the striking regularity (Kämpfer, Nußbaum) and the
confusion of some other proposals (Hübotter, no illustration). Instead it was clear
without being regular, characteristic for Mattern’s way of designing.

When it became known that the Bornimers were considered politically
‘unreliable’ they were refused the contract, but later were commissioned with single
exhibition gardens (Figures 125, 126) All the same, the realised project was based on
their proposal, but without official acknowledgement.819 This was the first time they
had first-hand experience of the changed political conditions. A second look at the
jury is eye-opening: it was presided over by Gustav Allinger, one of Mattern’s
personal opponents who had denounced his younger colleague on various occasions
(compare chapter II-g).820

The tremendous amount of attention the Bornimers were soon receiving is
striking. Moreover, the honouring of their many private gardens realised by the mid-


1930s was not restricted to the niche of garden design journals. For example, one year after the Munich competition success, Die Bauwelt dedicated two entire volumes almost exclusively to the work of the Foerster-Mattern-Hammerbacher joint venture (Fig. 127). The second part was signed with ‘LI’, which stood for the architectural journalist Alfons Leitl (1909–1975). The Monatshefte für Baukunst und Städtebau had already reported in 1933 with a seven-pages long article written by Mattern and Hammerbacher, followed in 1934 by six pages written by Mattern, and in 1935 by another two long reports. One dealt with the ‘Sommer Flower Show at the Broadcasting Tower’ (‘Sommerblumenschau am Funkturm’), a regular event between 1933 and 1943 staged at the aforementioned spaces beneath the Broadcasting Tower. Conspicuously, it showed – apart from some photos of the indoors flower arrangements – exclusively designs by Mattern, who had the artistic direction of the exhibition, but actually did not design all of its gardens (Fig. 128). The same year, the longest article presented gardens by FMH on thirteen (sic!) pages, probably written, again, by Leitl. All articles were generously illustrated with drawings and large, carefully chosen photographs, usually by zur Nedden. The comments were usually in accordance with the designer’s intentions – if they had not written them themselves, they were at least cited. It seemed that Leitl had a hand in all this

---

821 Bauwelt consisted of a part, mainly text, with news and reports about technical or legal aspects, and a second part with photo journalistic, mostly artistically culturally oriented contributions. The latter in the volumes 11/1935 and 12/1935 were almost exclusively (13 pages) dedicated to the work of Foerster-Mattern-Hammerbacher, with merely two pages on work by Otto Valentien and one page on a garden by Wiepking. ‘Häuser und Gärten’, Bauwelt, 11, 11 (1935), 1–8; ‘Häuser und Gärten, Teil II’, Bauwelt, 11, 12 (1935), 1–5. Part II is signed ‘LI.*’, and the register lists ‘Leitl’ as author.


publicity, who was trained as both a journalist and an architect.\textsuperscript{824} He was well connected, freelancing for \textit{Monatshefte} and working as an editor at the \textit{Bauwelt}, trying to steer the journal on a relatively modernist course, sometimes in direct confrontation with his more conservative editor-in-chief, Friedrich Paulsen.\textsuperscript{825} With him they had an able and relatively openminded expert writing about them, who was personally connected with Hammerbacher through Walter Kratz and through the work on the book about Hammerbacher's home.\textsuperscript{826} Leitl is not known as a personal friend of Mattern's, though he may well have been, as their ways crossed more often over the years. He was interested in Neues Bauen, but critical towards the 'doctrinaire pretension of the naked functionalism' and in favour of the more 'conservative modernism' – commonly referred to as 'Reformstil' – the architecture of Tessenow, Schmitthenner or Bonatz, that referred back to the pure compositions of end-of-18\textsuperscript{th}-century residential architecture.\textsuperscript{827} As editor in chief of the influential post-war journal \textit{Baukunst und Werkform}, where in the first editions Mattern is listed as an advisor, he also professed to an organic architecture, though he has been criticised for stereotyping and for a bias towards his friend Rudolf Schwarz (1897–1961), ignoring and thus blocking the career of the most explicit of organicists, Hans Scharoun.\textsuperscript{828} The Bornimers' gardens mentioned in Leitl's articles were usually connected to more or less traditionalist buildings, which were unproblematic to

\textsuperscript{824} About Leitl a monograph has been published: Johannes Busmann, \textit{Die revidierte Moderne: der Architekt Alfons Leitl 1909–1975} (Wuppertal: Müller und Busmann, 1995).


\textsuperscript{826} Alfons Leitl (text), Werner Kratz (drawings), E. M. Heddenhausen (photographs), \textit{Das Buch vom eigenen Haus} (Berlin: Bauwelt-Verlag, 1937).


\textsuperscript{828} Thilo Hilpert, 'Land ohne Avantgarde', \textit{Archplus}, 40, 186/187 (2008), 110–3.
publish (cf. Fig. 127, left). On the other hand, some more modernist examples were also shown, like the landscape architects’ own rather experimental house at Bornim, designed by Scharoun (cf. Fig. 127, right). However, in 1935 this did not yet mean risking much uproar. This changed when in the discussion about modern art Alfred Rosenberg, in his function as Germany’s supreme cultural supervisor, came out on top at the end of 1936. By what was simply referred to as ‘Rosenberg Office’ the modern art scene really started to be rigorously suffocated.

After 1933, with the Nazis gradually limiting artistic freedom, it seems that the Bornimers did not really have to adapt much. The design vocabulary of their jointly developed gardens was not conspicuously contradicting the new, unwritten style guides. Some of the landscape architects who were adhering more strongly to the architectonic garden design considered the soft plasticity of the Bornim School as effete and un-German, but those speaking their mind openly this way represented the extreme (see chapter II-i). Generally, most Bornim School designs were compatible with the mainstream, as their inclusion in some of the popular garden monographs of the 1930s and 1940s, like Herbert Hoffmann’s Gärten und Häuser (1939) or Hans Schiller’s Schöne und nützliche Gärten (1942), shows. However, here and there details bear witness of a modernist aesthetic ideal not compatible with the official doctrine. The case was rather different for Mattern as an individual designer. He may


830 Since 1934, Rosenberg’s official function was ‘Beauftragter des Führers für die Überwachung der gesamten geistigen und weltanschaulichen Erziehung der NSDAP’, shortly referred to as ‘Dienststelle Rosenberg’ (‘Rosenberg Office’, abbreviated ‘DRbg’). Cf. se short biography on the pages of LeMO (‘Lebendige Museum Online’), a project of the Deutsches Historisches Museum (German Historical Museum), https://www.dhm.de/lemo/Biografie/alfred-rosenberg (last accessed 10/10/2014).

not have had to renounce 100 percent, but enough to be living a simulacrum. His experimental urge he had to restrain. There is no explicit declaration known by him, but in one undated lecture manuscript about the Killesberg project from after the war he claimed that the Nazis' aesthetic doctrine was responsible for the use of rustic (though ironically not local) sandstone and traditional technique for all architectonic elements in the park design of 1936 to 1939. The Summer Flower Show of 1935 featured an expansive blanked sheet metal form, attached as a wall sculpture in the entrance yard, as well as a statues by artists such as the already ostracised Gerhard Marcks. Mattern's design was rather experimental, non-representative and intimate, with flower beds in free forms and temporary walls made of papier mâché with circular openings and a playful use of wooden rods for pergolas and treillage (Figures 129–132). A contemporary critic commended, that Mattern had 'departed from the common exhibitions with more representative character [...] and [had] accommodated, with a lot of design skill, to the plant [...]'. And the review continued:

832 The metal wall sculpture was possibly designed by Mattern's brother in law Henner Röser, as it showed outlines of slightly abstract animals reminiscent of Röser's drawing style. Marcks until 1925 had been Formmeister at the Bauhaus' pottery workshop Dornburg/Saale, where Theodor Bogler was working with him as a student. In 1925 Marcks did not move with the Bauhaus to Dessau (where there was no pottery workshop anymore); he was one of the teachers who disagreed with Moholy-Nagy's motto 'Art and technology – a new unit'. Marcks went on to teach at Burg Giebichenstein school of applied arts at Halle, where he became director in 1928 replacing the architect Paul Thiersch. In 1933 Marcks was dismissed and later ostracised. His works were shown at the infamous 1937 show of 'degenerate art' in Munich. Despite this, he gained several commissions under the regime. He he was more a classicist than a revolutionary, and – similar to Schlemmer – he felt at distance from the rationalist and functionalist aims of the Dessau Bauhaus. After the war he was appointed professor at Hamburg's Landeskunstschule, which had been oriented towards Bauhaus principles by its headmaster Gustav Hassenplug, and became one of Germany's most revered artists. See: Dictionary of Art, ed. by Jane Turner, 34 vols (New York: Macmillan, 1996), 20, p. 395–6; Magdalena Bushart, 'Ein Bildhauer zwischen den Stühlen: Gerhardt Marcks in den dreißiger Jahren', in Bauhaus-Moderne im Nationalsozialismus: Zwischen Anbiederung und Verfolgung, ed. by Winfried Nerdinger (München: Prestel, 1993), 103–12.
The designer cared less for dazzling the visitor with a grand general impression than to stir and to strengthen in him the love and joy to [sic] flowers and plants.833

The reviews of his similarly experimental ‘Fountain Courtyard’ (‘Brunnenhof’), through which the visitor entered the 1st Reich Garden Show at Dresden in 1936, were less enthusiastic. In fact, the project caused considerable irritation amongst the traditionally minded (Figures 133, 134).834 On the ground, pool liner was used to form little, organically shaped ponds; paving and water bodies dovetailed with each other to form an abstract landscape of flowers, water and flowing path surfaces. Most probably in reaction to the geometrical facades enclosing the courtyard, Mattern had come up with a treillage construction made of slanted slats, that changed appearance with the visitor’s movement through the space. This kind of light, transparent and easy to install wood constructions was also a typical feature of Mattern’s postwar work. With its play of horizontal and vertical lines, the structure appeared almost like constructivist art. The whole project was considered intelligently executed in view of the surprise effect that a main entrance to a garden show demanded, but it was also called ‘slightly histrionic’, even ‘slightly subversive’.835

The gardens of the Bornim School as organic functionalism
Contingent on the functionalist approach behind the designs, formally and structurally, the Bornim Gardens went into a symbiosis with organic-functionalist architecture, while somewhat struggling against a smooth affiliation with purely constructivist modernist architecture. With their embracing form and the lively multiplicity of their plantings, they also went into a picturesque alliance with the

834 Cf. pp. 302, 313 (fn 949).
inviting and homely character of the cottages and large detached houses, with their widespread volumes, by Otto von Estorff and Gerhard Winckler, Paul Schaeffer-Heyrothsberge, Fritz Schopohl and Heinrich Tessenow. These were rather conservative in appearance, and they were never flat-roofed. This hints at Mattern's flexibility in dealing with changing aesthetics, despite his identification with the modern movement. It should be kept in mind that more radically modernist residential architecture in the style of Neues Bauen had always been the exception, while slightly modernised traditional building forms prevailed – with undecorated façade, larger windows, and a better connection between living rooms and garden than the reactionary Heimatschutz estates. An interest in typing, e.g. in regard to Paul Bonatz' or Richard Riemerschmidt's earlier work, represents a certain rationalism in this 'vernacular modernism'.836 Before WWI, these had been the reformist forces. Mattern designed many gardens for traditionalist houses in Potsdam and beyond, and he collaborated on conservative town planning projects. His housing scheme 'Auf der Brücke' at Rottweil, on which he collaborated with Schaeffer-Heyrothsberge in 1936, illustrates this.837 It was one of the projects he liked to publish the most (Figures 135, 136). The today forgotten Walter Kratz of the DAF should be mentioned as well as Bonatz's student Gerhard Graubner. These collaborators illustrate the intrinsic connection of Mattern's œuvre with traditionalist architecture. This might give the impression that Mattern's career translated seamlessly into the 'Third Reich', but behind the scenes he had to be alert, and he had to defend himself in more than one case, as will be discussed later.


In architecture-theoretical terms Mattern can be associated with the Organic Modernists, or organic functionalists, who have sometimes been derided as the romantics among the avant-garde. Organic Modernism is represented above all by the writings of Hugo Häring (1882–1958) and the works of Hans Scharoun (1893–1972), who defined themselves as functionalist. Häring – and from an ideology-historical perspective this harbours problems – called for a new, nature-conform ‘Gestalt finding’ also for the entire society.838 In his essay ‘ways to form’ (‘Wege zur Form’) was explicitly opposed to Le Corbusier’s axiom of the natural originality of pure geometric form.839 Häring explains, that in nature the appearance of things could conform to a geometric form, but that the latter was ‘never the content and origin of the form [Gestalt]’.840 He argues in favour of searching the form ‘already contained in the plan’ and speaks against imposing a geometric design on things, literally, ‘[t]o pull geometrical figures over things’.841 Especially in the Anglo-American sphere, the design language of these architects has been considered non-typical for Modernism, as these architects strove for the most specific fulfilment of functional questions rather than finding a universally applicable form. Their forms were thus unsuitable for mass production, which contradicted the aims of the rationalists such as Walter Gropius or Hannes Meyer, and the concepts of the later Bauhaus. Already during the early 1920s Adolf Behne critically described the differences between the rationalists and the functionalism of the Organic Modernists in his seminal book Der Moderne.

838 To apply the term organic to societies has indeed parallels with völkisch thinking, and although Häring will not have meant it this way, his words make think of darwinist ideas (“survival of the fittest”).


840 Ibid.

841 Ibid.
Zweckbau (The Modern Functional Building, 1926). At the time organic functionalism was relatively prominent, but has since been omitted in the majority of accounts on Modernism. The striving for organic interrelatedness of design elements, site and surrounding space was Mattern's chief aim, right from the early days of his career. At the end of his life, Mattern named Häring and Scharoun as well as Hans Poelzig, and Frank Lloyd Wright as the most important 20th-century architects. The nature of the connection between Mattern and the great architectural critic Behne, who was on friendly terms with Scharoun, is not clear.

Some might suggest that organic principles bring along a debilitating reverence for natural elements. In the case of Mattern the organic ideal must be understood as intrinsic part of a strong creative volition. Mattern firmly believed in the necessity to thoroughly design our environment while using the site and organic principles as an inspiration. The 'virgin' landscape that Le Corbusier envisioned to set off his buildings is as removed from Mattern’s intentions as the clean aestheticism of the

842 Adolf Behne, Der moderne Zweckbau, series Ullstein Bauwelt Fundamente, 10, new edn (1st edn 1926) (Berlin, Ullstein: 1964), p. 42. Due to its late publication three years after its completion and shortly after Walter Gropius' Internationale Architektur (1925), Behne's book has somewhat been forgotten, while Gropius' idea of a more stylistically uniform 'international' architecture became prevalent. Compare the foreword by Ulrich Conrads in the above-mentioned 1964 re-edition of Der moderne Zweckbau. After this first reprint edited by Conrads himself (with Hermann Mattern, Hans Scharoun, Hans Posener and others as co-editors) Der moderne Zweckbau should again become standard reference for the architecture of 1919–1923. At least in Germany, architectural history now generally acknowledges the important role of Häringian functionalism as part of Modernist architecture. Der moderne Zweckbau has been published in English in 1996 as The modern functional building by The Getty Center for the History of Art and Humanities in the series Texts and Documents Series (Santa Monica, Calif.). About Behne, see: Adolf Behne, Essays zu seiner Kunst- und Architektur-Kritik, ed. by Magdalena Bushart (Berlin: Gebrüder Mann, 2000).


French ‘instant gardens’ of Gabriel Guévrékian. Instead, at a very early stage Hammerbacher had expressed thoughts that seem to anticipate Haring’s notion of form finding:

Amongst those who create form there are always two groups: those who wish to bring themselves to fruition and those prepared to subordinate their own talents to allow the work to speak for itself. The first kind will always only see his own idea in carrying through a task, will be unwilling to recognise technical difficulties, and will always transform the given in accordance with his wishes, whether by simply dominating it or by overwhelming it through indifference. The second creates from conscious or unconscious love for the thing itself. His effort should be to develop the original concepts already present in the given substance. Obstructions that arise through materials or circumstances can be sensitively overcome if one concentrates on the unique qualities that lie in the material itself.

---


However, as we can see in some of Mattern's works and their reception, his artistic drive was occasionally considered to be overshooting this mark as set by Hammerbacher's words.

**The connection with Hans Scharoun**

Mattern's little house with the surrounding garden at Bornim can be considered the epitome of his notion of the ideal home. A brief look at Behne's critical review of the contemporary tendencies in architecture may contribute to understanding the context of Mattern's perspective on design. Interestingly, it was Behne himself who discussed the building in *Deutsche Bauzeitung* in 1935.847 The special relationship between the landscape architect and Scharoun has been referred to many times, even though a detailed analysis of their influencing each other has yet to be made. It would go beyond the limits of the present text to discuss this aspect, as detailed case studies are necessary in order to illustrate any claim. Here it may become clear indirectly, why Mattern identified with Scharoun's organic functionalism. During the 'Third Reich' they collaborated on 10 projects together, and their balance in working jointly culminated in the winning entry to the competition for the Kassel State Theatre in 1952, which will briefly be dealt with below.848 After Mattern's death, Hammerbacher also emphasised that the Bornimers' approach to garden design married up with that of Scharoun to architecture.849

---


As a further illustration to the collaboration between Mattern and Scharoun shall serve Behne's review of the Mattern house at Bornim (Figures 137–139). It is touching how sensitively and precisely Behne seems to comprehend the building, its architect and its occupiers. Knowing the political context, the critic's initial judgement of the house almost appears like a menace, with the juxtaposition of 'misfit-like, quirky wishes of a client' that may in some cases clash with the 'objective cultural heritage [Kulturgut]'\(^\text{850}\). And indeed his first conclusion is that the building does not align itself smoothly with the surroundings.\(^\text{851}\) But after the – intelligent – criticism he had expressed about Scharoun's organic functionalism in earlier writings, it seems as if Behne now found peace with the architect.\(^\text{852}\) The main part of the building is an addition of simple square boxes, forming a functional shelter. The large southern window and the two facing exits into the garden allowed for a watching over the little daughter's play area. Life seemed to happen as much inside as outside. The element that makes this simple house into a poetic dwelling is the western wall in the living room, which is curved, holding an equally swung settee. This room, belonging to the sphere of 'wishing and imagining', Behne wrote, and complemented the rest of the building which belonged to the sphere of 'needing'.\(^\text{853}\) The western glass door is set back to the innermost point of the curved wall, so that a rectangular dining area is formed (Fig. 140) Thus the curved western wall structures the large space into these different areas, 'bringing an entirely natural liberty into this sociable room'.\(^\text{854}\)


\(^\text{852}\) Best known is the respective discussion in Der moderne Zweckbau, new edn (Berlin: Gebrüder Mann, 1998, 1st edn 1926), in particular pp. 43–60. Cf. the letters from Behne to Scharoun, 08/06/1923, and from Scharoun to Behne, 11/06/1923, reprinted in: Hans Scharoun: Bauten, Entwürfe, Texte, ed. by Peter Pfankuch, series Schriftenreihe der Akademie der Künste, 10 (Berlin: Gebrüder Mann, 1974), p. 38.


\(^\text{854}\) Ibid.
idiosyncratic protruding garden end of the wall, which makes the house appear as if it was sending roots into the ground, ‘carries, with the finely elaborate horticultural art of the proprietor, a delightful enhancement of the vegetative element to the window front’ (Fig. 141).855

Even though Mattern’s artistic expression seems to rely more strongly than Behne would like on the ‘quirky’, the random and the unique, these lines nonetheless sum up what Mattern tried to achieve. A final point to be stressed, which might help define the balance between a mere formal organicism on the one side and social rationalism, that ignores the individual on the other: the ultimate orientation to both human needs and wishes, once more expressed in Behne’s words:

[…] the artist with fine and alert senses has found the solution not in a theory and in setting up ‘principles’, but in an entirely simple and certain reference to the human being. Very attractive is also the conciliation between individual and society.

By all means it started with function in every point, but the functionalist subjectivism […] is lifted out of randomness and singularity by the clarity and the certainty of proportion. Proportion is an objective and societal element.856


II. g ‘Politically unsound’ – Mattern and National Socialism

‘Not only with German, but also with kind regards.’

(Mattern’s signature in a letter to the Foerster office, 12/07/1937)857

On 30th January 1933 Hermann Mattern was 32 years old and had just established himself as one of Berlin’s leading landscape architects with a growing nationwide reputation. Between 1929 and the ‘takeover of power’, as mentioned before, extensive and richly illustrated articles about the Foerster-Mattern-Hammerbacher cooperative made their work public. Understandably, this generation did not stop canvassing for customers. The Bornimers’ services were in high demand, but confronted with the world economic crisis it was advisable to strive for financial sustainability. One year into the ‘Third Reich’, when Mattern and Hammerbacher founded their own businesses, each of them must have been eager to keep these running. Since the launch of an official decree by the president of the Reichskammer der bildenden Künste (Reich Chamber of Fine Arts) on 23 March 1934, it was necessary, in order to enter to design competitions, to prove membership in the Reich Chamber.858 This was of course permitted only in the case of ideological and ‘racial’

857 ‘Nicht nur mit deutschen, sondern auch mit freundlichen Grüssen’. In 1937, in anger over a disagreement, he signed a letter with these words, ridiculing the NS way of signing with ‘mit deutschem Gruß [literally ‘with a German greeting’], and maybe even in reaction to the official letters issued by the Foerster firm – as he had received one that closed with the mentioned wording (the 12th July 1937). (Letter to the Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Gartengestalter Karl Foerster, Hermann Mattern, Herta Hammerbacher, Potsdam-Bornim, 1937, re: ‘Zum Schr. vom 4. 3. 37. Angelegenheit Voss-Bley’, private Mattern estate).

irreproachability. Jewish ancestry was enough to be rejected by the institution. This happened for example to Pniower, Eryk Pepinski (who refused to divorce from his Jewish wife) and Ludwig Lesser, who were thus unable to officially carry on their profession after spring 1934; and they only represent the best-known cases.\textsuperscript{859} All three counted amongst the most famous landscape architects of the Weimar years. Being one of seven divisions of the Reichskulturkammer (RKK, Reich Chamber of Culture), the Reichskammer der bildenden Künste was itself divided into professional associations, one of which was the Bund Deutscher Gartengestalter (BDG, German Society of Garden Designers). At that time Gustav Allinger was heading the influential Reichsverband des Deutschen Gartenbaus (Reichs Association of German Horticulture) as well as taking the post of the cahirman of the DGfG in 1933, whose \textit{Gleichschaltung}, the forcible-coordination of the professional field, he supported.\textsuperscript{860} Mattern was allowed into the chamber; his letter head stated his membership. Despite testimonials of Mattern’s alleged leftist orientation, he must have been comparably unpolitical and few of his friends (if any) will have been revolutionaries around 1918. But there was no ignoring that from day one in Nazi Germany many lives of friends were in danger. Mattern’s communist colleague in the Foerster business, Walter Funcke, later a renowned landscape architect in the GDR, was persecuted and 2 March 1933 was brought to the Oranienburg concentration camp where he spent half a year.\textsuperscript{861} The communist landscape architect Reinhold

\textsuperscript{75-109.}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{861} Susanne Karn, \textit{Freiflächen- und Landschaftsplanung in der DDR: am Beispiel von Werken des Landschaftsarchitekten Walter Funcke (1907–87)} (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2004) p. 30; Cf.: Vroni Heinrich, \textit{Hermann Mattern} (2013), p. 39 (it is noted that he probably was lucky enough not to
Lingner and his wife Alice were raided by the SA, physically abused, and parts of their private library were burned.⁸⁶² According to the landscape architect Hermann Göritz, since September 1929 employed by Foerster-Mattern-Hammerbacher, Mattern had in fact initiated a communist cell in Bornim.⁸⁶³ In the 1990s Göritz went on record as saying that 'Mattern had always been politically left, and he also persuaded us – the colleague Walter Funcke, myself, and others – to join the KPD [Communist Party of Germany] [...].¹⁰⁴ However, a few years earlier Mattern had qualified his sympathy with communism by declaring how his high regard for individualism clashed with communist ideology.⁸⁶⁵ Sebastian Haffner’s biographical Defying Hitler (1939) provides one of the best first-hand accounts of the earthquake of change taking place in 1933, and allows for an insight into the state of mind of a liberal conservative, average intellectual citizen of Berlin. The spine-chilling atmosphere Haffner evokes, with his realistic yet metaphorical narrative style, can serve as a basis for appreciating the conduct of those who did not applaud the Nazis’ advent, yet were comparably unpolitical and not immediately persecuted personally:

The plight of non-Nazi Germans in the summer of 1933 was certainly one of the most difficult a person can find himself in: a condition in which one is helplessly, utterly overwhelmed, accompanied by the shock of having been caught completely off balance. We were in the Nazis’ hands for good or ill. All lines of defence had fallen, any collective experience physical abuse).


865 Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, Nov. 26–13 (20/11/1926), EHH.
resistance had become impossible. Individual resistance was only a form of suicide. We were pursued into the farthest corners of our private lives; in all areas of life there was rout, panic, and flight. No one could tell where it would end.866

There is no detailed and sourced account about Mattern’s conflicts with the National Socialist system. It has in the past been difficult to give credit to his often-alleged political innocuousness without further proof than the repeated affirmation of people who knew and revered him. Some anecdotes have become known, but they originated mainly in zur Nedden’s memories, committed to writing by her friend Vroni Heinrich. Mattern’s first monographic publication of 1937, a self-edited brochure, has been quoted as a sign of his opposition, as its title *Freiheit in Grenzen* carries both the meaning of ‘spatially delineated freedom’ as well as that of a ‘restricted freedom’ in a wider sense.867

The reactions that Mattern’s modest acts of resistance were met with, verify claims that he suffered some degree of persecution during the Nazi dominion. From archival documents two cases have been found and chosen for further examination. One conflict, documented in the Federal Archives, concerned the inspection of


Mattern's 'political reliability' by the police shortly after the Nazi's advent to power. This case established the first example of Mattern's willingness to collaborate with the regime on an ostensibly 'unpolitical' level – a willingness he expressed quite literally. The second case concerns the hostilities against Mattern, when one of his designs was the object of a defamatory critique.

These three expositions about his book publication, about the police file, and about the defamation of the Killesberg design are intended to outline Mattern's position within the political-ideological constellation in the period under consideration — representing, respectively, the relation to society, the state, and the professional sphere.

'Restricted freedom' or 'liberating restraints'?

Mattern is generally seen as a liberal, but rather apolitical person. In retrospect and on first impression, the title of his publication Freiheit in Grenzen already seemed to hint at a critical distance to the National Socialist (hereafter referred to as 'NS') regime. At the same time however, the title can be associated with a wide field of significance spanning between spatial and philosophical meanings. A comprehensive analysis would lead beyond the constraints of this text, but three possible interpretations can briefly be discussed: a political statement, a spatial concept, and a spiritually informed artistic leitmotif. Considering the importance the book must have had for Mattern personally as his first comprehensive public self-presentation, the display of his work will have been of greatest importance to him. A noteworthy detail is to be found after an introductory text; a witty, hand-coloured double-paged presents birds-view illustrations of a countryside on the left and a settlement structure on the right. These were drawn by

Henner Röse, husband of Mattern's younger sister Marie (Figures 142, 143). In each of the two different places a typical garden is taking centre stage: On the left, a walled, regular garden differentiates itself from the grown countryside with trees, rivers animals and happy, relaxing people around. On the right, a naturalist garden – complete with a fishes in a pond – is shown entirely open to its urban surroundings, to which it stands in stark formal contrast. Obviously, these pages acted as ironic commentary to the stereotypical two poles, the architectonic and the classical landschaftlich. Freiheit in Grenzen presents in full-page photographs Mattern's best and most representative projects from his first years as an independent landscape architect.869 In many of these a graphic clarity of lines coalesced with a naturalist formal ease.

Almost all pictures were annotated with statements concerning design, sober but witty in their brevity (Fig. 144a). The exception is one picture showing a NS establishment with swastika flags – the only time this symbol crops up – peeking over a wall, at the foot of which one can discern perennial plantings in curvy outlines. This photo is the only one in the entire book annotated with nothing but four hyphens: ‘-----’ (Fig. 144b). Seeing this, all at once the image's entire composition seems to invite a dissident interpretation. The photograph was shot out of a pine grove and against the sun, so that the built structure in the background, black and undefined against the dazzling light, has a rather daunting impact. The motif – plantings, a wall, flags beyond – is evident, but at the same time it negates itself for several reasons. Firstly, the flags were half-covered by the wall, telling of an inaccessible and political space beyond. Secondly, the wall itself appears almost black in its own shadow, while, thirdly, casting a deep shadow on the greatest part of the perennial beds. This means that those elements in view that were relevant for a book on garden design were actually not really shown in the photograph. From this scene, the photographer was strangely distanced through a gap in form of a neatly cut, sunlit lawn in the middle ground. Moreover, the observer of

869 He was often still working in collaboration with his former wife Hammerbacher and Foerster, as the joint venture Foerster-Mattern-Hammerbacher.
the scene was positioned in the shadow of a pine grove, as if seeking concealment beneath the tall trees that stand in sight all across the closer middle ground. This specific viewpoint enhances the impression of spatial and psychological detachment from the symbolic motif across the lawn. The interpretation of this photo as a protest against the NS regime may seem quite a stretch, if it were not for the hint of the strange caption Mattern grafted, a detail that has formerly been overlooked by other authors.870

A second meaning of the title, and the most obvious one, would read freedom and limitations in a spatial sense. The topic of creating psychologically perceived, visual or actual spatial freedom in a limited space frequently appeared in Mattern’s writings; it was an obvious concern in his work. The formula of the unlimited, third spatial dimension of the garden – in contrast to architecture – representing freedom, he referred to still many years later in connection with his projects:

We refer to this structure [...] as an open space, even though it is in any case an enforced condition out of which this space arises. Also, within this enclosure only one spatial extension points at freedom, namely the one towards the unlimited sky.871

For pointing at this freedom, the sky, Mattern modulated the ground with the ‘hills’ he is known for. These ‘[...] tongue-shaped, plant-carrying ground waves that emerge

870 Wolschke-Bulmahn writes that a ‘careful reading [...] gives no evidence for such an interpretation of the title as subtle criticism of National-Socialism’, see: Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn, “‘Freiheit in Grenzen?’: Zum Zusammenhang von Gärten, Privatheit und Politik in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus’, in Privatheit, Garten und politische Kultur: Von kommunikativen Zwischenräumen, ed. by Siegfried Lamnek and Marie-Theres Tinnefeld (Opladen: Leske+Budrich, 2003), pp. 155–84 (154). In the following article, the authors suggest that the title represents the idea of the garden for ‘inner emigration’ and don’t rule out the intention of making a political statement: G. Gröning and J. Wolschke-Bulmahn, ‘Changes In the philosophy of garden architecture’, Journal of Garden History, 9, 2 (1989), 53–70 (60–1).

from the envelopment expand the small open space from the vertical into the horizontal' (Fig. 146).872

The third interpretation of the title as aesthetic might represent a connection to Kandinsky. Some twenty years earlier, in his key writing on modernism in art About the Spiritual in Art of 1914, he spoke about artistic ‘Freiheit in Grenzen’ (in the English edition: ‘freedom within boundaries’). According to Kandinsky, limitations were indeed needed for true artistic freedom, which corresponded to the artist’s formalistic approach (notorious his synaesthetic linking of one colour with a fixed set of associations).873 The idea of gaining ‘internal freedom’, Mattern had expressed ten years before the book publication by linking internal freedom with ‘being tied down’ by his love for Hammerbacher:

High-spirited for joy, high-spirited for being tied down and thus high-spirited for internal freedom I kiss you, yours, Josch.874

872 Ibid.

873 ‘This means that Schönberg realizes that the greatest freedom of all, the freedom of an unfettered art, can never be absolute. Every age achieves a certain measure of this freedom, but beyond the boundaries of its freedom the mightiest genius can never go. [...] Schönberg is endeavouring to make complete use of his freedom and has already discovered gold mines of new beauty in his search for spiritual harmony. His music leads us into a realm where musical experience is a matter not of the ear but of the soul alone — and from this point begins the music of the future.’ Wassily Kandinsky, Concerning the Spiritual in Art and Painting in particular (New York: Wittenborn, 1947; offset reprint 1970), p. 45. Cf. the German edn: ‘Hier fühlt Schönberg genau, daß die größte Freiheit, welche die freie und unbedingte Atmungsluft der Kunst ist, nicht absolut sein kann. Jeder Epoche ist ein eigenes Maß dieser Freiheit gemessen. Und über die Grenzen dieser Freiheit vermöge die genialste Kraft nicht zu springen. [...] Diese Freiheit zu erschöpfen sucht auch Schönberg, und auf dem Weg zum innerlich Notwendigen hat er schon Goldgruben der neuen Schönheit entdeckt. [Emphasis in the original]’ Wassily Kandinsky, Über das Geistige in der Kunst: insbesondere in der Malerei, 2nd edn of the rev. new edn (Bern: Benteli, 2006), p. 53.

874 ‘Unbändig vor Freude, unhändig vor Gebundenheit und daher unhändig vor innerer Freiheit kisse ich Dich, Dein Josch.’ Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, no. 26-21, 29/11/1926, EHH.
Here, the sufferance of self-imposed restrictions is seen as leading to true freedom. A similar phrase appears in the writing of one of Mattern’s favourite authors of the 1920s, Jean Paul. In his *School for aesthetics* he defined the literary topos of the idyll as ‘perfect happiness within limitations’ (‘Vollglück in Beschränkung’). And in the connection that Jean Paul’s expositions draws to the garden, and, more importantly, to Mattern’s personal definition of the sky as the garden’s freedom, we may see this peculiar author as a key to understanding one very particular facet of Mattern:

Indeed, you now lend the idyllically presented perfect bliss, which is always a reflection of your earlier youthful or otherwise sensuously limited bliss, the magic both of your memory and of your higher poetic perspective; and the delicate apple blossom and the hard fruit which in life is crowned with a dark faded remnant of flower meet and adorn each other wonderfully. [...] [T]he idyll presents perfect happiness in limitation [...].

[...] [P]assion insofar as it has hot storm-clouds behind it, cannot introduce its thunderclaps into this quiet heaven; only a few lukewarm rain clouds are allowed, before and after which the broad, bright sunshine is already visible on hills and meadows.

The scene of the idyll is unimportant, [...] for the idyll is a blue heaven and the same heaven arches over the rocky peak and the garden bed [...]; similarly the characters may be of any rank, if the condition of perfect happiness in ‘limitations’ is preserved. It is either incorrect or unnecessary to add to the definition that the idyll cultivates its flowers outside middle-class society [...]. At most one can say that as perfect happiness in limitation the idyll excludes great numbers of actors and the power of great wheels of state; and that only a fenced in garden life suits the idyllically blessed, who have torn a leaf from the book of the blest; for they are happy Lilliputians to whom a garden bed is a forest and who lean a ladder against a dwarf tree to gather its fruit.875

875 ‘Ja ihr leiht dem idyllisch dargestellten Vollglück, das immer ein Widerschein eueres früheren kindlichen oder sonst sinnlich engen ist, jetzo zugleich die Zauber euerer Erinnerung und euerer höheren poetischen Ansicht; und die weiche Apfelblüte und die feste Apfelfrucht, die sonst ein schwarzer welker Blüen-Rest bekrönt, begegnen und schmücken einander wunderbar. [...] [D]ie Idylle [stellt] das Vollglück in der Beschränkung dar [...] [D]ie Leidenschaft [kann], insofern sie heiße Wetterwolken hinter sich hat, sich nicht mit ihren Donnern in diese stillen Himmel mischen;
We may be freely associating a connection here rather than proving it, but Jean Paul's final lines appear to be perfectly illustrated by another set of paintings that Röse made of gardens designed by Mattern and friends. They could be found some years later in the Bauhaus-associated pictorial magazine *die neue linie* and were published at the occasion of the Reichsgartenschau 1939 (Figures 175–177, cf. Figures 142, 143)."876 Hammerbacher has given her own interpretation of the book title, a variation on the political perspective: according to her, the Bornimers merely with their 'libertarian' design vocabulary stood opposed to the allegedly strictly regular official style of the 'Third Reich', as related to the traditional German farmer's garden. In her view, the promotion of a free-flowing organic space in garden design was already an act of positioning oneself politically; the aim was 'to create spatial units', in which plants and the 'causalities of the landscape elements' around entered into an 'integral coaction' of what had as yet been 'considered a strict dualism': the nature–man relationship."877 Within this ideal the intended coaction was

---


to be understood as ‘unhindered and without coercion’. Hammerbacher’s strict rejection of geometric regularity in garden design resulted in clearer words than Mattern’s, but can be transferred to him as well. The Bornimers’ understood their artistic volition as a clear enough positioning against the, “relentless logic of architectonic means” (Gustav Lütge), and – as Hammerbacher indirectly suggested – thereby against the inhumanity of the regime:

The title of the garden book [...] Freiheit in Grenzen, in which are presented gardens designed by Mattern and his circle, documents the consciously taken opposite standpoint.

This bears witness to the paramount importance Mattern and Hammerbacher attached to aesthetics. Considering the importance the book must have had for Mattern personally, the presentation of his design ideas will have been of greater importance to him than a political statement. Despite their social conscience, their striving for fame, and their functionalist reasoning; in the end the Bornimers were idealists. This may be what enabled them to enter into collaboration with the system despite their personal opposition: they felt beyond all blame. Aestheticism and romanticism have long been considered one of the sources that fed the antidemocratic right in the Weimar Republic. The Bornimers were not the kind of political romanticists that Sontheimer has blamed for believing in revolution but ending as ‘henchmen of the reaction’ – at least three decades later Mattern called himself a democrat (while emphasising that he

878 Ibid.


was not attached to any political party). Nonetheless, Foerster’s, Hammerbacher’s and Mattern’s strong aestheticism may have been responsible for their underestimation of the ethical dilemma that becoming a cog in the Nazi wheel would entail.

The police investigation of 1936-1938

The occurrences closest to a true conflict of Mattern with the new system happened in 1936. After he had been accused by someone anonymous of being a leftist and having supported the Red Aid, the administrative machinery was put into motion. A file of 26 pages illustrates this process starting with being commissioned by Schulte-Frohlinde, a confidant of Albert Speer’s and head of the Agency for Beauty of Labour (Amt für Schönheit der Arbeit) in the DAF (Deutsche Arbeitsfront, German Labour Front). People who had known Mattern before Hitler’s seizure of power, were interrogated. An employment ban loomed ahead. Evidence against him was brought forward, although from 1933 Mattern’s record had been clean. Even a Nazi official - the Kreisleiter (district superintendent) in charge of the area of Mattern’s residence - attested to Mattern’s innocuousness. The record of the Mattern case is filed at the Federal Archive

881 Ibid; ‘Sehr geehrter Herr Kollege Kemmer, ich erfahre, daß man sich für meine politische Haltung interessiert. Ich bin überzeugter praktizierender tätiger Demokrat, gehöre keiner Partei an und stehe keiner parteipolitischen Gruppe nahe, auch nicht der SPD, weder passiv noch aktiv.’ (‘Dear colleague Kemmer, I understand that people are interested in my political standing. I am convinced actively practicing democrat, I do not belong to any party and I am not close to any party political group, this also applies to the SPD [Social Democratic Party], neither passively nor actively.’) Letter from Mattern to Erich Kemmer, folder 1, 23/02/1961, EHM.

