

## PUBLIC SPIRIT IN SUBURBIA? THE GARDEN CITY AS CIVIC EXPERIMENT

Gisela Mettele

*Deputy Director, GHI*

Suburbia—long dismissed as a “non-place”—has been considered in a more differentiated way in current debates. The new suburbanization discussion has, however, frequently lacked historical depth.<sup>1</sup> Suburban sprawl has been a fact of urban life since at least the end of the nineteenth century, both in Europe and America. On both sides of the Atlantic, these sprawl processes were recognized at an early stage, and alternative urban utopias were developed. The demand for healthy living close to nature formed the core of the early debates about suburbia. In the international city reform movements, the notion of the “garden city,” put forward most influentially by Ebenezer Howard in his *To-morrow* (1898), was regarded as the ideal solution for counteracting uncontrolled growth in congested urban areas.<sup>2</sup> To be sure, the idea of the “garden city” stood for an ecological utopia that attempted to reconcile nature and urban development. Above all, however, it was a political utopia: Howard’s garden city model sought to restore the quality of urban life, which threatened to become increasingly lost in the process of (sub)urbanization. He linked the harmonious interweaving of urban and rural with a comprehensive republican vision into which all aspects of life could be (re)integrated.

In both Europe and the United States, the idea of the garden city developed into one of the most important concepts in twentieth-century suburban city planning. It therefore seems worthwhile to look at the commonalities and differences of this settlement type in Europe and America. My research has two main points of focus: the first is the relationship of compactness and decentralization, which plays a key role in the debate about the “European” vs. the “American” city.<sup>3</sup> I will concentrate, however, on civil society, and consequently on the public spaces in suburbia that have long been largely dismissed by research. Civil society is here understood as individuals’ fashioning of their everyday worlds and their attempt to influence social processes in the free encounter of equal actors. It is based upon the forms of middle-class communication and interaction that had developed in urban spaces in the eighteenth and, above all, the nineteenth centuries, for example in voluntary associations. My research explores the migration of these forms from their bourgeois origins and their traditional location, the city.<sup>4</sup>

Similar to modern cities, which were alternately denounced as “Molochs” or idealized as “sources of power,” the suburbs have also elicited contrasting cultural metaphors.<sup>5</sup> In the popular perception transmitted by advertising, the media, and visual culture, they simultaneously symbolize bourgeois utopia—the realization of the dream of a better life—and dystopia—the conformist prison of privileged middle classes.<sup>6</sup> In either case, however, the death of public life in suburbia had long been an unchallenged assumption. Suburban living, which concentrated on the privacy of the nuclear family, was contrasted to the pulsing, public activities in the cities. In the suburbs, indifference or even aversion to participation in social life reigns. If the residents of suburbia participate publicly at all, they tend to be conservative defenders of their proprietary interests and the exclusivity of their residences.<sup>7</sup> The American suburbs, in particular, frequently appear to be places without character, whose design does not suggest any active society that would have given them a specific face and whose houses do not reveal the individuality of their inhabitants. Their uniform and banal external appearance corresponds to the social monotony. When Alfred Döblin migrated to the United States in 1941, he wrote about the “dreadful desert of houses” that he found in suburban Los Angeles: “indeed, one is much and extensively in the open here—yet am I a cow?”<sup>8</sup> Suburbia, thus, was a quiet life close to nature, similar to that of peaceful, cud-chewing animals in the pasture, a lot of open green but no public space.

Women were generally perceived as victims of suburbia’s spatial structures. Since Betty Friedan made the dissatisfaction of women in the suburbs a political topic in the 1960s, the sadness of suburban mothers has also been proverbial in research literature. Physically isolated, without any noteworthy social relationships, these women were separated from the male-dominated public world of the city. Suburbia appeared to be the successful implementation of a dichotomized concept of gender.<sup>9</sup>

Over the past few years, these stereotypes have increasingly been called into question. A growing number of researchers, primarily in England and in the United States, are addressing the subjective dimension of suburban life. They study the spheres of experience and communication, and, instead of uniformity, they find a multifaceted social life in music groups, sports clubs, neighborhood committees, and churches; instead of places of isolation and anomie, they find active communities; and instead of conformity, they find very diverse forms of self-realization.<sup>10</sup>

In more recent American and English research, women also appear more frequently as creative participants in the shaping of suburban lifestyles.<sup>11</sup> In suburbia, it was primarily women who had to struggle against the adversities of everyday life, from overcrowded schools to the lack of

public services. Women have frequently mobilized their neighborhoods very successfully in order to achieve improvements in their environment; they have organized collective babysitting and campaigns for safe streets; and they have been active in clubs and organizations, as well as in local politics. They have published local newspapers, organized parties, sung in choirs, and so on. In their own lives, the suburban environment was the hub, while the city was the periphery.

