

Title	Bauhaus: To turn away from normality
Type	Article
URL	<a href="https://ualresearchonline.arts.ac.uk/id/eprint/15904/">https://ualresearchonline.arts.ac.uk/id/eprint/15904/</a>
Date	2020
Citation	Sturgis, Daniel (2020) Bauhaus: To turn away from normality. Art, Design and Communication in Higher Education, 19 (1). pp. 9-18. ISSN 1474 273X
Creators	Sturgis, Daniel

### **Usage Guidelines**

Please refer to usage guidelines at <http://ualresearchonline.arts.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact [ualresearchonline@arts.ac.uk](mailto:ualresearchonline@arts.ac.uk).

License: Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial No Derivatives

Unless otherwise stated, copyright owned by the author

## **Bauhaus - to turn away from normality**

Professor Daniel Sturgis

University of the Arts London

Camberwell College of Arts, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UF

[d.sturgis@camberwell.arts.ac.uk](mailto:d.sturgis@camberwell.arts.ac.uk)

Bauhaus Legacy

Bauhaus Preliminary Course

Walter Gropius

Johannes Itten

Oskar Schlemmer

Gunta Stölzl

## **Bauhaus - to turn away from normality**

### **Abstract**

This paper revisits the history and legacy of the Bauhaus from the vantage point of contemporary art education. It explains how the design school was never a unified project, but rather a collection of disparate voices and opinions, and shows how ideas of community and subjectivity were at its centre. The author asks if these ideas, born out of early 19<sup>th</sup> century educational reform, and pressurized by the political turbulence of 1920s and 30s Germany may be the most useful influences for the Bauhaus impacting on Art and Design education today. The paper was prepared for the opening of the conference *Bauhaus Utopia in Crisis*, 24<sup>th</sup> October 2019, University of the Arts London, Camberwell College of Arts.

The conference was part of the week-long *OurHaus* festival at the University that ran between 21-25<sup>th</sup> October 2019. The festival included the exhibition *Utopia in Crisis*, curated by Daniel Sturgis at Camberwell Space Gallery (16 September – 9 November 2019) touring to Bauhaus-Universität Weimar (2020).

**Daniel Sturgis** is Professor in Painting at Camberwell College of Arts, University of the Arts London. Sturgis' work is regularly exhibited in the UK and internationally. His curated projects include: *Against Landscape* (Grizedale Arts), *The Indiscipline of Painting* (Tate St Ives), Daniel Buren *Voile Toile/Toile Voile* (Wordsworth Trust) and Jeremy Moon *A Retrospective* (Kettle's Yard). Sturgis was a specialist selector and chapter author for Phaidon's *Vitamin P3*, is an Associate Editor of the *Journal of Contemporary Painting* and has written for Burlington Contemporary and *Texte zur Kunst*.

## **Bauhaus - to turn away from normality**

From today's vantage point the Bauhaus should be seen as a turn away from normality. It is certainly this impetus that has governed much of the recent scholarship on the famous school that was founded by Walter Gropius in Weimar one hundred years ago.<sup>1</sup> The idea of the Bauhaus offering something different—creating license for different ways of thinking, living, and making—makes it a valuable focus for today's art schools who are also re-examining how art can and should interact with society at large, with technological change, environmental challenges and the shifting ideas around a constructed self and subjectivities.

The Bauhaus changed dramatically during its short existence, under the tenure of three different directors and its forced migration between three different German cities. The reception and legacy of the Bauhaus has likewise changed since it closed officially in 1933. In one respect in Britain we are perhaps still living with a vision of the Bauhaus created in 1968. Through the fifty-year anniversary exhibition of that year, which opened in Stuttgart arriving later at the Royal Academy, and pre-empting the anniversary date by a year, due in part, to a cold-war race between rival exhibitions being planned in East and West Germany at the time.<sup>2</sup>

For the West, western Europe and America, the cultural reception of the 1968 exhibition was important. The exhibition was claiming the Bauhaus as a precursor to the newly formed cultural policies of the still young Federal Republic of Germany. The exhibition proposed that the Bauhaus could be seen to help inform these developments. It could also help reposition Germany—devastated, defeated and culpable—after the horrors of National Socialism as a forward-looking cultural nation. There had been an earlier exhibition, notably

