

Sussex Research

Aims and obstacles, gains and setbacks: German women, 1945-1960

Christiane Niemeyer

Publication date

01-01-2000

Licence

This work is made available under the **Copyright not evaluated** licence and should only be used in accordance with that licence. For more information on the specific terms, consult the repository record for this item.

Citation for this work (American Psychological Association 7th edition)

Niemeyer, C. (2000). *Aims and obstacles, gains and setbacks: German women, 1945-1960* (Version 1). University of Sussex. <https://hdl.handle.net/10779/uos.23312861.v1>

Published in

University of Sussex Journal of Contemporary History

Copyright and reuse:

This work was downloaded from Sussex Research Open (SRO). This document is made available in line with publisher policy and may differ from the published version. Please cite the published version where possible. Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners unless otherwise stated. For more information on this work, SRO or to report an issue, you can contact the repository administrators at sro@sussex.ac.uk. Discover more of the University's research at <https://sussex.figshare.com/>

Aims and obstacles, gains and setbacks: German women, 1945-1960

Article (Unspecified)

Niemeyer, Christiane (2000) Aims and obstacles, gains and setbacks: German women, 1945-1960. University of Sussex Journal of Contemporary History (1). pp. 1-9.

This version is available from Sussex Research Online: <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/1751/>

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies and may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the URL above for details on accessing the published version.

Copyright and reuse:

Sussex Research Online is a digital repository of the research output of the University.

Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable, the material made available in SRO has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Aims and Obstacles, Gains and Setbacks: German Women, 1945 –1960

Christiane Niemeyer

The writing of women's history in the Federal Republic of Germany began in the mid- 1970s. The initiative to trace women's history was largely motivated by members of the second women's movement (*Neue Frauenbewegung*) that emerged in the late 1960s and early 1970s. These women focused their attention on the experiences of their mothers and grandmothers. In doing so they hoped to discover how the history of the past two generations had influenced their own thoughts and ideas i.e. how the historical causes and origins of the women's movement in the recent past had shaped their own beliefs concerning emancipation. The Kaiserreich, the Weimar Republic, and the Nazi regime are the three eras in contemporary women's history that have sparked off the greatest amount of writing and discussion. In comparison, women's history relating to the post-1945 period, especially the 1950s, was much less a forum for scholarly debates. In the mid 1980s and 1990s more attempts have been made to reconstruct the lives of women in the 1950s, but these works are still under-represented.¹

In the attempt to trace the roots of women's emancipation in Germany, it is clear why the members of the *Neue Frauenbewegung* focused on the *Kaiserreich* and the Weimar Republic. Broadly speaking, in the *Kaiserreich*, Germany's first women's movement had its origins under the numerically strong umbrella organization: *Bund Deutscher Frauen* (BDF). In the Weimar Republic, women were first granted the vote, and the Weimar constitution stated that women were 'in principal' equal to men. Thus, at least on the surface the women's emancipation movement gained momentum in both periods. Similarly the preoccupation, of writers of women's history with the Nazi regime can be explained with the aim of examining why women after a period of relative emancipation were, on the whole, willing to accept the repressive gender policies of the Nazis.² However, during the early years of writing German women's history, the willingness to closely examine the periods that contained little in the way of progress towards emancipation declined as the historian's retrospective gaze turned towards the Nazi-period.

In the post WW II period, no strong women's emancipation movement emerged, and Herad Schenk's pioneer work on the history of women's emancipation in Germany stated that in the 1950s and early 1960s the word 'emancipation' would only have produced a sense of fatigue among most German women. It was clear that the *Neue Frauenbewegung* felt their ideals had little in common with those of these 'disinterested' women and thus the 1950s had little to offer those who sought to trace the origins and development of women's emancipation in Germany.³

However, more recent works that look at the post-Nazi period in Germany have detected a quite 'favorable' climate for women's organization and emancipation during the direct aftermath of the war.⁴ The breakdown of the Nazi regime in 1945 is sometimes referred to as a 'zero hour': "a moment in history when the past is wiped out and human life begins anew as if after a great natural disaster".⁵ This 'zero hour', in many cases, was not pertinent to women. They continued, as they had during the war, to take over spaces in the job market and within the family, occupying roles that had traditionally been assigned to men.