882 The name Mattern had been found on a member list of Rote Hilfe, but Mattern controverted his involvement in this organisation, which had been founded to aid communist political persecutes. Hammerbacher was said to be the more active though only Mattern had to deal with a personal audit by the secret police. Analysing several resources, Jeong-Hi Go (2006) published this information in her dissertation about Herta Hammerbacher, see: Herta Hammerbacher (1900-1985): Virtuosin der Neuen Landschaftlichkeit – Der Garten als Paradigma (Technische Universität Berlin: 2006) p. 28-9.

883 Amt für Schönheit der Arbeit was a administrative propaganda office within the DAF headed by Julius Schulte-Frohlinde, officially established to promote the improvement of working conditions; David Welch, The Third Reich: Politics and Propaganda (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), pp. 69-71.
in Berlin (formerly Potsdam), under the signature R 4606/221. It covers a period from February 1936 to July 1938. Almost all letters are duplicates. It involved different DAF departments, the office of Speer – often communicating through his employee Kube –, the Gestapo, and different local party administration offices up to the prominent Gauleiter of the Kurmark, Wilhelm Kube.\(^\text{884}\) The long, somewhat tiresome exchange of letters yielded as a (temporary) result Mattern’s exclusion from any further commissions by party agencies.

The case took off on 17 February 1936, when investigations were triggered by a query of the treasury of DAF to gather information about Mattern. Therefore they contacted the Potsdam district committee of the NSDAP.\(^\text{885}\) In a first response to the enquiry, the superintendent of the Bornim-Bornstedt chapter (‘Ortsgruppenleiter’) of the NSDAP reported that, because of his information about Mattern’s membership with the Red Aid, Mattern had to be considered a Communist. At the same time he admitted that Mattern had never made a name as Communist for himself, rather leaving it to his wife, sister and others. All the same, he concluded, in Bornim Mattern was considered a ‘spiritual carrier of Communism’.\(^\text{886}\) Finally it was critically pointed out that Mattern was not a member of any National-Socialism-related organisation, concluding: ‘In our view he is one of those who know how to use the present situation, and that which the Führer has created respectively, for his

---

\(^{884}\) Please note, that the prominent Nazi politician is not identical with the person of the same name responding many letters at the Speer office, who is once addressed as ‘Beauftragter des Reichssachwalters für das KdF-Seebad Rügen’ (‘Commissioner of the Reich Trustee for the KdF-sea resort Rügen’). Cf.: Letter from DAF Zentralbüro to the Beauftragten des Reichssachwalters für das KdF-Seebad Rügen, Pg. Kube, Pariser Platz 4, Berlin W8, R 4606/221, 13/11/1937, BArch.

\(^{885}\) Letter from DAF to the Kreisleitung der N.S.D.A.P. Potsdam, R 4606/221, 17/02/1936, BArch.

\(^{886}\) Letter from N.S.D.A.P Ortgruppe Bornim-Bornstedt to the Kreisleitung der N.S.D.A.P. Potsdam, R 4606/221, 22/02/1936, BArch.
own property relationships. The Ortsgruppenleiter had to admit, though, that 'since the seizure of power nothing adverse has become known about Mattern'.

Mattern was informed about the proceedings. It is not clear whether he had been interrogated or sought clarification on his own behalf. Anyway, he tried to gain a reference of good repute and spoke to high ranking local NSDAP politicians, either the district officer (Kreisleiter) or possibly even the Gauleiter, which for the Kurmark (heartland of Brandenburg) at that time was Wilhelm Kube. A following letter despatched 01 April 1936 from the Gauleiter (i.e. Kube), though signed by the Kreisleiter, spoke out emphatically in Mattern's favour. The author claimed that the mentioned report by the party's Bornim-Bornstedt chapter was written in his absence and had cast Mattern in a negative light, which he would like to correct:

I believe the Volksgenosse Mattern has not been correctly seen and described. We are dealing with an idealist in the field of aesthetics. His world of ideas, which he consumed right from the cradle, meant to retreat from the political confusion of the past Germany onto the field of neutrality and the domain of beauty. From this basic attitude he came to the unpoltical scout movement. Once he became a grown man, he followed the principle of complete neutrality and friendliness towards anyone, no matter if Communist or Nazi. Mattern has given me his word of honour that he never belonged to the Red Aid or any other red organisation, and I want to believe him unconditionally. From his first wife he is divorced. I cannot ascertain if she had back then supported the Red Aid with money or sympathy. As regards the Mattern of today, there is hardly a doubt for me that he feels and affirms the greatness, strength and vigour of the Third Reich already for the simple reason

887 'Er ist aber d.E. einer von denjenigen, die es verstehen, die jetzige Lage bezw. das durch den Führer Geschaffene und im Werden begriffene für ihre eigenen Einkommensverhältnisse auszunutzen.' Ibid.

888 Ibid.

889 Between 06 March 1933 and 07 August 1936, see the database at http://www.verwaltungsgeschichte.de/gau_brand.html (documentation of a doctoral disseration thesis at the Universität Osnabrück, accessed 13/12/2013)
that this empire is about to realise his aesthetic ideals. I believe that a collaboration with Mattern raises no concerns.\footnote{890}

About three weeks later, Kube informed the DAF treasury, department of building inspection, about his decision to ask Count von Wedel, ‘who is indeed a party comrade from the times before the seizure of power’, to investigate ‘a detailed picture’ of Mattern, ‘with the assistance of the Secret State Police Potsdam’.\footnote{891} Wilhelm Graf von Wedel of the Prussian Gestapo (Secret State Police) at Potsdam filed his report a few days later, 30 April 1936. Kube’s comment is laconic: ‘Not much emerges from this report, of course’.\footnote{892}

The independent landscape architect Hermann Mattern […] has not come into the picture politically. Investigations have divulged that Mattern until 1933 has not regarded National Socialism with favour. The name Mattern was noted in a collection list of the ‘Red Aid’. However, this entry could refer to his first wife, from whom Mattern is divorced since 1933 (sic!). She had communist views.

\footnote{890}‘Ich glaube, der Volksgenosse Mattern ist nicht ganz richtig angesehen und gekennzeichnet worden. Es handelt sich um einen Idealisten auf dem Gebiete der Ästhetik. Seine Ideenwelt, die er von Kindesbeinen an in sich aufgenommen hat, war die, gegenüber dem politischen Wirrwarr im vergangenen Deutschland sich auf das Gebiet der Neutralität und in den Bereich der Schönheit zurückzuziehen. Aus dieser Grundeinstellung heraus kam er als Kind in die unpolitische Pfadfinderbewegung. Als er Mann geworden war, verfolgte er den Grundsatz gänzlicher Neutralität und der Freundlichkeit gegenüber jedermann, gleichgültig ob er Kommunist oder Nazi war. M. hat mir auf Ehre versichert, daß er niemals der Roten Hilfe oder einer anderen roten Organisation angehört hat und ich möchte dies ihm unbedingt glauben. Von seiner ersten Frau ist er geschieden. Ich kann nicht feststellen, ob diese damals die Rote Hilfe mit Geld oder mit Sympathie unterstützt hat. Was nun den heutigen Mattern anbelangt, so besteht für mich kaum ein Zweifel, daß er die Größe, Stärke und Kraft des Dritten Reiches schon deshalb stark empfindet und bejaht, weil dieses Reich ihm zugleich seine ästhetischen Ideale zu verwirklichen im Begriff steht. Ich glaube, daß keine Bedenken bestehen für eine Zusammenarbeit mit Mattern. Heil Hitler!’ Letter from Gauleitung of the Kurmark to the DAF, Schatzamt, Bauprüfungsabteilung, (Berlin), R 4606/221, 01/04/1936, BArch.

\footnote{891}Letter from N.S.D.A.P, Gauleitung Kurmark, der Gauleiter (Wilhelm Kube), to the Schatzamt der DAF (Bauprüfungsabteilung), R 4606/221, 29/04/1936, BArch.

\footnote{892}Letter from Gauleitung Kurmark N.S.D.A.P. to DAF, Zentralbüro, R 4606/221, 04/05/1936, BArch.
In political meetings Mattern has not been observed. Even though Mattern has not
made an appearance after 1933, it is still outlandish that up to the present day he does not
belong to any NS organisation.\footnote{893}

Another report filed internally in the DAF in December told of results of an
investigation, basically repeating the accusations of the Red Aid membership in
other words:

The non-party comrade Hermann Mattern before the seizure of power was employed in a
managerial capacity in Foerster’s horticultural business in Bornim near Potsdam, which was
organised in a purely communist manner. If M. had belonged as a member to the K.P.D.
cannot be ascertained, though in fact he sympathised with the K.P.D. and also belonged to it
with regard to his views. \textit{There is no mistaking}. In the lists of the Red Aid his name is noted.
M. tries to refute this fact by suggesting that it could only refer to his wife or his sister. After
the seizure of power M. has not become active or engaged himself in any way for the
\textit{Bewegung}. It is significant that he states only to want to live for his profession, in order to
achieve something there. Under these circumstances there can be not talk of his political
reliability, so that M. should not qualified for any further engagement with the D.A.F..\footnote{894}

\footnote{893} ‘Der selbständige Gartenarchitekt Hermann Mattern […] ist politisch hier nicht in Erscheinung
getreten. Die Nachprüfung hat ergeben, dass Mattern bis 1933 dem Nationalsozialismus nicht
wohlwollend gegenüberstand. Der Name Mattern war in einer Sammelliste der damaligen ”Roten
Hilfe” verzeichnet. Allerdings kann diese Einzeichnung auch auf seine erste Ehefrau zurückzuführen
sein, von der Mattern seit 1933 geschieden ist, diese war kommunistisch eingestellt. \textit{In politischen}
Versammlungen ist Mattern nicht beobachtet worden. Wenn Mattern auch nach 1933 nicht in
Erscheinung getreten ist, ist es doch befremdend, daß er bis zum heutigen tage keiner NS-
Organisation angehört.‘ Ibid.

\footnote{894} ‘Der Nichtparteigenosse Hermann Mattern war vor der Machtübernahme in leitender Stellung in
dem Förster’schen Gartenbaubetrieb in Bornim bei Potsdam tätig, der rein kommunistisch
aufgezogen war. Ob. M. der K.P.D. als Mitglied angehörte, ist nicht feststellbar, tatsächlich
sympathisierte er mit der K.P.D. und gehörte ihr auch seiner Gesinnung nach an. \textit{Eine Verwechslung
liegt nicht vor}. In den Listen der Roten Hilfe ist sein Name verzeichnet. M. versucht, diese Tatsache
dahin abzuweisen, daß dies nur seine Frau oder seine Schwester gewesen sein könne. Nach der
Machtübernahme hat sich M. für die Bewegung in keiner Weise betätigt oder eingesetzt.
Bezeichnend ist, daß er angibt, nur seinem Beruf leben zu wollen, um dort etwas zu erreichen. Von
Interestingly, Foerster’s humanistic family affiliations were apparently not known amongst the administration personnel involved.

For a period of about half a year there was no communication filed about the case. 22 June 1937, Kube sent in a report provided 12 December 1936 by the Information Office (Informationsamt).895 A certain head gardener Creplin had made a report to the Information Office that incriminated Mattern.896 At the same time Kube ordered that the Mattern firm might be employed longer to complete the assigned jobs for the design of the green spaces of the KdF-town at Nuremberg, but it had to be excluded from any further assignments.897 Creplin’s accusations, partly based on second-hand accounts, were rather dangerous in their specificity: Mattern had fostered the communist cell inside the Foerster business, he had provided his car several times in 1932 for the International Red Aid, he had taken part in communist meetings and made propaganda in the Foerster firm with cuttings from *Rote Fahne* and other communist papers. Creplin claimed to have seen Hammerbacher in a communist propaganda march, and on another occasion selling propaganda material at a communist meeting. Other employees, whose superior Mattern was, had been working at the till of the same meeting. Hammerbacher had also been known to be collecting for the Red Aid. A final point was, that ‘with the seizure of power, several


895 Letter from Kube to the DAF, Bauprüfungsabteilung (for the attention of Pg. Simon), R 4606/221, 22/06/1937, BAch. In this case it is not clear which of the two people of this name it the dispatcher.

896 ‘[… ] head gardener Creplin from Nowawes’, which is a part of the town of Babelsberg. Babelsberg in 1939 was incorporated into Potsdam). Ibid.

897 Letter from Speer to the DAF Bauprüfungsabteilung, R 4606/221, 18/11/1937, Barch. KdF (Kraft durch Freude) was the commonly used abbreviation for the state-operated leisure organisation ‘Strength through Joy’. The KdF-town Nuremberg was a part of the Nazi party rally grounds.
assistants have been taken to the concentration camps'. What does not become evident from the files kept at the Federal Archive is that Allinger was involved. In the Allinger estate a manuscript can be found, in which Creplin is quoted in a way that suggests Allinger actively coordinated the incriminating reports. In his own statement Allinger also quoted another landscape architect, Reinhard Besserer, who had claimed that 'Mattem still in April 1933 tried to make me understand that the idea of National Socialism and Anti-Semitism were complete nonsense.' For more details Allinger referred to Besserer in person.

Some three days after the report was filed with the DAF Mattem wrote one of his most remarkable known biographical documents. It was letter sent to Albert Speer's private address, avoiding the official channels. The choice of words seems prudent and open to interpretation. Because of its significance it shall be transcribed here in full:

Dear Mr. Professor Speer,

A short visit of mine would be more appropriate, only not to waste your time, I write. Through the fact that I had success with my work, and that I won several competitions during the last three years, I was enlisted more and more often for bigger assignments. Concurrently with this came mounting hostilities, and I felt beyond their reproach, as they had no basis in fact. But at the moment it is made difficult for those people, who wish my

898 Letter from Kube to the DAF, Bauprüfungsabteilung (for the attention of Pg. Simon), R 4606/221, 22/06/1937, BArch.


900 Ibid.
collaboration for none but objective reasons. For example Mr. Baurat Schulte-Frohlinde,
whose attention was drawn to me some years ago through some of my works, above all
counting my work on your garden and my first collaboration with the Agency for Beauty
of Labour at your instigation.

I was very happy to be brought in by you, also because – beyond professional matters
– I make an effort not to evade the problems of the present, but to wade right into them to
achieve something positive.

It is not in my nature to feign any kind of devotion or to let myself be dragged along.
I would like to ask you for a brief personal statement, if you agree with my collaboration
with those administrative offices, by which I am summoned. If not, – I will as of now
abstain from all those matters.

Heil Hitler! Yours sincerely, [signature]901

To this letter, according to Schulte-Frohlinde’s statement in an internal letter of
complaint to the DAF treasury, Speer did not react.902 Certain people within the DAF
treasury did not keep quiet, while Schulte-Frohlinde, with growing vigour, tried to
push through a permission to engage Mattern. He claimed that in Nuremberg nothing

901 ‘Lieber Herr Professor Speer, / Ein kurzer Besuch von mir würde richtiger sein, nur um Ihre Zeit
nicht zu belasten, schreibe ich. / Dadurch, dass ich in meinen Arbeiten Erfolg hatte, in den letzten
drei Jahren mehrere Wettbewerbe gewonnen habe, wurde ich mehr und mehr zu größeren Aufträgen
herangezogen. / Parallel damit wuchsen die Anfeindungen, über die ich mich erhäber fühlte, da sie
jedgger Basis entbehren. Jedoch wird es zur Zeit den Menschen erschwert, die meine Mitarbeit aus
nur sachlichen Gründen wünschen. / So Herrn Baurat Schulte-Frohlinde, der vor einigen Jahren
durch einige Arbeiten von mir auf mich aufmerksam wurde, vor allem durch die Mitarbeit bei Ihrem
Garten und durch meine erste Mitarbeit beim Amt für Schönheit / der Arbeit auf Ihre Veranlassung
hin. / Ich hatte mich seinerzeit sehr gefreut von Ihnen hinzugezogen zu werden, zumal ich bemüht
bin über die beruflichen Fragen hinaus mich den Gegenwartsproblemen nicht zu entziehen, sondern
mich mitten hineinzustellen, um Positives leisten zu können. / Mir liegt es nicht, irgendeine
Ergebenheit zu heucheln und mich mitschleppen zu lassen. / Ich möchte Sie um eine kurze
persönliche Erklärung bitten, ob Ihnen meine Mitarbeit an den öffentlichen Stellen, von denen ich
aufgefordert werde, recht ist. Wenn nein, – dann werde ich mich sofort von allen diesen Sachen
zurückhalten. / Heil Hitler! / Ihr sehr ergebener [signature Hermann Mattern]’ Letter from Mattern
to Speer, Kronprinzessinnenstraße at Berlin-Schlachtensee, R 4606/221, 12/07/1937, BArch.

902 Letter from Schulte-Frohlinde, DAF Bauabteilung, to Schatzamt, Abt. Bauwirtschaft (for the
attention of Pg. Rosin), R 4606/221, 12/11/1937, BArch.
had been concluded without consulting Speer. He mentioned Dr. Ley’s (head of the DAF) approval of Mattern’s drawings as ‘excellent’, and stated that he was not able to commission a different landscape architect at this stage, as the plans had been completed in their general outline, adding:

[... ] all the more because according to my experiences, Mattern is by far the best landscape architect in Berlin and has proven his skills with a series of competitions during the last years.

I urgently ask you, in these purely artistic matters, for which I carry the responsibility, not to cause me any difficulty.903

The next day the DAF’s department of construction industry, obviously annoyed by the confusion, filed a complaint with the General Building Inspector for the Reich Capital (i.e. Speer), asking for a direct communication between Speer and Schulte-Frohlinde’s DAF Building Department.904 Still, Speer sought to squirm himself free, simply repeating a statement made earlier:

In response to your repeated enquiry I report to you herewith, that in due time I gave my approval to the engagement of Mattern in the case of the horticultural design of the KdF-town grounds at Nuremberg. From further consignments, however, Mattern must be excluded.905


904 Letter from DAF Zentralbüro, Bauwirtschaft, to the Generalbauinspektor für die Reichshauptstadt (for the attention of Pg. Kube), R 4606/221, 13/11/1937, BArch.

In a following letter to Schulte-Frohlinde, the Department of Construction Industry in the DAF treasury declared that they considered the case settled.\(^{906}\) There was one more letter by Schulte-Frohlinde, in which he regretted that it was impossible to fulfil the wish to withdraw Mattern’s engagement, as he had already been commissioned.\(^{907}\) But on the 6 December 1937 Schulte-Frohlinde finally sent a letter with a declaration of regret to Mattern, telling him of Speer’s instruction: ‘I have to leave it up to you, if you now want to turn to Mr. Professor Speer’.\(^{908}\) By sending a copy of this letter to Speer he informed the architect of this communication.\(^{909}\)

It seems that at some later stage, Mattern approached the NSDAP district committee of Potsdam directly, to ask for official credentials concerning his political reliability. On this occasion he referred to Speer with whom he had collaborated repeatedly over the years and by whom he was commissioned time and again for different tasks. Because of this, in 8 February 1938 the NSDAP reported to Speer again, requesting clarification.\(^{910}\) The same day Speer wrote to the district committee of the NSDAP in Potsdam city castle to inform them that ‘from that point in time, when I found out, that Mattern was politically not impeccable, he did not get any commissions from me’\(^{911}\) — again not taking a stand.

The next file is from 07 June 1938. The building inspection department in the DAF treasury sent to Speer — on his request — all files and protocols ‘concerning the

---

\(^{906}\) Letter from DAF Schatzamt, Abt. Bauwirtschaft (signed Rosin), to Baurat Schulte-Frohlinde, DAF Bauabteilung, R 4606/221, 20/11/1937, BArch.

\(^{907}\) Letter from DAF Bauabteilung (Schulte-Frohlinde), to Schatzamt, Abt. Bauwirtschaft (for the attention of Pg. Rosin), R 4606/221, 23/11/1937, BArch.

\(^{908}\) Letter Schulte-Frohlinde to Mattern, R 4606/221, 06/12/1937, BArch.

\(^{909}\) Letter from Schulte-Frohlinde, DAF, Zentralbüro, Bauabteilung, to the Generalbauinspektor für die Reichshauptstadt, Mr. Professor Speer, R 4606/221, 06/12/1937, BArch.

\(^{910}\) Letter from the NSDAP Gauleitung Kurmark, Kreisleiter des Kreises Potsdam, to the Generalbauinspektor für die Reichshauptstadt, Prof. Albert Speer, R 4606/221, 08/02/1938, BArch.

\(^{911}\) Letter from Speer to the Kreisleiter des Kreises Potsdam der NSDAP, R 4606/221, 08/02/1938, BArch.
information about landscape architect Hermann Mattern. A few days later, during Mattern's absence, his office received a call from Speer. Mattern's friend and colleague Lorenzen reacted and wrote to the General Building Inspector that Mattern would get in touch immediately after his return, the 13 July. This is the last page in the Mattern file.

Conclusions

Concerning the truth behind these reports, one has to keep in mind the efficiency of a state secret police like the Gestapo. And strangely, Mattern's association with Foerster was no issue at any time in the reports. Nonetheless, Mattern's sympathy with the communists at times of upheaval and regular street fights between left-wing and right-wing hit squads was never really doubted. Whether or not Mattern was a Communist Party member, however, is a detail without much relevance. His entire standing was in some points too libertarian, in others too conservative to really identify with communism. If he did join, it must have been an expression of anti-fascism rather than of communist views.

If we look at Mattern's list of works, there are several projects for public commissions during the times of his official debarment. A large and attractive commission, which Mattern liked to publicise in later years, was the training camp of the Reichs Mail ('Schulungsheim der Reichspost') at Königs-Wusterhausen, district of Zeesen (Fig. 145). It lay not far from one of Germany's historic broadcasting centres. The Reichs Mail had an important role in the state security. Mattern's description of his design as 'uncoerced', or words to that effect, was naturally

912 Letter from DAF, Zentralbüro, Reichsfachverwaltung, Schatzamt, Abteilung Bauwirtschaft, Bauprüfungsabteilung, to the Generalbauminsektor der Reichshauptstadt (for the attention of Pg. Kube), 07/06/1938, BArch. The hierarchies seem to have been so complex that even in official communication people did not use titles consistently.

913 Letter from Büro Mattern (signed Lorenzen), Potsdam, to the Generalbauminsektion von Groß-Berlin, 09/07/1938, BArch.
thwarted by the propaganda character of the actual training and shows his naïve believe in the “power” of garden beauty. In 1938 Mattern designed the large gardens of the navy hospital at Stralsund, and gardens for navy hospitals in Heringsdorf (draft design, c. 1938) and Mürwick (1939) are also listed in the literature.914

Seeing that Mattern was not persecuted, what were the actual consequences of the NSDAP enquiry? As far as it is possible to tell from today, the immediate consequence was a loss of income – a fairly mild suffering. Nonetheless it must have been frustrating. The winning entry to the ‘Garden and Home’ exhibition as part of the German Settlement Exhibition 1934 was very positively received in the press.915

As mentioned above, the prize did not lead to a contract, while at the same time the Bornimers’ design was more or less copied for the realised project. A municipal employee, who had witnessed the jury session (and was later dismissed), had warned Mattern not to protest; he acquiesced.916 Even more devastating would have been a withdrawal of the project for the Reich Garden Show 1939 after Mattern and Graubner had won the competition held in 1935.917 The information had indeed (been) spread that Mattern’s political reliability was in question, and for a while Mattern was at risk of loosing the commission for the project that was to become not only his *magnum opus*, but also an icon of 20th-century garden design.918


916 This employee of the municipal administration was called Stadler. V. Heinrich, *Hermann Mattern* (2013), p. 40. Heinrich does not mention Allinger as president of the competition jury.


Contemporaneously with the police investigation, Mattern made a name as an experimental designer, and slightly too experimental for the times. As mentioned, reviews for his Fountain Courtyard were mixed, but the true impact of this design was revealed three years later in a private letter by Hübotter to the hostile-minded Wiepking (Figures 133, 134). Mattern’s friend Hübotter in this case meant his statement negatively: Mattern’s courtyard at Dresden had ‘put everyone into a flurry’. Apart from the political rumours, suspicions against Mattern must thus have been fostered by his uninhibited anti-traditionalist artistic drive.

It is worth not forgetting in particular Allinger’s involvement; with this in mind Mattern’s disgust for the older colleague and his reported disrespectful behaviour towards him after the war become more comprehensible.

It seems that Mattern learned to stay cautious, but at the same time did not feign any support of fascist politics. Incidents are reported, in which he actually spoke his mind, but they are few and not verified. The best example is the following anecdote from the early nineteen-thirties: In the garden Mattern and Hammerbacher had designed for the pianist Wilhelm Kempff, a Gauleiter had referred to the reed mats erected circularly for plant protection as ‘Negro kraals’, to which Mattern responded that reed was a native plant and a building material used in vernacular Nordic architecture (Fig. 147). Whether this is interpreted as irony, as a display of

---


920 ‘[…] des seinerzeit alle Gemüter mit recht in Aufregung versetzten [sic!] Dresdner Gartenhofes.’ Letter from Hübotter to Wiepking, Dep. 72b, no. 17, 12/10/1939, EHW.


Mattern's wit (as the author concerned suggested), or whether it was merely a case of being compelled to say the right thing, it is surely a good example of how in those times even a gardener's average working day could be imbued with racist polemics.
II. h ‘Obsolete individualism’ – the Killesberg design under-fire

1939 again the outrage made massive waves, this time about a colleague, who seemed to throw into disarray everything we had learned about architectonic garden design since 1907.923

(Alwin Seifert about Mattern, 1940)

The reviewing of private correspondence kept in the Wiepking estate has unveiled further details of how intensely Mattern’s professional freedom was attacked. This is an isolated event considering Mattern’s long career, but it is a momentous one in its negative potential and it helps understand the situation of liberals and outsiders, who were not immediately hit by measures of repression like active communists and social democrats or those affected by measures of ‘racial hygiene’. The hostilities against Mattern were uttered at times of highest tension and of the Nazi’s height in power, around the outbreak of World War II. With the published critique of Mattern’s Killesberg Park, the accusations amounted to dangerous public defamation. This is not presented here to merely show hostilities Mattern had to deal with. The discussion also outlines Mattern’s position within the aesthetic-ideological constellations of the professional sphere. Conflicts could be disclosed, which are not necessarily limited to the period under consideration in this chapter. Tradition lines were carried into the new ideological context from decades before, and they continued beyond.

923 ‘1939 schlug wieder die Empörung hohe Wellen, diesmal über einen Fachgenossen, der alles, was an architektonischer Gartengestaltung seit 1907 gelernt worden war, wieder über den Haufen zu werfen schien.’ (with reference to the criticism of the exhibition in 1907 at Mannheim bei Max Laueger) Alwin Seifert, ‘Über die Stuttgarter Reichsgartenschau’ (contribution to ‘Reichsgartenschau 1939 im Mittelpunkt fachmännischer Kritik’), Gartenkunst, 53, 02 (1940), 26–8 (26).
A ‘world garden’ in the face of Nazism: Flower show or show of strength?

The so-called Höhenpark (‘park on the height’) is one of Mattern’s chief works, sometimes considered his magnum opus, despite it having been conceived under restricted freedom of (artistic) expression. Despite Mattern’s own redesign on the occasion for the German Garden Show 1950, it is still today mainly characterised by the original substance and spatial concept of 1939. It represents the largest surviving projects of the Bornim School and the best-preserved park of the 1930s in Germany. At the same time it is not representative of public parks in Germany of that time: it does not represent a Volkspark defined by social objectives, but rather an aesthetic vision, a peculiar merger of neo-romanticism and modernist artistic expression. Also, it was initially planned as a zoo – and this plan was not dropped until the end of 1937 –, which will have been partly responsible for spatial diversity appreciated today.

Another reason for this diversity was the original condition of the site as a rutted, exhausted stone quarry (Fig. 148). The Killesberg was listed as a monument on the occasion of its 40 anniversary in 1979, following a motion by the DGGL, which brought the design into public awareness for the first time after the war.924 That year the Karl Foerster Foundation commissioned a vegetation inventory, dedicated to Hammerbacher’s 80th birthday (in 1980).925 In 1983 a detailed garden-historical and garden-artistic assessment was completed by Kurt Schönbohm, who had been Mattern’s construction supervisor for the project in 1939.926


925 Ibid.

park was being restored, so that today it can in great parts be experienced with the originally conceived visual axes and perennial associations.927

The competition for the area called Feuerbacher Heath was held in 1935, results being presented in January 1936 in Gartenkunst.928 The winning entry was the proposal by Mattern in cooperation with the architect Gerhard Graubner, a successful proponent of the conservative ‘Stuttgart School’.929 They were chosen mainly for their traffic solution, the logic layout of the streets and a consolidation of the future park area, which others had divided up unfavourably with avenues (Valentien) or streets (Figures 149, 150a–d). Apart from the first prize, three more teams were awarded equal second prices (landscape architects named first): Otto Valentien with Kurt Marohn and Werner Gabriel, Adolf Haag with Walter Ruff, and Herta Hammerbacher with Walter Kratz.930 All landscape architects from the winning teams, and with Hans Koch and Wilhelm Hirsch even two of the commendations, as well as some of the architects involved were rewarded with commissions, under the artistic direction of Mattern for the landscape and Graubner for the buildings. The project was huge compared with what Mattern had mastered until then, and because of the past political investigations against him for a while the commission was not certain. In 1939, Mattern wrote an article for Gartenschönheit presenting the works

927 The last of Mattern-designed exhibition halls, composed of prefabricated greenhouse-modules, from the 1950s were only torn down recently. During the last few years the entrance area has been completely changed by a project for the Stuttgart Exhibition Fair.


929 The ‘Stuttgart School’, referring to the architecture class at the Technische Hochschule Stuttgart, was defined by the reformist traditionalism of the teaching architects Paul Schmitthenner and Paul Bonatz.

930 Purchased were the contributions by: Hans Koch with Heinz Götze, Hans Lechner with Bruno Brimmeck, Wilhelm Hirsch with Konstanty Gutschow, Gerhard Prasser (listed alone) and Editha-Emmi Schröder with Karl Rückgauer. Ibid.
of those involved. The show was presented as a big team effort, under Mattern’s artistic direction.931

Because of the secret war preparations, the use of iron in building projects was strictly controlled, and initially there were problems getting the government’s permission; plans had to be amended accordingly. At some stage a directive from Göring’s Office of the Four-year plan ordered the immediate halt of all construction activities, as the necessary amount of steel could not be permitted.932 The Ministry of Agriculture and Nourishment (Reichsnährstand) was informed to consider the case. Eventually, the latter provided the 571.4 tons of steel needed from its contingent, probably in view of the expected propaganda effect.933 These expectations were not disappointed. Despite its early closure at the outbreak of WWII, with 4.5 million visitors the Reich Garden Show 1939 was seen by more people than many post-war garden shows. Weeks before Germany attacked Poland it was used proactively for matters of propaganda; a contemporary witness wrote about an exhibition that showed Poles committing brutal crimes against Germans living in the Danzig corridor, images that a child would never forget.934 But Mattern’s dream of a ‘world garden’ was already perverted literally with the first spadeful of earth that was turned: already in 1934 and then after the design competition forced labourers locked into a barn on the grounds had to clear out the site and level out the deep pits for the

931 Hermann Mattern, ‘Vorbetrachtungen zu der Reichsgartenschau Stuttgart’, Die Gartenschönheit, 20, 3, (1939), 86–98. It is possible that Mattern agreed on making the project a team work as part of a compromise not to loose the commission.

932 Jörg Kurz, author of a book about the history of the site, personal communication, 24/09/2013. Kurz has viewed the material at the Stadtarchiv Stuttgart. During the author’s visit at the archive, the relevant documents could not be seen due to a temporary staff shortage.

933 ‘Auszug aus der Aktenniederschrift Betr. Eisenbedarf der Reichsgartenschau 1939’, Baurechtsakte 1937–39, T.B.940 (protocol of a meeting ‘at I III’), 19/01/1938, SAS.

creation of the future park.935 Two years after the garden show a collection point was located in the park, for people to be deported to the extermination camps.936

landscape architecture as the recovery of a landscape

It was a group of young self-employed landscape architects, mostly born around 1900, who were working at the Killesberg, under Mattern’s artistic direction.937 Documents prove that the winning team, Mattern and Graubner, actively initiated this cooperation. A programmatic document can be found in the Wiepking estate, in which Mattern and Graubner suggest the involvement of the other prize-winning competition teams under their artistic direction, and they ask Wiepking, Germany’s only university professor for garden and landscape design, for support of the idea.938 Accordingly, Mattern called the Reich Garden Show a communal project which emerged from the ‘kindred attitude of several people’.939 In ‘Preliminary considerations to the Reich Garden Show Stuttgart’, published in Gartenschönheit in 1939, with photos and writing he presented the work of the others involved.940 This was characterised by an undogmatic functionalism which considered itself emblematic for the modern

935 Jörg Kurz, personal communication, 24/09/2013; Der Killesberg unterm Hakenkreuz: Eine Dokumentation der Geschichtswerkstatt Stuttgart Nord e.V., ed. by Geschichtswerkstatt Stuttgart-Nord (Stuttgart 2012), p. 9, 12. It has to be considered, though, that forced labour was common.

936 There are memorial stones and information steles in the park reminding of the deportations.

937 The years of birth were, for example: Otto Valentien (1896), Herta Hammerbacher (1900), Hermann Mattern (1902), Adolf Haag (1903), so at the time of the competition in 1935 they were in their thirties. Wilhelm Hirsch (1887–1957) was probably the oldest involved.

938 The document was also sent out to the mayor of Stuttgart, Wiepking, who the author assumes had been chairing the competition jury, generally welcomes the proposal but reacts with reservation. Letter from Mattern and Graubner to Wiepking, dep. 72b, no. 17, 25/03/1936, NHW.


dwelling garden, and which at the same time acknowledged many people’s desire for rich decorative plantings (Figures 151a, 151b).

The site for the Killesberg Park was unique for a garden show; in the past these had been held on existing park grounds, which were enlarged or altered, but none had been constructed on an industrial wasteland. Several pits were incorporated, which led to a great richness of different impressions. Some commentators referred to this fact and noted that the beauty of the result was not Mattern’s achievement but God-given. The diverse spaces facilitated a variety of gardens – for example Haag’s special garden for dahlias (Figures 152a, 153b), Hammerbacher’s ‘Garden of the Wild Flora’ (Fig. 161), a special primula garden designed by Mattern together with the Botanist Leo Jelitto, and an open-air stage by Valentien. The dominant element of the more open area – former orchard meadows – was a series of large ponds. The highest and biggest of them was constructed on the flat area of a former soccer field (Fig. 153). The incline of the former orchard below was graded into four similarly modelled lakes, interconnected by a rivulet set in boulders. The two opposite sides of each lake were formulated differently: while being retained on the lower side by a low, straight stone wall, the upper shoreline was S-shaped, with the water encountering plants or lawn without a constructed edge (Figures 153, 163). The repetitive pattern of the almost identical lakes clearly signalled that this was no imitated nature. The zone between the lakes, along the rivlet, was occupied by richly detailed plantings. All built elements were realised by locals, experienced in constructing dry stone walls in the nearby vineyards, and using a hard sandstone from the black forest, as local pits were exhausted. These constructions were praised as demonstrating the highest masonry skills and mostly still exist today.

The general character of the park was picturesque and organic – landschaftlich in the Bornimers’ way. The post-industrial, spontaneous woodland with Robinia

pseudoacacia was integrated; the picturesque habit noted in many descriptions, particularly the deeply furrowed bark as a special attraction.942 Karl Heinz Hanisch, a garden journalist and friend of Mattern's, cleverly described Mattern's design for the new Killesberg as equivalent to a Bach fugue, evoking a contrapuntal design concept: 'I mean firstly the flowing paths, how [...] they appeared to be passing the flow on to the next path'.943 He went on to describe parallel running paths, diverging and again merging, and how they became correspondingly narrower and wider. Hanisch's account of his visit as a young man in 1939 to the Reichsgartenschau reads like the description of a postwar design; the organic, flowing shapes were unusual at that time. According to Hanisch, none of the different elements in the park appeared as if it was designed to attract all the attention. Instead, each part was treated as equally important and developed according to its potential. Many of the authors of later descriptions claimed to detect a quasi liberal character; the 'inclusion of man into the landscape' and the spatial proportions of the park 'aim at the individual, and at the individual experience. [...] It is impossible to be awed by monumentality'.944

However, an analysis of photographs and plan drawings suggests that this was only a part of the story. There were also some rather sensational elements especially near the main access, as if Mattern tried to outpace the monumentality of Graubner's Hall of Honour with landscape-architectural means (Figures 154, 156). The great basin in particular was impressive: fitted with two lines of fountains, tilted inwards to form 'a guard of honour' for the 'unprecedented' horizontal water jets that shot


943 Ibid.

lengthways across the water. From here, on the way into the park the visitors could choose to walk across the special garden for dahlias, designed by Haag, or take the direct route passing large, geometric flower terraces planted with annuals. Water jets were used in (over)abundance, and at night their illumination catered for fascinating, if theatrical sights (Figures 155, 158, 164). This way, Mattern created a zone of transition between the gravity of the entrance area and the picturesque of the landscape garden beyond.

The conflict

The Reichsgartenschau 1939 was an occasion for Mattern’s artistic profile to become subject to a highly tensed-up exchange of indignant letters, more or less behind the scenes. People involved in this communication were on one side, Mattern, Hübotter and Seifert, who had formerly called Mattern the best garden designer in Germany.945 The opposition was formed by the municipal garden director of Berlin, Joseph Pertl (*1899), who was also chairing the German Society of Garden Art (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Gartenkunst, DGfG), Wiepking as Germany’s only professor for garden and landscape design, and Carl Wilczek (1887–1876), Agricultural Councillor and teacher at the horticultural college at Weihenstephan.946 The ideologically flexible Hübotter, a few years older than Mattern, was one of the most published landscape architects of the late 1920s to 1940s. His successful career, like that of many others, continued seamlessly into the postwar time, between designing Himmler’s Sachsenhain, a place of völkisch worship, in 1934, and the memorial

945 Letter from Pertl to Seifert, dep. 72b, no. 17, p. 3, 31/10/1939, EHW.

landscape on the grounds of the former Bergen-Belsen concentration camp between 1945 and 1946.\textsuperscript{947} He became one of Mattern’s closest friends within the professional environment.\textsuperscript{948} Hübotter was an ideological chameleon, but he seemed not to have tried to denounce anyone. Quite the contrary, he acted as mediator on several occasions, at times apparently telling people what they wanted to hear in order to pour oil on troubled waters and help colleagues in trouble.\textsuperscript{949} He generally defended Mattern and praised the Stuttgart garden exhibition in his review in \textit{Gartenkunst}, while at the same time in letters to Wiepking he admitted considering certain elements in the park design as a representation of ‘the Mattern of the past’, evoking the flaw of an exaggerated ‘individualism’ as a heritage of the so-called ‘\textit{Systemzeit}’ (‘system time’) of the Republic.\textsuperscript{950} Pertl, Wiepking and Wilczek on the other hand were uncompromising Nazis. Wilczek was deposed from office in 1945.\textsuperscript{951} Pertl was probably the most dangerous of them all. He had become head of the parks and gardens department at Mannheim in March 1933, and one year later garden director of that city. In February 1935 he was appointed to be garden director of Berlin. Pertl

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{950} Wilhelm Hübotter, ‘Über die Stuttgarter Reichsgartenschau’, \textit{Gartenkunst}, 53, 02 (1940), 21–2; letter from Hübotter to Wiepking, dep. 72b, no. 17, p. 1, 28/07/1939, EHW. Hübotter himself did not use the term \textit{Systemzeit} literally. With his criticism he referred to Mattern’s Fountain Courtyard at Dresden in 1936, cf. pp. 271, 302.
\end{thebibliography}
had been a member of the NSDAP as early as 1921, re-entering in 1925. In 1932 he had changed from the SA to the SS (Schutzstaffel, Protection Squadron).

