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This dissertation examines the periodical publication *Kriegszeit* (1914-1916) and its successor *Der Bildermann* (1916). Published in Berlin by the distinguished art dealer and publisher Paul Cassirer during the First World War, they featured contributions by over seventy contemporary German artists, who were primarily affiliated with the Berlin Secession. These include Max Liebermann, Ernst Barlach, Käthe Kollwitz, and August Gaul, but also artists who pursued modes of expression beyond Impressionism and Post-Expressionism, such as Oskar Kokoschka, Otto Mueller, and Ottomar Starke.

My dissertation argues that *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* were material manifestations of *Kultur*, a paradigm that was under attack during the war. At the time, *Kultur* signified not only the cultivation of the mind and spirit, but also a set of moral values that were said to be uniquely German. It acquired great urgency in light of Germany’s actions during the war and the resulting condemnation of its people as barbarians. In this heady period, *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* were proffered as defenders and bearers of *Kultur*. Cassirer and the art community he assembled to produce these publications exploited innovative strategies in the service of this goal. In the process, they formulated a unique, if sometimes paradoxical, paradigm for *Kriegszeit* and *Der*
Bildermann—which I call “flying pages”—that operated at the intersection of magazine publishing, art-making, and collecting.

My dissertation fleshes out the “flying pages” paradigm in three ways: first, by examining Kriegzeit and Der Bildermann’s materiality and showing what and why they borrowed from established print traditions; second, by demonstrating how they provided a space for artists and editors to present content in creative and experimental ways; and third, by investigating how their innovative distribution strategies reimagined German people as collectors and guardians of Kultur. The focused study of these material, presentational, and circulation strategies not only expands the existing scholarship—which tends to consider Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann as markers of changing public attitudes toward the war—but it also establishes them as records of Cassirer’s creative leadership during this period.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

During the early months of the First World War, Max Liebermann, one of Germany’s preeminent artists, made a print that presented a strange sight: a Classical male nude fighting a bear (fig. 0.1). With a lance in one hand and a shield in the other, the man moves in for the kill. There is no suspense in the fight between these two adversaries. Lieberman zeroes in on the moment of death as the man delivers the final, piercing blow. Despite the bear’s fleshly heft and towering frame, he lets out a final bellow and gives out. Although still standing, his body is already slack, hollow, and bereft of vitality. The bear’s vanquisher, by contrast, stands powerfully erect, his physique taut and radiant.

Liebermann’s caption identifies the two adversaries: Hercules: Hindenburg Slays the Russian Bear. The image was produced in September 1914, less than a month after the First World War’s Battle of Tannenberg, which the German general Paul von Hindenburg was in the process of winning just as Liebermann’s print was going to press. It took the German forces only about a week to decimate Russia’s Second Army and score a decisive victory. As a result, “the elderly general dragged from retirement in his old blue uniform [Hindenburg] was transformed into a titan by the victory. The triumph in East Prussia, lauded and heralded even beyond its true proportions, fastened the Hindenburg myth upon Germany.”

Hindenburg fed this myth-making by choosing a Pan-German name for the battle, in vengeance of the Slavic victory over the

---

Teutonic Knights, who perished on the same battlefield in 1410.\textsuperscript{2}

In addition to referencing an actual event, Liebermann’s image also metaphorically represents the struggle between humanity (Germany) and bestiality or barbarity (Russia, but also Germany’s enemies at large). Liebermann was invested in drawing this sharp rhetorical distinction because of persistent claims of German inferiority and brutality in the run-up to the First World War. As the French philosopher Henri Bergson bluntly stated in August 1914:

\begin{quote}
The struggle against Germany is the struggle of civilization against barbarism… [We are] fulfilling a scientific duty in pointing out that Germany’s brutality and cynicism, its contempt for justice and truth, signals a regression to a state of savagery.\textsuperscript{3}
\end{quote}

This point of view was pervasive not just in the academic elite circles, which Bergson inhabited, but in French popular culture as well. A French cartoon published in the magazine \textit{Le Journal} on November 12, 1915, and reprinted in Fredinand Avenarius’s \textit{The Picture as a Slanderer}— one of the earliest publications seeking to expose and dispel the vast propaganda efforts to characterize Germans as barbarians—echoes Bergson’s sentiment (fig. 0.2).\textsuperscript{4} It shows a German officer summoning German soldiers to shoot a young boy for playing with a toy rifle. Avenarius’s outrage is not only triggered by the unsavory portrayal of Germans, but also the fact that it was published under the subheading “\textit{Kultur!!!}”

German cultural community responded to such vitriolic attacks on the German people’s cultural and moral integrity through a number of individual and collective actions. Liebermann’s print of Hindenburg defeating the Russian bear is the case in point: it was made by the artist, but

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
published alongside other prints as a part of a periodical publication called *Kriegszeit* (Wartime). *Kriegszeit* and its successor, *Der Bildermann* (The Picture Man), provided platforms for artists to create art during the First World War. These publications, however, did not provide neutral support for art. Instead, their own complex and idiosyncratic material properties, editorial vision, and distribution network were brought to bear on the content. My dissertation will examine these three aspects of *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* in order to demonstrate the vitality and resourcefulness with which the Berlin art community, centered around the art dealer Paul Cassirer, engaged with the political and cultural realities of their day. It will argue that *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* developed a unique — if sometimes paradoxical — material and visual syntax, which posited a new vision for the production, distribution, and consumption of art that enabled them to become agents of the German *Kultur*.

I. *Kultur*

The German Empire was proclaimed at the conclusion of the Franco-Prussian War, on January 18, 1871 in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles. In the long shadow of the French military defeat upon which modern Germany was founded, Germans frequently found themselves having to fend off charges of barbarianism. In the lead up to the twentieth century, as the country was expanding through colonization and becoming powerful economically, scientifically, and politically, the perception of Germans as brash, willful, and numb to beauty only increased.

Germany’s conduct in the first days of the First World War only strengthened the stereotype of Germans as barbarians. Seeking to take over France, the German army mounted its attack via the neutral Belgium. In order to navigate the Belgian territory (for example, the major
fortification complex at Liège), Germans resorted to acts of destruction and violence that resulted in loss of life, floods of refugees, and destruction of important cultural landmarks—acts that resulted in a widespread condemnation of Germans as barbarians. In light of continued fighting, this perception continued to gather steam.\(^5\)

The German intelligentsia sought an antidote to claims of German barbarianism in the sphere of *Kultur*. Although often translated as “culture,” it is difficult to find an equivalent term in English that expresses ideals implicit in the concept of *Kultur*. These harken back to at least the eighteenth century, when the key German representative of enlightenment, Immanuel Kant, defined it in opposition to the civilization.\(^6\) Over the next decades this dichotomy was strengthened, with civilization representing all the results of ‘outward’ progress in economics, technology, and social organization, while *Kultur* always continued to stand for the ‘inner’ condition and achievements of cultivated men. ‘Civilization’ evoked the tangible amenities of earthly existence; ‘culture’ suggested spiritual concerns. In short, culture reflected cultivation, whereas civilization was ‘merely’ a product of man’s factual, rational, and technical training.\(^7\)

In the development of this antithesis, Germany became squarely associated with *Kultur*, in contrast to the merely civilized Western Europe (especially England and France), which was


seen as preoccupied with consumerism, materialism, and outward appearances. Kultur thus emerged as the building block of the German national identity, as well as a dividing line that distinguished it from the rest of the world.

The notion that Germany had a qualitatively different element to the national understanding of itself veers too close into the Sonderweg territory, the now disputed paradigm that saw Germany moving on a “special path” away from the normal course of history toward Nazism. In rebuke of this theory, historians like David Blackbourn and Geoff Ely have shown that in terms of its political, social, and economic development, Germany was not as unique as previously believed. Cultural historians, who cite equivalents of Kultur deployed by other countries seeking to establish their exceptional national identity, have extended Blackbourn and Ely’s argument.

The eighteenth-century definition of Kultur as a timeless and fixed ideal that is solely invested in the cultivation of the mind and spirit had been destabilized in the early twentieth century. By the First World War, as politics were folded into its discourse, Kultur found a new resonance among a frustrated German citizenry. In the lead up to the war

A belief in the superiority of German culture was widespread in [middle- and upper-middle-class Germans], as was the assumption after fighting began that German culture was a target of enemy hatred. The rhetoric of cultural superiority was not unique to Germans, but it seems that in Germany with deeper conviction than elsewhere, culture was

---


politicized both as an object and as a force.\textsuperscript{11}

“The Appeal of the 93” (Der Aufruf der 93) represents perhaps the most famous instance of such politicization of culture during the First World War. The appeal was published as a manifesto on October 4, 1914 in various newspapers on behalf of ninety-three artists, scientists, and authors, including Max Liebermann, Wilhelm Trübner, Peter Behrens, Leopold Graf von Kalckreuth, Arthur Kampf and Richard Dehmel. They addressed it “To the Civilized World!” (An die Kulturwelt!), renouncing claims of German humanitarian and cultural barbarianism while expressing a conviction in Germany’s moral imperative to wage war as a preemptive measure against French and English troops. According to the signatories, the war that Germany was fighting was a war against German culture.\textsuperscript{12} They closed the appeal with the following plea:

Believe us! Believe that to the last we will fight as a civilized nation (Kulturvolk), to whom the legacy of a Goethe, a Beethoven, and a Kant is no less sacred than hearth and home.” \textsuperscript{13}

“The Appeal of the 93” shows how an expanded concept of Kultur provided a rallying framework for the German cultural community. Against growing perception of Germans as barbarians, German intelligentsia coalesced under the banner of Kultur, a concept that allowed them to conjure up a veneration of cultural ideals in opposition to Western Europe’s misguided

\textsuperscript{11} Peter Paret, \textit{German Encounters with Modernism} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 134.


\textsuperscript{13} “Glaubt uns! Glaubt, daß wir diesen Kampf zu Ende kämpfen werden als ein Kulturvolk, dem das Vermächtnis eines Goethe, eines Beethoven, eines Kant ebenso heilig ist wie sein Herd und seine Scholle.” Original article reprinted in Jürgen von Ungern-Sternberg and Wolfgang von Ungern-Sternberg, \textit{Der Aufruf “An die Kulturwelt!”: das Manifest der 93 und die Anfänge der Kriegspropaganda im Ersten Weltkrieg} (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1996), 145. All translations from the German are by me unless otherwise acknowledged.
materialist pursuits.

Such lofty intentions are enshrined in Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann, two periodical publications that featured contributions by some of the most distinguished members of the German cultural community. Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann collectively aimed to materialize something that was metaphysical, spiritual, and at the time under attack: the notion of Kultur.

II. Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann

Kriegszeit was a periodical publication that featured content by German artists on a single subject: namely, the First World War. It was launched on August 31, 1914, in response to war euphoria that was gripping Germany.\textsuperscript{14} Kriegszeit was started by an accomplished art dealer and publisher, Paul Cassirer, but he shared the day-to-day running of it with the editor Alfred Gold.

Paul Cassirer (1871-1926) was well known for showcasing the latest international trends in art in his gallery and for exhibiting German artists who embraced modern modes of expression. Although Cassirer did not openly seek conflicts with the Imperial art establishment, the Impressionist and Expressionist art that he sponsored and his publishing enterprises were frequently perceived as assaults on the conservative taste. Being at odds with government-sanctioned aesthetic program did not diminish Cassirer’s reputation in the Berlin society. In fact, his keen business acumen and his ties to prominent German artists and writers ensured instant exposure for Kriegszeit on Germany’s art scene.

Except for two special issues, the publication consisted of one large folded sheet of paper, which was printed on both sides. The four pages of *Kriegszeit* featured four black-and-white original lithographs. These were interspersed with captions, excerpts from soldiers’ letters, and occasional literary passages penned by classic and contemporary German writers such as Heinrich Heine, Gottfried Semper, Heinrich von Kleist, Gerhart Hauptmann, Paul Zech, and Benno Geiger. While literary texts by these authors are a part of *Kriegszeit*’s overall makeup, I will not consider them in detail since they were culled from preexisting sources and not — like the images — commissioned specifically for the publication.

*Kriegszeit* stayed in production for twenty months, with a total of sixty-five issues. It was published weekly until October 1915; thereafter, and until its last issue in March 1916, *Kriegszeit* was issued bi-weekly. Both the regularity with which the publication appeared and its relatively long lifespan—especially considering the conditions of war—are noteworthy. Equally significant are the 263 pages of original lithographs created exclusively for *Kriegszeit* by some of the most distinguished artists associated with German modernism, such as August Gaul, Max Liebermann, Ernst Barlach, Käthe Kollwitz, and Rudolf Grossmann.

In a rare editorial message that marked the conclusion of *Kriegszeit*’s first year, Alfred Gold declared the magazine highly successful, with a circulation in the thousands. (The print run is estimated at over 3,000, but was likely much higher.) Its success can be attributed partly to its low cost of fifteen Pfennige (later increased to twenty Pfennige), which made the magazine very

---

15 Issue 18/19 (December 1914) and issue 64/65 (March 1916) were published as double issues, each featuring eight pages of lithographs.

accessible to a broad public. Therefore, when Kriegszeit ceased production in March 1916, it was likely not because it failed to sell, but because of changed political circumstances after two years of fighting and Cassier’s growing pacifist views after his discharge from the army in early 1916. In a very real sense, this period marked a turning point in the war when war-weariness was setting in, along with the horrific realization of the high material and human costs of war. It coincided with the longest single battle of the First World War and one of the costliest, resulting in massive casualties on both sides between February and December of 1916. Fought in Verdun, France, between February and December 1916, the offensive was framed by its chief strategist on the German side, General Erich von Falkenhayn, as delivering the decisive and final blow. Falkenhayn sought not to simply defeat but to “bleed to death” the French forces. His grotesque goal became a reality, with 367,000 French and 337,000 Germans casualties.

On April 5, 1916, less than a week after closing Kriegszeit, Paul Cassirer replaced it with a new magazine, Der Bildermann. Although the launching of Der Bildermann marked the start of Cassirer’s new project, the publication is in many ways an extension of Kriegszeit. It continued to produce original lithographs in the same format established by its predecessor on a bi-weekly basis. It also retained some of the same contributors. Among the eighteen artists who created contemporary work for Der Bildermann, half came out of Kriegszeit, including August Gaul, Käthe Kollwitz, Ernst Barlach, and Max Slevogt. The newcomers belonged, to some extent, to a younger generation associated with Expressionism; they included artists Oskar Kokoschka, Erich Heckel, and Ottomar Starke, as well as authors Christian Morgenstern, Walter Hasenclever, and Else Lasker-Schüler.
Der Bildermann did, however, receive new ideological direction after Cassirer hired the esteemed music critic and educator Leo Kestenberg to serve as editor. According to Kestenberg, Max Slevogt formulated the magazine’s title in reference to the Picture Man, an itinerant folk figure from the age of Reformation, who used images to educate and enlighten the crowds. That the magazine Der Bildermann was meant to function in a similar fashion as its namesake is underscored by its subtitle, “Lithographs for the German People” (Steinzeichnungen fürs deutsche Volk), and by Cassirer and Kestenberg’s assertion that the magazine hopes to “bring a broad public in direct touch with art.”

III: State of Research

An overview of the state of research reveals that the art historical scholarship has acknowledged Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann, albeit in a selective manner. The first article devoted exclusively to the two publications was published in 1976 by Victor H. Miesel. Although he provided a general introduction to Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann, he also established an interpretative framework for these publications that persists to this day. Specifically, Miesel set up Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann in opposition to one another. Despite its seventeen-month, sixty-five-issue print run, the former is identified with Germany’s war euphoria of 1914, with little regard for the significance of its medium; the latter is defined as a

17 Rahel E. Feilchenfeldt and Markus Brandis, Paul Cassirer Verlag, Berlin 1898-1933: Eine kommentierte Bibliographie (Munich: K. G. Saur, 2002), 511. This phrase was culled from Börsenblatt für den Deutschen Buchhandel, a book trade magazine that announced upcoming publications. Cassier and Kestenberg jointly composed the long advertisement for Der Bildermann.
vehicle for Paul Cassirer’s and Leo Kestenberg’s growing pacifist views. The noted historian—and Paul Cassirer’s maternal grandson—Peter Paret expanded Miesel’s discussion of the two publications in his groundbreaking book on the Berlin Secession, which concluded with a chapter devoted to Der Bildermann.19 Paret’s research contributed to the growing significance of the two magazines, but it also reiterated Miesel’s schema. In fact, Paret’s abbreviated consideration of Kriegszeit and his laudatory treatment of Der Bildermann further reinforced Miesel’s pro-war/anti-war binary. More recently, the impact of this scholarly approach can be detected in the work of Claudia Büttner, Georg Brühl, and Volker Probst.20 All three scholars continue to insist that Kriegszeit’s contributions are nothing more than reflections of the art community’s patriotic and nationalist fervor, while Der Bildermann was essentially a pacifist publication.

Biographers examining the oeuvres of contributors to Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann take a similar approach to considering the importance of these two art publications in the lives of their subjects. Take, for example, the recent monograph on Max Liebermann, which features an essay by Erika Eschenbach on the artist’s contribution to Kriegszeit.21 Eschenbach’s focused

---


evaluation is rich in pictorial analysis. She reads Liebermann’s contributions to *Kriegszeit* as markers of the popular sentiment toward the First World War, representative the German people’s initial support for the war.

While I do not dispute this characterization, I argue that what is missing from both her approach and that of other scholars is the recognition that *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* were periodical publications; in other words, that Liebermann’s contributions were not simply works on paper, but works on paper that existed materially in the world among other such images, which were then collectively assembled to constitute a physical object that has its own significance and meaning. In Eschenbach’s decontextualized analysis, *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* emerge as nothing more than compilations of individually created content. Therefore, the acknowledgement of *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann*’s material properties and approach to distribution is almost non-existent.22

Beyond art historical scholarship, my dissertation draws from and will build upon cultural histories of Germany during the reign of Kaiser Wilhelm II. Scholars such as Wolfgang J. Mommsen, Matthew Jefferies, and Robin Lenman have produced comprehensive studies on Imperial Germany’s complicated visual arts landscape and its relationship to wider political and social milieus.23 In addition, edited volumes by Rainer Rumold, O. K. Werckmeister,24 and

---

22 Literary histories, such as Roy F. Allen’s *Literary Life in German Expressionism and the Berlin Circles*, have expanded on the visual focus of *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* to consider contributions by members of Berlin’s literary circles. Although Allen’s study provides the necessary literary background to these two magazines, his continued emphasis on writers’ and poets’ biographies and autobiographies results in a neglect of specific texts and their functions within a larger magazine context. Roy F. Allen, *Literary Life in German Expressionism and the Berlin Circles* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1983), 173-204.

23 Wolfgang J. Mommsen, *Imperial Germany 1867-1918: Politics, Culture, and Society in an Authoritarian State* (New York: Arnold, 1995); Matthew Jefferies, *Imperial Culture in Germany, 1871-
Francoise Forster-Hahn\textsuperscript{25} provide an expanded context of Wilhelmine Germany’s destabilizing national politics, volatile social debates, and increasingly varied directions in art. Pioneering work in the field of \textit{Kunstpublizistik} by Fritz Herzog and Ernst Herbert Lehmann, as well as the more recent histories by Maria Rennhofer and Angela Karasch,\textsuperscript{26} allow me to contextualize \textit{Kriegszeit} and \textit{Der Bildermann} within their original place and time.

My dissertation will also contribute to the growing literature on visual culture during the First World War by extending the category of scholarship that privileges a select group of artists.\textsuperscript{27} In the context of German art history, this scholarship has tended to focus on figures such as Käthe Kollwitz, Max Beckmann, Otto Dix, and George Grosz. Representations of the First World War in German art are often framed from their perspective, as seen from the through a retrospective lens of the Weimar Republic in the 1920s. My dissertation seeks to dial back to clock and look at the war from the point of view of the art community that was experiencing the conflict during

\textit{1918} (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); and Robin Lenman \textit{Artists and Society in Germany, 1850-1914} (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997).


\textsuperscript{26} Ernst Herbert Lehmann, \textit{Die Anfänge der Kunstzeitschrift in Deutschland} (Leipzig: K.W. Hiersemann, 1932); Ernst Herbert Lehmann, \textit{Einführung in die Zeitschriftenkunde} (Leipzig: Verlag Karl W. Hiersemann, 1936); Fritz Herzog, \textit{Die Kunstzeitschriften der Nachkriegszeit: eine Darstellung der deutschen Zeitschriften für bildende Kunst von der Zeit des Expressionismus bis zur Neuen Sachlichkeit} (Charlottenburg: Lorentz, 1940); Maria Rennhofer, \textit{Kunstzeitschriften der Jahrhundertwende in Deutschland und Österreich, 1895-1914} (Wien: C. Brandstätter, 1987); and Angela Karasch, \textit{Illustrierte Moderne in Zeitschriften um 1900} (Freiburg: Universitätbibliothek Freiburg, 2005).

first two years of its existence. Similar to Kassandra: Visionen des Unheils 1914-1945—a recent exhibition addressing art produced during the two World Wars—my dissertation seeks to showcase German artists who have heretofore received little attention, such as Erich Büttner and Ottomar Starke. It also seeks to extend the scope of inquiry by looking beyond the so-called ‘major media’ of painting and sculpture. I model this approach on recent cultural studies that have already begun to do this work. For instance, Die letzten Tage der Menschheit: Bilder des Ersten Weltkriegs and Tod als Maschinist: Der industrialisierte Krieg 1914-18 consider the import of previously overlooked visual objects that were mass produced during the war, such as postcards, cartoons, posters, film, and photography.

This overview of the state of research shows that while Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann have not been extensively studied, they have attracted scholarly attention. This attention, however, exposes gaps that I will redress by moving beyond the correct yet narrow scholarly characterization of these publications, which essentializes Kriegszeit as a product of war euphoria and Der Bildermann as a pacifist publication. My analysis of these publications will show that: 1) Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann were unprecedented in uniting a large and eclectic group of German artists, including adherents to various styles, painters as well as sculptors, newcomers as well as established figures, and artists and writers operating from the home front and the battle front; 2) in a significant departure from other periodical publications, Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann’s pages were conceived as original works of art in collectible editions of varying paper quality, thus blurring the line between periodical readers and art patrons; 3)

---

*Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* enabled contributors to create and show contemporary work on a large scale, outside the context of the museum or gallery space; and 4) at the low cost of fifteen-twenty Pfennige, *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* sought to reach a broad public on the home front, but also soldiers on the battlefront by offering delivery through the military postal service.

My dissertation will reveal a more complex character of the German art community’s response to the war, beyond a simple pro-war/anti-war binary. It will show that these *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* did not simply mirror, comment upon, or reflect a given reality of war, but that they assumed an active role in the construction of this history. In other words, they did not passively promote or question Germany’s war effort; rather they acted as the advocates and defenders of *Kultur*.

In drawing on historical, cultural, political, and art historical studies of Wilhelmine Germany, I will argue that these publications have posited a new material and visual paradigm for how art could be produced and circulated. Since the vocabulary is singularly lacking in words to describe that paradigm, I propose the phrase “flying pages” to signify artworks that exist beyond museum and gallery spaces. Flying pages plays on the concept of “Museum without Walls,” coined by André Malraux, but extends his metaphor to suggest something less architectural and inert, something that is intended to move freely in the world.29 The phrase encapsulates both the medium and a different kind delivery and circulation system. And finally, it highlights the paradoxes inherent in *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann*: the way they oscillate between high and low art forms, between fine arts and commercial ephemera.

---

IV. Methodology

Because my reading of *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* hinges on the analysis of these art publications’ material attributes, a first-hand examination was an important step in the formation of my argument. As a part of my archival research, I made several trips to the periodical collection at the Robert Gore Rifkind Center for German Expressionist Studies in Los Angeles. I was also able to spend ten months in Berlin with archival collections at the Deutsches Historisches Museum, Staatsbibliothek, and Kunstbibliothek. I also examined issues of *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* in art museum collections at the Kupferstichkabinett Berlin and Staatliche Graphische Sammlung in Munich.

I am employing three main methodological frameworks to my analysis of *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann*. The first is the material culture approach because of its equal focus on both the materiality of objects and people’s relationship to and experiences of them. Thus, in addition to emphasizing the significance of how objects are made, material culture is also interested in how they circulate in the world (how they are bought, circulated, and displayed). In grounding my dissertation in this method, I will be able to unpack the role played by editors, publisher, and consumers of *Kriegszeit*.  

The second method that I am employing stems from periodical studies and theories posited by the literary theorist Jerome McGann, who proposes that we differentiate between the linguistic and bibliographic codes of a text. He defines the former as words in a literary text and

---

the latter as its physical features (such book prices, book bindings, and typefaces). In 2001, George Bornstein translated McGann’s notion of bibliographic codes to *periodical* codes. According to Bornstein, periodical codes usher in a new methodology, which enables scholars to analyze the physical materials of any magazine, including format, page layout, price, and quality of paper. The editors of *The Oxford Critical and Cultural History of Modernist Magazines* have recently proposed that we can further subdivide periodical codes into *internal* codes (meaning the design of the periodical) and *external* codes (described as “the external relationships to the imagined readership and the world of commerce and commodities”).

McGann and Bornstein’s methodology will be integral to my analysis of *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* because it illuminates the often-overlooked fact that these art publications are physical objects that exist materially in the world. My dissertation will therefore not examine pages of these art publications as neutral supports for image and text, as scholars have done in the past. Nor will I use the material approach to establish a connoisseurial appreciation of original prints published in *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann*. Instead, my dissertation will explore these art publications in the third dimension, as objects whose physical attributes can facilitate a better understanding of their unique contributions to visual culture during the First World War.

---


I borrow the second methodological framework from a branch of reception studies know as reception aesthetics. Its origin traces back to Alois Riegel and his seminal 1902 study “The Group Portraiture in Holland,” which posited the idea of the “beholder’s involvement.”34 The German historian Wolfgang Kemp elaborated Riegel’s notion further in his essay “The Work of Art and Its Beholder,” in which he argued that “each work of art is addressed to someone” and that it “works to solicit its ideal beholder.”35 Given that Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann’s subscription records are nonexistent and that we only have scant knowledge of their presence in private collections, Riegel and Kemp’s methods will help to advance my understanding of imagined audiences that were addressed by the material and visual attributes of Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann.

V: Chapter Outline

Following this introduction, the first chapter asks the fundamental question: “what are Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann?” Although these publications are generally described as “magazines” or “periodicals” this chapter will show how Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann do not neatly fit into these categories. The chapter will examine their complex material attributes by

34 In the English-speaking world, the American art historian Michael Fried contributed to this discourse by postulating a dialectical relationship between “absorption” and “theatricality,” i.e. phenomena that occur when a painting either directly engages or completely disavows the viewer. Michael Fried, Absorption and Theatricality: Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980).

analyzing how, what, and why they did and did not borrow from established print media traditions.

The second chapter shifts from the material to the visual content. This will analyze the form and content of images printed on individual pages of *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann*, but will also move beyond work-specific interpretations to consider meanings that emerge when visual content on one page is activated and read across an entire magazine issue.

The third chapter considers *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann*’s readers by examining the historical trajectory of how art audience was formed in Germany after the country’s unification in 1871. The chapter will then define *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann*’s intended audiences through an analysis of their pricing, marketing, and circulation strategies.

**VI. Paul Cassirer**

While my dissertation does not focus on Paul Cassirer’s biography, the vision he established for *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* came out of his professional and personal experiences. Paul Cassirer was born to a wealthy and prominent Jewish family on February 21, 1871. He spent his youth in Berlin, before moving to Munich in April 1893 to study law. His studies were, however, derailed by his burgeoning interest in the arts. During his time in the Bavarian capital—which at
this time was gaining prominence as Germany’s center of the avant-garde—he wrote a novel and worked for the satirical magazine *Simplicissimus*.36

Cassirer’s return to his native city in 1898 was an indication of Berlin’s growing reputation as a major center for the arts.37 That very year, he joined forces with his cousin Bruno Cassirer to open a gallery and a publishing house in a building located in the affluent *Tiergarten* neighborhood, just south of the *Matthäikirche*, famous for its opulent mansions and grand apartment buildings. The two branches of their business aimed to support the creation of a new art-making, new exhibition spaces, and new art audiences and patrons. That the cousins launched a publishing enterprise along with a gallery testifies to their shrewd understanding of the significance of communication via the print medium. More proof of their keen awareness of the role played by publications—especially art magazines—was their decision to commission the emerging Belgian architect and a practitioner of Art Nouveau, Henry van de Velde, to equip their gallery (*Kunstsalon*) with a reading room that would provide their visitors with a wide variety of art journals.38 A painter who exhibited at the gallery described it with following words:

[T]he reading room, designed by van de Velde, … [was] wherearty young men and ladies, bent over their reading, enjoyed the sacred atmosphere while awaiting the great moment when their work, too, would be accepted and displayed.”39

---

36 The extent of Cassirer’s involvement with *Simplicissimus* is neither known nor documented. He contributed one story to the magazine and is said to have served on the editorial board for a short time.

