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RICHARD J. EVANS

UNTIL very recently, almost no serious research into the history of feminism and female emancipation in modern Germany has been published. This neglect is indeed far deeper than that from which women's history in Britain, France, or the United States has suffered. In some measure, it is connected with the reasons for the general neglect of social history in modern Germany—the concern of German historians with questions of political power, foreign policy, and intellectual development, the perversion of historical studies in the Weimar Republic and the Third Reich, and the dominance in West German historiography of a close professional elite whose intellectual roots went back to the period before 1933. This situation is now changing, and there is growing interest in both West and East Germany in women's role in the German past. Yet, so far at any rate, this interest has not inspired in Germany any major work of research or synthesis. Even more surprising is the fact that the numerous recent American discussions of women and modernization in Europe almost entirely fail to discuss Germany, confining themselves instead to taking examples from Britain and France. In view of the centrality of the German

1. See especially the coverage of this subject in recent works such as Dieter Fricke, ed., Die bürgerlichen Parteien in Deutschland 1850–1945: Handbuch (Leipzig, 1968); Gerhard A. Ritter and Jürgen Kocka, eds., Deutsche Sozialgeschichte 1870–1914: Dokumente und Skizzen (Munich, 1975); Jutta Menschik, Gleichberechtigung oder Emanzipation? Die Frau im Erwerbsleben der Bundesrepublik (Frankfurt am Main, 1971); Gisela Brandt, Johanna Kootz, and Gisela Steppke, Zur Frauenfrage im Kapitalismus (Frankfurt am Main, 1973).

2. For an early discussion, see Urs Müller-Plantenberg, "Zur Geschichte der Lage der Frauen in Deutschland," Das Argument 4, no. 3 (1962): 20–26. More specialized recent scholarly work is cited in the footnotes below.
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model to more general discussions such as that in Kate Millett’s *Sexual Politics*, it seems astonishing that so little has been done to investigate the German dimension of women’s history.3

There are a number of possible causes for this more general failure to take Germany into account in developing theoretical and historical studies linking women and modernization. German women have always been thought unusually dull and submissive, and there may well be an assumption that their position and attitudes have changed very little in the course of modernization. Yet such studies as have been carried out on women in the late 1920s and early 1930s—a period generally considered too late by historians who use the theory of modernization as a basis for their work—have suggested that the contrary was true.4 The bias of social-historical studies of women’s history in the German field toward the period of the Nazi seizure of power and the Third Reich is perhaps understandable.5 But it is nonetheless re-

Louise A. Tilly, “Women’s Work and the Family in Nineteenth-Century Europe,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 17 (1975): 36–64; and Louise A. Tilly, Joan W. Scott, and Miriam Cohen, “Women’s Work and European Fertility Patterns,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 6 (1976): 447–76. The comparative neglect of Germany by these latter authors is all the more striking since their major objective is to attack the interpretations advanced by Edward Shorter in *The Making of the Modern Family* (London, 1976) and a number of articles (see n. 28 below), which are based to a great extent on German material, and which originated in research carried out on rural society in Bavaria.


4. See for example Renate Bridenthal, “Beyond Kinder, Küche, Kirche: Weibliche Women at Work,” *Central European History* 6 (1973): 148–66, which studies the impact of modernization on German women and argues that it made them look to an idealized past. Other students (e.g., Patricia Branca) emphasize the positive effects of modernization on women’s place in society, which may be an additional reason for their avoidance of Germany. Germany may also have escaped because (as Bridenthal shows) the real impact of economic and social modernization hit women in Germany only in the twentieth century, and students of modernization in Europe often tend to concentrate on the nineteenth century, neglecting the different pace of development in different countries.

Richard J. Evans

gretttable. Moreover, assumptions about the allegedly conservative nature at least of middle-class women in Germany have perhaps also been responsible for a marked tendency on the part of researchers to avoid studying the liberal feminist movement in Germany and concentrate instead on the superficially more radical, more attractive, and more impressive socialist women’s movement.\(^6\) Contributory factors may possibly include the scattered and uneven nature of the sources, a general preference for studying more obviously successful feminist movements elsewhere, or the difficulty of obtaining until very recently at least even a basic introductory knowledge of German feminist history from which to start serious research.\(^7\)

Yet the importance of Germany for women’s history is readily apparent. Germany industrialized very rapidly—far more rapidly than France, for example—and so should provide a good test case for the effects of industrialization on the position of women in society. Ger-

---

Research in progress on women in German society in this period includes: Dörte Winckler-Schurr (Trier/Freiburg) studying working women 1933–1945, Helen Boak (Manchester) researching into working women in the Depression, and Renate Bredenthal (Brooklyn) looking at working women in the Weimar Republic. By contrast, there is relatively little of a nonorganizational orientation on the period before 1918.


