

Dorothy Rowe, "Desiring Berlin: Gender and modernity in Weimar Germany," in Marsha Meskimmon and Shearer West (eds.), *Visions of the "Neue Frau:" Women and the Visual Arts in Weimar Germany* (Menston, England: Scolar Press, 1995): 143-164.

The knowledge of cities is a decoding of their images, ones uttered thoughtlessly, as if in a dream (Kracauer 1964 p.41).

When it first rose to prominence as the capital city of the newly unified Germany in 1871, Berlin rapidly became the centre of a variety of discourses of urban modernity, the most prominent of which focused on its rootlessness, ugliness and lack of tradition on the one hand, and its status as a *Weltstadt* (metropolis or world city) embodying technology, potential and progress on the other. By the time the Weimar Republic had recovered from its initial shaky start in 1919, Berlin had established its ground as the largely undisputed capital of European culture and the double strand of pre-war response to the city had translated into overtly sexual terms. Berlin had become a metaphor for a modernity both feared and desired, and as such it had become embodied in the figure of a sensuous woman.

Discourses of modernity centering upon the city would seem to be founded more often than not on male subjective desire where woman becomes an overdetermined sexualized object. Historically, such representations of the city, which serve to occlude the economic, social and historical specificity of women's relationship to modernity in 1920s Germany, can be in part traced to the increasing loss of (male) cultural authority as it was perceived during this period. This chapter will examine how Berlin is implicated in the construction of a gender-specific version of the experience of modernity and how such experience was articulated in visual representation, specifically painting, during this period. The argument will demonstrate how the sexualized image of Berlin in Weimar Germany arose at the same time as radical social changes in the history and position of women were taking place and that this specific image was related to particular anxieties regarding the role of women in the public realm at this time. I shall argue that the pre-war aesthetic responses to the city, combined with a certain sexual disquiet aroused by some of the effects of urbanization were accelerated as a result of the First World War and led to the fetishization of the city so apparent in the culture of the Weimar Republic.

Methodologically, I am indebted to Michel Foucault's reformulation of a Nietzschean "genealogy" which dispenses with the transcendental subject of history and replaces it with an investigation of the different relational levels of constituted knowledge which in turn allow for a reconstitution of the subject within a specific historical framework. By taking on board Foucault's premise that "it is not a matter of locating everything on one level ... but of realizing that there is actually a whole order of levels of different types of events, differing in amplitude, chronological breadth, and capacity to produce effects," I intend to display a sense of plurality in the sociohistorical readings of the visual and verbal images that follow (Foucault 1984 p.56).

I am aware that the invocation of the term "modernity" to denote the historically specific moments of late Imperial and Weimar Germany is problematic since the temporal and geographical boundaries of the term are open to constant historical negotiation. For my purposes I have taken it to signify the third phase of Marshall Berman's three-phase account of the history of Western modernity which focuses on the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as that post-Enlightenment period of mass industrialization in which "modern mankind found itself in the midst of a great emptiness of values and yet, at the same time, a remarkable abundance of

possibilities" (Berman 1982 p.21). Berman, together with Jürgen Habermas, Janet Wolff and other cultural commentators, couples the recognition that the temporal boundaries of modernity extend at least as far back as the sixteenth century with the notion that, during the eighteenth century, a specific change in the form of modern consciousness took place (Habermas 1985, Wolff 1990). Wolff in particular outlines the consequences of industrial modernity on the role and position of women in the nineteenth century. She argues that on the level of discourse, modernity is constructed wholly in terms of male-normative experience. Taking late nineteenth-century Paris as her paradigm, she uses Baudelaire's classic text, "The Painter of Modern Life" (1863), to reveal one of the central premises of the dominant constructions of modernity to be the controlling power of the male flâneur's gaze. She points out that there is no position left open to the flâneuse in the public realm and that the objectification of women in the male literature of modernity belies the historical experiences of women's particular relationship to it. She also notes that it was at this time too that the culture of separate spheres arose which served to confine women theoretically to the private realm (Wolff 1990). The rigidity of the distinctions between public and private, a palpably false dichotomy, was an attempt to mask the destabilizing effects on social relations of the new sense of time, space and motion which characterized the experience of modernity. It is with a similar viewpoint in mind that my analysis of the connections between gender and modernity in Imperial and more specifically Weimar Germany is located.

The rise of Berlin in Imperial Germany

The most predominant site of conflict and tension concomitant with the late nineteenth century transition to the "Industrial Age" in Europe was the metropolis. In Germany, Berlin was a late arrival in terms of its status as a European capital city when compared with the earlier achievements of London, Paris or Vienna.¹ During the early nineteenth century, Berlin was the undisputed capital of the Royal Court of Prussia, but its distinct transformation from a *Grosstadt* (an ordinary large city) to a *Weltstadt* (a metropolis or world city) only occurred after it became the new capital of the German Empire in 1871. Prior to this date, the city had already built up its position as a central location in the development of new communications networks such as railways and telegraph systems. Now, however, it also contained the seat of government, the already existing military from the former Prussian court and it became a new financial, commercial, industrial and manufacturing base of Germany. The demographic changes which this simultaneous expansion in different directions incurred were vast. In 1865 the population of old Berlin was just under 600 thousand; by 1910 that of Greater Berlin had risen to well over three million.² Within the space of half a century old Berlin had been transformed from an average-sized city into a thriving twentieth-century metropolis.

Thus, while the city was developing as a dominant capital in the pre-war era, familiar social and economic problems associated with rapid urbanization and industrialization were also occurring which gave rise to widespread cultural anxiety. Overcrowding, poverty, crime and prostitution were particularly acute.³ The disquiet caused by these factors was simultaneously exacerbated in Germany by the increasingly vociferous demands of the German women's movement which emerged most strongly at the turn of the century.⁴ Many cultural commentators registered a growing unease with regard to the regulation of female sexuality which was thought to be getting out of hand on a variety of social levels. While kleptomania was said to be on the increase among middle-class women—diagnosed as a disease of their uncontrolled and uncontrollable sexuality—prostitution was most commonly associated with the threatening

aspects of working-class female sexuality as the carrier of disease and death.⁵ Women who campaigned for equal rights on all social levels were seen as a direct threat to bourgeois male cultural authority and were thus blamed for the breakdown of traditional family values or else were equated with the general threat of social democracy and communism.

