

# From

# Utopian



After Gerhard Oberlander

by **Norbert Schoenauer**

La table magique du conte de Grimm est le symbole des idéaux utopiques de plusieurs réformateurs sociaux du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle. L'idée d'instaurer un système collectif de préparation des repas pour les habitants d'un même ensemble résidentiel s'inscrivait dans l'évolution de la société de l'époque; redéfinition du rôle de la femme, souci de rendement amené par les nouveaux concepts d'industrialisation et de mécanisation, et bien entendu, naissance des notions de collectivisme, socialisme et communisme. Cet article survole bon nombre de ces idéaux devenus réalité et qui se retrouvent tant aux Etats-Unis, qu'en Europe et en Russie.



# Ideal to Reality

## Introduction:

In one of Grimm's fairy tales, an apprentice to a joiner received from his master a magic table as a reward for his cheerfulness and industry. When instructed "Table, cover thyself" this magic table would at once be set with a fine table cloth, plates, cutlery, sumptuous dishes accompanied by wine.<sup>1</sup>

The magic table of this fairy tale represents an inspiration which parallels the utopian ideals of certain 19th century social and housing reformers, who attempted to provide meal service to inhabitants of multiple housing, thus making obsolete the need for food preparation in every household.

In the age of industrialization, when small scale handicrafts were gradually replaced by large scale industries, it was not surprising that domestic activities should also come under close scrutiny. The application of the two particular forces, "centralization" and "mechanization", that fostered industrial development, was thought to offer the greatest promise of utopian domestic life, first by easing, and thereafter by reducing the burden of housekeeping. Since these two forces were complementary, one would have expected equal emphasis to be placed upon both their applications, in order to improve housekeeping. However, this was not the case. In fact, there appears to have developed a divergence between the predilection of the Europeans and the North Americans in their respective emphasis on these two forces, the former favouring centralization, and the latter mechanization. This dichotomy is not surprising in the context of the historical background that shaped their respective societies. While Europeans, and even the socialists among them, accepted domestic service as a fulfilling profession (albeit restructured from a mistress-maid, to a manager-worker relationship), Americans saw in domestic service merely a temporary job and a "spring-stone to something higher".<sup>2</sup>

The emphasis upon centralization, in essence, led to the establishment of collective habitations where resources for household services were pooled in order to free tenants from the necessity of doing repetitive domestic work, while a reliance primarily on mechanization implied the development of servantless households where mechanical appliances did away with the most of the manual chores of housekeeping. Of course, an equal emphasis upon both forces would have promised the greatest revolution in domestic services, but this was not to be. The European evolution of collective habitation with centralized kitchen service as a pursuit of an utopian ideal is the subject of this paper. Its counterpart, the mechanization of household work processes which eventually led to the American servantless home, has been well described by Siegfried Giedion<sup>3</sup> and Dolores Hayden.<sup>4</sup>

## The Genesis of European Collective Habitation:

An early concept for the provision of centralized kitchen service to occupants of multiple dwellings was proposed during the first decade of the 19th century by utopian Charles François Marie Fourier. He advocated the abolishment of in-

dividual food preparation mainly to emancipate women, but also to avoid wasteful practice of simultaneous cooking inherent in private housekeeping. Fourier proposed centralized kitchens for those who were willing to join his utopian communities and live in so-called "phalansteries". Conceived as a large palatial building complex, the "phalanstery" was to consist of a number of individual apartments complemented by a series of common rooms for conversation, reading, and dining. "Dining rooms on the second floor were to be served by raising the tables (decked with food) through trap doors from the kitchens below".<sup>5</sup> But for those who preferred to eat in the privacy of their apartment, food delivery service was promised to be available. Patiently, Fourier waited for many years for a philanthropist to appear who would be willing to underwrite the initial cost of this social experiment, but no one ever came. He died disillusioned in 1837.

Five years after Fourier's death, an industrialist, Jean-Baptiste André Godin, adapted some of Fourier's ideas for his workers' housing and established in 1859 a "familistère" at Guise, France. Instead of installing individual kitchens in every dwelling, a central kitchen with a common dining room was built for the occupants of the familistère. But after a few years of service the centralized kitchen had to be abandoned for lack of popular support.