Considering Pertl’s early engagement in the SA and his reference to his fighting for the new Germany he may well have been part of the far right hit squads of the early 1920s, who were regularly involved in clashes with leftists, above all communists, that left many dead. He had probably fought in the streets of Munich as a member of the NSDAP’s paramilitary SA division (Sturmabteilung, Stormtroopers), with which his membership is documented since 1921. He was holder of the Blood Order (Blutorden), which makes probable his involvement in the Beer Hall Putsch of 1923. After January 1933 he was eagerly denouncing colleagues. Reinhold Lingner for example lost his poorly paid but badly needed employment due to Pertl’s intervention. The new realities meant that any professional not ostensibly supporting the ‘movement’ had to be prepared to find him- or herself confronted by a colleague with a recent past of this kind, and be asked by him critical questions about his ‘weltanschauliche’ – i.e. ideological – eligibility for his job. In the dispute over Mattern’s ideological eligibility, Wilczek, Pertl and Wiepking all sent each other duplicates of the letters they had sent to Seifert and Mattern, as well as those they had received. Thus, throughout the entire case their action was likely to have been coordinated.

---


953 Ibid. The SS was the NSDAP’s paramilitary Protection Squadron that initially acted as security for party meetings and became one of the most powerful organisations of the Third Reich.

954 It is not clear if he refers to physical fighting at times of the counterinsurgency ending the Munich Soviet Republic in 1919. Letter from Pertl to Seifert, dep. 72b, no. 17, 31/10/1939, EHW.

955 G. Gröning and J. Wolschke-Bulmahn, Grüne Biographien (1997), p. 287. The Blood Order (Blutorden) was initially only granted to fighters that had taken part in the Beer Hall Putsch.

Although it had a forerun, the case of 1939 was really set off by a harsh criticism of Mattern's design for the Killesberg Park, uttered by Wilczek on site and in presence of other visitors, and repeated in printed form. As a response to this rather crass critique, described below, Mattern did not shy away from threatening to resort to litigation. The successive exchange of opinions amounted to severe accusations of various different people, accused of a variety of professional incompeltences and character flaws. The dispute was short-lived but intense; respective letters are many pages long. With its complexity it allows for a deep insight into the professional sphere of landscape architects between self-employment, public office, activism in associations and the group of the Landscape Advocates, a group of free-lancers working under Seifert's supervision for the OT (see following chapter). Feelings seem to have been whipped up for different reasons: wounded pride, perceived clashes of ideology, commercial competition. We will look at the conflict above all in the interest of clarifying the contemporary reception of Mattern's work.

One relatively clear aspect of the background to the dispute of 1939 is represented by the divide between Seifert's group of Landscape Advocates - mainly independent landscape architects - and those organised in the DGfG, who were generally landscape architects in public office, often heading municipal garden departments. The DGfG had one important annual meeting, which served as an occasion not only to discuss professional matters, but also for networking and meeting old friends or college classmates. Seifert had used the very weekend of such an annual DGfG meeting for an advanced training course for those in contracts with the OT. Pertl in his function as chairman of the DGfG was highly resentful, as was Wiepking. In a letter Pertl suggested to Seifert that he must have known and had

957 Letter from Wiepking to Seifert, dep. 72b, no. 17, p. 4, 16/09/1939, EHW; Carl Wilczek, 'Über die Stuttgarter Reichsgartenschau' (contribution to 'Reichsgartenschau 1939 im Mittelpunkt fachmännischer Kritik'), Gartenkunst, 53, 02 (1940), 22-5.

958 See the following letters, dep. 72b, no. 17, EHW; letter from Wiepking to Hübottter, p. 1-2,
deliberately chosen the date to rebuff the DGfG as a gesture of superiority. Seifert responded that his seminar had been planned long before he knew of the DGfG’s meeting, and quite bluntly admitted that he considered the DGfG dispensable, as for many years he had in vain pleaded for support in different professional matters. Now he preferred to fight for the good cause by being proactive rather than sitting in meetings where matters were discussed, that in the advanced training courses organised for his Landscape Advocates had already been addressed years earlier. This was the background of the dispute, and it soon broached the topic Mattern. Seifert had asked several of the Landscape Advocates to prepare lectures for the training, and Mattern was chosen to speak about allotment gardens, as he had special experience in that field through his early commitment to Migge’s concepts. Wilczek responded fretfully and adamantly ruled out his attendance of a lecture by Mattern. From Pertl Seifert got the same reaction:

[...] one thing I know, that I will not attend a lecture, in which Herr Mattern wants to tell me something. Since this man has shown his true face and shown, how he would try to claim the papacy in questions of art if he only could, by menacing those with the Treachery Act, who permit themselves to criticise his works, I am once and for all through with him.959

The case became even more delicate through Seifert’s choice of location for his seminars: the Landscape Advocates met on the Plassenburg in Kulmbach. This was an ideologically charged site, similar to the National Socialist Ordensburgen, the

06/08/1939; letter from Wiepking to Seifert, p. 3, 16/09/1939; EHW, letter from Pertl to Seifert, 11/10/1939.

959 ' [...] aber das eine weiß ich, daß ich keine Tagung besuche, auf der mir Herr Mattern etwas erzählen will. Seidem sich dieser Herr ganz zu erkennen gab und zeigte, wie er in Kunstpapsttum machen würde wenn er könnte, indem er denen mit dem Heimtückengesetz drohte, die sich eine Kritik über seine Arbeiten erlauben, ist er für mich ein für allemal erledigt.' Letter from Pertl to Seifert, dep. 72b, no. 17, 11/10/1939, EHW
training schools for party leaders. It was a Schlungsburg training camp and
recreational home and the official Reichschule der deutschen Technik (‘Reich School
of German Technology’), associated with the NS-Bund Deutscher Technik (‘NS-
League of German Technology’), headed by Fritz Todt as well as the OT. Here,
engineers, technicians and Landscape Advocates met to coordinate their work. The
fact that Pertl, who considered himself a fighter for the new Reich, saw Mattern –
and others now furthered by Seifert – as a profiteer remaining from the overcome
system (the Weimar Republic) made this choice of location a sensitive issue:

Where were Herr Mattern and Herr Hirsch in the hard years of political fight? And what
kind of motivation should I have for having Herr Mattern tell me something on a National-
Socialist Schulungsburg!?960

Audaciously for someone not known to be particularly sympathetic to the ruling
party, to defend himself from criticism of his work Mattern had apparently invoked
the Treachery Act (Heimtückengesetz) of 1934, a law introduced by the Nazis that
dealt with the abuse of party insignia in order to protect the prestige of the party.
Defence was indeed necessary considering the aggressive character of the
accusations against him; implicitly these tied Mattern to degenerate art and cultural
modernism. What does this reveal about Mattern? First of all, he felt in the right and
he trusted the law. How risky his confidence was is difficult to assess from today’s
distance. For example, we cannot ascertain whether he knew about all the
accusations brought forward against him, although it is very probable he was
informed. The adaptive Hübotter for example stood by his side and had warned him
in another case, and Seifert of course, at least in 1939, did much to defend Mattern –

960 ‘Wo war denn in den schweren Jahren des politischen Kampfes Herr Mattern oder Herr Hirsch?
Was habe ich für eine Veranlassung, mir von Herrn Mattern auf einer nationalsozialistischen
Schulungsburg etwas erzählen zu lassen?!’ Letter from Pertl to Seifert, dep. 72b, no. 17, 31/10/1939,
EHW.
also indirectly by praising his professional skills. The antisemitic, rather
counter-revolutionary architect did not mind a certain ideological difference, he even accepted
a modernist past:

That Mattern, despite his peasantry ability and the fact that he owns a little farm, is not
grounded, is clear. But this is the case for many other garden designers before 1933,
whose field of work spread over an extended territory.961

In questions of art, Seifert was the exemplary reactionary modernist, opposed to
traditional art but equally opposed to cultural modernism; he has been classed with
the conservative revolution.962 From Seifert’s perspective, Mattern’s art was, so to
speak, a detour into the right direction, that is away from the traditionalism he
despised and at the same time restrained in relation to the generally rejected
experimental abstract modernist aesthetics:

Self-evidently, from an ideological perspective, also [the Stuttgart Reichsgartenschau]
lags behind our times. It corresponds in many respects to that unbound, intellectually
influenced arbitrariness of roughly the time of 1920–1930. Mind you it is much closer to
us than for example [the garden exhibitions at] Essen [1938] and Dresden [1936], which
by all means were reflections of that parvenu-ish Kommerzienrat’s world of the pre- and
post-war times. Exactly the fact that they did not invite any mental involvement is proof

961 ‘Daß Mattern trotz seiner Bauernfähigkeit und der Tatsache, daß er einen kleinen Bauernhof besitzt,
kein bodengebundener Mann ist, ist klar. Das waren aber vor 1933 auch andere Gartengestalter
nicht, deren Arbeitsgebiet sich über einen weiten Raum erstreckte.’ Letter from Seifert to Wiepking,
dep. 72b, no. 17, p. 1, 24/09/1939, EHW.

962 Charlotte Reitsam, Das Konzept der ‘bodenständigen Gartenkunst’ Alwin Seiferts – Fachliche
Hintergründe und Rezeption bis in die Nachkriegszeit (Frankfurt am Main et. al.: Peter Lang Verlag,
2001), pp. 30–41; Charlotte Reitsam, ‘Das Konzept der “bodenständigen Gartenkunst” Alwin Seiferts
– Ein völkisch-konservatives Leitbild von Ästhetik in der Landschaftsarchitektur und seine fachliche
Rezeption bis heute’, Gartenkunst, 02, (2001), 275–303. Compare also the discussion of reactionary
modernism in: Jeffrey Herf, Reactionary Modernism: Technology, Culture, and Politics in Weimar
that they belonged to a dying world, and in the case of Essen the general opinion was that we are really fed up with such things.963

And he added that the DGfG’s decision to reward the designer of the Gruga Essen 1929, Korte, with an honorary membership was wrong (Figures 168–170).

The nature of the criticism expressed on the day when Wilczek visited the show with a group of people (probably his students) from Weihenstephan is not recorded verbatim, but he repeated what he thought in letters to Wiepking and Seifert.964 A key term repeatedly used was ‘Asiatic’. It was used not only by Wilczek, but was a term commonly applied by far-right reactionaries to dismiss experimental modernist expression as foreign to the German cultural sphere; official communiqués for example spoke of ‘the Asiatic instincts of so-called artists’.965 It was at times meant literally, in the sense of a style reminiscent of typically Japanese or Chinese art and design. This was the case when Seifert rejected a naturalistic rockery garden at the Reichsgartenschau designed by Adolf Haag, whom he otherwise respected as a ‘capable’ landscape architect.966 At times it was meant figuratively, standing for some sort of expressionistic manner, for anything ever so slightly capricious, or simply for


964 Wiepking mentioned Wilczek’s visit and the fact that it was the occasion the first criticism that Mattem felt attacked by: Letter from Wiepking to Seifert, dep. 72b, no. 17, p. 4, 16/09/1939, EHW.


966 Letter from Seifert to Pertl, dep. 72b, no. 17, 19/10/1939, p. 3, EHW.
an ignorance of the traditional context. If it was linked to a person’s nature, the person addressed was both dismissed character-wise as well as subtly denounced as un-German in a racial sense. Although the second did not have to be founded on any real knowledge about the ethnic background, it was sometimes suggested in order to discredit a rival or to throw suspicion onto someone. Not only Wilczek, but also Pertl used this term in connection to Mattern, whose work was thus linked to degenerate art:

If in reference to Stuttgart I speak of Asiatic design, I mean a Potemkinian design, which is the characteristic of Matternian design. He likes to affect something, that is not, or he builds something, for which the requirements are lacking. I will be able to produce the respective examples if a controversy in front of a higher forum requires them.

Wiepking was said to have suggested, hardly less absurd, a ‘Slawic’ appearance of Mattern’s. In front of his students he described Mattern as having ‘a not an entirely German appearance, and exactly like this are his gardens’.

Another malpractice Mattern was charged with by his opponents – not directly, but via letters to different colleagues including Hübotter – concerned his involvement with the publication Häuser und Gärten, an impressively illustrated large-format book showing exemplary gardens from Germany and also examples from other European countries.

967 For a very brief summary of the Nazis’ concepts of their enemies, see: Jost Hermand, Kultur in finsteren Zeiten: Nazifaschismus, Innere Emigration, Exil (Berlin et. al.: Böhlau, 2010), pp. 15–25.

968 ‘Wenn ich bezüglich Stuttgart von asiatischer Gestaltung spreche, so meine ich eine Potemkinsche Gestaltung, die das Charakteristikum der Matternschen Gestaltung ist. Er täuscht gerne etwas vor, was nicht ist oder baut etwas, wozu die Voraussetzungen fehlen. Ich werde schon mit entsprechenden Beispielen aufwarten, wenn die Auseinandersetzung vor einem höheren Forum es erfordert.’ Letter from Pertl to Seifert, dep. 72b, no. 17, 31/10/1939, EHW.

and beyond. The publisher Herbert Hoffmann (not to be confused with the architect and planner Hubert Hoffmann) had admitted consulting Mattern, even though only Adolf Haag was mentioned in the acknowledgement. Why Mattern was not mentioned is not known. Wiepking and the other likeminded colleagues had heavy objections against the book. It showed some examples that were not acceptable under the new Zeitgeist: architecture by Max Ernst Häfeli, Otto von Salvisberg and other modernists, and, worst of all, Scharoun’s design for a house at Falkensee, the garden of which was designed by Mattern (Figures 171–173). From this book Wiepking chose to discuss negative examples in front of his students in a lecture in summer 1939. He told Seifert he had presented slides of the relevant pages with Mattern’s caption, the authorship of which he had previously verified with the publisher, and continued that his students had been very dismissive of what he had shown. Wiepking was seething:

[...] I can only be unsympathetic if Mattern publishes downright Dadaist shacks, like for example the house by Scharoun and sing its praise as ‘like a mountain house’. To compare one may read what Schinkel says about a real mountain house in his travel letters from Germany.

The house in question was a house for Pflaum/Bader-Bornschein, built in 1935 at Falkensee, north-west of Berlin, on top of a steep slope. The same year, that house

970 Herbert Hoffmann, Garten und Haus: Die schönsten deutschen und ausländischen Wohngärten und ihre Einbauten (Stuttgart: Hoffmann, 1939, 1st edn).

971 Blundell-Jones lists the house as Pflaum house (p. 92), but the photos in the Mattern estate list the project as Bader-Bornsstein garden (1935). Peter Blundell-Jones, Hans Scharoun (London: Phaidon, 1995), pp. 92, 236.

972 ‘[...] ich [kann] keinerlei Verständnis dafür aufbringen, wenn Mattern ausgesprochene Dadaistenbuden veröffentlicht, wie beispielsweise das Haus von Scharoun und es “wie ein Berghaus” besingt. Man lese im Vergleich einmal, was Schinkel über ein echtes Berghaus bei Gastein in seinen Reisebriefen aus Deutschland sagt.’ Letter from Wiepking to Seifert, dep. 72b, no. 17, p. 4, 16/09/1939, EHW.
was shown in the famous glossy *die neue linie*, which, according to Wiepking, 'stands in a certain inner connection with Mattern'. Such more or less subtle comments were meaningful; *die neue linie*, visually and partly in regard to its content, was a decidedly modernist publication. Over several years a former Bauhaus student, the influential Austrian typographer and graphic designer Herbert Bayer (1900–1985), held the artistic direction. Important artists were working for the periodical such as László Moholy-Nagy (1895–1946), who designed ten of the front covers. On every single page the photography, typography and layout were *neusachlich* in style and highly artistic. Even though there were articles praising the new Reich’s architects such as Wilhelm Kreis, Ernst Sagebiel, Albert Speer, or Paul Ludwig Troost, or the Führer’s favourite monumental artists (Arno Breker, Josef Thorak et. al.) the magazine’s affiliations with a bauhaus design philosophy were evident. Illustrations were cheerful but abstract. Suggesting someone had an ‘inner connection’ to it was close to calling him a cultural Bolshevist. Examples for the artistic illustrations were several depictions of gardens to be found at the Reichsgartenschau, designed by Mattern, Hammerbacher, Haag and Valentien, printed in the March number of 1939, the same volume Scharoun’s design was presented in as part of a series about country houses (Figures 174–178). The building was shown in several photos and a ground plan, which Wiepking considered a potentially ‘award-winning entry to an exhibition of degenerate art’.973 He knew that Mattern lived in a house designed by Scharoun and he told Seifert that he assumed the two ‘maintain an artistic fellowship’.974 In this case Seifert duly relented:

And, finally, concerning Mattern’s own house, we have called on him as plain as can be to change it, as soon as he has money to do so. In this context I would like to point out that the Führer has trusted Professor Bonatz with the design of the new Munich main station,

973 Ibid. Strangely, Wiepking did not mention Röse’s garden illustrations.

974 Ibid.
although Bonatz had once designed the Zeppelin building in Stuttgart. I'm not saying we should trust people, who once stood quite far left, with the final political guidance.975

Quite probably this, as in other cases, was sheer rhetoric. Mattern was never forced to change the house he lived in. Wiepking's reaction was again strident:

Your comparison with Herr Prof. Bonatz is inappropriate, as Herr Prof. Bonatz wouldn't dare in 1939, and on top of that for the Führer, to make suggestions like those he made 10 years ago. Herr Mattern, though, still in 1939 tries to con us into accepting foreign elements. I am astonished that you do not express any worry about our young professional talent [...].976

Maybe the fact that during the war Mattern appeared to retreat more and more into his second Bavarian home, a farm house he had bought from an old couple in 1938, silenced the most fierce criticism (Figures 179, 180).977 Working the land of a century-old isolated Chiemgau farmstead was obviously more compliant with Blood-and-Soil thinking, and the architecture here was naturally not in conflict with any building regulation (apart from the extensions added by Mattern later on). Also, quite surprisingly, the second edition of the criticised book was printed two years later.

975 'Was schließlich Matterns eigenes Haus anlangt, so haben wir ihn unmissverständlich aufgefordert es umzubauen, sobald er das Geld dafür hat. Ich möchte in diesem Zusammenhang aber darauf hinweisen, daß der Führer Professor Bonatz mit dem Bau des neuen Münchner Hauptbahnhofes betraut hat, trotzdem Bonatz auch einmal den Zeppelinbau in Stuttgart entworfen hat. Man muß ja Leuten, die einmal politisch sehr links hingen, noch nicht die endgültige Führung anvertrauen.' Letter from Seifert to Wiepking, dep. 72b, no 17, 24/09/1939, p. 5, EHW.

976 'Ihr Vergleich mit Prof. Bonatz ist unangebracht, denn Herr Prof. Bonatz wird sich schwer hüten, im Jahre 1939 und noch dazu für den Führer Vorschläge zu machen, wie er sie vor 10 Jahren gemacht hat. Herr Mattern aber versucht, uns 1939 noch arifremde Elemente aufzuschwätzen. Ich wundere mich nur darüber, daß Sie hier keine Sorgen um unser beruflichen Nachwuchs äußern [...].' Letter from Perl to Seifert, dep. 72b, no. 17, 31/10/1939, p. 3, EHW.

almost without any changes. The censors seemed to have been busy with more important things, and it is not known whether Wiepking had restrained himself from incriminating Mattern to some official entity. Actually, Seifert and others supporting Mattern assumed on later occasions that Wiepking was continuing to denounce him.

All this talk was already enough to damage Mattern’s reputation, which had just recovered from the police investigation. But Wiepking, Pertl and Wilczek also suggested informing a higher jury, namely Rosenberg, to decide whether Mattern should be disciplined. It is hardly imaginable that he would have survived such a trial without the imposition of a professional restriction. As might be expected, Hübotter tried to appease Wiepking, while Seifert did his best by suggesting a public exchange of arguments, in the form of a series of texts to be published in Gartenkunst.

I consider it erroneous to appeal to the Rosenberg department or to the Reich Chamber of Fine Art in such matters. Who in the Reich Chamber understands anything about garden art? Only we ourselves do! [...] I take no stock in a battle of words. The disputation between Eck and Luther also led to nothing. Dialectical agility easily decides. [...] Instead, I would think it excellent if Mappes allocated one or even two numbers of ‘Gartenkunst’ to an entirely open debate, in which Mattern should present his intentions firstly as well as have the final word, after both friend and foe openly, but also soberingly, have expressed themselves.978

978 'Ich halte es für durchaus abwegig in solchen Dingen sich auf das Amt Rosenberg zu berufen. Wer versteht denn in der Reichskammer etwas von Gartengestaltung? Das sind doch nur wir selbst! [...] Von einem Rede-Duell halte ich nichts. Auch bei der Disputation zwischen Eck und Luther ist nichts herausgekommen. Es entscheidet dabei viel zu leicht die dialektische Gewandheit. [...] Ich würde es aber ausgezeichnet finden, wenn Mappes ein oder auch zwei Hefte der “Gartenkunst” einer ganz offenen Auseinandersetzung zur Verfügung stellt, bei der zunächst Mattern seine Absichten darlegen und auch das Schlußwort erhalten müßte, nachdem Freund und Feind sich offen, aber auch ganz sachlich dazu geäußert haben.’ Letter from Seifert to Wiepking, dep. 72b, no. 17, 24/09/1939, p. 3–5, EHW. Hübotter, too, told Wiepking an appeal to Rosenberg or any other office would not do the profession a good service, see: Letter from Hübotter to Wiepking, dep. 72b, no. 17, 12/10/1939, EHW.
Apart from the intention to give Mattern the final word, Seifert’s proposal appears to have met with approval; in 1940 Gartenkunst published a series of five telling articles under the common title ‘The Reichsgartenschau 1939 as focus of a professional critical review’. The authors were first the Danish landscape architect Gudmund Nyeland Brandt from Copenhagen, second Hübottet from Hannover, followed by Wilczek from Weihenstephan, and finally Seifert from Munich. In Germany, Brandt in those years was probably Denmark’s best-known professional, not least through his contribution to the discussion about a ‘future garden’ (‘kommender Garten’). Depending on the reader’s perspective, the debate could be understood as won or lost — it offered both praise and scathing criticism. However, on balance the affirmative contributions held the upper hand, thanks to chief editor Mappes withholding a fifth unsolicited contribution from the landscape architect Alfred Last, who was strongly influenced by the architectonic tradition of his

979 Four separate contributions with a preface by the editorial board assembled under the common headline ‘Reichsgartenschau 1939 im Mittlepunkt fachmännischer Kritik’, Gartenkunst, 53, 02 (1940), 17–28 (G.N. Brandt: pp. 18–9; W. Hübottet: pp. 20–2; C. Wilczek: pp. 22–5; A. Seifert: pp. 26–8). The published debate is also dealt with by Reitsam, who however does present it as Seifert’s idea: Ch. Reitsam, Das Konzept der ‘bodenständigen Gartenkunst’ Alwin Seiferts (2001), p. 166–70.

teachers Alfred Lichtwark and Fritz Schumacher.\textsuperscript{981} Last was appalled by Mattern's 'wimpishness', his 'ragout of tectonic and organic intentions', which he dismissed as 'feminism' and 'misunderstood garden romanticism'.\textsuperscript{982} Last's letter was so polemical that Mappes decided to prune it in order to leave out the 'most daring statements'.\textsuperscript{983} Mappes had a tense relationship with Seifert, as the older man had recently humiliated the chief editor by publicly exposing mistakes in an article of his.\textsuperscript{984} In the end it was decided to completely omit Last's contribution. Mappes left it to Seifert to close the series of critiques and to try and incorporate a tamed version of Last's polemic, that nonetheless represented a widespread opinion.\textsuperscript{985} Accordingly, Seifert's polemics must be seen in this light; surely he prepared Mattern for what he was going to write. Hübotter managed to find fault without challenging Mattern's integrity, while at the same time launching substantial commendation of his friend's achievements at Stuttgart. Brandt, by invoking cultural modernism, produced an ambiguous article that may however be understood as praise, and indeed by a reference in a letter his enthusiasm for Mattern's achievement seems proven.\textsuperscript{986} This is equally true of Seifert's critique, which was more direct with criticism and free

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[984] Letter from Pertl to Seifert, dep. 72b, no. 17, 31/10/1939, EHW. Compare also: Ch. Reitsam, \textit{Das Konzept der 'bodenständigen Gartenkunst' Alwin Seiferts} (2001), p. 167 (fn 884).
\item[986] Hübotter reports to Wiepking how thrilled Brandt was on a site visit that the two had made together, see: Letter from Hübotter to Wiepking, dep. 72b, no. 17, p. 3, 28/07/1939, EHW. Reitsam considers Brandt 'one of the few' to acknowledge Mattern's design 'almost unreservedly as a work of art': Ch. Reitsam, \textit{Das Konzept der 'bodenständigen Gartenkunst' Alwin Seiferts} (2001), p. 167.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
from between-the-lines equivocation. Wilczek’s contribution as expected amounted to a clear-cut defamation.

Hübotter’s strategy was to stress in the first lines that any criticism had to be seen in context of the great achievements of Mattern and of the superiority of this garden show compared to the other ones of recent years. In this vein Brandt, too, wrote that any criticism felt out of place in view of the ‘largest and, regarding beauties, richest garden exhibition, that I have yet seen’. Nonetheless he cited the unusual combination of contrasting forms as risky. Brandt emphasised the example of the great basin with the strictly aligned series of water jets, near the main entrance, that had caused much indignation. Like his German colleagues, he had also photographed this element:

[...] but not as a negative example. I want to show this to my students as an example of what a severe stroke against tradition can succeed, if it is executed by a superior artist. At the same time I want to warn urgently of imitation. Many do not like it that Mattern has consciously inverted common practice, that is: the free-flowing water used according to architectonic laws, and the fixed frames of the basins designed in organic streamlines. This is relatively understandable, but there are also others, who know how to appreciate the artistic value of the ingenious contradiction of the nervous pulsation of the water rays and the sublime tranquility of the softly undulating green grassy embankments.

Hermann Mattern reminds us of certain composers who break with traditional sequences of notes creating disharmonies, which shrill in the ears of the musical middle class – but which still stand under full control of the composer.

---

987 G. N. Brandt, ‘Über die Stuttgarter Reichsgartenschau’ (contribution to ‘Reichsgartenschau 1939 im Mittelpunkt fachmännischer Kritik’), Gartenkunst, 53, 02 (1940), 18–9 (18).

988 ‘[...] aber nicht als ein Gegenbeispiel. Ich will meinen Schülern dies als Beispiel zeigen, welch derber Schlag gegen die Tradition gelingen kann, wenn er von einem überlegenen Künstler geführt wird. Gleichzeitig will ich unbedingt vor Nachahmung warnen. Viele mögen nicht, daß Mattern hier die Behandlungsweise bewußt umgekehrt hat, das heißt: das fließende Wasser nach architektonischen Gesetzen verwertet und den festen Bassinrahmen in naturalistischen Stromlinien gestaltet. Das ist einigermaßen verständlich, aber es gibt aushandele, die den künstlerischen Wert des geistvollen Gegensatzes im nervösen Pulsen der schimmernden Wasserstrahlen und der erhabenen Ruhe der sich
This implication of an avant-garde approach and elitism must have flattered Mattern. To evoke, as in the last sentence, twelve-tone technique or atonality, was again far from innocuous. While not officially ostracised by law, and despite Arnold Schönberg being himself ideologically a reactionary, atonality was associated by most NS functionaries with ‘Jewish intellectualism’ and ‘cultural Bolshevism’. \(^989\)

Implied in an affirmative sense as in Brandt’s critique, it could thus be read as veiled criticism of a severe kind. The fact that Brandt closed his article by pointing at a garden by Valentien, calling it ‘the most exemplary of its kind I have ever seen’ \(^990\), could again be read as a rhetorical distancing from Mattern. At the same time Brandt’s critique established the judgement met with through all of Mattern’s vita, and which has become central in cementing his significance as an artist: his break with tradition as sign of real artistry.

Wilczek’s contribution went far afield to make a swipe at internationalism and Mattern’s ‘certain individualist self-indulgence’, which Wilczek saw as the great flaw of most modern garden art generally: ‘The exhibition to me seems to be the result of a not yet entirely overcome epoch, which saw in the human work merely the expression of the individual [...]’. \(^991\) He quoted a German soul-centredness as opposed to the intellectual focus of a symbolic form in Japanese culture, again corresponding to the essential Blood-and-Soil motif of the emotive Nordic as

---


\(^{990}\) G. N. Brandt, ‘Über die Stuttgarter Reichsgartenschau’, Gartenkunst, 53, 02 (1940), 18–9 (19).

contrasted with the intellectualism of Jewish culture.\textsuperscript{992} Typical of right-wing cultural conservatism, Wilczek's stance bracketed together characteristic individualism and characterless internationalism: both individual artistic expression and lack of character he equally deplored. As a guarantee of character was presented (ethnic) regionalism, and in fact character was only accepted if it was deduced from regional or ethnic particularity. Writing his seething conclusion, emphasised by letter spacing, Wilczek's appeared to froth at the mouth:

> The look at history shows, that the individual was only ever significant within the delineations of fixed bonds, which are defined by völkisch particularity, i.e. the true artist has always been the instrument of the blood of his people [Volk]. [...] Thus character of each cultural act can only exist as derived from the character of the Volkstum and space. There is no international "character", an international face is characterless.\textsuperscript{993}

For the affirmative use of the term 'Weltgarten' – 'world garden' –, coined by Foerster and also used by Mattern in connection to the Killesberg park, Wilczek had no comprehension.\textsuperscript{994} To try and argue rationally with such an opponent was obviously a hopeless case.

Haag's garden was also severely criticised for taking up influences from Japanese garden art, which in its shunning of 'decisiveness, symmetry, repetition [...]'}


\textsuperscript{993} 'Die Betrachtung der Geschichte zeigt, daß das Individuum immer nur Bedeutung hatte im Raume festliegender Bindungen, die durch Volkstumseigenart bestimmt sind, d.h. Der echte Künstler war immer das Instrument des Blutes seines Volkes. [...] So kann die Eigenart jeder kulturellen Tat nur leben aus der Eigenart des Volkstums und Raumes. Es gibt keinen internationalen "Charakter", internationales Gesicht ist Charakterlosigkeit.' C. Wilczek, 'Über die Stuttgarter Reichsgartenschau', \textit{Gartenkunst}, 53, 02 (1940), 22-5 (22).

\textsuperscript{994} C. Wilczek, 'Über die Stuttgarter Reichsgartenschau', \textit{Gartenkunst}, 53, 02 (1940), 22-5 (24).
descends into formlessness’ (Fig. 181). Its character was seen as diametrically opposing Germanness in art defined by ‘vigorous accomplishment and reality’. Wilczek’s rejection of a naturalistic use of stone steps reflected the widespread dogma that such building materials could not express the clear intention of the designer by trying to adapt to natural forms. To Wilczek aligning architecture with nature by mimicking natural random shaping was unacceptable, even impossible, as it led to fussiness: ‘[…] instead of naturalness, this equals technical and artistic neglect.’ Stone steps were only worthy if they were werkgerecht – giving expression to the material’s characteristics –, and if they were obviously the result of a ‘systematic, human will to design’. In this judgement Wilczek was also connected to the position of, amongst others, Schultze-Naumburg in the Werkbund.

This way of thinking was widespread and can be traced back to Semperian materialism: each Werkstoff (material) should be used according to its inner nature. But it is the claim to absoluteness in his choice of words and his reference


997 C. Wilczek, ‘Über die Stuttgarter Reichsgartenschau’, Gartenkunst, 53, 02 (1940), 22-5 (23). Instead of with 'neglect', the German ‘Verwahrlosung’ can also be translated as ‘degeneration’, which would directly link it to the idea of degenerate art.

998 C. Wilczek, ‘Über die Stuttgarter Reichsgartenschau’, Gartenkunst, 53, 02 (1940), 22-5 (23).


1000 About the conservative wing of the Werkbund, see: Roland Günter, Der Deutsche Werkbund und seine Mitglieder 1907-2007: Ein Beitrag des Deutschen Werkbundes zur Kulturhauptstadt Ruhr im Jahr 2010, series Einmischen und Mitgestalten (ed. by Deutscher Werkbund Nordrhein-Westfalen), 10
to Volkstum and race that made his text such an aggressive attack on Mattern’s Stuttgart project, in particular on his and Haag’s ways of designing. His reproach included the use of ‘botanical abnormalities and pathological forms (dwarf, bizarre, absurd, creeping, cripple forms etc.)’, in Haag’s and also in other gardens on the Killesberg, and he criticised the declaration ‘of such “cretins” [sic!] as garden-worthy’, as well as the use of too many foreign plants.1001

Interesting about this entire discourse is a comparison between the two most conservative positions in the series of critiques. Despite defending Mattern, in regard to formative principles Seifert has to be placed into the same ideological tradition as Wilczek. With astonishing unconditionality, Seifert stated that artificial building materials ‘can only be used in bound form, not in nature-imitating form’.1002 Moreover, he postulated that decorative plants ‘belong into in some kind of mathematically graspable forms’, in the same way as perennial breeds, corresponding to their cultured character, belonged in rectangular beds.1003 These reproaches also stood for the already mentioned incorporated position held by Last and his teachers.1004

---

1001 C. Wilczek, ‘Über die Stuttgarter Reichsgartenschau’, Gartenkunst, 53, 02 (1940), 22–5 (23). In German, the term ‘Krüppel’ (cripple) is used for creeping varieties, especially the popular dwarf mountain pine (‘Krüppelkiefer’, Pinus mugo subsp. Mugo)


1004 As mentioned before, these were Lichtwark and Fritz Schumacher, a founding member of the Werkbund.
The diffulence of the perennial beds, however, as it wants to become fashion for a while now and as it reigned the exhibition in Stuttgart, is expression of a city- or literature-born romanticism, which might be acceptable to ladies (I didn’t say women!), but which does not suit a fine figure of a man. Should I be mistaken, I have to plead inability to follow due to being too much a builder and a peasant.1005

The reference to femininity had parallels in the reactionary, anti-jewish and misogynistic art theory of Otto Weininger, who in his influential cultural theory contrasted an alleged manly rigour with “feminine” dissolution of form.1006 However, while agreeing with (or yielding to) essential parts of the conservatives’ objections to Mattern’s design, Seifert gave this criticism a twist in Mattern’s favour. As in his earlier letters to Wiepking, he took a decidedly positive stance on Mattern’s heretical breaking of traditions: despite all its shortcomings, with the Killesberg design the younger had cleared the space for thinking the ‘coming garden’.1007 Now, in view of this positive judgement, where Seifert applied criticism it strikes one as scorching. Once more, we must bear in mind his (alleged) intention to incorporate aspects of Last’s derision. To be sure, his defence of Mattern was there and he praised the technical execution of


all the mural works, crediting Mattern with this. However, partly his defence was indirect and lay in the generalising character of his reasoning. With the final sentences of his article he declared all garden exhibitions since 1926 as lagging behind their times, including Mattern’s design for Stuttgart:

Dresden 1926 and 1936, Essen 1929 and 1938 represent in their sated abundance [Fülle] the equally sated and plump [fällig] and not quite German time of the Kommerzienräte of the prewar years [= the late Empire]. Stuttgart is a reflection of the literarily biased individualistic time of before 1933 [= the Weimar Republic]. The garden exhibition of our time of discipline and camaraderie does not yet exist. But despite all, Stuttgart is closer to it than Dresden or Essen. Düsseldorf can probably be seen as a preliminary stage. It will need some such stages, until the connection to the spirit of our days or even an far-sighted guidance will be achieved. Those engaged in building these stages can be very grateful to Hermann Mattern that he has cleared away the outdated, and, by loosening a lot of the uptightness, created free space for new kinds of design.\textsuperscript{1008}

Seifert credited Mattern for the unrestraint and ease of the park’s overall appearance and stated that, while some say that this was not Mattern’s achievement but provided by the site, it would have equally been possible to align the layout with rigid axes

\textsuperscript{1008} ‘Dresden 1926 und 1926, Essen 1929 und 1938 verkörpern in ihrer satten Fülle die ebenso satte und fällige und nicht recht deutsche Kommerzienratszeit der Vorkriegsjahre. In Stuttgart spiegelt sich die literarisch angehauchte, individualistische Zeit vor 1933 wider. Die Gartenschau unserer Zeit der Zucht und der Kameradschaft ist noch nicht da.
and create enclosed spaces. Mattern in contrast had laudably ‘redesigned the site aiming at unrestraint and distant views’. In a way, Mattern was at Seifert’s mercy; it is difficult to imagine how he must have felt in the face of this, his ‘patron’s’ double-edged verdict.

Conclusions

In respect of the hysterical refusal of Mattern’s position by Pertl, Wiepking and Wilczek one is left to ask: Why all these emotions? For a start, Mattern did provoke with much of what he represented: His taste was quite obviously modernist, it was known he lived in a modernist house (after its completion it had been published in the architectural press), he had provided rather daring designs still after the mid-1930s, and his language in publications was devoid of the common nationalist vocabulary. For Wiepking, a second reason for his disfavour has been suggested in reference to accounts about Mattern having discovered the older colleague’s unfair, if not necessarily illegal, schemes in cases when Wiepking collaborated with the Foerster nursery during the 1920s. Thirdly, Mattern simply was a strong professional rival competing for commissions. Rossow’s above-quoted memoires, calling the Foerster–Mattern–Hammerbacher joint venture and Wiepking’s the two most successful garden design offices in Berlin around 1930, bare witness to this. Did Wiepking, even when he had a safe income as university professor, see Mattern as his main rival? However, all three suggestions are without definite proof. On several occasions Mattern’s friends suspected Wiepking of making intrigues against him. In one case Mattern answered Seifert with a letter, for a change on a sheet with private letterhead, that contained nothing but a centrally set quote from one of Georg Christoph Lichtenberg’s (1742–1799) aphorisms: ‘I cannot say that I was ill-disposed


towards him, but neither was I well-disposed, I never dreamt of him.'

While probably intended as a display of coolness, the clout of this letter lay in its psychological value: to bother posting an almost empty page with a poetic quote does not suggest indifference.

Looking at the temporal, thematic and quantitative scope of Matterm’s works, and in view of the fact that the case of 1939 had no measurable consequences for his safety or career, to deal with it in such detail might at first seem like overemphasising a minor anecdote. As part of a Matterm biography it has to be considered a key case study, by which essential aspects of his contemporary reception can be explored. This includes some facets of his character that can only be fully appreciated by considering the judgement of critical competitors and ideological opponents. To a certain extent, conclusions about Matterm’s design approach can be made. At the same time, the dispute allows us a deep insight into the dynamics within the professional sphere during the National-Socialist regime’s most successful phase.

While from today’s perspective less obviously modernist than the few more purist and constructivist gardens we know, the perception of them breaking the mould emerges as a fundamental aspect of Matterm’s works. Reactions like Brandt’s follow Matterm throughout his life and exemplify his contemporary reception as an ‘enfant terrible’. In the same vein is the sentence by Seifert cited at the beginning of this chapter, and a full twenty-seven years later we can still find that judgement in Hübotter’s review of Matterm’s monographic book of 1960: ‘He understood it right from the beginning of his career always to surprise us.’