Little is known about everyday life in German suburbs. Have similar lifestyles developed here? Have new suburban civic cultures emerged? Did the suburbs only restrict women, or did they also provide women with opportunities?

Planned settlements, mostly in the tradition of garden cities, stand in the foreground of the more recent American and English studies. The very active German garden city movement, however, is hardly mentioned at all in the current Anglo-American debate.<sup>12</sup> My study aims to integrate German developments into the context of the international debate on suburbia. Initially, it will be limited to the period that begins with the founding of the German Garden City Society in 1902 and extends to World War I, the era that represents the zenith of garden city establishments in Germany.<sup>13</sup> In a comprehensive inventory of the German garden city movement, seventy-nine settlements, along with the most important structural data, have been recorded in a database.<sup>14</sup>

Only a diachronic comparison between the garden city movements in Germany and the United States is possible. While there were garden city experiments in Germany already at the beginning of the twentieth century, in the United States, the debate about Howard's ideas was long limited to intellectual discussions among progressive city planners and architects, above all Lewis Mumford, Catherine Bauer, and Clarence Stein. In the United States, an attempt to convert Howard's ideas into concrete settlement plans was not made until the end of the 1920s. The zenith of garden-city establishments came only around the middle of the century.

Despite or perhaps even because of these differences, a glance across the Atlantic—which already shaped city planning debates in the early twentieth century—seems important. The international framework of the city planners' discussions notwithstanding, the real developments took place in specific national narratives; they received different community and governmental support; and they were integrated into different urban configurations and fundamental social frameworks. Precisely because the garden city movement understood itself largely to be an international movement that developed within the constant interplay of mutual perceptions, it is even more interesting to inquire about the significance of the respective national conditions.

As is generally known, Ebenezer Howard wanted his garden city to provide a model for solving the acute social, hygienic, and ecological problems of the industrial cities of his age. At the same time, he wanted to find a solution to the problems associated with the beginnings of urban sprawl. The rapid improvements in transportation systems and communication technologies had opened up the region to settlement and dissolved what had previously been clear boundaries between the city and the countryside. Expanding urban sprawl threatened the very foundations of the countryside as well as the city, and destroyed the respective advantages that were associated with life in the country or the city.<sup>15</sup> Howard saw this process as irreversible. His goal, however, was to transform the “state of war” between the city and the countryside into a “happy marriage” (to use his famous expression) in which the respective advantages of life in the country or the city were harmoniously combined into a new type of settlement, the garden city.<sup>16</sup>

Howard considered the garden city to be a community that would unite as many functions as possible—living, working, culture, consumption, and recreation. With their multifunctional community facilities and public parks, the local wards into which the city was divided formed the basis of public life. It was clear to Howard, however, that the social life of the modern world, which was becoming more and more mobile in every regard, could not be restricted to the area of the local neighborhood, but—and herein lies the truly innovative character of his approach—would play itself out on various levels. As soon as a settlement had achieved a certain size, instead of further sprawl, a new settlement was supposed to be established, with a green belt separating the two, until a complete cluster of satellites finally emerged. A well-established and differentiated traffic infrastructure—a ring-shaped train, streets, and waterways—would connect the settlements with one another and enable easy exchange of goods, people, and ideas. According to Howard’s concept, the individual settlements could not be truly self-sufficient; rather, they could achieve their full potential only within a regional network. Together they were supposed to provide all of the economic, social, and cultural amenities of a large city.<sup>17</sup>

With this idea, Howard went well beyond the traditional concept of city and space. His design was not based, as is frequently claimed, on the contrast between city and countryside, hub and periphery.<sup>18</sup> In Howard’s broad vision of regional urban living, there is no longer a hub and periphery in the true sense. For all intents and purposes, the cities form only the intersections of the network of a mobile society, which is organized on various levels—via neighborhood, local, and regional connectivity. Howard was one of the first to foresee the decentralization of metropolitan areas and reflect upon the consequences of urban sprawl. According to