Towards the end of the 19th century the concept of centralized household services was gaining ever wider acceptance, at least in theory, and many social reformers extolled its virtues. The social philosopher Prince Petre Alekseevich Kropotkin, for example, advocated the adoption of centralized kitchen service for apartment dwellers. He bemoaned the inefficiency of innumerable housewives concurrently cooking meals for their families, and estimated that every day in England and the USA alone "eight million women spend their time to prepare this meal, that perhaps consists at the most of ten different dishes".<sup>6</sup>

Similar sentiments were also expressed by H.G. Wells, who asserted that an "ordinary Utopian would no more think of a special private kitchen for his dinners that he would think of a private flour mill or dairy farm".<sup>7</sup> Wells visualized the prosperous utopian living in "residential clubs" that offered to its occupants not only furnished bedrooms, but also elaborate suites of apartments, which could be furnished to suit individual taste. Among such luxuries as pleasant boudoirs, private libraries, studies, and private garden plots, Wells allocated mere "little cooking corners" for these suites, because a central kitchen was to cater to the Utopian.

## Catering Flats:

In fact, by the end of the 19th century a new residential building type came into existence in London, the serviced apartment building designed mainly for use by affluent people. Called "catering flats", these luxurious domestic buildings were developed to fulfill the demands of a certain segment of society, namely well-to-do single or elderly people



---

*"Dining rooms on the second floor were to be served by raising the tables (decked with food) through trap doors from the kitchen below."*

---

who sought the "home-like" quality of a luxurious apartment building combined with the services offered by a hotel.<sup>8</sup>

The evolution of this new building type was attributed to the increasing difficulty in obtaining good servants, but another reason was the demand for an agreeable form of dwelling for affluent people who were willing to pay for the conveniences they obtained.

Catering flats consisted of a number of self-contained suites of various sizes, usually with a pantry but without kitchens and servants' rooms. Household services and meals in the common dining room were paid for at a fixed charge whereas the use of all other common rooms, namely the drawing rooms, billiard rooms, etc. were included in the rent. (Apartment hotels are the American counterparts of the British catering flats).

"Queen Anne's Mansions", designed by E.R. Robson, "Marlborough Chambers", by Reginald Morphew, and "Camden House Chambers", by Balfour and Turner, are but three examples of catering flats in Greater London. The apartment suites in the second example were considered at the time to be "some of the best and most expensive suites in London".<sup>9</sup>

Serving an affluent clientele with a high living standard, catering flats were economically quite successful, but they were beyond the reach of most city dwellers and remained but a utopian dream to the majority of the people.

#### **The "Kollektivhus", a Danish prototype:**

At the turn of the century, Otto Fick, an energetic Dane with a lively imagination and a sincere commitment to the betterment of living conditions formulated a new concept for apartment living that was to complement imminent changes in society. His efforts led eventually to the development of a "Kollektivhus" (collective house), in Copenhagen, a new prototype of the multiple dwellings that was to be emulated later not only in the Scandinavian countries, but in several other European countries as well.

It is not clear whether Otto Fick knew about the catering flats of London, or the apartment hotels of North America, but there is an uncanny similarity between these and his proposed "Kollektivhus", since Fick too envisaged his building to be administered in such a way that all the housework and food preparation would be carried out by service staff so that tenants would not have to worry about house cleaning or cooking after they came home from work.

Fick's plan for an ideal housing development was realized in 1903, when a "Kollektivhus" was built in accordance with his design principles. The plans for this apartment building were prepared by the architects L.Chr. Kofoed, and the building was located at the corner of Forchammersvej and Sankt Markus Plads in Copenhagen. The building site was owned by the municipality which also raised sufficient capital for the construction of this building, it had to be financed as a co-operative.

Fick's collective apartment house was composed of 26

kitchenless but otherwise self-contained dwelling units ranging in size from three to five rooms. Apartments were centrally heated and had hot water supply, garbage disposals and a central vacuum pipe outlet to which vacuum cleaners could be attached.

Twenty-seven various common rooms for collective services were installed to serve the inhabitants of the building, including a central kitchen, laundry, drying room, ironing room, and maids' room. All dwelling units were served by dumb-waiters for the delivery of meals from the central kitchen. Fick argued that it was senseless to have 26 housewives cooking individually when it would be much easier and more efficient to have meals prepared centrally for every household. Other housekeeping services were also available to tenants, such as house cleaning, window washing, shoe polishing and even the mending of clothing, all upon request at fixed charges.<sup>10</sup>

Fick was concerned, however, that contact between neighbours could become too "liberal" if collective services were extended to include all family activities. For this reason, neither a common dining room, nor a nursery for children was planned for the building. Food was simply sent to each apartment unit via the dumb-waiter and in order to preserve the element of surprise, or the illusion of having home cooked meals for which there had never been any choice, there was no provision made for menu selection. If, however, certain members of a family did not like a particular dish, the central kitchen was notified and something else was sent up.