A clear double standard was operative among the male bourgeoisie who blamed the various women's movements for the decline in moral values and the break-up of the family. In Wilhelmine Germany one of the major social and political debates at the turn of the century, which engaged both men and women and which became one of the rallying cries of the bourgeois women's movement, was concerned with the legal status of prostitution. Prostitution was never made illegal in Germany, though it was a severely regulated activity. The rights of the prostitute were subject to the rules of the Sittenpolizei, or "Morals Police," yet as recent studies have shown, the numbers of prostitutes in Berlin far exceeded the available numbers of Sittenpolizei to regulate them.⁶ It was this lack of regulation that caused moral panic in the pages of the "respectable" middle-class press. Prostitutes were acceptable to the male bourgeoisie only in certain urban spaces but when they crossed defined boundaries they aroused moral indignation and outrage and, at the worst extreme, murder. They were welcomed at festivals, fairs and popular bourgeois entertainment establishments, but abhorred during daylight hours if they appeared in public civic contexts. This regulation of female sexuality in the public realm and the consequences of boundary breaking for the individual female became particularly pertinent to the modernist representation of women in urban contexts. In such images, women in the city were more often than not confined to the roles of prostitutes, sex-murder victims, widows (a significant post-war signal of a sexually available woman), or anonymous bourgeois shoppers whose identities were fixed in terms of their roles as wives and mothers.

Although anxiety and hysteria regarding female sexuality dominated debates about the character of the modern city in imperial Germany. Berlin was also firmly linked to a ceremonious military past and in this sense it was simultaneously represented in terms which also evoked an aura of civic pride and glory.⁷ It would seem that the concept of the "newness" of Berlin that was prevalent in the emerging discourses of urban modernity rested upon a tension between tradition and modernity that provoked a number of conflicting responses to the city.

As early as 1876 the Berlin executive council noted pleasurably that:

with a speed unprecedented in Europe, our community has burst its bounds as a modest princely seat with an almost all-pervasive small-town character, and has suddenly become a world city which is in equal of the million-peopled cities which have traditionally been the focus of great events.⁸

The futuristic note of potential witnessed in these sentiments was carried through some years later by the "great event" of the 1896 Berlin Trade Exhibition. The exhibition, in keeping with the pattern of other European "World Exhibitions", unofficially marked Berlin's arrival as a successful new *Weltstadt* able to represent the imperial power of Germany by the range of products it brought together under one roof. The official 1894 planning catalogue stated that "the Berlin Trade Exhibition taking place in the year 1896, will undertake the task of creating a total picture [*Gesamtbild*], of Berlin's trading activities in order to demonstrate the industrial and commercial achievements of Berlin and its environs in their versatility and quality and to clarify Berlin's importance as an industrial and trade city" (*Offizieller Haupt-Katalog* 1896 p.36). The organizers' intentions seemed to have been more than fulfilled and Berlin's status as a *Weltstadt*

became secured. Thus, in a review for *Die Zeit* published in Vienna in 1896, the German sociologist Georg Simmel, a native Berliner, commented that

It is a particular attraction of world fairs that they form a momentary centre of world civilization, assembling the products of the entire world in a confined space as if in a single picture ... Thus it becomes clear what is meant by a "world city" and that Berlin, despite everything, has become one. That is, a single city to which the whole world sends its products.⁹

Even Kaiser Wilhelm II, also writing in 1896 on the occasion of the Trade Exhibition, tentatively suggested that "Berlin is a great city, a world city perhaps?" (quoted in Masur 1970 p.153).

The bewildering array of goods on display at the exhibition was seen to embody a microcosm of world civilization to which Berlin was the key. For Simmel the "exhibition [showed] the attempt, often successful, to develop aesthetic opportunities which through display can contribute to their attractiveness" (Simmel 1991 p.123). The concept of a new type of aesthetic sensation aroused by the exhibition could also be extended to the perception of the city itself. One of the major aesthetic features of Berlin's modernity was the new experience of space, time and motion by which it was now characterized. Indeed many of the comments relating to the city during this period bristle with the language of dynamism and energy. In 1895 a Berlin publicist, Paul Lindenberg, described the city's "fresh diligence and buoyant spirit of enterprise ... its earnest struggling and restless striving upward - ever more conscious of the goal" (Lindenberg 1895 pp.6-8). Seven years later, Bruno Taut, writing to his brother in 1902, after his first visit to Berlin, commented that:

I always felt happiest on the great traffic arteries of Berlin, Leipzigerstrasse and Friedrichstrasse where the life of the city pulsed most vigorously. The throng is particularly odd when viewed from the bus, and I had the feeling that the people, electric railways, etc., were bustling around down below simply to give me this picture.¹⁰

Such abstracted vitality, which as Iain Boyd Whyte has pointed out "prompted a positive, if superficial response to the city as the *Stadt der Zukunft*, the future made real", also had its negative side (Whyte 1991 p.229).

Simultaneously, then, there appeared to have been a mood of aesthetic dissatisfaction with the appearance of large sprawling cities, especially Berlin, which was not confined to any one particular political ideology. In 1899 the young Walter Rathenau, later to become the extremely short-lived socialist Prime Minister of Bavaria in 1918, published an ironically titled essay on Berlin, "The Most Beautiful City in the World" (Rathenau 1902). The essay was Rathenau's analysis of Berlin's architectural ugliness in relation to its modernity. Like Simmel, Rathenau recognized that Berlin had been thrust into a modernity which had coincided with the ascendancy of consumer capitalism but for him it was a superficial modernity that lacked any reflective dialectic with tradition. Karl Friedrich Schinkel's early nineteenth-century cathedral had been hastily demolished and replaced by a large new building designed by Julius Raschdorff which Rathenau topically and somewhat acerbically described as a "cathedral in World-Exposition style." The association between the site of the "new religion" of capitalist consumerist pleasures (the world exposition), replacing traditional religious values implicit in

Rathenau's critique was to become a recurrent trope in a variety of discourses of modernity during the Weimar period. For Rathenau, the authentic Prussian culture of Berlin represented by Frederick the Great and Schinkel had all too readily been demolished and replaced by a hybrid of uncomfortable and eclectic styles which lacked definition and clarity. The sense of cultural history that Berlin once had, had been usurped by an ugly Americanism, a "Chicago on the Spree." Rathenau's polemic against Berlin was not simply a reactionary plea against modernity; it articulated a specific desire to ground Berlin's modernity in a more convincing dialogue with its past.¹¹

Similar sentiments were expressed continuously by the editor of the journal *Kunst und Künstler*, Karl Scheffler, whose position with regard to Berlin's modernity remained fairly consistent throughout his publishing career. For Scheffler, Berlin was "the capital of all modern ugliness" as expressed in his book *Berlin: Ein Stadtschicksal* (Berlin: A City's Destiny) of 1910.¹² His arguments were a development of those voiced by Rathenau in that he too deplored Berlin's absence of any urban traditions and its aesthetic formlessness which he articulated in terms of the city's lack of physiognomic character.