*Bauhaus 1919-1928* in 1938 at the new Museum of Modern Art in New York.<sup>3</sup> This exhibition had similar intentions to *50 Years Bauhaus* and it can be argued had a huge impact on the very conception of the museum's view of the idea and qualities of European modernism. Indeed, it is possible to equate MoMa's curatorial and collections policy as the active art historical epicentre that has shaped the dominant understanding of both a modernist canon and its characteristics. A policy that saw modernism as being utopian, progressive and not unimportantly in this instance clean, austere and in black and white. The vibrant colours of much early Bauhaus design and all Bauhaus architecture was misrepresented in this exhibition by being reproduced in solely black and white photographs. This aesthetic which was a misrepresentation was extremely powerful and influential and can be seen to have influenced the development of the international style norm. Of course, the 1938 exhibition was staged just one year after the Nazi *Degenerate Art* exhibition opened in Munich.<sup>4</sup> The message by default was clear: America understood modernism and the Nazi Degenerative Art exhibition did not. Bauhaus Masters like Klee and Kandinsky being poignantly represented in both exhibitions.

The 1968 exhibition built on this, but was much bigger, and was able to source exhibits from the continent rather than just the few artworks that were in the US in the late 1930s. The 1968 exhibition was also supported by the German state—and therefore indirectly through cultural and political soft power, by the United States through their contributing financial resources. The show travelled for three years spreading its message to the world. It is from this exhibition, designed by one of the Bauhaus's most notable students Herbert Bayer, then a resident in the US, that we get the idea of the Bauhaus as a self-contained homogeneous school, built following the architect Walter Gropius' sole vision and solely concerned with ideas of progress, freedom and democracy. *Bauhaus 68* showed that the school's greatest

achievement was undoubtedly architectural and built through a select roster of individual characters—men—mainly pedagogic masters that came together to trumpet a utilitarian design vision. A vision that eliminated the old with all its fussy decorative and dusty bourgeois excesses and created a new vocabulary around the idea of mass production in the servitude of a people's architecture.

Undeniably this is all true... the Bauhaus can be seen as all those things but the picture is more complicated and this inherited 50-year-old vision is only a partial reading which misses much that is perhaps now more useful to consider when thinking of the school now. There are many Bauhauses. Indeed, can one institution ever be one thing, and can its reception ever just mean one thing. Now in 2019, the Bauhaus is just as much an historical fact as it ever was, but it can no longer be commodified so easily. It is an historically framed complex pedagogical organism—that had ambitions as all great educational institutions do in shaping and changing society through discourse. Through recognising the importance of this internal dialogue and its international ramifications one can see more clearly now how the Bauhaus intersected with ideas of politics, history, and its diaspora and how those qualities shaped and pressurized the sphere of its influence.<sup>5</sup>

The roots of the Bauhaus are in the November revolution of 1918 and the abolition of the German federal monarchy and the formation of Weimar Republic. A republic conceived along soviet lines. Walter Gropius, an architect with a zeal for teaching before the Great War and a decorated Hussar during it, was involved in this new revolutionary fervour. He was active in the extremely political November Group. A group of mainly expressionist artists and architects that were linked by their shared socialist values and a desire to support a socialist revolution in Germany. The November Group and the associated Arbeitsrat für

Kunst or soviet art council, included many of the artists and founders of the Bauhaus, and had one key objective: the union of art and the people. Of changing art from a bourgeois commodity to an art to influence society and the public. As one Arbeitsrat für Kunst flyer from March 1919 stated:

*Art and the people must form an entity. Art shall no longer be a luxury of the few but should be enjoyed and experienced by the broad masses. The aim is an alliance of the arts under the wing of great architecture. Arbeitsrat für Kunst 1919<sup>6</sup>*

In the same year and more or less the same month as this publication the Bauhaus itself opened its doors in Weimar. Gropius had renegotiated a tenure to lead the art and design school that was first offered to him in very different political circumstances before the war. He wrote and sent out the now famous Bauhaus publicity with its expressionistic woodcut of a cathedral by the American artist, then resident in Weimar, Lyonel Feininger.