Howard, compactness in terms of the traditional “European” city had become an illusion in view of urban growth and the new traffic and communications options in modern industrial societies. Howard’s so-called “social city,” as a complex structure at the regional level, was the new site of urbanity and civil society. His model therefore is extremely relevant to current discussions about “post-suburbia” and “post-metropolis.”<sup>19</sup> Key in these discussions is the assumption that the compact city in the conventional sense is becoming increasingly obsolete due to modern traffic and communications technologies, and that it is being replaced by new, decentralized structures. Howard’s design, which looks beyond the classic concept of the compact “European” city while preserving its key features and the social vision implicit in it, is as relevant and as promising today as when he proposed it over a century ago.<sup>20</sup>

If one understands Howard’s idea as an ideal model, then—as has frequently been emphasized—no garden city has ever been built. The history of the international garden city movement is a history of very different interpretations, selective adaptations, and numerous changes through international transfer.<sup>21</sup> Yet Howard himself expected that his design would change during the process of implementation since his idea was not based upon a tangible concept of city. He did not define a city primarily by its structural features, but by its social processes.<sup>22</sup> Social practices were more important to him than a precise, detailed implementation of his model. It is therefore inappropriate to disqualify the suburban reality of most garden settlements as nothing more than an atrophied step of an ideal model, as frequently happens in German garden-city literature.<sup>23</sup> In contrast to most of this literature, my study will focus on analyzing social practices rather than architectural structures.

The question of “civic design,” that is, to what extent participation in civic action can be promoted by structural design, has been an important topic in city-planning debates since the beginning of the twentieth century. During the past few years, this question has been revisited primarily by New Urbanism.<sup>24</sup> Compared to planning debates, however, there are surprisingly few studies that examine what actually happens after the planners and architects have more or less successfully concluded their work. My study will rely on a concept of space which assumes that spatial structures influence social activity and, more importantly, that social space is created by social activity.<sup>25</sup> It is based on the premise that the availability or lack of public facilities, buildings, and spaces (for example, libraries, museums, churches, schools, kindergartens, community centers, washhouses, community kitchens, public gardens, restaurants, parks, etc.) is not decisive for the success or failure of an urban design as a civic project. It is more important to examine the lifestyles that have developed due to the availability (or despite the lack) of community facilities, that is,

the public space resulting from social interactions, appropriations, and conflicts that, not least of all, have gender-specific connotations.

On the basis of my preliminary research, I would propose several tentative theses. Despite having arisen in different contexts, everyday life in garden-city settlements developed a dynamic that was similar on both sides of the Atlantic. Borne by the pioneer spirit of highly motivated residents, an active social life developed both here and there, even if community facilities could not be completed due to lack of funds or for other reasons during the construction of the settlements. Cooperatives, associations of mutual self-help groups, were the most important organizational form, both in Germany and in the United States. On this basis, joint bulk purchasing of consumer and household articles was organized, shops were operated, child-care facilities were organized, local newspapers were founded, and much more.

In the German garden settlements of the early twentieth century, residents were consulted more during the planning and design processes than they were in the greenbelt towns of the United States. The residents' wishes were frequently clarified in meetings using drawings, plans, models, or general questionnaires. Above all, personal contributions played a greater role in German developments, that is, in settlements that as a rule were built by self-help initiatives and financed by savings and building cooperatives. In the United States, it was generally private developers who planned, built, and marketed a settlement. Philanthropic entrepreneurs, however, played an important role in such developments, both in the United States and in Germany. Some well-known examples include James Rouse, the builder of New Town Columbia, Maryland, or Karl Schmidt, the founder of Dresden's garden suburb, Hellerau.

The question of whether a "fortress mentality" developed among the residents, or whether supra-local networks existed, must still be examined. In Hellerau or Berlin's garden suburb, Falkenberg, some cultural events attracted thousands of visitors from Dresden or Berlin. In Falkenberg, the German premiere of Eisenstein's "Panzerkreuzer Potjemkin" took place, and the Berlin theaters "Freie Volksbühne" and "Reinhardt Bühne" also sponsored events. Hellerau and Falkenberg are the outstanding examples among garden suburbs. How far the experiences of other garden cities were similar remains to be investigated. The examples suggest that it is misleading to refer to garden suburb culture as anti-urban. Instead, here new spatial relationships of urbanity become evident, and the activities of their residents show that civil society could also exist in the suburbs.<sup>26</sup>

To echo Thomas Sieverts, I would therefore like to refer to garden-city settlements as "experimental fields of modernity."<sup>27</sup> They were spaces for new lifestyles that for economic or political reasons had become more

difficult or even impossible to realize in the city. In contrast to the city and the village, with their highly structured and regulated public spaces, the suburbs were an open “realm of opportunity” that could be assigned new—and one’s own—meanings.<sup>28</sup> If the city had traditionally been the place where individuals could reinvent themselves, this site was now being shifted to suburbia. In this sense, the history of suburbanization was also the history of emancipation.