---


Another conclusion to be made is, that Nazi landscape architecture, like the official architecture of the late Reich, was tending towards the monumental and architectonic. This contrasts with the suggestion of a Nature Garden in the tradition of William Robinson, adopted for the Blood-and-Soil ideology by Willy Lange, as the prevalent form for the völkisch landscape architects.1013 In respect of the planting concepts, a ‘nature garden’ concept was demanded by many. Formally, however, the majority of conservatives as well as Nazi sympathisers demanded the architectonic principle in order to represent modern German characteristics. Quoting Seifert these were: masculinity, sobriety and discipline. This corroborates what Hammerbacher has claimed in her ‘Entgegnung’ of 1977: in regard to form, the Bornimers demonstratively stood outside the mainstream.

II. 1 Working towards the Führer (?) – Mattern during the war

[...] We are in the middle of work – it goes from base camp to base camp – some are situated in the immediate vicinities of the frontline – yesterday we were there – in 10 km distance lay in the grey mist the former capital of the giant empire – from a small elevation we could overlook everything [...] Generally there is a ‘deathly’ silence, in the true sense of the word – every now and then this is interrupted severely.1014

(Mattern, in a letter to his wife, 14/08/1942)

The 1930s and 1940s have recently been drawing increasing attention from researchers, as they are more and more understood as a period fundamental for the professionalisation of Landscape Architecture in Germany.1015 This concerns less the traditional field of garden design. The scope of the modern profession as we know it today already began to be delineated during the Weimar Republic, in particular with regard to ecology-oriented landscape planning as complementing the urban development-oriented landscape architecture practice. But it was during the Nazi


years that the field really gained momentum, with its considerable strengthening of nature conservation legislation and the growing awareness of the environmental impact of grand planning projects, such as roadways, water works or industrial landscapes. The discipline’s authority was further boosted by the attention to an alleged Germanness of the nation’s landscapes. Much has been written about the history of nature protection in these years. While nature protection in Germany partly grew out of the Heimatschutz movement, there are many overlaps with National Socialism and nationalism in general, as well as certain connections to völkisch concepts. This is the case if one looks at the almost religious reverence of the alleged German 'Ur'-landscape, the primordial landscape Hammerbacher also referred to, which was considered instrumental in shaping the German race.

---


Conceptually, this reverence in a way contradicted the plans to install what was
considered a traditional German cultural landscape in the occupied territories. In
völkisch publications the Eastern landscapes were presented as eroded steppe,
exploited by nomadic peoples. In these territories, with their plan for
'Germanisation', the German planners overrode the local primordial origins they
cherished so much at home. However, behind it stood the same idea: to re-connect
with a German landscape character that supported the Aryan qualities in the people
(Figures 182, 183). 1018 And, not to forget, initially nature conservation was explicitly
revolving around questions of aesthetics. 1019 One of the most-noted contributions to
that debate during the first half of the century was Alwin Seifert's ecological
pamphlet Die Versteppung Deutschlands (The steppefication of Germany), originally
published in the journal Deutsche Technik, later reprinted as chapter of his best-
selling Das Zeitalter des Lebendigen (The Age of the Animate, 1942). 1020 Seifert was

by Joachim Radkau and Frank Uekötter, series Geschichte des Natur- und Umweltschutzes, I
(Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag, 2003), pp. 183–205.

1018 See e.g.: Gert Gröning and Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn, 'Zum Verhältnis von Landschaftsplanung
und Nationalsozialismus. Dargestellt an Entwicklungen während des Zweiten Weltkriegs in den
"eingegliederten Ostgebieten"', in Naturschutz hat Geschichte, Eröffnung des Museums zur
Geschichte des Naturschutzes, Fachtagung 'Naturschutz hat Geschichte', ed. by Stiftung
Naturschutzgeschichte, series Veröffentlichungen der Stiftung Naturschutzgeschichte, 4 (Essen:
Klartext, 2003), pp. 163–91; Gert Gröning, 'Teutonic Myth, Rubble, and Recovery: Landscape
Architecture in Germany', in The Architecture of Landscape The Architecture of Landscape:
M. Lekan, Imagining the Nation in Nature (2004), chapter 'From Landscape to Lebensraum: Race

(chapter 3.3.2 'Ideelle Ausrichtung der Landschaftspflege').

1020 Alwin Seifert, 'Die Versteppung Deutschlands', Deutsche Technik, 04 (1936), 423–7, 490–2; Alwin
Seifert, Im Zeitalter des Lebendigen: Natur – Heimat – Technik (Planegg: Müllersche
Verlagshandlung, 1943). Seifert's 'Die Versteppung Deutschlands' was reprinted Jost
Hermand's anthology Grüne Utopien (1991). pp. 90–1. Deutsche Technik was the official organ of
the Hauptamt für Technik der Reichsleitung der NSDAP and the Reichswaltung des
Nationalsozialistischen Bundes deutscher Technik (NSBDT), and thus affiliated with Fritz Todt, later
an expert, and his mind functioned in a way rational enough to develop concepts that were technically progressive, tainted however by his devotion to 'raciology'.

The Nazi years, in particular the years between the passing of the Reichsnaturschutzgesetz (Reich Nature Conservation Act) of 1935 and the war, have sometimes been considered a high time of nature conservation. 1021 Firstly this concerned legislation: Hermann Göring passed several bills on animal welfare, forest protection, and nature conservation – above all the Reichsnaturschutzgesetz. 1022 Remarkable was the instalment of the so-called Reichslandschaftsanwalt (Reich Landscape Advocate) in the person of Seifert, supported by a team as consultants for the Reich's motorway project, the before-mentioned Landscape Advocates (Landschaftsanwälte, a new term). 1023 Thirdly, some historians have pointed to the experimentation with bio-dynamic agriculture under the Reich Minister for Food and Agriculture and Reichsbauernführer ('Reich Leader of the Farmers', head of the Reichsnährstand, the national farmers' association), Richard Walter Darré. 1024 With

Albert Speer. In Mattern's Bavarian home three copies of this book could be found as part of the joint book collections of Hammerbacher and Mattern, which their daughter Merete had taken over. Seifert's general motivations are well summarised in: W. Oberkrome, 'Deutsche Heimat': Nationale Konzeption und regionale Praxis (2004), pp. 183-91.


1022 Several of the many functions Göring held, such as Reichsforstmeister ('Reich Master of Forestry'), Reichsjagdmeister ('Reich Master of the Hunt') and prime minister of Prussia, were indirectly related to nature conservation.


1024 Above all Bramwell: Anna Bramwell, Blood and soil: Richard Walther Darré and Hitler's 'Green Party' (Bourne End, Buckinghamshire: Kensal Press, 1985). However, Uekötter has declared
hindsight, the findings of recent historical research have considerably relativised this
assessment of the Nazi era as environmentalist heyday; as mentioned further below,
the work of the so-called Landscape Advocates had limited success, and generally it
seems that the progress in the field of nature conservation during these years was
outweighed by throwbacks.1025 Anyhow, the initially promising atmosphere must have
intrigued critics of the regime and lured them into taking a more active part in the
Nazi system in order to help enforce nature conservation policies, despite the
‘glaring contradiction’ between the National Socialists’ reactionary cult of the farmer
and of a pre-industrial landscape on the one hand, and their quite radical
technological modernism on the other hand.1026

In recent years, an extensive body of literature has been produced, above all by
environmental historians, both in German and English.1027 Two dates in particular have

---

1025 Most mentioned titles critically re-assess the long-held belief of in alleged Nazi environmentalism,
see e.g.: W. Oberkrome, 'Deutsche Heimat': Nationale Konzeption und regionale Praxis (2004), pp.

1026 R. H. Dominick III, The Environmental Movement (1992), p. 91, with reference to Jeffrey Herf,
Reactionary Modernism (Cambridge et. al.: Cambridge University Press, 1984), and Eberhardt
Jäckel, Hitler's World View: A Blueprint for Power, trans. by Herbert Arnold (Cambridge, Mass.:

1027 E.g.: Naturschutz und Nationalsozialismus, ed. by Joachim Radkau and Frank Uekoetter, series
Geschichte des Natur- und Umweltschutzes, 1 (Frankfurt a.M.: Campus, 2003); Natur und Staat:
Staatlicher Naturschutz in Deutschland 1906–2006, ed. by Hans-Werner Frohn and Friedemann
Schmoll, series Naturschutz und Biologische Vielfalt, 35 (Bonn: Bundesamt für Naturschutz, 2006);
and the references listed in the previous endnotes. In 2002 a first conference dedicated to the history
of nature protection in Nazi Germany resulting in a major research project funded by the Bundesamt
für Naturschutz (Federal Agency for Nature Conservation, BfN) and the Federal Ministry for the
Environment, with the aim of reviewing its predecessor institutions and the ideological heritage of
environmentalist thinking in Germany, see: Frank Uekötter in his introduction to: Naturschutz und
Nationalsozialismus, ed. by J. Radkau and F. Uekötter (2003), p. 13–29 (13). In this context one
also has to point at the rich research output by Gröning and Wolschke-Bulmahn, e.g.: Gert Gröning
and Wolschke-Bulmahn, Die Liebe zur Landschaft, Teil III: Der Drang nach Osten (München:
Minerva-Publikation, 1987). Cf. for the pioneering role of Gröning's and Wolschke-Bulmahn's:
Stefan Körner, 'Kontinuum und Bruch: Die Transformation des naturschützerischen
been occasions for a retrospection: the 100th anniversary in 2006 of the foundation of the Staatliche Stelle für Naturdenkmalpflege in Preußen (State Office for the Preservation of Natural Monuments in Prussia) in 1906, and the 75th anniversary of the internationally unique Reichsnaturschutzgesetz in 2010. Concerning the profession of landscape architecture, Alwin Seifert features strongly as one of the most influential figures in the debates on nature conservation of those years. Through his occupation as one of the Landscape Advocates working under Seifert, Mattern is concerned, too.

Advocating the interest of the homeland: the introduction of the Landscape Advocates

Right with the introduction of the regional planning offices of the autobahn building administration in 1934, the idea had been to select a group of landscape architects to work for these offices respecting a section of the autobahn project; as a matter of fact the Heimatschutz movement had actually contacted Todt in this matter shortly before. In this context, in 1934, Alwin Seifert, the Munich architect with long affiliations with the Deutscher Bund Heimatschutz (German League for the Protection of the Homeland), initiated the establishment of a group of Landscape Advocates who were to be consulted by the technical departments of the OT in order to

---


minimise the destructive effect of the new roads on the German landscape, mainly from the perspective of cultural policies (Fig. 184).\textsuperscript{1031} Correspondingly, the Heimatschutz has been identified as acting as a liaison between the road building agencies and the landscape architects.\textsuperscript{1032} Todt himself was personally connected with the Heimatschutz, at least in the mid-1930s.\textsuperscript{1033}

The appreciation of landscape-sensitive construction that was contained within the notion of German Technology corresponded with a general and vague readiness on the part of Todt to involve consultants with Heimatschutz experience in the planning for the autobahnen, provided they affirmed the primacy of technology.\textsuperscript{1034}

This consultatory task was related to the aesthetics of the routing of the actual lanes, which was to be more or less carefully integrated with the existing topography, but also to planting schemes for the introduced strip of unbuilt landscape going alongside the carriageways in a minimum width of thirty-five to forty metres.\textsuperscript{1035} Corresponding with the progressivist part in the thinking of the Heimatschützer, the roads were not necessarily seen as a curse only; the landscape of the Heimatschutz was not congruent with a purely biologist ideal of landscape. Their notion of a pure landscape comprised culture as much as nature, an obvious parallel to Mattern’s notion of Wohnlandschaft. Roads were part of this image; indeed, if well designed, they could be seen as an enhancement, retracing the characteristic features of a view like the

\begin{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{1032} Th. Zeller, \textit{Driving Germany} (2007), pp. 79–85.

\textsuperscript{1033} As chairman of the Society of the Friends of the German Heimatschutz, see: Th. Zeller, \textit{Driving Germany} (2007), p. 79.


\end{flushleft}
kohl lines beneath the eyes of a woman. An important role in this was played by the vegetation, as Seifert declared in 1934:

Protection of the landscape is possible with the construction of the mighty road, too, if the technician does not operate autocratically, but instead gets out as much attachment as possible from undulations and rhythm, from the fabric and history of the landscape, and if he integrates his thinking into the law that governs it. Enhancement of its beauty can also bring along the new road, if this becomes a truly German one.

A road is defined as a German road by the fact that it, seemingly magically, attracts tree, shrub, and hedge. Since the primordial beginning, the tree correlates with the Nordic man, thus in the German country the tree belongs to the house, the tree belongs to the church, the tree belongs to the village square, and the tree belongs to the road, too.1036

This meant believing that in other, for example Slavic countries, the people did not have the sensitivity towards such matters in order to protect their landscape and live in tune with it. Even though he adhered to a particular race theory that contrasted with the mainstream Nazi Blood-and-Soil doctrine, Seifert was nonetheless a racist.1037

Conceptually, the target was ethnically motivated: racial purification by achieving a 'volkstumsbildend' ('Volkstum-generating') symbiosis between 'German

1036 'Schonung der Landschaft ist auch beim Bau der gewaltigen Straße möglich, wenn der Techniker nicht selbstherrlich schaltet, sondern so viel Bindungen als nur möglich aus Schwingungen und Rhythmus, aus Gefüge und Geschichte der Landschaft herausrückt, wenn er sein Denken einfügt in das Gesetz unter dem sie steht. Mehrung ihrer Schönheit bringt ihr auch die neue Straße, wenn diese eine wirklich deutsche wird. Das nämlich macht erste eine Straße zur deutschen, daß sie wie magisch Baum und Busch und Hecke an sich zieht. Der Baum ist dem nordischen Menschen zugeordnet von Urbeginn an, und so gehört in deutschem Land der Baum zum Haus, der Baum zur Kirche, der Baum zum Dorfplatz und der Baum auch zur Straße.' Alwin Seifert, 'Die landschaftliche Gestaltung der Reichsautobahnen', Naturschutz, 01, 16 (1934/35), 20–1 (21), (originally published in Völkischer Beobachter, 5 September 1934).

1037 Charlotte Reitsam, Das Konzept der 'bodenständigen Gartenkunst' Alwin Seiferts: Fachliche Hintergründe und Rezeption bis in die Nachkriegszeit, series Ökologie, Umwelt und Landespflege, 25 (Frankfurt am Main et. al.: Peter Lang, 2001), pp. 45–58.
technology’ and ‘German landscape’. From a National-Socialist ideological point of view this would have meant above all the protection of the local character of a landscape, its identification potential as homeland – the ‘German essence’.

Naturally, these targets were not necessarily shared by those working in the respective field. For Seifert, who was coordinating the assignments of the Landscape Advocates as Chief Landscape Advocate, völkisch and aesthetic ideals were connected with ecological motifs. The following, tripartite sentence combined all these aspects into one pathos-loaded formula: ‘The first empire has bowed to nature; the second one has trampled it imperiously, to its own perdition; the third one builds itself into it harmoniously.’ This corresponded with Seifert’s often repeated damnation of a professional differentiation between the architect and engineer, which according to him came to pass in the course of the development of the railways during the late 19th-century (i.e. the ‘second’ German Empire, founded in 1871). The ‘Third Reich’ offered redemption with a combination of progressive building activities (‘... builds itself ...’) and harmonious integration (‘... into it harmoniously.’) of ‘spiritual’ völkisch identity and nature.


1042 See e.g.: Alwin Seifert (et al.), ‘Die Ausbildung des Garten- und Landschaftsarchitekten’, Garten+Landschaft, 60, 10 (1950), 1–5 (3) (contribution to an article with paragraphs written by different authors: Hermann Mattern, Alwin Seifert, Heinrich Friedrich Wiepking, and Ulrich Wolf.)
The reality of the building of the autobahn, however, stood in quite a contrast to
the "green" project as which it was often imagined.1043 The Landscape Advocates had
to struggle with obstruction – from avoidance tactics through to open opposition – by
the engineers of the Directorate Reichsautobahnen. Todt himself demanded that
Seifert be careful to exclude romantic aestheticists who lacked proper comprehension
of the project’s momentousness, and who could potentially impede a smooth building
process.1044 As a consequence the Landscape Advocates were merely allowed to
improve ‘the wounded edges of the forest’ through planting and soften the harshness
of the interventions by designing a more gentle moulding of the ground.1045 By most
of them, the work could thus only have been perceived as a prevention of the worst
damage. In 1936 Todt tightened the strings, increasingly demanding a more economical
use of plants.1046 In a review of Mattern’s work in April 1936, for example, he was
instructed to increase the distance between his typical ‘tongues’ of shrubs running
down embankments and to generally decrease the density of his planting schemes.1047

What should not be underestimated, despite the early disillusionment, is the
significance of landscape advocacy for the recasting of the landscape architecture
profession in Germany and its adaptation to modern challenges beyond the classical
field of garden design. The work of the Landscape Advocates is now considered one

1043 The seminal work in this regard is: Thomas Zeller, Straße, Bahn, Panorama: Verkehrswege und
Landschaftsveränderung in Deutschland von 1930 bis 1990 (Frankfurt: Campus, 2002); Th. Zeller,
Driving Germany (2007). A second work focusses on aspects of landscape and design: Charlotte
Reitsam, Reichsautobahn-Landschaften im Spannungsfeld von Natur und Technik: Transatlantische
und interdisziplinäre Verflechtungen (Saarbrücken: VDM, 2009) (at the same time habilitation
dissertation at the Technische Universität München, 2007).


1047 File memo by the office of the Inspector-General about a review of the planting schemes produced
by Hermann Mattern (attendees: Regierungsbaurat at the Inspector-General Lorenz, garden designer
Mattern), F1b/137, 30/04/1936, EAS.
of the central fields of innovation above all for the professionalisation of the nascent professional field of landscape planning. The others were the development of a nationalised organisational structure for nature conservation, and the concepts developed with the planning of the occupied eastern territories. For obvious reasons, the term 'innovation' in this context has to be used with reservations, strictly limited to technical and maybe methodological progress. There is hard-to-refute evidence, however, that argues for using this term as applied to those three fields: based on the experiences made with the new nature conservation legislation, with the Reichsautobahn projects, and with the plans for the East, a fundamental body of literature was produced that remained relevant for many years to come. Mattern himself still in his 1964 monograph Gras darf nicht mehr wachsen quoted several of the publications with völkisch content. It seems quite obvious that the period of National Socialism has seen a professionalisation of landscape architecture probably


1051 These were: H. Schwenkel, Grundzüge der Landschaftspflege (edn of 1955); A. Seifert, Im Zeitalter des Lebendigen; H. F. Wiepking-Jürgensmann, Die Landschaftsfibel (1942), cf. fn 952. In Mattern's bibliography, only 24 monographs are listed altogether. Noteworthy is also Mattern's reference to two titles by the influential anthroposophical soil scientist Ehrenfried Pfeiffer, namely: E. Pfeiffer, Die Fruchtbarkeit der Erde, ihre Erhaltung und Erneuerung (Dornach: Rudolf Geering, 1938); E. Pfeiffer, Gesunde und kranke Landschaft (Berlin: Metzner Verlag, 1942).
equal in significance only to the institutionalisation of the education of garden artists and the corresponding gain in social status during the early 19th century. How far this boost can be seen as independent of the prevailing ideology has yet to be assessed; more universal developments will have had their influence, too.\textsuperscript{1052} Notwithstanding, the Nazis' particular mixture of technological progressiveness and the view of technology as a matter of 'cultural development' in combination with conservative social parameters seem to have fostered a certain sensitivity towards questions of landscape protection, at least in theory.

With his identification with the modernist movement – albeit it from a critical distance –, Mattern's adaptation to the new power system and its aesthetic and social guidelines may at first seem unfathomable. However, over the years our understanding of modernism has shifted considerably. Many scholars hold the view that the term modernism cannot exclusively be taken as synonym for enlightenment social ideals. It has become generally known that not only Fascist movements more generally, but also parts of the Nazi sphere were indeed compatible with modernist aesthetics, and that some of the greats of modernist art and design – from artists like Richard

Scheibe and Hinnerk Scheper to designers like Herbert Bayer and Wilhelm Wagenfeld to architects like Egon Eiermann and Lilly Reich – offered the Nazis their services during the first years of the 'Third Reich', also for project with explicit propaganda function or racist content (Figures 185, 186). In the forerun, if we go with Herf’s thesis formulated as early as in 1984 and adopted already in the paragraphs above, the ‘reactionary modernists’ shifted technological innovation and modernism into the cultural sphere, thus being in the position to promote technological modernism ‘without adopting a rationalist word view in politics and culture’. On the other side stood the progressive art scene as represented by the Bauhaus: it ‘tried to demonstrate, that Enlightenment reason was indeed fully compatible with a fruitful interaction of art and technology’, and this is one of Mattern’s most important ideological focal points; one that stood for the incorporation of both individualist artistic expression and higher social aims. The overlap between the modern movement as represented by the key ideas of the Bauhaus and the technically progressive aspects that the OT offered as a work place will have intrigued Mattern in 1934, when he approached Seifert. At the same time, he – like many other German citizens – to a great extent renounced not only his democratic ideals, but also his devotion to modernism in the cultural sphere.

Once having won Seifert’s trust and sympathy, Mattern’s renown constantly rose, while his career unfolded simultaneously. In many cases his promotion happened thanks to Seifert’s suggesting him to Todt, Speer or others for a particular position. Seifert repeatedly, in letters to different people, emphasised Mattern’s artistic expertise as well as his (and Göritz’s) unique experience in working in areas with poor sandy soil as found in Brandenburg.


1055 Ibid.
Aspiring to serving the Organisation Todt: Mattern as Landscape Advocate for the autobahn project

In later accounts, as stated in his published CV, Mattern wrote that in 1936 Seifert had ‘called him’ to the task, while evidence seems to suggest quite clearly that Mattern approached Seifert of his own accord, and two years earlier than he later claimed.\textsuperscript{1056} In 1934 Mattern must have contacted Seifert personally with the idea of applying for a post as Landscape Advocate at the Highways Directory (Direktion der Reichsautobahnen). After a personal meeting at Munich, on the 4th June 1934 Mattern wrote a letter thanking his older colleague for the several hours he had spared to talk to him.\textsuperscript{1057} Herein Mattern suggested, in case Seifert needed to extend the group of Landscape Advocates, to be given responsibility for an area that he knew in detail from his days as a Wandervogel – Lower Hesse, Upper Hesse, the Harz area, the Rhôn area, or Westphalia. The Wandervogel itself Mattern named as a guarantee for ‘the necessary respect’ – in regard to weltanschauung – for the matters dealt with in the job.\textsuperscript{1058} Intriguing from today’s point of view is the fact that he also suggested two Nazi personalities to be contacted for testimonials: Secretary of State Gottfried Feder and Dr. Luetgebrune. The men in question were probably the economist Gottfried Feder and the jurist Walter Luetgebrune, two prominent Nazi ideologists who were associated with the extreme right already since around 1920, and who according to Mattern knew him ‘personally and through [his] work’.\textsuperscript{1059}

\textsuperscript{1056}‘Gesellschaft Reichsautobahnen, Werkvertrag Landschaftsanwalt, 1936–1945.’, typewriter-written document, folder 1 (no date, no inventory no. – consulted before the estate’s systematisation), EHM. Cf. Mattern’s CV as published in \textit{Garten+Landschaft}, 8 (1972), 350

\textsuperscript{1057}Letter from Mattern to Seifert, 04/06/1934, Flb/137, EAS. Interestingly, in those times Mattern used an address at Kassel (Wohnstraße 60).

\textsuperscript{1058}‘[... \textit{schon weltanschaulich (als Wandervogel)} [...]}’, Ibid.

\textsuperscript{1059}Ibid. Gottfried Feder was an early member of the NSDAP, a co-author of the party programme (1920), being foreseen as Minister of Finance. Feder had taken part in the Beer Hall Putsch of 1923. He was highly influential for the development of the Nazis’ anti-semitic economic theories during the 1920s. At the time of Mattern’s letter, Feder held amongst others (in his function as Reich
Mattern did not get assigned to the ‘Higher Construction Management [for the] Motor Carriageways’ (Oberste Bauleitung Kraftfahrbahnen, OBK) Kassel, as he had wished. Seifert let him know in August with an awkward explanation: ‘[B]y coincidence the Inspector General was late to pass along your appointment as Landscape Advocate to the OBK Kassel, as requested by me 21 June 1934’. In the meantime, the party leadership for the Gau of Kurhessen had chosen a different man, Fritz Stück, for the job, and Seifert managed to have those promoting the competitor agree on a little competition between Mattern, the landscape architect Schimmelpfennig, and the architect Stück (Fig. 187). Subsequently, Seifert declared the entries of Mattern and Stück to be equal in quality, and informed Mattern that he had decided to suggest him to Todt as Landscape Advocate for the section in the area of authority of the OBK Berlin. The same year Mattern started to work on several sections of the motorways around Berlin (Fig. 188), the route

Commissioner of Settlement) the posts of the Head of the Department of Habitation and Settlement in the Reich Ministry of Work, President of the Reichsbund Deutscher Technik (Reich Union of German Technics) and acted as chief editor of the journal Deutsche Technik. Devoted to the autobahn project, Feder had been Todt’s competitor for the post of Inspector-General of German Roadways. After serving as a while as Secretary of State in the Reich Ministry for Economy, he fell out of favour with the party in November 1934, following a career as university professor at Berlin and Braunschweig. Walter Luetgebrune was one of the most prominent right-wing jurist at the time of right-wing extremist terror during the Weimar Republic, who acted amongst others as defending lawyer for Ernst Röhm in later years. Luetgebrune fell out of favour with the party due to his association with the SA after the Night of the Long Knives (‘Röhm-Putsch), 2 July 1934. After the war he worked as a lawyer at the Higher Regional Court of Bavaria. For Feder, see: Ernst Klee, Das Personenlexikon zum Dritten Reich: Wer war was vor und nach 1945, (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch, 2003), pp. 133–4 (entry no. 227). Th. Zeller, Driving Germany (2007), pp. 53–5. For Luetgebrune see: Rudolf Heydeloff, ‘Staranwalt der Rechtsextremisten. Walter Luetgebrune in der Weimarer Republik’, Vierteiljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte, 32, 4 (1984) 373–421. It is a peculiar coincidence that both lost their position and their influence only weeks after Mattern named them as referees.


1061 Ibid.

1062 Letter from Seifert to Mattern, Flb/137, 23/10/1934, EAS.
from Berlin to Hannover, the Berliner Ring ring motorway, or the extensions to the
AVUS (Automobil-Verkehrs- und Übungsstraße – ‘Automobile Traffic and Training
Road’, opened to traffic already in 1921).\textsuperscript{1063} He also had to write bills of quantities
for the works conducted by the Landscape Advocates.\textsuperscript{1064} Mattern’s skills were
generally highly regarded, both in regard to professional matters such as plant
knowledge and artistic design as well as concerning his communication skills.\textsuperscript{1065} The
latter ensured his success in making himself respected both amongst higher ranking
engineers and planners on the one hand, and technical practitioners on the other. In
1937, for example, Todt’s deputy Eduard Schönleben, asked to consult Mattern and
extend his assignment to the area around Nikolassee, as its ‘scenic design
\textit{[landschaftliche Gestaltung]}[…] is eventually of crucial importance’.\textsuperscript{1066} Seifert, too,
generally praised Mattern’s work in his reports, for example as ‘artistically and
biologically correct’, arguing that Mattern’s somewhat dense planting practice was

\textsuperscript{1063} Heinrich wrote that Mattern received his first fee for December 1934: V. Heinrich, \textit{Hermann Mattern}

\textsuperscript{1064} Letter by Seifert to Mattern, Flb/137 20/04/1936, EAS. In this letter Seifert wrote that the Inspector-
General had inquired about when he could expect the BOQ that Mattern had agreed on writing, and
he adds that the Inspector-General would prefer it if Mattern did not write a separate bill for the job.

\textsuperscript{1065} Seifert referred to the good cooperation between OBK Berlin and the Landscape Advocates in the
section that lay Mattern’s area of responsibility, suggesting that he had a positive influence in this
regard on Göritz’s sites. Good cooperation between technicians and landscape architects seems to
have rather been an exception: Letter from Seifert to the \textit{Generalinspektor für das deutsche
Strassenwesen}, Flb/137 12/02/1938, p. 2, EAS; Th. Zeller, \textit{Driving Germany} (2007), e.g. chapter 5
(‘Conflicts over a harmonious road’), in particular pp. 102–5.

\textsuperscript{1066} Letter from Schönleben to the \textit{Direktion der Reichsautobahnen}, Flb/137 18/01/1937, EAS. Heinrich
Schönleben was a close collaborator of Todt’s in the \textit{Directory of the Reich Motorways} and the \textit{NS-
Bund Deutscher Technik (NSBDM, NS League of German Technology). After the war he worked in
private business, and he is today mainly known as author of a book as eulogy for Todt: Eduard
Schönleben, \textit{Fritz Todt: der Mensch, der Ingenieur, der Nationalsozialist, ein Bericht über Leben
133–5, 138, 193.
necessary on the poor Brandenburg soils to achieve a desired result.\textsuperscript{1067} Still, the job was not without risks regarding the satisfaction of the superiors. An interesting case is documented with Mattern’s project for the ‘AVUS triangle’ (AVUS-Dreieck, a motorway merging point), where he conceived the planting schemes in accordance with Seifert’s notion of a naturalistic but artistically enhanced landscape involving native species. A conflict arose, when Fritz Todt preferred a more gardenesque – ‘urban’ as he called it – treatment of the road-encircled plot, where Mattern had suggested an oak-tree grove. Todt instead imagined a green space with urban character, similar to the hedge-framed geometric flower beds below the Victory Column, with a municipal gardener employed to cater for changing seasonal blooms.\textsuperscript{1068} Seifert had suggested sowing out lupins for nitrogen fixation, disguised as ornamental flower beds to please the Inspector-General.\textsuperscript{1069} However, even after Todt had reviewed the design and demanded changes, Mattern did not give in and produce a more representative solution. This led to a spontaneous deferral of Mattern’s for this specific case, and the alternative assignment of Wiepking, whom Seifert and Mattern both rejected professionally and personally. When Seifert communicated this (so he claimed) to Todt, Mattern was given another chance.\textsuperscript{1070} Such anecdotal details illustrate both the agility of Seifert and the juggling that was part of the job. They also hint at the ideological aspects of the work of the Landscape Advocates, which have been summarised above. To keep those in mind is important in order better to evaluate Mattern’s involvement in the task – and his desire to get involved – as well as his later ideas on landscape protection and development.

\textsuperscript{1067} Letter from Seifert to the Generalinspektor für das deutsche Straßenwesen (Todt), Flb/137 12/02/1938, p. 2, EAS.

\textsuperscript{1068} Letter by Mattern to Seifert, Flb/137 19/08/1941, EAS.

\textsuperscript{1069} Letter from Seifert to Mattern, Flb/137, 18/07/1941, EAS.

\textsuperscript{1070} Letter from Seifert to Mattern, Flb/137. 02/09/1941, EAS.
What were the motifs that induced Mattern to work for the autobahn? The financial enticement was not strong, as the payment the Directorate Reichsautobahnen had finally agreed on was below that initially demanded by Seifert, and below the usual tariff for 'garden designers' as stipulated by the Reich Chamber of Fine Arts.\textsuperscript{1071} Anyway, Mattern did not seem to have been in financial distress, despite his exclusion from public commissions due to 'political unreliability'. Knowing Mattern's deep familiarity with the unspoilt landscapes of northern Hesse it is understandable that he wished to exert influence on the routing of the corresponding section of the autobahn, which is why, regarding a prospective work place, his desired location was the regional office of Kassel in the region were he had grown up. Mattern's interest might in addition have been to minimise the ecological impact, but in regard to his interest in the active shaping of landscape as a cultural product, the job must have promised an unequalled playing field and a unique chance to implement his artistic ideas. One (possibly the only) article written by Mattern about his work for \textit{Die Straße}, published 1937, in which he describes the process of locating service areas along the road, illustrates the visual approach the landscape advocates had to apply.\textsuperscript{1072}

One aspect with hindsight considered technically progressive in Seifert's work is his promotion of a considerate treatment of the soil – today common practice. This was also an important topic in the internal discussion amongst the technicians and landscape architects involved in the building of the Reichsautobahnen. The second known article that Mattern wrote in the context of his involvement with the autobahn project was a technical description, quite untypical for him, of the advisable treatment of the topsoil, which was routinely stacked into accurately shaped rectangular heaps. In the light of Mattern's former focus on questions of design, this purely technical article could be interpreted as a strategic one, published to show his

\textsuperscript{1071} Th. Zeller, \textit{Driving Germany} (2007), p. 100

\textsuperscript{1072} Hermann Mattern, 'Rastplätze', \textit{Die Straße}, 1 (1937), 155–6.
devotion to the matter, and to build credentials for an uncertain future, but archive letters reveal that article was produced by order of Seifert's, who had promised Todt to have Mattern document the exemplary work of a colleague. Mattern had to be reminded several times by Seifert of the 'promised' article, which Mattern produced after about one year's delay.

However, in view of his later indictment of modern society's ignorance towards the unmissable impairment of the ecological balance, Mattern perhaps truly identified with his job. This does not exclude a hope for a quick end to the extreme right's rule. Many environmentalists later claimed they had more or less cooperated with the Nazis in order to gain the little influence they had to prevent worse. As in many cases, a combination of these different aspects may come closest to the truth.

**The 1940s, an overview**

Due to the wish to present Mattern as showpiece liberal, it has rarely been mentioned that he was also involved in considerable strategic activities. Due to a damaged collarbone Mattern did not pass the fitness assessment and was initially in the position to continue his work, until he was eventually conscripted in 1941. He did not have to fight and was employed on matters in his professional field. Not only that, he was approached from different sides and the following years may count amongst his most challenging.

---

1073 Letter from Seifert to the Generalinspektor für das deutsche Straßenwesen (Todt), Flb/137 12/02/1938, p. 2, EAS; Letter from Seifert to Mattern, Flb/137, 03/10/1938, EAS.

1074 Letter from Seifert to Mattern, Flb/137, 02/02/1939, EAS. Letter from Beate Mattern to Seifert, Flb/137, 06/02/1939, EAS.


In December 1939 Mattern applied for membership in the NSDAP, which was granted 1 January 1940.\textsuperscript{1077} The same month he was suggested as advisor for the Berlin Waterways Directorate (Wassersträßendirektion), with Seifert making him responsible for all bodies of water of the Spree, while the Havel basin was assigned to his employee Göritz.\textsuperscript{1078} In the process of this assignment (and maybe other assignments, too) Mattern’s wife’s father must have played a role, as Dr. Franz zur Nedden was an authority in the area of water management.\textsuperscript{1079} The same year Mattern was approached by the one-time successor of Ernst May at Frankfurt’s Department for Urban Development, now Planning Commissioner for the Province of Brandenburg, Reinhold Niemeyer.\textsuperscript{1080} He intended to call on Mattern’s services for his area of authority. He also wanted to have Mattern work on the green spaces for Prague, the capital of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, for which Niemeyer

\textsuperscript{1077} NSDAP file (index MFOK O 0044), file card Hermann Mattern, membership no. 7409839, applied for membership 02/12/1939, granted 01/01/1940, BArch.

\textsuperscript{1078} Letter from Seifert to Mattern, Flb/137 18/07/1940, EAS.

\textsuperscript{1079} Seifert expressed his wish to hear Beate Mattern’s father’s opinion concerning the idea of suggesting Todt as Generalinspektor für das deutsche Wasserwesen (Inspector-General for the German Water Management, which he became in 1941), see: Letter from Seifert to Mattern, Flb/137 05/03/1938. The name ‘Dr.-Ing. Franz zur Nedden’ (‘Dr.-Ing. Franz zur Neiden, Geschäftsführer des Deutschen Vereins von Gas- und Wasserfachmännern, Berlin, [geehrt: 1953], verstorben 23.10.1954’) can be found on a list of honorary members on the website of the Deutscher Verein des Gas- und Wasserfaches e.V. - Technisch-wissenschaftlicher Verein (DVGW, German Technical and Scientific Association for Gas and Water), http://www.dvgw.de/dvgw/mitgliedschaft/ehrenungen/ehrenmitglieder/ (accessed 14/06/2014). Compare also: Letter by Mattern to Seifert, Flb/137 10/03/1938, EAS.

\textsuperscript{1080} As Building Councillor in Frankfurt, Niemeyer had been suspended for alcoholism and a sexual liaison – private matters that were milked by the press leading to his dismissal in 1938. Bettina Tüffers, Der Braune Magistrat. Personalsstruktur und Machtverhältnisse in der Frankfurter Stadtregerung 1933–1945, series Studien zur Frankfurter Geschichte, 54 (Frankfurt am Main: 2004). See a summarised biography at: http://www.ffmhist.de/ffm33-45/portal01/portal01.php?ziel=t_ak_magistrat_niemeyer (accessed 13/04/2014).
acted as Head of the Planning Commission (Figures 189, 190). Here, for foreign-political reasons the German government wanted to show exemplary results.

For the year 1941 Mattern’s catalogue raisonné lists the green system for Prague, the advisory task for the Berlin Waterways Directorate, the official residence of Arthur Greiser (Reich Governor of Warthegau, Figures 191, 192) at Posen (Polish Poznan), the planning of different settlements and village development concepts at Eberswalde, Heikendorf near Kiel, Heydebreck (Polish Kędzierzyn, Upper Silesia), an advisory opinion on the development of Malchow (Mecklenburg), the conversion of parts of the Grunewald into a recreational woodland by order of Albert Speer, and two more private commissions for gardens. In between he found time to prepare an exhibition of his work that the society Kunst-Dienst der Evangelischen Kirche (‘Art Service of the Protestant Church’) showed in its spaces in at Matthäikirchplatz in Berlin (a member was Stephan Hirzel, the later director of the Werkakademie Kassel). The tiny accompanying catalogue, a number in the series Werkstattberichte with a text by the architect Diez Brandi, is today one of the better printed documents of his work of the 1930s, but Bauwelt also reported over eight

---

1081 Letter by Mattern to Seifert, 24/04/1940, EAS. Heinrich refers to a letter by Niemeyer to Mattern from 11/04/1940: V. Heinrich, Hermann Mattern (2013), p. 52 (the repository of this letter is not given).

1082 Heydebreck was until 1934 the town of Kandrzin, only between 1934 and 1945 it carried the named Heydebreck in honour of the Freikorps- and SA leader Peter von Heydebreck.

pages with large illustrations. This selective glance at only the year 1941 gives a hint at Mattern's impressive workload during the war.

In February 1942, Fritz Todt died in a plane crash and Albert Speer replaced him in all of his offices, including the direction of the OT and the supervision of the roadways and the waterways. The same year, Mattern's official post of Landscape Advocate 'was changed into' – as he claimed – Expert Advisor for Nutrition Issues, Fruit- and Vegetable-Growing (Fachberatung für Ernährungsfragen, Obst- und Gemüsebau) for the entire OT, while in another document he is addressed as 'head of the Department for Cultivation at the OT Central Office' ('Leiter der Abteilung Landbau der OT-Zentrale'). He was suggested for this post – once more – by Seifert in front of Speer, from whom Mattern then received his orders. In 1943, Seifert suggested him as counsellor on landscape-related questions for the training of the rivers Moldau (today Vltava, Czech Republic) and Berounka. Apart from his

---


1085 The first information Mattern gave in his last published curriculum vitae in Garten+Landschaft (8, 1972, 350), the latter title was can be found in a letter by Seifert: Letter from Seifert to the 'head of the Department for Cultivation at the OT headquarter' ('Leiter der Abteilung Landbau der OT Zentrale, Herrn Hermann Mattern, Berlin-Charlottenburg, AVUS-Nordschleife'), Flb/137 13/11/1944.


work for the OT, Mattern had other commissions, from projects on an urban planning scale down to classical garden designs.