Feininger's expressionistic image symbolized dramatic and utter newness. Raw in its style, it was also radically looking backwards via William Morris and the Arts and Craft's movement, which Gropius was very familiar with, to the new Medievalism. To the collective endeavour of the great Bauhütte craft workshops which surrounded the building of each of Europe's great Gothic cathedrals. These were craft workshops or guilds, and Gropius saw them as working in harmony, on the creation of the total work of art, that was the cathedral. For Gropius this was a total work of social art. As the cathedral was a site that was both secular and sacred. Through this thinking Gropius was transposing and adapting the popular Wagnerian idea of an 'art form of all art forms' the Gesamtkunstwerk for his own needs.<sup>7</sup> Rather than being manifest in an all-encompassing opera the Gesamtkunstwerk was now to

be seen in the construction of a cathedral. A building that could be understood as being the greatest manifestation of all the arts: of architecture, of painting, of glass, of craftsmanship in all its guises, and housing the creative and dramatic staging of the liturgy itself. For Gropius, the cathedral was a collective coming together of many people, ideas and skills working harmoniously through shared endeavour to address or celebrate the spiritual and theological needs of a society or community. It was this model of shared co-working towards a common goal that became his template for the Bauhaus in Weimar. Thus, all students needed to be above all craftsmen or women and would have experience of working together, collectively with different materials and different artistic mediums, relinquishing in co-production the ego of their own authorship.

The famous Bauhaus curricula diagram, of concentric circles was drawn by Gropius. The rings move inwards, as the student progresses, from the preliminary course through the various workshops and practices to the centre ring titled 'Bau' or building, or more correctly 'construction' in German. Although it is tempting to just equate this Bau with Gropius' creation of a raw new secular Gothic serving societal needs, such a reading perhaps overemphasizes architecture as the sole and only focus for a Bauhaus construction. It was only in 1927 that architecture was formally taught at the Bauhaus and for many of the Bauhaus Masters and students there was some equally important parallel constructions taking place. For the preeminent Bauhaus artist Oskar Schlemmer the Feininger and Gropius cathedral of the arts was a cathedral to socialism. For many others, though, through varying degrees of experimentation, the Bau at the centre was also the construction site of new subjectivities and new ideas of self.



The preliminary course and formation of almost all of the workshops were influenced by Johannes Itten, who was one of an international group of artists drawn from central Europe that Gropius collected to instruct at the school. Gropius called them Masters, as opposed to academic Professors so as to stress their craft and workmanlike credentials and to break with the dominant Atelier system of German art education. The Atelier system of education is built around students gaining instruction from an individual artist or professor in his studio. Students would follow a hierarchical curriculum initially undertaking observational drawing from plaster casts of Greek and Roman statuary, before progressing to study anatomy and then drawing the human figure. The focus of the atelier was on the learning skills and techniques associated with realism and the dominant genres of painting and sculpture. In the Bauhaus curriculum at Weimar the Masters' responsibilities were quite different and each workshop, not atelier, had a Master of Works and Master of Form delivering technical and artistic instruction respectively. This was a radical re-organisation and was designed to create new forms of pedagogic interaction and educational contact. It was part of the Bauhaus desire to question the past and preconceived ideas in the hope of being able to allow people to develop new and more responsive, collective interactions. Gropius understood that any art or design institution is really making people rather than products. For Gropius and others mankind as well as society had been broken by the First World War. Radical change was needed. When the Bauhaus moved to Dessau the dual Master roles changed with the creation of Junior Master and Masters both working together and taking collective responsibility jointly for technical and artistic instruction.