7. The only reliable account based on primary sources was until recently Irmgard Remme, “Die Internationalen Beziehungen der deutschen Frauenbewegung vom Ausgang des 19. Jahrhunderts bis 1933” (Ph.D. diss., Free University of Berlin, 1955), which confines itself to one aspect of the question. The problems of the sources are discussed in part v of this article.
many also experienced in the Third Reich one of the most violently antifeminist regimes of modern times. It is surely of interest to investigate why this was so, and whether or not this corresponded to a failure or weakness on the part of the German feminist movement. Indeed, there is now some discussion of issues such as this in the general context of German history; and the position of women in society, with the rise of the feminist movement, is being made something of a test case for the liberality or authoritarianism of German society in general both before and after the First World War.\(^8\)

The purpose of this article is not to review these issues and problems, or to discuss in any detail the historiography that is beginning to grow up around them. It is, rather, to clear the ground by surveying the sources available to researchers who wish to tackle these and other aspects of German women’s history, to discuss the problems involved in evaluating and interpreting these sources, and to suggest at least a few of the directions in which research might proceed and some of the methods it might employ. In so doing, I hope to provide some useful information to intending researchers (and teachers) and also to point the way to future work, as well as (by implication at least) discuss some of the problems that are involved in evaluating certain kinds of historical sources.

II

Perhaps one of the most surprising aspects of the neglect into which the history of German women has fallen is the almost complete absence of any serious discussion of the economic effects of industrialization on women. It is possible, of course, that historians have been deterred from tackling this subject by the problematic nature of the statistics available. The starting point for an investigation of the effects of industrialization on women in Germany must of course be the volumes of the *Statistik des Deutschen Reiches* devoted to the labor censuses of 1895 and 1907. The material contained in these statistical volumes is rich and detailed, but unfortunately as far as women are concerned it is incomplete, particularly for the census of 1895, in which women who gave unpaid assistance to their fathers or husbands in agriculture or artisan or retail trades were not counted as employed. A further complication is introduced by the fact that they were so counted in 1907, with the result

---

that the two sets of statistics are only comparable on the basis of a back projection of the categories employed in 1907 onto the statistics of 1895. Such an exercise naturally leaves room for considerable differences of opinion on the figures arrived at. Moreover, before 1895, that is, in the important early phases of industrialization, when (according to some historians at least) female participation in the economy actually declined, there are no available statistics for the whole of the German Empire, and estimates have to be made on the basis of Prussian or other Land censuses and local investigations carried out by individual social scientists.

The pioneering work on sources such as these is Jürgen Kuczynski’s *Die Geschichte der Lage der Arbeiter unter dem Kapitalismus, Band 18: Studien zur Geschichte der Lage der Arbeiterin in Deutschland von 1700 bis zur Gegenwart* (East Berlin, 1963). Like all the volumes in Kuczynski’s massive work, it is a mine of fascinating information, but put together rather hastily and thus somewhat haphazard in its coverage. It is primarily a compilation of empirical material relating to women workers in agriculture, factories, and domestic industry. It must undoubtedly form the starting point for further study of this subject, and remains useful for the statistical tables and early documents it prints. But it attempts to cover a vast and largely unexplored subject in a relatively short space, and so necessarily lacks the nuances that a more detailed investigation of individual sectors of female employment might provide. It is in this area, indeed, that the most fruitful research can now be undertaken. Some attempts have already been made to discuss the situation and evolution of a few specific female occupational categories, but a great deal of work remains to be done. In particular, we need more work on the nineteenth century, and more research into the phenomenon of middle-class employment. Scholarly attention has indeed come to focus in recent years on middle-class, and especially lower middle-class forms of employment, but none of this work takes adequate account of the crucial role played by women in these sectors.


11. Work is being carried out by Robyn Dasey (Portsmouth Polytechnic / London School of Economics) on working women in nineteenth-century Germany.
where they often formed a majority of people in employment. Yet there is much to be learned from an investigation of the role of middle-class women in the trades and professions, as the following example may perhaps suggest.