The effects of the war had created a numerical imbalance between men and women. In 1948, 7.3 million more women than men lived in Germany. This imbalance was felt most amongst the generation of the 20-40 year old cohort.⁶ Not only had many men died during the war but a large number were still prisoners of war and would not be reunited with their families until the mid- 1950s. For the majority of German women this meant a continuation of their situation during the war. In order to survive they had to take on the responsibilities of sole breadwinner and head of the family household, adding to their traditional roles of housewives and mothers. However, after the war for a great number of women this was done without the hope that the 'double burden' situation would cease to exist in the near future. It seemed that the effects of the war, the death and absence of many men, together with the slim possibility of remarrying and returning to 'normality', had broken down the patriarchal family structure. By having to compromise the traditional gender roles for socio-economic reasons women were led into 'semi-emancipation' gaining a sense of independence in their everyday life.

It is this context, derived from necessity, which some recent writers of women's history have classified as favorable to women's emancipation. This raises the question of whether women did in fact react to a post-war climate that was favorable to their own emancipation. What factors prevented many women in the Federal Republic from taking more interest in their own emancipation by the 1950s? The following will examine these issues, firstly by analyzing how women's emancipation was defined in legal terms during the early years of the newly established Federal Republic of 1949, together with how the male dominated major political parties perceived the status of women. Secondly, it will look at the main organizations women founded in the late 1940s and the 1950s and taking into account the goals for which they fought.

In what follows I will for the most part use the term 'women' in its collective sense. By this I do not intend to imply that all women's experiences in the post-war period were the same. My analysis will not give specific consideration to women in rural settings or refugee women. Their opportunities to organize, their economic hardships and job possibilities differ from women in an urban setting and would necessitate a separate analysis. The women referred to here are those living in towns. Even though class differences existed between them they seem to be of a more secondary nature compared to the common gender based problems urban women faced in the war's aftermath. Also it should be mentioned that the development traced after 1949 is that of women in the Federal Republic of Germany. The experience of women in the German Democratic Republic was a rather different one.⁷ During the post 1945 period, the question of women's work was a focal point of debate. It was the nature of women's work in Germany's reconstruction period that led some men and women to believe that the definition of gender roles was undergoing a change. As mentioned above, one legacy of the war in Germany was the 'surplus' of women and the absence of able men who could take on the role of the family breadwinners. Not only single women, but also one third of women with families and children were forced to find work outside the home.⁸ In the direct aftermath of the war many worked in what were formerly male dominated jobs such as in construction and the heavy industries. Jobs in industries formerly dominated by women i.e. textile were at first not readily available as the materials needed for production could not be provided.⁹ Throughout this time the economic situation in Germany was obviously not seen as normal, and it was expected that, just as during the war, this abnormal situation called for a temporary acceptance of atypical labor divisions.

During Germany's occupation the Allies were quick to recognize that women's work was needed to rebuild Germany and its economy. Women's achievements in this respect were widely praised by men in post-war writing. Here women were mostly seen as having

acquitted themselves well, sometimes even better than men.¹⁰ Even though it was appreciated that women were capable of doing a good job in typically male dominated areas, such pronouncements did not mean that they should permanently take over such jobs. Women were to be replaced by men as soon as they returned from captivity. In particularly male dominated industries, women's work was always seen as temporary in the eyes of their male counterparts.

However, the 'surplus' of women meant that women's work in other industries, even that of married women, could no longer be classified as a short term temporary phenomenon. When the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) was founded in 1949, this fact was recognized even by the most conservative German politicians. Among them was Chancellor Konrad Adenauer who stated that it was necessary to make a greater variety of job opportunities available to women.¹¹ For most conservative politicians women's work was acceptable mainly for two reasons; first as a financial necessity for women to support themselves and their families¹², and secondly, as a much needed labor force without which the German economy could not flourish. These reasons had little to do with men's willingness to generally open up the job market for women and grant them equal job opportunities.¹³ It was because of the fast flourishing economy, the need for a labor force and for potential consumers in the 1950s, that women's work, and especially married women's work, was accepted and not more harshly condemned under the Christian Conservative German government (CDU/CSU).¹⁴