The aesthetic contemplation of the city did, however, occasionally find its allies, especially in the work of August Endell whose book, *Die Schönheit der grossen Stadt* (The Beauty of the Metropolis), was published in 1908. Endell's text was a metaphorical stroll through the "landscape" of Berlin. For him "the metropolis, despite all the offensive buildings, despite the noise, despite everything for which one can reproach it, is, to one who wishes to see, a miracle of beauty and poetry, a fairy tale brighter, more colorful, more variegated than anything related by a poet."¹³ Endell sought to aestheticize the city in a similar way to Baudelaire in late nineteenth-century Paris, by accepting its modernity and engaging with it.

One of the most recently celebrated pre-war responses to the development of Berlin came in the sociological work of Georg Simmel, especially, although not exclusively, in his 1903 essay "The Metropolis and Mental Life." In his response to the Berlin Trade Exhibition in terms of its effects upon the changing perceptions of Berlin, as well as its status as a shop window onto the world of global commodity production, Simmel had already revealed his interest in the phenomena of modern urban capitalism and its effects upon the social life of the individual. This was a theme that was to characterize most of his work from the publication of *The Philosophy of Money* in 1900 to his death in 1918.

"The Metropolis and Mental Life" is an attempt to come to terms with the psychology of the male individual as he is affected and changed by the particular experiences of modern urban life. It differs in this respect from the responses to the city examined above in that it does not chart a specific aesthetic response to the city, but it remains firmly grounded in a general sociological analysis. Recalling the familiar Baudelairean tropes of the shifting stimuli that the modern city has to offer to the gazing flâneur, Simmel proceeds to elaborate his theories of the effects of the industrial capitalist metropolis on the psyche of the individual city dweller. Janet Wolff has pointed out quite cogently how Simmel's position on modernity in this essay shares its masculine bias with Baudelaire, although it is clear from many of Simmel's other writings that he was concerned to situate the position of women within a framework of sociological modernity. Although he may not have been wholly successful in these attempts, he did display an unusual awareness of and sensitivity to the complexities of women's role in social life in much of his other work.¹⁴

In "The Metropolis and Mental Life," Simmel writes that "Man is a creature whose existence is dependent on differences" and that "to the extent that the metropolis creates these

psychological conditions—with every crossing of the street, with the tempo and multiplicity of economic, occupational and social life—it creates in the sensory foundations of mental life ... a deep contrast to the slower ... rhythm of ... rural existence” (Simmel 1971 p.325). The result of the city dweller’s continuous exposure to different sensory impressions is that the integrated total (male) individual dissolves into elements whereby in order to protect itself from “the profound disruption with which the fluctuations and discontinuities of the external milieu threaten it”, it acts “in a primarily rational manner” (Simmel 1971 p.326). The construction of human ties becomes rationalistically based around the money economy while at the same time each individual becomes differentiated (as opposed to integrated). Thus, while the individual is interacting with other individuals in a rational manner on the public social and economic level, his inner life remains supposedly free, although the thus differentiated individual then also becomes subject to a crisis of identity. Simmel’s theory of the differentiation of the individual includes notions of impersonality, detachment, isolation, segmented friendships, commodification of relationships and, above all, the significance of boundaries. Since these factors remained specific to Simmel’s conception of metropolitan life, rural existence posed none of these problems and the mental life of the country dweller was said to be altogether more calm and less differentiated.

Simmel’s theory of differentiation of the alienated individual in the big city raised important questions regarding problems of social control that concerned many commentators in Germany at this time on both sides of the political spectrum.¹⁵ While capitalism was increasingly experienced as monolithic, the subjectivity of the individual was becoming progressively more fragmented and therefore difficult to subject effectively to regulation and control. For conservatives such as Theodor Fritsch and slightly later, Oswald Spengler, it could and indeed would, be taken as an open invitation to impose order by authoritarian means (Spengler 1980; Fritsch 1896).

For Theodor Fritsch writing in 1896, the proposal for a “*Stadt der Zukunft*” was a very different order from the polluted overcrowding of the present industrial metropolis of Berlin. Fritsch’s *Weltanschauung* stemmed from the late nineteenth-century German *volkisch* movement, already propagating racial purity and anti-semitism and influenced heavily by Julius Langbehn’s notorious work *Rembrandt als Erzieher* (Rembrandt as Educator, 1890). During the 1890s Fritsch began to publish the journal *Der Hammer* which deplored the physical degeneration of the German people produced by the cosmopolitan character of modern urban life. Instead, he extolled the virtues of the soil and racial purity “as potential conquerors of the Jews” (Stern 1961 p.168). The *Stadt der Zukunft* became Germany’s equivalent to the garden city movement popular in England at this time. However, Fritsch’s “city of the future” differed from the English garden city in that he did not actually propose urban decentralization as the ideal alternative to *Grosstadt* living. What Fritsch did propose was in many ways far more severe. As a racial and social propagandist, he was concerned to create an urban society which was totally regulated and in which each member of that society knew exactly where his or her place on the social scale was. Fritsch’s ideal city would be based around a zoned grid system in which the proletariat and the industries in which they worked would be located at the periphery in zones V and VI, with a green belt dividing the factories from the inner city of the wealthy elite who would be more centrally located in zones II and III. The city would be a semi-circular format in which open land would be directly at the centre in zone I and there would be a surrounding green belt. The size of the city could be infinite, spiraling outwards from the centre but it would be strictly regulated with low-rise housing.¹⁶

Fortunately, Fritsch's idiosyncratic ideas never really gained a substantial following, yet they were symptomatic of a growing right-wing unease with regard to social control in the ever-expanding metropolis. The thrust of the more popular tight-wing attack was laid down between 1851 and 1869 in William Riehl's four-volume work entitled *The Natural History of the German People as the Foundation of German Social Politics*.¹⁷ Riehl's argument and that of his subsequent popularizers was one which advocated the dissolution of the city completely. It was believed that only via such an act of disablement, followed by the reinstatement of rural hierarchies and values, could the spread of social democracy be stemmed and the threat of a revolutionary uprising be avoided. For the left, however, fear of the impotency to act as a social body due to the experience of fragmentation caused by the onslaught of global capitalism had already been voiced by Engels in 1844:

However much one may be aware that this isolation of the individual, this narrow self-seeking is the fundamental principal of our society everywhere, it is nowhere so shamelessly bare-faced, so self-conscious as just here in the crowding of the great city. The dissolution of mankind into monads ... is here carried out to its utmost extremes (Engels 1936 p.24).

Thus, for Engels, while individuals became fragmented on a social level, capitalism was experienced as monolithic and the individual city-dweller became paralyzed to act beyond his own individualistic needs; this was alienation in the extreme.