For Johannes Itten, with his interest in Eastern and esoteric mysticism, the brain and the body were linked, and both were broken. It was for this reason that in the preliminary course he devised the curriculum focused on unlearning things. It was about rejecting the pre-conceived

ideas and habits that had been inherited by a bourgeois Western society—a society that had ended so bloodily and disastrously—and through unlearning, dismantling, and returning to beginnings it was possible for students to endeavour to rebuild. In this respect, it was out with the traditions of the renaissance and the beaux arts studio and in with experimentation, play and the new educational theories around childhood development being put forward by Friedrich Fröbel, and others. It is this unlearning that remained key to all the subsequent iterations of the Preliminary course especially those devised by Itten's student Josef Albers and László Moholy-Nagy and indeed it is this translation of unlearning and beginning again that leads via the Breton Hall Arts and Education conference in 1956 to the development of the Basic Design Courses and on to the Foundation course of today.<sup>8</sup>

The role of Itten in the early Bauhaus cannot be underestimated and his presence could even dominate that of Gropius. He was tied to and came from a pedagogic model of individual instruction and self-discovery that complicated Gropius' position on collective authorship and community. This was a tension between artistic self-expression and shared communal production. Itten, influenced by the new educational theories of kindergarten education, as well as the new theories of psychoanalysis, believed in personal growth and individual self-discovery. These ideas he brought to the Bauhaus as he did his experience of running a Viennese Beaux Art atelier. Indeed, it was in Vienna that he had first met Gropius as he taught the architect's estranged first wife Alma Mahler. In Weimar, Itten set himself apart. Like his fellow Bauhaus Master, Paul Klee, Itten set up his atelier at arms-length from the main school, but unlike Klee's, his studio was romantically and symbolically housed in a disused church standing alone and set in the picturesque park that Goethe had laid out in the town. However, it was perhaps Itten's over enthusiasm with bridging for students, the dichotomy of the mind and body, that really set himself apart. To rebuild the self—to create

that new human—Itten was drawn to the Mazdaznan religion, an esoteric and spiritual belief system centered on a late 19<sup>th</sup> century Chicago based reinterpretation of ancient Zoroastrianism. It was a belief system that focused on binaries, of good and evil, of light and dark, and took its name from Mazda the ancient god of light and wisdom. The student's bodies were purged spiritually through meditation but also for some physically through enemas and 'light and bright' hallucinations induced through yogic group exercises that starved their brains of oxygen. Although that search can be seen as new-age and innocent, it touched or resonated especially in Germany, with more troubling ideas of physical, racial and spiritual perfection. Indeed, even Itten's shaved head was to demonstrate a form of cranial superiority.

The Bauhaus curriculum diagram was drawn in 1922 the year before the Weimar exhibition, housed in the school's upstairs hall, where the new co-authored products, fabrics, weavings and furniture, were first shown, and where commissions were sought from local and national businesses. It was during this exhibition that Georg Muche and Adolf Meyer's revolutionary prototype of a white-box modernist house, the *Haus am Horn*, was unveiled in the outskirts of town and Gropius gave his *Art and Technology* lecture. Here the Bauhaus director, four years into his role, fully articulated and repositioned the school towards industrial manufacture rather than the hand-tooled and hand-made products that had until then dominated the workshops. Gropius promulgated the ethical necessity of the emancipatory qualities of mass production and through this turn he re-asserted his authority over arguably the more charismatic, cultish and experienced pedagogue Itten, who was soon to leave the school. A departure, that was bound to come but was catalysed by the skirmishes that Itten and the school had with the avant-garde Dutch constructivist and Neo Plasticist artist Theo van Doesburg.<sup>9</sup> Van Doesburg was in Weimar and actively teaching in small studio at the

time, drawn like so many to Weimar that can be seen as undergoing an avant-garde renaissance. For the individualistic Itten constructivism was too objective, rule based and authoritarian. Gropius' realignment in *Art and Technology* can be understood therefore as a middle ground. One that points still to the importance of the individual working with others and in harmony with the machine world. Even in 1923 Gropius wanted the Bauhaus to be experimental and catholic. To be more open and to be non-unified.