Even though women's work was recognized as a necessity in the above mentioned cases, the model women for the CDU/CSU party throughout the late 1940s and 1950s remained that of the devoted mother and housewife who was selflessly dedicated to the good of her family.¹⁵ The election propaganda of the CDU/CSU strongly reflects this ideal. In the 1953 campaign, the concerns of women working outside the home were not considered. Instead, for example, the CDU economic minister, Ludwig Ehrhard, only addressed women in their role as housewives during his election campaign. Ehrhard compared his job as economic minister to that of every German housewife. He equated the worries of the private household with those of 'his' state household.¹⁶ The message was clear: What Ehrhard was doing in large in the world of male politics, the housewife was doing on a small scale in her household. Thus, every housewife shared the worries of the economic minister and he shared theirs. This propaganda tactic implies that women could only understand politics by having them equated to the 'female sphere' of family and household. In the view of conservative male politicians women's votes were not won through facts and figures nor in light of changing gender roles.¹⁷ Moreover, women in general were seen as politically disinterested. It was felt that they could only relate to politics and their attention and vote could only be won by converting political facts into abstracts and redefining these within the 'female sphere' of the household. Nevertheless, women voted for the CDU/CSU in 1953.¹⁸ This shows that they were susceptible to this election propaganda and did not necessarily object to what CDU/CSU saw as women's primary role.¹⁹

Defining women's role as that of mother and housewife was further underlined by what the newly established Ministry for Family Affairs proclaimed in 1953. Franz-Josef Wuermeling became the Ministry's head official and stayed in office until 1962. As a practicing Catholic and arch conservative, CDU member Wuermeling was essentially concerned with the revival of the German family and the role women should play within this context. For Wuermeling women were at their best when they conformed to the status of housewife and mother of numerous children. Consequently, employment outside the home was seen as an undesirable aspiration. Instead, under Wuermeling, much was done through financial benefits to make the role of dedicated mother and housewife attractive for women.²⁰

The CDU/CSU women's ideal demonstrates that a necessitated acceptance of women's work did not mean that the conservative party member's view of women had been challenged or changed. The politics of CDU/CSU tried to honor the role of mother and housewife rather than to support the needs of the working woman.²¹ There seems to be a discrepancy between the 'real' politics, and the CDU/CSU ideal. On the one hand it was necessary to open the job-market for women, on the other hand the politics of CDU/CSU largely ignored the needs of working women. As governing party throughout the 1950s the female model of CDU/CSU dominated the political arena. The CDU/CSU policies during the 1950s ensured that work outside the home was seen as unattractive by most women because they received less pay and job training. It's possible that in the role of mothers and housewives they felt they could gain more recognition and achieve more self-fulfillment.

The Social Democratic opposition party's perception of women differed from that of the CDU/CSU. Traditionally the Social Democrats (SPD) had encouraged the political equality of men and women. When in the 1950s, surveys showed that the majority of women had little interest in politics, the SPD claimed the reason for this apathy was to be found in the fact that women had few opportunities to actively participate in politics and the working world. Indeed, they were often isolated in their traditional roles as housewives and mothers. The political goal of the SPD was to change this political apathy.²² The Social Democrats further recognized the double burden of work and motherhood by calling for equal job opportunities and equal pay for men and women. In 1959, their political agenda stated that equality of women had to be realized politically, socially and economically.²³

However, throughout the 1950s, the SPD also encouraged the role of mother and housewife for women and, perhaps unintentionally, underlined women's roles as such.²⁴ For example, their later claim that the household chores of women should be recognized as a 'career job' did little to encourage women to actively participate in political life nor would this suggestion help assuage women's isolated position that, according to the SPD, precipitated political indifference in the first place. The attitudes to women of both SPD and CDU/CSU politicians show how deeply ingrained the woman's role of mother and housewife was in post-war German society. This was even present amongst those who felt they were fighting for the equal recognition of women's work.

A cautious and, to some extent, hostile attitude towards equality and emancipation of women is further reflected in major legal debates of the late 1940s and 1950s. In particular, the discussions on the equalization law and the reforms in family law are of crucial importance.