In 1944, finally, Mattern was asked by Schulte-Frohlinde if he would take over the chair at Munich’s Technische Hochschule, shortly before granted to Seifert. Seifert was no longer wanted. After his friend Rudolf Heß’ flight to England in 1941 and Todt’s unexpected death he had lost influence. But more fateful for this case was that he had fallen from grace in the Bavarian political scene, due to disagreements with Hermann and Paul Giesler. Hermann Giesler was a director in the OT and General Building Director of Munich, since 1941 also architect for the re-designing of Hitler’s hometown Linz, and thus responsible for the appearance of two of the five ‘Führer Cities’, his brother Paul was amongst others Bavarian state governor and Gauleiter of Munich an Upper Bavaria. In 1943 the Gestapo inquired against Seifert for defending female students against the infamous misogynistic public address by Paul Giesler of 1943, allegedly criticising the official state architecture in his lectures, being connected to Rudolf Heß and promoting the Anthroposophy-connected bio-dynamic agriculture. In a letter Mattern answered Schulte-Fohlinde with a rejection and sent Seifert a copy. This shall be quoted here in great parts, as it illustrates well Mattern’s standing within the sphere of technology in the ‘Third Reich’:

1088 Ch. Reitsam, *Das Konzept der ‘bodenständigen Gartenkunst’ Alwin Seiferts*, (2001), pp. 23–4. SS Reich Leader Heinrich Himmler had initiated bio-dynamic aromatic and medicinal herb production in the Dachau concentration camp. About this and Seifert’s connection with bio-dynamic crop cultivation see pp. 65–74 in the same publication. In 1943, in a full auditorium, Paul Giesler had caused uproar by turning to the female students and telling them that instead of visiting the University they should make the Führer a present of one baby boy [sic!] each year, and the ugly ones, who did not find a man, could be provided with his adjutants, for ‘a pleasant experience’. Protesting students were arrested, cf.: Heidrun Holzbach-Linsenmaier, ‘Dem Führer ein Kind schenken’, *Die Zeit*, 06/05/1994, available online: [http://www.zeit.de/1994/19/dem-fuehrer-ein-kind-schenken/komplettansicht](http://www.zeit.de/1994/19/dem-fuehrer-ein-kind-schenken/komplettansicht) (last accessed 10/10/2014). The occurrences are for example part of the film ‘Sophie Scholl – The Final Days’ (by Marc Rothemund, 2005).
Dear Herr Schulte-Frohlinde!

I thank you for your letter from 26/06, in which you offer me to succeed Herr Professor Seifert. As Reich Minister Albert Speer has obliged me for his tasks long ago, I am not free to take over other tasks.

At this moment a succession of Professor Seifert by me would also not be possible, as I feel very grateful to him, and in my opinion everybody has to try the possible, to settle contingent disputes or disagreements that have come up in Munich.

The 'mind of his own' Herr Seifert is often reproached with, is his strength and to this we all owe essential insights. Dear Herr Schulte-Frohlinde, you cannot do anything better for the work of the Generalbaurat and the University than to contribute to giving Herr Seifert the place that momentarily he alone deserves. [...]

After a lecture in mid-July at the Plassenburg I will come to Munich. I will try to call you between the 12th and 13th of this month, maybe you will have time, so that we can have an informative discussion.

With the my very best regards, Heil Hitler! 

---

1089 'Lieber Herr Schulte-Frohlinde! / Für Ihr Schreiben vom 26.6., in dem Sie mir die Nachfolge für Herrn Professor Seifert anbieten, danke ich. Da mich Reichsminister Albert Speer seit langem für seine Aufgaben verpflichtet hat, bin ich nicht frei andere Aufgaben zu übernehmen. / Im Augenblick würde auch eine Nachfolge Professors Seifert [sic] durch mich nicht möglich sein, da ich in ganz besonderer Hochschätzung mich mit Professor Seifert verbunden fühle und meines Erachtens Alles durch alle versucht werden muß, um eventuelle Streitfragen und Meinungsverschiedenheiten die in München aufgekommen sind zu beseitigen. / Der vielsch Herrn Seifert vorgeworfene "eigene Sinn" ist seine Stärke und dem verdanken wir alle wesentliche Erkenntnisse. Lieber Herr Schulte-Frohlinde, Sie können nichts besseres für die Arbeit des Generalbaurats und der Hochschule tun, wenn Sie dazu beitragen, Herrn Seifert den Platz zu geben, der augenblicklich ihm allein gebührt. / Nach einem Vortrag mitte Juli auf der Plassenburg komme ich nach München. Ich werde versuchen Sie zwischen dem 12. und 13. dieses Monats anzurufen, vielleicht haben Sie dann Zeit, dass wir uns aussprechen können. / Mit den herzlichsten Grüßen, Heil Hitler' Letter from Mattem to Schulte-Frohlinde (duplicate), 04/07/1944, EAS. The phrase 'eigener Sinn' (lit. 'own sense') can be translated as 'to have ones own mind', but in addition it is a play on words, as the compound noun 'Eigensinn' means stubbornness. Seifert was widely known for a certain obstinacy and occasionally caustic reactions regardless of appearances.
**A new relevance: of a profession serving the war**

About Mattern’s position as Expert Advisor on Nutrition Issues as yet little has become known.\(^{1090}\) In the documents about the OT in the Federal Archive no hints were found. The fact Mattern spoke of a changing of his existing contract during the war, instead of saying he was rewarded (or even applied for) a new, more important position, may be due to the fact that his work contract in the context of the Reich motorways – the Landscape Advocates were free lancers – was indeed merely amended, although for a head of an OT department a regular employment is probable.\(^{1091}\) On the other hand, it may also be a sign of how he dealt with the realities psychologically. As shown, Mattern had risen considerably in the hierarchies of the OT, one of the great power centres of the ‘Third Reich’.

From today’s perspective, it is surprising how relevant such an innocuous professional field as landscape architecture could become for the conduct of war. Relatively new research has cast some light on these matters.\(^{1092}\) Within one year, landscape architects were – at least in their self-conception – in high demand, above all for camouflaging tasks. The new confidence and enthusiasm speaks out of the following lines, with which the landscape architect Wilhelm Hirsch addressed his fellow Landscape Advocates in October 1940, after his appointment as a chief advisor on camouflaging measures for the OT:

> The current developments of the war demand from us to bring our complete working power

---

\(^{1090}\) First to expose details of this occupation was Reitsam: Charlotte Reitsam, ‘Der Landschaftsanwalt Hermann Mattern: Aufgaben und Konflikte’, *Stadt+Grün*, 03 (2003), 20–4.

\(^{1091}\) Cf. Mattern's CV as published in *Garten*Landschaft, 8 (1971), 350.

into the service of war. With the camouflaging activities the Landscape Advocates has been given a crucial task. It has been proven that only landscape-oriented screening can result in a satisfying screening. The confirmation of this has been the result of a meeting in the OT a few days ago, where I was subsequently asked not only to advise in matters I had been responsible for until then, but on all operational areas of the OT. For all Landscape Advocates involved in camouflaging work, this implies that our work and all the entailed effort and struggle have been met with appropriate acknowledgment. In order to fulfil these expanded duties as far as possible, it is necessary for all Landscape Advocates who are not in military service to let me know immediately whom I can rely on in this matter.1093

Poorly paid and worn down by the difficult task of mediating between conservationist interests, road technicians and planners in the OT offices, especially after Todt’s change of attitude in 1936 and his increasing demands for cost-efficiency, the influence of the Landscape Advocates had been limited.1094 As expert advisors with a strategic agenda, they experienced the new affirmation with pride. In his new position, Mattern’s life changed considerably. It meant above all travelling to estates in the outmost Eastern territories, as well as to objects in the occupied west (France) to be camouflaged. Here, always in relatively close proximity to the frontline, vegetable and fruit gardens were maintained to provide the battlefronts

1093 ‘Die jetzige Kriegsentwicklung fordert von uns, die gesamte Arbeitskraft in den Dienst des Krieges zu stellen. Dem Landschaftsanwalt ist durch die Tarnung ein wichtiges Aufgabenfeld gegeben worden. Es hat sich erwiesen, dass nur eine landschaftliche Tarnung eine befriedigende Lösung der Tarnung ergeben kann. Diese Bestätigung ergab vor wenigen Tagen eine Besprechung in der O.T. Zentrale, wo ich anschliessend gebeten wurde, nicht nur die seitherigen mir übertragenen Aufgaben zu beraten, sondern alle Einsatzgebiete der O.T. Daraus ergibt sich zunächst für alle die bisher bei der Tarnung beschäftigten Landschaftsanwälte, dass unsere Arbeit und die damit verbundenen Mühe und Kämpfe eine entsprechende Anerkennung fand. Um diese vergrösserten Aufgaben so weit wie möglich erfüllen zu können, ist es notwendig, dass alle Landschaftsanwälte, die nicht im Kriegsdienst stehe, sich weitgehendst zur Verfügung stellen.’ Wilhelm Hirsch, circular to the Landschaftsanwälte, Fl1a, 30/10/1943, EAS.

with food. Literature on this topic is very scarce, but essential sources in private possession, from which has only been quoted selectively, may hold more for future research. Like other colleagues of the "peaceful" profession, Mattern provided his knowledge and skills for the interest of war, receiving ad hoc instructions whenever his landscape expertise was needed. Typical for the cultural field in the Nazi state also in other disciplines, along with Mattern's 'process of self-disciplining' came 'a boost in status': he now held his own agency in the OT Central Office.

In some sort of managing position, Hirsch published a circular of the Landscape Advocates, in which he summarised letters he received from the members of the


1097 Apart from Mattern, the following landscape architects have been named in this connection: Werner Bauch (Plauen), Josef Breloer (Hildesheim), Guido Erxleben (Essen), Hermann Göritz (Potsdam und Danzig), Adolf Haag (Stuttgart), Reinhold Hoemann (Langenfeld/Rheinland), Hans Kern (Salzburg), Otto Kurz (Neu-Ulm), Gustav Langerhans (Hannover), Josef Leibig (Duisburg), Hermann Mattern (Potsdam), Max Müller (Bamberg), Ludwig Römer (München), Alwin Seifert (München), Max Karl Schwarz (Worpswede), Carl-Wilhelm Siegloch (Barmen), Hans Solbrig (Berlin), see: Olaf Hiller, *Hermann Göritz, Eine biographische Studie als Beitrag zur Fachgeschichte der Garten- und Landschaftsarchitektur im 20. Jahrhundert*, series Materialien zur Geschichte der Gartenkunst, 1 (Berlin: Technische Universität Berlin, 1997), pp. 103, 105, 109; Wilhelm Hirsch, circular to the Landschaftsanwälte, Fla, 30/10/1943, EAS; the text by Axel Zutz as part of the online documentation '100 Jahre Landschaftsarchitektur', on the occasion of the centennial of the Bund Deutscher LandschaftsArchiteken (Association of German Landscape Architects, BDLA), [http://100-jahre-landschaftsarchitektur.de/ausstellung#echoche-2](http://100-jahre-landschaftsarchitektur.de/ausstellung#echoche-2) (entry for the year 1942 'Westwall', accessed 14/05/2014). Apart from Bauch, Breloer, Erxleben, Schwarz, Seifert, and Solbrig, in a letter Hübotter mentions a person called Gillhoff: EAS, letter by Hübotter to the Landschaftsanwälte, attached to the circular of the Landschaftsanwälte, 19/12/1943. In Hirsch's circular in addition to the already mentioned the following names appear: Erich Ahlers Friedrich Heiler, Bruno Hildebrandt, Hans Kayser, Friedrich Schaub, Luz Schnitzlein, Kurt Schütze, Baurat Schurhammer, Walter Steinle, Georg Witasek.


1099 Cf.: Letter from Seifert to the 'head of the Department for Cultivation at the OT headquarter', Flb/137 13/11/1944.
group. In the circular of 8 December 1941, twenty names are listed, with longer or shorter information on the respective colleagues' occupation, location and well-being.\footnote{The following landscape architects contributed to the circulars: Werner Bauch, Josef Breloer, Guido Erleben, Adolf Haag, Friedrich Heiler, Bruno Hildebrandt, Wilhelm Hirsch, Reinhold Hoemann, Wilhelm Hübter, Hans Kayser, Hert Kragh, Josef Leibig, Hermann Mattern, Meyer-Jungclaussen, Kurt Prädel, Otto Rindt, Alwin Seifert, Hans Solbrig, Max K. Schwarz, and Reinold Tüxen. See: Wilhelm Hirsch, "Rundbriefe" (circulars) to the Landschaftsanwälte, F1a, EAS.}{1100} The short comment on Mattern stands out as the only one deploying slight irony in view of the lack of information: "It seems Hermann Mattern has completely buried himself in his agriculture, as from him unfortunately nothing can be heard or seen."\footnote{Wilhelm Hirsch, circular to the Landschaftsanwälte, F1a, 08/12/1941, p. 6, EAS.}{1101} This was far from the full truth, as working the land on his Bavarian home was more or less left to his petite wife, while Mattern himself was busy enough with professional orders.\footnote{The cultivation of the property Mattern soon had to leave to his wife Beate, a delicate, petite woman who nonetheless proved to be equal to the difficulties to make the farm – with the help of two horses, with goats, pigs and hens, but without electricity or engines, with steep meadows and fields covered in stones, in the midst of a lonely wood clearing – the basis of life and nourishment for many people with the most different fates, for stepchildren, fosterlings and refugee children, for relatives and prisoners of war. V. Heinrich, Hermann Mattern (2013), p. 47 (trans. LH).}{1102} In the next existing circular from the end of October 1943, Hirsch again made a hint at Mattern's apparent reluctance to contribute, expressing the wish for a report for colleagues to gain some insights into his wide scope of work. Others had written extensively for example about typical aspects of cultural landscapes in which they had to travel, and natural vegetation or traditional agricultural methods they observed as soldiers or in their functions for the OT. At least Hirsch knew at that stage, probably through a private letter the content of which was kept out of the circulars, that Mattern had 'months ago taken over the agriculture in all war zones of the OT, and he conducts it with great energy and success'.\footnote{Wilhelm Hirsch, circular to the Landschaftsanwälte, F1a, 30/10/1943, p. 4, EAS.}{1103}

The circulars of the group were sometimes drenched in a pathos of comradeship, evoking the 'deepening of inner values' confronted with the threats of the 'grave
times, which decide over the fate of the German people', as Hübotter put it in his Christmas letter of 1943. Mattern's usually so jocular friend invoked 'something beautiful and precious': 'the certainty of the great German volk's community'.\textsuperscript{1104} By this he also specifically addressed the bond between the Landscape Advocates, who fought for the fatherland by providing their skills in camouflaging, strategic analysis of aerial photographs, or the supervision of crop production: 'It makes me very happy that I am able to send you the blue candle this year again. Take it as a symbol of our comradeship'.\textsuperscript{1105} The Christmas ritual of lighting a blue candle surely referred to the Wandervogel symbolism of the blue flower, as the shared Wandervogel experiences of their youth was crucial for the bond between the Landscape Advocates.\textsuperscript{1106} They also helped colleagues in distress, as in the case of Reinhold Tüxen, when his home was bombed. The renowned Botanist had issued a letter asking for help, listing things he wished to receive, which caused Hübotter to appeal: 'I ask all comrades to please quickly fulfil their duty'.\textsuperscript{1107}

Heinrich quotes selected, sometimes spine-chilling lines from letters in her private possession. These show how busy Mattern was, and how much he was travelling: between the Baltics and Belarus (Generalbezirk Weißruthenien) in the newly created Reich Commissariat Ostland, and even into the parts of Russia that were under German military jurisdiction, in the East, and the French Atlantic coast in

\textsuperscript{1104} Letter from Hübotter to the \textit{Landschaftsanwälte}, attached to the circular of the \textit{Landschaftsanwälte}, Fla, 19/12/1943, EAS.

\textsuperscript{1105} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{1107} letter by Hübotter to the \textit{Landschaftsanwälte}, attached to the circular of the \textit{Landschaftsanwälte}, Fla, 19/12/1943, EAS.
the West.\textsuperscript{1108} Just a mere list of names of the places mentioned is impressive, and considering this was the 1940s, some of them invoke images of war and destruction. His letters came from Prague (several), formerly Polish territories in East Prussia, Narva in occupied Estonia (August 1942), and even Novgorod (July 1942). He reported from extensive trips through France (listing cities he passed through: Cherbourg, St. Malo, Brest, Lorient, St. Nazaire, Nantes, Angers, Tours, Chartres, later Marseille and St. Gilles are mentioned), and in this context it has been claimed that it is thanks to Mattern that the traditional but discontinued rice cultivation in the French region of Provence was revived.\textsuperscript{1109} More places appearing in Mattern’s letters are Paris, Hamburg and Kiel – where he occasionally collaborated with a local architect on town planning projects and received commissions from the Naval Planning Department (Marine-Bauamt)\textsuperscript{1110}, Prague, Riga, where he was busy working on the garden at the private residence of the Reich Commissioner Hinrich Lohse (he wrote to his wife how he enjoyed watching the ballet ‘Don Quixote’, sitting in the official’s exclusive loge at the Riga theatre). At some stage, after a visit by Mattern, Seifert expressed concern that the younger might burn himself out, warning him not to risk ‘everything that you have built up within the O.T.’.\textsuperscript{1111} One time he wrote from Pleskau (today Pskow, Russia), reporting about forced rehousing of poor farmers.\textsuperscript{1112} Over the years – the latest is documented for 1944 – he also held lectures, for example about settlement and allotment gardens, at the Plassenburg

\textsuperscript{1108} See: V. Heinrich, \textit{Hermann Mattern} (2013), pp. 52–6. Heinrich was handed these letters by Mattern’s widow.

\textsuperscript{1109} V. Heinrich, \textit{Hermann Mattern} (2013), pp. 59–60; EHM, letter Mattern to Zirkel, 26/10/1965. Heinrich refers to a lecture by Mattern about this topic, to accounts by Beate Maltusch, and to the letter at the estate. A letter in the Mattern estate seems to corroborate this story.

\textsuperscript{1110} V. Heinrich, \textit{Hermann Mattern} (2013), pp. 53, 58.

\textsuperscript{1111} Letter from Seifert to Mattern, Flb/137, 13/12/1943, EAS.

Reich School of German Technology. His letter head usually bore the business address at Bornim, although he must often have visited his wife and daughter on the little farm at Graimharting. He also occasionally visited Seifert at Munich, or he joined him, together with his wife, in excursions Seifert undertook with his university students.

His letters, despite the risk this meant, showed occasional signs of remorse:

'Today I had to resettle Russian farmers from our building site. [...] They are attached to their neighbourhood and their piece of land just like us and all other Europeans'. Naturally most of his communication had to consider interception by the censors. Yet some risky lines can be found, signs that he made an effort to keep at least a minimum of independence:

The excitement arising around me doesn't concern me, as here, too, I have retained my independence towards all sides. That is not an easy thing, as a man not under orders is unimaginable for all the others around here.

1113 Letter by Mattem to Seifert, Flb/137, 08/07/1944, EAS; Letter from Mattem to Schulte-Frohlinde (duplicate), 04/07/1944, EAS. In 1939 Seifert had written to Wiepking: 'If I want to let Mattern speak about settlement gardens then because he understood particularly well to cooperate with settlers and allotment gardeners. The Reich Association of Allotment Gardeners has spoke out strongly in favour of Mattern's work [...] ('Wenn ich Mattern über Siedlungsgärten sprechen lassen möchte, so deswegen, weil er es ganz besonders verstanden hat mit Siedlern und Kleingärtnern zusammen zu arbeiten. Der Reichsverband der Kleingärtner hat sich sehr für Matterns Arbeit ausgesprochen [...]') See: Letter from Seifert to Wiepking, dep. 72b, no. 17, 24/09/1939, p. 5, EHW.

1114 Letter by Mattem to Seifert, Flb/137 08/07/1944, EAS.


1116 'Die Aufregungen, die um mich herum entstehen, berühren mich nicht, da ich auch hier mir meine Selbständigkeit nach allen Seiten bewahrt habe. Leicht ist das nicht, denn ein Mann ohne Kommando hier ist für alle anderen unvorstellbar.' Ibid.
In a grim warning, with which he clearly risked being charged with ‘subversion of the war effort’, he meant to prepare his hard-working wife about things to come:

Again I have seen entirely and radically destroyed cities – by air raid – in which no man can live any more – I fear that there is much, much more in store for our cities than there has been up to now.1117

II.j Atmosphere of departure and disillusionment: Post-war art and life

Silently the soaring ruins stare at us, not as if they had collapsed in the din of explosions, but as if they had slumped down from an internal cause. Can we, do we want to rebuild all this cruel unmasked machinery of our engineered existence [...]? No, says the inner voice.

(Otto Bartning, 1947)\footnote{8}

After the war was over, Mattern tried to secure his belongings still at Bornim and retreated into his old farm house south-east of Munich.\footnote{9} Disillusioned, for a short while it looked as though nothing could entice him away from the place that had already served as a peaceful retreat during the awkward years past. Destruction and the loss of dear friends caused him much grief. Schlemmer’s tragic end in 1943 will not have left Mattern cold. Then his brother in law Henner Röse, born 1911, fell in 1945.\footnote{10} The same year came the notice of the death of Mattern’s oldest friend, the younger Bogler brother, who had died in a field hospital in Austria. Yet Mattern had a rather privileged position around the time of the Zusammenbruch. Neither of his houses was affected by bombing. At Graimharting, during the last years of the war, he had even retained the capacity to provide refugees with lodging.\footnote{11} Contacts were sought to hear


\footnote{10}Dictionary of Monographs, ed. by Paul Pfister (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995), p. 1013

if friends were well off. In late 1946, Ferdinand Möller wrote to Foerster at Bornim from his summer house at nearby Zermützel:

From the Matterns we recently received a lengthy letter. He dedicates himself wholeheartedly to agriculture and is regaining his strengths. There will be enough to do for all of us here, once the waters have cleared.¹¹²²

Soon the sorrows stepped into the background as all were confronted with such urgent work. In 1946, the Deutsche Werkbund was re-established at Berlin, and amongst others Scharoun, Lingner and Mattern were strongly involved; meeting protocols document that Mattern insistently demanded a better consideration of landscape-related matters in future planning legislation.¹¹²³ Mattern was very active in the Werkbund during the early 1950s, heading the northern Hessian section (his colleagues at the Werkakademie Kassel Hans Leistikow and Stefan Hirzel representing the rest of Hesse) and becoming one of 36 members of the German Design Council (Rat für Formgebung) in 1952, a foundation established for the promotion of the ‘good form’.¹¹²⁴ Mattern’s skills were needed, especially as he was considered politically unburdened. It would have seemed uncharacteristic for Mattern to miss the professional opportunities the reconstruction offered an experienced planner like him. After an initial two-year period of contemplation, activities began.

¹¹²² ‘Von Matterns haben wir kürzlich einen längeren Brief. Er steht mit beiden Beinen in der Landwirtschaft und sammelt neue Kräfte. Es wird hier für uns alle reichlich zu tun geben, wenn sich die Wässer einmal geklärt haben [...]’. Letter by Ferdinand Möller to Karl Foerster (05/11/1946), Dok 773, Ferdinand Möller Archive at the Berlinische Galerie.


Very soon he activated a design studio in his brother’s timber mill in Hofgeismar.\textsuperscript{1125} Here, he also had to take over the administration during the time of his brother’s denazification procedure.\textsuperscript{1126} By coincidence he got to know the artist Arnold Bode, who lived nearby. Soon, the idea was born to join forces to re-establish the Kassel art academy. Actually, amongst the first planning and design commissions after the war – buildings included – three projects are already listed for the year 1945. A quick list of key dates shows the activism Mattern was caught in within two to three years:

1947: The joint venture Foerster-Mattern-Hammerbacher was invited to deliver a concept for the garden show to be held at Erfurt, and Mattern travelled there with Walter Funcke to examine the site.\textsuperscript{1127} The only rival in this competition was Gustav Allinger.\textsuperscript{1128} Foerster-Mattern-Hammerbacher delegated the project to Funcke, who chose to stay in East Germany.\textsuperscript{1129}

1948: the Werkakademie Kassel was opened under Mattern’s involvement, later as a professor. Beside this, he had already fourteen projects to work on, although they partly remained non-realised concepts (Figures 193, 194). Apart from this, Mattern started working on a unique project: the designing of the entirely new settlement Hinrichssegen at the Mangfall river near Rosenheim. Everything, from the general layout of the streets

\textsuperscript{1125} Klaus Vondermühl, personal communication, 02/03/2012.

\textsuperscript{1126} V. Heinrich, Hermann Mattern (2013), p. 64.

\textsuperscript{1127} V. Heinrich, Hermann Mattern (2013), p. 64. According to Heinrich, at Mattern’s advice a site below the Cyriaksburg citadel was chosen instead of the initially considered inner-city area (ibid.).


\textsuperscript{1129} Ibid. The actual garden show, the ‘International Horticultural Exhibition of the Socialist Countries’, was only held in 1961, eventually designed by Lingner. See: text by Dr. Rüdiger Paul Kirsten as part of the online documentation ‘100 Jahre Landschaftsarchitektur’, on the occasion of the centennial of the Bund Deutscher LandschaftsArchiteken (Association of German Landscape Architects, BDLA), http://100-jahre-landschaftsarchitektur.de/ausstellung/epoche-4 (entry year 1961 1. Internationale Gartenbauausstellung sozialistischer Länder in Erfurt’, accessed 14/04/2014).
and the arrangement of buildings in relation to the river, to the architectural details, including parts of the interior, was defined by him (Figures 195, 196). Also, Hubert Hoffman started his initiative to re-establish the Bauhaus Dessau, for which Mattern was foreseen as a key player.

1949: Mattern was appointed by the Vorbereitender Ausschuß für die Einrichtung der Stadt Bonn als provisorisches Regierungszentrum ('Preparatory Committee for the Constitution of the City of Bonn as Provisional Centre of Government') to form a planning consortium together with the architects Hans Schwippert (1899–1973) and Otto Ernst Schweizer (1890–1965). Out of this task arose several commissions for gardens attached to governmental offices such as the Federal President's residence (Palais Schaumburg), the Federal Chancellor's residence (Villa Hammerschmidt), and the Bundeshaus, the new parliament building (Figures 197a+b). Also first drawings for the Federal Garden Show at Kassel 1955, including a sketch for a future theatre, can be found in the archive (Fig. 198, cf. 193, 194).

Looking at his projects listed in the literature, it becomes clear that in 1948 the offers really started pouring in. Naturally, pure numbers are not very telling, as of course the commission for a tiny cemetery chapel cannot be compared to the project for a national garden show (Stuttgart 1950, Kassel 1955) or a settlement project for many multi-storey residential buildings (Fig. 199). However, even considering this, the sheer number of projects is impressive. Into the third year after the downfall of the Hitler regime, Mattern was one of the most demanded landscape architects in Germany. If we start counting in 1948, Mattern was working on an average number of 26 projects per year, with a peak in 1950 (47 projects) due to an unusually high number of 17 housing estates. The Deutsche Gartenschau Stuttgart (German Garden Show) at the

1130 E.g.: New town and cloth mill Hinrichssegan at Bruckmühl (1945–53); Competition for the reconstruction of the city centre of Wiesbaden, together with Paul Bode (1948–49); a housing scheme for officers, Siegen (1949–50); a housing scheme at Wuppertal-Barmen, together with his brother Erich Mattern, architect (1949–50), and several private gardens, manors and cemetery schemes. Cf. the. Mattern inventory, AMTUB.
Killesbergpark, which had been reconstructed by Mattern and his team in a record time of only four months, was also opened that year (Fig. 200a+b). Besides the projects in the context of the constitution of the federal capital city Bonn, and the many projects originating in the dramatic shortage of housing space – i.e. the planning and greening of housing estates –, there was a specific project category that kept Mattern busy over the years: Aussiedlerhöfe, farmsteads for the resettlement of farmers out of inner-city locations and for colonisers who had to leave the lost territories east of the new eastern border that had been defined during the Potsdam Conference in the summer of 1945 (Fig. 201). Many millions of Pomeranians, East and West Prussians, and Silesians came to the new Germany. The new farmsteads were planned under the caption ‘Inner Colonisation’, which described a programme with a history that reached back at least to Prussian policies of the mid-nineteenth century. It should be noted that designing buildings – in addition to deciding on their integration into the landscape – is a task well beyond the usual capabilities of a landscape architect. Despite not having a degree in architecture, Mattern was a chartered ‘Architekt BDA’ registered with the Bund Deutscher Architekten, the national institute of architects. His interest in architecture and related fields also caused suspicion amongst the more horticulturally oriented colleagues, where he was at times perceived as a ‘wannabe architect’. This was indeed brought up against him when he was discussed as a successor to Allinger on the professorial chair at Berlin ten years later: in a letter to Allinger, Konrad Glockner, head of the Dortmund garden department, called Mattern egocentric and leaning towards architecture, citing as negative evidence Mattern’s membership with the BDA instead of the Bund Deutscher Gartenarchitekten, the landscape architects’ professional body.

For the German Garden Show 1950 Mattern published the accompanying book Die Wohnlandschaft (‘The Dwelling Landscape’ or ‘Landscape for Living’), which

1132 Letter from Glockner to Allinger, 12/01/1961, EGA.
contained a collection of essays by different authors like the writer on art Stefan Hirzel, the journalist Walter Kiaulehn, Alwin Seifert, the architect Hans Schwippert, Max K. Schwarz and Otto Valentien, as well as one of Mattern’s most noteworthy texts. Here he positioned himself firmly opposed to a merely preservative nature conservation and exposed his provocative ideas of a landscape for living:

Biological coherencies in the landscape always relate to humankind, and they are also assessed exclusively by man in reference to their effects on man himself.\textsuperscript{1133}

The rationalism and at the same time abstractness of its key message was not congruent with the mainstream; obviously not within the sphere of nature conservation but neither within the landscape architecture profession. The photo on the book’s sleeve featured a view onto an intensely settled landscape; the fact that it was framed by branches of \textit{Rhus typhina}, a neophyte and fashionable garden tree, and not by oaks or linden, can almost be taken as a political statement (Fig. 202).\textsuperscript{1134} Ironically, the photo was taken at the Reich Garden Show and had already been published, for example accompanying the Killesberg critiques of 1940 in \textit{Gartenkunst}.

One more achievement of Mattern’s, which is not further documented but needs to be mentioned for its significance, is the foundation of the today forgotten but once important journal, \textit{Pflanze und Garten}. It appeared between 1951 and 1970, when it was united with \textit{Gartenpost} to become \textit{grün}, and it contained many articles by Mattern, his wife, his friends and like-minded personalities. These dealt with a wide scope of topics


\textsuperscript{1134} The photo, taken by the renowned photographer Willi Moegle, actually shows a scene from 1939, as it is included in: \textit{Das Erlebnis einer Landschaft: Ein Bildbericht von der Reichsgartenschau Stuttgart 1939}, ed. by Erich Schlenker, (Nürnberg: Georg Michel, 1939), p. 46.
though essentially concentrating on the classical field of garden design, Mattern's own article headlines already tell how the rise of Sociology and Social Science found expression in his own evolving perspective.\textsuperscript{1135} \textit{Pflanze und Garten} is also a rich source for descriptions of Mattern's projects by the artist himself, as well as being proof of his ethical-ideological sense.\textsuperscript{1136}

\textbf{Horticulture as basis of a reestablished Bauhaus: intermezzo at Dessau}

We have learned in chapter II-d that the Bauhaus and modern art played an important role for Mattern personally. But there were further incidents, as yet merely registered as historical footnote, which are of significance for the entire profession of landscape architecture in Germany. These incidents relate to the intention of former Bauhaus student Hubert Hoffmann (1904–1999) and his efforts soon after the war to re-establish a post-war Bauhaus at Dessau. Hoffmann, a friend of Mattern's from the days when they had been neighbours in Berlin-Zehlendorf in the early 1930s, formed a planning consortium to direct these activities.

Every week there were public discussions about culture, city planning, and political questions. We organised exhibitions and contests to interest the population of Dessau in our undertaking. Scharoun and Mächler, Mertens, Mattern and Funke [sic], Bruno Paul, Kurt Lähs, and others came to Dessau to discuss the question of revival and continuation of the Bauhaus.\textsuperscript{1137}

\textsuperscript{1135} E.g.: 'Die Schule und ihre Freiflächen' ('The school and its open spaces'), 07 (1952), 16–18; 'Die zeitgemäßen Schrebergärten' ('The modern type of the allotment garden'), 09 (1959), 231–232; 'Aktive Gärten beim sozialen Wohnungsbau' ('Active gardens in social housing projects'), 04 (1965), 126–127.

\textsuperscript{1136} For example when he wrote an obituary about Lesser, who had fled the Nazis: Hermann Mattern, 'Erinnerung an Ludwig Lesser', 03 (1958) 3.

In reference to the former head of the Bauhaus Hannes Meyer’s concepts, Hoffmann strove to upgrade his former teacher’s biological bias and to implement ecology as ‘a basic attitude’ for the teachings – a foresighted decision from today’s perspective. The foundation course (Vorkurs) Hoffmann wanted ‘to consist of the major part of a horticultural training course [...]’.\textsuperscript{1138} The entire project was strongly backed by the reinstated mayor of Dessau, the liberal Fritz Hesse. He had already been in this post from 1918 to 1933 and in 1925 had invited the Bauhaus to move from Weimar – where it was no longer welcome – to Dessau. After one year in office in 1946 however he was replaced by a member of the \textit{Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands} (SED, Socialist Unity Party of Germany) who had won the local elections, and the entire undertaking had to be stopped due to the new mayor’s politics and the authorities’ drop of support. For a while Hoffmann and his allies continued with their efforts, but the next mayor, a former cashier, was even more difficult to deal with, so that Hoffmann finally left Dessau at the end of 1947.\textsuperscript{1139}

The bauhaus anecdote of 1945–1947 is consciously overemphasised here, as, despite its lack of consequences, it clearly represents an important detail for the profession as well as for Mattern’s biography: it illustrates both the risen general importance of landscape architecture and Mattern’s association with the bauhaus circles. Hoffmann had suggested ‘Mattern as head of the future Bauhaus’ and ‘his employee [Walter] Funke was to take over the municipal gardening office’.\textsuperscript{1140} Hesse had ‘provided Groß-

\begin{itemize}
\item Gropius, Hilring and other Modernists, did not use capital letters except for the beginning of sentences.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{1138} Hubert Hoffmann, \textit{Ökologie als Schwerpunkt der Bauhauslehre}, unpublished manuskript, dated 1948, Hof-01–85, Hubert Hoffmann Archive, Baukunstarchiv der Akademie der Künste Berlin.


Kühnau Castle, situated in a geographically [landschaftlich] predestined location, for a horticultural workshop and a botanically enriched foundation course.\textsuperscript{1141} Hoffmann and Hesse did not agree on Mattern, so that nobody was officially announced as the head of the school.\textsuperscript{1142} In an undated typewriter manuscript, with handwritten amendments, Mattern and Rossow are listed as 'guest teachers', after being at first listed in the column for 'teachers for minor subjects'.\textsuperscript{1143} Walter Funcke was to teach in a full-time position for open space planning, plant science and landscape design (‘Grünplanung’, ‘Pflanzenkunde’, ‘Landschaftsgestaltung’), and Kurt Lorenzen as teacher responsible for the 'Horticultural Workshop' (‘Gartenbauwerkstatt’).\textsuperscript{1144} Funcke was also member of the ‘Planungsgemeinschaft Bauhaus’ (‘Bauhaus Planning Consortium’), a half-institutional office that was to form the school as an institution together with the workshops, which were to be established in eight educational fields: building, wood and metal, colour (paint), textiles, printing, pottery, and garden and landscape.\textsuperscript{1145} By January 1946 six of these were already in operation.\textsuperscript{1146} The fact that all the landscape architects involved can be counted amongst Mattern's friends may serve as another indirect attestation of Mattern's association with a certain faction of the modernist avant-garde. Noteworthy is the fact that Hoffmann's plan had striking analogy with the concept for the Werkakademie Kassel, and that both school projects, at Dessau and at Kassel, anticipated the ecological

\textsuperscript{1141} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{1142} S. Simon, ‘Der Versuch der Wiedereröffnung’, in ...das Bauhaus zerstört, (1996), pp. 8–33 (18).

\textsuperscript{1143} The names had been obviously erased and written into the other column, see the reproduction of the document in: S. Simon, ‘Der Versuch der Wiedereröffnung’, in ...das Bauhaus zerstört, (1996), pp. 8–33 (19) (Original document in the Hubert Hoffmann Archive at the Akademie der Künste Berlin).

\textsuperscript{1144} Ibid.


aspirations of today’s Bauhaus Dessau Foundation. How often Mattern was actually physically present at meetings or involved in the preparations is unknown, but at least Funcke was present at Dessau. The Bauhaus Planning Consortium’s defeat in the face of the political circumstances did not put an end to the idea to re-establish a school oriented towards Bauhaus concepts:

When our efforts in the east proved to no avail, we started our endeavours in the west: hassenpflug in hamburg, mattern in kassel, the berlin bauhaus members at the hochschule für bildende künste; max bill and inge scholl in ulm. All of them tried to convert the traditional schools into institutes according to the principles of the bauhaus [...]. Each of them had to make numerous compromises or was only partly successful. [...] It seems to me that the framework set up by the masters will be valid for a long time.1148

In the public perception, and more or less officially, Ulm finally was to host a new Bauhaus, the famous Hochschule für Gestaltung (HfG). At the alternative location, Kassel, the – nonetheless obvious – connection with the Bauhaus idea was much less advertised than at Ulm.1149

**A new Bauhaus: the foundation of the Werkakademie Kassel**

All the same, Kassel with the interrupted history of its Kunstakademie was to become the place for a new kind of art academy. Members of the Werkbund and like-minded people had formed a group occupying themselves with plans for a new beginning in Kassel, a city with a remarkable historic legacy. The former capital of the historical German state of Hesse-Nassau, an opponent to Prussia in the Holy Roman Empire of

---


the German Nation, rich in cultural heritage — including one of Europe’s most impressive Baroque ensembles, the castle and mountain park of Wilhelmshöhe and the Karlsaue Park with its Orangery at the river Fulda beneath the city — had almost been eradicated in the heavy bombings of 1943. Mattern, who had grown up in Hofgeismar, some 20 km north of Kassel, held a strong connection to this region.

Mattern’s life-long close friend and colleague Gottfried Kühn, in an article on the occasion of Mattern’s sixty-fifth birthday, remembered that the founding of the Werkakademie was a consequence of an apparently coincidental meeting of Mattern with Arnold Bode and Ernst Röttger in a shack in Grebenstein, a small town between Hofgeismar and Kassel, in search of drawing paper. As the first lecturers at the school Kühn named Stefan Hirzel (1899–1970), Heinrich Lauterbach (1893–1973), a sculptor and architect and former student of Hans Poelzig’s at Breslau who had founded the Silesian representation of the Werkbund in 1926, the graphic artist Hans Leistikow (1880–1962), who had been active in Frankfurt in the 1920s under Ernst May, and Kai Uebel, also named are the artist Arnold Bode (1900–1977) and the art educator Ernst Röttger (1899–1968).