37 The German artist George Grosz described the lure of the capital for the artists as “Berlin was ‘where it was at.’” George Grosz, *Ein kleines Ja und ein grosses Nein* (Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1955), 94.


39 Quoted in Paret, *Berlin Secession*, 70.
A photograph of the room captures that “sacred atmosphere,” replete with elegant leather chairs around a large table strewn with books and magazines to beckon a scholarly mind. Some of the key aspects of *Kultur* were enshrined in this space (fig. 0.3).

In 1899, the Cassirer cousins were asked to jointly run the Berlin Secession’s business affairs. This arrangement lasted until 1901, with Bruno exiting the firm and severing the agreement with the organization. (The cousins agreed that Bruno Cassirer would take over the publishing end of the business, while Paul took charge of the gallery.) Paul stayed on at the Secession, enjoying a position of authority that was unprecedented for a non-artist, and which enabled him to serve on the executive committee and hold an advisory role that included the selection of exhibited artworks. Cassirer’s intention was not to use his association with the Secession for financial gain, but instead to attain a leadership role and a personal stake in Berlin’s modern art affairs. In doing so, he helped establish and oversee the Secession’s operations while elevating its stature nationally and outside Germany’s borders.

Cassirer promoted the organization with the help of his elegant gallery, while at the same time drawing on his connections at the Secession to stimulate his art dealings. He bolstered these efforts through the printed image and word upon re-entering the field of publishing in 1908 (after

---

a deal with his cousin Bruno, which contractually obligated him to abstain from publishing for seven years, had expired). That year he launched a publishing house and the Pan-Presse, a printing press that was devoted to producing luxury edition illustrated books and print portfolios. The publishing house was first led by Wilhelm Herzog, who helped published some of the most important German authors of the time, including Heinrich Mann, Frank Wedekind, and Ernst Bloch. The contributors to these projects also came from the ranks of the Berlin Secession and included Max Slevogt and August Gaul. Through this enterprise, Cassirer fostered a privileged status for the cadre of Secessionist artists and highlighted his own association with the Secession.

As a prominent and wealthy member of the Berlin society, Paul Cassirer was often portrayed as simply a profit seeker. The criticism came from all sides, including from the Secession. During an early chapter in Cassirer’s career—while still in partnership with his cousin Bruno—the satirical magazine Die Lustigen Blätter had parodied the Cassirer cousins’ profitable dealings (fig. 0.4). The caricature was crafted to raise eyebrows about the Cassirers’ lucrative commercial dealings and featured elegant visitors outside his gallery, accompanied by the following caption: “Salon Cassirer. Motto: With Manet and Monet to money.” (Salon Cassirer. Devise: Durch Manet and Monet zu money.) The injected note of foreignness—the use of the English word “money” as well as the mention of French, not German artists—suggests that Cassirer cousins’ ambitions and means to success had non-German origins. It pointed to the cousins’ religious background and the negative stereotype of “Jewish” materialism and rapacity that accompanied

---


42 Peter Paret, Berlin Secession, 200-234.
it. During the course of his career, the accusations that Cassirer prioritized financial gains over artistic expression persisted. Although these critiques had some factual basis—Cassirer did have a shrewd ability to capitalize on his connections at home and abroad—he repeatedly repudiated the contention that he was driven by profit. Of his professional goals, he wrote in 1915: “… I speak of the duty imposed on me by my business, as I understand it, to use my influence in helping Germany to secure, or rather develop, a reputable, artistic standing.”43 Yet despite Cassirer’s efforts to reverse this perception, it continued to hold sway. One of Berlin’s most respected art critics, Karl Scheffler, put it thus: “… [Cassirer’s] interests were universal, his temperament inspiring; he was more concerned with ideology than business success. He also may be called a representative of his times. He suffered all the more when the public refused to believe this dealer’s idealized motives and selfless enthusiasm. That was the sting.”44

The Berlin’s art scene before 1914 was marred by such contentious and frequently hostile debates, which often involved Paul Cassirer. Although Cassirer did not openly seek conflicts with the Imperial establishment, the art he sponsored and his publishing enterprises were frequently perceived as assaults on the conservative taste. Kaiser Wilhelm II referred to him once


44 “…seine Interessen waren universal, sein Temperament anregend, es ging ihm mehr um Weltanschauung als um geschäftlichen Erfolg. Auch ihn dürfte man einen Beauftragten der Zeit nennen. Um so mehr litt er, wenn das Publikum dem Kaufmann nicht ideelle Beweggründe und selbstlosen Enthusiasmus glauben wollte. Dieses war der Stachel.” Scheffler, Die fetten, 121.
as “…that Cassirer who wants to bring here the filthy French art (*französische Dreckkunst*).”

He was also frequently challenged by the generation of German avant-garde artists who came of age after Impressionism and Post-Impressionism, whose criticisms eventually led to the splintering of the Secession in 1910 (New Secession) and 1914 (Free Secession), and thus to a further fragmentation of Germany’s art scene.\(^{46}\)

The outbreak of the First World War disrupted Cassirer’s dealings, but it also presented him with new opportunities. Like many museum professionals, academics, gallerists, publishers, writers, musicians, critics, and artists, Cassirer was swept away by the impassioned outburst of nationalist feeling in summer of 1914. His widow, Tilla Durieux, recalled following Cassirer on a business trip to Paris to sit for a portrait by the French Impressionist painter Auguste Renoir in late July 1914, and rushing back to Berlin just before the outbreak of the war. There he learned to operate a car in preparation for a voluntary service as a driver for the war effort. He and Tilla also started a soup kitchen for struggling artists in the same building that housed Cassirer’s elegant gallery.\(^{47}\) These philanthropic efforts collectively testify to Cassirer’s strong commitment to both his nation and his arts community during a time of great turmoil. This would culminate with the launch of *Kriegszeit* in August of 1914 and *Der Bildermann* in April of 1916.


\(^{46}\) Paret, *Berlin Secession*, 200-234.

\(^{47}\) Tilla Durieux, *Meine ersten neunzig Jahre. Erinnerungen* (Berlin and Munich: Rowohlt, 1976), 148. Although Cassirer may have learned how to drive a car, it is likely that his own driver operated the vehicle instead.
Chapter One
MATERIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF KRIEGSZEIT AND DER BILDERMANN

I. Introduction

The outbreak of the First World War resulted not only in the great mobilization of people, but also in a glut of printed materials. Although both the Entente and Central Powers contributed to the production and distribution of hundreds of thousands of posters, flyers, newspapers, postcards, commercial photographs, books, and magazines, Germany stood out for its leadership in the preservation of these materials. Very quickly after the beginning of this global conflict, German libraries established collections dedicated specifically to such ephemera, while also calling on citizens to contribute their own cache to public collections.¹

Among the many items that German libraries collected during this time period were the periodic publications published by Paul Cassirer.² The first issue of Kriegszeit, published on August 31, 1914, was printed on heavy paper stock. It was constructed from one large sheet of paper that folded into two equal-sized panels to form four pages that consisted of a front cover, back cover, and inside spread (figs. 1.1-1.3). The issue was not bound, stapled, or stitched—only folded. Each of the four pages of Kriegszeit measured 19 x 12 inches. With this substantial presentation, Kriegszeit demanded attention and the reader’s active participation. Its size meant that one could not simply flip through the pages. Instead, the reader had to engage Kriegszeit


² The issues of Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann in the collection of Berlin’s Staatsbibliothek bear the old royal seal, which dates their entry into the library’s collection between 1914 and 1918.
physically, laying it out on a table and most likely standing so as to take in the full view. By using these dimensions and a foldout structure, Cassirer asserted *Kriegszeit’s* importance as a document to be taken seriously.

Launching on April 5, 1916, *Der Bildermann* was formatted in the same way, with two key differences: the pages were slightly smaller at 14 x 11 inches—still a sizable presence—and they contained a loose insert that featured a poem or text in prose, which was accompanied by an illustrated image (fig. 1.4). In comparison, the magazine *Pan* (which I discuss later in the chapter) measured 14 x 11 inches and its successor *Kunst und Künstler*, one of Germany’s best-known art magazines before 1933, was 12 x 9 inches.

Despite this deceptively simple physical format, both *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* represent a significant effort made by over one hundred German artists and poets, whom Cassirer assembled as contributors. Yet despite leaving an indelible mark on First World War visual culture, the material features of these two publications have been relegated to the margins. The aim of this chapter is to examine the physical attributes of *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* in an effort to understand how and why these publications borrowed from three distinct print media: magazines, lithographs, and broadsheets.

**II. Rise of Art Magazines and the German Avant-Garde**

Although literary magazines had been established in the West by the early eighteenth century, the first magazine devoted to the visual arts took a few more decades to come into being. Ernst Herbert Lehmann, one of the first scholars to study *Zeitschriftenwesen* (magazine
publishing), traced its emergence to Johann Daniel Herz’s *Die reisende und correspondierende Pallas oder Kunst-Zeitung* (1755-56), a short-lived but influential magazine that he launched at the Augsburg academy of arts and sciences.\(^3\) Herz’s efforts were taken up more rigorously by Johann Georg Meusel, who in the period between 1779 and 1808 launched a number of magazines focused on the visual arts in Erlangen, Germany (where he taught history), most notably *Neue Miscellaneen artistischen Inhalts für Künstler und Kunstliebhaber*. Published in a modest sixteen-page octavo format and featuring articles on aesthetics, art history, and great artists’ lives, Meusel’s pioneering publications carved out a decidedly specialized niche for art, but the academic content that they featured attracted only a small, educated audience.\(^4\)

The rarefied and scholarly model established by Meusel held sway until the last quarter of the nineteenth century, when it changed radically under the impact of forces of modernization. In this context, modernization can be understood according to the definition put forth by Marshall Berman, and in particular “the social processes that bring [the] maelstrom [of modern life] into being, and keep it in a state of perpetual becoming.”\(^5\) Berman cites the sources of this maelstrom as being generated by processes such as “great discoveries in physical sciences,” “the industrialization of production,” “immense demographic upheavals,” “rapid and often cataclysmic urban growth,” “systems of communication,” “increasingly powerful nation states,” “mass social movements of people,” and “an ever-expanding and drastically fluctuating capitalist:


world market.” By the 1880s, the technological and engineering feats had revolutionized the printing industry, resulting in the emergence of new reproduction technologies. Most notable of among these was the development of the rotary press (which fed sheets of paper from a continuous roll through the press) and the linotype machine (which enabled type to be set mechanically instead of manually), as well as a number of photomechanical processes, such as photogravure and collotype, which enabled the high-end photographic reproduction of a work of art. Taken together, these printing innovations increased the speed, efficiency, and quality of production, spawning an unprecedented expansion of the mass media, including the steady proliferation of art magazines in the years leading up the twentieth century.⁷

Among those first alerted to the potential offered by the magazines were cultural producers resistant to dominant cultural expressions and norms. In turn-of-the-century Germany, they became increasingly at odds with guardians of academic—and, by default, of state-sanctioned⁸—traditions, tastes, and biases, for whom the authority of history painting reigned supreme.

History painting, or Historienmalerei, was formulated in Germany by the artist Peter Cornelius and his followers. Although this idealistic strain of painting (which, in addition to history, also encompassed mythological and biblical subjects) was already a marker of excellence at art academies across the country by the mid-nineteenth century, it received new

---

⁶ Ibid, 6.


⁸ German art academies were subsumed under the cultural ministry (Kultusministerium), which gave the government (including the Emperor) control over the academy’s activities, such as budget, elections, and exhibition policies. Paret, Berlin Secession, 10-12.
impetus after the founding of the German Empire. From 1871 onwards, it was pioneered by Anton von Werner, an artist whose photographically precise history painting resulted not only in the creation of the Empire’s ur-artwork, but also earned him a position as the director at the Berlin art academy in 1875, at the young age of thirty-two. Werner became celebrated for his special blend of “Prussian chauvinism and romantic mythmaking,” which constructed a rousing vision of the German nation as triumphant and all-powerful. Along with such other expressions of official culture such as monuments and public buildings, Werner’s grand paintings lent the new regime grandeur and legitimacy at a scale that was befitting the newcomer nation. They also served as the antithesis and the antidote to what Kaiser Wilhelm II famously referred to as “gutter art,” a phrase that described any forms of expression that existed outside officially sanctioned purview. This included progressive art tendencies represented by the Berlin Secession, especially the colorism and brushwork of Impressionism that did not follow court-sanctioned school of Realism represented by Anton von Werner. The Kaiser was also famously involved in the Empire’s cultural affairs. In striving to legitimize the new Empire, he “made

---

9 Lenman, Artists and Society, 27-36.

10 The work I refer to here is Werner’s iconic *The Proclamation of the German Empire (January 18, 1871)*, a painting commissioned by Kaiser Wilhelm I that acted as a visual document of the founding and founders of the German nation. For analysis of this towering work that stood at fourteen feet by twenty-four feet, and its four versions, see Peter Paret, *Art as History: Episodes in the Culture and Politics of Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), 165-180.


12 This phrase stems from the speech, known as the *Rinnsteinrede* (Gutter Speech), which is reprinted in Jürgen Schutte and Peter Sprengel, eds., *Die Berliner Moderne 1885-1914* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1987), 571-574. “Gutter art” was a particularly pointed insult in Berlin given that the city did not have a modern sewer system until the late 1870s and its gutters were a source of malodorousness known *Berliner Luft* (Berlin air). David Clay Large, *Berlin* (New York: Basic Books, 2000), 18.
sure he had a finger in almost every pie: churches, prisons, barracks, hospitals—all more the imprint of his vision, for good or ill.” This extended to the arts as well.\textsuperscript{13}

In light of official limitations and affronts, various members of the German art community interested in producing, displaying, and discussing more modern modes of expression started to explore alternatives. The historian Celia Applegate portrays Germany’s pre-1914 avant-garde as standing apart from its counterparts in Britain and France. She describes it as:

… too elitist for the everyday artists of amateurism, at once too iconoclastic, too market-oriented, and too separatist for the establishment, and too philosophically and artistically demanding for the consumer of art as entertainment. Its self-consciousness explains its ability to generate names for its activities (Naturalism, Expressionism, neo-Realism, \textit{Jugendstil}), which in turn created movements out of small numbers of people and disparate, even incoherent, stylistic innovations.\textsuperscript{14}

Despite being characterized as disjointed, the German avant-gardes mounted a series of brazen challenges to the establishment in the late nineteenth century with the founding of secessionist societies that marked their withdrawal from the government-run academic system and formation of institutional alternatives. On the surface, the Berlin Secession could be idealized as a defiant and bohemian initiative against the Imperial arts establishment. However, Shearer West cautions us that the Secession movements in Germany “initiated institutional change, but instead of reforming established academies, exhibitions and \textit{Kunstvereine}, they set up competing organizations. They abjured commercialism, but were dependent for their success on a growing commercial market.” Furthermore, “The Secessionists may have been rebels, but they were

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{13}] Annika Mombauer and Wilhelm Deist, \textit{The Kaiser: New Research on Wilhelm II’s Role in Imperial Germany} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 38.
\end{itemize}
merely creating new institutions to replace the old ones; they may have been revolutionaries, but they were not as democratic in their promotion of art as the well-established exhibition societies.”

Berlin’s answer to the secessionist movement—which had its formal start in Munich in 1892, followed by Vienna in 1897—grew out of an unprecedented opposition to two Anton von Werner-led art institutions, the Royal Academy of Arts and Berlin Artists’ Association, which regulated the professional lives of the city’s painters, sculptors, and architects. This opposition was aimed at the conservative policies enforced by these institutions, whose penchant and advocacy of the monumental variant of history painting was perceived as complacent, mediocre, and ultimately stifling to the progress of German art. The artists who eventually founded and joined the Berlin Secession in 1898 were united not by a particular style but by a shared desire to provide an alternative to official tastes and prejudices. Because of the Secession’s affinities with movements that emerged in late nineteenth-century art, most notably Realism, Symbolism, and Impressionism, their joint mode of expression was labeled as “modernism.” Once again, Marshal Berman’s definition is particularly salient. He argues that modernism is informed by “an amazing variety of visions and ideas that aim to make men and women the subjects as well as objects of modernization, to give them the power to change the world that is changing them, to make their war through the maelstrom and make it their own.”

---


16 Berman, *All That is Solid*, 16.
to encompass artworks that explore and seek to come to terms with the various processes of modernization.

Although the Berlin Secession never produced its own magazine, the organization’s mission and membership ranks dovetailed with those of Germany’s preeminent art magazine, *Pan*. Although certainly not the only noteworthy art magazine published in Germany prior to 1914—the magazine *Jugend*, for example, could be signaled out as one of the publication that defined the period and the tendency of *Jugendstil*. Subtitled “Youth: The Illustrated Weekly for Art and Life” (Illustrierte Wochenschrift für Kunst und Leben), *Jugend* was a popular review of art and literature that was launched in Munich in 1898 by Georg Hirth. Its commitment to a visual language that embraced the curving, whiplashed line and floral ornamentation of Art Nouveau gave rise to the term *Jugendstil*, the German synonym of Art Nouveau, a style that had originated in France in the last decade of the nineteenth century. It was derived in equal measure from Japanese art and the Arts and Crafts movement that had launched in England. By the turn of the century it had become an international phenomenon, serving as one of the alternatives to academic and historicist modes of expression.

While *Jugend* left a mark as an important fin-de-siècle periodical, it was a decidedly lighthearted and upbeat publication that sought to entertain as much as to elevate its audience. In contrast, *Pan* wanted to be taken more seriously. It aspired to reach the pinnacle of magazine publishing, both in concept and execution. Although short-lived in its inaugural configuration,

---


18 Lydia L. Dewiel, *Jugendstil* (Köln: DuMont, 2002).
*Pan* established a model for subsequent periodical publications and exerted a powerful influence on Cassirer’s vision for *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann*.

**III: Pan**

Otto Julius Bierbaum and Julius Meier-Graefe launched *Pan* in April 1895 in Berlin (fig. 1.5). Bierbaum made his career as a poet while Meier-Graefe became in the following decades one of the most eminent historians of modern art. He is especially well known for his writing on Édouard Manet, Vincent van Gogh, Paul Cézanne, and Auguste Renoir, as well for writing *Die Entwicklungsgeschichte der modernen Kunst* (The Historical Development of Modern Art), one of the earliest surveys of modernism in two volumes in 1904. Acting as co-editors, Bierbaum and Meier-Graefe described the magazine as a “monthly publication for artistic production in word and image.”

*Pan* foregrounded poetry and prose framed by lavishly ornamental graphic design, but the magazine also showcased discussions and representations of modern painting, sculpture, and decorative arts. Its title was a reference to the magazine’s ambition to exert an all-encompassing editorial reach, but also an aspiration to capture the ethos symbolized by the Greek god Pan. The half-man and half-goat, Pan represented the Dionysian side of human nature, which stood for creativity, unrestrained passion, and pursuit of pleasure. Bierbaum and Meier-Graefe’s reference to this deity underscored their complete commitment to radical revivification of society through the pursuit of absolute ideals of beauty. They underscored this notion by choosing to open the magazine’s first issue with an excerpt from Friedrich Nietzsche’s

---

Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for All and No One, which describes the prophet Zarathustra’s “injunction to the king to annihilate all people who have no image or goal toward which they strive: they are the arch-enemies of all humanity” (fig. 1.6).20

Visually, Pan stood out for experiments with new typography and plantlike ornamentation inspired by Art Nouveau. This richly decorative presentation, along with substantive essays on modern art and literature, clearly articulated Bierbaum and Meier-Graefe’s non-academic and ambitious editorial agenda, as well as their cosmopolitan outlook. The program they presented in the introduction of the first issue also made clear that Bierbaum and Meier-Graefe sought attract the privileged segment of German society, aiming to realize “… the goals of a purely artistic publication, which does not correspond to the wishes of the public at large.”21 The cost of Pan, which ranged between seventy-five and 160 Marks, underscored this intention.22

The program formulated by Bierbaum and Meier-Graefe ultimately failed to convince conservative forces on Pan’s Genossenschaft, the supervisory board they assembled to financially support the magazine. Ultimately, the magazine’s high-end and all-embracing “art-for-art’s sake” concept met with their disapproval. After only three issues, and less than a year after the magazine’s founding, Pan’s two founders were dismissed in large part because their uncompromising commitment to beauty and international modernism with a Francophile bent


21 “…die Ziele einer rein künstlerischen Publikation, die sich nicht nach den Wünschen des großen Publikums richtet…” Quoted in Maria Rennhofer, Kunstzeitschriften der Jahrhundertwende in Deutschland und Österreich, 36. [Emphasis mine]

was deemed unpalatable. Under its new editors, Cäsar Flaischlen and Richard Graul, the magazine continued to be published for twenty-one issues, until 1900, featuring far less adventurous content that focused on German art and art historical writing.

IV: Pan’s Influence on Cassirer

Pan’s short-lived existence was a distinctive feature of early modern magazines. Many magazines of the era that committed to experimentation — commonly referred to as “Little Magazines” — experienced a similar fate. Although Bierbaum and Meier-Graefe’s editorial vision for Pan was cut short, the ideological and material vision they set forth left a lasting impression on Paul Cassirer. Pan’s influence on Cassirer prior to 1914 appears in at least two ways. In 1908, Cassirer paid homage to the magazine by naming his printing press the Pan-Press; two years later, he started a bi-monthly magazine Pan, a forum that reincarnated the original magazine’s literary arm with an introduction by Meier-Graefe. Cassirer’s close ties to Meier-Graefe continued into 1914 with the publication of Kriegszeit, which opened with a program written by the art critic.


Ideologically, the most significant principle set forth by Pan and advanced by Cassirer in Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann was Bierbaum and Meier-Graefe’s belief that art could be an agent of change. This idealistic notion is expressed by an astonishing number of Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann issues that were published between 1914 and 1916 (sixty-four in total), which reflect contributions by over sixty artists that yielded more than 250 discrete works of art. Cassirer also indirectly conveyed this aspiration by donating all proceeds from Kriegszeit to an artists’ relief fund, making it the magazine’s key imperative. Each title page was emblazoned with a following declaration: “Proceeds are designated for charitable purposes!” But perhaps the most notable affirmation of art’s ability to affect change was stated in an April 4, 1916, advertisement announcing the launch of Der Bildermann: “Despite the horror of our times, our spirit has remained faithful to the old gods. In the midst of war it wants to see as it did before the war, even take pleasure as it once did.”

This text, co-written by Cassirer and Der Bildermann’s editor, Leo Kestenberg, speaks powerfully of art’s potential to sustain the life of the nation and offer relief from distress, a message that is particularly poignant given the military stalemate and mounting deprivation on the home front in 1916.

Materially, the most significant principle set forth by Pan and advanced by Cassirer in Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann was the delivery of original prints via the magazine medium. Pan

---

26 An advertisement in the magazine trade publication Börsenblatt für den deutschen Buchhandel, from September 3, 1914, drew attention to this feature of Kriegszeit. It read: “Hinweise auf die hohe Bedeutung dieser Zeitschrift, deren Reinertrag dem Kriegsfonds des Wirtschaftlichen Verbandes bildender Künstler zugeführt wird, sind in der ganzen deutschen Presse erschienen. Quoted in Feilchenfeldt and Brandis, Paul Cassirer Verlag, 477.

27 “Trotz den Schrecken unserer Zeit blieb unsere Seele den alten Göttern treu. Mitten im Krieg will sie schauen, wie sie vor dem Krieg geschaut hat, sogar genießen, wie sie vordem genossen hat.” Quoted in Feilchenfeldt and Brandis, Paul Cassirer Verlag, 511.
was a trailblazing publication not only because of its ambitious editorial strategy, but because of how it reimagined the function of an art magazine. Although not the first such publication to feature original prints,\textsuperscript{28} *Pan* skillfully deployed new printing technologies as means of providing reproductions of already-existing images. In a more significant move, Bierbaum and Meier-Graefe’s program introduced ambitious plans for this enterprise: there were to be at least twenty original prints in each issue.

These were to be offered in an elaborate and highly priced system that ranged from *Allgemeine Ausgabe* (general edition), to *Luxusausgabe* (luxury edition), and finally to *Künstlerausgabe* (artist’s edition). The three options were based on varying subscription levels, each assigned its own paper quality. Although this multi-faceted strategy and the high number of original artworks could not be carried forth as originally proposed by Bierbaum and Meier-Graefe, the magazine continued commissioning the production of original prints, albeit in a limited form. (At the end of its five-year run, *Pan* had published a total of 100 prints.\textsuperscript{29} Its subscribers numbered 1,400 in the first year and 1,100 by its third year.\textsuperscript{30}) Yet even as Bierbaum and Meier-Graefe’s initial idea did not come fully to fruition, the notion of magazines as vehicles for original art resonated with Cassierer and emerged powerfully in a reworked form in both *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann*.

\textsuperscript{28} Important precedents were set by the Viennese magazine *Die Graphischen Künste* (1879-1933) and the Munich magazine *Kunst für Alle* (1885-1944), which was edited by Friedrich Pecht. Both publications championed the inclusion of graphic arts among magazine page. Yet in these cases the production of original prints was the sole focus of these publications. See Karasch, *Illustrierte Moderne in Zeitschriften um 1900*, 1-76.

\textsuperscript{29} Rennhofer, *Kunstzeitschriften der Jahrhundertwende in Deutschland und Österreich*, 36-68.

Thus for both Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann, the emphasis was as much on content as on deploying the magazine as an instrument for the distribution of original works of art. This approach meant expanding the occasional inclusion of original prints introduced by magazines like Pan so that every page of every issue would double as an original lithograph. Kriegszeit’s weekly frequency, which it maintained for the majority of its life (changing only after issue forty-eight to a ten-day model, which would be maintained by Der Bildermann), demonstrates the aspirational nature of this commitment. For example, within a thirty-day period Kriegszeit’s readers received approximately sixteen original lithographs; in four instances, this number increased because of double or special issues.

V: “Original Lithographs by a Master Hand”

Although I am tracing lines of influence between Pan on the one hand and Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann on the other, these latter publications cannot properly be classified as magazines. They borrow significant attributes from magazines, such as their periodicity (the interval between issues and the frequency of publication)\(^{31}\) and their methods of dispersal through sale at bookstores and subscriptions. Given that both Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann run at only four pages and eschew some key magazine features such as ads, editorials, reviews, and critiques, it is clear that they appropriate from the magazine category without fitting neatly into it. Similarly, they cannot be fixed as prints either, even as the lithographic process defines their material identity.

\(^{31}\) Scholes and Wulfman, Modernism, 47-49.
Although some cities in Germany, most notably Leipzig and Hamburg, are known for their great support of printmaking, Germany as a whole was trailing significantly behind France and Britain by the nineteenth century. Printmaking as a practice was generally relegated to the margins. By the beginning of the twentieth century, however, the art market’s overwhelming preference for highly finished oil paintings had begun to diversify. In a marked shift, collectors were increasingly paying attention to the so-called “minor” arts represented by drawings and prints. The print curator Deborah Wye traces this development to the rise of the burgeoning bourgeois class with the leisure time and financial resources to collect art, as well as the desire for the social status that came with it. Artists realized that their reputation could grow through the potentially broad audience for printmaking, while art dealers recognized opportunities as well and began to publish prints to complement the paintings they exhibited in their galleries. Workshops with professional painters provided artists with technical expertise, in increasing numbers. And, most importantly, through a growing familiarity with the medium, artists came to realize that printmaking offered new aesthetic possibilities.

Among emergent reproduction methods that offered these “new aesthetic possibilities” was lithography.

Used to create both Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann, lithography was invented in Germany by Alois Senefelder around 1798. Prior to this event, all printing process could be classified as either relief or intaglio. These terms reference how the printing surfaces are handled. In relief, the printing surface is carved (as in a woodcut), and the raised parts of the block create the image; in intaglio, the printing surface is either scratched or “bitten” by acid (as in an engraving or etching), and the image results from recessed areas, which hold the ink.

32 Robert Lenman, Artists and Society, 166-167.

By contrast, lithography is produced by drawn lines that are made on the same flat level as the surface. Senefelder’s invention started with drawing on stone (and later metal plate), which was made with either a greasy ink or crayon (this initial step explains the German name for lithography, Steinzeichnung, or stone drawing). The stone was then chemically treated to bond the image to flat surface, and subsequently dampened with water and inked for printing. Put simply, lithography worked on the principle that water and oil do not mix; thus the greasy, drawn marks tended to attract the ink, while the moistened stone repelled it. The entire process is summed up by the expression “like water off a duck’s back.”

Before being co-opted by artists, lithography was used for commercial purposes, especially for posters that proliferated in new urban spaces, and was deemed “particularly suitable for maps, plans and short-run printing that combined simple pictures and words.” The first artist to examine its aesthetic potential was Francisco Goya in the early nineteenth century, but the medium did not experience an artistic flourishing until the 1870s and 1880s. By that time, lithography had shed its commercial stigma and the status inferiority vis-à-vis drawing and painting, making it more attractive option to a number of esteemed modern artists, including Honoré Daumier, Édouard Manet, and Odilon Redon.