Of course, the history of German garden suburbs did not end after World War I. Many settlements from the first phase still exist today, despite all the intervening political and cultural disruptions. The fact that as early as the Weimar era, garden-city settlements were home not only to avant-garde cultural movements, but also to radical nationalist ideas and projects, is frequently overlooked. For example, already in 1910, the *völkischer* journalist Bruno Tanzmann came to Hellerau, where he opened a bookstore and a “self-consciously-German” [*deutsch-bewusste*] circulating library and a nationalist reading circle that became the meeting place of the newly organized *völkische* scene.<sup>29</sup> In 1912 the bookseller Ernst Kraus settled in Hellerau and subsequently edited the collaborative “Notes from Hellerau.” Under the pseudonym Georg Stammer, he became one of the most important *völkische* authors in Germany. The *völkisch* movement and, later, the Nazis were able to take advantage of the distinctive communal structure of the garden suburbs to serve their political ends. How large the following of the *völkische* scene was in the garden suburbs, however, has not been explored.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Klaus Brake, Jens S. Dangschat, and Günter Herfert, eds., *Suburbanisierung in Deutschland: Aktuelle Tendenzen* (Opladen, 2001); Kevin M. Kruse and Thomas J. Sugrue, eds., *The New Suburban History* (Chicago/London, 2006).

<sup>2</sup> A new and excellent edition of *To-Morrow* has recently been published: Peter Hall, Dennis Hardy, and Colin Ward, eds., *To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* (London, 2003). See also Peter Hall and Colin Ward, *Sociable Cities: The Legacy of Ebenezer Howard* (Chichester et al., 1998); Stephen V. Ward, *The Garden City: Past, Present, and Future* (London et al., 1992); Kermit C. Parsons and David Schuyler, eds., *From Garden City to Green City: The Legacy of Ebenezer Howard* (Baltimore and London, 2002); Stanley Buder, *Visionaries and Planners: The Garden City Movement and the Modern Community* (New York and Oxford, 1990).

<sup>3</sup> See for example Dieter Hassenpflug, ed., *Die europäische Stadt: Mythos und Wirklichkeit* (Münster, 2002); Walter Siebel, ed., *Die europäische Stadt* (Frankfurt am Main, 2004); Friedrich Lenger and Klaus Tenfelde, eds., *Die europäische Stadt im 20. Jahrhundert: Wahrnehmung—Entwicklung—Erosion* (Cologne, 2006); Friedrich Lenger, “Urbanisierung als Suburbanisierung: Grundzüge der nordamerikanischen Entwicklung,” in *Die europäische Stadt*, ed. Lenger and Tenfelde, 437–475. With New Urbanism, the garden-city idea has been experiencing a renaissance for several decades in the United States as a model for sustainable design. For a detailed discussion of New Urbanism, see Harald Bodenschatz and Barbara Schöning, *Smart Growth—New Urbanism—Livable Communities: Programm und Praxis der Anti-Sprawl-Bewegung in den USA* (Wuppertal, 2004). In Europe, there is no equivalent

correlation. Just the opposite: The “Green Paper on the Urban Environment” of the European Commission, published in 1990, mentions the garden city only twice, both times critically, for example, as the cause of urban sprawl. The Commission instead advocates the traditional townscape as a “compact,” densely populated city. See Stephen Ward, “The Howard Legacy,” in *From Garden City to Green City*, ed. Kermit C. Parsons and David Schuyler (Baltimore and London, 2002), 222–244, here 233ff.; Mike Jenks, Elizabeth Burton, and Katie Williams, *The Compact City: A Sustainable Urban Form?* (London, 1996). On this, see the criticism of the European Commission’s paper by Dennis Hardy, “The Garden City Campaign: An Overview,” *The Garden City: Past, Present, Future*, ed. Stephen Ward (London, 1992), 187–209, here 205.