The result of big city dwelling for the individual was perceived most often then, in terms of a tension between mass crowding and egotistical individualism. The cynicism regarding the political and social merits of the emerging urban proletariat recalls Andreas Huyssens' observation that:

the fear of the masses in this age of declining liberalism (of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries) is always also a fear of woman, a fear of nature out of control, a fear of the unconscious, of sexuality, of the loss of identity and stable ego-boundaries in the mass (Huyssens 1988).

While the writings of Fritsch, Riehl, Simmel and Engels cited above on the whole make no specific mention of the role of women in the city as subjective individuals, it is quite clear that historically, women were increasingly evident in the public realm. Although in economic terms, their presence did not significantly alter their status of independence and equality when compared with that of men, simply the emergence of a more publicly prominent profile for women led to a prevailing sense of challenge to existing male-dominated hierarchies. Thus, hand in hand with the growing mythology of Berlin as a rootless disordered "world city," went an often sublimated fear of female sexuality.

Sexuality and the city in Weimar Germany

The outbreak of the First World War in 1914 and the ensuing political revolution in 1918 acted as a catalyst not only for the modernization of Germany but also for the various pre-war anxieties central to debates regarding the effects of urban modernity upon the changing sexual roles of the individual in society. Pre-war concerns regarding prostitution and its associated sexual diseases as well as the challenges to male authority being voiced by the various women's movements

were now coupled with the increase of women in the public realm seen to be replacing men on the homefront. Ute Frevert has convincingly argued that the actual economic and demographic changes which occurred between the years 1914 and 1918 were not necessarily solely accelerated by the war but were merely a continuation of existing pre-war trends in the rise of female employment. She also points out that the perceived increase of women in the public realm, as railway guards, postal deliverers, steamroller drivers, etc. was due to the partial relocation of existing female labor out of domestic service and factories and into other war-time jobs as well (Frevert 1989 pp. 151-67). This apparently new public profile of women caused anxiety which was increasingly exacerbated by fears of a declining birthrate, a rise in abortions, the procurement of female suffrage in 1918, the increase of war widows and impotent war-wounded and unemployed men. While women's presence in the public realm was not significantly greater than during the pre-war period, the relocation of their economic roles as a result of the war gave the illusion that they were gaining access to greater amounts of power. All of these factors contributed to a direct sense of challenge to existing hierarchies of male cultural authority. However, the way in which many male writers and painters of German modernity sought to control this challenge was by projecting their fears onto paper or canvas in a way which objectified women purely in terms of their sexuality.

Weimar culture especially took on an identity of sexual liberation and daring innovation which focused upon the exaggerated centrality of Berlin in discourses of modernity. The elevation of Berlin in this manner served partially to mask the tensions and divisions on different political levels that scarred the whole geographical range of the Weimar Republic. Berlin became a convenient target of the Republic's enemies and allies alike. The problems which beset the epoch were more often than not framed in terms of gender difference. The new constitution of the Republic, while introducing fundamental human rights such as female suffrage and social welfare guarantees, also retained a large body of imperial law, especially relating to the illegality of abortion and the restricted rights of women in marriage and divorce.¹⁸ The new Republic's attitude to sexuality was riven with contradictions and ambivalences. On the one hand it was informed by the two politically opposed regimes of Russia and America, and on the other, the majority of bourgeois Society found it hard to relinquish the pre-war values of sexual morality which had formed the backbone of their imperial civic identity.

Taking Russia as their example, German sex reformers and communists campaigned for the introduction of new social legislation that would provide separate financial protection for both mothers and children and decriminalize abortion and homosexuality. This aroused concern among some middle-class feminists in particular, who worried about the future of the family as an institution. The lifting of censorship in 1919 also had an immediate cultural impact marked by the upsurge of sexually explicit films, literature, cabaret and other forms of entertainment. In addition Magnus Hirschfeld's Institute for Sexual Science founded in 1918, made Berlin the international center of sexology and the sex reform movement. In 1931, Hirschfeld published *The Sexual History of the World War* in which he gave a retrospective account of the effects of the changing gender roles caused by the War upon the relations between the sexes. He cited a number of episodes in which returning soldiers committed brutal acts of violence against their wives who were thought to have been exercising too much freedom during the war. Hirschfeld especially blamed the press for fostering reactionary attitudes of violence towards women. However, he also castigated women, much in the vein of Freud and other pre-war sexologists, regarding the problem of male violence against women as stemming in part from the aggressive nature of female sexuality (Hirschfeld 1941 vol.1, chapter 1). Hirschfeld's observations were

largely in keeping with other evidence from the Weimar period which suggested a new aggressive and violent attitude towards women. Klaus Theweleit has meticulously documented the sexual aggression and fantasy of the right-wing *Freikorps* fighters whose Weimar letters, novels and autobiographies reveal a deeply embedded misogynistic fear and fascination of women that was bound up with political and ideological positions of fascism and racism. For many *Freikorps* fighters, for example, the left-wing proletarian "Red Nurses" symbolized the decadence and degeneration of the "new" Germany; as women they served as a metaphor for everything detested and vile to Fascist ideology (Theweleit 1989 pp. 159-62).

Such aggression, recorded in Theweleit's work at probably its most extreme, seems to have arisen from a hysterical response to the specter of sexual laxity fostered during the Weimar period. A particular site of such laxity was most often identified with the Berlin nightclub scene. The arrival of American culture, especially in the form of the Tiller Girls dance troop and American jazz spawned a craze for all-night dance clubs and introduced new role models in fashion, hair, make-up and sexual behavior for women. As the German *Paris Soir* journalist Curt Reiss noted in a recently published oral history of the period:

the picture of "my Weimar" was not entirely without the observation that, especially in the big cities, everything at that time became open, free. Everything was permitted. Drugs became fashionable, transvestite clubs "fascinating:" homosexuals and lesbians also appeared on the scene. And there were many sex-murders, as there had never been before (Reiss 1990 p.54).

The fear and fascination of transgressive sexuality which resulted in the series of male modernist images of sex murders outlined below was clearly geographically specific, located in large cities, the largest and most demanding of which was Berlin. Representations of the city as a site to be both feared and desired also extended to the media where the degeneracy of modern city life was measured in everything that was other to the white male norm. Berlin of the Weimar period was said to have become: "a melting pot of everything that is evil—prostitution, drinking houses, cinemas, Marxism, Jews, strippers, negroes, dancing and all the vile off-shoots of modern art."¹⁹ Such hostile comment, taken from the National Socialist newspaper, the *Völkische Beobachter*, was typical of the increasingly popular bourgeois press which remained the refuge of middleclass reaction during this period of intense upheaval which marked the history of the 1920s and early 1930s in Germany. Part of the vehement rightwing denigration of the city and its modernity which was represented by such popular journalism, included an attack on women's rights, as well as an appeal to a sense of "tradition" which Berlin was thought to be historically lacking. However, the sense of degenerate rootlessness that Berlin evoked for many commentators was not only confined to the political right and it also became a source the excited fear and desire already indicated. For Wilhelm Hausenstein writing about the city in 1932, on the eve of its fall to the Nazis, the existence of Berlin:

is as if it were grounded on nothing, but a nothing that is the nothing - a nothingness elevated into an essence ... Think of Vienna, Paris, of the old cities in southern and western Germany whose very essence and nature is their rootedness. Berlin has no provenance, as it were, no rootedness or history (Hausenstein 1984 p.10).