In 1947 the Werkakademie started in former military barracks near the landmark castle and baroque park of Wilhelmshöhe. It took up a thread that had been cut in 1931: within the framework of the austerity measures introduced by chancellor Heinrich

---


1152 Gustav Lange, personal communication, 14/01/2008
Brüning Kassel’s art academy – like the schools at Breslau and Königsberg – had been closed. Kassel and Breslau had counted amongst the most progressive institutions of this kind.1153 Mattern, with his Bauhaus experience and his personal connections to many of the teachers of the Breslau art academy (Lauterbach, Moll, Poelzig, Scharoun, and Schlemmer), felt part of this reformist tradition in art and design education.1154 As he optimistically wrote to Martin Wagner in 1950, Mattern was able to engage Lauterbach and probably Hirzel, too, as he knew him through the exhibition of Mattern’s work in 1941 at the Protestant Church’s Art Service, which Hirzel had been chairing.1155 A typewritten reference page in Mattern’s university estate states the date 1st February 1950 as beginning of his contract with the Werkakademie, State College of Art, but he was in fact teaching much earlier, without an official professorial post.1156

For the Werkakademie ‘concepts for an art college [could be developed], which [were] largely independent from the international political constellation of the Cold War’, as, in contrast to Ulm – the location for the “official” successor to the Bauhaus school –, Kassel had ‘no great importance for the west-integration promoted by the Allied [Forces]’.1157 Also, with its closure in 1931, there was no possibility of a


1156 Typewriter-written document, EHM, folder 1 (no date, no file no. as viewed before the estate’s systematisation).

doubtful continuity in regard to the ‘Third Reich’; during the Nazi reign the academy simply had not existed. Thus an officially untainted, completely new beginning was possible.\textsuperscript{1158} Ironically, and for a long time this was not known, Matter had collected some of his first didactic experiences as lecturer at a prestigious National-Socialist training camp, which at least some of his colleagues must have been informed of.\textsuperscript{1159}

The Werkakademie holds a certain importance in historiography of German post-war design education, even though it is not often mentioned in the literature on the post-war continuity of the Bauhaus idea.\textsuperscript{1160} At least Hoffmann wrote 1953 in \textit{Baukunst und Werkform} that, beside the Landeskunstschule Hamburg, with the former Bauhaus member Gustav Hassenpflug as headmaster, the HfG in Ulm and the Werkakademie Kassel were the three most obvious art colleges created in the spirit of the Bauhaus, and all were struggling with a lack of public support. These three schools nourished his hopes that the original Bauhaus idea might regain its strength.\textsuperscript{1161} This did not, as is often wrongly understood, refer to common formal characteristics of the works produced at the school, but to the educational concepts, the working ethics and the learning conditions which the Bauhaus stood for. The so-called International Style – as promoted by Henry Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson – is frequently mistaken for “the Bauhaus style”, which in reality never existed; it has become widely known that at the Bauhaus – especially in its early period in Weimar – a stylistic open-mindedness and

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{1158} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{1159} He had held lectures at the Plassenburg, the Reich School of German Technology, during the times of the war, see: EHW, letter Seifert to Wiepking (DEP. 72b, Nr. 17), p. 5, 24/09/1939; EAS, letter Mattern to Seifert, F1a, 08/07/1944.
\item \textsuperscript{1160} E.g., in Christian Grohn’s \textit{Die Bauhaus-Idee: Entwurf, Weiterführung, Rezeption} (Berlin: Mann, 1991), a key reference for this topic, the Werkakademie is only mentioned in passing, while the competing \textit{Werkkunstschule}, a type of art college on the level of a polytechnic school, is dealt with in great depth.
\item \textsuperscript{1161} Hubert Hoffmann, ‘Das historische Bauhaus: Eine Darstellung seiner Idee und Geschichte 1919–1933’, \textit{Baukunst und Werkform}, 10, 11 (1953), 564–70 (570).
\end{enumerate}
a freedom concerning the creative process prevailed.\textsuperscript{1162} This ‘tolerance and amplitude of thinking’ and a mental flexibility was also attributed to Mattern by former students as one of his most typical characteristics; he taught his students according to the principle ‘to maintain an inner agility and to foster it if one has it’.\textsuperscript{1163}

In 1951 the Werkakademie published a brochure with the title \textit{The ABC of the Werkakademie Kassel} (Figures 203, 204). This booklet was in fact a kind of manifesto. In regard to architecture, for example, it claimed that the student, coming to Kassel after a technical education at a different school,

\begin{quote}
'[h]ere [...] will gain awareness about the fact that building, painting, form-giving are congenial design forces, which only jointly accomplish the “work”'.\textsuperscript{1164}
\end{quote}

The foundation of the school also received considerable attention in the journals. In an article in \textit{Baukunst und Werkform} it was explained that ‘Architects, usually educated above all in technical knowledge’, according to the aims of the Werkakademie, ‘already with their initial central theme [should] imagine an environment of a different kind, neither a somehow stylistically organised, nor a disorderly technoid world’.\textsuperscript{1165} Both stylistic doctrine and extreme technicist rationalism were rejected. Following the paragraphs speaking about the education of


\textsuperscript{1163} Raimund Harms, a former student of Mattern’s and friend of his family, in a personal communication, 26/02/2007.


architects, under Professor Lauterbach, Mattern's department was introduced. His course was presented as 'the most important enhancement of [the school's] architectural objectives'. Mattern's teaching, the article claimed, clarified the character of the aims that the school of architecture had. At the Werkakademie for the first time in Germany landscape architecture stood side by side as equal with the other arts – something, as Mattern proudly pointed out later, that had already been demanded about two centuries ago by the eminent garden theoretician Christian Cay Lorenz Hirschfeld (1742–1792).

At the Werkakademie there was one semester of Vorlehre (foundation course), obligatory for all students after an initial admission examination, and this explicitly drew a connection to the Bauhaus, where the Vorlehre had been an intrinsic part of the educational concept (Figures 205, 206). All students of all the different courses were attending this course together: architects, art teachers, graphic artists, landscape architects, and painters. The teachers at the Werkakademie were anxious to take up the development that was cut by the Nazi regime when it closed the Bauhaus under Mies van der Rohe in 1933, although they also said that it made no sense to just continue where it had stopped; the search for a modern style was definitely over. A central aim of the Werkakademie was to achieve cognition (Erkenntnis) through experience (Praxis). It was the aspiration of the teaching staff to 'impart skills as a preparation for true art', as art per se was considered not to be teachable; a central paradigm of the art school reform of the early 20th century and an essence of the idea of the Bauhaus.

In this context, it suggests itself to draw a connection to Mattern's own experience with

1166 Ibid.
1168 Das ABC, ed. by. Werkakademie Kassel (1951), p. 3.
his teacher Faust during his Hofgeismar school days. The variety of methods cultivated at the Werkakademie and the freedom from stylistic guidelines still appear modern today. For such pedagogical principles Mattern would be known amongst his students at Kassel and later, when he held the professorial chair at Berlin.

As Hoffmann's quote above already implied, the Werkakademie also had to deal with opposition. A draft appeal for support in case of a probable future 'threat' exists that is annotated with a list of names, amongst which are Hübotter, the architects Werner Hebebrand, Rudolf Hillebrecht and Scharoun, one of the Thonet brothers and the expressionist artist Theodor Werner.1171 This way a network was established, that would be informed regularly about the school's work. Impressive for the 1950s is also the international list of 'constant working contacts and student exchange programs' of Mattern's course: apart from the German schools at Munich (Prof. Walter Schreiber), Hanover (Prof. Werner Lendholt) and Berlin (Hammerbacher at the University of Technology and Walter Rossow at the Academy of Fine Arts), Mattern lists the following institutions and personalities: Wageningen (Prof. Bijhouwer), the Dutch Rijkswaterstaat-Directie Landaanwinning-Lauwerszeewerken at Leeuwaren (Jan J. Pilen), the Brussels Art Academy (René Pechère), the Copenhagen Art Academy (C. Th. Sørensen), the college at Alnap in Sweden (Count Sven A. Hermelin and Per Friberg), Pennsylvania Institute of Technology (Prof. Ian McIlarg and Prof. Linn), Kyoto University's Department of Forestry (Prof. Dr. A. Okasaki), Israel's State Architect Ariel Sharon at Tel Aviv, the University of Berkeley (Prof. Dr. Herwin Schaefer), the municipal Garden Directorate of Kairo (Garden Director C. Ismail), and the University of Sheffield (Prof. Bird).1172 This network would be kept up and extended further when Mattern moved chairs to the Berlin University of Technology in 1961.

1171 Judging by the style of the handwriting, the names are written down by Mattern (without inv. no.), EHM.

1172 Undated typoscript 'Abteilung Landschaftskultur an der Staatlichen Hochschule für bildende Künste (Werkakademie) Kassel.', Ma 62, EHM.
Taking up the Weimar thread: the birth of the documenta

During the ‘Third Reich’, the curtain covering Schlemmer’s wall painting in Mattern’s house from suspicious neighbours’ eyes must have been a humiliation. The Nazis’ dictatorship of taste must have been hard to bare for a connoisseur like Mattern. Now that it had fallen, he also publicly reconnected with modernist art. For example, a four-page manuscript for a lecture he held in 1953 at Kassel’s Art Club illustrates Mattern’s commitment. It may be a coincidence that until 1955 the most significant solo exhibitions the Art Club showed were names familiar from Mattern’s biography: Oskar Moll (1951), Otto Pankok (1952), Frans Masereel (1953), Gerhard Marcks (1953) and Adolf Hoelzel (1954). All were artists Mattern revered since his youth, owned works by, or was connected with in some way, Hoelzel being Schlemmer’s influential teacher at the Stuttgart Art Academy. Mattern’s interest led to his initiative to combine the Garden Show held in Kassel in 1955 with a major art exhibition of formerly ostracised works, which eventually resulted in the establishment of the documenta.

The documenta art exhibition at Kassel, held every five (originally four) years, is one of the world’s major regular art events. In reference to its duration, and as it is not a selling exhibition, it is also called the ‘museum of 100 days’. Arnold Bode found his way into the history books as its initiator, and he was indeed the driving force behind the first three exhibitions (1955, 1959, 1964), as well as exerting some influence still on the fourth in 1968. However, to stage such an event had not been his idea in the first place. It has been claimed earlier, that Mattern had an important role as the idea generator for the documenta, but without stating very authoritative sources.

---


1175 V. Heinrich, Hermann Mattern (2013), pp. 147, 197. Her sources are Mattern’s own CV, which was published in Garten + Landschaft, 08 (1972), 350, and: Ursula zu Dohna, Philipp Schönborn, and Marianne zu Sayn-Wittgenstein-Sayn, Private Gartenkunst in Deutschland. Private gardens of
However, Mattern's crucial role is indeed documented and dealt with in a fundamental publication on the documenta's history, and it forms an organic part of his biography.\textsuperscript{1176}

Furthermore, documents in the Mattern estate prove Mattern's active involvement in the very first steps of organising the exhibition. This involvement actually redefines Mattern's cultural significance as reaching beyond the field of landscape architecture. He not only contributed to the shaping of the tangible modern landscape, but also dealt with the design of the cultural sphere, which then defined society and life in the Federal Republic. Seeing this, Mattern's interest in artistically motivated projects – for example the design of 'artful gardens' for art collectors like Daniel-Henri Kahnweiler (Saint Hilaire, 1955–58; Figures 207–209), Henke (Essen, 1953; Figures 210, 211), or Karl Ströher (Darmstadt 1957–60; Fig. 212) – gains a new meaning.\textsuperscript{1177}

For three centuries before the Prussian annexation in 1866, Kassel had been a small but prestigious princely residence.\textsuperscript{1178} After the Austro-Prussian war, in which the state of Hesse-Cassel had sided with Austria, it was incorporated into the Prussian province of Hesse-Nassau. In the following decades its former capital developed as a industrial town. It became a major home of the armaments industry, distinguished by its advantageous central location and its function as an important

\textit{Germany (Herford: Busse+Seewald, 1986).}


\textsuperscript{1177} 'An artful garden' ('Ein kunstvoller Garten') is the title of the article, in which Mattern resonated the garden of the art collector Karl Ströher at Darmstadt. It is a play on words, as literally \textit{kunstvoll} translates as 'full of art', which the Ströher garden as presentation space for sculptures literally was – equally so the Kahnweiler garden, with sculptures by Picasso and Henri Laurens. Cf.: Hermann Mattern, 'Ein kunstvoller Garten', \textit{Pflanze und Garten}, 4, (1960), 88–92; Beate Mattern, 'Garten eines Kunsthändlers in Paris', \textit{Pflanze und Garten}, 9, (1960), 231–3 (the latter is identical with a chapter in his book \textit{Gärten und Gartenlandschaften} published that year).

\textsuperscript{1178} All historical information in this paragraph is taken from: Harald Kimpel, \textit{documenta: Mythos und Wirklichkeit}, vol. 5 in the series 'Schriftenreihe des documenta-Archivs' (Köln: DuMont, 1997), pp. 94–95.
traffic hub and rail junction between Berlin and Frankfurt Main, between the Ruhr area and Leipzig. During the 1940s, it thus became a preferred focus for allied bombardments. In one night alone, 22 October 1943, Kassel lost 83 % of its residential architecture and 65 % of its industrial premises. Formerly a beautiful town in the geographical heart of Germany, the the course of history with its changing political conditions meant that a few years later Kassel found itself almost completely ravaged and cut off from its important hinterland, namely Thuringia, by the new frontier just 30 km away. In addition to the sweeping economic prostration, political offices were moved to Frankfurt, and Kassel from now on was associated with the very periphery of the new Federal Republic. Despite the many investment schemes and tax reliefs, the development of the town lagged behind for decades to come. Efforts to fight the downgrading included the failed application to become the new federal capital, *Bundeshauptstadt*, which was ridiculed as application for 'Budenhauptstadt' (capital of shacks).\footnote{The only serious competitor as alternative to Bonn was Frankfurt a.M., when the rivals Stuttgart and Kassel had already been knocked out, see: Jens Krüger, *Die Finanzierung der Bundeshauptstadt Bonn* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006) p.14; Harald Kimpel, *documenta: Mythos und Wirklichkeit*, series Schriftenreihe des documenta-Archivs, 5, (Köln: DuMont, 1997), p. 95.} The application to hold the second *Bundesgartenschau* (Federal Garden Show) in 1954, eventually postponed to 1955, in contrast was crowned with success. Similar events of this kind had been staged at Stuttgart, the German Garden Show 1950, at Hanover, where the first Bundesgartenschau had been held in 1951, and at Hamburg's Planten un Blomen park, the IGA 1953 (Internationale Gartenausstellung, International Garden Exhibition). With his distinct eagerness to experiment, Mattern in his function as chief landscape architect of the event at Kassel was keen on making this one unique.

Mattern was now the one with whom originated the impulse to link the Kassel prestige event with an art exhibition, which, when the plan was hailed by his colleagues at the Akademie –
first of all Bode – and was put in more concrete terms, was called ‘documenta’.\textsuperscript{1180}

The enthusiasm with which Mattern's idea was greeted has been explained by the fact that besides the exodus of political bodies and of capital, culturally, too, Kassel had suffered immense loss. The different reinstated art institutions were lacking space, as the war had damaged the major public buildings. For years only small exhibitions could be held in the surviving buildings, and important master pieces from the former state collections of Hesse-Cassel, now in the National Picture Gallery, had been transferred by the Allied Control Council to Vienna, from where they only returned in 1956, months after the Austrian State Treaty had become effective.\textsuperscript{1181}

Mattern and Bode, who got involved immediately, formed a group together with Herbert Freiherr von Buttlar, director of Kassel's Museum Fredericianum, and with three regional politicians with the aim of establishing an art exhibition of international calibre, initially named ‘\textit{Ausstellung und Aufführung Europäischer Kunst des XX. Jahrhunderts}’ (‘Exhibition and Performance of European Art of the 20\textsuperscript{th} Century’).\textsuperscript{1182} The working title was soon changed on the advice of Herwin Schaefer, a friend of Mattern's working as Cultural Affairs Officer for the US Foreign Service, who deemed it unwise to refer to European Art when the support of American institutions was sought.\textsuperscript{1183} Accordingly from then on it was referred to ‘Occidental art’. Schaefer immediately sought an involvement of the MoMA New York and the support of the American Foreign Service. The exhibits were to be


\textsuperscript{1182}See ‘\textit{Unterlagen zum Plan einer “Europäischen Kunstaustellung des 20. Jahrhunderts” während der Bundesgartenschau 1955}’, EHM. The signing persons were: Dr. Fritz Hoch (Regierungspräsident), Dr. Erich Lewinsky (Landgerichtspräsident), Prof. Arnold Bode, Prof. Hermann Mattern, Dr. Herbert Freiherr von Buttlar, Heinz Lemke (Member of Parliament).

\textsuperscript{1183}Letters from Schaefer to Mattern, 05/04/1954 and 26/04/1954, and letter Mattern to Schaefer, 14/04/1954, EHM.
proposed by an international jury of authorities in the field of modern art. Suggested at the early stage were Grothe (Nuremberg),\textsuperscript{1184} Schmidt (Bale, Switzerland),\textsuperscript{1185} Sandberg (Netherlands),\textsuperscript{1186} Read (UK),\textsuperscript{1187} Cassous (France),\textsuperscript{1188} Ponti (Italy),\textsuperscript{1189} and Herwin Schäfer ‘as connection to the USA’.\textsuperscript{1190}

Mattern probably pulled out of the planning of the \textit{documenta} at an advanced stage due to disagreements about the concept for the art exhibition, when the association preparing the exhibition ceased to exist. Through a letter from the social scientist and social democratic parliamentarian Ludwig Preller to Mattern these conflicts become clear. Basically, the original idea of presenting the different divisions of modern art in connection with each other, including the performance of contemporary music and theatre, had been abandoned. The involved personalities like Mattern and Preller wanted to try to take up the thread that had been cut so suddenly by the fascist regime. Preller described this original idea as crucial to communicate a true idea of modern art, and expressed his irritation at a concept letter written by other members of the group.\textsuperscript{1191}

Another hint at disagreements may lie in the process of choosing an indoor space for the presentation of art works. Mattern had come up with the rather outré idea to install a

\textsuperscript{1184} Probably the art historian Hans Wilhelm Karl Ludwig Grote (1893–1974).

\textsuperscript{1185} Probably the Swiss art historian Georg Schmidt (1896–1965).


\textsuperscript{1187} Probably the English art critic and poet Herbert Edward Read (1893–1968).

\textsuperscript{1188} Probably the French art historian and writer Jean Cassou (1897–1986).

\textsuperscript{1189} Probably the architect Gio Ponti (1891–1979).

\textsuperscript{1190} The architect Herwin Schaefer, a friend of the Mattern’s, who Mattern would later meet at Berkeley on the occasion of his lecture there in summer 1965, where Schaefer then held a professorship, V. Heinrich, \textit{Hermann Mattern} (2013), 330; Hermann Mattern, "The Growth of Landscape Consciousness", \textit{Landscape}, Spring (1966), 14–20 (the lecture in article form).

\textsuperscript{1191} Letters from Prof. Dr. L. Preller to Mattern, 16/04/1955, and from Preller to Lemke, 25/01/1955, EHM.
raft-mounted tent on the Küchengraben ('Kitchen Moat'), one of the Baroque canals in the low-lying park, while Bode, usually open to experimentation, opted for a safer solution and had prevailed with his idea of using the ruin of the Orangerie instead.\textsuperscript{1192} This has been seen as a definite break point for the initial friendship of the two creative spirits,\textsuperscript{1193} who would later be direct opponents in the occurrences surrounding the Kassel theatre project.

\textbf{The Karlsaue and State Theatre projects}

The planning of BUGA and documenta 1955 went parallel with a third major project Matern was involved in, and which went down in history for not being realised: the project for the Hessian State Theatre (1952–1954). It was one of the great events in post-war building, and Hans Scharoun and Matern won the competition jointly and were subsequently commissioned with the realisation. Their design was celebrated across the architectural factions. Even the conservative head of the jury, Paul Bonatz, who had not long before ridiculed Scharoun’s architectural approach, praised the integration of the architecture into the topographic situation.\textsuperscript{1194} The strength of Scharoun’s and Matern’s solution was how the projected building seemed to organically grow out of the difficult topographic conditions, negotiating the slope between the higher city and the lower Fulda meadows, the historical Karlsaue (Fig. 213). Then the site’s pitfalls in shape of underground fortifications, remains of the historical theater building destroyed in the war, caused the costs to rise unexpectedly. In an unnerving phase first the legibility of the construction plans was questioned, then the architects were declared incompetent.


The city then commissioned a local architect, Paul Bode, brother of Arnold Bode, who curiously had already prepared a project beforehand. The story made history as one of the biggest post-war building scandals in Germany. The final withdrawal of the commission is remembered until today and documented in many articles in the architectural as well as daily press. Colleagues wrote open letters in support of the competition winners, the sympathetic journalist Kiaulehn wrote articles from the designers' perspective in the *Münchener Merkur*, but to no avail. A smell of corruption surrounded the proceedings, which corroborated Kassel's repute as political province. One result was Bode's exclusion from the Werkbund for unfair conduct – a decision Mattern announced in an interview with the local press.

Had it been realised, the Kassel theatre would have been Scharoun's masterpiece. Mattern's contribution, however, is difficult to assess. Unusually, in this case the landscape architect was credited equal to the architect. Due to the contemporaneous realisation of his designs for the Karlsaue park and his childhood in the area, Mattern was very familiar with the terrain and its history. Beautiful sketches suggest that he advised Scharoun on several aspects. Most importantly, he analysed the characteristics of this part of the city, the Friedrichsplatz overlooking the Fulda meadows with its historical baroque park. Three axonometric drawings, coloured in as if intended for presentation, visualised how the Wilhelmine theatre building had blocked the historical landscape view (Figures 214–216 show the simpler black and white version of these visualisations) Not least since the Berlin philharmonic building (1960–63) that Scharoun designed became such an icon, also with regard to the acoustics and the internal program, it became clear what Kassel had lost.

1195 Walter Kiaulehn, 'Affäre Staatstheater vor Hessens Ministerrat', *Münchener Merkur*, no. 112, 11/05/1955 (?).

1196 Newspaper cutting (title/date not available), EHM.

For the Karlsaue park, on the occasion of the Federal Garden Show 1955, Mattern's greatest achievement was arguably the creation of an accessible 'Rose Slope' ("Rosenhang") where the rubble of the destroyed city had been disposed of over many years. With the help of dry stone walls and stairs he managed a stabilisation of the slope beneath Schöne Aussicht, between the city and the Fulda river (Figures 217–221). The greatest attention in 1955, however, received the amoeba-shaped (so Seifert's contemporary critique) flower beds, which appeared like they were encroaching the great Karls Meadow in front of the baroque ruins of the former Orangery castle (Figures 222–224). The typical Matternian love of experimentation also resulted in eccentric temporary architecture and equipment made from then en-vogue Eternit, and these unfamiliar shapes divided the minds – Seifert, for example, in his outspoken and witty review for *Baumeister* deplored the inflationary use of triangles were usually square shapes should used, and called the Mattern-designed planters – not for no reason – 'drugstore spoons' (Figures 225, 226). Generally speaking, the design made a great impression on the visitors of the contemporary documenta, prompting the German-born art dealer Daniel-Henri Kahnweiler, famous for his representation of Picasso, to enquire about who had created this great 'flower painting'. A commission for one of Mattern's most interesting garden projects followed: the Kahnweiler garden and Saint Hilaire, in the Essonne department south of Paris. Here, modern sculpture and garden art met to form a special unity, with the garden nonetheless keeping an independence as work of art in its own right, as zur Nedden explained in 1960.

---


1200 Hermann Mattern (with texts by Beate Mattern), *Gärten und Gartenlandschaften* (Stuttgart: Hatje, 1960), p. 56. The relevant pages about this project in that book were also published as: Beate Mattern, 'Garten eines Kunsthändlers in Paris', *Pflanze und Garten*, 9 (1960), 231–3.
Kahnweiler’s house was an exquisite rural mansion. Mattern complemented the elegant classicism of the house with an expressive Modernism in the garden. The premises consisted of several parts. One was a walled garden beyond the street, on a terrace five metres below the house. Here, Mattern designed a pattern of hammer-shaped brick paths, round flower beds and long-stretched clusters of higher perennial crossing these circles like lines in different directions (Fig. 209). The lower garden appeared to laid out as a picture to be looked at from the house. The large surfaces of the higher lying grounds – apart from the lawns – were ‘typically French gravel yards in modern form’.\textsuperscript{1199} The most intriguing aspects of the design lies in the rich textures and abstract, expressive shapes of the brick pavement that connected the different levels. In the courtyard was laid out with an almost expressionist vigour, seemingly organically grown (Figures 229, 230). Despite its graphic appearance it was also functional, tracing the most-used connection route from the gate and the chapel ruin to the house door. The the transition between gravel, brick edge and plant beds was typically Mattern (Fig. 227, cf. 207, 208). Behind the house, the brick formed into an edge for the gravel paths, morphing into a large, crescent-like shape that surrounded a tree (Fig. 231). Photos in books about Picasso’s plastic work show that later at the end of the shape a huge sculpture was placed.

This garden was not a \textit{Wohngarten}, and zur Nedden’s lyrical, haiku-like explanations published in the monograph on Mattern’s work of 1960, \textit{Gärten und Gartenlandschaften} explicitly listed what it was not supposed to be. At least the upper garden part above the street did ‘not invite’, it was ‘not a space of encounter’, and not even dedicated to ‘relationship with the other garden’ below.\textsuperscript{1200} Instead, it separated the gardens even more, by focussing on its own relation to a sculpture by Henri Laurens and on the facade of the house (Figures 207, 208). The text in \textit{Gärten}


und Gartenlandschaften claimed that a man like Kahnweiler, who was so knowledgeable about matters of art, was capable of grasping the ' [...] pictorial, graphic and plastic characteristics of a garden as part of its "architecture"'.\textsuperscript{1201} In the end, however, Mattern became disappointed: between his visits to the project, Kahnweiler changed parts of the design without consulting him. It seemed that the owner had his own ideas for the garden.

In Mattern's career the design marked a change towards stronger angularity and a less naturalist expression, although this could be interpreted as 'inorganic' naturalism, not a turning away from nature. The expressiveness of the forms was a reminder of two things: the fact that, for the Bornimers, 'life' was also in what Hammerbacher called 'crystalline nature' of the inanimate building materials, and Mattern's aspiration to explore a modern art of the garden.\textsuperscript{1202} The project represents also a very specific garden category: a private sculpture garden, designed with the placement of art works in mind. The main structures have survived and will hopefully be preserved as a unique example of mid-century modernist garden design.\textsuperscript{1203} Amongst Mattern's projects are at least three private sculpture gardens (Figures 210, 211, 212), which bear witness to the close contacts he had to the art world:\textsuperscript{1204}

\textsuperscript{1201} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{1203} The author visited Saint-Hilaire in 2006 and found the brick pavement largely intact.

\textsuperscript{1204} Cf. fn 1175.
The names Karl Foerster [...], Oskar Schlemmer and Walter Gropius at the Bauhaus, the architects Poelzig and Scharoun, the art dealers Ferdinand Möller and Henry D. Kahnweiler [sic] – all of them mentors and at the same time friends – hint at his preferred field and at the type of conversations that he felt inspired and challenged by.\textsuperscript{1205}

II. k The ‘landscape for dwelling’ and its limits of resilience

The landscape must become the law.\textsuperscript{1206}

(Walter Rossow, 1960)

Due to its wide context, a thorough exploration of Mattern’s ecological thinking and his idiosyncratic planning concepts would go beyond the constraints of the thesis. However, as ecological thinking of early 20\textsuperscript{th}-century reformism goes, it forms part of a holistic weltanschauung, and therefore cannot be omitted completely. Here, it will be dealt with in a summarised way that complements the biographical insights and its historical context of the postwar decades. To be sure, ecological thinking in general did not yet distinguish Mattern from the mainstream of professionals concerned with the impacts of industrial and technological development on a holistically perceived landscape. At least with regard of aesthetics, the publication by the Heimatschutz movement and those by the Association of German Engineer dealing with a landscape-friendly way of building with regard to the big infrastructure projects had made ‘broad segments of the educated middle class and the engineers’ conscious of the topic of landscape protection.\textsuperscript{1207} However, progressive were Mattern’s very personal notions of \textit{Heimat} and of a \textit{Wohnlandschaft}


('dwelling landscape' or 'landscape for living'). These dissociated him from the patriotic tradition in which ecological thinking in Germany developed.

**Landscape culture: nature conservation as creative occupation**

Already during the 1930s Mattern had been committed to cleaning up and redesigning industrial wastelands, for example connected to mines or to the autobahn project, or the exemplary project for garden show in the exhausted sandstone quarry at Stuttgart-Killesberg. But despite his commitment for the cause, not least as Landscape Advocate, Mattern did not come forward much with his own warnings about the destructive level of landscape consumption before the end of the regime. Afterwards, obviously it was less risky for him to stick his neck out on matters of public interest. For a while it looked as though his position gained a certain prominence, backed by his editorial involvement in publication projects like the series *Bauwelt-Fundamente*, or the journals *Baukunst und Werkform* and *Pflanze und Garten*, but effectively his writing on landscape consumption did not find much resonance in his days. What makes it more complex: Today his standing towards questions of nature conservation is generally regarded as a noteworthy contribution and even considered ahead of its time. Mattern held a position of some importance for the history of Landscape Planning, which in Germany has – roughly since the late 1960s – detached itself more and more from the classical professional field and developed into a separate discipline. In 1966 Walter Rossow founded the then unique Institute of Landscape Planning at the University of Stuttgart.1208 At the same time, Landscape Architecture focussed increasingly on questions of design and construction. One common point of differentiation today is the fact that Landscape Planning deals with the objectives

---

'protection, conservation and development of the landscape' as defined in the Federal Nature Conservation Act (Bundesnaturschutzgesetz, BnatSchG), while Landscape Architecture is more closely linked to tasks in the scope of the Federal Building Code (Baugesetzbuch), and – simply put – focuses more on immediate human needs and less on the ecology of an area.\textsuperscript{1209} Until recently, university education was commonly organised in joint courses, while the personal differentiation parallel with the establishment of different professorial chairs has happened around the time when Mattern's generation was superseded around 1970.\textsuperscript{1210} Before, planning with a focus on ecological objectives, and designing with a focus on human needs were taught by the same personalities. This forms in fact the background for the discussions about the effectiveness of landscape planning since the late 1980s, when a strongly empirically oriented, 'scientific' practice was increasingly questioned in view of frustrating results concerning aesthetics and other human interests. Even in his own time, Mattern had held a position more strongly oriented towards the traditional objectives of the Heimatschutz, emphasising the importance of creative, 'peerless inventions' to define 'new relationships between man, building and landscape', between man's immediate sphere of dwelling and a constantly changing environment.\textsuperscript{1211} These ideas were emphatically promoted from the nineteen-eighties on by a faction of landscape architects critical of the quantitative-scientific planning.\textsuperscript{1209} In power since 1986, formerly (1960–1986) Bundesbaugesetz (Federal Building Act), 1945–1960 Aufbaugesetzgebung ('Reconstruction Legislation'). However, the main professional representation, the Bund Deutscher Landschaftsarchitekten (BDLA, Federal Landscape Architecture League), uses the term 'landscape architecture' to address all fields of activity, including nature conservation and landscape planning. One argument for preferring this term over possible alternatives (such as the widespread Landespflege') was the international currency of the term. Compare: Gerd Düümel, 'Zur Terminologie: Fach- und Berufsbezeichnungen', Das Gartenamt, 18 (1969), 204–7 (207).\textsuperscript{1210} Since the Bologna Process, a clear tendency towards differentiation into separate, more specialised courses of study (BA as well as MA) can be observed.\textsuperscript{1211} Hermann Mattern, Gras darf nicht mehr wachsen: 12 Kapitel über den Verbrauch der Landschaft (Berlin et. al.: Ullstein, 1964), p. 9; Hermann Mattern, 'Gartenbilder', Baukunst und Werkform, 06 (1961), 317–33 (317).
practice as well as the normative orientation on purely empirical methods of evaluation (e.g. of a site’s aesthetic potential). In this discussion, Mattern featured as a point of reference, albeit referred to mainly by former students and assistants of his. Post-mortem, Mattern’s *Landschaftsaufbauplanung* of the 1960s was considered conceptually much more progressive than the landscape planning of the 1980s and -90s, which according to the critics had failed miserably by ignoring human aesthetic needs, cultural values and its historical origins in, for example, the land beautification movement of the 19th century.

---


1213 J. Wenzel, ‘Der kulturelle Aspekt der Landschaftsarchitektur’, in *Perspektiven der Landschafts- und Umweltplanung*, ed. by U. Eisel et. al. (1992), pp. 7–28. Wenzel, who had studied architecture and was initially critical of Mattern, who he saw as an old-fashioned modernist when architects were rediscovering the old European city as a new paradigm. He was assistant of Mattern’s and was promoted professor in the same department after Mattern’s death. Wenzel then increasingly learned to appreciate Mattern’s views and revised his critical stance towards his former principal. Jürgen Wenzel, personal communication, 01/03/2007. Although being more or less the only one writing about it, Wenzel was not alone with his critique, cf. the publications by Körner, e.g.: Stefan Körner, *Theorie und Methodologie der Landschaftsplanung, Landschaftsarchitektur und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Freiraumplanung vom Nationalsozialismus bis zur Gegenwart*, series *Landschaftsentwicklung und Umweltforschung*, 118 (Berlin: Technische Universität Berlin, 2001),
After the collapse of the Nazi regime, with regard to the politically charged history of ecology, it was very unpopular amongst liberals to promote ecological thinking the way it had been done until then. The cultural values associated with terms such as ‘Heimat’ – so strongly linked with nature conservation since the late 18-hundreds – were now disqualified by the Nazis’ amalgamation of that tradition with racist Darwinist Blood-and-Soil ideology. Indeed, as mentioned, the modern profession of landscape architecture, during the 1950s and 1960s commonly referred to as Landespflege (literally ‘land care’ or ‘land maintenance’), was shaped by the work done during the ‘Third Reich’ and also earlier. After WWI new fields had emerged, such as roadway integration, the recuperation of industrial wastelands, and later the organisation of occupied territories. The engagement with these had led the discipline away from traditional garden design. In addition, landscape architecture matured through the study and application of the new vegetation-related sciences relevant to planning practice, such as phytogeography and phytosociology. Reinhold Tüxen, whom Mattern visited with his university classes, had held seminars for the Landscape Advocates during the 1930s and 1940. He was a pioneer on an international


level in this field, making Germany an centre of geo-botanic research.\textsuperscript{1216} Already in 1935 \textit{Gartenkunst} had dedicated an entire volume to phytosociology. In it, and again in 1939, Tüxen had presented his findings on plant associations, and these must have made him widely know also outside the circle of landscape advocates.\textsuperscript{1217} The same year the first edition of the journal \textit{Zeitschrift für Pflanzensoziologie} appeared, dedicated to phytosociology.\textsuperscript{1218}

Paradoxically, despite the new striving for scientification, and despite the efforts to discard with the ideological baggage, after 1945 only a few managed to speak out against the destruction of the natural and cultural landscape without a subliminal orientation towards the old racist values.\textsuperscript{1219} In fact there were to a great extent the same personalities employed in the nature conservation agencies as before the war and partly even before 1933, so within the sphere of nature conservation a national conservative stance prevailed.\textsuperscript{1220} In this environment Mattern's voice appeared like that of an outsider. The Nazis' strategy of taking technological development into the cultural sphere meant that those ideologically involved now had to retreat onto allegedly 'neutral', i.e. scientific territory.\textsuperscript{1221} The original, cultural guiding

\textsuperscript{1216} See the brief information about Tüxen ('Informationen zur Reinhold-Tüxen-Gesellschaft (RTG)'), downloadable PDF on the website of the Reinhold Tüxen Society (Reinhold-Tüxen-Gesellschaft): http://www.reinhold-tuexen-gesellschaft.deZ (last accessed 10/10/2014).

\textsuperscript{1217} Reinhold Tüxen, 'Natürliche Vegetation und Landschaftsgestaltung in Nordwestdeutschland', \textit{Gartenkunst}, 48, 5 (1935), 70–80; Reinhold Tüxen, 'Die Bedeutung der Pflanzensoziologie für die Landeskultur' (1st part), \textit{Gartenkunst}, 52, 3 (1939), 59–62; R. Tüxen, 'Die Bedeutung der Pflanzensoziologie für die Landeskultur' (2nd part), \textit{Gartenkunst}, 52, 6 (1939), 133–6. Below that article Tüxen noted that the first part had been printed without his knowledge, copying a manuscript he had handed out at a lecture. On the same page can be found a laudation of his work combined with the wish for a general text on the topic, complementing the available lists of

\textsuperscript{1218} R. Tüxen, 'Die Bedeutung der Pflanzensoziologie' (2nd part), \textit{Gartenkunst}, 52, 6 (1939), 133–6 (136).

\textsuperscript{1219} S. Körner, \textit{Landschaftsentwicklung als kulturelle Aufgabe} (2010), pp. 55–60.


principles, however, still showed through. With Mattern this was different, as his motivations had never been völkisch ones. Accordingly he had no scruples stressing the cultural aspects of landscape. At the same time, in comparison with purely scientific literature his writing appeared idiosyncratic. In it a high sensitivity to environmental problems was united with an essentially modernist positivism. While he condemned the authority’s ignorance towards unrestrained landscape exploitation, he affirmed the sustainable use of natural resources. But he pointed to the mistakes that were due to inappropriate legislation, that is, due to the failure not to employ the special knowledge of the landscape architecture profession:

The landscape itself largely absolves us from teachings and tradition. It urges us now without example, that is creatively-planning, to breast its further consumption.1222

One of the most startling parts of Mattern’s writing about the landscape is his demand for a constant redefinition of the landscape as vital space. His writings resemble ecological essays, developing images in front of the reader’s eye and often making a series of conclusions, which set forth his central idea and slowly unfold his idea of how we should dwell in the natural environment. His accumulated thoughts about the dangerous consumption of the landscape – written down with zur Nedden in an almost Heideggerian ductus – attracted only a little attention when published as the book Gras darf nicht mehr wachsen (‘Gras may no longer grow’) in 1964. His particular ecological thinking was too progressive for its time to assert itself.

A very concise delineation of Mattern’s superordinate ideological standing, which is equally helpful to better understand his larger-scale design practice – has been produced as part of newer historical research on the history of the landscape planning profession.