Oskar Schlemmer debuted in 1923 his *The Triadic Ballet* where twelve movements and extraordinary costumes explore form, colour and content. Although the Bauhaus stage does not appear on the curriculum diagram, by the time the school moved to Dessau three years later in 1926, the stage was to become the central hub of the school's new purpose-built building. Architecturally in the middle of it and to be experienced every day. Gropius's new palace of glass in Dessau, held collectivism and the sharing of performative experiences central. The stage was a focus not only for the Bauhaus parties, that were pedagogic as well as celebratory and had started with the very inception of the school, but also for other experiments, performances and play. It was also no accident that the glass curtain walls in Dessau, inspired by the fenestration of medieval cathedrals as much as London's Crystal Palace and prototyped by Gropius before the war, looked out onto the woods near an ornamental parkland. A view that complicates and reinstates the Bauhäusler's connection to nature as well as industry and recognising the role of park-learning, exercising, candlelit processions, kite festivals, and the legacy of Goethe's park in Weimar.

If you can accept that the Bau at the centre of the curricula diagram can be seen as a construction of the Bauhäusler's ideal self, a politicized and collectivized self, with that assumed emancipatory loss of ego, it is interesting to see how the design of the Dessau school

facilitated this. For unlike in Weimar where the school was housed in Van der Velde's existing buildings, Gropius' showcase to the world was the Dessau Bauhaus. A building that proclaimed newness and a creative and revolutionary collective eco-system, and was moored like a beaming and otherworldly ocean liner in the outskirts of industrial Dessau, the school's new civic host. Light, and air permeated these spaces. Looking in, at creativity and radical lifestyles, looking out at nature, industry and the world. All part of a vision that meant that when students leant forward on the now iconic balconies of the residential Prellerhaus, with architectural site-lines carefully obscuring the balcony's handrails, the students could feel like they were flying—beyond the limitations of the existing material world. In just the same manner that at the same time the Bauhaus Master Marcel Breuer could conceptualize the development of the chair from ethno-arts-and-crafts, to form-following function wood, to chrome, to nothing but air.<sup>10</sup> Just air.

It was this 'beyond' that was important, and although it is clear how this idea links with Itten's idea of perfection and light, it is interesting to think of it also through Schlemmer's new-human. For Schlemmer both on and off the stage, as in for instance in the Rabe House murals (1928-30), the new human is pan-sexual, non-gendered and above all androgynous.<sup>11</sup> Not trapped in singularity, a body, or convention.

From the very beginning gender politics in the school was not straightforward. The school was founded in the year of women's suffrage and Gropius' invitation was to all 'irrespective of age and sex'. His message echoed those of the Viennese educational reformers he so admired and was positioned against the more traditional all-male Fine Art Academies. The women came. Initially there were more women than men, 84 to 79 in the first semester of 1919. However, although they met a very progressive environment the Bauhaus was

unsurprisingly still steeped in the patriarchal hierarchies of the age and the more dominant Enlightenment positions of Rousseau and Nietzsche which separated intelligence and feelings across the gender divide. A position that was visualized and conceptualized by Wassily Kandinsky with his famous schema which attributed colour and shape to emotions.

The contribution made by female students at the Bauhaus was not solely focussed on the weaving workshop. Significant numbers of students progressed past the preliminary course into all the workshops in the school. However, it is undoubtedly true that many of the workshop Masters were suspicious of their talents and gender. Women who made up a third of all Bauhaus students made up at least half of the students in the Pottery, Drawing and Photography workshops. Many of these artists work, such as Margarete Heymann-Loebenstein Marks, Marguerite Friedlaender-Wildenhain, Grete Stern, Ise Gropius, Lucia Moholy and Florence Henri are only now being recognized and their work fully celebrated. Their visibility within Bauhaus scholarship and the history of modernism having been obscured by the legacy of the not so subtle forms of sexism within the Bauhaus itself. There were also at least forty women students studying architecture at the Bauhaus, as well students working in advertising, wall painting and theatre design.<sup>12</sup> Indeed, the commonly held view that the Bauhaus women were solely in the weaving workshop perpetrates the denigration of all the women at the school.