Hausenstein's observation of Berlin's lack of historical tradition was translated by the numerous artists, writers and other cultural commentators arriving in Berlin after the war, into the very source of its appeal. It was precisely the anonymity and rootlessness of Berlin that appealed to their sense of excitement and which also contributed to the fetishization of the city into a highly desirable but voracious and devouring woman. As Peter Gay perceptively notes about "Berlin of the golden mid-twenties:" "Berlin, it is obvious, aroused powerful emotions in everyone. It delighted most, terrified some, but left no one indifferent, and it induced, by its vitality, a certain inclination to exaggerate what one saw" (Gay 1968 pp.134-6).

Such a comment becomes clearly appropriate to the mythologizing of the city so evident in both the German and English perceptions of Berlin at that time. Thus, the playwright Carl Zuckmayer wrote retrospectively of the city:

Some saw her as hefty, full breasted, in lace underwear, others as a mere wisp of a thing, with boyish legs in black silk stockings ... All wanted to have her, she enticed all ... To conquer Berlin was to conquer the world. The only thing was—and this was the everlasting spur—that you had to take all the hurdles again and again, had to break through the goal again and again in order to maintain your position (Zuckmayer 1970 p.217).

For Christopher Isherwood, Stephen Spender, Wyndham Lewis, W.H. Auden, Robert Graves, Harold Nicholson and many other observers, images of Berlin during the 1920s remained extremely close to the sexualized account so alive in Zuckmayer's memory.²⁰ For Harold Nicholson writing in *Der Querschnitt* in 1929:

Berlin is a girl in a pullover, not much powder on her face, thighs like those of Atlanta, an undigested education ... one walks with her among the lights and the shadows. And after an hour or so one is hand in hand ... Berlin stimulates like arsenic, and then when one's nerves are all ajingle she comes with her hot milk of human kindness; and in the end, for an hour and a half, one is able, gratefully to go to sleep (Nicholson 1929 p.345).

From a pre-war image of ambivalent rootless modernity, evoking both loathing and excitement, the image of Berlin was gradually translated into a post-war metaphor of desirable female sexuality, which was also tempered at times with a bitter cynicism and fear. The attraction and danger of the city was seen to lie both in the abstracted vitality it generated and in the resulting anonymity and liberality it appeared to offer. For Isherwood, Spender and Auden, Berlin was "wicked" and therefore desirable in terms which were transgressive of heterosexuality, but Berlin was also "the tension, the poverty, the anger, the prostitution, the hope and despair thrown out onto the streets" (Spender 1953 p. 111).

Such wide-ranging desire and fear of the city was the result of a male urban consciousness which systematically denied access to a female subjectivity on a representational level.²¹ If the city was seen by artists, writers and other commentators to offer the means to the pursuit of sexual desires outside of familial constraints, woman was represented on the metaphorical level as present in the city in terms either of the fixed sexualized categories outlined above or else, but less often, as virtuous country heroine triumphing over the evils of the big city in order to return "home." To be a single woman in the public realm was ultimately to be

categorized in the male discourses of modernity as sexually available and probably a prostitute (Wilson 1991 p.6).

Representing Berlin in Weimar Germany

The trope of individual differentiation versus social order foregrounded as a result of the overcrowding in mass-industrialized cities provided much of the stock imagery for the modernist representation of urban life. Such imagery depended upon the mobilization of race, class and gender differences in which a white male experience of modernity was privileged above any other. It was also bound up with fundamental changes of perception which had been transformed under the impact of modernization. In 1910, speaking at the "First German Sociologists" Conference", Max Weber stated that:

the distinctive formal values of our modern artistic culture could only have been derived from the existence of the modern metropolis with its tramways, underground railways, cafes, smokestacks, masses of stone and the wild dance of impressions of sound and color, impressions and experiences *which have an effect on sexual fantasy*, all variants of a spiritual constitution, which brood voraciously over the seemingly inexhaustible possibilities of means to life and happiness [my italics] (Weber 1969 pp.98ff).

In his speech, Weber explicitly associates the context for modernist representations of the city with the notion of sexual fantasy which the experience of the modern metropolis is said to stimulate. His observations of this experiential background become particularly pertinent during the First World War and the Weimar period. It was during this time especially that a series of images were produced by various German modernists which specifically engaged with the representation of the city in sexual terms.

While Berlin was becoming increasingly subject to sociological debate regarding its effects upon the individual, modernist artists were responding to the challenge to engage with "the universal dynamism" of modern life centered upon the city which had first been signaled by the Futurist manifesto of 1909 (Marinetti 1968). For many artists, the city, though exciting, also came to be identified as the site of personal and cultural anxiety. Artists such as Ludwig Meidner, who settled in Berlin in 1907, took the representation of the city to be the main subject matter of modern art and he urged others to do likewise. In his 1914 essay, "An Introduction to Painting Big Cities", Meidner exclaims to his fellow artists:

Let us paint what is close to us, our city world! the wild streets, the elegance of iron suspension bridges, gas tanks which hang in white cloud mountains, the roaring colors of buses and express locomotives, the rushing telephone wires the harlequinade of advertising pillars and then night ... big city night (Meidner 1970 pp. 114-15).

For Meidner, closely in keeping with the sociological observations of Weber, the city is full of potential for the future development of the visual arts which, he says `is emphatically not a question of filling an area with decorative and ornamental designs à la Kandinsky or Matisse but rather, it is a question of life in all its fullness" (Meidner 1970 p. I 11).

Meidner's self-portrait of 1913, *The City and I*, unambiguously and deliberately displays a sense of unease and egotism in relation to his experience of modernity in the city but as such, it remains a sympathetic image of personal crisis. The work does not betray the obvious agenda of sexual anxiety so prevalent in the works of his contemporaries Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, George Grosz and Otto Dix.