During the last decade-and-a-half or so, a certain agreement has taken root over the view that Mattern developed the 'Landschaftsaufbauplanung', his concept of landscape planning, 'in opposition to the development of the [...] Landespflege of the post-war times', which, in an effort to strip it from of ideological baggage, was pushed more and more towards the sciences.\footnote{S. Körner, \textit{Theorie und Methodologie der Landschaftsplanung}, (2001), p. 127.} This development of 'scientification' ('\textit{Verwissenschaftlichung}') represented thus one 'strategy of de-ideologisation', and it was lead also by some of those who had employed Blood-and-Soil reasoning in their planning concepts before 1945 rather emphatically.\footnote{Ibid.} Mattern's was a variation of that strategy, (sub-consciously) aiming at a dissociation of 'völkisch-racist figures of thought'.\footnote{Ibid.} The pivot of Mattern's planning concept – which quite clearly has relevance for his garden design work as well – was the 'principle of "life"'.\footnote{S. Körner, \textit{Theorie und Methodologie der Landschaftsplanung}, (2001), p. 129.} The very general term 'life' in his thinking was the principle that bound together the terms culture and nature. Mattern used 'life' to replace the idea of the genetic superiority of Nordic man ('Blood-and-Soil') that reactionary planning concepts had promoted; Blood-and-Soil thinking saw the Nordic people as predestined to colonise new territories, as only they had the genetically defined special relationship with nature that enabled them to design new landscapes after the model of their traditional \textit{Heimat} environment. Mattern in contrast demanded a constant redefining of modern man's relationship with the environment under rejection of traditions; man's identification with the landscape was born through the principle of variation and creative invention, as used in the work of the landscape architect.
The landscape to be law: ecological thinking and the Werkbund

Although Mattern’s ecological thinking was much older, it was channelled in the post-war years through the activities of the Werkbund, which, under its president (1947–1963) Hans Schwippert and under conceptual guidance of the landscape architect Walter Rossow, was dedicating itself to this urgent question with all its might. In this context Mattern wrote *Gras darf nicht mehr wachsen* (1964).\(^{1227}\) It exposed in its twelve chapters the ‘consumption of landscape’, including numbers and quoting quantitative research, but above all written in a today uncommon language, personifying the landscape in a way that resonated the influences from the 1920. The chapter titles dealt with different ways man interacts with the environment: ‘The Fence’, ‘The Hoof’, ‘The Plough’, ‘The Chimney’, ‘The Hand’, etc. In a cultural-critical way it looked back into historic forms of land use and looked at other cultures. Mattern deplored in strong words the incompetence of the administration bodies and the inappropriateness of the legislation, but he also constantly implied measures for improvement. While blaming a thorough rationalisation of resource utilisation and different areas of production for many problems, Mattern still believed in progress. For example he clearly affirmed an increasing urbanisation, ‘with delineated and clean’ fringes.\(^ {1228}\) The book was a polemic.\(^ {1229}\) The architecture critic Ulrich Conrads, editor of the series *Bauwelt-Fundamente* in which Mattern’s book appeared, called it an effort by ‘proto-Greens’, anticipating the thinking of *Die Grünen* decades before they came into being as a political party in January 1980.\(^ {1230}\) Many years after its publication, the appreciation of the environmental crisis

---

1227 H. Mattern, *Gras darf nicht mehr wachsen* (1964). With its elegant alliterations, the title sounds less naïve in German than the literal translation suggests.


expressed in the polemic became a consensus in wide parts of German society and politics. According to Conrads, Mattern's effort was also a 'pioneering feat' too progressive to find wider reception at the time.\footnote{As the editor, Conrad includes himself into the credits for this. Ulrich Conrads, in letters to the author (11/05/2009; 15/10/2009).} Yet the conditions had seemed so good: a few years earlier the Deutsche Werkbund had chosen for its annual conference at Marl in October 1959 the motto 'The great destruction of land' ('Die große Landzerstörung'), while Walter Rossow had inspired a corresponding, now famous public appeal under the title \textit{Die Landschaft muß das Gesetz werden} ('The landscape has to become the law').\footnote{R. Günter, \textit{Der Deutsche Werkbund und seine Mitglieder 1907–2007}, online chronic of the Werkbund (http://www.deutscherwerk bund-nw.de/index.php?id=476, last accessed 04/01/2014) – for the printed version see fn 1101; Walter Rossow, 'Die Landschaft muß das Gesetz werden', \textit{Werk und Zeit}, 9, 12 (1960), reprinted in: Monika Daldrop-Weidmann (ed.), \textit{Walter Rossow. Die Landschaft muss das Gesetz werden} (München: DVA, 1991).} Understandably, the editors of \textit{Gras darf nicht mehr wachsen} expected a synergetic effect with the Werkbund activities, conducive to the book's sales figures.\footnote{Ulrich Conrads, in letters to the author (11/05/2009; 15/10/2009).} These hopes were deeply disappointed. Despite the impression that the time for such a basic appeal had arrived, due to lack of demand the fate of a major part of the first edition was to collect dust in storage rooms, and half of the printed copies finally had to be pulped.\footnote{Ulrich Conrads, in a letter to the author (11/05/2009). Still today it is the publication by Mattern that is easiest to find second hand and at a relatively cheap price.} With his unconventional yet accessible language Mattern had the wider public in mind, including school teachers of biology and geography, hoping to 'break the narrowness of the common approach to architecture and city planning'.\footnote{Ulrich Conrads, in a letter to the author (11/05/2009).} Conrads suggested that at best the book project had, little noticed, prepared the ground, which some years later other publications...
took up.\textsuperscript{1236} Noteworthy in this context is Mattern's frank critique of the eco-centrism of Rossow's appeal:

Last year the Deutsche Werkbund, at its symposium in Marl under the theme 'The Great Destruction of Land', called for a halt to all building projects in the landscape. With this, consciously something was demanded about which the speaker — my colleague Walter Rossow — knew that he called for the impossible, just to make the public sit up, just to cause a protest, which might possibly ignite a debate. [...] However, from us planners, from us as designers, from us as farsighted thinkers, the general public may actually expect more than merely a 'no' and a 'stop'. With the process of proceeding landscape depletion — with the state of alarm of landscape destruction — we should immediately present possible correctives. With this I mean that the plan for development, for restoration — yes, even the opportunity for improvement of the landscape, for the correction of man-made inadequacies — we have to be able to see already in a state of devastation.\textsuperscript{1237}

\textsuperscript{1236}Ulrich Conrads, in a letter to the author (11/05/2009).

A key concept of Mattern's was the – for humans – healthy use of the landscape, comprising a constant change taking place in a healthy landscape. These thoughts must have been rooted in Mattern's personal childhood experiences with the *Wandervogel* and they also found expression in a life in close contact with the landscape, in particular since the acquisition of his Bavarian farm house. The influence of the German youth movement is widely considered crucial for the ecological conscience of the first post war generation of environmentalists.\textsuperscript{1238} For example Konrad Buchwald of the University of Hanover, one of the initiators of the Federal Nature Conservation Act (*Bundesnaturschutzgesetz*) of 1976, has referred extensively to this defining social phenomenon of the youth in the late Kaiserreich, the Weimar Republic and National Socialist Germany in reference to his generation of landscape planners and natural scientists.\textsuperscript{1239} However, the argumentation, that the 'getaway' character of the youth movement's hiking tours has led to a 'by tendency static notion of landscape', meets in Mattern its counter-example.\textsuperscript{1240} The crucial texts are his essays *Über die Wohnlandschaft* (1950) and *Flurlandschaft* (1964).\textsuperscript{1241} The first appeared in Mattern's afore-mentioned book *Die Wohnlandschaft*, published on the occasion of the German Garden Show Stuttgart 1950. Intriguingly, the same year Garrett Eckbo's *Landscape for Living* (New York: Dodge 1950) – literally the same title – was published, but dealt mainly with garden art and design, thus focussing on completely different questions. *Flurlandschaft* was published in 1964

---


\textsuperscript{1239} J. Wolschke-Bulmahn, 'Zu einigen Vorstellungen über Heimat', in *Der Heimatbegriff*, ed. by Institut für Landschaftspflege und Naturschutz (2005), pp. 39–55 (40–1).

\textsuperscript{1240} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{1241} Hermann Mattern, 'Über die Wohnlandschaft', in *Die Wohnlandschaft: Eine Sammlung von Aussagen über die menschliche Tätigkeit in der Landschaft*, ed. by H. Hermann Mattern (Stuttgart: Gerd Hatje, 1950), pp. 6–27
jointly with a text by Ernst May, the prominent building councillor of the 'New Frankfurt' of the 1920s, in the book *Stadtlandschaft – Flurlandschaft*.\(^{1242}\) It was edited by the Arbeitsgemeinschaft zur Verbesserung der Agrarstruktur in Hessen (AVA, ‘Association for the Improvement of the Agrarian Structure in Hesse’), of which Mattern was a member. This commitment has also to be related to Mattern’s projects for modern colonisers’ farmsteads (*Aussiedlerhöfe*), which were planned in association with the AVA. Mattern intensely occupied himself with questions of agrarian re-organisation, land-use planning and the natural resources. The fact that his work represented German agriculture and land-use planning at the Expo 58, the Brussels World’s Fair – Mattern designed all details of the respective exhibition room – points to his prominence in this field (Fig. 232).\(^{1243}\)

The most intriguing part of Mattern’s ecological thinking was the unusual precedence he claimed for the aspect of *change* as the defining landscape feature – even more so if one considers his transference of this predicate ‘change’ not only to the idea of landscape, but also to that of *Heimat*. Despite concerns regarding a life in close relation with the local landscape, Mattern described *Heimat* as ‘a dynamic affair’.\(^{1244}\) He did not refer to it as an actual territory, but spoke of the ‘notion of *Heimat*’, which ‘has to be recognised and redefined again and again’.\(^{1245}\) In the context of *Heimat*, tradition could only play a role in form of ‘settled empirical values’, and then only if these values were ‘bearer of new animate tasks’, because ‘tradition is static’ while ‘*Heimat* is dynamic!’\(^{1246}\) In this context one has to point


\(^{1245}\) Ibid.

\(^{1246}\) Ibid.
once more to similarities to the concept represented by the Heimatschutz: a productive sense of *Heimat* was seen as the result of an aesthetically satisfying integration of industries, infrastructures, agriculture, and traditional culture, with "nature"; i.e. the Heimatschutz, too, had had a dynamic notion of *Heimat*. The crucial difference was that Mattern dissociated 'tradition' from it.\(^{1247}\)

The more discursive, theorising papers on Mattern have claimed that his thinking was essentially conservative, interspersed with progressive ideas, but generally more progressivist than that of others dealing with the same questions.\(^{1248}\) The unity between culture and nature, that was so drastically underlined by National Socialism, Mattern, too, believed in: 'A cultural nation can be recognised by its well-tended lands'.\(^{1249}\) By replacing the notion of *Volk* with a very general, though abstract idea of a propulsive life force, he managed to detach his thinking from the racist content of blood-and-soil ideology, while still staying structurally close to NS thinking.\(^{1250}\) The notion of progress in his propulsive idea of life Mattern located in subjectivity, in the 'internal' of the creative individual.\(^{1251}\) Thus he avoided an expansive idea of progress in the mould of the *Lebensraum* concept, according to which a stronger people is entitled to redesign landscapes of recently occupied territories in correspondence with its 'racial soul'.\(^{1252}\)


\(^{1251}\) As in the entire paragraph, I follow Körner in his reasoning: Ibid.

His idea of Heimat Mattern also discussed in connection with the natural environment. As the healthy use of the environment was always in balance with what a functioning landscape could cope with, he consequently rejected a conservative nature protection legislation and practice. While exposing a positivist concept of an actively designed and inhabited landscape, he drew a connection between a dynamic ecological environment and a dynamic concept of Heimat:

All values, which are alive within, do not need protection. [...] Protection is always offered to weak situations only, protection – thus nature protection, too – is a negative activity.1253

The forceful wording of this quote expresses one of Mattern's most trenchant thoughts and presents a hard blow aimed at the nature conservation (in German: 'nature protection') movement in general.1254 His harsh criticism of merely protective nature conservation policies as expressed in Über die Wohnlandschaft was greeted with indignation by the conservative faction within the conservation establishment, contributing to his role as 'the, in his day, most severe critic of the scientific planning practice'.1255 By all means, there were also environmentalists who promoted a more holistic, planning-oriented concept of nature protection, such as those associated with Martin Klose and his Zentralstelle für Naturschutz und Landschaftspflege ('Central Office for Nature Protection and Landscape Management', successor to the corresponding Reichsstelle).1256 However, the

---


1254 The German term for 'nature conservation' is 'Naturschutz', which literally translates as 'nature protection'.


1256 About the role of Klose as progressive, see the biographical sketch by Hans-Werner Frohn, in: Natur
reactionary doyen of nature protection, Walther Schoenichen, complained in an article about Mattern's *Die Wohnlandschaft*, that it contained paragraphs which grotesquely distorted the aims of nature protection.\(^{1257}\)

**Landschaftsaufbauplanung vs. Landespflege**

As described, tradition was dismissed by Mattern as static, while *Heimat*, usually inseparably linked to tradition, was to Mattern a 'living', animate affair. *Heimat* was revitalised through inventions, for which there were no examples yet, and which only the landscape architect could provide.\(^{1258}\) With this figure of thought Mattern defined a special task for his profession, and a social relevance that went beyond the provision of functional living space or recreational atmospheres. It will be difficult to find another landscape architect so consequent in his -- in a positive sense -- devaluation of traditional references. In the end this will to progressiveness enabled him to be artistically free from restrictions set by existing notions of what a garden should look like.

Mattern made great efforts to adapt the profile of landscape architecture to changed realities, always with a critical distance to any kind of one-dimensional rationalism. In opposition to the more empirical *Landespflege*, he developed his concept of Landscape Development Planning. For him, too, the Landscape Development Plan was something new, that had to be explored: when the students asked what such a plan would look like, he signalled them that he did not know and they had to find out by experiment themselves. In his lectures he then expounded his theories.\(^{1259}\) About some questions,

---


\(^{1259}\) Ehrhard Mahler (in personal communcation with Pobloth), quoted in: Sonja Pobloth, *Die
however, he was certain: In dealing with such a human-defined object as European landscapes, it could not be the aim to define a fixed plan. Instead, it was the planner’s responsibility to seek – and to constantly re-think – a far-sighted integration of ecological cycles and changing demands for uses. He did try to establish some sort of systematic guidelines, suggesting an ‘appropriate’ procedure, which he put down in a list of steps, corresponding to survey, assessment of potentialities and deficiencies, directives and so on. In the end, however, seeing the immaturity of the field, he stated that it was ‘premature (if not pointless altogether), to tie oneself down to one method [...]’.1260 Noteworthy in this context is the characterisation of Mattern’s in a conjoint obituary dedicated to him and Seifert, written by the landscape architect Ludwig Roemer (1911–1974), a colleague from the group of the Landscape Advocates and now professor at Munich Institute of Technology.1261 Roemer emphasised Mattern’s ‘trust in the human spirit, in the ability of man to plan, to plan understood as foresighted [activity]’, which was meant to contrast him with the older colleague.1262 In the same text Seifert was characterised with his ‘trust in a divine wisdom in the workings of nature’, if one did not disturb her ‘or if one only learned about her secrets by watching her […]’, thus setting off by contrast Mattern’s progressivist outlook.1263 Roemer’s

1263 Ibid.
delineation of Mattern's characteristic beliefs dovetailed with many texts Mattern wrote about landscape planning and the 'landscape for dwelling', which one of the most pointed quotes from a key text can illustrate:

In order to make sense, the establishment of a new quality of an area can only be focussing on a better general and long-term economic viability for man. This is why the Landscape Development Plan aims at sustainable improvements in a general economic regard, i.e. also with regard to the society ('social') and of health. To secure the sustainability, the demand for 'natural auxiliary resources' (those which renew themselves in cycles), in particular the cultivation of the organic substance for the benefit of the vegetation, plays a crucial role for the Landscape Development Plan. Thus, to care for the vegetation usually appears as the special concern and special task.

However, it must not be overlooked that all natural phenomena, including the vegetation, even when put under special protection, eventually can only be considered as part of planning and developing the landscape in the interest of man – and man's culture and economy must be the point of departure. Economy and culture – for better or worse – influence the changes that take place in the landscape. Only them, they make necessary (for their own correction) new landscape development, the aim of which is again the economy and culture of man.1264

This view was nothing short of radically modernist. One of his former students, and later a representative of Berlin’s highest nature conservation authority, said that Mattern’s notion of landscape was so abstract and so aesthetically oriented, that it missed essential ecological considerations:

With Mattern that was a formation at the drawing board, making designs with a broad nib, accordingly more towards garden and landscape architecture.\textsuperscript{1265}

The aspects of open space uses and the overall appearance of the landscape were amongst the main focus points.\textsuperscript{1266}

The fact that [...] in hedges and on deciduous trees [...] there are also birds nesting and that nature lives there, was actually not discussed. [...] Habitat and species conservation [...] was not the topic, less even the ecosystem.\textsuperscript{1267}

Ironically, this quote actually confirms Mattern’s critique of the narrow perspective of ‘species protection’, and it has to be seen in context. Mattern may not have addressed the ecosystem in a classical scientific way, with quantified analyses of effects and potentials, as done today in landscape planning. But at that time the field was only developing. Criticism like that was often voiced against Mattern, especially during the times when the landscape planning discipline focussed on scientific credentials, between the 1960s and the 1980s. And while it almost appeared as if Mattern sought the


\textsuperscript{1266} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{1267} '[...] Dass [...] in Hecken und auch auf Laubbäumen [...] auch Vögel nisten und die Natur da lebt, davon war eigentlich nicht die Rede. [...] Biotop- und Artenschutz [...] war da nicht das Thema, und noch weniger der Aspekt Naturhaushalt.' Ibid.
opposition to almost the entirety of the professional circles, he nonetheless found his ways to disseminate his anthropocentric perspective. One intriguing detail was the fact that between 1952 and 1954 he wrote the entries to the *Brockhaus* dictionary for the term ‘Garten- und Landschaftsgestaltung’ (garden and landscape design).\(^{1268}\) Until its demise in 2009, the *Brockhaus* was Germany’s largest and most recognised printed encyclopedia for a non-academic audience.\(^{1269}\) Mattern thus in the position to disseminate his personal term and his idiosyncratic notion of the profession’s profile – the Landscape Development Planning – with the help of an approved institution’s irreplaceable authority. The drafts for the text in his university estate show that he could not present his view in all its radicalness. Still, the final text promoted technical terms that were his personal invention, and ignored those terms established by the majority (above all ‘Landespflege’), which he opposed.

Finally, to sum up Mattern’s ecological thinking, we shall refer to one of his very few English publications which appeared in the 1966 spring edition of *Landscape*. The paper with the title ‘The Growth of Landscape Consciousness’ was originally held as a lecture at the University of Berkeley following an invitation, translated by Schaefer.\(^{1270}\) While it may be influenced by his wife’s esoteric interest, it can be considered as essentially expressing his personal positivism and his notion of landscape as a matter of mindset:

The Grand Design for the world contains not only the cultivation of the earth, the soil and the species in it, but also their improvement. Progress and development are, without doubt, inherent in it. We are aware that this creative activity of man on the soil, on the land, in the landscape, obviously promotes the unfolding of vital forces, but at the same time a

\(^{1268}\) Typescript ‘I. Publikationen Professor Hermann Mattern’, folder 1, 2 pages, EHM.


\(^{1270}\) The invitation may have come through Herwin Schäfer, a friend.
development beyond – a turning away from – the original state of nature; the ambivalence of the process is a deeply disturbing part in the new landscape consciousness. I feel it incumbent on me as a planner of the soil and of the landscape to try to clarify this consciousness. I want to prove that this particular consciousness is not only correct, but also ethically right. The new landscape consciousness is based upon ethics; it is in accordance with the Grand Design.1271

II. 1 International orientation and retrospection: The late years

Good Lord, what a stupendous life you two have!1272

(Karl Foerster 1960, in a letter to Beate Mattern)

In 1961 Mattern finally answered a call onto the Chair of Garden and Landscape Design at the Berlin Institute of Technology (Technische Universität Berlin), while continuing to teach at Kassel for another four years until Günther Grzimek’s appointment in 1965.1273 At Berlin he hoped to gain the authority to further increase the awareness for the profession and for the grave situation regarding landscape consumption and bad planning practice.

In the light of his promotion of an artistic formation of garden designers, the fact of Mattern’s change in 1961, from the art academy he cofounded after the war to Berlin’s Technische Universität (TU), is rather intriguing. The new job must have been attractive in many ways: first of all in meant that he became Ordinarius – tenured professor –, secondly Berlin represented the oldest university chair for garden design in Germany, and last but not least he succeeded his long-time foe Gustav Allinger. Exactly this fact, though, Mattern saw as a negative: ‘It didn’t come easy to me to assume an office where before a certain Herr Allinger was at work.’1274

1272 ‘Mein Gott, habt ihr ein gewaltiges Leben!’ Letter from Karl Foerster to Beate Mattern zur Nedden, 01/05/1960, EHM.


1274 ‘Es ist mir nicht leicht gefallen, einen Laden zu übernehmen, in dem vorher ein Herr Allinger gewirkt hat.’ Letter from Mattern to Kurt Schönbohm, folder 1, 12/05/1961, EHM.
The new position must have been paid much better as well. But Mattern was not a materialist. One of his first moves was to swap the room reserved for him with Jürgen Barth, Erwin Barth’s son who held a post as lecturer occupied with the field of landscape and regional planning. Barth was an invalid and had to climb the stairs to his small room, while Allinger had resided in the representative ground level office. Allinger had tried to hinder Mattern’s appointment by collecting incriminating material about alleged mismanagement during the planning of the presidential gardens at Palais Schaumburg, Bonn. But accusations proved wrong and the positive references by Hübotter, Rossow and others convinced the faculty and its dean, the specialist for pomiculture Erich Kemmer.

**Widening the curriculum: studium generale at Berlin**

In Berlin Mattern did not change the study programme fundamentally, but it was extended into a true *studium generale*. In direct comparison with the Werkakademie, the sciences expectably gained importance and the focus shifted. In 1963 Mattern stated the knowledge about ecological and economical relationships within an area, technical knowledge and knowledge of construction methods and knowledge about the plants as the base for any activity in this profession. Yet he emphasised the necessity to train the perceptual capabilities, the sense of scale, and he closed with the declaration: ‘To comprehend the interrelatedness of man–nature–structure and form [*Gestalt*] in any

---

1275 Vroni Heinrich, personal communication, 22/02/2007.

1276 The estate of Gustav Allinger contains a collection of newspaper cuttings and transcripts of newspaper articles all reporting critically about Mattern and the proceedings at Bonn, see EGA, inventory no. 300.

1277 See the letters of reference in folder 1, EHM.

given space will be aimed for as the spiritual basis of the course of studies'. In competition with the stronger scientific tradition of the equivalent course at the Universität Hannover, Mattern in Berlin had to try to build a scientific reputation without betraying the creative approach he was known for. By the end of the 1960s, when the ecological problems caused by the continuing economic utilisation of the cultural landscape could not be ignored any longer, the university at Hanover with her comparably good equipment and financial resources, and with influential landscape planning teachers like Buchwald and Tüxen, had become the most renowned school for 'Landespflege' in the Federal Republic. This renown though disguised the fact that creativity in the design process had been replaced to a great extend by empirical studies. Design was considered an old-fashioned affair while Hans Kiemstedt's purely quantitative analysis of a landscape's beauty was seen as the tool to help guarantee a human environment. Some of the students who were interested in studying landscape architecture as a creative discipline were disappointed. Yet, in contrast with the scientific renown of Hanover, the TU Berlin over the years had somewhat lost its attractiveness. Mattern's predecessor Gustav Allinger had taught garden design in a very traditional way. Students were asked to design for example a 'garden for a bee lover', a 'garden for a rose lover' or a 'garden for a family with many children'. Design templates circulated amongst the junior semesters to copy time-proven solutions — unthinkable under Mattern, who laid such emphasis on specific solutions. To be sure, some attention was paid to the evolution of the professional profile since the

1279 Ibid.
1280 Raimund Herms, personal communication, 05/01/2005.
1281 Ibid.; Jürgen Wenzel, personal communication, 01/03/2007.
1282 Raimund Herms, personal communication, 05/01/2005.
1283 Antje Solmsdorf, personal communication, 28/12/2006.
1284 Ibid.
beginning of the century, also thanks to Jürgen Barth’s classes. The replacement of Allinger, whose past must have been at least vaguely known, with a more liberal successor created some excitement amongst the students. Mattern soon initiated a transferral of the institute from its traditional premises in quiet Dahlem into the centrally located IBM building designed by Rolf Gutbrod and Hermann Kiess (1960–61).\footnote{1285} This move, from the old-world, vine-clad villas at Dahlem into brand new premises at the urban Ernst-Reuter-Platz – an icon of post-war town planning – clearly contributed to the atmosphere of departure (Figures 233–235).

The atmosphere changed radically. Mattern was vain and elitist in the eyes of some of his students, and the unfamiliar quality of his lectures did not satisfy everyone. His language, shaped by influences from his youth, tended to be abstract and his sentences, despite a staccato-like rhythm and reduction to necessary words, appeared convoluted or unwieldy.\footnote{1286} Some said lecturing was his one true weakness, while talking in a small circle he would impress everyone.\footnote{1287} Nonetheless, as a human being he was far more approachable than Allinger had been, and he undeniably modernised the curriculum.\footnote{1288} In contrast with Allinger, Mattern also dedicated himself to the youngest, patiently sitting down with everyone who wished to discuss drawings in detail. With a piece of tracing paper and his legendary fountain pen he would draw over the student’s sketches, suggesting amendments.\footnote{1289}

\footnote{1285 http://www.berlin.de/ba-charlottenburg-wilmersdorf/bezirk/lexikon/ibmhaus.html (accessed 19.02.2014).}

\footnote{1286 Cf. the following two contributions in Hermann Mattern 1902–1971: Gärten, Gartenlandschaften, Häuser, ed. by Akademie der Künste, series Akademie-Katalog, 135 (Berlin: Akademie der Künste & Technische Universität Berlin, 1982): Karl Heinz Hanisch, ‘Über Hermann Mattern’, pp. 8–9 (8); and Eike Schmidt, ‘Mattern als Lehrer, nach Gesprächen mit anderen Mattern-Schülern skizziert’, pp. 12–3 (12). Hanisch, a jovial garden journalist, called writing the only field in which the usually agile Mattern turned wooden (ibid.).}

\footnote{1287 Jürgen Wenzel, personal communication, 01/03/2007.}

\footnote{1288 Christoph Repenthin, in a letter to the author, 12/07/2010.}

\footnote{1289 Heinz Hallmann, former student of Mattern’s, on the occasion of the presentation of Vroni}
Apart from his different personal style, Mattern also considerably widened and differentiated the conservative curriculum of the course, also in comparison with his own course at the Werkakademie; just how strongly he did it is proved by a comparison between the course catalogues before and after 1961, when Mattern took over duties. He introduced joint design studios with architects and town planners and encouraged the students to attend lectures in other departments.\(^{1290}\) He invited a series of international guest lecturers, amongst them now legendary personalities: LaVern A. Freeh (University of Minnesota), Brian Hackett (University of Newcastle, UK), John Brinckerhoff Jackson (University of Santa Fe, New Mexico), Zvi Miller (Israel), European colleagues like Bohdan Wagner (University of Brno, horticultural faculty at Lednice), the Swede Gunnar Martinson (who taught in the architecture programme at Karlsruhe), the Belgian René Pechère, the Dane Carl Theodor Sørensen, an American sociologist and others from countries such as Czechoslovakia, South Africa, Turkey, Yugoslavia, as well as several Japanese Professors, e.g. Seihei Kato from Tokyo University.\(^{1291}\) The guests introduced the students to unfamiliar topics, from forestry to Japanese garden art to sociological field studies using transportable tape recorders. The institute’s guest book bears witness of this impressive international network and documents the positive responses — surely not all of them merely polite phrases — to the teaching methods introduced by him (Figures 236, 237) Particularly respectful are for example the greetings left by C. Th. Sørensen, Bohdan

---

\(^{1290}\) In the prospectus selected lectures and courses at other faculties were explicitly recommended, such as: art history and history of music, communicological principles of language and music, landscape ecology, business administration, economics and law. In addition there were listed many courses from the Faculties of Architecture and Civil Engineering. Before Mattern’s time there was only a short list of courses or lectures, and none from other faculties than the latter. Cf.: the Vorlesungsverzeichnisse, the printed prospectus of the Technische Universität Berlin, of the years 1960 to 1962.

\(^{1291}\) See the guest book of the former Chair ‘Landschaftsbau und Gartenkunst’ (‘Landscape Construction and Garden Art’), inventory 430, no. 29, EHM.
Wagner or Zvi Miller, the latter praising the ‘education of future garden and landscape architects that stands on the highest level’, and wishes emphatically: ‘Could one only go to school once more! ...’.1292 Similarly put it Pechère, an old friend from the war years, who wrote in 1968: ‘I would prefer to be student here rather than master [...], not actually to be younger ... but because there is always so much to learn.’1293

Mattern took the course members to see planning projects and gardens in other countries, using his innumerable contacts for the benefit of his students. He organised conferences on urban greenery, in a time when a lack of green spaces was a problem as urban planning was still mainly conducted from the perspective of the car drivers. Each symposium – which was followed by a respective publication – was dedicated to one issue relevant to the profession and topical in contemporary town planning: ‘The cemetery’ (‘Der Friedhof’, 1962), ‘The gardens separated from habitation’ (‘Die wohnungsfernen Gärten’, 1963), ‘The urban fringe, the meeting of city and country’ (‘Der Stadtrand, Begegnung von Stadt und Land’, 1964), ‘Water in the city’ (‘Das Wasser in der Stadt’, on the occasion of the centennial of Peter Joseph Lenné’s death-day, 1966).1294

1292 ‘Jedem praktizierenden Landschaftsgestalter der älteren Generation, dem beim kurzen Besuch Ihrer Fakultät die auf höchstem Niveau stehende Erziehung künftiger Garten- und Landschaftsarchitekten offenbar wird, will sich unwillkürlich der leise Wunsch aufdrängen: Könnte man doch mehrmals auf die Schulbank!...’ Guest book of the Chair ‘Landschaftsbau und Gartenkunst’, inventory 430, no. 29, EHM.

1293 ‘Je préfèrerais être ici élève plutôt que maître [...] Pas tellement pour être plus jeune ... mais parce qu’il y a toujours tant à apprendre ici.’ Guest book of the Chair ‘Landschaftsbau und Gartenkunst’, inventory 430, no. 29, EHM.

The new course was clearly structured by Mattern, beginning with the technical and planning-related basic knowledge. Remarkably enough, the topic ‘application of vegetation’, which Mattern is usually so strongly associated with, hardly appears in his descriptions of his teaching prospectus. Apart from modules with abstract titles such as ‘exercises in identification of functions’ (‘*Funktionsbestimmungsübungen*’) or ‘foundations for locality definition’ (‘*Grundlagen zu Ortsbestimmungen*’), during the sixth and seventh semester was spent working on a ‘*Landschaftsaufbauplan*’ (‘landscape development plan’). The latter, as a form of course entitled ‘*Studienpraxis*’ (‘study practice’), represented an entirely new teaching format that Mattern had introduced. Over the course of this work information was compiled through ‘investigations into economic structures and into the ecological and economical foundations of a district with its core of settlement’. The *Studienpraxis* represented a type of applied research experience, in which the students in effect experienced the real work practice of landscape architecture. It was in fact work on projects that the university department had obtained from municipal offices as research commissions. One such project had to be completed by each student as a final dissertation. The best-known of these Landscape Development Plans was probably the one for the town of Marl, for which a group of students stayed for three months in the west-German city, 500 km away from the university at Berlin. The assistant teacher Günther Nagel stayed at Marl for one year as ‘field personnel’.1296

Mattern did stress the importance of economical-ecological aspects, but the initial teaching of design skills was a precondition for becoming a good landscape architect:


As experience teaches, it comes more naturally to students coming from the high schools to pass over into purely scientific studies than to take up a technical or artistic, respectively creative formation. To impart to the students the essentials, i.e. the manual and the intellectual know-how that is necessary for the engagement with form creation and designing, they are initially – beside the elementary scientific subjects – prompted to take measure, to recognise scale, to observe and to perceive through graphical and sculptural structure exercises.1297

This resonated Mattern’s youth experience with his art teacher Faust at Hofgeismar. In a way, as illustrations accompanying this quote showed, the foundation course from Kassel was transferred to the course in Berlin (Figures 238–240). The art school reform of the early 20th century, or possibly Mattern’s experiences at the Bauhaus Weimar, can also be inferred from the illustrations. Mattern’s suggestion, that students were more used to cognitive occupations and less accustomed to the technical and creative practice, has been substantiated not least with insights from modern time knowledge research.1298

---


Lenne's legacy: promoting the young

Everything speaks for Mattern having been a committed professor. As conditions for taking the chair, during his appeal hearing he had demanded from the university administration to immediately provide a model workshop of at least 100 sqm with equipment for the cost of c. DM 10,000, a new teaching position for drawing and model making connected with the workshop, another position for a teaching assistant, another professorial chair to be created as soon as possible.\footnote{1299 Letter from Lorenz, President of the Technische Universität Berlin to Mattern, including a summary of Mattern's demands worded at the appeal hearing, folder 1, 11/07/1961, EHM.} All these wishes were granted.

Furthermore, Mattern emphasised that it was necessary to create completely new spaces for the institution within three years, as the existing were entirely inappropriate; and the dean Erich Kemmer confirmed this evaluation. Interestingly, in view of the strong competition between the universities, Mattern had pointed at the need to improve the position of the Berlin institution in comparison to the one at Hanover, headed by Wiepking. He demanded the creation of a new building but offered to relinquish the trial fields at Dahlem, that Allinger had still considered necessary. For the initial fitting out of the interim location established at Ernst-Reuter-Platz Mattern estimated DM 20,000. Also these further demands were held out in prospect.\footnote{1300 Ibid.} One of his first activities was to contact friends like Kurt Schönbohm, now heading Cologne's Parks and Gardens Department, in order to build up a network and search for real-world application exercises and excursion areas. Mattern's promotion of the young landscape architects went beyond his professional duties as university professor. In 1965, on the occasion of Karl Foerster's 90\textsuperscript{th} birthday, in honour of his friend and professional companion during the earlier years of his career, Mattern founded the Karl-Foerster-Stiftung für angewandte Vegetationskunde ('Karl Foerster Foundation for Applied Vegetation Science').\footnote{1301 See the website of the Karl-Foerster-Stiftung: http://www.ulmer.de/Die-} As original capital Mattern invested the fees charged for his
chair’s research commissions, which were in fact the above mentioned students’ applied research projects.\textsuperscript{1302} In his speech at the third award presentation at 23 January 1968, Mattern exposed the foundation’s aims as follows:

We have brought the Karl Foerster Foundation into being in order to create an institution, by virtue of which we can promote talented gardeners non-bureaucratically, by virtue of which we want to unconventionally support vegetation-related research, also – or even more so – if such is approached by non-academics, and by virtue of which we are able to encourage comparative observation of selective breeding results, which often exceeds [...] the means of a commercial enterprise \textsuperscript{1303}

This was seen as continuation of Foerster’s work.\textsuperscript{1304} Another initiative of this kind Mattern took in 1966, when he prompted the Senate of Berlin to establish an annual design competition for young landscape architects named after Lenné. Like the Karl

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{1304} *In diesem Sinne möchte die Karl-Foerster-Stiftung die Lebensarbeit Karl Foersters fortsetzen.* Ibid.
\end{flushleft}
Foerster Foundation established one year earlier, the Peter Joseph Lenné Award (Peter-Josef-Lenné-Preis) still exists today, and it regularly attracts entries from different countries.1305 Together with the first prize giving ceremony Mattern organised a spectacular exhibition at the Akademie der Künste presenting Lenné's works, the centenary of whose death was remembered at this occasion.1306 Mattern was assisted in this by his old acquaintance and respected colleague from East Germany, Reinhold Lingner. The two met for an official visit of the Administration Office of Castles and Gardens at Potsdam, in order to select plans from the archive.1307 Mattern managed to take many original drawings across the inner-German border, from the archives at Potsdam to West Berlin. Thanks to Lingner's authority and the trust Mattern himself enjoyed in his former home town, he was allowed to simply put the precious works into the boot of his private car and drive across the border at Glienicker bridge to the Akademie der Künste in Tiergarten's Hansaviertel, where they were shown to the awestruck professionals and an unsuspecting public.1308 With respect to educational initiatives, Mattern saw himself in Lenné's tradition. This showed in the short essay in the exhibition catalogue of 1966, in which he pointed out Lenné's endeavours to establish a better formal training of garden artists through the foundation of the Association for the Furthering of Horticulture in 1822. More than half of Mattern's essay dealt with questions of education, including the hint that his chair at the TU


1308 V. Heinrich, Hermann Mattern (2013), pp. 369; Raimund Herm, personal communication 05/01/2005. Heinrich and Herm do not, however, mention Lingner's contribution, so that it must be suspected Lingner's help was not (or could not be) appropriately acknowledged in the West.
Berlin indirectly originated in Lenné's initiatives of some 150 years ago. But not only as an academic, also as a professional his reverence for Lenné was great:

Please do consider: the influence of Peter Joseph Lenné's plans for green spaces, his urban planning, and his water management of in and around Berlin affect the life in this city, and the architectural expression of the cityscape today to a higher degree than any façade, be it ever so well made, or artistic, or unconventional.

Yet another connection between Lenné and Mattern is documented by the exhibition catalogue. The page-filling photographs by his wife Beate expose well Lenné's characteristic modulations of the terrain by focussing on tree shadows cast by a low-standing sun onto the lawns (Fig. 241). These spaces share a formal language with many of Mattern's designs, as isolated by the eyes of an empathic observer and great photographer (Figures 242-244).

Increasing the international perspective

In the 1960s, Mattern also became more actively involved in international activities of the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA), although his commitments were cut short by his deteriorating health. He also seemed to have been in touch with Sylvia Crowe, as he listed her two-volume publication *Shaping tomorrow's landscape* of 1964 as one of his upcoming publications in his CV of 1961, though he was eventually not involved as an author, for unknown reasons.

---


1311 Sylvia Crowe, *Shaping tomorrow's landscape preservation of existing values in landscapes and the creation of new landscape*, 2 vols (Amsterdam: Djambatan, 1964). Mattern's friend the Israeli landscape architect Zvi Hecker was one of the authors.
Over the years, Mattern received several invitations for guest lectureships, as international friends returned the favour he had granted them by inviting them to Berlin. In 1965 he travelled as guest lecturer to Japan, and the following year he spoke about Japan at the University of Durham at Brian Hackett's invitation. In 1968 he held a speech at the IFLA meeting at Montréal, extending this trip with lectures in other cities.\footnote{Over the years, Mattern received several invitations for guest lectureships, as international friends returned the favour he had granted them by inviting them to Berlin. In 1965 he travelled as guest lecturer to Japan, and the following year he spoke about Japan at the University of Durham at Brian Hackett's invitation. In 1968 he held a speech at the IFLA meeting at Montréal, extending this trip with lectures in other cities.}

Mattern's increasing international orientation found expression in a handful of publications in other languages than German. His mentioned paper 'The Growth of Landscape Consciousness', held at the University of Berkeley in summer 1965, was published in the 1966 spring edition of Landscape.\footnote{Mattem's increasing international orientation found expression in a handful of publications in other languages than German. His mentioned paper 'The Growth of Landscape Consciousness', held at the University of Berkeley in summer 1965, was published in the 1966 spring edition of Landscape.} The fact that Colin Ward quoted Mattern in reference to the 'unpublished lecture manuscript' of a Toronto appearance may be interpreted as a sign of his growing international renown, as may his inclusion in Architecture, Formes et Fonctions, published by the Suisse architect Anthony Krafft at Lausanne, alongside illustrious international colleagues such as Jacob Berend Bakema, Giancarlo De Carlo, Sigfried Giedion, Sybil Moholy-Nagy, Frei Otto, Peter and Alison Smithson and Paul Virilio.\footnote{Mattem's increasing international orientation found expression in a handful of publications in other languages than German. His mentioned paper 'The Growth of Landscape Consciousness', held at the University of Berkeley in summer 1965, was published in the 1966 spring edition of Landscape. The fact that Colin Ward quoted Mattern in reference to the 'unpublished lecture manuscript' of a Toronto appearance may be interpreted as a sign of his growing international renown, as may his inclusion in Architecture, Formes et Fonctions, published by the Suisse architect Anthony Krafft at Lausanne, alongside illustrious international colleagues such as Jacob Berend Bakema, Giancarlo De Carlo, Sigfried Giedion, Sybil Moholy-Nagy, Frei Otto, Peter and Alison Smithson and Paul Virilio.} Taking part in a survey that investigated the state of Modern architecture and town planning, this last contribution before his death the same year represents an insightful résumé of Mattern's views on architecture, who describes Modernism as "fight against formalism", but the result has given birth to a


1313 The invitation may have come through Herwin Schaefer. As the correspondence reveals the two knew each other well, and Mattern had contacted Schaefer, then Cultural Affairs Officer for the US Foreign Service, to help with the establishment of what would become the documenta art exhibition in 1955, see: Letter from Schaefer to Mattern (viewed before the re-organisation of the estate), 26/04/1954, EHM. Schaefer was later appointed a member of the board of documenta advisors.