<sup>4</sup> Up to now, research on the middle class has dealt little with these transformation processes. On the concept of civil society, see Manfred Hildermeier, Jürgen Kocka, and Christoph Conrad, eds., *Europäische Zivilgesellschaft in Ost und West: Begriff, Geschichte, Chancen* (Frankfurt am Main, 2000); Jürgen Kocka, “Zivilgesellschaft: Zum Konzept und seiner sozialgeschichtlichen Verwendung,” in *Europäische Zivilgesellschaft*, ed. Hildermeier, Kocka, and Conrad; “Neues über Zivilgesellschaft: Aus historisch-sozialwissenschaftlichem Blickwinkel,” *Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung* P 01-801 (December 2001): 4–21.

<sup>5</sup> Clemens Zimmermann and Jürgen Reulecke, eds., *Die Stadt als Moloch? Das Land als Kraftquell? Wahrnehmungen und Wirkungen der Großstädte um 1900* (Basel et al., 1999).

<sup>6</sup> See the presentation on suburban myths in Mark Clapson, *Invincible Green Suburbs, Brave New Towns: Social Change and Urban Dispersal in Postwar England* (Manchester and New York, 1998), 1–22; Robert Fishman, *Bourgeois Utopias* (New York, 1987); Kenneth T. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier* (New York and Oxford, 1985); Mike Davis, *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles* (London and New York, 1990).

<sup>7</sup> For the American example, Mike Davis and, more recently, Robert M. Fogelson have primarily emphasized the role of home-owners associations; Davis, *City of Quartz*; and Robert M. Fogelson, *Bourgeois Nightmares* (New Haven and London, 2005).

<sup>8</sup> Quoted in Mike Davis, *City of Quartz*, 34.

<sup>9</sup> Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier*, 244. Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique* (New York, 1963). For an overview of the debate, see Marc Clapson, *Suburban Century: Social Change and Urban Growth in England and the United States* (Oxford and New York, 2003), 125–142.

<sup>10</sup> See especially Clapson, *Invincible Green Suburbs*; Mark Clapson, *Suburban Century: Social Change and Urban Growth in England and the United States* (Oxford and New York, 2003); Ann Forsyth, *Reforming Suburbia: The Planned Communities of Irvine, Columbia, and The Woodlands* (Berkeley and others, 2005); Nicholas Dagen Bloom, *Suburban Alchemy: 1960s New Towns and the Transformation of the American Dream* (Columbus, 2001); Cathy D. Knepper, *Greenbelt, Maryland: A Living Legacy of the New Deal* (Baltimore and London, 2001); George A. Warner, *Greenbelt: The Cooperative Community* (New York, 1954); Richard Harris and Peter J. Larkham, eds., *Changing Suburbs: Foundation, Form and Function* (London, 1999); Rosaly Baxandall and Elizabeth Ewen, *Picture Windows: How the Suburbs Happened* (New York, 2000).

<sup>11</sup> For example, see Veronica Strong-Boag et al., “What Women’s Spaces? Women in Australian, British, Canadian and US Suburbs,” in *Changing Suburbs*, 168–186; Deborah Chambers, “A Stake in the Country: Women’s Experiences of Suburban Development,” in *Visions of Suburbia*, ed. Roger Silverstone (London and New York, 1997), 86–107; Sylvie Murray, *The Progressive Housewife: Community Activism in Suburban Queens, 1945–1965* (Philadelphia, 2003).

<sup>12</sup> It is significant that in the volume edited by Stephen Ward, *The Garden City*, only an older article by Gerhard Fehl on Nazi concepts of spatial planning is published: Gerhard Fehl, “The Nazi Garden City,” in *The Garden City*, ed. Ward, 88–106.

<sup>13</sup> Following World War I, the garden-city concept was absorbed more and more by the various reform movements of the small settlement construction industry. Furthermore, the

designation was increasingly used in an inflationary manner as little more than an effective advertising slogan for living in a green area in the suburbs.

<sup>14</sup> The recording included, among other things, location, type (social housing, private-sector utilization interests, industrial settlement, etc.), start of planning, developer (cooperative, private investors, city, federal government), community facilities and public buildings (schools, kindergartens, washhouses, community centers, libraries, churches, museums, etc.), and transportation infrastructure.

<sup>15</sup> See Howard's famous diagram "The Three Magnets," in *To-Morrow*, ed. Hall, Hardy, and Ward, 24.

<sup>16</sup> It is often overlooked that, in this regard, Howard's reflections frequently begin with the city, and his consideration of the countryside is, in the final analysis, colonialist. He wanted to halt the increasing destruction of the landscape, but it was above all the idea of the city that he wanted to save with his model.

<sup>17</sup> See the "Social City" diagram in *To-Morrow*, ed. Hall, Hardy, and Ward, 158.