In 1949, the Federal Republic was founded on the constitutional pillars of the new Basic Law (Grund Gesetz/GG) and the old civil law code Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch (BGB) that had survived from the Kaiserreich and the Weimar Republic. Many of the basic principles that were manifested in the GG were inspired by the Weimar Reichsverfassung. The equality law was such a principle. However, in the Weimar Reichsverfassung, the equality of men and women was conditioned as 'equality in principle', while the law which was written in the GG 'unconditionally' stated that men and women were equal.²⁵

Those in the parliamentary committee²⁶ working on the FRG's constitution, agreed that an equality law should be part of the GG. Nevertheless, they did not unanimously agree on the simple wording and the 'unconditioned' nature of the law that was finally accepted as GG Art. 3, Sec. 2, on January 18, 1949. Men in the CDU, the German Liberal Party (FDP) and at first also some SPD members, proposed that equality of men and women should be further conditioned just as in Weimar. That this proposal was not accepted is mainly due to the effort of SPD member Elisabeth Selbert who successfully involved the public in the 'equality' debate.²⁷

Selbert had been active in politics during Weimar. For her it was obvious that, since Weimar, an evolution in gender relations should have taken place in German society. In particular, women's work achievements for the German state in the aftermath of the war called for the validity of such an evolution. Consequently, for Selbert, this had to be recognized in the new law. That an evolution had not happened for many men is sadly reflected in the 'equalization' proposal of CDU, FDP and SPD male politicians. It seems that already in 1949, men had to be reminded of what women's achievements had meant for Germany in the previous four years. Through the efforts of the few female politicians and women's pressure groups, men in the parliamentary committee were pushed to do more than simply pay lip-service to these achievements by recognizing them in literature and the press. Many women felt they deserved official acknowledgment. With the unconditioned equality law this acknowledgment became an official manifestation of law. The GG equalization law permitted that, at least in theory, a milestone for women's equality in Germany was reached.²⁸

The acceptance of the unconditioned equality law had consequences for other parts of German legislation. Most laws in the BGB that dealt with the relationships between men and women were affected, especially those on marriage and family. Since the BGB laws had been approved during Weimar they were in accordance with the old equality law of 1919. This proved problematic as discrepancies would be unsurmountable once the GG's new equality law was actively applied. It was necessary to amend the BGB in these areas so that the unconditioned equality of men and women would be reflected in all German law articles. This task was to be completed in a four year time period. The time frame given, however, proved too short. Most of the BGB's marriage and family law was not changed until 1958. Thus, the theoretical equality of men and women in this area did not happen until the late 1950s. Furthermore, in 1953, after the end of the four year amendment period all old BGB laws that were not in accordance with the GG, Art. 3, Sec. 2 were no longer considered valid. This meant that for a period of almost five years no complete marriage or family law existed. Judges were bound by the new equality law but the settlement of many finer points of marriage and family disputes were entirely up to their personal judgment.²⁹ Whether this was to women's advantage or disadvantage is questionable. However, it can be assumed that many judges during these five years acted in basic accordance with the old family law, within which they were at least provided with detailed guidelines.

The nature of the old marriage and family law was heavily dominated by patriarchal principles. Any legally binding decision concerning a couple could only be made by the husband and by legal definition a couple's possessions belonged only to the husband. In marriage women were forced to take on their husband's surname. Even though the wife was responsible for the children's upbringing, the husband as their legal guardian had the final say on how this upbringing should be conducted. In addition, where the mother had received custody of the children through divorce settlements, the father continued to be the legal guardian. Moreover, the law stated that wives were fully responsible for all domestic duties necessary to smoothly run a household. If they were unable to fulfill these successfully because they were working outside the home, the husband had the right to bar the possibility of paid employment to his wife.³⁰ These are just a few examples of the marriage and family law that was actively binding until 1953.

In 1958, the new marriage and family law settlements had reformed most of these 'equality hostile' statements. However, some 'unequal' implications remained, and these are crucial indicators for the legislators' ideal perception of men and women. For example, married women still had to give up their maiden names and thus part of their identity. A clear division of gender roles was further part of the recommended ideal family structure.

Although it was stated that both men and women had the right to work, the expected norm for a German nuclear family was defined in accordance with the 'woman housewife ideal'. Man was the breadwinner "while woman's most noble duty had to be at the heart of the family".³¹ Thus, even the amended version of the family and marriage law was based on a different equality, implying that at least for married women there were still discrepancies between the equality of the GG and that of the BGB.