---


Redon is especially known for mastering a variant of lithography known as transfer lithography, which was used to produce *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann*. In this process, instead of a stone, the artist draws directly onto a special type of paper (called transfer paper), which is subsequently dampened, pressed onto the stone, and passed through the printing press.\(^{37}\)

It seems at first that transfer lithography creates a distance between the artist and the audience; given that lithography depends on specific chemical interactions, its execution required the assistance of professional printers. Traditionally, artists would make drawings on the lithographic stone and turn them over to technicians for printing. Conversely, technicians would receive transfer drawings and execute them into prints.\(^{38}\) Redon, however, felt that transfer lithography captured the artist’s expression more faithfully:

> The stone is harsh, unpleasant, like a person who has whims and fits. It is impressionable, and submits to the most moving and variable influences of the weather. …. The future of lithography (if it has one) lies in the resources, still to be discovered, of paper, which transmits so perfectly to the stone the finest and moving inflections of the spirit.\(^{39}\)

In addition to foregoing the stone and working directly with a drawing—a medium that is already second nature to artists—transfer lithography provided additional benefits to artists who practiced it. For example, the process would not reverse the drawn lines; instead, it would yield an image that when printed would be oriented in the direction in which it was originally made. This aspect was particularly valuable to artists who included the written text alongside their


\(^{38}\) For the making of *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann*, Cassirer enlisted three firms—Imberg & Lefson, H. S. Hermann, and M. W. Lassally—which executed the majority of work. The latter also produced some of Edvard Munch’s prints.

images. The ease of transport was another important benefit, especially to soldier-artists of
*Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* who sent their contributions while serving in the war.40

Perhaps the greatest lure of transfer lithography, and lithography in general, was the quality
of line it afforded. Unlike the clear and smooth line of an engraving, the lithographic line
possesses a tar-like quality (figs. 1.7 and 1.8). It conveys graphic immediacy that is reminiscent
of a pencil or charcoal drawing. The gestural mark-making inherent in a lithography obscures its
mechanical, reproductive origin and minimizes the difference between drawing and printmaking.

In the introductory essay to *Der Bildermann*, Cassirer and Kestenberg fully take advantage of
this feature, stating that like *Kriegszeit*,

*Der Bildermann* will bring original lithographs by a master hand…. What we bring are
no reproductions. The print from stone is an original. The photographic plate does not
come between the artist’s drawing and the print. The lithographic line is as alive as the
line of a drawing. The artist’s unconscious, which is expressed in the silent movement of
the drawing hand that cannot be reproduced, is preserved in the artistic lithograph.41

The value that this passage ascribes to the quality of the lithographic line celebrates—even
fetishizes—the artist’s hand. As the most painterly printmaking technique, lithography readily
reveals traces of the artist’s movement across the drawing surface. Contributors to *Kriegszeit* and
*Der Bildermann* expressed this movement through image but also through word; their
handwritten captions and poems underscore their presence, which, by extension, serve as


41 “Zweimal monatlich wird Der Bildermann Originallithographien von Meisterhand bringen….Was wir
bringen sind keine Reproduktionen. Der Druck vom Stein ist ein Original. Die photographische Platte ist
nicht zwischen die Zeichnung des Künstlers und den Druck getreten. Der Strich der Lithographie ist so
lebendig wie der Strich der Zeichnung. Das Unbewußte des Künstlers, das sich ausdrückt in den leisen,
niemals zu reproduzierenden Bewegung der zeichnenden Hand, bleibt der Künstlersteinzeichnung
erhalten.” Quoted in Feilchenfeldt and Brandis, *Paul Cassirer Verlag*, 511.
markers of feeling, unfettered artistic expression, and authenticity. In addition to handwritten passages, both *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* featured the so-called “blackletter” script, which stood in contrast to the Roman script we use today. *Fraktur* is the notable form of this script and has a uniquely German origin, having been commissioned by Emperor Maximilian I in 1513. *Fraktur* was often politicized and proffered as a symbol of the German nation.\(^{42}\)

The fact that the paper edges of *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* are slightly irregularly and appear not to be cut by mechanical means further underscores the presence of the human hand. Given that lithographs are multiples, Cassier and Kestenberg’s argument (“What we bring are no reproductions”) uncovers a glaring paradox that they seek to minimize. In doing so, they split the difference established in Walter Benjamin’s famous essay “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction”; on the one hand, they celebrate and want to benefit from the techniques of copying and dissemination that are inherent to multiples, while on the other hand they want to preserve the work’s “aura,” (defined as a reverence commanded by a work of art because it belongs to an elite system that guarantees its meaning), which is threatened by those very techniques.

That this sense of graphic and material immediacy was to have both a visual and also an ideological function is expressed in another passage of Cassirer and Kestenberg’s essay:

*Der Bildermann* wants to bring broad circles in direct touch with art, the touch that is not attained through knowledge about art but is conveyed from the artist directly to the friend of the arts through feeling.\(^{43}\)


\(^{43}\) “*Der Bildermann* will weite Kreise mit der Kunst in unmittelbare Fühlung bringen, nicht in die Fühlung, die durch Wissen über Kunst erreicht wird, sondern in die, die mittels der Empfindung sich vom
At the core of this sentence is the deep conviction in the primacy of an idealistic and all-encompassing aesthetic experience à la Pan, which Der Bildermann set out to fulfill. Cassirer and Kestenberg leave little doubt that Der Bildermann’s—and by extension Kriegszeit’s—material setup was meant to have an aesthetic and spiritual payoff. At its core, this belief in the power of art to affect positive change refers back to the high regard that the German people accord to art and culture even, and perhaps especially, during the time of war.

VI: Künstlerflugblätter

The subtitle of Kriegszeit defined the publication as Künstlerflugblätter—artist’s Flugblätter, a word that is difficult to translate. Given that its literal translation is ‘the flying pages,’ the term ‘flyer’ appears to be the best fit, especially given the fact that flyer’s contemporary uses hint at a commercial market — a domain that Kriegszeit and Bildermann aspired to reach. Yet “flyer” is also a term conjures up associations that are too close and familiar to our daily lifes. I have therefore chosen keep the literal translation, in effort to evoke a form that is both dynamic and ephemeral.

Although Der Bildermann was never explicitly identified as “Flying Pages,” its title referred to a throwback folk figure, the Picture Man, whose job was to spread the news of current events, often with the help of illustrated broadsheets. Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann thus firmly reference a print tradition whose origin went back to the invention of printing in the sixteenth

Künstler direkt zum Kunstfreund überträgt.” Quoted in Feilchenfeldt and Brandis, Paul Cassirer Verlag, 511.
century and upheavals triggered by the Reformation and German Peasants’ Revolts. It was during this period that printmaking emerged in German rural areas as a vehicle of social critique leveled at the establishment.44

A broadsheet are traditionally defined as a single sheet of paper that is printed on either one or both sides. It features social, political, or commercial content on a single and topical subject. Flying pages are also intended for a mass audience. Times of crisis, like wars, have historically triggered the production of these materials, which are generally inexpensive to produce and quick to make. With their streamlined content and clearly presented information, broadsheets emerged as potent vehicles of persuasion.45

*Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann*’s close association with this print tradition is notable for two reasons. First, it shows that Cassirer wanted the two ventures to be relevant and of their time — dynamic enough to quickly respond to the events of the day. And second, given Cassirer’s framing of *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* as vehicles for original works of art, the notion of flying pages transforms them from passive objects to be beholden to objects of mass communication—widely circulating artworks dispersed to the people. *Der Bildermann* took this notion a step further: each issue featured a double-sided insert sheet embellished with image and text, which could be read along with each issue and then dispersed individually on its own (fig 1.4).

44 Sigrid Weigel, *Flugschriftenliteratur 1848 in Berlin: Geschichte und Öffentlichkeit einer volkstümlichen Gattung* (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1979), 5-10.

VII: Conclusion

One compelling way to study *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* is by examining their material properties. This approach reveals these publications’ complex and hybrid material features, which are culled from three distinct print traditions: magazines, lithographs, and broadsheets. In borrowing structure from magazines, aesthetic value from lithography, and aspirational reach from broadsheets, *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* assumed a function that made them do more than serve as as neutral support for the art. Instead, their material features articulated a new syntax, which I am describing as flying pages. Flying pages did not fall back on established conventions, but posited a redefinition of how contemporary art could exist in the world: as both an artifact that is traditionally bound to the realm of *Kultur* and as an ephemeral mass product. In this way *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* situated themselves between tradition and experimentation, high and low artistic production, with one foot in the realm of rarefied art and the other in the lowly mass-produced ephemera. This paradox created a productive tension that opened up the rarefied sphere of *Kultur* to experimentation.
Chapter Two

*KRIEGSZEIT AND DER BILDERMANN’S CONTENT AND ITS PRESENTATION*

I. Introduction

This chapter introduces and analyzes content published in *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann* that, while image-heavy, also features text; moreover, this chapter advances the argument that materiality is crucial to our understanding of these two publications. With such a strategy, I will read *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann*’s content in two ways: first, at the level of individual contributions, taking into account composition and narrative; and second, on a material level, so that individual contributions will be set in motion and read across a page (or in many cases several pages), in order to recover *Kriegszeit*’s and *Der Bildermann*’s historical and material specificity. This two-tiered reading of these publications will provide an insight into efforts made by Cassirer, his editors, and contributors to put *Kriegszeit*’s and *Der Bildermann*’s content in service of *Kultur*.

II. What is German? The Task of Building National Identity

“*Was ist deutsch?*” This question posed by Richard Wagner in an important 1878 essay,¹ preoccupied German citizens since the country’s political and administrative unification in 1871, and loomed large well into the twentieth century. Friedrich Nietzsche summarized it thus: “It is

---

characteristic of the Germans that the question: ‘What is German?’ never dies out among them.”

Despite great efforts, the German people’s search for social, economic, and political common ground yielded competing answers, even outright clashes, which threatened to disrupt the country’s inchoate national identity. Against this discord, some believed that the nation’s artistic traditions could supply a foundation upon which consensus could be reached. The painter Hans Thoma shared this sentiment with the art historian Henry Thode in a 1905 letter, in which he wrote: “If a person asks what is German? Then he absolutely has to name Grünewald’s altar.”

But the strategy of building national identity upon the arts was ultimately fruitless, if we consider the heterogeneous character of German art in the period before the First World War, which offered no coherent course and no dominant aesthetic tendency. The intellectual discourse, while striving to produce a unified and fixed definition of German art, remained riddled with tensions and ambivalence. This is particularly well-expressed in the debates between two dominant cultural positions that emerged in Germany before 1914, represented by cultural conservatives who advocated academic classicism and cultural progressives who advocated a variety of avant-garde experiments. Although this is an essential binary that needs to be explored, we must be careful not to exaggerate the differences between these two sides or suggest that there was clear uniformity among each group’s constituents. Neither the conservatives nor the progressives were in complete agreement with each other, as the Berlin Secession itself demonstrates. As an organization, the Secession embraced modern modes of

---


expression, however it still encompassed a variety of often-competing styles and theoretical positions.

The fact that cultural conservatives and cultural progressives also divided citizens along political and ideological lines rendered their disputes even more complex and contentious. As a result, both sides led an uneasy coexistence, often clashing over Germany’s cultural mission. This discord produced some of the most inflammatory episodes in the country’s artistic history, which notably included the scandal over the exhibition of Edvard Munch’s paintings in Berlin in 1892, the quarrel over German representation at the 1904 Saint Louis International Exposition, as a result, both sides led an uneasy coexistence, often clashing over Germany’s cultural mission. This discord produced some of the most inflammatory episodes in the country’s artistic history, which notably included the scandal over the exhibition of Edvard Munch’s paintings in Berlin in 1892, the quarrel over German representation at the 1904 Saint Louis International Exposition,^4^ the firing of *Nationalgalerie* director Hugo von Tschudi by Kaiser Wilhelm II in 1908^5^ for broadening the museum’s modern art collection, and the conservative painters Carl Vinnen’s inflammatory *Ein Protest deutscher Künstler* (A Protest of German Artists) of 1911, which was triggered by the purchase of a Van Gogh painting by a museum in Bremen. Signed by 118 artists, Vinnen’s manifesto inveighed against German art dealers, including Paul Cassirer, accusing them of overwhelmingly supporting “foreign” (read French) art at the expense of German art and German artists. To Vinnen—a German landscape painter who worked in the artist colony at Worpswede—this trend presented a “danger to our national traditions.”^6^

One figure who was often at the center of such volatile cultural disputes was the preeminent art critic Julius Meier-Graefe. His Francophile writings, known for their passionate and combative voice, championed Impressionism and Post-Impressionism, while continually

---


^6^ Belting, 67.
challenging the imperially sanctioned conservative Kulturpolitik. Nowhere is this more manifest than in the widespread debate that Meier-Graefe’s 1905 book Der Fall Böcklin (The Case of Böcklin) unleashed, addressing the merits of the beloved painter Arnold Böcklin specifically and the inherent qualities of German art and culture more broadly. During this well-publicized episode, and especially in its aftermath, Meier-Graefe became a lighting-rod figure to those like Henry Thode, a German art historian opposed to modernism, and particularly French modernism, which they perceived as a threat to the true character of German art.

In light of his unapologetic and continuously embattled position, the text Meier-Graefe composed for the first issue of Kriegszeit in August 1914 stands in sharp contrast. Since it comes the closes to outlining Kriegszeit’s official program, this text, it is worth considering in full. Meier-Graefe writes:7

The war is a blessing to us. As of yesterday we are different people. The dispute over words and programs is at an end. We fought against windmills. For many, art was just a diversion. We had colors, lines, pictures, luxuries. We had theories. What we lacked was substance, which, brothers, the time now offers us. Let us be worthy of it. No more restrained commitment! Out of fiery abysses, from adversity and blood, from love and sacred hatred, experience will come to us. Woe to the artist who does not experience today!

Brothers, let us show the slanderers who taste our weapons, whether we are justified, whether we are barbarians. Our weapons will demonstrate power; our spirit will establish law/justification. The spirit, which inflames our honor, animates the artist’s perception. The war gave us unity. All parties proceed toward the goal. The art follow suit.8

---

7 Meier-Graefe mentions his contribution to Kriegszeit in his diary with the following sentence: “Ich habe Heute früh Cassirer für die I. N° seiner Flugblätter ein paar einleitende Worte gegeben.” Quoted in Julius Meier-Graefe, Tagebuch 1903-1917: Und weitere Dokumente, ed. Catherine Krahmer (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2001), 258.

The ubiquitous and heated intellectual and aesthetic exchanges, in which Meier-Graefe was a major participant, were clearly on his mind as he composed this text. But so was Germany’s new political reality, triggered by the events of the summer of 1914, which played well politically, even among the regime’s many skeptics. His sharp patriotic turn was on display not only in *Kriegszeit* but also in a newspaper article published a month later:

Every German takes this into the battle: may we win or succumb, the path is just. It works only this way, if at all. Only with the Kaiser. If the unthinkable was to occur, if everything was to fall, the throne would persist. If three people remain, they will bow before the throne and begin anew. No other country enjoys such a powerful symbol of self-preservation.”

Meier-Graefe’s words boosted the national confidence, while temporarily—but forcefully—granting an answer to the question “Was ist Deutsch?” One particular article for the *Berliner Zeitung* newspaper went even further in affirming reverence for German national identity:

We Germans had forgotten to correctly pronounce the word “German.” Some had adopted Western habits of dropping [the term] somewhat condescendingly, searchingly, doubtfully. Others trumpeted it defiantly into the world. Then the war happened, teaching people so much and suddenly everybody could say “German” as it ought to be said: seriously, powerfully, and purely; and from the deep within comes a hint of something we can probably call—without sentimentality—piety.”

---


The same note of robust patriotic surge can be felt throughout Meier-Graefe’s introduction to *Kriegszeit*. For example, we can start with his view of the war as a blessing, an unmissable opportunity and a harbinger of the grand promise of change. The war presents a new path that causes a break with the past. In fact, the past is to be entirely rejected. The erstwhile heated theoretical and aesthetic arguments, which Meier-Graefe helped shape, he now declares banal, obsolete, and non-essential. The new *raison d’etre* in the arts, according to Meier-Graefe, consists of rising up to the occasion of war and demonstrating the artist’s spirit without hesitation or restraint.

Despite Meier-Graefe’s aggressive rhetoric—delivered in his characteristically truculent style—there is broadness in his language. The lack of specific proper nouns such as “Germans” or “Impressionists” in his call to action is puzzling, especially if we consider that its purpose was to serve as a manifesto. Manifestos are often ambiguous, but at the very least they outline a sense of direction. Since Meier-Graefe’s text launched *Kriegszeit*, its function parallels other founding documents that inaugurated modernist periodicals. The goal of these manifestos was to publicize the launching of a publication as an expression of a new artistic force, its credos, and ideas. At their core, these documents aim to express a mission, which is generally defined in opposition to an existing position. After all, to publish a manifesto is to forge a sense of community just as much as it is to establish a critical distance from some other ideological position. The “we” against “them” rhetoric serves to animate the nascent identity of a new artistic force, as well as to petition future adherents for their support. Manifestos are thus inextricable from the history of modernism, but they also play a crucial role in the history of modernist periodical publications. In fact, the first modernist manifesto, composed by Filippo
Tommaso Marinetti in 1909, was strategically placed on the front page of *Le Figaro* newspaper, signifying the fruitful relationship between art and the emerging mass media.

While Meier-Graefe’s text resonates with these various functions and features of a modernist manifesto, it does not explicitly outline a specific position. Nor is the audience’s course of action clearly defined. Is it called upon to paint? Fight in battle? Furthermore, who is Meier-Graefe addressing specifically? There is certainly no shortage of first-person plural pronouns and antagonistic attitude, but who is meant by the “we” and “us”? The advocates of modern art in Germany? The entire German art community? German people in general? In other words, can it be located in this founding text?

While Meier-Graefe’s language is vague in its prescription, it nonetheless carries meaning. In fact, the broad rhetoric he espouses reflects a new political and cultural mission. Draining his text of specificity allows Meier-Graefe to level differences between people from different sides of the cultural debate. It also allows him to highlight an idea around which *Kriegszeit* and its audience could coalesce: unity. While the concept of unity may be programmatically simple but it played a central role as *Kriegszeit*’s organizing principle.

Beyond Meier-Graefe’s opening text, the highly direct title of *Kriegszeit* itself served programmatically to supply a powerful sense of direction to the contributors. Although “wartime,” as a directive and a genre, could have inspired manifold interpretations, the *Kriegszeit* artists channeled their responses into a narrow range of thematic concerns. These included images of German soldiers, allegorical depictions of the enemy, war-torn environments,
home front scenes, refugees, prisoners, and the dead and the wounded. Among these, the overwhelming majority focused on scenes of German soldiers on active duty.

The German soldier emerged as a favorite motif among both the artists who stayed at home and artists who served in the battlefield. These two groups were split mostly along the generational divide—those born in the 1880s generally joined the army—although the war continued to claim older artists as the third year of fighting commenced. Unsurprisingly, the two groups portrayed and imagined the German soldier in markedly different ways, which are best illustrated in a comparison between two key Kriegszeit contributors, Max Liebermann (1847-1935) and Erich Büttner (1889-1936).

III. Max Liebermann and the Triumphant Soldier

By 1914, Liebermann was acknowledged as one of the country’s great modern painters, having played an important role in shaping the German response to French modernism. He made his debut in the 1870s, with his own brand of peasant-themed Naturalism, tinged by an interest in seventeenth-century Dutch painting. Liebermann’s early work eschewed the prevailing penchant for idealized beauty, edifying messages, and classical themes, a tendency that frequently engendered a scathing critique, and even a few controversies. The violent reaction to his work

---

11 Two of Kriegszeit’s regular contributors, Otto Hettner (1875-1931) and Erich Barlach (1870-1938), were conscripted into war service in 1916, by which time Kriegszeit had ceased its run.

hardly abated after he adopted a “modified” Impressionist style in the 1880s, which was distinguished by a lighter palette and looser application of paint, but also a continuing insistence on linear means of expression. Against the backdrop of the repressive and censorious Wilhelmine art scene, Liebermann joined and also helped found societies that served as alternatives to official exhibition channels, including the Berlin Secession, of which he was a founding member and the first president. It was through this organization that he met and befriended Paul Cassirer. The men shared a similar background, as members of wealthy Jewish Berlin families, a heritage that tended to elicit anti-Semitic views in regards to their professional pursuits. They bonded over their liberal views, deep interest in the latest trends in French art, and the desire to foster vibrant modernism within Germany’s borders. Through this long-term relationship that straddled professional and personal interests, Liebermann became a central contributor to Kriegszeit. He not only created the magazine’s first cover image, but also twenty-five additional lithographs, four of which formed the entire contents of the sixth issue.

Of the motivation that inspired him to contribute to Kriegszeit, Liebermann wrote in the summer of 1914, as the war was getting underway:

I am much in favor of giving work to the artists: illustrations, current events. It would be foolish if we were to twiddle our thumbs; on the contrary, the muses should strive to do the same to the fighters. Every man should do what he does best. That seems patriotic to me. For this reason, I have shown an active interest in the founding of wartime flying pages [Kriegszeit], whose success surpasses our boldest expectations. The third edition of the first number has already been printed.13

13 “Ich bin mehr dafür, dass man den Künstlern Arbeit gibt: Illustrationen, Aktuelles. Das Thörichste wäre, wenn wir die Hände in den Schoss legten, im Gegentheil sollten die Musen sich bemühn, es den Kämpfern gleich zu thun. Jeder soll das thun, was er am besten thun kann. Das scheint mir patriotisch. Deshalb habe ich mich lebhaft für Gründung der Kriegsflugblätter interessiert, deren Erfolg unsere kühnen Erwartungen übertrifft. Von der ersten Nummer ist schon die dritte Auflage gedruckt.” Quoted in Marina
Liebermann’s contributions to *Kriegszeit* centered around the German soldier, a subject to which he remained faithful throughout the publication’s entire run. The Max Liebermann Special Issue—*Kriegszeit*’s sixth, published on September 30, 1914—marks the height of the artist’s involvement with this project. The images in this issue are worth examining in detail, not only because they encapsulate Liebermann’s early vision of wartime, but also because they reveal his keen awareness of the narrative potential offered by the medium’s format, which he strategically utilized to further his artistic goals. To study the successive images of this *Kriegszeit* issue in its entirety reveals how carefully he arranged content into an almost storyboard fashion.

The cover image, Liebermann’s fourth for *Kriegszeit*, locates the viewer on the home front (fig. 2.1). It takes place at the foot of the Brandenburg Gate, a historically meaningful location in the very center of Berlin and a site of the Liebermann family residence, located just a few doors down. The handwritten subtitle, *Extrablatt!* (Newspaper Special Edition Supplement), makes audible the loud and sharp sound emanating from the newspaper seller, whom Liebermann depicts striding across the foreground, with an *Extrablatt* raised in his outstretched left hand to beckon the next customer. Judging from the size and the shape of papers draped across the man’s right hand, which correspond to the format of *Kriegszeit*, Liebermann has cast the viewer in the role of the customer and a recipient of news from the front. Although this news has already captivated a sizable crowd, it remains undisclosed to the viewer, thus encouraging him to turn the page and discover the content of the latest dispatches on *Kriegszeit*’s subsequent pages.

The following page shifts the stage from the home front to the battlefield (fig. 2.2). Here

---

again, Liebermann advances the narrative in both image and text. The handwritten subtitle excerpts a famous line of a cavalry song from Friedrich von Schiller’s *Wallenstein* (1799): “Come on, comrades, to the horses, to the horses” (Wohlauf Kameraden auf’s Pferd, auf’s Pferd). As on the previous page, the subtitle conjures a sound, most likely boisterous singing delivered by the chorus of cavalrymen who are riding off into the distance. Buoyed by the song and its lyrics, the soldier in the foreground reaches for the reins to mount his horse in a dramatic mid-stride motion. He enacts the song’s call for service, while capturing the excitement that grips a military unit just before battle. Liebermann conveys this rush of energy through the whooshing pen marks that enliven a strong linear composition. In this lithograph, Liebermann merges literary and visual modes to express bravery, readiness, and the gung-ho spirit of the German soldier.

The third page continues and amplifies this narrative in a nighttime scene of menacing calm (fig. 2.3). A single soldier has multiplied into five artillerymen, who wear the famous German *Pickelhaube* helmets. Under the cover of darkness, these men receive reinforcements from the naval vessels, which emerge through the fog in the distance, and three zeppelins, whose size has the power to astonish, as shown by the soldier at far right who gazes up at them in awe. Liebermann describes this three-pronged offensive by land, sea, and air brashly and unabashedly as “England’s Bad Dream!” (Englands schwerer Traum!). Although this image enacts a fantasy scenario, it succinctly outlines Germany’s perceived ability to launch a formidable assault.

Liebermann closes the issue with an allegory, which depicts a heroic male nude who closely resembles the classical Greco-Roman warrior type as he delivers a lethal stab of his lance to an ungainly bear (fig. 2.4). Here we finally witness an actual battle as direct combat. The subtitle
identifies two sides represented in this duel: “Hercules: Hindenburg Slays the Russian Bear” (Herkules: Hindenburg erschlägt den russischen Bären). In the mismatched fight between the heroic Paul von Hindenburg, Germany’s celebrated war commander, and the ungainly Russian bear, there can only be one clear winner.

In this special issue, Max Liebermann used a number of strategies to produce a powerful statement. He depicted wartime on the home front (characterized by supportive and engaged home crowds) and the battlefield (replete with soldiers fighting on land, air, and sea). He also integrated the visual and textual components into a narrative system that addresses Germany’s enemies to the West (England) and to the East (Russia). In this way, Liebermann demonstrated an awareness of the options afforded to him by the magazine medium. He skillfully managed the placement and pacing of image and text to gradually unfold the story of Germany’s inevitable triumph over its enemies.

Two additional lithographs fully realize Liebermann’s 1914 vision of the German soldier. From the second issue (September 1914), the caption “Now We Will Thrash Them!” (Jetzt wollen wir sie dreschen!) was inspired by a proclamation by Kaiser Wilhelm II; in the Christmas issue of that year, the caption reads “March, March, Hurrah!!” (Marsch, Marsch, Hurrahh!!) (figs. 2.5 and 2.6). In both artworks, Liebermann pairs bellicose captions with displays of violent action. Both images capture a swirling moment of aggression, as the German forces unleash a vigorous onslaught against the enemy. The work from the second issue focuses on the cavalryman on a leaping horse, rallying the landed soldiers with a raised sword, who in turn declare their readiness with drawn bayonets that pierce the air. In the work from the Christmas issue, Liebermann closes in on rows of frontline soldiers on foot as they hurtle toward the
enemy; this charge seems to resonate from a soldier marshaling the group. In these two scenes of battle, the anticipation of violence is underscored, not its realization. We do not see the enemy; the brutal acts are not accomplished, only suggested.

In 1915, Liebermann’s soldier imagery underwent a change. He shifted from group scenes and action sequences to portraits of single soldiers, thus effectively turning toward portraiture, a genre for which he would be known in his later years (fig. 2.7). He showed soldiers monumentally, in full view, in uniforms, posing in a standing position, against a blank background that is emptied of detail. There is little emotional resonance in these images. Liebermann does not engage the viewer, and there is no narrative that is advanced or even suggested by the text. In contrast to Liebermann’s previous output, and perhaps in response to the onsetting war weariness, this image shows the modern master shifting from scenes of military aggression to those of introspection and contemplation.

IV. Erich Büttner and Max Beckmann: Artists on the Front

In contrast to Liebermann, Erich Büttner was not a household name at the time the first gunshots announced the war’s beginning. While Liebermann was sixty-seven years old in August 1914, Büttner had not yet turned twenty-five. He had started training as a glass sculptor, before turning to printmaking—with a focus on lithography—under the auspices of the famed teacher at the Berlin School of Decorative Arts, Emil Orlik. Many well-known German artists studied under Orlik, including the Dadaists Hannah Höch and George Grosz, as well as Oskar Nerlinger, the founder of “Die Abstrakten.” In 1908 Büttner became a member of the Berlin
Secession, a distinction that reveals a measure of prominence that he must have gained as a young artist.

Although it remains unclear whether Cassirer represented Büttner, his membership in the Secession, exhibiting alongside seasoned artists such as Liebermann, Max Slevogt, and Käthe Kollwitz, suggests at the very least that the dealer was familiar with the young artist’s work. If Büttner’s oeuvre has been omitted from the canon, he enjoyed a measure of acclaim during the Weimar era for his Expressionist-style paintings and prints depicting views of Berlin and portraits of the city’s famous inhabitants. These artworks followed Büttner’s contributions to Kriegszeit, which revealed a nascent interest in the psychological ambiguities of his sitters.