However, the weaving workshop was predominantly, not exclusively, female and many students entered into it as if into a safe space. A space where the personal and social constructions of how a 'new' woman and a woman artist could be was fully explored. The workshop was under Gunta Stölzl's influence from 1925 and her official direction from 1927 when Stölzl was appointed the only female Bauhaus Master. The weavers discovered

that textiles were far more than just a decorative art form or traditional craft. Through the study of ethnographic samples and taking account of new technological developments, the students realized they could articulate textiles as a medium of communication. A medium, as opposed to a design, that was sensual—haptic—as well as optical and that could retain and importantly theorize a sense of touch in industrialisation. The workshop attracted 128 female students over its existence and was to become the income generating centre for the school's products, being one of the few workshops that could turn a commercial profit through sales. It is only in the last twenty years that art historians have been positioning individual weavers, such as Benita Koch-Otte, Otti Berger, Gertrud Arndt, Anni Albers, Lilly Reich firmly into the Bauhaus cannon.

It is worth remembering that Gropius was the first of three directors at the school. As its founder, he could legitimately lay claim to its inception, but later when exiled in America he can be also seen to have commodified and unified the school's history, downplaying certain positions and asserting his overall authority. Perhaps the clearest example of this is in his relationship to Hannes Meyer the school's second director, who he had first championed, when he brought him to Dessau when the school began more formally teaching architecture and working on external building projects. However, in just a year that relationship soured. By the time Meyer officially took over the directorship in April 1928 both had fallen out. Meyer even seeing Gropius as an obstacle to the Bauhaus ideals and trapped in a retrogressive 'medieval cult' rather than as an emancipatory design school or a cathedral to socialism.<sup>13</sup>

One way to see Meyer's rise and Gropius' departure is as a consequence to the founder's greater focus on his individual architectural practice which was taking him further and further

away from the school. However, it can be argued that Gropius' absences, which were both actual and conceptual, were in part trying to alleviate the school's increasingly dire financial situation. The Bauhaus' difficulties were brought about by the costs of the schools move and their new building in Dessau, but also by the city's own developing financial insecurities. In a fast changing and darkening political climate the civic authorities began to hold back support for the Bauhaus which they saw as an increasingly politically unacceptable Jewish-Bolshevistic enclave.

Under Meyer there was a clear shift within the Bauhaus pedagogy away from an artistic and towards a social contract. Although an architect Meyer was to state that the final goal of the Bauhaus was not to be framed as a building—or buildings—as with Gropius, but rather the more ambitious mantra of creating the 'harmonious arrangements of our society'.<sup>14</sup> As such Meyer tried, ten years after its initial founding, to redefine the Bauhaus ethos and to move it away from a unity of art and technology, to something far more social and political. He openly fought what he saw as 'the Bauhaus style' so as to enhance this new vision built totally on the idea of the collective and against individual experimentation. A vision that was against high art, that he saw and despised in the Bauhaus tea glasses and tapestries, and for a celebration of grand-scale life-oriented design. Although passionate and transformative, Meyer's vision was short lived, not only because by mid-August 1930 he had been expelled from his position by the mayor of Dessau who was increasingly worried by the Bauhaus director's Marxist stand, but also because in the subsequent telling of the Bauhaus story his politicized stance was an awkward counter-position. A counter position that was ignored.

When Gropius claimed the Bauhaus was non-political, he did so as means to ensure political and financial support for the school in an increasingly hostile political environment.



However, by the final directorships of Hannes Meyer and then later Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, an already very well-established German architect who purged the communist and collective sensibilities and moved the Bauhaus into a more architecturally focused training school, the fallacy of this statement was plain to see. In the swirling, turbulent political climate, with the rise of National Socialism and the fight against communism, the ideals that the Bauhaus embodied seem very political indeed. So much so that of course under pressure Mies closed the much depleted school soon after its final migration to Berlin.