One of the largest, most interesting, and most influential of the middle-class groups of working women was the schoolmistresses. As Helmut Beilner has already shown in the case of Bavaria, there is plenty of material to work on. Here, as in other Länder, there is a great deal to be learned from the files of educational and school authorities on the one hand, and records concerning the schoolmistresses' own organizations on the other; and there is enough material available to relate conditions of pay and service to social and political attitudes. The major organization representing the interests of women schoolteachers was the General German Women Teachers' Association (Allgemeiner Deutscher Lehrerinnenverein), whose files, covering a period stretching from the 1890s continuously across to the Gleichschaltung of the organization, in 1933, lie unexplored in an archive in West Berlin. Even more interesting than this, perhaps, is the fact that women schoolteachers were generally agreed to form the mainstay of the liberal feminist movement. Male teachers, on the other hand, were one of the major supports of antifeminist sentiment. An analysis of the social and economic status of women schoolteachers, therefore, if properly handled, could illuminate a whole range of subjects, many of which, such as the relationship between economic and professional inequality on the one


14. See for example the relevant files in the Oberschulbehörde papers in the Staatsarchiv der Freien- und Hansestadt Hamburg, where there are elaborate analyses, with a wealth of statistical and illustrative material, of the pay and terms of employment of women schoolteachers in the city.


16. For the general context, see Gerda Caspary, Die Entwicklungsgeschichte der bürgerlichen deutschen Frau um die Jahrhundertwende (Heidelberg, 1933).
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hand, and political activism on the other, are at the moment at the center of interest for historians of modern Germany.\textsuperscript{17}

Approaches to the study of women who, unlike the schoolmistresses, did not form their own professional associations and were not in the employ of the state, are naturally rather more problematical. The archives of business and industrial enterprises, which have often been explored in an attempt to chart the political activities of the employers, but have rarely been used to illuminate the lives of those who worked for them, may conceivably be of some use here. More important, however, are the large numbers of contemporary sociological investigations of the situation of working women, many of which have been used by Kuczynski and other historians such as Renate Bridenthal in their work on the women of the industrial proletariat. Such surveys appeared in magazines such as Kautsky’s \textit{Die Neue Zeit}, where thirty-five articles were published on female labor, and forty-six on women in various occupations, between 1883 and 1923, or the \textit{Archiv für Soziale Gesetzgebung und Sozialpolitik}, the more strictly academic organ of the \textit{Kathedersozialisten}. A very few women workers left autobiographies, and a rather larger number of middle-class women did; something can also be gleaned from these sources, as well as (incidentally) from the autobiographies of male workers; and the researcher who has the patience to comb through national and local newspapers will also find a great deal of valuable material there.\textsuperscript{18}

Middle-class professional women, white-collar workers, shop assistants, and factory girls by no means exhaust the categories of women workers whose lives would repay closer examination by historians. By far the largest group of women workers in Germany until well into the twentieth century were those employed in agriculture. We know little about them. To some extent, indeed, this is a field in which the lead has


been taken by ethnographers rather than by historians. Their way of life and mental attitudes certainly differed very considerably from those of the women in the cities and towns who form the basis for most historical generalizations about the place of women in German society. We need to know in much more detail precisely how far and in what way these women were affected by the modernization of the German economy. Yet the presence of large numbers of women workers in agriculture, in strong contrast to their almost complete absence by the turn of the century in England, does seem to suggest that here was a relatively “unmodern” sector of the female population. There were others too: domestic service, for example, where female numbers remained relatively strong well into the twentieth century. The study of the nature and extent of domestic service in the 1920s can surely provide us with many important clues to the social attitudes of the German middle classes; it offers an unfamiliar entrée into the middle-class home—through the servants’ entrance. Domestic servants occupied a peculiarly sheltered position in the battle lines of the class struggle; they were perhaps the object par excellence of the paternalism of the “feudalized” middle classes. Beyond this, the existence of such a large number of domestic servants, and the persistence of opportunities for employment in this particular sector, may have acted as one of a number of factors retarding the politicization of working-class women and perhaps also, through them, pulling the working-class family in a conservative direction. In such ways as these, the condition of female domestic servants was linked to some of the major features of German society and politics in the early twentieth century; and the study of domestic service provides but one example of how much may be gained by linking women’s history to general history in a way that has so far been all too often neglected by the historians of women in society.