The above mentioned laws and ideal perceptions were most often directed to the maintenance of the patriarchal family and the revival of women's sole role as housewives and mothers. After 1949, in law and in conservative dominated politics every effort was made to suppress any initiative that strayed from traditional gender roles. Male politicians feverishly emphasized the role of housewife and mother to such an extent that by the early 1950s women who did not fit this ideal were seen as abnormal. Once most men returned from captivity in the early 1950s, those women who remained single were no longer considered as strong and independent. They were increasingly pitied, by both men and women, as being the unfortunates who had not succeeded in the competitive marriage market. Indeed, matriarchal family structures were defined as an abnormal necessity that some women were forced to endure.³²

Why women did not protest more strongly against an evolution that aimed to lead them from semi-emancipation and independence back to the role of the 'happy' housewife and mother is a question that is often raised in connection with women's roles in the 1950s. It seems that no single explanation can be readily allocated here but a variety of factors, often very case specific, such as time to organize and financial hardships, played an important role. In the following I will briefly investigate what factors most suppressed protest. In doing so, I will focus on how women chose to organize and what their most pressing concerns were in the years that followed the war.

After the German surrender in 1945, many women in urban centers first chose to organize in antifascist committees. Within these committees women became responsible for looking after refugees, setting up shelters, and distributed food and living space for those in need. The specific life problems that the committees dealt with made participation in the 'political' antifascist organizations easy for women. They felt competent in solving 'everyday' problems.³³ In March 1947, several of the antifascist committees evolved into the Democratic Women of Germany (DFD). The close links with communism made the organization unacceptable for the Allies in the West-German zones and it was not until 1950 that the organization was re-founded in the FRG. The DFD was probably the most political women's organization that was 'independent' and not directly connected to a political party. Its first priority was peace keeping closely followed by women's emancipation.³⁴ When in 1957, the Communist Party in Germany was declared unconstitutional, the small political DFD was also made illegal. Attempts by women to organize in traditional political structures were on the whole unsuccessful. The failure to establish a women's political party in 1947, and the lack of enthusiasm shown by most women to join the women's organizations of the Federal Republic's political parties after 1949, vividly demonstrate this.³⁵

After the breakdown of the Nazi regime, several of the old women's organizations which had been disbanded in 1933, such as many confessional groups, were re-established. In 1949, a majority of these were loosely joined under the umbrella organization *Deutscher Frauenring*/German Woman's Circle. The *Deutscher Frauenring* considered itself to be non-confessional and apolitical.³⁶ The groups it organized were diverse in their aims and therefore the umbrella was seldom able to appear as a unanimous front. This limited its influence as a pressure group. Most of the *Frauenring* members, however, stood in accordance with the

conservative CDU politics. Hence, from its outset there was little potential in the Frauenring to challenge the political establishment of the 1950s.³⁷

On the whole, no numerically strong and politically minded women's organization emerged after the antifascist committees. In the 1950s, the most 'political' task many women were involved in was peacekeeping. In 1948, the American military government estimated that in Bavaria only 8 to 9 percent of all women were politically active. Although the potential for women to organize and be active in a 'politically minded' structure existed in 1945, it had largely disappeared by the late 1940s. The breakdown of the Nazi regime in 1945 had destroyed the male dominated political foundations which theoretically created a favorable climate for women to organize on their own terms. However, the quick return to the traditional, male-defined political structures ensured that women were pushed outside of what was defined as politics. The political work they had done in the antifascist organizations was directly concerned with human survival. Once politics were equated with 'higher' goals such as the ideological differences of the Allies, most women felt that these stood in no direct relation to the pressing problem of everyday German life. In this domain women were still continuously involved, aiding themselves and others in everyday survival.³⁸ In a sense, women's participation in politics had not changed but rather the definition of political work had.

When male political structures regained the upper hand women had little with which they were able to challenge them. Organizations such as the DFD that aimed to provide a political counterweight and challenged the ideal role of women as mother and housewife were few. The DFD was on the whole ignored by men and finally overruled and forbidden.³⁹ Why organizations such as the DFD were small and why a larger political counterweight did not exist cannot only be assigned to the fact that women felt they had no place in the re-established male dominated political structures. That they were not able to create a place for themselves in these structures was also linked to the fact that many women had little time to organize in groups that were not directly concerned with matters of survival. The hardships that women had to endure in the aftermath of the war should not be underestimated. Food, clothes, shelter, as well as all basic necessities were insufficiently provided, so that most women had to be inventive in order to maintain a living for themselves and their dependants. In the post war years everyday survival was time consuming.⁴⁰ Only when economic burdens for some women lessened would they have found time to organize in structures that were not primarily concerned with survival.