In 1907, a detailed account of Fick's collective house services was chronicled in a periodical<sup>11</sup> and the amenities enjoyed by the tenants of this new establishment were described in great detail. Accordingly, breakfast was delivered as requested at a specific time and announced by an electric bell in the apartment. At lunch or dinner, if guests were to be entertained, notice had to be given only one hour before meal time so that food could be delivered in more attractive and festive dinnerware. Laundry service and special errands were arranged by management upon request against a charge that was reasonable because of the efficiencies inherent in centrally organized housekeeping.

As a social reformer, Fick, was of course, primarily concerned with the working class, and would have liked to have his collective house built for them. However, before the First World War, very few workers were able to afford the luxury of any housekeeping services. Consequently, although originally designed for lower income groups, the "kollektivhus" attracted only middle income dwellers. To remedy this situation, Fick later attempted to create collective services on a wider basis by establishing central kitchens, laundries and other services for an entire city district, but these concepts were too advanced for their times and were never implemented.

The "Kollektivhus" was composed of predominantly large dwelling units for large families, rather than similar units for childless couples or single tenants. Thus, 26 large



---

*"an ordinary Utopian would no more think of a special private kitchen for his dinners than he would think of a private flour mill or dairy farm."*

---

families with few wage earners had to bear the costs of all collective services, whereas a large number of smaller households with correspondingly more wage earners would have made the individual burden less. In spite of this, the collective house continued to function well during the First World War, until food rationing was imposed and the central kitchen service had to be suspended. After the war, when things returned to normal, tenants once again requested meal service from the central kitchen, which functioned satisfactorily until 1942, when the building was sold, and when, incidentally, food rationing was again enforced.

During the Second World War, the housing shortage in Denmark became so acute that the new owner converted the communal rooms into self-contained apartments and offices, thereby ending all collective services of the first "Kollektivhus".

#### **The "Einküechenhaus" in Germany, Switzerland, and Austria:**

In 1901, the German social democrat and women's activist Lily Braun published in Berlin a book entitled "Frauenarbeit und Hauswirtschaft" (Women's Work and Home Economics) in which she proposed the formation of housekeeping cooperatives as a means to accelerate the supply of homes for lower income groups suffering from an acute housing shortage. She envisaged these cooperative societies providing apartment buildings of 50-60 kitchenless dwelling units in landscaped garden settings with a centralized kitchen catering for their inhabitants.<sup>12</sup>

Lily Braun sincerely believed that apart from the building cost reductions derived from kitchenless apartments, these housing cooperatives would also bring about (1) the end of "dilettante" food preparation, (2) the improvement of child rearing, (3) the emancipation of women, and (4) the phasing out of "servants" or "maids" through their replacement by "workers" hired by management of these cooperatives.

Apart from a few socialist colleagues, Braun's housing reform proposals were rejected by her contemporaries and the kitchenless apartment buildings ridiculed as comparable to "rabbit warrens" where home life was limited to bedroom activities only. But a few years later, news of Otto Fick's collective house in Copenhagen reached Germany and many former antagonists of kitchenless apartment buildings changed their attitude. After Rosika Schwimmer's account in the periodical "Die Umschau", in 1907,<sup>13</sup> the virtues of this new Danish dwelling form were freely discussed in the Berlin press. Some hailed the collective house as the "urban apartment house of the future", while others still feared that this dwelling type would spell the beginning of the end for the sanctified status of marriage and the family. Undeterred, however, a group of housing reformers formed a "one-kitchen-house" society in 1908 and published an informative pamphlet extolling the virtues of collective habitation.<sup>14</sup> Plans and model photographs of projected collective apartment buildings in Lichterfelde and Friedenau, both garden suburbs of Berlin, were published and Hermann Muthesius

and Albert Gessner identified as their architects.

To forestall any negative reaction and to reassure potential clients, a promise was included in the cooperative's prospectus asserting that by living in these new types of apartment buildings, closeness and intimacy between family members were not going to be endangered, but on the contrary, would be strengthened since centralized kitchen and housekeeping services would free the mother from housework and enable her to devote greater attention to the healthy development of her children.