Unlike Liebermann, Büttner served in the army, although it is unclear in what capacity. The Allgemeines Künstlerlexikon\textsuperscript{14} states that he was a cartographer, but Büttner’s rank, proffered as a part of his signature in one lithograph in Kriegszeit, identifies the artist as an Armierungssoldat.\textsuperscript{15} Büttner’s lithograph “In the Sign of the Spade” (Im Zeichen der Schippe), published in the fortieth issue (May 1915), depicts primary duties performed by soldiers of his rank: digging, building, reinforcing, and maintaining trenches (fig. 2.8). Either because of a lack of physical fitness or because he was wait-listed for combat duty, Büttner was in the non-combatant position as an Armierungssoldat, so he would not have been directly in the line of fire. Nonetheless, he would have shared the same milieu with frontline soldiers, who undoubtedly


\textsuperscript{15} The Vocabulary of German Military Terms and Abbreviations (Washington DC: War Department, 1917) translates Armierungsbatallion as a “labor battalion”; according to this translation, a soldier serving in this battalion would be charged with providing labor support to those men fighting on the front lines.
provided him with vivid accounts of the battlefield.

Like Liebermann’s, Büttner’s twenty lithographs focus on the solider. Yet in contrast to Liebermann, Büttner idealized military life only in a few instances, such as the lithograph entitled “Cavalry Song” (Reiterlied) in the sixteenth issue (December 1914) (fig. 2.9). Here, the double-headed eagle on the flag and the song’s lyrics featured in print announce the presence not of Germans, but of their fellow Austro-Hungarian counterparts: “Why fear the end! / Ten thousand Austrian men / Will fill the ranks again.” In the foreground, Büttner depicts an Austrian cavalry officer riding alongside his unit. Moved by the song and its patriotic message, he gestures toward a distant Belgrade to announce his company’s triumphant entrance into the city. The brutal reality of the impending battle for control of the Serbian capital is suggested only by the movement of whips wielded by the Austrian cavalrymen. Other than that, Büttner keeps the spotlight firmly on the exaltation of heroic military combat. His “In the Argonne Forest” (Im Argonner Wald) published in the forty-second issue (June 1915) moves closer to the action (fig. 2.10). Büttner places the viewer directly in the line of fire, amid an intense gunfight that takes place in the thicket. The scene is teeming with soldiers, who are shielded by trees as they take aim at the unseen enemy. Büttner’s characteristically dark and dense penmarks heighten the intensity of the booming gunshots and the frenzy of the battle. Such dynamic portrayals of soldiers are rare in Büttner’s Kriegszeit œuvre. More frequently, his lithographs chronicle soldiers’ everyday lives and show them engaged in mundane tasks that were not often the subject of art, such as eating, mulling about, resting, and reading newspapers (figs. 2.11-14).

The soldiers he showcases even have time for creative tasks. In the fiftieth issue (August 1915), war as a catalyst for artmaking is expressed in the lithograph “Poet in the Fields” (Der
Dichter im Felde) (fig. 2.15). Here Büttner depicts a poet-soldier hunkered over few pieces of paper, completely immersed in the act of writing. The text that accompanies the image, a poem culled from a Cassirer-published book of poetry by the soldiers from the front,\(^\text{16}\) gives viewers a glimpse into a soldier’s literary creation. Furthermore, to represent the soldier’s inner landscape, Büttner unravels a panoramic tableau above him, depicting various scenes that range from thundering explosions to benign countryside views.

For the most part, these images of everyday life exhibit little excitement. Still they do not appear static, mainly because Büttner composes the daily hustle and bustle loosely, as if pausing the action to randomly capture a fleeting moment in time: for example, during mid-snore or mid-bite. Although at first this soldierly routine may appear somewhat pedestrian, it subtly and powerfully conveys an ideological message, which functions on two levels. First, it conveys that German soldiers enjoy a level of normalcy even amid a war. And second, it bridges the distance between the viewer and the men on the battlefield, so that their experience and sacrifice feel more personally relatable.

Büttner’s ability to involve the viewer is best captured in his self-portrait, which he contributed to Kriegszeit’s thirty-fifth issue (April 1915) (fig. 2.16). It appeared over a printed subtitle that read “Drafted! Self-Portrait of Our Contributor Erich Büttner” (Einberufen! Selbstbildnis unseres Mitarbeiters Erich Büttner). Here, Büttner presents himself in a half-length portrait, in an outdoor winter setting, donning his military garb. He appears in a moment of solitude and rest, in counterpoint to his fellow soldiers, who are suggested in abstract outlines

that reveal Büttner’s move toward Expressionism. Pushed right against the picture plane, Büttner faces the viewer directly, but not in a frank encounter. Instead, his gaze belies a quick rapport; it is not fixed but divided, with the right eye engaging the viewer while the left drifts away.

Büttner’s expression oscillates between intimacy and withholding. It is at once assertive and reserved, indicative of a psychological complexity that humanizes the artist. The hastily jotted caption in Büttner’s own hand—“January 31, 1915 / Erich Büttner / currently 43rd Armierungsbatallion”—serves as another sign of the artist’s presence.

Büttner’s ability to capture a subject’s inner life is evident even in portraits of government officials. Take, for example, his rendering of Wilhelm I, which appeared on the cover of Kriegszeit’s twenty-fourth issue (January 1915) (fig. 2.17). Rarely had an artist attempted this type of intimate depiction of the then-Emperor.

There are only a few additional portraits published in Kriegszeit that exhibit equal measure of subtlety and feeling for the sitter, notably by Max Beckmann. Beckmann visited the Eastern Front in the autumn before he volunteered for service as a medical orderly that would take him to Belgium in the winter and spring. Although he didn’t fight as a soldier, the artist witnessed a number of “truly horrible things,” which led him to note in his diary: “In a short amount of time, I’ve experienced more than I have in years before.”

---

18 Ibid, 139.
battlefield. But tragedy soon struck Beckmann closer to home.

Published in the eleventh issue (November 1914), Beckmann’s only contribution to Kriegszeit stands out for its notable insight into the sitter’s physical and psychological character: a close-up portrait of his brother-in-law, Martin Tube (fig. 2.18). While the heavy bandages wrapped around the crown of his head indicate that Tube had suffered a severe head injury, his uniform is still fully buttoned, and his face bears a soft expression that exudes gentle calm. Beckmann averts Tube’s eyes, inviting the viewer to behold the man’s youth and handsomeness. Beckmann also renders Tube’s face with a sensitivity of detail that betrays his deep familiarity and fondness for the sitter. The printed subtitle that accompanies Beckmann’s lithograph reveals the reason behind this heartfelt portrayal and the dark shadow that ominously falls across Tube’s face: “In Memory of a Fallen Friend / Martin Tube, Captain and Company Commander in the 59th Infantry Regiment / Wounded at Tannenberg in August. Died in action at Ivangorod on October 11th.” In other words, Beckmann’s image acts not simply as a portrait, but as a lovingly rendered death notice. 20

V. August Gaul and the Rendering of Germany’s Enemies

This poignancy was uncommon for Kriegszeit, a magazine that more often featured images of the battlefield as a site of heroic fighting. And in this arena of war, the German solider is the

---

19 Ibid, 136-139.

20 For more on Beckmann’s portrait of Martin Tube, see Barbara Copeland Buenger, “Max Beckamnn in the First World War,” in The Ideological Crisis of Expressionism: The Literary and Artistic German War Colony in Belgium 1914-1918, eds. Rainer Rumold and O.K. Werckmesiter (Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1990), 237-75.
figure on which *Kriegszeit*’s contributors focused. But this raises the question: who are the German soldiers fighting? The contributor who most articulated the answer to this question was August Gaul (1869-1921), who was also *Kriegszeit*’s most prolific contributor. Gaul portrayed these enemies not as counterparts to the German soldiers, but as diminished forms, and in fact not as soldiers at all.

Although Gaul began his career working for Reinhold Begas, a beloved sculptor of the court-sanctioned school of classicism, he veered away from the strictly traditional style and subject matter to become one of the founding members of the Berlin Secession. He became best known for his work in the niche field of zoomorphic sculpture (in the German language, a sculptor of this persuasion is called a *Tierbildhauer*). A catalogue\(^{21}\) of a 1919 one-man exhibition at the Paul Cassirer Gallery shows Gaul’s favorite motifs, including bears, bulls, and geese, executed mostly in bronze. The location of this commemorative show at the Cassirer Gallery was not a coincidence. The artist’s work was represented by Cassirer, and the two men were also very good friends whose mutual affection was perhaps best expressed through their respective nicknames, “Paulchen” and “Gaulchen,” derived from the diminutive versions of their names. In addition to Gaul’s sculptural work, executed for both private and public commissions, he made a foray into printmaking with a group of etchings that debuted in 1912 at the Berlin Secession.

Because of his age, Gaul did not join active service in 1914, but he did join the war effort through the pages of *Kriegszeit*, proffering a steady repertoire aimed at disparaging the enemy. His strategy was based on the idea of repurposing. It consisted of injecting animal imagery, which was the mainstay of his oeuvre, with a strong partisan message. As a result of this clever

revisioning, the animal subjects that had heretofore served as a foil for Gaul’s interest in form—animals for animals’ sake—became stock characters representing the key players of the First World War.

Through this shift, Gaul’s symbolically understated imagery became political, and he was certainly not alone in making this transition. Thomas Theodor Heine, Germany’s most prominent caricaturist whose work for the satirical magazine Simplicissimus was well-known for its sharp critique of the social orders, decided in 1914 to put his work in support of Germany’s war effort. Gaul made this transition seamlessly, mostly because of the long-standing idiom dating back to Aesop’s fables, which established the convention of supplying animals with human traits, so that foxes became associated with cunning, donkeys with stubbornness, and so on. He used this shorthand device to turn the animals already present in his work into surrogates for countries fighting the war. In this anthropomorphic move favored by other artists, caricaturists, and illustrators as much as by Gaul, Great Britain was cast as a sea lion, France as a rooster, Russia as a bear, and Serbia as a pig. Germany and Austria-Hungary also assumed animal forms as an eagle and a double-eagle, respectively. After Italy officially betrayed its commitment to Germany and Austria-Hungary to support the Triple Entente in 1915, Gaul allegorized the country with no fewer than six species—crows, ravens, vultures, wolves, elephants, and geese—most likely in reaction to what Germans perceived as the country’s duplicitious character.23

---


23 The forty-first issue (May 27, 1915) featured only works by Gaul, which he dedicated to a bitter critique of Italy’s shifting role in the war.
In Gaul’s fifty-two contributions to *Kriegszeit*, he turned to the sea lion most. He depicted the animal serially, across issues, in a way that created two parallel narrative threads. The first weaves together a story of Britain’s inability to manage and maintain its status as a seafaring superpower. Gaul launched this thread in the fourth issue (September 1914) with an image that shows a sea lion midway through a circus act (fig. 2.19). Under the watchful gaze of the French rooster and the Russian bear, it balances a globe on the tip of its nose. Gaul depicts the sea lion with a measure of agility and control; it is centered on the page, appearing physically strong and successful in stabilizing the sphere. Yet the animal’s inevitable loss of control is announced by the heading above the image: “Last appearance by Popular Demand!” (Auf vielfachen Wunsch letztes Auftreten!). Gaul fast-forwards this moment in time in the fifty-first issue (August 1915) (fig. 2.20). In a summary of the state of British power, “After the First War Year” (Nach dem ersten Kriegsjahr), Gaul depicts the sea lion’s precarious performance slipping into chaos. He shows the animal shrieking in anguish as its body contorts awkwardly in a futile attempt to steady the globe. By *Kriegszeit*’s last issue (March 1916), the sea lion has completely lost control (fig. 2.21). The globe over which it once had command has mushroomed and is threatening to escape its stranglehold. Despite the sea lion’s best attempts to cling onto the globe, the caption makes its steady loss of grip unequivocally clear: “It is no longer enough” (Es langt nicht mehr).

Gaul paired this portrayal of Britain’s steadily eroding power with a corresponding narrative.

---

24 Anglo-German antagonism was on the rise in Germany in late nineteenth century. Heinrich von Treitschke (1834-96), for example, a politically involved historian and author of the hugely influential five-volume *History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century*, stated: “Among the English the love of money has killed all feeling of honour and all distinction between right and wrong. They hide their cowardice and materialism behind fine phrases of unctuous theology.” Quoted in Antoine Guillard, *Modern Germany and Her Historians* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1970), 272.
of the country’s growing vulnerability to attacks. In Kriegszeit’s thirtieth issue (March 1915), the image captioned as the “Idyll in the North Sea” (Idyll in der Nordsee) depicts the sea lion in an enervated state, slumped over a tombstone that bears its name (fig. 2.22). Rising up from a body of water, the tombstone is besieged by submarines, whose presence is announced by periscopes that emerge over the water’s edge.

Gaul delivered on this threat with a lithograph featured in the thirty-ninth issue (May 1915) (fig. 2.23). In this work, the animal is shown wailing in agony and surging above the waves to reveal an arrow piercing its body. In both hand-written and printed format, the title reference to a topical event that would have been much discussed as Gaul’s lithograph was being printed: the sinking of the British ocean liner Lusitania by a German submarine. Interestingly, Gaul depicts the sea lion’s injury as minor (affecting its hind flipper rather than vital organs), most likely as an expression of solidarity with the official German line, which sought to minimize international outrage at the event. In contrast to this image, which shows the sea lion leaping up above the water’s edge—even though the subject is the act of sinking—Gaul’s conclusion to this narrative thread shows the animal barely able to stay afloat. In Kriegszeit’s penultimate issue (February 1916), the artist took inspiration from an actual event, another German-British confrontation on the high seas, which took place on January 16, 1916 (fig. 2.24). In honor of the German vessel that carried out the strike, the S.M.S. Möwe, or His Majesty’s Ship Seagull, Gaul depicts a seagull in a nosedive attack against a hollow-eyed sea lion, which can barely keep its head above

---

25 This controversial event—which vacillated between German claims that this civilian vessel was illegally carrying ammunition and British outrage over the death of over 1,000 ordinary citizens—precipitated a crisis that eventually paved America’s entry into the war. In Germany, the sinking was justified as a regrettable, but necessary action.
While the British sea lion played an important role in Gaul’s *Kriegszeit* oeuvre, the artist did not overlook Germany’s enemy to the east. Yet the Russian bear never posed quite the same threat as its British counterpart. Instead of showing the gradual but steady decline of power, Gaul preferred to depict the bear as already weakened and on the verge of collapse. His trajectory begins with the bear fleeing, then enduring captivity, and finally suffering vicious attacks by the German and Austro-Hungarian forces (figs. 2.25-27). The narrative that emerges from these lithographs is of Russia as an ungainly and spent force, destined to suffer a rough and violent treatment.

**VI. Homefront Rallies of Support**

*Kriegszeit* created a space that was teeming with German heroes and their incompetent enemies. Amid these mutually dependent narratives, there were other, less commonly featured scenes from the home front, in which people rallied in support of the war effort. That support was sometimes expressed literally, as in works by Arthur Kampf (fig. 2.28) and Hans Baluschek (fig. 2.29): the former a history painter of the academic persuasion, and the latter a painter from the east side of Berlin, renowned for his socially-conscious work. Both drew images of crowds to signal German people’s excitement about the war.

*Kriegszeit* contributors also singled out children as champions of war. On two occasions the publication featured images of children, in both cases role-playing as soldiers. In the forty-eighth issue (July 1915), Rudolf Grossmann uses the nineteenth-century children’s song “A Young
Recruit” as his inspiration (fig. 2.30). He responds to the opening lyrics, “Who Wants to Become A Soldier,” by depicting a young boy with a *Pickelhaube* helmet, a rucksack, and a sword. Poised and steadfast, the boy conveys qualities that embody and foreshadow his future as a solder. Erich Büttner’s image also shows the little recruit, now joined by his friends play-acting various military roles: drummer, swordsman, flag bearer, and riflewoman, among others (fig. 2.31). Inspired by stories from the battlefield, this jumbled infantry unit prepares to march into battle against an unseen target.

Women made an occasional appearance on the pages of *Kriegszeit*. In a few prints, mostly by Liebermann and Ernst Barlach, women were featured among portrayals of the larger civilian population, fleeing the East Prussian territory. Hedwig Weiß proffered the most concentrated and methodical exploration of women’s roles in wartime in the thirty-sixth issue (April 1915). Now almost entirely forgotten, Weiß was one of the few female artists who worked in Berlin as a member of the Secession. Rendered in rich texture and tone, and with loose application of pigment, her work for this issue of *Kriegszeit* was billed under the title “Women in Wartime.” It opened with an image showing three generations of women in a domestic setting (fig. 2.32). Weiß depicts the two older women sewing a large piece of white cloth, with the little girl following their example. On the next page, Weiß continues the sewing motif, but in a more intimate and interactive scene (fig. 2.33). Here we witness a tender moment between a corporal’s wife and her young daughter. Weiß captures a moment when the girl stands up on a footstool so she can help her mother with needlework. On the following page, Weiß leaves the cozy domestic setting to show soldiers’ wives on a train, after a visit to their fighting men (fig. 2.34). Despite the fact that the visit has ended and that the husbands’ fates remain uncertain, the women show
no signs of worry. In fact, three of the four are asleep, while the fourth calmly reads a letter. The issue closes with an image of a war sewing room populated by women sewing and ironing white cloths (fig. 2.35). They are completely absorbed in their work; they don’t waste time with small-talk, but are driven only by the important task at hand. In addition to Weiß’s images, the text of the issue is culled from women throughout history, from Goethe’s mother to Mme. de Stael, who in various ways praise Germans and their strong character. Although Kriegszeit privileged male experiences, these images of women played an important role in conveying their steady influence on the home front.

•

In order to provide an overview of the 263 lithographs published in Kriegszeit, I have thus far discussed content by theme and artist, which both contributes to and advances the two tendencies favored by scholars who have examined the publication. The latter approach is especially prevalent in monographic studies, because it helps illuminate the trajectory of a single artist’s sustained engagement with the subject of wartime. This is especially true of Max Liebermann\textsuperscript{26} and August Gaul,\textsuperscript{27} Kriegszeit’s best-known and most prolific contributors.

Yet to examine Kriegszeit solely on the basis of individual contributions is to misrepresent and ultimately de-contextualize the publication’s broader mission and meaning. Although Kriegszeit evidences Ernst Barlach’s ebbing enthusiasm for the war effort, for example, it is equally important to recognize the publication constructed: an edited and bound volume, and not

\textsuperscript{26} Erika Eschenbach, “Zeichen für den Krieg?”, 112-159.

\textsuperscript{27} Richard Schaffer-Hartmann, “Kriegszeit: Gauls Graphiken zum Ersten Weltkrieg” in Der Tierbildhauer August Gaul, ed. Ursel Berger (Berlin: Nicolai, 1999), 164-174.
a vehicle for stand-alone, loose-leaf prints, whether by Barlach or any other contributor. In fact, within a single issue, prints were not self-contained as they would be in a portfolio, but arranged in a side-by-side fashion. Since the content was not featured in a disconnected manner, we need to look past individual prints and their thematic concerns to examine how an entire issue—and *Kriegszeit* as a whole — was compiled, edited, and presented to the public.

**VII. Alfred Gold: Portrait of an Editor**

Because the content of *Kriegszeit* did not feature randomly assembled contributions but carefully selected images and text, it is critical to explore the editorial figure behind such careful selection, Alfred Gold. His editorial interventions, an overlooked aspect of *Kriegszeit*’s identity in existing scholarship, will enrich understanding of how this publication functioned.

In lieu of Alfred Gold’s personal papers or his correspondence, which I was not able to locate, his published work outlines a trajectory that naturally leads to the leadership post of *Kriegszeit*. Gold was born to a Jewish family in Vienna in 1874. His publishing career started auspiciously at *Die Zeit*, a weekly periodical founded in 1894, which covered an array of topics ranging from politics and economics to science and art. In Vienna at the fin-de-siècle, *Die Zeit* was highly regarded for pioneering works by such notable German-speaking literary figures as Theodor Herzl and Hugo von Hofmannsthal and international counterparts including Henrik Ibsen, Leo Tolstoy, and Oscar Wilde.28

---

In 1901, Gold left Vienna and his work at Die Zeit for Germany, where in the next decade he served as the Berlin cultural correspondent for the Frankfurter Zeitung, writing theater, exhibition, and book reviews. This work helped Gold to establish a considerable understanding of the city’s cultural scene, which he wrote about in his 1910 novel that depicted the Berlin’s art world as a vibrant nexus between bohemian, speculative, literary, philistine, and capitalist interests. Two years later, he earned a doctorate degree in art history. Although Gold most likely knew Paul Cassirer before 1912, their professional association commenced that year with the publication of Gold’s book on the painter Johann Carl Wilck, also the subject of Gold’s dissertation, at Cassirer’s publishing house. A highly educated man from a progressive Jewish background, Gold must have formed a natural connection to Cassirer and his milieu. The two men partnered again in 1913 to produce an exhibition catalogue in commemoration of the painter Carl Steffeck. Gold co-authored that publication with Max Liebermann, thereby forming another link that would lead him to Kriegszeit.

Gold’s appointment as the editor of Kriegszeit in 1914 is evidence of the respect and goodwill that he earned while working on publication and exhibition projects with Cassirer in the two years prior to the war. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine a more ideally suited candidate for the position as Cassirer turned his attention to the founding of Kriegszeit; Gold not only had a decade of experience with the worlds of publishing, but he also possessed art historical training.


31 Heuer, et. al., Lexikon, 9:44-47.
and familiarity with Berlin’s artists.

VIII. Gold’s Editorial Strategies

How do we determine the scope of Gold’s editorial reach? How do we establish parameters of his editorial strategy? Although no record exists detailing the nature of the artists’ commitment to Kriegszeit, some clues relating to their working relationship with Gold emerge from their extant letters and diaries. Take, for example, Käthe Kollwitz’s diary entry of September 26, 1914, which reads: “Gold telephoned; I should draw for [Ludwig] Frank’s death.”\textsuperscript{32} Likewise, in a letter of December 10, 1914, Ernst Barlach mentions that Gold had asked him to create “something pretty” (etwas Schönes) for Kriegszeit’s first Christmas issue.\textsuperscript{33} And a year later, on August 25, Barlach writes: “I am drawing a ‘Masurian Thrasher’ for Kriegszeit after a poem by [Wilhelm] von Scholz; at first I didn’t want to, but an image created itself: Hindenburg shod with cannons as boots, surrounded by flames, and spinning a flail.”\textsuperscript{34} In the first two instances the work itself never materialized; Otto Hettner eventually tackled the subject of Frank’s death, after

\textsuperscript{32} “Gold telephoniert mich an, ich solle zu Franks Tode zeichnen.” Jutta Bohnk, ed., \textit{Käthe Kollwitz. Die Tagebücher} (Berlin: Siedler, 1989), 161. Ludwig Frank (1874-1914), a Social Democrat famous for founding the Association of Young Workers, died at the front soon after volunteering for the war effort. It comes as no surprise that Gold would have asked Kollwitz to tackle this subject matter; as a committed Socialist, she would have been an ideal choice to commemorate Frank’s death.

\textsuperscript{33} “Und ich soll für die Weihnachtsnummer der Kriegszeitung etwas Schönes machen. Und tue—was?” Quoted in Friedrich Droß, ed. \textit{Ernst Barlach. Kunst im Krieg} (Bremen: Heye, 1953), 10.

Kollwitz failed to realize it in three failed designs. Similarly, the directive to create “something pretty” seems to have challenged Barlach from the start. We can surmise from these records that in addition to commissioning artists to work for Kriegszeit, Gold also had a hand in determining the actual thematic content of works themselves.

In a letter dated March 9, 1915, Barlach described another level of Gold’s influence. He writes: “I’m having some trouble with Kriegszeit. That I have let myself be persuaded into contributing quite against my initial reaction is already embarrassing enough. That Mr. Gold then puts aside my drawing for ten weeks, gives me no pleasure. He doesn’t want to publish a ‘Mass Grave,’ which is in his possession. He is afraid.” Barlach was not the only artist disappointed by having his work withheld from Kriegszeit. Willy Jaeckel also complained: “I have been compensated for the lithograph that I have created for Kriegszeit with twenty Marks, but it has

35 The three versions are discussed in Alexandra von dem Knesebeck, Käthe Kollwitz. Werkverzeichnis der Graphik (Bern: Verlag Kornfeld, 2002), 2:408-411. The diary entry in which Kollwitz mentions Gold’s request covers the period from September 8th through the 13th. The fact that the lithograph commemorating Frank was published on September 23rd suggests that the turnover was fast and that the contributors had only about two week’s notice before submitting finished work.

36 Barlach was at first reluctant to join the ranks of Kriegszeit’s contributors, but he changed his mind after learning that the magazine was selling extremely well, and that the proceeds from would benefit struggling artists. He summarized his decision in a letter to Arthur Moeller van den Bruck on December 28, 1914: “Sie werden sich wundern, daß ich doch für die Kriegszeit arbeite. Ich habe es getan, weil ich hörte, daß ziemlich viel damit verdient wird, und halte es für recht auf diese Weise etwas für die Hülfskasse der Künstler beizutragen.” Quoted in Friedrich Droß, ed. Ernst Barlach. Briefe I, 1888-1924 (Munich: R. Piper & Co Verlag, 1968), 318.

not yet been published. There are some people who don’t entirely wish me well.” Although the record is limited to these two instances, it nonetheless offers insight into Gold’s keen awareness of the government censors and his reluctance to violate standards set by the authorities. While Gold’s regulative process may have frustrated the artists he represented, it allowed Kriegszeit to be published without interruption or external intervention.

The impact that Gold made on Kriegszeit goes far beyond efforts he took in commissioning and monitoring works of art, however. The most significant mark he left on the publication was in how he presented and arranged the content. In order to understand the true scope of Gold’s intervention, it is useful to consider the work published in Kriegszeit in the context of recent developments in editorial theory.

IX. Alfred Gold and the Tenets of Editorial Theory

Editorial theory is underpinned by the poststructuralist challenge to the traditional characterization of literary texts as stable and fixed expressions of the author’s original intention. In an extension of this argument, editorial theory posits that at least two processes have the ability to destabilize the text. The first is the process of reproduction (from edition to edition), which alters the text’s material features such as typography, layout, and binding, thereby affecting the way that we read and understand the text. The second is the editing process, which can significantly alter both the presentation and meaning of works.

38 “Die eine Litografie, die ich für die Kriegszeit gemacht habe ist mir wohl mit 20 Mark honoriert worden, aber ist bisher nicht erschienen. Es gibt da einige Leute die mir nicht ganz wohl wollen.” Quoted in Dagmar Klein, Der Expressionist Willy Jaeckel (1888-1944). Gemälde-Biographie-Künstlerbriefe (Köln: Müller Botermann Verlag, 1990), 539.
These tenets of editorial theory provide a new lens through which we can open up Gold’s editorial reach to further analysis. This begins with an acknowledgment that to include a print in *Kriegszeit* is to give it a new embodied form. In other words, by the virtue of being featured in the publication, a lithograph (a flat visual image) assumes a new material identity as a building block of a three-dimensional, multi-sensory object (the magazine). While this new context does not displace the original authority of the print as a record of the artist’s marks and intentions, its function and meaning thus become laterally expanded by the editor whose choices construct a new context for its presentation. To illustrate this point and show the impact of Gold’s editorial choices, I propose that we examine four material sites across which content in *Kriegszeit* can be read: 1) across the page; 2) across the spread; 3) across a single issue; 4) and across both basic and luxury multiple editions. My intention is to use this four-fold approach as a way to not only tease out the extent of Gold’s influence, but also to track *Kriegszeit*’s content back to its original physical and historical context.

Gold’s influence across a page manifests itself in his handling of the texts he featured in the magazine. Although *Kriegszeit* emphasized the image as the primary carrier of meaning, the role of the written word, subservient to and generally in service of the picture, cannot be underestimated. It appeared in *Kriegszeit* in various forms, ranging from brief captions and poems to short essays, which were either authored by classic writers such as Heinrich Heine and Friedrich Schiller or proffered by contemporary authors such as Richard Dehmel and Paul Zech. By examining the selection of these various texts and their placement relative to images, we can gauge the impact of Gold’s editorial intervention.

In most instances, Gold used text to reinforce the message delivered by a visual. For
example, on the second page of *Kriegszeit*’s sixteenth issue (December 1914), we encounter a lithograph by Rudolf Grossmann that depicts a convoy of mostly women, children, and the elderly making its way through a nondescript town (fig. 2.36). The caption beneath the image identifies the people as Polish refugees. Since Poland was geographically situated at the embattled crossroads of the German and the Russian Empires, its people fled en masse in 1914, right after the fighting commenced. Unlike other *Kriegszeit* contributors,\(^{39}\) who tackled the subject of this exodus as a sign of the Tsar’s reckless political decisions and pursuits, Grossmann renders the displaced persons rather matter-of-factly. The emotional temperature of this image, however, shifts in light of how Gold paired it with Maxim Gorki’s “Song of the Stormy Petrel” (1901), a prose poem that functioned as a thinly veiled protest against the Tsar. The addition of this text enabled Gold to shore up a vision of Russia as an overbearing tyrant. The anti-Tsarist message continued, with Gold also introducing Gorki’s text with a subtitle that reads: “When the poet, himself a fugitive, was still fighting for the free Russia, not the Tsar.”\(^{40}\) This example illustrates how Gold used two types of text—a self-created caption and a literary text—to dramatize a key aspect of the image in order to invest it with deeper, more poignant, meaning.