However, in the late 1940s when the economic situation improved for a number of women, men had already recreated the old traditional political structures by which many women felt intimidated. Elisabeth Selbert's experience and involvement in this male dominated structure was a rare exception.⁴¹ Nevertheless, this does not mean that women were not at all interested in their emancipation as the GG debates show. Rather they seemed to have problems following up on these in the sphere of male dominated political structures. It was especially younger women who were most reluctant to organize in any way. They had little interest in joining the old and mostly apolitical women's movements, with whose aims they could not identify. Nor did they want to be involved in any overtly political organizations. This aversion to organization can be traced back to the experiences of the Third Reich. The breakdown of the Nazi regime, where many had gained their first 'politicalization' and organization experiences, had proven disastrous and left feelings of disillusionment and betrayal towards political structures. Most women decided to stay away from politics altogether.⁴² This was also the case with many young men. Privatization rather than politicization became most important for many young German people.⁴³

Within this context the revival of the patriarchal family structure was most meaningful. In the 1950s, the family was increasingly seen as the institution of the past that could return psychological and social stability to those whose lives had been turned upside down with the breakdown of the Nazi regime.⁴⁴ Once their economic situation improved, many young women did not object to taking on the role of mother and housewife. They had seldom experienced only the apparently traditional women's role of housewife and mother which was so widely propagated by men. To be feminine was a novelty that many women had never known.⁴⁵ Throughout the 1940s, they had not been given the choice but were rather forced to take on men's roles and endure the double burden with the effects of the war and its aftermath. The jobs women had to take on were often underpaid and provided few career opportunities. Indeed, on the whole the 'taste of independence' experienced by women was full of burdens and hardships. On the contrary, the status for women encouraged by the political establishment in the late 1940s and 1950s seemed to offer comfort, stability, and normality, something many women had not had in years and were longing for.

It is questionable whether women in the direct aftermath of the war actually saw their situation as a chance to become more independent. If they had, most no longer expressed this in the 1950s. With the return of men from war and the quick reestablishment of the male defined political structures men and women's roles were again rigidly categorized. In theory the potential for women to organize and break out of the traditionally defined gender roles existed. How practical the realization of this potential was is hard to determine if we consider the demanding situation many women faced after the war. Moreover, the potential for women's organization and emancipation rests on a narrow definition. It implies that in 1945, through the breakdown of male political structures, and by entering the male sphere in the job market, women were able to strive for more independence. However, the breakdown of institutions is not automatically followed by a change in thought patterns. If these are not altered a real change in society cannot take place. Especially during the Nazi period, men and women had, in theory been firmly indoctrinated with the traditional division of gender roles. While during and immediately after the war a deconstruction of gender roles occurred for some women and men they remained unchanged in the minds of the majority of Germans. Therefore, when the political establishment and legislation in the late 1940s and the 1950s promoted traditional gender roles in exchange for a sense of stability, normality, and recognition through economic growth, this seemed a fair trade for many German women and men.

-
1. Ute Frevert, "Historische Frauenforschung", in *Deutsche Frauenforschungs-gemeinschaft, Sozialwissenschaftliche Frauenforschung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Berlin, 1994) and Herad Schenk, *Die Feministische Herausforderung: 150 Jahre Frauenbewegung in Deutschland* (München, 1980), p.7.
 2. In this context it was first seen as most important to give the women of the *Neue Frauenbewegung* some basic knowledge of the existence of the first women's movement in Germany i.e. the period up until 1933. The goal was to establish a sense that there existed a specific 'feminist' past in Germany and that the ideals of this first women's movement partly coincided with the demands of women in the *Neue Frauenbewegung*. To emphasize this common past was more important than to look at areas that were outside this sphere such as the 1950s. Schenk, p.7.
 3. Schenk, p.8.
 4. Jutta Beyer/Everhard Holtmann, "'Auch die Frau soll politisch denken' oder: 'Die Bildung des Herzens'", *Archive für Sozialgeschichte*, vol.25 (1985), p.387.
 5. Gisela Kaplan, *Contemporary Western European Feminism* (New York, 1992), p.107.