This painting signals an important aspect of many modernist artists' response to the city, namely the position of the self within it. Irit Rogoff has recently argued that the masculine normative tradition of self-portraiture is one which has been constructed to serve what she identifies as a self-legitimizing "author-function." In her analysis, she sees the purposes behind such procedures as bound up with the establishment of cultural authority. She recognizes that such authority is "not necessarily determined by the direct subjugation or domination of the other" but that even so, gender difference is more often than not inscribed in the cultural products of modernity.²² Several commentators have observed the gender strategies of subjugation and control operative in a variety of self-portraits executed by Kirchner, who was also in Berlin at the time of Meidner's painting (Duncan 1982; Lewis 1990). Recently, however, Kirchner's series of 1911-14 "Berlin Street Scenes" have been subject of reassessment by Charles Haxthausen, who argues that Kirchner saw these images not as representative of sexual anxiety and alienation in the modern metropolis but rather as a "contribution to an aestheticization of urban life" which remained sympathetic to the plight of the prostitute.²³ While unconvinced by Haxthausen's general thesis, I concede that Kirchner, like Meidner did respond in an ambivalent way towards the city and towards his individual position within it. However, for Kirchner, unlike Meidner, that ambivalence is played out in a series of images which concentrate upon female sexuality in the public realm. The concentration on female sexuality in these paintings remains confined to representations of city inhabitants; the foundations for the modernist conflation of the city with threatening aspects of female sexuality have been laid in these images but have not as yet converged as they were later to do so aggressively in the Weimar works of Grosz and Dix, among others.

From about 1916 onwards Grosz, who had moved to Berlin from Dresden in 1912, chose as one of the major themes of his painting, detailed and often sexually sordid scenes of the modern city. Grosz's heady and dynamic work *The Big City* was produced in Berlin in c.1917 and is symptomatic of the growing anxiety also prevalent during the Weimar period with regard to the place of the individual in big city crowds. Grosz, obviously influenced by the work of the Italian Futurists in terms of the spatial construction of this work, retained a distinctly ambiguous position with regard to the modern metropolis. Although this painting has been read by some commentators as a celebration of the vitality of urban life, taken in relation to some of his other works on similar themes, it might more plausibly be read as an image that elicits a sense of threat to the artist.²⁴ The city is represented here as both potentially exciting but also extremely destabilizing; the bustling crowds, among whom a naked female body is included, are no longer individuals socially interacting with one another; they have become instead a near-hysterical amorphous mass.

Although an explicitly gendered reaction to the city crowds is not directly readable in this image, it becomes more explicit in relation to Grosz's city oeuvre as a whole, in both his graphic work and his painting. In a painting such as *Metropolis* of 1917 (Museum of Modern Art, New York), the metropolis comes to signify a site of disorienting perspectives, isolated class-bound male individuals and sordid sexuality. It is a city of men in which women are situated merely to serve in their capacity as sexual beings. The pre-war excitement, nervous energy and potential

found in the big city by Meidner and others has been translated into the beginnings of a post-war threat where the city becomes a specific site of anxiety, individualism and sexual tension. The potential thrill that hovers over Meidner's call to paint "night ... big city night" gradually turns into aggressive sexual danger in the course of Grosz's oeuvre. In the slightly earlier painting of *The Street* (Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie) of 1916, individuals nervously watch each other, either from the isolation of their own apartment windows or else from the more vulnerable position of the night time street, frightened by the possibility of contact. In *The Woman Slayer* (private collection) of 1918, the possible outcome of such contact is made evident in one of several images of Grosz on the same theme; a theme in which dismemberment of a woman's body becomes a major and disturbing hallmark of male modernist culture. In this image we see an angry red-faced murderer whose shirt is stained with the blood of his victim, as is the knife he clutches in his right hand. The slain woman is spread out bleeding behind him, her breasts still intact but her arms severed and her face bruised. In the scene through the window of the dingy room in which murderer and victim are situated, we see the stockinged legs and bare buttocks of another potential murderer's victim; this is a recurrent scene of city night-life that Grosz presents to his viewers throughout his works at this time. The beginnings of the Weimar Republic seem marked with the overt sexual tension and brutality witnessed in these paintings.

It was not only Grosz who played out male fantasies in these images either. Rudolf Schlichter, Heinrich Maria Davringhausen and Dix all engaged in similarly disturbing and sexually explicit themes during the immediate post-war and Weimar periods. Several of Dix's most notorious works date from 1920-22 and depict a series of graphically imagined sex murders. In *Self Portrait as Sex Murderer* of 1920 (destroyed), he placed himself in the role of the sex murderer, grinning like a madman and immersed in an orgy of severed limbs and bloody handprints. The individual limbs of the dissected female torso fly around Dix's head as though he were performing a circus juggling act of the most gruesome kind. The *Self Portrait* is supplemented by other works such as *Altar for Gentlemen* also of 1920 (private collection), in which the individuals depicted mask hidden sexual identities which can be peeled back to reveal an alarming scene of prostitution and female bodily dismemberment. Davringhausen executed his sinister work *The Sex Murderer* in 1917 (Munich, Bayerische Staatsgemaldegammlungen), his victim modeled after that archetype of avant-garde female sexual aggression, Edouard Manet's *Olympia* (1863). Davringhausen's nude is displayed on a bed, with the buildings and apartment blocks of a large city at night dimly visible behind her through the window of her room. She is still alive and unaware of the potential danger that lurks menacingly under her bed in the form of a pair of shifty eyes belonging to a sex murderer who is staring at the pistol on her bedside table. Rudolf Schlichter also depicted an almost surgically cold watercolor and a chalk drawing, of a "Sex Murder" in 1924, (both in private collections). In many of these images, the scene of the crime is invariably a cityscape at night. Although such a setting is not always explicit, given the large city locations of all of these artists, whether it be Berlin, Dresden or Munich, one can safely assume that it is "big city night" that acts as the stimulus for the sexual fantasies played out in these paintings.

These images are disturbing, not only for their gruesome subject matter but also for their literal depiction of the punitive consequences for women who step out of rigidly defined bourgeois spheres of the private and into the public realm of the masculinized spaces of urban modernity. The sheer proliferation of these images during and after the war specifically in Germany seems to have been intimately connected to current debates regarding the blurring of gender roles and the perceived disintegration of fixed sexual categories of public and private.

The construction of urban space in terms of masculine bourgeois normative assumptions was being eroded by the disintegration of fixed social and sexual roles, accelerated by the processes of war when the majority of middle- and working-class families could no longer afford to restrict female labor to fixed economic categories; women and men on the homefront had to take work where they could get it.