In other cases, Gold forged a completely different relationship between image and text. On every page of *Kriegszeit*’s fifty-fourth issue (October 1, 1915), Gold featured contributions by Waldmar Rößler, a thirty-four-year-old artist-soldier. On the last page of the issue, Rößler unfolds a grotesque sight: we witness a soldier staring across a barren landscape dotted by burial heaps that have been disturbed to reveal a dead soldier’s half-decomposed body (fig. 2.37).

\(^{39}\) Both Liebermann and Barlach represented refugees from Poland in the third and twelfth issues, respectively.

\(^{40}\) “Als der Dichter noch, selbst ein Flüchtling, für Rußlands Befreiung, nicht für den Zaren kämpfte.”
Rößler clarifies the scene with a hand-written, almost clinical caption: “Artillery Shells Exhume the Dead” (Die Granaten decken die Begrabenen wieder auf). Although Rößler obliterates some of the horror of the scene with a loose, dark pen, his image and caption collide to convey death’s failure to deliver lasting peace to the fallen soldiers. This grim message, however, shifts if we read Rößler’s contribution in the context of the entire page, alongside Gold’s own caption, which, by being set in type, captures the viewer’s attention. In contrast to the artist’s powerful description, Gold labels the image “Behind the Front Line in Flanders” (Hinter der Front in Flandern), thereby offsetting the macabre impact of Rößler’s original stand-alone contribution.

We have already seen that Gold was prepared to entirely exclude bleak subject matter from the magazine (such as Barlach’s “Mass Grave”), but this page reveals another dimension of Gold’s self-censorship efforts by offering us a glimpse into how he used the written word to divest a work of art of some its intended meaning.

In addition to enhancing or neutralizing the meaning of the visual through text, Gold also used captions to give a new context to the image. This is exemplified strongly in Kriegszeit’s fifty-sixth issue. A lithograph by Willy Jaeckel depicts a pre-industrial forest backdrop against which two primal figures are locked in a brutal combat (fig. 2.38). Jaeckel zooms in on a moment when the physically dominant man gathers strength to deliver a mortal blow to his opponent. His liquidy application of pigment not only foreshadows the bloody outcome of this encounter, but its caption also predicts “Serbia’s Fate” itself. Although this print falls easily in line with Kriegszeit’s imagery aimed at diminishing the enemy, the Jaeckel scholar Dagmar Klein questions such characterization. She argues that Jaeckel did not caption this work himself and that he titled only two out of the eight lithographs that he created for Kriegszeit. Klein
believes that instead of depicting Serbia’s downfall, this print relates to the David and Goliath story that Jaeckel was drawing at the time. Although we may never know whether the artist’s intention was to summon up Serbia’s downfall allegorically, Gold’s caption left no room for doubt of his own intention, thereby altering our understanding of Jaeckel’s work.

If we move beyond the single page to consider an entire spread, it becomes clear that the expanded physical space allowed Gold to creatively intensify his editorial efforts. Kriegszeit’s twenty-second issue (January 1915) demonstrates a particularly ingenious way in which Gold did this (fig. 2.39). The first half of the spread, contributed by Gaul, shows a pack of bears (i.e., Russians) running away from the viewer. The source of the bears’ anxiety is revealed in the caption, which proclaims “Hindenburg is coming!” (Hindenburg kommt!). The other half of the spread, created by Liebermann, depicts a German soldier as he lifts a rifle to take aim. The soldier is untethered to a narrative because Liebermann renders him nondescriptly, against a blank background. But a narrative does emerge once we zoom out of this page to behold the entire left-right spread. In this new and expanded context created by Gold, Gaul’s running bears and Liebermann’s rendering of a soldier enjoin to tell the story of Germany’s relentless offensive against Russia. In breaching the gulf between Gaul’s and Liebermann’s contributions, Gold created an entirely new image. To what extent the artists themselves were complicit in the recreation of their contributions is not known. But Gold’s role in supplying these prints with a new context cannot be denied.

Gold also used a spread to set up a dialogue between two separate and opposing concepts. The spread of Kriegszeit’s ninth issue (October 1914), created by Wilhelm Oesterle and Otto

---

41 Klein, Der Expressionist Willy Jaeckel, 14.
Hettner, allegorizes themes of victory and defeat (fig. 2.40). At left, Oesterle translates a hymn by the nineteenth-century Romantic poet Heinrich Heine\textsuperscript{42} into an image of a classical male nude lifting a sword in a field littered with his vanquished foes. In contrast to this scene of triumph, the second half of the spread presents Hettner’s rendering of a battalion on the verge of defeat: coiled around a cannon are a pile of dying men, whose agony is underscored by a horse rearing high above them to let out its last gasp. Despite a thematic contrast between Oesterle and Hettner’s prints, they form a cohesive unit that is expressed through parallels in dark, heavy lines, emotional intensity, and layout. This correspondence demonstrates Gold’s penchant for creating a spread across which opposing ideas are highlighted but also narratively and visually integrated.

Gold’s interest in presenting a coherent narrative flow can be found not only across spreads, but also across some of Kriegszeit’s most accomplished issues. For example, the twenty-fifth issue (February 1915) opens with Wilhelm Trübner’s print of Rupprecht von Bayern, the Crown Prince of Bavaria, who was celebrated for commanding the Sixth Army in the Battle of Lorraine in August 1914 (fig. 2.41).\textsuperscript{43} This portrait commences a series of Trübner’s three covers, each commemorating Germany’s present-day war heroes. It was most likely based on a press photo by the official court photographer Franz Granier (fig. 2.42). The Crown Prince’s determined gaze

\textsuperscript{42} “I am the sword, I am the Flame. I have lit you through darkness; and when the battle began, I fought in the first rank and led you on…Round about me lie the bodies of my friends, but we have triumphed. We have triumphed – but round me lie the bodies of my friends. Amid the jubilant songs of victory the dirge of the funeral is heard. But we have neither time for rejoicing nor for sorrow. The trumpets are sounding again – there shall be new and holier battles…I am the sword, I am the Flame.” Translation found in Jost Hermand and Robert C. Holub, eds., \textit{Heinrich Heine: Poetry and Prose} (New York, London: The Continuum Publishing Company, 1982), 55.

\textsuperscript{43} Tuchmann, \textit{Guns of August}, 244.
directs us toward the next page, which features a print by the artist-soldier Georg Kolbe. It shows a large plane surrounded by men, who, according to the artist’s handwritten caption, are engaged in air force training (fig. 2.43). Kolbe shares the page with Georg Herwegh’s 1841 poem “The German Fleet,” which was written in commemoration of the Hanseatic League’s 600th anniversary. In the context of this issue of Kriegszeit, however, Herwegh’s poem assumes a new function as a preamble to the print on the following page. Rendered by Ulrich Hübner, it depicts an action-packed battle on the high seas from a dramatic angle. Hübner situates the viewer onboard a battle cruiser, whose firing cannons deliver fatal blows to the two battleships in the distance. The narrative trajectory of this issue thus progresses from a specific German military leader on the cover to German heroes writ large, who defend country in the air and on the seas. The print on the last page by Arthur Kampf concludes this thread with an image of grateful Germans on the home front, clamoring in the public square to hear the news of the latest victories secured by the soldiers abroad (fig. 2.28).

The fifteenth issue (December 1914) unfolds in a similar fashion. It commences with Büttner’s image of an epic battle, which stands as a modern-day version of Albrecht Altdorfer’s The Battle of Alexander at Issus (fig. 2.44). This grand scene is bookended by a more personal rendering of the battlefield. On the back cover, Alexander Kolbe proffers his own experience of war in six captioned vignettes, which show him fighting against Cossacks on horseback and in hand-to-hand combat (fig. 2.45). These battlefield reports by artist-soldiers are complemented by allegorical imagery of the spread, contributed by artists on the home front. The left side of the spread features Gaul’s mockery of Serbia and Montenegro (countries that he represents as pigs and sheep, respectively) and the right side shows Hettner’s paean to German soldiers as they
battle under the protection of higher powers (fig. 2.46). This spread again reveals Gold’s interest in interrelating contrasting ideas: Germany’s enemies are lethargic, lazy, and weak compared to its heroes, who are dynamic, muscular, and determined. Gaul and Hettner’s spread, together with the front and back covers, coalesces into a single narrative that reports epic and personal war stories and combines front line reporting with allegory.

Once we consider prints that appeared in Kriegszeit across editions, we see a diminishing of Gold’s ability to affect the interpretation of the image. To illustrate this, we can compare Käthe Kollwitz’s lithograph as it appeared in the tenth issue of magazine (October 1914) to its special-edition counterpart. The difference between the two editions does not emerge from the image itself, which is identical in both material instantiations: an inert female figure with closed eyelids and crossed hands being enveloped by a black cocoon. The difference is instead established by the text that appears below the image. The special-edition print (fig. 2.47) bears Kollwitz’s own handwritten inscription (fig. 2.48) and replaces with a typeset caption. Thus, instead of reading the artist’s own title, “Waiting,” (Das Warten) the reader of the 4-page publication encounters the word “Trepidation” (Das Bangen) as the print’s title. At first this title change seems counterintuitive, considering that Gold’s tendency was to mitigate, not escalate, bleak submissions to Kriegszeit. But in fact his word choice cleverly diffuses the narrative that Kollwitz’s title connotes. By renaming the print “Trepidation,” Gold recalibrates Kollwitz’s image from one that conjures up a narrative of women at wartime, “waiting” to hear from their men on the battlefront, to one that represents a universal, allegorical figure of “trepidation.” Thus, while both titles express a state of anxiety that Kollwitz captures through expression of form, Gold’s word choice removes its specific source as the uncertainty about a soldier’s well-
being and its problematic parallels to the reality of war.

Prints by Gaul function in a similar fashion, except for the important distinction that it was the artist, not Gold, who used text to alter the meaning of images across editions. Take, for example, a lithograph that Gaul contributed to Kriegszeit’s forty-seventh issue (July 1915). In the special edition version of the print, he portrays a pack of bears plodding across the picture plane (fig. 2.49). These animals exist in a nondescript surrounding and are utterly devoid of any context. Yet Gaul accompanies the transfer of this imagery onto an issue (fig. 2.50) with a handwritten poem by Gotthold Ephraim Lessing entitled “The Flight,” which utterly changes the work’s narrative context: the trudging bears thus become fleeing bears, which connote Russian fright and cowardice.

Due to the paucity of records, it is difficult to ascertain whether Gold sought the involvement of Kriegszeit’s artists in the selection and placement of their contributions. Regardless, we know that as editor the decisions were indeed his. Indeed, examining Kriegszeit’s content across the four material sites of the page, spread, single issue, and multiple editions illuminates his consequential role. He established the magazine as more than the sum of its individual contributions. As a result, it serves as a record of his skillful creativity as an editor, forging connections between works both textual and visual. Gold’s particular genius was to convey the intensity of German artists’ commitment to their nation at wartime and their unified advancement of Kultur.

XI. Der Bildermann (“The Picture Man”)
Kriegszeit closed in late March of 1916, concluding its run with little fanfare about its closure. No mention was made of Alfred Gold, whose professional relationship with Paul Cassirer seems to have ended with the closing of the magazine. By all accounts, the production of Kriegszeit ceased not because the magazine failed to sell, but because Cassirer, demobilized in early 1916 because of a heart condition that contributed to his untimely death, returned from the front with a changed, war-weary outlook. Cassirer channeled this newfound perspective into a new publication, Der Bildermann, which he co-edited with Leo Kestenberg.

Kestenberg was an unusual choice for Cassirer’s new venture. Although he was an accomplished pianist and music educator, unlike Gold he was unfamiliar with either the publishing industry or the visual arts. Nonetheless, Kestenberg had much to recommend him. Before 1918, his professional work included staging popular piano recitals and performing as the member of the Kestenberg Trio. He was also an insider figure with a broad network of collaborators, friends, and acquaintances in Berlin’s cultural and political circles. This included well-to-do members of the high society (such as Cassirer’s wife, the actress Tilla Durieux, who was the first to made Kestenberg’s acquaintance), and revolutionary politicians Roxa Luxemburg

---

44 The only mention of the magazine’s closing came in the form of a two-sentence announcement on the bottom of the back cover, which stated curtly that the “Die ‘Kriegszeit’ stellt mit der vorliegenden Ausgabe ihr Erscheinen ein. Wir verweisen auf den beiliegenden Prospect.”

45 It seems that immediately after Kriegszeit closed, Gold left the country to work in the neutral Denmark; he regularly contributed articles to the newspaper Berliner Tageblatt from Copenhagen in 1916.

46 Cassirer died in 1926. He perished not from the gunshot wound he inflicted in a suicide attempt during divorce proceedings initiated by his wife, Tilla Durieux, but because his heart failed him during the recovery process.
and Karl Liebknecht. However unconventional, Kestenberg’s appointment indicates Cassirer’s desire to branch out beyond the direction that a trained editor would venture. It signals his growing interest in the politics of pacifism and socialism, which Kestenberg supported, and an affinity with Kestenberg’s friendly and amendable personality. In his memoir Kestenberg described himself as having close friendly relations with all authors of the Paul Cassirer’s publishing house, which he ran from 1916 until his appointment in 1918 as the music adviser within the new ministry of culture. In the memoir Kestenberg also recalled his response to being offered the position: “The job excited me and I accepted it gladly, although I had never run a magazine. But the idea appealed to me.” Kestenberg also claimed that Cassirer asked him to lead the magazine with a pacifist spirit, thus giving credence to the idea that in addition to a changing outlook on the type of art he wanted to sponsor, Cassirer was adopting a new political position as well. This was perhaps best encapsulated in Cassirer’s willingness to publish works by Rosa Luxemburg and thus offer her financial support during her internment in Breslau between August 1917 and November 1918.

XII. A Longing for Higher and Purer Things


50 Ibid, 35.
The launching of *Der Bildermann* coincided with the Battle of Verdun, the longest single battle of the First World War that resulted in a great number of casualties. As the grave news from the battlefield kept mounting, Kestenberg and Cassirer were in the process of outlining their vision for *Der Bildermann* in a prospectus that was included in *Kriegszeit’s* last issue (figs. 2.51a and 2.51b). Unlike Meier-Graefe’s broad concept of unity that set the stage for *Kriegszeit*, Kestenberg and Cassirer aimed at establishing a more sharply defined program for their new venture:

In addition to our Volk’s natural and self-evident interest in the feelings and images of war, during these last war months their love and passion for any and all art—regardless of its subject—has grown daily and has even become stronger than during peacetime. Despite all the twists of fate and hardship, the passion for beauty and inwardness [Innerlichkeit] has grown in us all, and it appears that the belief in the final moral victory has given rise to the hope in the rebirth of art and art appreciation.

Despite the horror of the times, our spirit has remained faithful to the old gods, in the midst of war we want to use our eyes as we used them before the war, even take pleasure as we once did. The strain of war has taught us to look horror calmly in the face, but it has also reawakened our longing for higher and purer things.

With this realization in mind, on April 1, 1916 we are publishing a new art magazine entitled *Der Bildermann: Lithographs for the German People*, which is not exclusively limited to the images of war but is amenable to anything that is artistically rendered.

….. *Der Bildermann* wants to bring broad circles in direct touch with art, the touch that is not attained through knowledge about art but is conveyed from the artist directly to the friend of the arts through feeling.

Since it seems to us that this effect should not only be delivered by visual arts, we will introduce old and new *Volkslieder* from the field of poetry, which will be carefully printed onto individual pages alongside artistic embellishments; these may fittingly be displayed on walls as speaking pictures. Thus we want to launch a people’s magazine with the best that the beautiful German art and German poetry can engender…

51 “In unserem Volke ist während dieser Kriegsmonate neben dem natürlichen und selbstverständlichen Interesse für die Empfindungen und die Bilder des Krieges die Liebe und die Sehnsucht nach den Werken jeglicher Kunst, gleichgültig welcher Gegenstand behandelt ist, von Tag zu Tag wieder erstarkt und sogar stärker geworden, als im Frieden war. Trotz aller Schicksalsschläge und Mühsale ist die Sehnsucht nach
It is difficult to read this passage as anything but Cassirer and Kestenberg’s implicit critique of Kriegszeit’s two major features: first, the magazine’s steadfast commitment to war as its sole subject matter; and second, its emphasis on content that rarely departed from glorifying Germany’s might, denouncing the enemy, or calling for unity and sacrifice.

In contrast to Kriegszeit’s narrow thematic and ideological concerns, the aim Cassirer and Kestenberg had for Der Bildermann was to establish a broad direction, undergirded by a “longing for higher and purer things,” which they anchored to lofty terms, such as love, passion, pleasure, beauty, and most importantly, Innerlichkeit. The concept of Innerlichkeit—a word that is difficult to translate, but which connotes the inner self, interiority, innerness, and introspection—holds a key to our understanding of Cassirer’s shifting view of art’s relationship to the subject of war.

Innerlichkeit describes a condition or even a tradition that is said to have beset Germans in the modern period. Gordon A. Craig defines it as a tendency to regard “the external world and its works as being of no legitimate concern,” thereby making “aesthetic contemplation and the

Schönheit und Innerlichkeit in allen gewachsen, und es scheint, daß mit dem Glauben an den endgültigen moralischen Sieg auch die Hoffnung erwachsen ist, der Kunst und der Kunstpflege erthehe ein neuer Frühling. In dieser Erkenntnis veröffentlichen wir vom 1. April 1916 an eine neue Kunstzeitschrift unter dem Titel “Der Bildermann. Steinzeichnungen fürs deutsche Volk”, die sich nicht ausschließlich auf die Bilder des Kriegs beschränkt, sondern jedem künstlerisch behandelten Stoffe offen steht.....Der Bildermann will weite Kreise mit der Kunst in unmittelbare Fühlung bringen, nicht in die Fühlung, die durch Wissen über Kunst erreicht wird, sondern in die, die mittels der Empfindung sich vom Künstler direkt zum Kunstfreund überträgt Es scheint uns, daß wir der bildenden Kunst nicht allein diese Wirkung überlassen dürfen, und so werden wir aus dem Bereiche der Poesie alte und neue Volkslieder bringen, sorgfältig auf einzelne Blätter gedruckt, mit Künstlerzierat, geeignet an den Wänden als sprechendes Bild angeheftet zu werden. So wollen wir versuchen, mit dem Besten, was deutsche schöne Kunst und deutsche Dichtkunst schafft, ein Volksblatt zu gründen, und so hoffen wir, daß durch dieses Volksblatt festgehalten wird, was unser deutsches Volk während des Krieges erlebt, nicht nur die kriegerische Gegenwart, der wir uns nicht entziehen werden, soder auch die Vergangenheit und die schönere Zukunft.” Quoted in Feilchenfeldt and Brandis, Paul Cassirer Verlag, 511-512.
formulation of theory ends in themselves.”\textsuperscript{52} Innerlichkeit is often identified with German Romantics, who exalted withdrawal from society and cultivation of “the inner voice.” But the phenomenon is also closely associated with the German middle class in the wake of the failed 1848 revolution. We read in Peter Watson’s \textit{The German Genius}, for example, that having been denied political participation, the members of the middle class began to eschew political and social engagement in favor of cultivating a rich inner life in the realms of art and culture.\textsuperscript{53}

Although this retreat was not without its detractors—Karl Marx famously denounced it as the “Germany’s plight” (Deutsche Misere)\textsuperscript{54}—and although the tendency toward Innerlichkeit receded in the wake of the political crisis in the summer of 1914 that united the German nation in pursuit of war, the phenomenon started to again gain traction in 1916. To explain the renewed interest in Innerlichkeit we need not look further than the German army’s inability to break the stalemate on the Western front and the harsh conditions of the winter of 1916-17, known as the Turnip Winter or Hunger Winter, which threatened life on the home front.

In light of the war’s worsening toll on Germany’s military and civilian population, Cassirer and Kestenberg’s idealist emphasis on the "passion for beauty and inwardness" as a catalyst for the creation of an autonomous aesthetic realm in the form of a periodical publication is initially understandable, but also ultimately difficult to reconcile. Their aim was to channel \textit{Der}


Bildermann (The Picture Man), a pre-industrial, itinerant figure who sold copper engravings at fairs and festivals. Max Slevogt—one of Der Bildermann’s key contributors, who suggested the magazine’s title—created a vignette for the masthead showing the Picture Man on a stage wearing an image-filled sandwich board in the company of a younger assistant, who distributes prints to an attentive crowd (fig. 2.52). The Picture Man epitomizes the role that Cassirer and Kestenberg wanted to play as patriotic agents of Kultur, in charge of creating edifying “lithographs for the German Volk” that would capture the people’s interest and bring value to their lives. But what imagery could deliver on this promise in the context of the war’s worsening conditions?

XIII. The Realities of War Test a Longing for Ideals

Despite Cassirer and Kestenberg’s desire to swing the pendulum away from politically-charged content toward the realm of ideal beauty and pleasure and thus a more traditional notion of Kultur, many Der Bildermann contributors struggled to veer from the course first set by Kriegszeit. Even as their imagery shifted to reflect growing uncertainty, it remained deeply mired in the subject of war. During Der Bildermann’s eighteen-issue run (from March to December 1916), works by contributors Max Slevogt and Ottomar Starke illustrate how the realities of war encroached on Cassirer and Kestenberg’s idealist program for the magazine.

One of Germany’s best-known representatives of modernism, Max Slevogt reflected this tension in a series of ten prints under the title “Signs of the Times” (Symbole der Zeit). He launched the series in Der Bildermann’s first issue with an image that depicts a figure registering
the third year of war on a board, whose large expanse indicates the conflict’s potentially infinite duration (fig. 2.53). There is no hint of triumph in Slevogt’s print. On the contrary, the pitch-black lithographic mark on the staircase, which bleeds over steps, suggests bloodshed and violence. Slevogt fleshes out the resultant sense of foreboding in the barely discernible background, where dead bodies litter the graveyard. This narrative thread crescendos eleven issues later, in the seventh installment of the series, with a lithograph that shows a seemingly endless procession of women of all ages grieving for dead soldiers entombed in a mass grave (fig. 2.54). The poetic caption that accompanies the image intensifies the mourners’ anguish: “Eternal pain covers all lands, Across borders there are no ends.” (Über die Grenzen in weitem Land, Unendlicher Schmerz den Bogen spannt.) Slevogt most certainly based this image on his battlefront experience. Immediately after the war began, he volunteered as a war painter, only to return to Germany in November 1914. His disillusioned attitude is evidenced clearly in his war diary: “Trenches, how awful—like ridiculous figures that children make of clay, and so terribly battered!! I made a stop to paint watercolors of the dead, reluctantly and with much unease.”\(^\text{55}\)

Slevogt’s poignant response to the war finds its satirical counterpart in prints by Ottomar Starke. Across a series of six lithographs entitled “The New Society” (Die neue Gesellschaft), Starke registers deep disgust with war profiteers. The exploitative practices that led to their ascent are explored in a print Starke contributed to Der Bildermann’s twelfth issue (September 1916 (fig. 2.55). Here the artist shows two feeble-looking men in the act of counting money. The evidence of their greedy and corrupt dealings emerges from the caption, which also doubles as

the men’s business motto: “We work only for 300% net profit.” In order to make clear that these profits do not have a larger public benefit for the nation, Starke proffers another image, in which he stages an encounter between a sharply dressed war profiteer and a down-on-his-luck war cripple (fig. 2.56). The vast gulf that separates the man who served his country and the man who served himself is conveyed through appearance, but also through interaction; the profiteer responds to the cripple’s plea for charity not with compassion and magnanimity, but complete disregard. Even as the profiteer firmly attempts to look away from the war veteran, his stiff body language and clenched cigar-chomping reveal his awareness of the beggar’s presence. The profiteer shows little remorse or accountability. His allegiance is to the pursuit of his own well-being, not his countrymen’s.

Slevogt and Starke’s work in Der Bildermann exposed the disparity between people for whom war was a source of deep emotional and physical suffering and individuals for whom war was a source of great wealth. By eliciting emotional responses that oscillated between lamentation and anger, Slevogt and Starke raised doubts about conditions created by the war. Although powerful, their bleak and sobering imagery represents only about a half of Der Bildermann’s content. The remainder departs dramatically from this track and instead responds more directly to Cassirer and Kestenberg’s call for a return to beauty in art.

Take Max Liebermann’s contribution to Der Bildermann’s tenth issue (August 1916), for example (fig. 2.57). Here the artist reverts to his plein-air sensibilities to show a summertime scene of leisure. At the banks of the river Elbe, middle-class men and women lounge in an open-air beer garden. The wind gently rustles the trees. Far off in the distance, boats glide along the placid lake. Nothing in Liebermann’s image hints at disorder or unrest. A sense of gentle calm
fills the scene. The same is true of Liebermann’s other contribution to Der Bildermann, which was proffered as a loose-leaf insert in the magazine’s fifth issue (June 1916) (fig. 2.58). Here Liebermann illustrates a poem by the nineteenth-century writer Gottfried Keller, which describes one man’s encounter with three laundresses who inflame his passions. Liebermann captures a picturesque scene to reflect the poem’s exaltation of love, pleasure, and affirmation of life in the spirit of the poem’s ending line: “Schön ist doch das Leben!” (Life is beautiful!)

Like Liebermann, most of Der Bildermann’s Expressionist contributors created work that used nature as a backdrop. In the magazine’s ninth issue (August 1916), the artist Otto Mueller portrayed nudes luxuriating on the shore, amid tall grasses and palm trees (fig. 2.59). His sketchy, crude rendering and the theme of man’s communion with nature are typical of Expressionism. So too are landscapes contributed by Mueller’s colleagues from Die Brücke group. Erich Heckel’s snow-covered locale and Ernst Ludwig Kirchner’s alpine vista exhibit a rough-hewn character that distinguishes the Expressionist re-interpretation of the picturesque ideal (figs. 2.60 and 2.61).

Other Expressionists including Oskar Kokoschka and Ernst Barlach embraced religious themes in fulfillment of Cassirer and Kestenberg’s “longing for higher and purer things.” In his seven-print “Passion” series,56 Kokoschka drew inspiration from the New Testament. The lithographs in this series chronicle various stages of the Christ’s life in random order, including the “The Kiss of Judas” and “Crucifixion” (figs 2.62 and 2.63). Kokoschka’s expressive and

56 The catalogue raisonne of Kokoschka’s prints identifies his contributions to Der Bildermann under this title; the series was never identified in the magazine as such. Friedrich Welz and Hans M. Wingler, Oskar Kokoschka: Das druckgraphische Werk, 1906-1975 (Salzburg: Verlag Galerie Welz, 1975), 98-101.
distorting gestural style, as well as his ability to orchestrate a psychologically charged atmosphere, is on full display in these lithographs. The work also testifies to Kokoschka’s debt to the Old Masters, especially to Lucas Cranach the Elder and Rembrandt, whose oeuvre he studied closely.57

Kokoschka had drawn motifs from Christian iconography even prior to the war. The subject of Christ’s crucifixion held a particular interest for him, which he related back to his own biography as early as 1912.58 But Kokoschka’s identification with Christ’s suffering becomes more compelling in light of his horrific war experience. Swept up by patriotic enthusiasm, Kokoschka volunteered as a soldier in the Austro-Hungarian cavalry immediately after war was declared; by 1916, he was discharged from active service, having sustained serious injuries including a bullet through the head and a bayonet stab in his side. Despite parallel connections that we may make between Christ’s and Kokoschka’s own suffering, it is important not to read the “Passion” series simply as a visual manifestation of Kokoschka’s inner anguish. Instead, prints in this series resonate with the larger tendency in Kokoschka’s oeuvre to reach deep into the psyche to contemplate the human condition and our struggle to transcend it. This highly emotional process of introspection is directly in line with the program that Cassirer and Kestenberg had outlined for Der Bildermann.

In contrast to Gold’s strong editorial presence in Kriegszeit, Kestenberg and Cassirer managed Der Bildermann in a less dogmatic manner. By eschewing a firm and coherent


ideological direction, Kestenberg and Cassirer allowed disparate and even contradictory ideas to co-exist, even within a single issue. Nowhere is this more on display than in *Der Bildermann’s* eighth issue spread (July 1916) (fig. 2.64). The left side of the spread features a lithograph by Gaul, which depicts a pastoral scene with butterflies in mid-flight. This peaceful scene, suffused with sunlight and nature’s quiet murmurs, exists in perfect harmony with Christian Morgenstern’s poem, extolling the pleasures offered by a meadow on a summer day. Gaul’s image, pitched at a low angle, even takes into account the poem’s title, “Lying in a Meadow” (Mattenrast).

The other half of the spread features a lithograph by Heinrich Zille, an artist whose vernacular imagery is inextricably linked to Berlin and its inhabitants. Here Zille takes viewers inside an orderly, but humble, domestic space occupied by a working-class woman and her four young children. The family members stare at two objects on the table that unlock the narrative of the scene: an Iron Cross and an opened letter, which delivered the news of the husband and father’s death on the battlefield. Zille portrays the mother with downcast eyes to register her deep sorrow, but he also captures her stoic demeanor to imply her awareness of the duty to fend for her children during and after this tragic moment. Nothing could be further from this dark, solemn scene than Gaul and Morgenstern’s paean to summer’s bucolic pleasures. Yet Kestenberg and Cassirer allows the two extremes to converge and co-exist in a jarring juxtaposition that would have been entirely antithetical to Gold’s editorial vision.