From today's perspective, it is perhaps important to revisit aspects of this contested story—to remember most pertinently the political and societal turbulences that formed the Bauhaus, the political trauma that ended it, as well as the cold war dialogues that framed its initial receptions. The Bauhaus and later its wider diaspora shows us how artists sought to create a vision for utopia but were fraught by crises. That it is inspirational to artists and designers now must surely be most useful when this predicament is fully acknowledged. The Bauhaus challenges our own artistic institutions to recognize and react to the politics within and around them and more importantly ask how they can offer a place for social and societal experimentation and propositions.

[4822]

---

<sup>1</sup> The Staatliches Bauhaus, was founded on the 1<sup>st</sup> April 1919.

<sup>2</sup> *50 Years Bauhaus: German Exhibition* (1968) [exhibition] London: Royal Academy of Arts. Sept. 21-Oct. 27, 1968. For a fuller international reflection on the legacy of this exhibition see *50 Years after 50 Years of the Bauhaus 1968* (2018) [exhibition] Stuttgart: Württembergischer Kunstverein. May 5 – September 23, 2018.

<sup>3</sup> *Bauhaus: 1919–1928* (1938/9) [exhibition] New York: The Museum of Modern Art. December 7 1938–January 30 1939.

<sup>4</sup> *Die Ausstellung "Entartete Kunst"* (1937) [exhibition] Munich. 19 July -30 November 1937.

---

<sup>5</sup> For a fuller account on the influence and intersection of the Bauhaus with an associated diaspora of art and design schools see: von Osten, M. Watson, G. (2019) *Bauhaus Imaginista A School in the World*, London: Thames and Hudson.

<sup>6</sup> Arbeitsrat für Kunst, [flyer] published March 1st 1919.

<sup>7</sup> Wagner popularized the idea of the idea of Gesamtkunstwerk or ‘total work of art’ in two essays both written in 1849 *Art and Revolution* and *The Artwork of the Future*, where he saw theatre as being a means to unify all works of art. The idea of a ‘total work of art’ and the first use of the term Gesamtkunstwerk was first put forward by the German philosopher Karl Friedrich Eusebius Trahdorff in his essay *Aesthetics* 1827.

<sup>8</sup> Basic Design pedagogy and its relationship to foundation and preliminary courses in art and design was the focus of the Bretton Hall *Society of Education through Art* conference in 1956. The British artist Tom Hudson was instrumental in these developments and was the focus of the exhibition *Tom Hudson Transitions – Interactions in Art Education 1960-68* (2013) [exhibition] Yorkshire Sculpture Park: Garden Gallery. 25 May – 8 Sept. 2013. Also see National Arts Education Archive / Yorkshire Sculpture Park (2013). Tom Hudson: Education through Art. [video] Available at: <https://vimeo.com/72877635> [Accessed 17 Dec. 2019].

<sup>9</sup> see Hemken, K. (2009) ‘Clash of the Natural and Mechanical Human: Theo van Doesburg versus Johannes Itten 1922’ in: Oswalt, P. *Bauhaus Conflicts, 1919-2009 Controversies and Counterpoints*, Berlin: Hatje Cantz. pp 34-46

<sup>10</sup> *ein bauhaus-film*. (1926). [film] Directed by M. Breuer. Bauhaus Dessau: Bauhaus Journal.

<sup>11</sup> see Ascher Barnstone, D. (2019) ‘Androgyny in Oskar Schlemmer's Figural Art’ in: Otto, E and Rössler, P. (eds.) *Bauhaus Bodies Gender, Sexuality, and Body Culture in Modernism's Legendary Art School*, London: Bloomsbury. pp 217-239

<sup>12</sup> A full breakdown of women and the workshops that they studied in at the Bauhaus is included in Otto, E and Rössler, P. (eds) (2019) *Bauhaus Bodies Gender, Sexuality, and Body Culture in Modernism's Legendary Art School*, London: Bloomsbury. pp 10-11

<sup>13</sup> see Droste, M. (2009) ‘The Successor's Disinheritance: The conflict between Hannes Meyer and Walter Gropius’ in: Oswalt, P. *Bauhaus Conflicts, 1919-2009 Controversies and Counterpoints*, Berlin: Hatje Cantz. pp 68-86

<sup>14</sup> *ibid*