Otto Dix's painting of 1925, variously referred to as *Three Women of the Street* or *Three Prostitutes of the Street* (private collection) and probably painted shortly after his arrival in Berlin in the same year, indicates the ambiguous position with which women in the public realm were regarded. These women lurk in front of the richly decorated shop window, neither buying nor selling but hovering both literally and metaphorically between the roles of commodity and consumer. The catalogue entry to the recent Tate Gallery exhibition of Dix's work, notes that he appears to have borrowed and satirized certain tropes of medieval iconography in this painting, such as that each of the three women are holding, variously, a lapdog, a handbag and an umbrella in a sexually demonstrative manner "that parodies the poses of medieval saints holding the symbols of their martyrdom" (Otto Dix 1992 p.129). The catalogue argues that these women remain morally unjudged by Dix's depiction, but I read this painting as precisely symptomatic of the exaggerated threat which female sexuality appeared to have presented to existing constructs of masculine identity. The *Three Women* are ultimately presented as commodified objects for sale, framed by the picture space in the way that items in a shop window are framed for display, and it is we, the spectators, who become the potential customers. As if to underline the point further, it is a shop window before which they are placed. The foot of the model in the window behind them points to Germany on a globe, thus locating the image and condition of these women firmly within Dix's own society.

The association between consumerism and gender elicited by this image is a recurring trope of male modernist discourses of modernity and as such it extends to the representation of other aspects of the city. The "wickedness" of Berlin's West End night-life was, to Isherwood in 1929, for example "of the most pitiful kind; the kisses and embraces, as always, had price-tags attached to them, but here the prices were drastically reduced to cut-throat competition of an overcrowded market" (Isherwood 1966 p.86). Part of the resonance of this image of ruthless financial competition comes in the wake of the knowledge of Germany's precarious economic situation at this time and indeed throughout the Weimar period. The associations between economic and political tensions and conflicts of interest in terms of sexual politics and gender roles were intimately connected, especially via the dominant aesthetic of *Neue Sachlichkeit*. During the mid-1920s, the Republic had seen a brief period of relative economic and political stabilization. The SPD lost its dominant position in the coalition and there was a general shift to the right prompted by business and industrial interests. It was this period that became associated with the phrase "*Neue Sachlichkeit*", which heralded a shift towards rationalization in most spheres of social, economic and cultural life. Siegfried Kracauer noted that this "change in taste ... began with the "Tiller Girls:"

these products of American "distraction factories" are no longer individual girls, but indissoluble female units whose movements are mathematical demonstrations ... Through weekly newsreels in movie houses, they have managed to reach even the tiniest villages. One glance at the screen reveals that the ornaments consist of thousands of bodies, sexless bodies in bathing suits. The regularity of their

patterns is acclaimed by the masses who themselves are arranged in row upon ordered row (Kracauer 1989 p.145).

Frans Hessel similarly noticed the effects of the "*Neue Sachlichkeit*" on the new building projects springing up all over Berlin when he observed that "as soon as a house becomes dilapidated or just in need of repair, the young architects give it the page-boy haircut of a simple clear facade, and clear away all the fancy curlicues."²⁵ In both Kracauer's and Hessel's conceptions of the *Neue Sachlichkeit*, it is the image of female sexuality, whether real or metaphorical (the page-boy haircut of "Bubikopf" was the most fashionable women's hairstyle of the day), that becomes the signifier for representing Berlin's modernity. The spread of the *Neue Sachlichkeit* as an aesthetic after the mid-1920s has here become associated with the de-eroticization of the female body in a discourse which objectified women both as sexually voracious and as mechanically or androgynously dehumanized.

In industry the *Neue Sachlichkeit* was made manifest in new methods of "time and motion" studies which were introduced in an attempt to rationalize the work place whereby a labor force of un- or semi-skilled workers were supervised and utilized as mere appendages to a paced machine.²⁶ Working-class women especially comprised a significant proportion of this assembly-line proletariat. However, as Renate Bridenthal notes, "rationalization did not significantly increase the proportion of women in the paid labor force" (Bridenthal, Grossmann and Kaplan 1984 p.10). She points out that what it succeeded in doing was simply to reorganize the labour market so that women's jobs became a distinct category that did not displace or interfere with men's. Bridenthal's study, taken together with the literary and artistic evidence I have presented so far, reveals that women's relationship to modernity in Weimar Germany was distinctly double-edged; while on a politically rhetorical level they were given a new freedom and access to the public sphere, in actual practice, their gains were minimal and subject to divisions of class, race, marital status and age. On a cultural level, women served to represent the decadent aspects of urban modernity, epitomized in the many images of a sexualized Berlin, while at the same time they were appealed to for the protection of moral standards and the traditional family unit.

It would seem, then, that although certain constructions of modernity evince a distinct fear of the threat of female sexuality which is often played out representationally in the context of the big city, such a threat was, as I have indicated, grossly over-exaggerated. In *Neue Sachlichkeit* painting—the realm with which the term is most often associated—the simultaneous fear and fascination of "woman" in the modern metropolis reached a zenith in Dix's *Big City Triptych*, painted in 1927-28 as a result of his two-year stay in Berlin. This work can be read as a response to his particular experience of modernity in 1920s Berlin but it can also serve as a more generalized example of such a response. The painting is primarily concerned with the commodification of female sexuality on different class levels. The once sharp divisions between the public and the private body are shown to be no longer applicable in the modern capitalist metropolis where human interaction of any kind is inscribed by the economic sphere. The dissolution of such spheres, for which the female body serves as a catalyst, is perceived to be one of the major threats to masculine identity, represented here in the guise of the "Big City." The choice of triptych form by Dix is a wry comment on the nature of what he sees to be the modern metropolitan religion of consumerist pursuit of sexual gratification. In the central panel, upper- to middle-class women are displayed as conspicuous objects for consumption, touting the marriage market for a suitable economically dependable partner. If women have been granted the

right to vote, for Dix they remain predatory sexual animals whose only concern is their immediate economic situation. Such a reading is corroborated by both left and right panels. On the right, "sex for sale" is taken to extremes via the fetishization of high-class prostitutes into mere signifiers of sexual stimulation. The body's materiality, its corruptibility and the aesthetic of fragmentation and dislocation it induces is crystallized in this severe image of prostitution. The fur and red cape of the woman at the front is formed into an unmistakable sign of female genitals while the breast of the woman behind her is situated in a position which gives no respite to the viewer's eroticized gaze. The mutilated beggar on the floor is rendered powerless in the face of such excessive sexuality. The aesthetic of excess is heightened by the ersatz baroque of the architectural setting, the swirling forms of which become an almost fluid echo of the prostitutes' drapery.

The notion that female sexuality is seen as a threat to male potency is made even more explicit in the left panel which sets up a dynamic of bestiality and carnal lust. The exchange of glances between the prostitute and client is framed by the dead fox fur of the second prostitute, the immobile figure on the ground, either dead or desiring, and the panting dog, lean with hunger. In this triptych, crippled war veterans, outcast from the society which sent them to war, are shown weakened in every way by the aggressive sexuality of Weimar women. Both the economic and sexual bargaining power rests with the demonized whores of modernity. Standard art-historical readings of this work, such as the one given by Frank Whitford in his essay "The City in Painting" celebrate Dix's biting "indictment of the scandalous inequalities, the exploitation and the degradation that were daily visible on the streets" (Whitford 1985 p.63). While Whitford's reading certainly has some currency in relation to the poverty and degradation of much of Weimar existence during the supposedly "golden twenties," he fails to comment on the history of grotesque misogyny that characterizes Dix's work and chooses instead to celebrate him purely as a great satirist of modernity.