This is not to say that Kestenberg was uninterested in using a full spread to unfold parallel and mutually reinforcing narratives. The spread of *Der Bildermann’s* twelfth issue (September 1916) is a case in point. Kestenberg pairs Starke’s image of two greedy profiteers with Zille’s
portrayal of everyday Berliners waiting for food (fig. 2.65). Kestenberg makes a similar editorial decision for the spread in Der Bildermann’s fourteenth issue (October 1916) (fig. 2.66). Here, Kestenberg establishes a link between Gaul’s monkeys on the left and Starke’s female protagonists on the right, who appear to be in the middle of an elegant evening. Despite the women’s elaborate dress, they do not exude ease and sophistication. On the contrary, their faces exhibit simian features and their fussy headwear suggests the jungle landscape inhabited by Gaul’s monkeys. The caption below Starke’s image captures a snippet of the women’s hushed conversation—“…in former times my husband was…/….and mine…..”—that unmask’s their spouses’ shadowy ascent to power. The women’s vain and useless way of life is underscored by a caption that accompanies Gaul’s image. In today’s topsy-turvy world, it seems, people have ceded their role as guardians of the order of things to animals, declaring, “If this continues, we will also have to fight for civilization.” An analysis of these two spreads indicates Kestenberg’s awareness of how a single lithograph’s narrative could be expanded onto a spread for an enhanced form of storytelling.

After eighteen issues and 112 lithographs, Der Bildermann ended its run in December 1916. According to Kestenberg’s memoir, Cassirer closed down the magazine not because some of its critical content had raised red flags with the censors, but because the magazine failed to sell. Was the public that made Kriegszeit a success just not ready for Der Bildermann’s changed attitude toward the war? Or did the presence of disparate thematic threads confuse and alienate

59 Gaul’s own writing differs greatly from the script that appears on this page. Since similar handwriting accompanies other lithographs featured in Der Bildermann, it seems more likely that this caption was contributed by Kestenberg.

60 Kestenberg, Bewegte Zeiten, 36.
the public? We may never be able to adequately respond to these questions. We do know, however, based on Kokoschka’s letter to Kestenberg, that the contributing artists bemoaned *Der Bildermann*’s demise, having also been left with unanswered questions: “When will you again be publishing a periodical? I so love being a contributor, having to formulate my ideas quickly. And your objectives were so inspiring; what is the reason that you are not carrying them out?”

My reading of *Der Bildermann*’s content shows that the publication defined itself in opposition to *Kriegszeit*. Because of Kestenberg and Cassirer’s romantic notions about art as a source of truth and beauty, contributors to *Der Bildermann* were given free rein to express different points of view. In doing so, the publication became characterized by irreconcilable tensions that were made possible through an open-minded and tolerant editorial approach. In this way *Der Bildermann*’s split identity marks a transition away from *Kriegszeit*. Its divergent content foreshadows postwar divisions, as well as the spirit of experimentation, that would again complicate the answer to the central question, “was ist Deutsch?”

---

Chapter Three

RESHAPING THE PUBLIC SPHERE FOR ART

I. Introduction

Both Kriegszeit and its successor Der Bildermann opened with images of crowds. Kriegszeit launched on August 31, 1914, with a cover that was drawn by the esteemed Berlin artist and father figure of German Impressionism, Max Liebermann (fig. 3.1). It depicts a mass of people surging toward the Imperial Palace in Berlin, whose attention is directed at the diminutive figure occupying the building’s Baroque balcony. Both this figure’s identity and the source of the crowd’s frenzied energy are identified in Liebermann’s handwritten caption below the image: “I no longer see any political parties, now I see only Germans,” a famous statement made by Kaiser Wilhelm II on August 4, 1914.¹

Almost two years later, on April 5, 1916, Der Bildermann opened with a similar image by another leading practitioner of German Impressionism, Max Slevogt (fig. 3.2). Yet in contrast to Liebermann’s crowd, Slevogt’s gathering is more dispersed and individualized. The figure addressing the people is neither sovereign nor a luminary; he is the Picture Man, an itinerant folk character who used images to educate and enlighten people. Slevogt depicts him on a dais displaying and describing images to an engaged public.

*Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann*’s first issue cover images are frequently singled out as representing the shift in the German public’s opinion of the First World War from its beginning to its middle stages. Thus, Liebermann’s crowd is the literal manifestation of *Hurrapatriotismus* (rah-rah patriotism), which formed the core of what became known as *Augusterlebnis* (the August experience) and eventually culminated in Germany declaring war on Russia on August 1, 1914, and on France two days later. The historian Jeffrey Verhey, described the first month of the war as

...a month-long patriotic festival. In the first three weeks of August Germans said goodbye to their troops, smothering them with flowers and so much chocolate that the Red Cross asked the population to be less generous; the soldiers were getting sick. At the end of August Germans celebrated the news of the first successful battles with exuberance, as if the war had been won. The national flag flew everywhere….²

By contrast, Slevogt’s more subdued and composed gathering represents the waning of the *Kriegsbegeisterung* and patriotic exuberance that took hold as the number of casualties mounted and it became clear that the war was not over “before the leaves have fallen from the trees.”³

This reading of Liebermann and Slevogt’s lithographs provides an important insight into the political moment in which they were made, but their significance does not stop there. It is important to look beyond the atmosphere and feeling that they convey and examine the changing dynamics of the crowd these images were both documenting and addressing, in addition to the shifting identities and relationships to art that are implied by these images.


³ “You will be home before the leaves have fallen from the trees.”—The pronouncement that Wilhelm II made to German troops as they departed for the front. Tuchman, *Guns of August*, 141.
II: Germany’s Modernization and Its Effects

*Gründerboom*, or Founders’ boom, describes the period of short and speculative, but also profound, economic growth that Germany experienced shortly after the formation of the nation state in 1871.⁴ The resulting spread of national prosperity was expressed by its net domestic product, which grew during the second half of the nineteenth century nearly four times as quickly as it did during the century’s first half.⁵ Stoked by the excitement of Prussia’s victory over France, the promise of war reparations, as well as prospect of a new marketplace, the economic development, despite some ups and downs, triggered the industrial boom.⁶ The accelerated pace of German industrialization can be measured by the flourishing rate of its exports, which in this period surpassed those of Great Britain and the United States.⁷ On the whole, industrial production increased fivefold in the second half of the nineteenth century.⁸ Banks and businesses multiplied in response to this remarkable growth, and private fortunes came into being. As David Clay Large notes, the newly established German Empire “was born with a golden spoon in its mouth.”⁹

---


⁵ Ibid, 11.

⁶ Ibid, 337.


⁹ Large, *Berlin*, 12.
The rapid pace of German industrialization provided the precondition for the sustained population growth. Between 1871 and 1914, Germany’s population exploded, mostly in the urban areas. Previously a country where nearly two-thirds of the population lived in the country, Germany had shifted significantly; now, nearly that same percentage lived in large metropolitan centers. The process of urbanization was most dramatically felt in Berlin, the capital of the unified German Empire, where newcomers arrived by the thousands. The city saw a remarkable increase from 826,000 inhabitants in 1871 to over one million in 1877. By 1910, the population surpassed the two million mark, making Berlin the world’s third largest city in the world (after London and New York). Most new residents came from Germany, but a sizable number of Jewish newcomers arrived from Eastern Europe. The liberal business climate and ever-growing job offerings in areas of commerce, banking, journalism, the arts, and the law made their integration possible.

The forces of modernization that dramatically transformed Berlin into a major metropolis during the second half of the nineteenth century also led to dramatic social and cultural changes. Although this “Boomtown on the [River] Spree” was identified with the Hohenzollern dynasty, it also became the city of middle and working classes, whose contact with the arts was

---


13 Large, *Berlin*, 12.
conditioned by the new institutions that emerged under the influence of accelerated economic
growth and development.

III: Expanded Public Sphere for Art, 1880-1914

Prior to 1914, the visual diet of Berlin’s residents was saturated by celebrations of Prussia’s
military past and displays of power. This “age of festivities” was marked by endless pageants,
marches, and processions, which were spearheaded by the Kaiser, especially during the national
holidays. He held such public outings in high regard, arguing that they were “particularly
comforting in these fast-moving times, which are so dominated by economic and political
interests, for they force one to halt for a moment in the haste of the working life and to look at
the past.” And while such affairs of pomp and circumstance were both prevalent and pervasive
in Berlin after the unification, the city’s visual landscape became more rich and varied during the
last two decades of the nineteenth century.

This period is marked by the advent of a new exhibition system that was dominated by vastly
expanded showing of artworks, which dramatically changed the way people looked at art. The
intimate presentations of small-scale artworks by local artists that characterized early nineteenth
century grew and expanded in the 1880s and 1890s into “great exhibitions.” These officially
sanctioned showcases for art were modeled on “international” or “world” expositions, which

---

14 Annika Mombauer and Wilhelm Deist, The Kaiser: New Research on Wilhelm II’s Role in Imperial
came of age in the middle of the nineteenth century. They first appeared in Munich (via London) in large halls that were filled with thousands of artworks by both German and foreign artists, who increased the size of their creations in order to attract attention among copious other works on display from academic paintings of military, mythological, and biblical scenes to art that embraced more modern expressions.

Berlin was quick to catch up to this phenomenon. In fact, Germany’s most lavish great exhibition was staged there in 1886 to mark the centennial anniversary of the Academy’s first salon. Its aim was to put Berlin on the map with other, more established European capitals, as well as to signal the city’s ascendance as the country’s preeminent place for visual arts. The 1886 centennial exhibition was thus more than simply a cultural event of the year; it became a platform for national and civic pride, as well as a way to legitimize the Empire and consolidate the nation. The exhibition attracted a mass audience of well over one million visitors who purchased admission tickets totaling one million Mark: five times the amount of the previous exhibition in 1884, and thus fundamentally changing how people interacted with art.

Although the great exhibitions achieved unprecedented levels of success both financially and in terms of attendance, the conditions they set up for the appreciation of visual art unleashed

---


16 Six major art exhibitions were hosted in Munich’s cavernous Glaspalast (Crystal Palace) between 1858 and 1888. For more, see Maria Makela, *The Munich Secession: Art and Artists in Turn-of-the-Century Munich* (Princeton, NY: Princeton University Press, 1990), 19-57.


heated debates in art circles. Critics were especially alarmist in raising objections to: 1) overcrowding of people and artworks as a barrier to experiencing the art; 2) impoverished presentation of paintings and sculptures; and 3) the socializing element, which trumped art appreciation; 4) various entertainment and recreational activities that one could enjoy on exhibition grounds. These sources of contention give rise to one of the key questions besetting the nineteenth century art scene: How to reconcile high-minded demands for proper contemplation of the art with new, more modern opportunities to see art?

The great exhibitions also gave birth to a new entity, the modern art public, thus raising another thorny question: who was this new audience for art? The very origin of the term “public” hints at the root problem: coined in France in 1750s, le public referred to a small group of the newly established upper-middle classes, whose wealth was not inherited but earned through capitalist enterprises, a fact that the members of the group had an obligation to conceal. Historically, therefore, “the public” was seen as a potentially disruptive entity with troublesome origins. The parameters of “the public” were rigidly defined and included only an elite group of people.

With the emergence of public art exhibitions and institutions in the second half of the nineteenth century, the public’s rarefied and exclusive domain was eroding, thereby bringing the more dubious nature of its origins to the fore. Yet as an ever-present phenomenon in the daily life of the modern day metropolis, the public could not be overlooked. Sociologists wrestled to

---

19 Lewis, *Art for All*, 93-139.

understand it, artists strove to depict it, and art critics inveighed against its influence. This came to a fever pitch in the 1893, with the publication of Eugen von Franquet’s *Schaupöbel* (Exhibition Mob). 

In her book *Art for All? The Collision of Modern Art and the Public in Late Nineteenth-Century Germany*, Beth Irwin Lewis wrote extensively about the growing rift between art connoisseurs and the public during the last two decades of the nineteenth century. She devotes a chapter in this groundbreaking study to charting the growing contempt leveled by the art press against the emerging public, whose identity coalesced around the figure of the *Schaupöbel* or *Kunstpöbel*. The product of the great exhibitions, he is variously disparaged as “ignorant,” “insensitive to art,” “uncultured,” “crass,” and “philistine.” Lewis notes that:

> Class bias and elitist snobbery underlay these critiques in which the connoisseur from the cultivated middle class expressed dismay over the invasion of common folk, whose greatest joy was reputed to lie only in a glimpse of sensational paintings followed by a bottle of beer in the garden pub… In the first years of the 1890s these people—the uncultured public—far from being seen as capable of becoming educated patrons of art, were increasingly perceived as debasing and degrading art exhibitions by their overwhelming numbers and crude tastes.

In addition to noting the backlash against the great exhibitions, Lewis refers to the growing fear that art appreciation was at risk. She also argues that the notion of the “public” was tied up with a

---

21 The notion of the public attracted the attention of sociologists, most notably: Robert E. Park, *Masse und Publikum* (Bern: Lack und Grunau, 1904); and Ferdinand Tönnies, *Kritik der öffentlichen Meinung* (Berlin, J. Springer, 1922). Both strove to come to terms with phenomena such as the public, the mass, and the crowd.


23 Lewis, *Art for All*, 141-183.

24 Ibid, 144.
hot button issue of the day: namely, the demographic shift that saw Berlin becoming the city of middle and working classes. The sphere of art that had been reserved for a small educated, wealthy, and intellectual minority was now invaded by an ascendant and more economically diverse public. Since the members of the working classes in search of entertainment were more likely to take part in leisure activities outside art exhibition halls (such as festivals and dances), the “philistines” under attack in the art press hailed from Bildungsbürgertum, the cultural middle-class. This complex and varied social category was comprised of prominent and propertied middle class members from the fields of business, finance, industry, law, and the arts; in other words, the social strata that sat between nobility and the lower middle classes.  

In light of the deepening frustration that the great exhibition and its attendant mass audience would have on the rarefied realm of art, the last decade of the nineteenth century saw several efforts at course-correction. “The public” was still a group to reach, but there was a courting of a different kind of public, a contraction of focus from the masses to more discriminating individuals. A proliferation of art galleries was increasingly introduced as viable venues for the display and contemplation of modern art. By the end of 1904, Berlin’s robust gallery scene “offered a remarkable panoply of artists” of “unrivaled” variety; on the whole, the city was


considered second only to Paris as a bastion for contemporary art.\textsuperscript{27} Among the most important Berlin galleries at this time was Paul Cassirer’s, noted for its commitment to both German Secessionist artists and “French artists with a proven historical reputation.”\textsuperscript{28} Critic Hans Rosenhagen once distinguished Cassirer’s gallery by defining his intentions and audience this way:

Paul Cassirer does not have the inordinate ambition to attract the public at large to his salon; instead he wishes to acquire the applause of the [connoisseur] (\textit{Kenner})… Cassirer disdains cheap success and remains always bent on showing his visitors only the most stimulating kind of art. However, he therefore demands much of the art understanding of his subscribers.\textsuperscript{29}

Art magazines, too, offered another venue for the public to encounter the arts. \textit{Pan}, a luxurious, expensive, and influential journal that published for five years in the mid-nineties, was founded with the commitment of focusing on the “exclusive character of art… a purely artistic publication that is not guided by the wishes of the general public.”\textsuperscript{30} Crafted for an elite audience of in-the-know aesthetes and priced at an annual fee of seventy-five Marks for the basic edition, \textit{Pan}’s issues were out of reach for most Germans. While \textit{Pan} was widely received either skeptically or ambivalently, those behind the magazine were confident in their approach; they were not after all readers, just the right ones.

In each of these examples of new venues for art, there is a unique relationship with the art market. The implied courted public of cultured middle- and upper-class Germans with means is
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\end{flushright}
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\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 76.
\end{flushright}
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\textsuperscript{29} Jensen, \textit{Marketing Modernism}, 78.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{30} Lewis, \textit{Art for All}, 269.
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encouraged not simply to appreciate or contemplate art, but also to become a consumer of it, to be a patron of its makers. In trying to elevate people’s taste, and turn them into connoisseurs, the gallery owners and magazine editors were in effect encouraging patronage and purchase of new modern art, working outside the officially sanctioned system of great exhibitions and established institutions.

IV: 1914—The Turning Point

Germany went to war in August 1914. This new and unprecedented chapter in the country’s history reignited an interest in and enthusiasm for the idea of a nation, conferring upon it a quasi-religious status. Many understood that the war was as much about territorial gains as about surviving and preserving the principles upon which the German nation was built. With so much on the line, nothing less than patriotic solidarity expressed through the full cooperation and participation of the country’s citizens would rule the day. As A.J.P. Taylor succinctly noted: “In the age of mass warfare, nations had to be told that they were fighting for some noble cause.”

The narrative of nationwide exhilaration and mobilization has begun to be rewritten by historians such as Jeffrey Verhey and Jay Winter. While their revisionist scholarship has added more complexity and nuance to our understanding of the popular response to the war, it has not controverted how its outbreak unleashed a cataclysmic social and psychological experience. The


war set events in motion that irrevocably altered the way that people lived and institutions operated. For German artists and those who belonged to their milieu, the war acted as an instrument of profound change, bringing them in touch with a new cause and a renewed sense of purpose. It also created conditions that propelled them to re-examine ways in which their professional output could align with public needs. With his two distinct and important publishing efforts, Cassirer would proffer a way in which it could be done.

V: *Kriegszeit*’s New Vision for Art and Artists

By August 11, 1914, already 260,000 German men had signed up to serve in the war. Many artists joined this mobilization effort, inspired by the patriotic call to service. Several are well-known today (such as Oskar Kokoschka, Franz Marc, Max Slevogt, Otto Dix, and Max Beckmann), but a great number were artists whom art history has overlooked. The artists’ involvement in the war was a matter of great national pride. An article titled “Visual Artists on the Front,” published in *Berliner Tageblatt*, one of Berlin’s most important and widely read newspapers, proudly declared that the “number of German artists on the front is growing more

---

33 Verhey’s and Winter’s research do not topple the long-held notion that the enthusiasm for the war had seized the majority of public intellectuals, academics, authors, and artists—in other words, Bürgertum’s cultural representatives—who saw it as a potentially renewing, life-affirming event. Even after the death of colleague August Macke, the artist Franz Marc (who would die fighting in 1916) wrote in his friend’s obituary: “The blood sacrifice that turbulent nature demands of nations in great wars they offer with tragic enthusiasm, without regret. The whole clasps loyal hands and bears the loss proudly under peals of victory.” Quoted in Susanna Partsch, *Marc* (Cologne: Taschen, 2001), 89.


35 The circulation of *Berliner Tageblatt* increased from 220,000 in 1913 to 300,000 in 1918. Niall Ferguson, *The Pity of War* (New York: Basic Books, 1999), 243.
and more” while proceeding to list the names of Berlin artists who had joined the army ranks and those who had been invited by the army to serve as official war artists.36

Although the artist’s participation in the war was a cause for celebration, their departure caused a break in how the art community functioned. In response, the art community rallied to support its own. Numerous fundraising events were staged immediately following the outbreak of the war, including those by Cassirer and his wife, Tilla Durieux.37 Cassirer’s most significant demonstration of leadership in the war effort was the launching of Kriegszeit, a publication that aimed to support the artists, but also sought to re-imagine the encounter between art and the public, while also rethinking whom that public is and whom it could be.

If we consider Kriegszeit as a collaborative creation of its publisher, editor, and upwards of fifty contributors,38 it becomes clear that the magazine operated on a few basic, mutually-reinforcing principles. The first emerges from its list of contributors, which indicates artists across a broad age spectrum. Among visual artists, the youngest, Oskar Nerlinger, was twenty

---

36 Berliner Tageblatt, evening edition, no. 495, September 29, 1914.


38 This number takes into consideration only visual artists; the number doubles when we consider the writers and poets who contributed to the magazine.
one years old in 1914; by contrast, the oldest, Max Liebermann, celebrated his sixty-seventh birthday that year. This multi-generational span is significant when we take into account the growing social divisions that had developed between young and older Germans in the years leading up to the First World War. The historian Robert Wohl situates this phenomenon against the emergent Youth Movement in Germany, which had its roots in late nineteenth-century youth organizations including the famous and influential back-to-nature Wandervögel, but which “soon outgrew the limits and functions of an association of recreation clubs and eventually came to play an ideological and even a political role in pre-1914 German life.”

Lacking neither enthusiasm nor idealism, the Youth Movement echoed the ethos of the various turn-of-the-century life-reform movements of vegetarianism, nudism, and clothing reform and their quest for a revitalized Germany. Its particular adversary, however, was not modernization and its ills, but patriarchal authority. The world of fathers and teachers that took shape and was popularized in novels by Hermann Hesse, Frank Wedekind, and Heinrich Mann was characterized as overbearing, ruled by false manners and morals. A contrast was proposed, most notably, by Friedrich Nietzsche’s paean to the strong-willed individual, the Übermensch—the super-human figure who railed against social conventions, and which emerged as a symbol of empowerment for the adult-weary youth (Jugend). Advocating a frank and unrestrained

---

expression of free will, young Germans aimed to create a new culture, seeking nothing less than Germany’s complete social, cultural, and spiritual renewal.⁴⁰

Against this social phenomenon, Kriegszeit’s cadre of artists represented a shift in the pre-1914 intergenerational tensions. By showcasing works by representatives from a wide range of age groups, Kriegszeit created a common ground for emerging artists and their more established peers. This resulted in unlikely but compelling convergences, so that across issues readers encountered works by Waldemar Rösler (b. 1882) but also Wilhelm Trübner (b. 1851); Willy Jaeckel (b. 1888) in addition to Arthur Kampf (b. 1864); and Max Oppenheimer (b. 1885) as well as August Gaul (b. 1869).

By extending across generational lines, Kriegszeit also bridged the gap between artists operating on both the home front and the battlefield. The magazine’s captions frequently identified contributors as soldiers on active duty by listing their rank and sometimes their position on the front. In a few instances, artists directly recorded their stations on the field of battle. For example, Heinrich Kaiser’s self-captioned lithograph of a church in ruins laid a claim to his presence in the French town of Arras on March 6, 1915 (fig. 3.3). Similarly, Helmuth Stockmann bore witness to his experience as a soldier with a contribution drawn as a series of episodic scenes that he records as taking place on September 6, 1914, and captions as, “What I saw! We are fighting the enemy! Outside Namur!” (fig. 3.4).  

⁴⁰ Ibid, 43-47. Both Expressionist groups formed in Germany before 1914, Der Blaue Reiter and Die Brücke, reflect some tenets of the Youth Movement and its emphasis on the radical renewal of the German culture’s spiritual awakening.
The work produced by artist-soldiers and their civilian counterparts received equal billing in *Kriegszeit*. On the pages of the magazine, these two groups’ experiences and resulting representations of wartime did not stand apart but were equal, jointly adding depth to the magazine’s representation of a country at war. This tendency of joining dissimilar constituents is also revealed in *Kriegszeit*’s decision to feature works across a range of stylistic traditions, including Symbolism, Naturalism, Impressionism, Expressionism, and even Academicism. *Kriegszeit* also extended past the gender line, albeit in a limited way. Although women were underrepresented as contributors and as subjects (reinforcing the view of the war as a primarily male experience), the magazine did publish works by Käthe Kollwitz, Hedwig Weiß, Dora Hitz, and Alice Trübner, some of Germany’s well-regarded female artists. And lastly, *Kriegszeit* reached across branches of the humanities to proffer responses to the war that were not only visual, but also literary—approaches consistently joined in Paul Cassirer’s ventures. Among the poets whose verse was published in *Kriegszeit* were Paul Zech, Gerhart Hauptmann, and Richard Dehmel.

By featuring patriotic content by a growing list of contributors from diverse backgrounds across ages, war experiences, styles, sexes, and disciplines, *Kriegszeit* shored up a vision of German artists as a thriving force committed to the country’s political aims and to the production of art as a means of asserting *Kultur*. These commitments had a dual function: on the one hand, to correct and finally put to rest the unwarranted but prevalent interpretation of German modern artists’ challenge to the official *Kunstpolitik* as an unpatriotic affront to the *Vaterland* itself; and

---

41 *Kriegszeit* did, after all, maintain a high level of production, changing from an impressive weekly to a ten-day model only after the forty-eighth issue.
on the other hand, to invalidate the Triple Entente’s branding of Germans as barbarians by showcasing the country’s artists as representatives of a nation that invests in creating culture, not destroying it.

In pursuing these objectives, artists represented in *Kriegszeit* joined forces to channel their individually produced content into a single, collective magazine project, thereby establishing the concept of unity as the publication’s organizing principle. Unity was expressed both symbolically and materially by the shared space of magazine pages, across which artists coalesced as a community. Accordingly, artists represented in *Kriegszeit* were described as *Mitarbeiter* (literally “co-workers”) while the magazine’s subtitle, *Künstlerflugblätter* (literally “artists’ flying pages”), reinforced the view of *Kriegszeit* as an expression of fellowship and solidarity among German artists. Within these circulating pages, art is the unifying mechanism, delivering and reinforcing the concept of *Kultur* for the many recipients.

The community that *Kriegszeit* showcased calls to mind Jürgen Habermas’s notion of a literary-political “public sphere,” which emerged in the eighteenth-century and was comprised of bourgeois private citizens who gathered in the coffee houses “to create a forum for a critically debating public: to read periodicals and to discuss them, to exchange personal opinions, and to contribute to the formulation of an option.”42 According to Habermas’s narrative, participants included only propertied and educated middle-class men; the differences spanned by *Kriegszeit*’s circle of contributors offered only a minor corrective. However, Cassirer made a more profound

---

VI: How \textit{Kriegszeit} Reached Its Public—From Production to Pricing

With the launch of \textit{Kriegszeit}, Paul Cassirer moved his publish enterprise into a more inclusive direction. As discussed in Chapter One of the present study, he presented every page of \textit{Kriegszeit} as an original lithograph. While earlier magazines had featured original prints within their pages—the creators of \textit{Kunst für Alle} and \textit{Pan}, for example, used the magazine medium as a vehicle for delivering original prints—Cassirer went a striking step further. Instead of simply using the publication as courier for original art, he made the publication in its entirety an original work of art.

While the strategy was ambitious in terms of what it offered readers, Cassirer was able to keep his costs exceptionally low. The magazine’s reviewers responded with surprise and enthusiasm to this pricing decision, as evidenced in a review by Hans Bethge: “Each number—fifteen Pfennige! Four lithographs by our best artists for fifteen Pfennige: Germany is a fabulous country!” Keeping the prices low while proffering original prints was quite a feat for a weekly publication, especially since most art periodicals cost well around three Marks. In terms of price

\footnote{Located in the archives of the \textit{Deutsches Historisches Museum}, this newspaper article bears the publication date of November 21, 1914, but it is not clear where it was published. Bethge concludes his article by stating that, “We…warmly recommend to everyone these exceptionally inexpensive and original lithographs which German artists were encouraged to produce during important times for Germany.”}
point, *Kriegszeit* can therefore be more comparatively linked to the cost of the popular press; in 1914, for example, a single newspaper issue cost around five Pfennige (e.g. *Berliner Tageblatt*, *Vossische Zeitung*, *BZ am Mittag*) while illustrated weeklies cost around ten Pfennige (e.g. *Nimm mich mit*, *Deutsche Illustrierte Zeitung*).

Cassirer’s outreach efforts did not rest there. With the tenth issue, only two months after launching, *Kriegszeit*’s material presence expanded. The change was described in the following way: “In order to meet many requests *Kriegszeit* will also be printed on real hand-made paper.”

At the same time, the first nine back issues were to be reprinted and available for purchase on the new and improved paper. The introduction of this so-called *Ausgabe B* (Edition B) demonstrated Cassirer’s commitment to raising the quality level of its product while still keeping the cost low. This commitment was extended even further at the end of *Kriegszeit*’s first year. In the magazine’s first double issue, published on Christmas Eve 1914, the readers learned that, “In response to the popular demand, we will use better paper, paper from fine, wood-free material for issues starting with the twenty-first (the first number of 1915)” (fig. 3.5).

The announcement goes on to say that *Kriegszeit* will continue only in this improved edition, thus discontinuing the earlier Edition A/B options. This upgrade carried with it an increase of only five Pfennige, bringing the total for *Kriegszeit* issues in 1915 to twenty Pfennige. Given that

---


45 “*Einem allgemeinen Wunsch zufolge werden wir für die Blätter von Nr. 21 an (der ersten Nummer im Jahre 1915) besseres Papier, Papier aus gutem, holzfreiem Stoff nehmen.*” *Kriegszeit* 18/19 (December 14, 1914): 6.
twenty Pfennige could buy a pound of pears of potatoes at the Kaufhaus des Westens, one of Berlin’s prominent department stores, the increased cost of Kriegszeit still kept it accessible to the broad public. We therefore warmly recommend to everyone these exceptionally cheap and original lithographs which German artists were encouraged to produce during important times for Germany.”