Four types of collective services were proposed for this new prototype apartment building, namely (1) centralized food service, (2) centralized housekeeping service, (3) child care in a "House-Kindergarten", and (4) recreational facilities for free-time activities.

Five one-kitchen-houses were opened on April 1st, 1909. The initial success was tremendous since all apartments were rented before the completion date, but only one month later the owners went bankrupt. Thus, the much publicized collective habitation movement which had promised extensive gastronomic and housekeeping reform to apartment dwellers, received a major setback. A new owner attempted to continue the operation by increasing the yield for services, but eventually individual kitchens had to be retrofitted into every apartment unit and centralized food service was discontinued.

Two noted architects, namely W.C. Behrendt and Henry van der Velde, sought to rescue the collective habitation movement. Since they were unable to raise enough funds, both architects had to be satisfied with giving only moral support to the cause.

Of course, not all German architects shared the views of Behrendt and van der Velde, especially such conservative architects as Paul Schultze-Naumburg. The latter saw in collective service buildings the atrophy of soulful life and a manifestation of the oddity of an ignominious large city. Nor did it help the cause of the advancement of collective habitation that centralized kitchen services were viewed by Schultze-Naumburg and others as leading to other collective organizations which were associated with communism.<sup>15</sup> But, with the outbreak of World War I, four years later, most building activities were stopped and further experimentation with new house forms ceased in Germany until 1919.

In neutral Switzerland, however, a collective habitation project was started during the war years with the founding of a cooperative society called "Wohnund Speisehausgenossenschaft" (dwelling-and-board cooperative society). The initiator of this venture was Oskar Schwank.<sup>16</sup>

By training as a building construction foreman, Schwank worked for some years in architects' offices and thereafter declared himself to be an architect. He was a handsome and dapper man who gave the impression of a serious burgher, but his appearance was misleading because he was anything but conventional. Not only was he already divorced, but he



---

*"Some hailed the collective house as the 'urban apartment house of the future,' while others still feared that this dwelling type would spell the beginning of the end for the sanctified status of marriage and the family."*

---

was also a supporter of social reform, which was uncommon among burghers at the time. Most likely Schwank read about one-kitchen-house experiments in architectural journals and may even have heard of the success of apartment hotels built in North American cities before he formulated and "patented" his design for collective habitation.

With a conviction and persuasiveness approximating that of a preacher, Schwank had little difficulty in convincing eleven building tradesmen and building material suppliers, all burghers of Zurich, to form a cooperative society. It may be of interest to note that none of the founding members of this society had any intention of living in the projected one-kitchen-apartment-house. Schwank prepared the necessary plans for the project and a building permit was issued by the municipal authorities in the summer of 1915. By January 1916 a mortgage for two-thirds of the anticipated building cost was secured and the suburban building site on the corner of Ida and Gertrude Strassen of Zurich-Wiedikon acquired. Construction commenced shortly thereafter and in the spring of the following year the structure was in such a stage of completion that it could receive its first tenants. During the construction period, however, Schwank made several major errors and lost control of the development. In consequence, he was forced to withdraw from both the job and the cooperative.

During construction, several changes were made to Schwank's original plans, one of which entailed the replacement of the common dining room planned for the exclusive use of the tenants by a public restaurant. Nevertheless, the central kitchen service was retained to cater for the tenants and the new restaurant alike.

Popularly known as the "Amerikanerhaus" (American house), this apartment building also offered to its residents other collective services of which the central heating system was the most admired.

It is undeniable that Schwank's collective house, consisting of 45 dwelling units, was well-liked, since many of its initial residents, at least until a few years ago, still lived in it. In 1976, some of these elderly persons were interviewed by a journalist, and their anecdotes of happiness clearly reflected great satisfaction, in spite of the fact that changes have occurred over the years.<sup>17</sup>

Perhaps the most significant change to the "Amerikanerhaus" was the dissolution in 1946 of the cooperative society that had built it and its replacement by a real estate company.

After 1916, Schwank never visited the building that he conceived. He married a third time and divorced shortly after. He gave up the practice of architecture, worked in a shoe factory, and died in 1951 at the age of 76.