I read this work partly as the epitome of male cultural reaction to the anxieties of modern metropolitan life in Weimar Germany, anxieties which are exaggeratedly centered upon the imagined threat of female sexuality which is feared to be subverting a secure masculine identity. In order to control such a threat, which as I have already shown was far less real than was supposed, it would seem to be necessary for Dix and other male modernist artists and writers to engage in a constant dialectic of repression and projection of female sexuality so as to keep the anxieties provoked by the supposed increase of women in the public realm at a psychologically acceptable distance. During the Weimar period, the image of Berlin, already associated with the changes concomitant with the processes of modernity in the pre-war period, came to serve as the ideal vehicle for the generalized projection of such fears. The fetishization of the city as a site both loathed and desired was not confined to any one particular ideological or political stance and as such it calls into question the efficacy of the avant-garde in accurately representing a full picture of the experience of modernity.

NOTES:

The author gratefully acknowledges the financial support of the British Academy and the University of East Anglia and the helpful assistance of Dr Margaret Iversen and Professor Peter Vergo of the University of Essex; Friederike Weigle, Markisches Museum, Berlin and Eva Zdchner and the library staff of the Berlinische Galerie, Berlin.

¹ For the development of London and Paris see Sutcliffe 1984. For Vienna, London and Paris, see Olsen 1986.

² For a more detailed account of these changes, including demographic tables and architectural plans, see Horst Matzerath, "Berlin, 1890-1940" in Sutcliffe 1984 pp.289-318.

³ For an examination of the crime rate and the status of prostitution during this period see Evans 1988.

⁴ For further details regarding the emergence of the German women's movement and its variety of political shades, see Frevert 1989 and Rosehaft 1992.

⁵ For further details about the origins of the emergence of kleptomania as a recognized medical category particular to urban middle-class women, see Abelson 1989. For details and further references to the equation of female sexuality with disease and death, see Lewis 1990. Lewis deals in detail with Grosz's city oeuvre in terms of its sexual themes, especially relating his work to prevalent attitudes of misogyny in both science and popular culture. She also analyses other German modernists' images of sex murders to emphasize her argument. I began my work on sexuality and the city prior to reading Lewis's article and have found her work extremely useful; although she touches on many of my concerns, my main argument is more generally concerned with the sexualization of the city, rather than an explanation of specific "Lustmord" images.

⁶ See Lynn Abrams, "Prostitutes in Imperial Germany, 1870-1918: Working Girls or Social Outcasts?" in Evans 1988 pp.189-2 f)9.

⁷ I am grateful to Dawn Ades for pointing out to me the possible implications that such civic pride has in terms of the constriction of masculinity and the city during the imperial era, particularly regarding Berlin's history as the centre of Prussian military excellence.

⁸ *Verwaltungsbericht des Magistrats zu Berlin pro 1876*, p.3, quoted in Matzerath in Sutcliffe 1984 p.298.

⁹ Simmel 1991. Simmel's essay was originally published as "Berliner Gewerbeaussiellung", *Die Zeit*, 7 (91), 1896, p.204.

¹⁰ Bruno Taut, letter to Max Taut, 2 March 1902, private collection. Lehnitz; quoted in Whyte 1991 p.229.

¹¹ For more details on Rathenau's polemic, see Lothar Muller, "The Beauty of the Metropolis" in Haxthausen and Suhr 1990 pp.37-57.

¹² Scheffler 1910 p.200. For more details on Scheffler's arguments see also Muller in Haxthausen and Suhr 1990 pp.40-1.

¹³ August Endell (1908), *Die Schönheit der gross en Stadt*, Stuttgart: Strecker and Schroder. quoted from Muller in Haxthausen and Suhr 1990 p.49.

¹⁴ Wolff 1990 p.39. For Simmel's writings on women and female sexuality see Oakes 1984.

¹⁵ For further examples see Andrew Lees "The Metropolis and the Intellectual" in Sutcliffe 1984 pp.67-94. See also Kelly 1981, chapters 6 and 7.

¹⁶ See Fritsch 1896. For more details as to the Garden City Movement in Europe, see Hall 1988 p.168.

¹⁷ Wilhelm Riehl, *Die Naturgeschichte des deutschen Volkes als Grundlage einer deutschen Sozialpolitik*, 4 vols. Berlin, 1851-1869, cited in Whyte 1991 p.230.

¹⁸ For further details, see Bridenthal, Grossmann and Kaplan 1984 pp. 1-29.

¹⁹ *Der Völkische Beobachter* (1928), quoted in Guardian, 8 November 1991 p.27.

²⁰ For further details of many of these writers' responses to Berlin in sexual terms, see White 1989 pp. 124-45. See also Petro 1987.

²¹ By this I am referring specifically to the cultural construction of modernity in which a male consciousness is privileged. I am not denying the systems of representation that allowed for an exploration of female subjectivity, e.g. the works of Kathe Kollwitz, Grethe Jürgens, Hannah Höch and others. For further details, see Chapter 1 by Marsha Meskimmon in this volume.

²² Irit Rogoff, "The Anxious Artist - Ideological Mobilisations of the Self in German Modernism" in Rogoff 1991 p.118.

²³ Charles Haxthausen, "Kirchner's Images of Berlin" in Haxthausen and Suhr 1990 pp.58-94. Haxthausen fails to take account of both Theda Schapiro's and Beth Irwin Lewis's observations regarding Kirchner's attitude towards the city and female sexuality. Schapiro cites comments in Kirchner's *Davos Tägebücher* (1926), as evidence of Kirchner's anxiety towards the city and Lewis cites misogynist sexual perversions which formed part of a series of lithographs executed by Kirchner. See Theda Schapiro, "The Metropolis in the Visual Arts, Paris, Berlin, New York 1890-1940" in Sutcliffe 1984 pp.103-4, and Lewis 1990 p.139, n.49.

²⁴ For a "vitality" reading, see Whitford 1985 p.60.

²⁵ Frans Hessel. *Ein Flâneur in Berlin*, Berlin, 1984, p.146, first published as *Spazieren in Berlin*. Berlin, 1929. This translation is by Whyte 1991 p.240. 26.

²⁶ For further details regarding the mechanization of the workplace and "Taylorism", see Jordanova 1989 p.118; Annemarie Troger, "The Creation of a Female Assembly Line Proletariat" in Bridenthal, Grossmann and Kaplan 1984 pp.237-70 and Maier 1970 pp.27-82.