6. These figures refer to Berlin, the British-American and French occupation zones, Rita Polm, "...neben dem Mann die andere Hälfte eines Ganzen zu sein"!"; *Frauen in der Nachkriegszeit – Zur Situation und Rolle der jüngeren Frauen in den Städten der Bundesrepublik (1945-1949)* (Münster, 1990), pp.70-71.
7. Compare e.g. Gisela Helwig/Hildegard Maria Nickel, eds., *Frauen in Deutschland: 1945-1992* (Berlin, 1993) and Renate Wiggershausen, *Geschichte der Frauen und der Frauenbewegung ; In der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik nach 1945* (Wuppertal, 1979).
8. Beyer/Holtmann, p.391.
9. Polm, p.136.
10. Beyer/Holtmann, p.391.
11. Polm, p.140.
12. The FRG had little money for welfare in its early years and was thus unable to support women and their families sufficiently.
13. This is reflected in the fact that women usually received less training and less pay in jobs that were also desirable for men. Polm, pp.135-141.
14. Ute Frevert, *Frauen-Geschichte zwischen Bürgerlicher Verbesserung und Neuer Weiblichkeit* (Frankfurt, 1986), pp.255-256.
15. Waltraut Cornelissen, "Politische Partizipationen von Frauen in der alten Bundesrepublik und im vereinten Deutschland", in Gisela Helwig/Hildegard M. Nickel, eds., *Frauen in Deutschland: 1945-1992* (Berlin, 1993), p.330.
16. Wiggershausen, pp.57-59.
17. Ibid., p.58.
18. The main reason for this is seen in the fact that the CDU/CSU stood for Christian values and many women who were looking for stability saw these Christian values as a continuation of something they knew and felt comfortable with from personal experience. Polm, p.99.
19. Annette Kuhn/Doris Schubert, eds., *Frauenalltag und Frauenbewegung im 20 Jahrhundert; Materialsammlung vol.4* (Frankfurt, 1980), p.141.
20. Beate Hocker/Renate Meyer-Braun, *Bremenerinnen bewältigen die Nachkriegszeit* (Bremen, 1988), p.193.
21. Wiggershausen, p.56.
22. Both major parties had very few women in politically influential positions.
23. Wiggershausen, pp.64-65 and Cornelissen, p.330.
24. Wiggershausen, p.65.
25. Frevert, *Frauen-Geschichte*, p.265.
26. The committee consisted out of 61 men and 4 women.
27. Polm, p.106, Frevert, p.265, and Rosemarie Nave-Herz, *Die Geschichte der Frauenbewegung in Deutschland* (Hannover, 1997), p.50.
28. Wiggershausen, p.24 and Polm, p.106.
29. Frevert, *Frauen-Geschichte*, p.267.
30. Polm, p.107.
31. (All translations are my own unless otherwise stated), "... während es die Frau als ihre vornehmste Aufgabe ansehen muss, dass Herz der Familie zu sein.", Wiggershausen, p.30.
32. Sibylle Meyer/Eva Schultz, eds., *Wie wir das alles geschafft haben: alleinstehende Frauen berichten über ihr Leben nach 1945* (München, 1985), p.147.
33. Frevert, *Frauen-Geschichte*, p.274.
34. Ingeborg Nödinger, "Für Frieden und Gleichberechtigung; Der Demokratische Frauenbund Deutschlands", in Florence Hervé, *Geschichte der Deutschen Frauenbewegung* (Köln, 1983), pp.189-190.
35. Polm, pp.95-96.
36. Wiggershausen, pp.91-94.
37. Kuhn/Schubert, p.150.
38. Frevert, *Frauen-Geschichte*, pp.274-275.
39. Nödinger, pp.193-198.
40. Polm, pp.54-68.
41. Waltraut Cornelissen, "Politische Partizipation von Frauen in der alten Bundes-republik und im vereiten Deutschland", in G. Helwig/H.M. Nickel, eds., *Frauen in Deutschland: 1945-1992* (Berlin, 1993), pp.321-322.
42. Wiggershausen, p.91.
43. Frevert, *Frauen-Geschichte*, p.253.
44. Kuhn/Schubert, p.39.
45. Hoecker/Meyer-Braun, pp.193-194.