The idea of collective habitation also reached Vienna, and plans for a "Einküechenhaus" were drawn up by the architect Otto Hellwig,<sup>18</sup> but its realization was postponed until after the First World War and its aftermath of economic instability. In 1922, a collective house comprising 25 dwelling

units, each with 1 to 5 rooms, was built as a first phase development of a large project. With an additional 246 apartments, mostly one and two room dwellings, this project called "Heimhof" (Home Court), was completed four years later. Although the dwellings were rather small, these apartments nevertheless became very popular. Collective services made house-keeping easy and common facilities such as dining halls, bath houses, a Kindergarten, as well as social rooms stocked with daily newspapers, were luxuries greatly appreciated.

Each floor of all the apartment blocks was served by a maid, who also served meals in one's apartment if requested to do so. Laundry services as well as other housekeeping services were offered at cost, since this housing development was run by the occupants themselves as a non-profit cooperative. Each year members elected new executives whose responsibility was to efficiently manage the building.

After the German occupation of Austria in the thirties, the cooperative administration of Heimhof ceased and its central kitchen service, together with all other housekeeping services, including social common rooms, were closed.

#### **The "Dom-Kommuna", a Russian experiment:**

As might be expected after the Revolution of 1917, the notion of collective habitation was also embraced in Russia after the First World War. In fact, for a few years between 1926 and 1930, close to thirty percent of newly erected dwelling accommodations were "housing communes" or "dom-kommunas", which in their organization were very similar to the "Kollektivhus" concept.

In his book, *Town and Revolution*, Anatole Kopp attributes the development of dom-kommunas to the creative forces of the Russian revolutionary society. From the outset of the Soviet rule, it was an accepted notion in Russia that life was to change and that corresponding changes would have to follow in the home. Social changes coupled with the great housing shortage made it necessary to look beyond the traditional bourgeois apartment building for a new housing form that would act as a "social condenser" and would require a reduced volume of building construction per household so that the needs of an increased number of families that were victims of the housing shortage could be satisfied.

According to Anatole Kopp, the responsible people among the proletariat were "inspired by a legitimate desire to free women from domestic slavery, which in the conditions that existed in the U.S.S.R. of the twenties meant back-breaking labour".<sup>19</sup> Additional considerations were, first, "the need to release as many of the non-active population as possible (again mainly women) to play their part in industrialization of the country", and second, "the economic impossibility of giving each one individually the comfort and conveniences that it was rightly believed could be more easily provided for groups".<sup>20</sup> El Lissitzky recounts, that "the Soviet architect was given the task of establishing a new standard of housing by devising a new type of housing unit, not



---

*"The important thing is that the housing block, which up to now has merely represented the algebraic sum of self-contained private apartments, has now been transformed into a synthetic complex for total communal living."*

---

intended for single individuals in conflict with each other as in the West, but for the masses".<sup>21</sup> Finally, in a desire to transform the national way of life in a few brief years, housing communes were to bridge the border separating a reasonable idea from utopia.

As early as 1919, the management of a large Soviet State industrial plant prepared specifications for the construction of apartments of the "hotel" type. This project contained the germ for an idea that later led to the development of the dom-kommuna, or housing commune concept described in 1925 in the program of a housing design competition organized by the Moscow Soviet. Two years later, an inquiry was instituted into the dom-kommuna concept followed by a series of "fraternal competitions" all of which led to the creation in 1928 of a research and design group headed by the architect, and editor of the architectural magazine *S.A.*, Moses Ginsburg. Other members of this group were M. Barshit, A. Pasternak, G. Sum-Shchik and V. Vladimirov.

Only a few months after the formation of this research group, five prototypes of dwellings, which became known as "stroikom units" were published by the group. Four out of the five prototypes were conventional designs, but the fifth, namely the F-type unit, represented a real innovation and a genuine response to the needs of the day. This innovative design featured two superimposed compact one bedroom units serviced by a single loaded corridor at mid-level between the two units. Each dwelling was a through-unit enabling cross-ventilation, and of course, exposure to two orientations; the favourable exposure towards south featured living rooms that were one-and-a-half stories high, thereby allowing deep penetration of sunlight into the dwelling during the long winter months.

In a slightly modified form, this F-type dwelling unit was employed in the design of a collective apartment building on Novinsky Boulevard in Moscow. Built between 1928 and 1929 for the People's Commissariat of Finance, and called "Narkomfin", this building contained several collective facilities and common rooms, such as a canteen, central kitchen and dining room, laundry, gymnasium, library, day nursery, and a roof garden. Moses Ginsburg together with I. Milinis and S. Prokhorov were the architects of the building, which in many respects anticipates subsequent developments by Le Corbusier and others in the West.