In addition to publishing original works of art on a weekly basis and in an enhanced presentation, Cassirer also created special edition prints, the so-called Vorzugsdrucke (Edition C), which were comprised from images introduced in the magazine, but reprinted separately on high-quality paper to achieve greater expression of the lithographic line. In doing this, Cassirer established yet another tier for Kriegszeit’s overall endeavor, one that emerged from and was in sync with the other editions but directed its sights on a more affluent reader.

While special edition prints did not include the text that accompanied the images in the Kriegszeit’s other editions, Cassirer ensured that they would not be dissociated from their original context. To publicize them he devoted an exhibition entitled Vorzugsdrucken der “Kriegszeit” at his gallery on Berlin’s fashionable Viktoriastraße in the summer of 1915. The exhibition featured a total of seventy-eight numbered and signed special edition lithographs.

46 Berliner Tageblatt, Number 445, 2. September 1914.

47 This tradition traces back to the fifteenth century and the advent of printmaking. Albrecht Dürer, for example, bound his prints into books but he also “published impressions from his blocks without the accompanying text and made them available for purchase. It was in this textless form that the images were also printed after Dürer’s death, no longer bound into book form, using original blocks, specifically for print collectors and connoisseurs seeking images unencumbered by the ‘interference’ of rows of printed text.” Reinhold Heller, “Observations, In the Form of a Survey, on the History of Print Cycles in German Art from the Fifteenth to the Nineteenth Century,” in The German Print Portfolio 1890-1930: Serials for the Private Sphere, by Robin Reisenfeld (London: Philip Wilson Publishers, 1992), 11.
produced in an edition ranging from ten to thirty impressions, at a price between fifteen to fifty Marks. In narrowing down the number of artists represented in the show to ten, Cassirer focused a list of contributors to a more select group. Nonetheless, he presented the exhibition under the *Kriegszeit* heading, thus signaling the special edition prints’ ties to their magazine origins and affirming the significance of *Kriegszeit* as an important source of contemporary works of art in wartime.

Yet Cassier did not stake the magazine’s promotion on this exhibition alone. He also helped establish other outlets designed to place the magazine in the hands of as many readers as possible. *Kriegszeit* was sold in Cassirer’s gallery headquarters on Viktoriastraße as well as in general bookstores. The gallery also shipped issues for only twenty-five Pfennige. Significantly, the deliveries were offered to homes in Germany but also to soldiers in the battlefield through the army postal service (*Feldpostbestellung*). The readers could also request a subscription at the quarterly cost of 2.30 Marks, which could be redeemed in either back or forthcoming issues. And lastly, *Kriegszeit* was offered to residents of Germany and to their war allies in Austria-Hungary. Each of these outreach options shared the same aim: to make *Kriegszeit*’s presence widely known.

In addition to raising *Kriegszeit*’s profile through various promotional efforts, Cassirer sought to make the publication into a bona-fide collector’s item. He did this starting on September 23, 2014, by offering collecting portfolios (*Sammelmappen*) at the cost of 1.25 Marks.

---

Less than two months later, on November 4, 2014, an additional portfolio version was made available for sale at 1.50 Marks. Eventually portfolios could be purchased in three types of construction and design, ranging from basic (in heavy parchment and a linen spine) to more embellished (in leather with gold embossing).

The history of the collectors’ portfolio traces back to the fifteenth century and the early days of printmaking when the religious imagery commonly found on church walls and multi-paneled paintings started to be translated onto paper, for personal viewing and private worship. With the revival of graphic arts in the nineteenth-century, avant-garde groups rediscovered the tradition of the print portfolio. The most notable example in Germany was the Expressionist artist group Die Brücke, which turned to printmaking as a way of promoting its artistic endeavors and to the portfolio as a way of generating financial support for the group.

In contrast to painting, sculpture, or a framed work on paper, the collectors’ portfolio offers a uniquely personal encounter with art, often exploring a single motif or subject matter. The portfolio safeguards one’s collected prints and serves as a portal through which the art is experienced. A collector has to open a portfolio up physically to interact with the sheets within. This tactile and intimate experience is one that few other formats can deliver.

---

49 The sale of portfolios was announced in the fourth issue of Kriegszeit.

50 Announced in the eleventh issue of Kriegszeit.

51 Feilchenfeldt and Brandis, Paul Cassirer Verlag, 477.


In making use of this tradition, Cassirer gave greater weight to *Kriegszeit*, demonstrating that both it and its contributors’ artistic and literary expressions were worthy of sustained contemplation. In offering custom-sized collectors’ portfolios at different price points, Cassirer sought to appeal to collectors across the social strata. Further, Cassirer’s promotional and presentational strategies showed how he was actively trying to broaden and diversify the art-consuming public while also encouraging them to shift from passive viewers to active collectors whose participation would deepen the existence of German *Kultur*.

**VII: Reception and Der Bildermann**

Despite Cassirer’s efforts to proffer a new and unique vision of German art during wartime, the reviewers failed to recognize his broader efforts to reach the public, focusing instead on the imagery alone. Richard Hamann, an academic and a public intellectual, singled out *Kriegszeit* in his 1917 speech on the state of German art:

What should we have said when artists of the highest quality like Liebermann and Gaul gilt their art with patriotism, and then stripped away all traces of universal significance through the contemporariness of their omissions. … Liebermann drew an agitated, surging crowd with the Berliner Schloß in the background and identified it with the situation when the Kaiser spoke to the people: I know parties no longer, I know only Germans. But if you want to see a mob of Social Democrats or a food riot, there is nothing anyone can do about it. It is, of necessity, a crowd scene, but without a goal or any discernible sense. And it is just as annoying when he sticks the people in his dashed-off, impressionistic sketches in uniform, slapping his art in some field-gray, even though here, too, this art consists only in the most general sense of motion and the most disrespectful disregard of important matters.

There was a classical, plastic style to Gaul’s animal bronzes that conveyed the mood of timeless monuments and architectural creations more than anything. Serious and heavy, there was nothing they were so ill-suited to bear as the monumentality of the joke or punch line. Now he uses this same serious artistic language, this Bible German, to make
jokes about Russian bears, Gallic roosters and British sea lions. He prostitutes his art. The connections to the war do not make his works richer and grander; they rob them of their impact and classicism.54

Although this is by far the most scathing review of Kriegszeit, it is not representative of the publication’s overall critical reception; the popular press was much more welcoming to the publication.55 The critics zeroed in on the subject matter and manner in which the imagery was drawn—and then only by established artists, such as Liebermann and Gaul—while failing to take into account the innovative ways in which Kriegszeit was bringing the broader public in touch with art. They struggled to reconcile the imagery that they had come to expect from certain artists with their new subject matter, the war. Cassirer’s response to those objections was to


literally change both the subject and the vehicle to carry that subject. On April 5, 1916, he converted *Kriegszeit* into *Der Bildermann*, a publication that functioned in the same way as its predecessor, minus the exclusive focus on the subject of war. Working together with Leo Kestenberg, *Der Bildermann*’s editor, Cassirer continued the *Kriegszeit* tradition by offering this new publication in three editions. The first was a basic, or “people’s edition” (*Volksausgabe*), which was produced on sturdy parchment and distributed in the same print run as *Kriegszeit* (estimated at over 3,000). The second edition, known as the *Vorzugsausgabe* or special edition, was created on hand-made paper in an edition of seventy-five prints. Cassirer also commissioned a third edition to be created by his luxury art and book press, *Pan-Presse*; this edition was printed twice (possibly due to high demand) and assigned greater value in part because of the actual, not lithographically reproduced, artists’ signatures. As with *Kriegszeit*, Cassirer offered portfolios across editions to encourage collecting and safekeeping of *Der Bildermann*’s issues (fig. 3.7).

Like *Kriegszeit*, *Der Bildermann* continued to be offered at a low cost of just thirty Pfennige, belying the high quality Cassirer sought to offer its audience:

*Der Bildermann* will become a people’s art magazine [*Volks-Kunstblatt*] in the actual sense of the word and will satisfy all printing standards regardless of the low price. The widest artists’ circles will contribute to it and the art and daily press will devote it lasting attention.56

---

With this statement, Cassirer confirmed the broadening of the public sphere that was at the heart of *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann*. The selling price was set low to more diverse segments of the German public. As if to leave no question about for whom exactly *Der Bildermann* was created, whether for citizens or the critics, Cassirer subtitles it with the unmistakable “Lithographs for the German people” (Steinzeichnungen furs deutsche Volk). Not only were the German people portrayed in the cover images of the first issue, but they were permanently fixed in the nameplate, clear to all. Cassirer seemed to hope it would be easier than ever for the Germans to find themselves in its pages.

**VIII: Conclusion**

Because Cassirer’s gallery archive has not survived, 57 there is no extant subscription record that can give us insight into *Kriegszeit* and *Der Bildermann’s* recipients. I have examined the publication in several public institutions, including libraries and museums in Germany 58 whose collections feature prints in both basic and luxury editions. A collection amassed by Rudolf Ibach, the Austrian businessman and patron of modern art, is the only private collection to which I could definitely trace these publications.

---

57 After Paul Cassirer’s suicide in 1926, Walter Feilchenfeldt (1894-1953), his business partner since 1923, took over the business, along with the gallery’s historic records. These were lost after 1933, during Feilchenfeldt’s exile to Amsterdam. In recent years Feilchenfeldt’s son has embarked on an ambitious series of publications with the literary scholar Bernhard Echte, to restore the history of the gallery. The first two of five volumes have been published, covering the years 1898 to 1905. Running at over 1,250 pages and 1,100 color illustrations, the publications colorfully recreate the early years of one of Europe’s most successful gallery enterprises, but they have not yet reached the war years. Bernhard Echte and Walter Feilchenfeldt, *Kunstsalon Cassirer* (Wädenswil: Nimbus, 2011).

58 Deutsches Historisches Museum, Kunsthistorische Bibliothek, Berlin’s Kupferstichkabinett, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, to name a few.
In order to understand Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann’s intended audiences, I turned to Cassirer’s pricing, marketing, and circulation strategies. Having analyzed these in light of the changing face of German’s art-consuming public after 1871, it became clear that Cassirer’s vision of the German public had profoundly changed with the onset of war. While Cassirer catered mostly to the cultured bourgeois connoisseur prior to 1914, his launch of Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann shows him reimagining members of the German nation more broadly as patrons of the arts. The publications showcase a new, more inclusive vision of the German nation comprised of the dynamic, excited, and engaged citizens that had been represented in the inaugural covers in both publications. And while the existing scholarship has overwhelmingly focused on presenting these publications and their images as reflections of the changing public attitudes to the war, my reading casts them as records of Paul Cassirer’s creative leadership during the First World War: his active call on the German public to demonstrate themselves as active and engaged guardians and patrons of culture.
CONCLUSION

In my study of Kriegzeit and Der Bildermann, I have focused on three specific areas: first, how these publications uniquely borrowed from different print traditions; second, how they engaged both artists and editorial contributors in creative ways; and third, how they reimagined the German people as patrons and guardians of Kultur. Cassirer’s aim was to create unique visual and ideological material that could contribute a new vision for how art could be brought in touch with the German people.

Cassirer himself was a highly productive and engaged member of the German art community. His vision for Kriegzeit and Der Bildermann was ambitious and inventive, but often paradoxical. His flying pages straddled the line between being deluxe and plain; collectible and ephemeral; addressed to elites and all German people; idealistic and nationalistic. Such a complex, bold project could be executed only by someone who 1) had a great deal of resources and connections; 2) did not shy away from running an experiment; and 3) believed in art as an essential expression of the German Kultur. Despite the prevailing notion that Cassirer’s avant-gardism harkens back to the nineteenth-century and his association with the Secessionist, Impressionists, and Post-Impressionists, Kriegzeit and Der Bildermann reveal him as a complex, modern man, who was willing to strike in new directions.

This commitment would remain after Kriegzeit and Der Bildermann ended and the war concluded, and through Cassirer’s own continued intellectual shifts. Just as he demonstrated a willingness to embrace new position between launches of Kriegzeit and Der Bildermann in his transformation from prowar to pacifist stances, he did so after the war as well. By 1918, when he
was living in exile in Bern, Switzerland, Cassirer’s politics had become less nationalist and more pacifist-socialist. In an essay he wrote that year titled “War and Art,” (Krieg und Kunst), Cassirer again confronted the accusation of Germans as barbarians. He returned to the theme by questioning the merger between war and art that had been at the heart of Kriegszeit and Der Bildermann:

The hostile world calls the Germans barbarians. We answer this charge (not to our enemies directly, but rather to the neutral countries, so that they do not believe our enemies) with a theater performance, an art exhibition, a concert, an arts and crafts show.

What do these things prove? What are they supposed to prove? When our enemies call us barbarians, they surely can’t mean that we run around naked, eat raw meat and are unable to read, write, play music, make theater, or paint. They aren’t saying we are inartistic or incapable of thought. They call our morals, politics, and the way we wage war barbaric….

Germany’s enemies claim that our politics, methods of warfare and hunger for power make us barbarians. We can refute this only with evidence concerning our politics, our warfare and our hunger for power….

Only sorrowful politicians, abandoned by God and art, only limping artists who scooted along on the crutches of approval from the state and artists’ associations believed in the battle of the arts, believed that Cézanne could endanger Marées, that Menzel could fight Daumier. They did not see that true artists are never enemies, that true artists always help one another. Artists must push their way through the crowds of would-be artists, but the seats for the great artists are empty, they are always available. Every person who enters the realm of art finds his own place; he must never shove someone else to the side. His throne always awaits him.

Artists are brothers of a single family, no matter what nation they belong to. And the more of them that are assembled, the greater their family’s power: art….

Artists are like trees, they grow out of their native soil, but their fruits benefit the entire world. And a French cherry tree is always more closely related to a German cherry tree (as different as their fruits may taste) than a German cherry tree is to a German genista.

No matter what is on exhibition, whatever kind of art is mobilized for battle on enemy lines in the neutral countries, it does not fight, thrust, or serve. It does next
to nothing, or an immeasurable amount: it sings, it speaks, it intones this single meaning: human being!¹

Cassirer’s declaration about the impartiality of art can seem surprising, at odds with the tendentious, nationalistic, and at times bellicose content, found in both Kriegzeit and Der Bildermann. Art and war, he had come to believe, should be decoupled: answer war and politics with war and politics, but art belongs to the world of art and exists for all humanity.

While Cassirer had distanced himself from the politicization of art-making, his beliefs still uphold the core of why Kriegzeit and Der Bildermann existed as ambitious, earnest, and idealistic efforts to make great art that has merit and integrity, and which plays an important role in people’s lives. Kultur, Cassirer seems to have concluded, can be even more potent and all-encompassing in the absence of nationalistic politics. Art has been elevated above the current events of nations to its central place in the lives of its makers and receivers. May the next age of experimentation begin.

Appendix One

ISSUES OF KRIEGSZEIT

Kriegszeit, no. 1 (31 August 1914)
1. Max Liebermann, Untitled [Crowd in Street]
3. Otto Hettner, “First Flag” (Die erste Fahne)
4. Max Oppenheimer, “Victory News” (Siegesnachrichten)

Kriegszeit, no. 2 (7 September 1914)
1. Max Liebermann, “The Kaiser” (Der Kaiser)
2. Hans Baluschek, “Messenger of Victory on the Public Clock” (Der Siegesbote auf der Normaluhr)
3. August Gaul, Untitled [Bear and Vultures]
4. Otto Hettner, “Germany to her Children” (Germania an ihre Kinder)

Kriegszeit, no. 3 (16 September 1914)
1. Otto Hettner, “Thanks to Senior General von Hindenburg” (Dank an den Generaloberst von Hindenburg)
2. August Gaul, “Battle” (Kampf)
3. August Gaul, “Victory” (Sieg)
4. Max Liebermann, “To My Beloved Jews” (An meine lieben Juden)
5. Heinrich Hübner, “In the Dust with All Enemies of the Brandenburgs” (In Staub mit allen Feinden Brandenburgs)

Kriegszeit, no. 4 (23 September 1914)
1. Max Liebermann, “Entry of the Russians” (Einzug der Russen)
2. Willi Geiger, Untitled
3. Otto Hettner, “In Memory of Ludwig Franks” (Dem Andenken Ludwig Franks)
4. August Gaul, “The British Lion” (Der Britische Leu)

Kriegszeit, no. 5 (30 September 1914)
1. W. Boning, “The Cathedral at Reims” (Die hohn Kirche zu Reims)
3. Erich Büttner, “Honest Play!” (Eheliches Spiel!)
4. Wilhelm Trübner, “Heroes, Accept the Wreath!” (Nehmt Helden, Hinden Kranz!)

Kriegszeit, no. 6 (30 September 1914)
1. Max Liebermann, “Extra! Extra!” (Extrablatt!)
2. Max Liebermann, “Come on, Comrades, to the Horses, to the Horses” (Wohlauf Kameraden, aufs Pferd, aufs Pferd)
3. Max Liebermann, Untitled
4. Max Liebermann, “Hercules: Hindenburg” (Hercules-Hindenburg)

_**Kriegszeit**, no. 7 (7 October 1914)
1. August Gaul, “Our Fliers” (Unsere Flieger)
3. Wilhelm Trübner, “Greeting of the Valkyries” (Walkürengruss)
4. Max Liebermann, “The English Miscalculation” (Der englische Rechfehler)

_**Kriegszeit**, no. 8 (14 October 1914)
1. Rudolf Grossmann, “Street Battle” (Strassenkampf)
2. August Gaul, “India/French Africa” (Indien/Franz-Afrika)
3. Helmuth Stockmann, “What I saw!” (Was ich sah!)

_**Kriegszeit**, no. 9 (21 October 1914)
1. Ernst Feigl, Untitled [Portrait of General von Stein]
2. Wilhelm Oesterle, Untitled [Man with a Sword]
3. Otto Hettner, “Destroyed Battery” (Zeischossene)
4. Alice Trübner, “Ferdinand Hodler, the Woodcutter” (Der Holzfäller Ferdinand Hodler)

_**Kriegszeit**, no. 10 (28 October 1914)
1. Otto Hettner, “Nicolai’s Ride to Victory” (Nikolai’s Ausritt zum Seig)
2. August Gaul, “The Lying Flute” (Die Lügenflöte)
3. Max Liebermann, “Samaritan” (Samariter)
4. Käthe Kollwitz, “Trepidation” (Das Bangen)

_**Kriegszeit**, no. 11 (4 November 1914)
1. August Gaul, “Animal Fable” (Tierfabel)
2. Erich Büttner, “The Flag in the Field” (Die Fahne im Feld)
3. August Gaul, Untitled [Wild Dogs and Leopard]
4. Max Beckmann, “Portrait of Wounded Brother-in-Law Martin Tube” (Bildnis des verwundeten Schwagers Martin Tube)

_**Kriegszeit**, no. 12 (11 November 1914)
1. Erich Büttner, “Rest” (Rast)
2. George Greve-Lindau, “Nighttime Spadework” (Nächtliche Pionierarbeit)
3. Ernst Barlach, “On the Eastern Frontier” (An der Ostgrenze)
4. Karl Walser, “With the Munitions Column” (Bei der Munitiana kolonne)

_**Kriegszeit**, no. 13 (18 November 1914)
1. Otto Hettner, “Tisingtau”
2. August Gaul, “The Sugar Beet” (Die Zuckerrübe)
3. Max Liebermann, “Our Blue Youths” (Unsere blauen Jungen)
4. Rudolf Grossmann, “Hospital Barracks in Berlin” (Berliner Baracken-Lazarett)

**Kriegszeit**, no. 14 (11 September 1914)
1. Max Liebermann, “Germany’s Battle Song” (Deutschlands Fahnenlied)
2. Erich Büttner, “Winter Campaign” (Winterkampagne)
3. Ernst Barlach, “Lie, Storms, Lie!” (Lügt, Stürme, lügt!)
4. August Gaul, “Support Troops in the West” (Hilfstruppen im Westen)

**Kriegszeit**, no. 15 (2 December 1914)
1. Erich Büttner, “Attack on a Fort” (Sturm auf ein Fort)
2. August Gaul, Untitled [Pigs and Sheep]
3. Otto Hettner, “To the Fainthearted Ones!” (Den Kleinmütigen!)
4. Alexander Kolbe, “Sketches from the Field” (Skizzen aus dem Feld)

**Kriegszeit**, no. 16 (9 December 1914)
1. Max Liebermann, “The Chancellor” (Der Reichskanzler)
2. Rudolf Grossmann, “Polish Refugees” (Polnische Flüchtlinge)
3. Erich Büttner, “Cavalry Song” (Reiterlied)

**Kriegszeit**, no. 17 (16 December 1914)
1. George Greve-Lindau, Cavalry Battle (Reitergefecht)
2. Otto Hettner, Local Reserve Troops (Der Landstrum)
3. Ernst Barlach, “The Holy War” (Der heilige Krieg)
4. Otto Hundt, Untitled [Newspaper Announcement]

**Kriegszeit**, no. 18/19 (24 December 1914)
1. Max Lieberman, “March, March, Hurrah!” (Marsch, Marsch, Hurrah!)
2. Otto Hettner, Untitled [Marginalia]
3. Erich Büttner, “After the Distribution of Christmas Presents” (Nacht der Bescherung)
4. Max Liebermann, “War on Earth” (Krieg auf Erden)
5. Erich Büttner, “The Imperial Anthem” (Das Kaiserlied)
6. Rudolf Grossmann, Untitled [Armed Arabs]
7. Otto Hettner, “The Horse of Hell” (Das Hollenpfard)
8. August Gaul, “Under the Mistletoe 1914” (Unter dem Mistelzweig 1914)

**Kriegszeit**, no. 20 (30 December 1914)
1. August Gaul, “View to the West” (Ausblick nach Westen)
2. Rudolf Grossmann, “Suburb in the Snow” (Vorstadt im Schnee)
3. Ernst Barlach, “First Victory, Then Peace” (Erst Sieg, Dann Frieden)
4. Otto Hettner, “The War Year” (Das Kriegsjahr)

**Kriegszeit**, no. 21 (6 January 1915)
1. Otto Hettner, “In the Military Hospital” (Im Lazarett)
2. Erich Büttner, “Artillery Behind the Dunes” (Artillerie hinter Dunen)
3. Max Liebermann, “In East Prussia” (In Ostpreussen)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 22 (13 January 1915)
1. M. Mory, “The Flag of the Prophet” (Die Fahne des Propheten)
2. August Gaul, “Hindenburg is Coming!” (Der Hindenburg Kommt!)
3. Max Liebermann, Untitled [Rifleman]
4. Otto Hettner, “It Will Happen One Day” (Einst geschieht’s)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 23 (20 January 1915)
1. Erich Büttner, Untitled [Portrait of a Man]
2. Fritz Rhein, “Alarm!” (Alarm!)
3. August Gaul, “Bullet-riddled Farmstead” (Zerschossenes Gehoßt)
4. Otto Hundt, “Misunderstandings” (Missverständnisse)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 24 (27 January 1915)
1. Erich Büttner, “Wilhelm II”
2. Franz Heckendorf, “From East Prussian Days of War” (Aus ostpreussischen Kriegstagen)
3. Max Liebermann, “Cuirassier-Major” (Kurassierer-Oberst)
4. August Gaul, “The British Lion in a Predicament” (Der britscher Leu in Verlengenheit)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 25 (3 February 1915)
1. Wilhelm Trübner, “The Bavarian Crown Prince” (Der bayerische Kronprinz)
2. Georg Kolbe, “The German Fleet” (Die deutsche Flotte)
4. Arthur Kampf, “Remembrance of the First Days of August” (Erinnerung an die ersten Augusttage)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 26 (10 February 1915)
1. Otto Hettner, “Survivors of the Emden” (Die Letzten der “Emden”)
2. Franz Rhein, “Bullet-riddled Village” (Zerschossenes Dorf)
3. M. Mory, “Oath of Allegiance” (Fahneneid)
4. Alexander Kolbe, “Sketches, from the Field” (Skizzen aus dem Feld)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 27 (17 February 1915)
1. August Gaul, “The British Lion” (Der britische Leu)
2. Franz Heckendorf, “Marine Flyers’ Station” (Marine-Flieger-Statio)
3. Max Unold, “Before a French Country House” (Vor einem Französischen Landhaus)
4. Max Liebermann, Untitled [Wounded Soldier]

*Kriegszeit*, no. 28 (24 February 1915)
2. Ulrich Hübner, “Fire in Antwerp” (Brand in Antwerpen)
3. Ernst Barlach, “Street Corner in Warsaw” (Strassenecke in Warshau)
4. Otto Hettner, “The Kaiser in Lyck” (Der Kaiser in Lyck)

_Kriegszeit_, no. 29 (3 March 1915)
1. Erich Büttner, “Lieutenant General von Ludendorff” (Generalleutnant v. Ludendorff)
2. Max Unold, “Trench in the Forest” (Schutzengraben im Wald)
3. Emil Rudolf Weiss, “Comforting Voice” (Trostende Stimme)

_Kriegszeit_, no. 30 (10 March 1915)
1. Wilhelm Trübner, “General von Falkenhayn”
2. Ulrich Hübner, “Battle in the Dardanells” (Kampf vor den Dardenellen)
3. August Gaul, “Idyll in the North Sea” (Idyll in der Nordsee)
4. Josef Bato, “Advancing in Grenade and Shrapnel Fire” (Vorrücken im Granate- und Schrapnellfeuer)

_Kriegszeit_, no. 31 (17 March 1915)
1. Max Liebermann, “Kant”
2. M. Mory, “War Hospital in Arabia” (Kriegslazarett in Arabien)
3. Otto Hettner, “Memorial Page” (Gedenkblatt)
4. Franz Heckendorf, “Battle on the Angerapp” (Kampf an der Agenrapp)

_Kriegszeit_, no. 32 (24 March 1915), 1915
1. Willy Jaeckel, Massacre of the Jews (Juden-Massaker)
2. Max Liebermann, The Wounded Commerade (Der verwundete Kamerad)
3. Ernst Barlach, Assault (Sturmangriff)
4. Ulrich Hübner, U-Boats in Battle (U-Boote im Kampf)

_Kriegszeit_, no. 33 (31 March 1915)
1. Wilhelm Trübner, “Bismark”
2. Willy Jaeckel, “Przemysl”
3. Max Liebermann, “Reiter-Kamp”
4. Erich Büttner, “Hand to Hand Fighting in Champagne” (Nahkampf in der Champagne)

_Kriegszeit_, no. 34 (7 April 1915)
1. August Gaul, “The Dardanelles” (Die Dardanellen)
2. Willy Jaeckel, “Grimaces of Death” (Fratzen des Todes)
3. Max Slevogt, “Kitchener’s Sacrifice” (Kitcheners Schlachtopfer)
4. Kurt Schafer, “In the Snowstorm” (Im Schneesturm)

_Kriegszeit_, no. 35 (14 April 1915)
1. Kurt Schäfer, “Field Battery” (Feldbatterie)
2. Erich Büttner, “Drafted!” (Einberufen!)
3. Fritz Rhein, “In the Bomb Shelter” (Im alarmkeller)
4. Oskar Nerlinger, “Russian War” (Russischer Krieg)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 36 (21 April 1915)
2. Hedwig Weiß, “A Corporal’s Wife and Child” (Frau und Kind eines Unteroffiziers)
3. Hedwig Weiß, “Between Hannover and Lehrte” (Zwischen Hannover und Lehrte)
4. Hedwig Weiß, “War Sawing Room” (Kriegsnahstube)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 37 (28 April 1915)
1. August Gaul, “The Bear in the Carpathian Mountain” (Der Bar in den Karpathen)
2. Hans Meid, “Cavalry Patrol” (Kavallerie-Patrouille)
3. Max Liebermann, Untitled [Rifleman]
4. Wilhelm Wagner, “Return to the Prison Camp” (Ruckkehr ins Gefangerlager)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 38 (5 May 1915)
1. Wilhelm Wagner, “Slow March in Zossen” (Paradeschritt in Zossen)
3. Max Liebermann, Untitled [Drummer]
4. Ulrich Hübner, “Hurray for the U-5” (U-5 Hurra!)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 39 (12 May 1915)
1. August Gaul, “Lusitania”
2. Hans Meid, “Street in Kalisz” (Strasse in Kalisch)
3. Fritz Rhein, “In the Foxhole” (Im Unterstand)
4. Oskar Nerlinger, ‘Visit to the Military Hospital” (Besuch im Lazarett)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 40 (20 May 1915)
1. Wilhelm Wagner, “Target Practice” (Schiessübung)
2. Max Slevogt, “Three Ambushers” (Drei Wegelagerer)
3. Dora Hitz, “Where Are You Going, Italy?” (Quo vadis, Italia?)
4. Erich Büttner, “In the Sign of the Spade” (Im Zeichen der Schippe)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 41 (27 May 1915)
1. August Gaul, “The Newest Renaissance” (Die neueste Renaissance)
2. August Gaul, “The Common Hornbill” (Der gewohnliche Hornrabe)
3. August Gaul, “The Senate and the People of Rome” (Senatus populusque Romanus)
4. August Gaul, “Divine Comedy” (Divinia commedia)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 42 (2 June 1915)
1. Anonymous [Ottomar Starke?], “D’Annunzio”
2. Erich Büttner, “In the Argonne Forest” (Im Argonnen Wald)
3. Willy Jaeckel, “Carpathian Mountains” (Karpathen)
4. Hans Meid, “Street Watch’ (Strassenwache)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 43 (9 June 1915)
1. August Gaul, “Romulus-Sonnino and Remus-Salandra” (Romulus-Sonnino und Remus-Salandra)
2. Hans Meid, “From the Life of a Hero, or Gabirele d’Annunzio; or, The Poet’s Departure and Return” (Aus einem Heldenleben oder Gabriele d’Annunzio oder des Dichters Abscheid und Wiederkehr)
3. Hans Meid, “From the Life of a Hero” (Aus einem Heldenleben)
4. Oskar Nerlinger, “Hospital in the Sudende” (Lazaret in Sudende)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 44 (17 June 1915)
1. Fritz Rhein, “Return in the Rain” (Ruckkehr im Regen)
2. Friedrich Tischler, “Sheet of Sketches by Menin” (Skizzenblatt aus Menin)
3. Rudolf Grossmann, “Berlin Suburb” (Berliner vorort)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 45 (24 June 1915)
1. August Gaul, “Tirol”
2. Otto Hettner, Untitled [Horse and Rider]
3. August Gaul, “Enthusiasm at the Capitoline” (Begeisterung auf dem Kapitol)
4. Valer von Ferencky, “Senior General von Mackensen” (Generaloberst von Mackensen)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 46 (1 July 1915)
1. August Gaul, “Chanticlair” (Chantecler)
2. Ernst Barlach, “And if the World Were Full of Devils” (Und wenn die Welt voll Teufel war)
3. Oskar Nerlinger, “In the Grunewald” (Im Grunewald)
4. Helmuth Stockmann, “War Against Italy!” (Krieg gegen Italien!)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 47 (8 July 1915)
1. Otto Hettner, “War Council in the Tent of the Czar” (Kriegsrat im Zelte des Zaren)
2. Franz Heckendorf, “Hangar” (Fliegenschuppe)
3. Franz Heckendorf, “Flying Practice” (Fliegerübung)
4. August Gaul, Untitled [Bears]