The first question concerned the 'several well-known names' that have dominated contemporary architecture during the last fifty years. Asked to name which (a) and explain the choice (b), the greatest share of the authors name Gropius and some also Mies van der Rohe. With their choices, Moholy-Nagy (who names Frank Lloyd Wright, Le Corbusier, Hans Scharoun, Carlos Villanueva, Eero Saarinen and Paul Rudolph) and Mattern and are the exceptions:

a) Frank Lloyd Wright, Hans Poelzig, Hugo Häring, and as living - but not as least important - Hans Scharoun, and in fact, because these architects are not formalists but because they planned their constructions in accordance with man's requirements.

b) The work of those mentioned above is certainly important, but still more important is the intellectual attitude behind their achievements and from which they were inspired. The intellectual will survive the structural work and the influence of the mind grows with time. It does not lessen or degenerate, but reasserts itself increasingly.

During these last months of his life, Mattern jointly with his wife Beate also wrote a series of articles for Grün, a journal that had come into being in 1970 as a merger of the two journals Gartenpost and Pflanze und Garten. The focus group was the garden enthusiast, not the professional, and the language of these articles was simple without oversimplifying the content. It seemed as though Mattern's eagerness had been tamed by his waning strength. Trying to capture national characteristics they critically discussed series of photos depicting gardens and cultural landscapes taken on their trips. The following countries and places were addressed: in 1970 Denmark, Holland, 'Gardens east of the Elbe' (on the occasion of Karl Foerster' 96th

---

1315 In the original the quotation marks differ in the German from the French and English translations. Generally, the text is not very carefully translated. Architecture, Formes et Fonctions, 16 (1971), 10-2 (10).

1316 See the interview questions and foreword by the editor Anthony Krafft in Architecture, Formes et Fonctions, 16 (1971), (no pagination).
birthday), England, Switzerland, the USA (‘Two German gardens in North America’), and Japan, and in 1971 Czechoslovakia (mainly about specific traditions in garden history, broderie motifs etc.), Slovenia, Italy (focusing on the cultural landscape), France, the USA (general landscape issues) and a second time Japan. 1317 Also two contributions with what could be called a sociological focus were published, and finally a contribution about Seifert’s book Gärtnern ohne Gift (‘Gardening without poison’), which showed that finally the two colleagues, who had not spoken with each other for about two decades, became reconciled. 1318 In 1966 Mattern had put great effort in having Seifert rewarded with a honorary professorship awarded through the Berlin Institute of Technology. 1319


1318 ‘Ein Garten ohne Gift’ (about Seifert’s garden and book), 08 (1970), 394–6; ‘Wie schön könnten unsere Städte sein!’ (with reference to Alexander Mitscherlich’s seminal polemic Die Unwirtlichkeit unserer Städte) 12 (1970), 572–3; ‘Markt und Garten – Orte der Begegnung?’, 10 (1971), 14–8. Mattern mentioned not having spoken with Seifert for ten years, for his ‘weaknesses, vanities, solecisms [Ungeschicklichkeiten]’, see: Letter from Mattern to Wilhelm Wortmann, 10/01/1965, EHM. Specific reasons remain unknown, but may lie in Seifert’s complete lack of comprehension for Mattern’s concept to create a course of study at an art academy as in Kassel immediately after the war. In this context Seifert had insulted Mattern by using the term ‘paper artist’, see: Alwin Seifert (et al.), ‘Die Ausbildung des Garten- und Landschaftsarchitekten’, Garten+Landschaft, 60, 10 (1950), 1–5 (3)

1319 See the documents in folder 9, EHM.
The late works

During the 1960s Mattern's design language changed with the changing fashion. The explosive shapes of the 1950s became first more rigid and geometrical. Triangles appeared in his designs, reminding of Ernst Cramers geometrical work. Towards the end of the 60s the crystalline angularity became softer; the circles, curls and a whorled organisation of elements of the flower-power generation became prevalent, and this might be an influence of his daughter Merete, whose work displays a strong use of almost metaphorical organic shapes and compositions recalling fractal aesthetics (Fig. 245). Also other young employees in Mattern's office may have contributed to this change. Merete collaborated with both of her parents, and noteworthy competition entries bear witness of the family's great openness to experiment (Fig. 246). Particularly exciting is a competition entry with Mattern for Bratislava (and it was surely not common to take part in projects located in the Eastern Block), which resembles results of deconstructivist approaches that were developed many years later (Fig. 247). The foresightedness may be down to Merete's great artistic vision, as collaborations with her mother produced similarly exciting, if time-bound, results, which in the case of Düsseldorf Ratingen-West was crowned with a second prize. Mattern's design's for private gardens during the last decade of his life, too, are proof of his unbroken creativity. The aforementioned Kahnweiler and Ströher gardens could be seen as marking the break to a more geometric, stiffer formal language of the 1960s (Figures 209, 212). The garden for the architect Wiersing in Detmold-Hiddesen (1960–61) showed a particularly interesting way of connecting and interlocking garden and house and of differentiating between an intimate 'dwelling garden' and a 'wild garden' beyond, also in the interest of ease of care (Figures 248–250). The spatial concept represents a further development of the 'glade' model of the Bornimer Gardens of the 1930s. The modulation of ground

gained a clearer, more linear quality, and the harmonic tension between parallel bars of concrete and the organic elements was carried further. Yet the overall composition did not appear coerced at all.

Mattern's planting concept had changed over the years. In areas more distant from the house, and along the borders of the gardens, the extremely diversified perennial plantings of the 1930s to 1950s had successively been given up. Since the mid-1950s the trend had gone towards schemes that relied strongly on the effect of low-maintenance woody plants - park roses and polyantha hybrids, *Berberis, Pyracantha,* lilac and many more.\(^{1321}\) However, the concept for the Wiersing garden seems to have tried to counteract this 'impoverishment', which zur Nedden's text about it addresses: 'Unfortunately, perennials disappear more and more from our gardens. Because the maintenance requires knowledge and instinct.'\(^{1322}\) Few garden owners wanted to invest the necessary physical and organisational work. However, the Wiersing family were enthusiasts, so four different areas with complex perennial compositions were concentrated around the terrace (cf. Fig. 250). Even years later all planted species could still be found, which also speaks for the wise selection by the landscape architect.\(^{1323}\)

One of the best examples to illustrate the curvilinear form vocabulary of the late years is a project for a small estate near the Olympic Stadium. The architecture was designed by Heinz Schudnagies (1925–1996), who stood in the organic tradition of Háring and Scharoun. Circular shapes seem to be cut out of a dense wood of shrubs and small trees to form clearings (Fig. 251a+b).


\(^{1323}\) Ibid.
Death

Mattern had tried to change the profile of the landscape architect in correspondence to the changed realities. In contrast to this, many students increasingly saw him as an old man from a different age. His teaching style to some seemed anachronistic. One important other reason for his exit was the changing attitude of the younger generation at the university. By the end of the 1960s students were highly politicised and wanted to discuss basic questions of social coexistence. Although his was one of the few doors not blocked by revolting students, Mattern became disillusioned by all the talking; instead, to arrive at solutions, he expected his students to produce something, be it drawn or written. In 1969 he held his last lecture, aged 67. The following year he retired, struck by a stroke that led to his death about a year later. His former assistant and office partner Nagel remembered one specific severe argument with the fundamentalist fractions amongst the students, which shortly preceded the last stroke Mattern suffered 17 November 1971, from which he did not recover. This relatively early death may have contributed to a certain mystification, as a critical review of the early twentieth century began clearly a decade or more later. Because of this, a clear personal statement by him on the modernist movement and its different manifestations, or his memory, with the benefit of hindsight, of important contemporaries he knew and worked with, is sadly missing. In those days, few were interested in reviewing Modernism.

At his Bavarian house there is a small collection of letters of condolence, for example by Kahnweiler and Stuttgart's mayor Klett. Mattern was remembered with some articles in the press, although due to Seifert's imminent death, the two were more strongly associated with each other than necessary. Römer's mentioned

1324 Raimund Herms, personal communication, 05/01/2005; Jürgen Wenzel, personal communication, 01/03/2007


obituary in fact directly compared the two with each other. A Festschrift as produced on the occasions of some of his colleagues’ retirement or milestone birthdays, has not been found.\textsuperscript{1327} In January 1972 there was a brief obituary in \textit{Neue Landschaft}, in which it is referred to a more extensive celebratory text in the December edition of 1967, which in reality was only a few words longer than the obituary.\textsuperscript{1328} In its obituary in December 1971 \textit{Bauwelt} announced an ‘extensive tribute’ to appear the coming year, but it never did. Apart from the August edition 1972 of \textit{Garten+Landschaft} dedicated entirely to Mattern and Seifert, including Roemer’s extensive essay, the now forgotten journal \textit{Grün}, of which Mattern had been a member of the editorial board, published an extensive interview with zur Nedden. This represented a second detailed and personal review of not only his work but also his character, obviously from a thoroughly affirmative perspective. Zur Nedden’s key message was that her husband had been an experimenter, a tinker even, who had felt positively challenged and inspired when confronted with limited resources; the greatest freedom of expression he developed within limitations, as his book title of 1938 had already suggested.\textsuperscript{1329} The image he had amongst those who knew him in person, as we have seen, corresponded to this: the more practically oriented Hübotter, for example, upon hearing about Mattern’s death said that his friend had


\textsuperscript{1328} Cf. the obituary in \textit{Neue Landschaft}, 01 (1972), 32 (signed ‘Hb’, probably for Dieter Hennebo, the doyen of German garden preservation); personalia column in \textit{Neue Landschaft}, 12 (1967), 656.

always had ‘ants in his pants’. Others have attributed to him ‘a searching mind’ (Figures 252, 253).

In view of Mattern’s achievements, and compared to the honouring of similarly influential colleagues of his on the occasion of becoming emeritus, it surprises that during more than two decades Vroni Heinrich was the only person perpetuating Mattern’s memory though lectures and publications. This may be due to his position as an outsider and occasionally a stirrer. He did not leave behind a best-selling, much-cited book, like those by Foerster, Wiepking’s *Landschaftsfibel* (1942), Seifert’s *In Zeitalter des Lebendigen* (first published 1941) or the countless accessible garden design monographs by Allinger, Schiller, Valentien and others. Mattern’s books were by comparison awkward to read, a part of the photos illustrating his works were more abstract than usual, and some of the titles irritatingly programmatic. He was too individualist to be truly popular as a person and colleague. Also, considering his role as teacher, some were highly critical of his orientation towards design teaching and his demands with regard to drawing skills was considered elitist.

During the last years as a professor, in a time when the self-conception of the young generation shifted towards becoming “post-modernist”, the appreciation of his oeuvre faded; he was more and more seen as an old-fashioned modernist who had known many of the new bogeymen like Gropius in person. The younger generation was interested in the old European city, in history and ‘complexity and

1330 Ute Lienemeyer-Russell, personal communication (Nov. 2008). Lienemeyer-Russel was working in Hübotter’s office at that time.


1332 Jürgen Wenzel, personal communication, 01/03/2007.
contradiction in architecture'. In the image of him as Modernist there was no place for an acknowledgment of his critical distance to one-dimensional rationalism. Relatively early, however, Germany’s national arts council Akademie der Künste Berlin in 1982 dedicated an exhibition to Mattern’s work. He was thus one of the first of his generation to receive new attention about one decade before a general recollection of the profession’s modern heritage began.\textsuperscript{1334}


III. Conclusion

Mattern's biography revealed a series of surprises. His connection to the art world was much closer than imagined, his involvement in the OT was deeper than expected and the amount of material which has not yet been assessed is difficult to estimate – certainly with concern to archives and private correspondence; and much of the easily accessible material, like the recently published lecture notes and manuscripts, has not even been fully considered. What can be said is that the image of him as a creative without theoretical grounding is down to either a reductionist notion of theory or a lack of engagement with his writings (and the existing literature about him). It is, however, difficult to make comparative statements. The complexity of his ideas cannot be compared to many of his colleagues; at present, detailed research has only been published on a very few. A comprehensive comparative study was not aimed for, as the thematic scope was too wide and much primary material had still to be collected and presented. A comparative inquiry could follow from this as a next step. The biographies about Hammerbacher, Seifert and Wiepking show that in matters of design Mattern was extremely progressive and experimental, particularly in the largely 'soil-rooted' profession of garden and landscape architecture. At the same time it has to be considered that the National-Socialist terror eliminated part of the competition, amongst them some of the best-known and most experimental landscape architects of the Weimar Republic. In the little literature that exists that engaged with Mattern's writing on a scholarly level, his ideological standing has been described as – 'formally', or should one say structurally – a balance of conservative and progressivist ideas. In view of his countless initiatives and achievements, however, the question arises how this alleged theoretical conservatism found expression in concrete results, and if the conservative elements in his language have not been overvalued in contrast to his progressive acting and creating. The language of a landscape architect, however well reflected it may be, cannot be expected to be as philosophically elaborate as that
of a humanities scholar or a party ideologue; practical knowledge is necessary for a
great part of the daily work of landscape architecture, leaving little time to devote to
the development of a personal philosophy. Also, conservative elements are natural in a
person committed to working with the landscape – something animate and fragile and
visibly declining during the first half of the 20th century. Mattern’s combination of an
acute concern for the natural basis of our lives with an outspoken criticism of merely
conservatory concepts of nature protection was unique. He may represent a type of
modernist that has not yet been considered, simply because his kind of professional
concern is so strongly associated with anti-modernism and cultural pessimism. With
regard to the design of gardens, a thoroughly rationalistic philosophy is difficult to
imagine; garden culture comprises too much symbolism and too much of man’s
longing for his nature, for a harmonic unity with nature (‘paradise lost’). This
complements the more immediate needs that architecture fulfils. From all this,
Mattern’s standing emerges as avant-garde, and, central to this is what has been called
his ‘searching mind’.1335

The form question: garden Modernism

The process of the modernist reformation of garden design, from an artistic
perspective, could be summarised by referring to three generations. The first, born
around 1860 (Fritz Encke, *1861; Carl Heicke, *1862), introduced a new, social
agenda and first steps towards overcoming the stereotype of the landscape garden.
Inspired by theoretical input by reformers such as Lichtwark or Muthesius, then by
the work of architects like Behrens, Laeuger and those of the Vienna School, they
rediscovered geometrical design principles with the introduction of the Architectonic
Garden. The second generation, born around 1880 (Harry Maasz, *1880; Leberecht

1335 ‘Er war ein Suchender.’ Heinz Hallmann, former student of Mattern’s, at the occasion of the
presentation of Vroni Heinrich’s book Hermann Mattern (2013), Akademie der Künste Berlin,
28/04/2013.
Migge, *1881) revolutionised the idea of the garden with regard to its social function and developed the strongly representative Architectonic Garden into a space that focussed on habitability, healthy exercise, function and, later, the post-WWI demands for crop production and technological development. Design-wise, well into the 1920s, great parts of their work was still abiding by the principle law of symmetry; although they loosened the overall stiffness of the earlier Architectonic Gardens. Geometrical layouts were contrasted with rather non-representative formulation of the spaces and by introducing an informal way of planting. The contribution of Mattern’s generation, born around 1900 (Pniower, *1896; Valentien, *1897), was that of a further break in handed down notions of garden art. But while most colleagues preferred a geometrical basic structure and still incorporated formalist path layouts in symmetrical forms, the Bornimers went one step further away from classical ways of composition and design. Right from the beginning of their career, they clearly revealed their organic approach in publications. These bear witness to a very conscious and careful use of language developed under engagement with contemporary developments in architecture, literature, art and vegetational sciences and informed by their personal spiritual beliefs. The Bornimers radically reduced paths, using stepping stones only where necessary, and, out of space-economical thinking, avoided fixed separating elements. Movement through the space became less prescribed and outlines and delineations were softened by unrestrained plant growth. The abandonment of all but the essential built elements effectively made a garden larger. Economy, ecology and social considerations equally defined their art. Thus the decorative tradition, which was still – and in two-dimensional form – quite persistent in the work of many of their contemporaries, reconciled by the Bornimers with the agenda of the life reform. At the same time, it has also been shown how they benefitted from the pioneering work of slightly older colleagues, from whom they eagerly learned.
Alongside these rational considerations, the transcendental aspect of their work cannot be ignored. Mattern's and Hammerbacher's idea of beauty was strongly connected to their notion of freedom. Rather than for their mass effect, plants were chosen for their particular habit; vegetational beauty was seen in the free development of a plant's individual character. This perspective allowed for a more nuanced work with atmospheres and made for less static visual impressions. The decorative aspect of the Bornimers' gardens lay in great parts in the overall picturesque quality of their spaces.

The most fundamental aspect of their work was their consistent avoidance of symmetry. Hammerbacher's expositions about this topic bear witness to a radicalism of thought as expression of the strong beliefs that stood behind their way of designing. Their approach was thus strongly intellectually guided. This is not to claim that abidance by symmetry in garden design contradicts artistic mastery, but the Bornimers' conscious rejection of it does represent strong intellectual principles. According to Hammerbacher, as late as the 1930s, an asymmetrical layout of gardens was still uncommon. 1336 While being coloured by her dogmatism, her judgement once more points at the consciousness and consistency with which the Bornimers tried to realise their own concept of modern outside dwelling; against mainstream notions of the garden as well as against social conventions. In this context, a noteworthy aspect lies in the fact that some of their thoughts seem to anticipate or at least reflect contemporary developments. The idea, shared by Mattern and Hammerbacher, of 'dwelling' to be something that had to be learned, we find in Martin Heidegger's famous published Darmstadt lecture 'Bauen Denken Wohnen' (1951), which deeply impressed the architectural scene. 1337 Blundell-Jones and Woudstra have pointed out that Hammerbacher's article 'Wie sollen wir gestalten' ('In what way should we


design?" of 1934 resonated the idea of form finding as expressed in Häring's 'Wege zur Form'. The young Mattern's critical judgment, after reading Le Corbusier's *Vers une architecture*, that '[...] the appearance of the same thesis in different places is enough proof of its viability', corroborates the impression of his open-mindedness and his high sensitivity towards developments of their time.

What we can also observe is that a 'creative volition' in Mattern's work sometimes lead to formalist solutions, but these express his will to experiment and try something new and unproven – 'vorbildlos' ('peerless', literally: 'without example'), as he used to say. The result was not always convincing, as for example in his use of Eternit at the Federal Garden Show Kassel 1955 shows. But the absolute consistency with which Mattern lived this article of faith enabled him to truly free himself from traditional restrictions and 'reset' himself – a mindset he had already in the 1920s attributed to artists he admired, like Kirchner.

Although his admired works were due to his personal skills, the role of the women in his life has also become clear. In the biographies of influential men, sometimes the wives' contribution has been overlooked, while it was commonly them who sorted correspondence and played a crucial role in networking. In Mattern's life there were at least three creative women, which include his talented, extremely eccentric daughter Merete, who collaborated on many projects. Hammerbacher's crucial influence

---


1339 '[...] das Erscheinen gleicher These an verschiedener Ortes ist für Lebensfähigkeit Beweis genug.' Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, HH. 26/3, 02/09/1926, EHH.

1340 'My intuition regarding [the artist Ernst Ludwig] Kirchner does not deceive me. He is someone who was able to reset himself completely. Yesterday I saw some woodblock prints [...]'. ('Meine Ahnung mit Kirchner beträgt mich nicht. Es ist einer der sich ganz zurücksetzen konnte. Sah gestern einige Holzschnitte [...]'.) Letter from Mattern to Hammerbacher, inv. no. HH. 26/4, 03/10/1926, EHH.
emerged from early correspondence and common work, while zur Nedden's influence lies unmistakable in her sensible photography, her literary work and her philosophical (theosophical) interests that will have rubbed off on Mattern. Merete's influence appears to be obvious in the design vocabulary of some of Mattern's late projects, but still has to be understood better for an evaluation. Naturally, the influence was mutual: Hammerbacher always acknowledged the great potential of Mattern's will for experimentation, and zur Nedden has professed Mattern's role in teaching her 'to see': to look at gardens and landscape in spatial terms.

The ethical question: working for a totalitarian regime

Different perspectives are now possible concerning Mattern's personal way of dealing with the Hitler regime. One could leap to the conclusion that, in order to avoid being forced to restrain his formal expression and to adapt artistically, he simply concentrated on matters that meant much to him beyond questions of design. His commitment to ecological aims in the context of his work for the roadway projects, for example the greening of pithead stocks, seems to hint at this interpretation. The fact that Mattern, towards the end of the 1930s, still designed many gardens since modernist expression had been severely sanctioned, however, contradicts this assumption. His projects for the roadways were equally far from mere eco-functionalist problem solving. Mattern's aestheticism, which seems to have caused him to feel beyond reproach, could be interpreted as elitism that made him blind to the horror he supported by playing his role in stabilising the system. Seeing

---

1341 Her son Fabian Zimmermann is cooperating with the Deutsches Achitekturmuseum (German Museum of Architecture, DAM) at Frankfurt, and is planning a first small review of her work.


1343 EAS, letter Mattern to Seifert, Fla, 18/05/1938.
his commitment to the cause of landscape development, however, with an involvement in the autobahn project that turned into a strategic function for warfare, it is difficult to imagine that he simply closed his eyes to the realities. He knew and saw too much to be this naïve, so a comprehensible explanation would be that he hoped that his work in the interest of the landscape would benefit the entire society. Those excluded from that society were the price he seems to have accepted. Mattern saw himself as a modernist artist, and there is no denying that with this self-conception to a certain extent he 'reneged' and, to quote Haffner once more, made his 'pact with the devil'.1344 That he even joined the NSDAP for the benefit of his career has for some been unthinkable. This contradicts his obvious significance as one of the progressives and as the landscape architect to whom, more than to any other, the profession owes a transferal of the reform of design education (e.g. of the Bauhaus) into post-war landscape architecture education. Part of this conclusion is that such contradictory aspects can form part of any biography and do not have to be resolved. Personal pride and the reluctance to turn down economic opportunities, despite moral doubts, are human motives (and weaknesses). These do not absolve responsibility, but neither should they overshadow the progressive contributions of a personality like Mattern. We do not dismiss the significance of œuvres like those of Egon Eiermann or Herbert Bayer because of their canvassing for more than doubtful commissions (Fig. 185). Also, one should not forget that from some point in time, during the war, a withdrawal from collaboration would have been treated as desertion and led to persecution.

The tinkerer as innovator

Mattern was not a loner and generally known for approachability and open-mindedness. He was respected by a wide scope of people from different social and ideological backgrounds – as the police report of 1936 already professed –,¹³⁴⁵ but there was a series of aspects that made him being looked at as an odd fellow. For a start, he didn’t mince his matters; when he fought for a cause he believed in, he could be sharp-tongued. The same is true when his pride was wounded. Also, not a few amongst his colleagues felt personally provoked by his individualism in design; as we have seen, even friends like the artistically more conservative Hübotter, frowned upon some of his more experimental works. Then there was Mattern’s wide scope of interests, his connection to artists and his active promotion of the exchange between the artistic fields as aimed at with the preparation of the documenta art exhibition, and realised with the establishment of the Kassel Werkakademie after WWII. It seems probable that the width of his intellectual horizon – his interest included acting, theatre, music, literature, pedagogics, dance and other cultures – baffled some of his contemporaries. This will have made him appear to some as out of touch with reality. And indeed, his considerable spiritual disposition lead to a very high level of abstraction in both his work as well as his writings – he was the ‘outsider as insider’,¹³⁴⁶ and this was invoked and used against him several times, as much as it earned him respect and honour.

¹³⁴⁵ Letter from Gauleitung of the Kurmark to the DAF, Schatzamt, Bauprüfungsabteilung, (Berlin), R 4606/221, 01/04/1936, BAB.

IV. Abbreviations

AMTUB  Architekturmuseum in der Universitätsbibliothek der Technischen Universität Berlin (Architecture Museum at the University Library of Berlin Institute of Technology)

BArch  Bundesarchiv (Federal Archive, Finckensteinallee 63, 12205 Berlin)

EAS  Estate Alwin Seifert, Technische Universität München (Munich Institute of Technology)

EGA  Estate Gustav Allinger

EHH  Estate Herta Hammerbacher

EHM  Estate Hermann Mattern

EHW  Estate Heinrich Friedrich Wiepking at the Lower-Saxon State Archive, Osnabrück

EMG  Mattern Estate Graimharting, private family property

SAS  Stadtarchiv Stuttgart (Stuttgart City Archive)

* in the University Archive (Hochschularchiv) of Technische Universität Berlin.
VI. Glossary

Architektonischer Garten, Architekturgarten – (Architectonic Garden, formal garden)

Architectonic Garden is used here as a translation of the German term ‘Architektonischer Garten’, or ‘Architekturgarten’, which established itself as common term for the regular garden style of the reform movement around 1900, which was strongly inspired by the gardens of the English Art and Crafts movement. The Architectonic Garden stands for a re-evaluation of Baroque and Renaissance regularity, which was to replace the landscape garden style, also referred to as English garden, which by the end of the 18th century was considered outdated. The architectonic design principle was considered to allow for a modern, functional combination of building and garden into one connected living space for healthy living as promoted by the Lebensreform (‘life reform’) movement. Other terms used for the architectonic mode of garden design are ‘Formaler Garten’ and ‘Formgarten’. 1347

Bornim

Bornim is a village, since 1935 incorporated as a district into Potsdam, situated not far north of the royal gardens of Sanssouci. Bornim is mainly known for Karl Foerster, who moved his perennial nursery here and built a house in 1912. Bornim is also associated with the landscape embellishment work regulated by the Prussian crown especially during the early 19th century.

**Bornimer Kreis (Foerster-Kreis) – Bornim Circle**

The horticulturist and self-declared mystic Karl Foerster stood in intense exchange with several people who formed the later so-called Bornim Circle or Foerster Circle. The term is mainly locally known and it was mainly used in a self-referential way. It has gained a certain currency within 20th-century German garden history for Foerster’s influential position. His family was famous before, but thanks to both his publications and his personal aura he became known in his own right as a person to seek out for advice. At the centre of the Bornim Circle was a group of landscape architects, amongst them Mattern. Famous names associated with it were for example the architects Otto Bartning and Hans Poelzig, the pianist Wilhelm Kempff or the cultural politician Edwin Redslob.1348

**Bornimer Schule – Bornim School**

‘Bornimer Schule’ or ‘Bornimer Stil’ refers to the style in garden design that was developed by Mattern and Hammerbacher around 1930, in accordance with Foerster’s ideas. It can be considered a particularly organic variant of the modern Wohngarten type, the ‘garden for living’ that had developed out of the Architectonic Garden of the garden reform movement.

**Dahlem**

The former village of Dahlem, today a borough of Berlin, is located south-west of central Berlin. It was built radically developed and urbanised at the turn of the century around a royal domain as an exclusive residential area, and as a new centre

---

for administrative and research institutions. In the context of landscape architecture and horticulture, Dahlem is associated firstly with the Botanic Garden, which was transferred here between 1899 and 1904 from Schöneberg, and secondly with the horticultural college where many later well-known landscape architects received their training.1349

**Gartenarchitekt** – garden architect, landscape architect

While until the end of the 19th century the most commonly used amongst several expressions were ‘*Landschaftsgärtner*’ (‘landscape gardener’) and ‘*Gartenkünstler*’ (‘garden artist’), during the Weimar Republic, also due to the better organised education system, the term ‘*Gartenarchitekt*’ became the standard. In 1933, with the introduction of compulsory membership in the Bund Deutscher Gartengestalter (BDG, German Society of Garden Designers) as division of the Reichskulturkammer (RKK, Reich Chamber of Culture), the National Socialists prescribed the use of the term ‘*Gartengestalter*’ (‘garden designer’). The term ‘*Landschaftsarchitekt*’, today the standard, while being discussed and used occasionally already in the first Republic, only established itself about one decade after WWII: in 1948 the professional body chose the term ‘*Garten- und Landschaftsarchitekt*’ (‘garden and landscape architect’), not least as expression of the grown importance of landscape-related questions in contrast to the traditional field of garden design. Towards the end of the 1960s the term ‘*Landespfleger*’ (literally ‘land keeper’ or ‘land carer’), repeatedly criticised by Mattern as misleading, asserted itself. Apart from these mentioned, there were also other expressions in use, which prompted Mattern to comment on a general ‘mess’ in terminology and to add one more to the confusion: for his course of study at Kassel and later at Berlin he used the term ‘*Architekt für Landschaftsbau*’ (‘architect for landscape construction’, or ‘architect for building of

---

landscape'). He may have been inspired in this by his idol, Leberecht Migge, who between 1915 and 1920 called himself ‘Architekt für Gartenbau’ (‘architect for horticulture’). For the sake of consistency in the current text the term ‘landscape architect’ will be used, as it is today’s correct term and the most common term in the English language, and because the other common English term ‘garden designer’ reminds some German readers of NS repression.1350

*Gartenkunst* — (fine) garden art, garden design

Until the 1920s the term ‘*Gartenkunst*’ was used for the professional field. Later it was used usually with the intention of emphasising the artistic aspect, otherwise ‘*Gestaltung von Gärten*’ (‘design of gardens’) or similar would have been used. In quotes the literal translation will be used, so occasionally the term ‘garden art’ will appear in a context where the notion of garden design as a fine art plays a role. Otherwise the term garden design or landscape architecture will be used as common terms in English. After WWII, also in Germany the term landscape architecture became the standard.

*Naturalistisch/Naturalismus* — naturalistic/naturalism

Naturalism in an art historical context can have a variety of different meanings, partly inspired by literary theory. It is not always easy to distinguish the expression from ‘realism’, although the latter can again be differentiated into two semantic

levels. The general meaning of 'realism', independent of the epoch, is verisimilitude, with the qualification that an artefact still has to be recognisable as such.1351 Beside this, and beside the translation with 'imitation (of nature)' - in Latin 'imitatio (naturae)', in Greek 'mimesis' --, in the context of the early 20th century a more specific, historical meaning exists. This is linked to Gustave Courbet's aspiration for a 'democratic art' and it includes the notion of realist art as critical commentary to the social reality. In the context of the Bornim School, 'naturalism' does not refer to a critical approach to reality, although that appertained to this group of landscape architects as well. Naturalism, as understood here with reference to early 20th-century garden design, is a matter of mimesis in the sense of an emulation of formative principles as observed in nature. This means it is first of all a matter of form, connected to questions of sensory form perception and its psychological dimension, which under the heading 'Einfühlung' ('empathy'), exerted a crucial influence on artistic practice and on architecture at the beginning of the 20th century.1352 A famous definition of naturalism in this context, that seems to outline the Bornimers' approach, is contained in the writings of Theodor Lipps, further disseminated by


Wilhelm Worringer: 'aesthetic enjoyment is objectivated enjoyment of self'.\textsuperscript{1353} The principle of empathy that is active in artistic naturalism is here construed as realisation of one's own corporeality and being bound to nature. The term 'naturalism' is not used in the sense of imitation.\textsuperscript{1354} As yet, for garden modernism this inspiration has not been discussed. In case of the Bornimers, i.e. Foerster, Hammerbacher, Mattern and their circle of friends, from their language use can be deduced a strong romantic-idealistic influence, which is added to that from aesthetic theory and perceptual psychology. Historically, the latter has not been regarded philosophically but it was considered empirical science. Another art historical facet of the term 'naturalism' – one of many –, which appears in Mattern's social context, can be found in the writings of the art historian Cornelius Gurlitt (1850–1938), one of Hugo Häring's teacher's at the Dresden's Institute of Technology. With the affirmation of naturalism formulated in the context of his research on Baroque, Gurlitt influenced Häring's ideas about organic building.\textsuperscript{1355} More pervasive was the association of the Gothic with naturalism, connected to the idea of a Nordic sense of nature.

\textit{Landschaftsanwalt (pl. Landschaftsanwälte) – Landscape Advocate}

The Landscape Advocates were a group of freelancing landscape architects originally commissioned in the context of the autobahn project. The German term is translated here literally, to expresses the idea of a specialist advisor advocating the 'interest of the landscape'. The Landscape Advocates tried to gain acceptance amongst the technicians for a more organic integration of the roadways into the landscape, but in


\textsuperscript{1354} W. Worringer, \textit{Abstraktion und Einfühlung} (1959), e.g. pp. 44, 61–69.


\textit{Landespflege} – ‘land maintenance’, ‘land care’

Despite the fact that many reference publications for \textit{Landespflege} appeared during the 1940s and were strongly associated with Blood and Soil ideology, such as Erhard Mäding’s \textit{Die Landespflege} (Berlin: Deutsche Landbuchhandlung, 1942), the term became more widely used after WWII. It is generally associated with the more planning oriented perspective that had become increasingly influential in the academic training since Wiepking’s appointment to the university chair in Berlin in 1933. With him, the word ‘Landschaft’ (in ‘\textit{Garten- und Landschaftsgestaltung}’ – ‘garden and landscape design’) had first been used as part of the name for the course of study. In particular during the 1950s and 1960s, the expression \textit{Landespflege} was more and more used instead of those containing ‘garden’ or ‘architecture’. This trend has been
interpreted as a sign for the wish to shed the ideological ballast of the Nazi years, as semantically it swings away from designing and constructing and towards ecology, planning and conservation. Mattern criticised the term for the conservative stance it implied. The modern equivalent would be *Landschaftsplanung* — landscape planning —, but in those days that had not been institutionalised and legislated as today.1357

*landschaftlich*

The most problematic term, with some potential for confusion and which is central in German garden history, is of course the adjective *landschaftlich* and its nominative form *Landschaftlichkeit*. Literally this would be the impossible landscapely/landscapelyness (or: ‘landscapelikeness’). The vaguely corresponding term *organic* firstly seems too general, and secondly it would not allow to differentiate between *landschaftlich* and *organisch*. Concerning human form giving, the latter could be applied in a structural sense, meaning an organic connection of, say, purely orthogonal spaces. At the same time *organic* can mean non-geometric, organically conceived form (clumps of trees instead of a circle or matrix). This is why at times in translations presented in the main text, *landschaftlich* will be translated with *organic*, when it is used in the source to differentiate a stylistically organic – landscape – garden from a geometric (garden) design, as in the Renaissance or Baroque tradition and the Arts and Crafts tradition respectively – the *architektonischer* garden or *Architekturgarten*. At times, however, the German terms *landschaftlich* or *Landschaftlichkeit* will be used in German when a meaning beyond the purely formal one should be conveyed. This meaning is connected to the English landscape garden and its continental variations; to the traditions of the pastoral and the picturesque.

The image behind it is fundamentally a culturally defined one, both a mythical Arcadian landscape as we have come to know from painting as well as an agricultural, West-European land shaped at the turn from the middle ages to pre-industrialised modernity, with the first stages of a rationalising of agriculture. This traditional image can be addressed critically, reflected on and even to a certain degree adjusted to the environmental realities, but it cannot be erased completely. Apart from that, the term is originally connected to a people living in a geographical area, its characteristics and traditions. This is why landschaftlich cannot be translated with 'organic' or 'naturalist', as sometimes suggested.

*Landschaftsaufbauplanung* — 'landscape development planning'

This term was created by Mattern, and it has only been used by him and some of his students to distinguish it from the mainstream landscape planning practice, then referred to as 'Landespflege'. Mattern emphasised the creative and the development aspect of landscape and criticised that planning practice was neither acknowledging sufficiently the natural dynamics of landscapes and its connectedness to modern society. In this context he also developed a particular curriculum for his teaching.1358

*organisch/Organik* — organic/organic form, organic character

In the context of design, 'organic' usually refers to form (not style). One of the main aims of the reformist promoters of the Architectonic Garden was an 'organic connection' between building and outside spaces, implying the idea of house and garden forming a unity as living space. Mattern and Hammerbacher strove for organic form as expression of a democratic standing, respectful towards nature, and of life. In the history of ideas, 'the organic' is connected to anti-democratic thinking, as it can be understood in terms of organically grown relationships between the

individual and a society defined by traditions as opposed to a modern state. Opinions differ on the question whether the organic as artistic ideal is always connected to the ideological dimension of the term or not. At least in theory, organic form with its focus on the individual and local contradicts the democratic ideal of equality and internationality. 'Organic' can also refer to the animate, and connected to this is an idea of design following organic principles of form creation that are believed to lead to the most functional solutions, as promoted by the Organic Modernists in architecture, most famously Hugo Häring.1359

Wohngarten – garden for living, dwelling garden, inhabitable garden

Wohngarten is a term that appeared shortly after 1900, it was used to promote a new garden type that focussed on healthy and active living rather than representational aesthetics. It was thus connected to the Architectonic Garden as well as to the general Lebensreform movement. It gained currency with the generation of Mattern, when a modern garden culture was thriving, above all within the middle classes. Its main aims were economy, functionality, and artistic sobriety free from anachronistic romanticisms and ornamentations. In addition to this, the Bornimers emphasised the idea of a space for a self-determined life, free from social conventions.1360


1360 Books that use the term in their title, and are noteworthy primary sources: Guido Harbers, Der Wohngarten. Seine Raum- und Bauelemente (revised four times: München: Callwey, 1933; 1937; 1952; 1954); Otto Valentien, Zeitgemäße Wohngärten. Eine Sammlung alter und neuer Hausgärten (München: Bruckmann, 1932), Herbert Hoffmann (with Mattern’s colaboration), Garten und Haus: Die schönsten deutschen und ausländischen Wohngärten und ihre Einbauten (four revised edns: Stuttgart: Hoffmann, 1939; 1941; 1951), Beate Hahn (a friend of Mattern’s), Dein Garten wächst mit Dir: vom Kinderbeet zum Wohngarten (Ravensburg: O. Maier, 1952), Gustav Allinger, Schöne Wohngärten in Stadt und Land (München: Bruckmann, 1955), Hans Grohmann, Eigenheim und Wohngarten (München: Bruckmann, 1955)
Wohnlandschaft – landscape for living, dwelling landscape

Wohnlandschaft expresses an anthropocentric notion of the landscape as being shaped and inhabited by man. It refers to the cultural landscapes most of Germany and central Europe consist of. Mattern used the term to express his progressivist view on landscape planning, and he used it as a combat term against the conservatism of the discipline and the widespread focus in landscape planning on nature conservation.1361
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