After the completion of the Narkomfin building many other collective houses were constructed in Russia. In the northern part of the country, an indoor corridor gave access to the various dwelling units, while in the South, an outdoor gallery-type access corridor was used to link the entrances of individual apartments with the stairways and the building's collective facilities. Usually, collective services included a central kitchen and dining room, day care nursery and kindergarten, as well as recreation and club rooms. The number of residents of a dom-kommuna ranged between 400 and 800 persons.

The architectural faculty of the Technical Arts Institute

(Vkhutein) was also called by the Building Department of the Mossoviet "to work on a project that called for the planning and design implementation of a human settlement".<sup>22</sup> One of their solutions was a circular point block, consisting of a number of wedge-shaped kitchenless dwelling units for single persons; this residential tower was to be complemented by an adjacent communal structure where collective facilities were available.

The idealism of Russian housing reformers of the twenties is summed by Lissitzky. He wrote: "The important thing is that the housing block, which up to now has merely represented the algebraic sum of self-contained private apartments, has now been transformed into a synthetic complex for total communal living". And, only after "the functions of the individual elements become better defined" will it be possible "to give more consideration to individual desires".<sup>23</sup>

The dom-kommuna with its collective facilities was to release women from domestic labour for gainful employment in the labour short industry and was to make her a responsible member of a socialist society. Moreover, through living collectively with their every day housekeeping needs satisfied by common services, all inhabitants of the dom-kommuna would have every opportunity to improve and educate themselves in order to make a maximum contribution to society. This new way of life was hoped to discourage self-centeredness in the individual, and do away with materialism as manifested by the bourgeoisie class in capitalistic societies, whose members are perpetually engaged in an endless race to acquire consumer goods.

Lenin himself suggested in his manuscript *The Great Initiative* that, like true communism, the true emancipation of women would only come about when the micro-economics of the individual household was replaced by the macro-economics of the socialist state.<sup>24</sup>

The dom-kommuna building program did not live up to these expectations. It had a short life span and by 1932 had already been discontinued. The abandonment of Russia's collective habitation experiment is likely attributable to four conditions. First, the housing shortage in Russia during the twenties and the early thirties was so acute that compact one bedroom dwellings were often occupied by a large family, or in extreme situations by more than one family. Second, the acute housing shortage necessitated the postponement of the construction of some collective facilities in order to free labour and building materials for more essential industrial constructions; the promise that the omitted "non-residential" services were to be installed at some future date, when the housing shortage was alleviated, did not prevent daily aggravations and discontent. Third, Russians had no previous experience in the management of collective apartment houses, which often resulted in the large scale dissatisfaction of their tenants. Fourth, it must be remembered that the concept of collective habitation presupposes a considerable degree of sophistication and affluence on the part of its users, which was hardly the case at the time in Russia. In sum-





mary, overcrowded living conditions, incomplete facilities and poorly managed collective services, and perhaps most significant of all, the difficult and rapid transition from an agrarian and rural folk society to an industrialized urban society, are not ideal conditions under which to test the validity and success of a new housing concept.

After the "housing commune" lost its original appeal more traditional building types were adopted to meet the housing shortage, which led to the construction of large residential block developments called "kvartaly".<sup>25</sup>

### Conclusions:

For many decades, it seemed that the elusive ideal of collective habitation with meal service was unrealizable until the 1930's when another attempt was made in Sweden. Although this attempt represented a continuation of Fick's concept of Kollektivhus living, it also drew insights from the German Einküchenhaus, the Russian Dom-Kommuna, and the North-American apartment hotel experience.

Two sociologists, Alva and Gunnar Myrdal, emerged as the main protagonists of the Swedish collective habitation movement. Also engaged in the women's emancipation movement, Alva Myrdal saw in collective habitation the liberation of women from housekeeping chores and the potential for them to have opportunities in the work force equal to those of men.<sup>26</sup>

Sven Markelius, an architect and town planner, was sympathetic to Alva Myrdal's ideals and together they set about to translate them into buildable substance. Thus, in 1935, the first Kollektivhus for family living was realized at 6 John Ericssonsgatan, in the Centrum of Stockholm. It was a successful building, but like its precedents, it too later experienced some problems maintaining its centralized kitchen service.