*Kriegszeit*, no. 48 (18 July 1915)
1. August Gaul, “Past and Present” (Einst und jetzt)
3. Rudolf Grossmann, “‘Who Wants to Become a Soldier…”” (“Wer will unter die Soldaten…”)
4. Carl Olof Petersen, “England’s Air and Underwater Fleet” (Englands Luft-und Unterseeeflotte)
**Kriegszeit, no. 49 (28 July 1915)**
2. Ludwig Danziger, “Behind the Lines in Poland” (Hinter der Front in Polen)
3. Ernst Barlach, “The Bethlehem Steel Company in America” (Die Bethlehem Steel Company in Amerika)
4. Carl Olof Petersen, “The Fable of Gray Bird” (Das Marchen vom Vogel Grey)

**Kriegszeit, no. 50 (5 August 1915)**
1. Valer von Ferenczy, “Army Commander in the East-General Boehm-Ermolli” (Heerfuhrer in Osten-General Boehm-Ermolli)
2. Ernst Barlach, “Evacuation” (Evakuierung)
3. Erich Büttner, “Poet in the Field” (Der Dichter im Felde)
4. August Gaul, “The Bear Held at Bay” (Der Gestellte Bar)

**Kriegszeit, no. 51 (17 August 1915)**
1. Jozef Arpad Murmann, Our Heroic Troops (“Unsere heldenhaften Truppen...,”)
2. Wilhelm Wagner, In the Neutral Zone (Im neutralen Land_)
3. Carl Olof Petersen, England-Japan-China
4. August Gaul, After the First Year of War (Nach dem ersten Kriegsjahr)

**Kriegszeit, no. 52 (31 August 1915)**
1. August Gaul, “Glider Flight in the East” (Gleitflug im Osten)
2. Jozef Arpad Murmann, “German Prisoner Transport in France: Exodus from Chartres” (Deutscher Gefangenen-Transport in Frankreich: Auszug aus Chartres)
3. Jozef Arpad Murmann, “German Prisoner Transport in France: Journey to the South” (Deutscher Gefangenen-Transport in Frankreich: Fahrt nach dem Suden)
4. Carl Olof Petersen, “The American Angel of Peace” (Das Amerikanische Friedensengel)

**Kriegszeit, no. 53 (15 September 1915)**
1. August Gaul, “Concert of the Dardanells” (Konzert an der Dardanellen)
2. Ernst Barlach, “The Thresher of Masuria” (Der Drescher von Masuren)
3. August Gaul, “Farewell, Dear Uncle!” (Adjo, Onkelchen!)

**Kriegszeit, no. 54 (1 October 1915)**
1. Waldemar Rösler, “Quiet Heroes” (Stille Helden)
2. Waldemar Rösler, “Relief” (Ablösung)
3. Waldemar Rösler, Untitled [Battlefield]
4. Waldemar Rösler, “Behind the Front in Flanders” (Hinter der Front in Flandern)

**Kriegszeit, no. 55 (15 October 1915)**
1. August Gaul, “12 Billion (Nec soli cedit)” (12 Milliarden [Nec soli cedit])
2. August Gaul, “In Bjelowian Moors” (In der Bjelowjesher Heide)
3. August Gaul, “The last Wisent” (Die letzten Wisente)
4. August Gaul, “Cadorna reports….” (Cadorna berichtet…)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 56 (1 November 1915)
1. Peter Behrens, “Army Commander in the East” (Heerführer im Osten)
2. August Gaul, “Bad Moods” (Verstimmungen)
3. Willy Jaeckel, “Serbian Destiny” (Serbisches Schicksal)
4. Carl Olof Petersen, “Russian Hangover” (Russischer Katzenjammer)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 57 (15 November 1915)
1. Reinhard Pfachler-von Othegraven, “Sick Tartar” (Kranker Tatar)
2. Friedrich Tischler, “In Flanders” (In Flandern)
3. Ernst Barlach, “Serbian Elegy” (Serbische Elegien)
4. Alice Trübner, “Isadora’s Invitation to Dance” (Isadoras Aufforderung zum Tanze)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 58 (beginning-December 1915)
1. Max Liebermann, “Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Mollendorff”
2. Max Unold, “March Through the Woods” (Marsch durchs Geholz)
3. Erich Büttner, “Southeastern Theater of Battle in Berlin” (Sudostlicher kriegschauplatz in Berlin)
4. Carl Olof Petersen, “The Expeditionary Force” (Das Expeditionsheft)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 59 (mid-December 1915)
1. Otto Hettner, “The Conquered” (Der Besiegte)
2. August Gaul, “Soldiers’ graves in Poland” (Soldatengräber in Polen)
3. August Gaul, “Soldiers’ graves in Poland” (Soldatengräber in Polen)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 60 (January 1916)
1. August Gaul, “Compulsory Military Service Debate” (Wehrpflichtdebatte)
2. Hedwig Weiss, “Longing” (Sehnsucht)
3. Willy Jaeckel, “Gott von Berlichingen”
4. Otto Hettner, Untitled [Figures Around a Table]
5. August Gaul, “Saloniki-kikikiki”

*Kriegszeit*, no. 61 (end-January 1916)
1. August Gaul, “Gallipoli”
4. August Gaul, “The First Olive Branch” (Der erste Olzieg)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 62 (mid-February 1916),
1. August Gaul, “The ‘Good Shepherd’ Nikita” (Der “gute Hirt” Nikita)
2. Erich Büttner, “Soldier’s Mess” (Mannschaftsessen)
3. Willy Jaeckel, “Forest Shot to Pieces” (Zerschossener Wald)
4. Otto Hemel, “Advancing Column” (Kolonne in Vormarsch)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 63 (end-February 1916)
1. Ernst Feigl, “Mackensen”
2. Max Liebermann, Untitled [Drummer]
3. Otto Hemel, “Fleeing” (Auf der Flucht)
4. August Gaul, “S.M.S. Seagull” (S.M.S. Möwe)

*Kriegszeit*, no. 64/65 (end-March 1916)
1. August Gaul, “It’s No Longer Enough!” (Es langt nicht mehr!)
2. Carl Olaf Petersen, “French Prisoners at Work” (Französische Gefangene bei der Arbeit)
3. Friedrich Tischler, “Kraljevo”
5. Erich Thum, “Wounded Woman” (Trauernde Frau)
6. Heinrich Kaiser, “Church Near Arras” (Kirche bei Arras)
7. Ulrich Hübner, “Bringing in a Prize” (Einbringen einer Prise)
Appendix Two

ISSUES OF DER BILDERMANN

Der Bildermann, no. 1 (5 April 1916)
1. August Gaul, “Europe” (Europa)
2. Leopold von Kalckreuth, “Götz von Berlichingen”
3. Ernst Barlach, “Humility” (Demut)
4. Max Slevogt, “Signs of the Times I” (Symbole der Zeit I)
   Insert: August Gaul, Illustration for the “Song of Friendship” by Simon Dach

Der Bildermann, no. 2 (20 April 1916)
1. August Gaul, “Early Spring” (Vorfrühling)
2. Willy Jaeckel, “Canal in Berlin” (Kanal in Berlin)
3. Kathe Kollwitz, Untitled [Mother Holding a Child]
4. Max Slevogt, “Signs of the Times II” (Symbole der Zeit II)

Der Bildermann, no. 3 (5 May 1916)
1. Max Slevogt, Untitled [Fear of the Average German]
2. Rudolf Grossmann, “German Town” (Deutsches Städtchen)
3. August Gaul, “New Summertime” (Die neue Sommerzeit)
4. Erich Heckel, “The Drive” (Die Fahrt)
   Insert: Klaus Richter, Illustration of the poem “Nostalgia” by Jos. Eichendorff

Der Bildermann, no. 4 (20 May 1916)
1. August Gaul, “Siege of Kut” (Kut el amara)
2. Erich Heckel, “Ghent” (Gent)
3. Ernst Barlach, “The Weary One” (Der Müde)
4. Max Slevogt, “Signs of the Times III” (Symbole der Zeit III)
   Insert: Heinrich Zille, “My sausage is good–” (“Meine Wurst is jut–”)

Der Bildermann, no. 5 (5 June 1916)
1. Rudolf Grossmann, “In Munich’s Hofgarten” (Im Münchner Hofgarten)
2. August Gaul, “A Raven Flies Toward a Raven Over There…” (Der Rabe fliegt zum Raben dort…)
3. Heinrich Zille, “Singing Children” (Singende Kinder)
4. Max Slevogt, “Pax Vobiscum”
   Insert: Max Liebermann, Illustration of the poem “Pfingsten in Berlin” by Gottfried Keller

Der Bildermann, no. 6 (6 June 1916)
1. August Gaul, “Horn’s Ledge” (Horns Riff)
2. Willy Jaeckel, “Mother with Child” (Mutter mit Kind)
3. Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, “Landscape in the Taunus” (Landschaft im Taunus)
4. Max Slevogt, “Signs of the Times V” (Symbole der Zeit V)

Insert: August Gaul, “Animal Assembly” (Tierversammlung), accompanied by Robert Walser’s “The Merchant”

_Der Bildermann_, no. 7 (5 July 1916)

1. August Gaul, “A Ray of Hope on Meatless Days” (Ein Lichtblick in fleischlosen Tagen)
2. Rudolf Grossmann, “Munich, Chinese Tower” (München, Chinesischer Turm)
3. Wilhelm Wagner, “Berlin, at the Kurfürstendamm” (Berlin, Am Kurfürstendamm)
4. Oskar Kokoschka, “Annunciation” (Verkündigung)

Insert: Ernst Barlach, Illustration of the poem “Brother” by Christian Morgenstern

_Der Bildermann_, no. 8 (20 July 1916)

1. Erich Heckel, “Belgian Landscape” (Belgische Landschaft)
2. August Gaul, Untitled [“Mattenrast”]
3. Heinrich Zille, “The Iron Cross” (Das Eiserne Kreuz)
4. Max Slevogt, “Signs of the Times VI” (Symbole der Zeit VI)

_Der Bildermann_, no. 9 (5 August 1916)

1. Ottomar Starke, “The New Society I” (Die neue Gesellschaft I)
2. Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, “Portrait of Carl Sternheim” (Bildnis Carl Sternheim)
3. Otto Müller, “Three Figures and Crossed Tree Trunks” (Drei Figuren und gekreuzte Stämme)
4. Oskar Kokoschka, “Christ Crowned with Thorns” (Christi Dornenkrönung)

Insert: Max Slevogt, Illustration of the poem “Wo wird einst des Wandermüden letzte Ruhestätte sein?” by Heinrich Heine

_Der Bildermann_, no. 10 (20 August 1916)

1. Rudolf Grossmann, “At Munich’s Hofbräu” (Im Münchner Hofbräu)
2. Ottomar Starke, “The New Society II” (Die neue Gesellschaft II)
3. Heinrich Zille, “The Godchildren’s Holiday” (Ferienpaten)

_Der Bildermann_, no. 11 (5 September 1916)

1. August Gaul, “To My Friend B. Berneis” (Meinem Freunde B. Berneis)
2. Ottomar Starke, “The New Society III” (Die neue Gesellschaft III)
3. Ernst Barlach, “From a Modern Dance of Death” (Aus einem neuezeitlichen Totentanz)
4. Max Slevogt, “Signs of the Times VII” (Symbole der Zeit VII)
Insert: József Bató, Illustration of the poem “Morgenrot, Morgenrot” by Wilhelm Hauff

Der Bildermann, no. 12 (20 September 1916)
1. August Gaul, “Hamster” (Der Hamster)
2. Ottomar Starke, “The New Society IV” (Die neue Gesellschaft IV)
3. Heinrich Zille, Untitled [Standing in Line for Potatoes (Kartoffelstehen)]
4. Oskar Kokoschka, “The Crucifixion” (Christus am Kreuz)

Der Bildermann, no. 13 (5 October 1916)
2. Ernst Barlach, “For Whom Time is an Eternity” (Wem Zeit wie Ewigkeit)
3. Rudolf Grossmann, “Hilly Landscape” (Hügellandschaft)
4. Max Slevogt, “Signs of the Times VII” (Symbole der Zeit VIII)
Insert: Walther Klemm, Illustration of the poem “Die drei Zigeuner” by Nikolaus Lenau

Der Bildermann, no. 14 (20 October 1916)
1. Ernst Barlach, “ANNO DOMINI MCMXVI POST CHRISTUM NATUM”
2. August Gaul, “If This Continues…” (Wenns so weiter geht…)
3. Ottomar Starke, “The New Society V” (Die neue Gesellschaft V)
4. Oskar Kokoschka, “Resurrection” (Auferstehung)

Der Bildermann, no. 15 (5 November 1916)
1. Rudolf Grossmann, Landscape by the Neckar River (Landschaft am Neckar)
2. Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, In the Barrack’s Yard (Auf dem Kasernenhof)
3. Erich Heckel, Near Ghent (Bei Gent)
4. August Gaul, Mountain Goats (Bergziegen), with a poem by Christian Morgenstern
Insert: Ottomar Starke, Illustration of the poem ‘O mein Heimatland’ by Thu-Fu

Der Bildermann, no. 16 (20 November 1916)
1. August Gaul, “Resurrectio Poloniae”
2. Ernst Barlach, “Blessed Are the Merciful” (Selig sind die Barmherzigen…)
3. Heinrich Zille, “Schapps” (Schnapsdestille), with a poem by Bruno Schönlank
4. Oskar Kokoschka, “Kiss of Judas—Christ’s Arrest” (Der Judaskuß – Gefängennahme Christi)

Der Bildermann, no. 17 (5 December 1916)
1. Oskar Kokoschka, “Last Supper” (Das Abendmahl)
2. Ottomar Starke, “The New Society VI” (Die neue Gesellschaft VI)
3. Rudolf Grossmann, “Pious Helene” (Die fromme Helene)
4. Max Slevogt, “Signs of the Times IX” (Symbole der Zeit IX)
   Insert: August Gaul, “Flying Dove: Dove with an Olive Branch” (Fliegende Taube; Taube mit Oelzweig), with a story “Die Legende der dritten Taube” by Stefan Zweig

*Der Bildermann*, no. 18 (20 December 1916)

1. Ernst Barlach: “DONA NOBIS PACEM”
3. Max Slevogt, Untitled [Signs of the Times X (Symbole der Zeit X)]
4. Oskar Kokoschka, “Rest after the Flight to Egypt” (Rast auf der Flucht nach Ägypten)
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Figure 0.1. Max Liebermann, “Hercules: Hindenburg” (Hercules: Hindenburg). Kriegszeit, no. 6 (30 September 1914).
Figure 0.2. French cartoon published in *Le Journal* on November 12, 1915.
Figure 0.3. The reading room at Kunstsalon Cassirer, designed by Henry van de Velde.

Figure 0.4. Cartoon published in the twelfth issue of *Die Lustigen Blätter*, 1899.
Figure 1.1. Diagram indicating *Kriegszeit*’s format.

Figure 1.2. Front and back cover of *Kriegszeit*’s first issue.
Figure 1.3. Spread of Kriegszeit’s first issue.

Figure 1.4. Der Bildermann, no. 9, with its insert (5 August 1916).
Figure 1.5. Cover of the magazine *Pan*, no. 1 (April 1895).

Figure 1.6. First page of the magazine *Pan*, no. 1 (April 1895).
Figure 1.7. Max Slevogt, “Signs of the Times III” (Symbole der Zeit III). Der Bildermann, no. 4 (20 May 1916). Detail.
Figure 1.8. Max Beckmann, “Portrait of Wounded Brother-in-Law Martin Tube” (Bildnis des verwundeten Schwagers Martin Tube). *Kriegszeit*, no. 11 (4 November 1914). Detail.
Figure 2.1. Max Liebermann, “Extra! Extra!” (Extrablatt!). *Kriegszeit*, no 6. (30 September 1914).
Figure 2.2. Max Liebermann, “Come on, Comrades, to the Horses, to the Horses” (Wohlauf Kameraden, aufs Pferd, aufs Pferd). *Kriegszeit*, no. 6 (30 September 1914).
Figure 2.3. Max Liebermann, Untitled. *Kriegszeit*, no. 6 (30 September 1914).
Figure 2.4. Max Liebermann, “Hercules: Hindenburg” (Hercules: Hindenburg). *Kriegszeit*, no. 6 (30 September 1914).
Figure 2.5. Max Liebermann, “The Kaiser” (Der Kaiser). Kriegszeit, no. 2 (7 September 1914).
Figure 2.6. Max Lieberman, “March, March, Hurrah!” (Marsch, Marsch, Hurrah!). *Kriegszeit*, no. 18/19 (24 December 1914).
Figure 2.7. Max Liebermann, Untitled [Rifleman]. *Kriegszeit*, no. 22 (13 January 1915).
Figure 2.8. Erich Büttner, “In the Sign of the Spade” (Im Zeichen der Schippe). *Kriegszeit*, no. 40 (20 May 1915).
Figure 2.9. Erich Büttner, “Cavalry Song” (Reiterlied). *Kriegszeit*, no. 16 (9 December 1914).
Figure 2.10. Erich Büttner, “In the Argonne Forest” (Im Argonner Wald). *Kriegszeit*, no. 42 (2 June 1915).
Figure 2.11. Erich Büttner, “Winter Campaign” (Winterkampagne). *Kriegszeit*, no. 14 (11 September 1914)
Figure 2.12. Erich Büttner, “After the Distribution of Christmas Presents” (Nach der Bescherung). Kriegszeit, no. 18/19 (24 December 1914).
Figure 2.13. Erich Büttner, “Rest” (Rast). *Kriegszeit*, no. 12 (11 November 1914).
Figure 2.14. Erich Büttner, “Soldier’s Mess” (Mannschaftsessen). Kriegszeit, no. 62 (mid-February 1916).
Figure 2.15. Erich Büttner, “Poet in the Fields” (Der Dichter im Felde). Kriegszeit, no. 50 (5 August 1915).
Figure 2.16. Erich Büttner, “Drafted!” (Einberufen!). Kriegszeit, no. 35 (14 April 1915).
Figure 2.17. Erich Büttner, “Wilhelm II.” *Kriegszeit*, no. 24 (27 January 1915).
Figure 2.18. Max Beckmann, “Portrait of Wounded Brother-in-Law Martin Tube” (Bildnis des verwundeten Schwagers Martin Tube). *Kriegszeit*, no. 11 (4 November 1914).
Figure 2.19. August Gaul, “The British Lion” (Der Britische Leu). *Kriegszeit*, no. 4 (23 September 1914).
Figure 2.20. August Gaul, “After the First War Year” (Nach dem ersten Kriegsjahr). *Kriegszeit*, no. 51 (17 August 1915).
Figure 2.21. August Gaul, “It’s no Longer Enough!” (Es langt nicht mehr!). *Kriegszeit*, no. 64/65 (end-March 1916).
Figure 2.22. August Gaul, “Idyll in the North Sea” (Idyll in der Nordsee). *Kriegszeit*, no. 30 (10 March 1915).
Figure 2.23. August Gaul, “Lusitania.” *Kriegszeit*, no. 39 (12 May 1915).
Figure 2.24. August Gaul, “S.M.S. Seagull” (S.M.S. Möwe). Kriegszeit, no. 63 (end-February 1916).
Figure 2.25. August Gaul, “Hindenburg is Coming!” (Der Hindenburg kommt!). *Kriegszeit*, no. 22 (13 January 1915).
Figure 2.26. August Gaul, “The Bear in the Carpathian Mountain” (Der Bar in den Karpathen). *Kriegszeit*, no. 37 (28 April 1915).
Figure 2.27. August Gaul, “Glider Flight in the East” (Gleitflug im Osten). Kriegszeit, no. 52 (31 August 1915).
Figure 2.28. Arthur Kampf, “New Victory Sheets” (Neue Siegesblatter). Kriegszeit, no. 38 (5 May 1915).
Figure 2.29. Han Baluschek, “Messenger of Victory on the Public Clock” (Der Siegesbote auf der Normaluhr). Kriegszeit, no. 2 (7 September 1914).
Figure 2.30. Rudolph Grossmann, “‘Who Wants to Become a Soldier…’” (“Wer will unter die Soldaten…”). *Kriegszeit*, no. 48 (18 July 1915).
Figure 2.31. Erich Büttner, “Southeastern Theater of Battle in Berlin” (Sudöstlicher kriegschauplatz in Berlin). Kriegszeit, no. 58 (beginning-December 1915).
Figure 2.32. Hedwig Weiß, “Women in Wartime: Housework” (Frauen in der Kriegszeit: Heimarbeit). *Kriegszeit*, no. 36 (21 April 1915).
Figure 2.33. Hedwig Weiß, “A Corporal’s Wife and Child” (Frau und Kind eines Unteroffiziers). *Kriegszeit*, no. 36 (21 April 1915).
Figure 2.34. Hedwig Weiß, “Between Hannover and Lehrte” (Zwischen Hannover und Lehrte). *Kriegszeit*, no. 36 (21 April 1915).
Figure 2.35. Hedwig Weiß, “War Sawing Room” (Kriegsnahstube). Kriegszeit, no. 36 (21 April 1915).
Figure 2.36. Rudolph Grossmann, “Polish Refugees” (Polnische Flüchtlinge). Kriegszeit, no. 16 (9 December 1914).
Figure 2.37. Waldeman Rösler, “Behind the Front in Flanders” (Hinter der Front in Flandern). *Kriegszeit*, no. 54 (1 October 1915).
Figure 2.38. Willy Jaeckel, “Serbian Destiny” (Serbisches Schicksal). *Kriegszeit*, no. 56 (1 November 1915).
Figure 2.39. Two-page spread from *Kriegszeit*, no. 22 (13 January 1915). Left page: August Gaul, “Hindenburg is Coming!” (Der Hindenburg kommt!). Right page: Max Liebermann, Untitled [Rifleman].
Figure 2.40. Two-page spread from *Kriegszeit*, no. 9 (21 October 1914). Left page: Wilhelm Oesterle, Untitled [Man with a Sword]. Right page: Otto Hettner, “Destroyed Battery” (Zeischossene).
Figure 2.41. Wilhem Trübner, “The Bavarian Crown Prince” (Der bayerische Kronprinz). Kriegszeit, no. 25 (3 February 1915).

Figure 2.42. Rupprecht von Bayern, the Crown Prince of Bavaria. Press photograph by Franz Granier.
Figure 2.44. Erich Büttner, “Attack on a Fort” (Sturm auf ein Fort). *Kriegszeit*, no. 15 (2 December 1914).
Figure 2.45. Alexander Kolbe, Sketches from the Field (Skizzen aus dem Feld). *Kriegszeit*, no. 15 (2 December 1914).
Figure 2.46. Two-page spread from *Kriegszeit*, no. 15 (2 December 1914). Left page: August Gaul, Untitled [Pigs and Sheep]. Right page: Otto Hettner, “To the Fainthearted Ones!” (Den Kleinmütigen!).
Figure 2.47. Käthe Kollwitz, “Waiting” (Das Warten), lithograph, 1914.

Figure 2.48. Käthe Kollwitz, “Trepidation” (Das Bangen). Kriegszeit, no. 10 (28 October 1914).
Figure 2.49. August Gaul,Untitled [Bears], lithograph, 1915.

Figure 2.50. August Gaul, Untitled [Bears]. *Kriegszeit*, no. 47 (8 July 1915).
Figure 2.51a. Leo Kestenberg and Paul Cassirer, prospectus for Der Bildermann. Included in Kriegszeit, no. 64/65 (end-March 1916). Front.

Figure 2.51b. Leo Kestenberg and Paul Cassirer, prospectus for Der Bildermann. Included in Kriegszeit, no. 64/65 (end-March 1916). Back.
Figure 2.52. Max Slevogt, frontispiece design for *Der Bildermann*, 1916. Detail.
Figure 2.53. Max Slevogt, “Signs of the Times I” (Symbole der Zeit I). *Der Bildermann*, no. 1 (5 April 1916).
Figure 2.54. Max Slevogt, “Signs of the Times VII” (Symbole der Zeit VII). Der Bildermann, no. 11 (5 September 1916).
Figure 2.55. Ottomar Starke, “The New Society IV” (Die neue Gesellschaft IV). Der Bildermann, no. 12 (20 September 1916).
Figure 2.56. Ottomar Starke, “The New Society III” (Die neue Gesellschaft III). *Der Bildermann*, no. 11 (5 September 1916).
Figure 2.57. Max Liebermann, “On the River Elbe” (An der Elbe). *Der Bildermann*, no. 10 (20 August 1916).
Figure 2.58. Max Liebermann, illustration of the poem “Pfingsten in Berlin” by Gottfried Keller. *Der Bilderman*, no. 5 (5 June 1916).
Figure 2.59. Otto Müller, “Three Figures and Crossed Tree Trunks” (Drei Figuren und gekreuzte Stämme). Der Bildermann, no. 9 (5 August 1916).
Figure 2.60. Erich Heckel, “Near Ghent” (Bei Gent). Der Bilder mann, no. 15 (5 November 1916).

Figure 2.61. Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, “Landscape in the Taunus” (Landschaft im Taunus). Der Bilder mann, no. 6 (6 June 1916).
Figure 2.62. Oskar Kokoschka, “Kiss of Judas—Christ’s Arrest” (Der Judaskuß—Gefangennahme Christi). *Der Bildermann*, no. 16 (20 November 1916).

Figure 2.63. Oskar Kokoschka, “Resurrection” (Auferstehung). *Der Bildermann*, no. 14 (20 October 1916).
Figure 2.64. Two-page spread from *Der Bildermann*, no. 8 (20 July 1916). Left page: August Gaul, Untitled [“Mattenrast”]. Right page: Heinrich Zille, “The Iron Cross” (Das Eiserne Kreuz).
Figure 2.65. Two-page spread from *Der Bildermann*, no. 12 (20 September 1916). Left page: Ottomar Starke, “The New Society IV” (Die neue Gesellschaft IV). Right page: Heinrich Zille, Untitled [Standing in Line for Potatoes (Kartoffelstehen)].
Figure 2.66. Two-page spread from Der Bildermann, no. 14 (20 October 1916). Left page: August Gaul, “If This Continues…” (Wenns so weiter geht…). Right page: Ottomar Starke, “The New Society V” (Die neue Gesellschaft V).
Figure 3.1. Max Liebermann, Untitled [Crowd in Street]. *Kriegszeit*, no. 1 (31 August 1914).
Figure 3.2. Max Slevogt, frontispiece design for *Der Bildermann*, 1916. Detail.
Figure 3.3. Heinrich Kaiser, “Church Near Arras” (Kirche bei Arras). *Kriegszeit*, no. 64/65 (end-March 1916).
Figure 3.4. Helmuth Stockmann, “Maubeuge: What I saw!...” (Maubeuge: Was ich sah!...). *Kriegszeit*, no. 7 (7 October 1914).
Figure 3.5. Comparison between *Kriegszeit* no. 20 and no. 21, indicating improvement in paper quality.
Figure 3.6. Portfolio for safekeeping of *Kriegszeit*.
Figure 3.7. Portfolio for safekeeping of Der Bildermann.