<sup>18</sup> In the United States, Jane Jacobs is considered to be the most important critic of Howard's model. In Howard, she sees a promoter of a backward-looking, city-destroying utopia. Although her book reveals an almost complete ignorance of Howard's work, it has continued to be extremely influential up to the present (See Ward, *The Howard Legacy*, 230). In his essay "The American Garden City: Still Relevant?" (in: Ward, *The Garden City*, 164) Robert Fishman took a position similar to that of Jacobs, but then developed a more differentiated position in his "The Bounded City," in Parsons, *From Garden City to Green City*, 58.

<sup>19</sup> See, for example, Edward W. Soja, *Postmetropolis: Critical Studies of Cities and Regions* (Oxford, 2000); Saskia Sassen, *The Global City* (New York, 2001).

<sup>20</sup> Recently, Friedrich Lenger again reminded us of the link between urban historical research and contemporary urban developments. See Friedrich Lenger, "Einleitung," in *Die europäische Stadt*, ed. Klaus Tenfelde, 1–21, here 2.

<sup>21</sup> Stephen Ward, "The Garden City Introduced," in *Garden City*, ed. Ward, 1–27. Eugenie Birch, "Five Generations of the Garden City: Tracing Howard's Legacy in Twentieth-Century Residential Planning," in *From Garden City to Green City*, ed. Parsons, 171–200, traces the various adaptations of the garden-city idea in international transfer.

<sup>22</sup> Hall and others, *To-Morrow*. See also Robert Beevers, *The Garden City Utopia: A Critical Biography of Ebenezer Howard* (New York, 1988).

<sup>23</sup> See for example Walter Pahl, *Die Gartenstadt: Visionen und Wirklichkeit am Beispiel der Gartenstädte Dresden-Hellerau und Mannheim* (Mannheim, 2000). Frank Jost, *Roter Faden "Gartenstadt": Stadterweiterungsplanungen von Howards garden city bis zur "Neuen Vorstadt"* (Berlin, 1999); Axel Schollmeyer, *Gartenstädte in Deutschland: Ihre Geschichte, städtebauliche Entwicklung und Architektur zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Münster, 1988). Exhibiting the same tendency, but more sophisticated, is Thomas Krückemeyer, *Gartenstadt als Reformmodell: Siedlungskonzeption zwischen Utopie und Wirklichkeit* (Siegen, 1997). On the German garden city movement, see also Franziska Bollerey, Gerhard Fehl, and Kristiana Hartmann, eds., *Im Grünen wohnen—im Blauen planen: Ein Lesebuch zur Gartenstadt* (Hamburg, 1990) and Kristiana Hartmann, *Deutsche Gartenstadtbewegung: Kulturpolitik und Gesellschaftsreform* (Munich, 1976).

<sup>24</sup> Ward, "The Garden City Introduced"; Bodenschatz and Schönig, *Smart Growth*.

<sup>25</sup> See Martina Löw, *Raumsoziologie* (Frankfurt am Main, 2001). On the various dimensions of public space, see Tilman Harlander and Gerd Kuhn, "Renaissance oder Niedergang? Zur Krise des öffentlichen Raums im 20. Jahrhundert," in *Stadt macht Platz—NRW macht Plätze*, ed. Initiative StadtBauKultur NRW (Düsseldorf, 2004), 6–13.

<sup>26</sup> Participation in the annual Labor Day Parade in Greenbelt, Maryland, is still a "must" for many Democratic politicians within the Washington establishment. See the list of participants at [www.greenbelt.com](http://www.greenbelt.com).

<sup>27</sup> Thomas Sieverts, "Die Kultivierung von Suburbia," in *Die europäische Stadt*, ed. Walter Siebel (Frankfurt am Main, 2004), 85–91.

<sup>28</sup> See Walter Siebel, "Einleitung: Die europäische Stadt," in *Die europäische Stadt*, ed. Siebel, 11–50, here 49.

<sup>29</sup> The importance of the *völkische* variants of the garden-city idea for the German Garden City Association has hardly been researched at all. Also, Dirk Schubert, *Die Gartenstadtideologie zwischen reaktionärer Ideologie und pragmatischer Umsetzung. Theodor Fritschs völkische Variante der Gartenstadt* (Dortmund, 2004) only marginally addresses actual social activities in the garden cities. Similarly, Fehl, *The Nazi Garden City*, mainly focuses on *völkische Raumplanungskonzepte*.