Six years after the opening of Markelius' collective house, Olle Engkvist, a private builder, established a second Kollektivhus called "Lundagaarden", then a third, "Marienberg" (1944), followed by "Nockeby" (1951), "Blackeberg" (1952), and "Hasselby" (1955-56).<sup>27</sup> All of these developments were very successful and established the viability of collective habitation, known by this time as "familjehotell" (family hotel). Subsequently, the collective house was renamed "servicehus" (service house), and as such it still enjoys its present popularity in Sweden.

First established in Sweden, the concept of collective habitation was reintroduced in Denmark after the Second World War, and here too it succeeded in becoming an accepted alternative to traditional dwelling accommodation. "Hoje Soborg" (1951), by P.E. Hoff and B. Windinge<sup>28</sup> and "Carlsro" (1958), by Arne Jacobsen<sup>29</sup> in collaboration with two other architectural firms, are well known family collective houses in Copenhagen, but several large provincial towns also built them with equal success.

Thus, after a long elusive pursuit an approximation of the "magic table" ideal of Grimm's fairy tale found realiza-

tion in Scandinavian collective houses proving that these buildings' protagonists anticipated an emerging domestic demand.

### NOTES:

1. Grimm, Jacob and Wilhelm. *Fairy Tales and Stories*. New York: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., p.116.
2. Beecher, Catherine, and Beecher Stowe, Harriet. *The American Woman's Home*. New York:.....1869, p.318.
3. Giedion, Siegfried. *Mechanization Takes Command*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1969.
4. Hayden, Dolores. *Seven American Utopias: The Architecture of Communitarian Socialism, 1790-1975*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1976, p.151.
5. Ibid., p.151.
6. Kropotkin, P. *The Conquest of Bread*. London: Chapman and Hall Ltd., 1906, p.165.
7. Purdom, C.B. *The Garden City*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1913, p.98.
8. Perks, Sydney. *Residential Flats of all Classes*. London: Batsford, 1905, p.54.
9. Ibid., p. 155.
10. Waagensen, Bent, and Rubin, Jenny. *Kollektivhuset og dets Forudsætninger*. Copenhagen: Nyt Nordisk Forlag. Arnold Busck, 1949, p.13-15.
11. Schwimmer, Rosika, "Zentral Haushaltung", *Die Umschau*, no.52 (1907), p.1024-1029.
12. Uhlig, Günther, "Zur Geschichte des Einküchenhauses", *Wohnen im Wandel* (9 ed. Lutz Niethammer), Wuppertal, West Germany: Peter Hammer, 1979, p.159.
13. Schwimmer, Rosika, "Zentral Haushaltung", *Die Umschau*, no.52 (1907), p.1024-1029.
14. Muhlstein, Erwin, "Kollektives Wohnen gestern und heute", *Archithese*, vol.14, p.5.
15. Uhlig, Guenther, "Zur Geschichte des Einküchenhauses", *Wohnen im Wandel*, (9 ed. Lutz Niethammer), Wuppertal, West Germany: Peter Hammer, 1979, p.151-170.
16. Troesch, Peter, "Idastrasse 28, Zuerich-Wiedikon", *Tages Anzeiger Magazin*, no.3 (January 1976), p.6-11 and 30.
17. Ibid., p. 30.
18. Ibid., p.9.
19. Kopp, Anatole. *Town and Revolution: Soviet Architecture and City Planning 1917-1935* (translated by Thomas E. Burton). New York: George Braziller, 1970, p.145.
20. Ibid., p.145.
21. Lissitzky, El. *Russia: An Architecture for World Revolution* (translated by Eric Dluhosh). London: Lund Humphries, 1970, p.35.
22. Ibid., p.41-42.
23. Ibid., p.41-42.
24. Lenin, Vladimir Ilich, *Die Grosse Initiative*, Werke Bd.29. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1961, p.419.
25. Cohen, Jean-Louis, and Claverie, Jana. *Architecture Soviétique: 1917-1933*. Paris: Centre Georges Pompidou/CCI, 1980, p.32.
26. Muhlstein, Erwin, "Kollektives Wohnen gestern und heute", *Archithese*, Vol.14, p.5.
27. Berkeley, Ellen Perry, "The Swedish 'servicehus'", *Architecture Plus*, May 1973, p.56.
28. "Kollektivhuset Hoje Soborg", reprinted from *Arkitekten*, no.12, 1952, p.1-12.
29. Muhlstein, Erwin, "Kollektives Wohnen gestern und heute", *Archithese*, vol.14, p.9-10.

Norbert Schoenauer is a MacDonald professor of architecture at McGill University.