Another such example might be provided by the history of female social deviance. The nature and extent of female criminality, for instance, especially during the First World War, could provide important

21. For the earlier feminization of domestic service in Germany, see Rolf Engelsing, Zur Sozialgeschichte deutscher Mittel-und Unterschichten (Göttingen, 1972).
clues to the culture of poverty in Germany and its political implications. Similarly, prostitution, a major source of public alarm and public debate in Germany in the 1890s, was a graphic example of the kind of "social crisis," brought on by industrialization, to which German historians frequently allude, but seldom, if ever, trouble to examine. In a recent article, I have tried to explain the rapid growth of casual prostitution in late nineteenth-century Germany as a direct consequence of rapid industrialization and urbanization, to show how the authorities failed to adapt their policies to deal with the new problem, and to instance the ways in which various political and social groups, in trying to grapple with the problem, tended in fact only to use it as a means of emphasizing the virtues of their own particular philosophies. The official treatment of the problem, in particular, reflected changing political circumstances in the ways it evolved from 1890 through the First World War and the Weimar Republic to the Third Reich.

Groups of women such as prostitutes, domestic servants, waitresses, and female agricultural workers all attracted the attention of contemporary social scientists; and there are a good many sources, both official and private, that can be used to illuminate the condition of their lives. Yet little research has been carried out into these categories of female employment. There is a distinct tendency to concentrate on factory-employed women, despite the fact that most women in urban trades were employed in domestic manufacture. One possible reason for this concentration is the Marxist theory of women's emancipation, which postulated that the foundations of liberation for women lay in their increasing employment in large-scale modern industry, just as the concern of other historians with professional women can perhaps be traced back to the liberal view that the way to equality for women lay in the opening-up of more opportunities for women in the professions. Perhaps it is time that German women's history widened its horizons beyond these two groups toward larger but less progressive sectors of female employment.

23. For another aspect of the culture of poverty with significant implications for the social position of women, the housing problem, see Lutz Niethammer in cooperation with Franz Brüggemeier, "Wie wohnten Arbeiter im Kaiserreich?" Archiv für Sozialgeschichte 16 (1976): 61–134.
Employment, however, is only a part of the picture; it is also arguable whether it is in fact the most significant part. Certainly for most women, a very important area of experience lay in personal relationships and family life. Here too research is only just beginning, and no clear picture has yet emerged. We lack reliable data either on the sexual experiences and attitudes of younger women, or on the childbearing and child-rearing that were the lot of the great majority of women for most of their mature years, and we know next to nothing about the changing division of power within the family or the variations in family relationships between social classes. An important study of birth rates and working classes in Germany before 1914 published in a recent issue of the Archiv für Sozialgeschichte by Ulrich Linse, for example, brings together a mass of qualitative data on working-class attitudes towards conception. In addition to this, much of the article is devoted to an examination of the attitudes and policies of the SPD and other political organizations; though here, while a great deal of new and interesting information is presented, there are some errors too, deriving mainly from the author’s failure to consult unpublished sources. Furthermore, while Linse’s major thesis—that the SPD’s official attitudes toward sexuality and birth control were out of tune with those of the mass of the party’s working-class supporters—is impressively documented, there are disappointingly few conclusions drawn from this and applied to the party’s relations with its constituency on a general level.

The same lack of general reference is also a feature of articles published recently by Robert Neuman. In many respects, however, Neuman’s work is methodologically rather more interesting than Linse’s, and opens up significantly more possibilities for future research. Neuman has made extensive use of workers’ autobiographies, which, though

their authors were to a degree untypical of workers in general, nevertheless offer an unrivaled insight into proletarian culture in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Germany. As Neuman points out, these sources could give a useful qualitative dimension to studies of family history and the history of marriage and morals. Such a history, however, still has to be written, and beyond arguing that the sexual attitudes of urban and rural workers were probably more similar than many commentators have previously supposed, Neuman rightly concludes that “at present, nothing conclusive can be said about the relationship between industrialism, urbanization, and illegitimacy.”

This cautious approach is certainly not shared by Edward Shorter in his bold and challenging work on sexual morality in nineteenth-century Germany and elsewhere. Shorter argues that the emergence of propertyless classes in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries brought with it a massive revolution in sexual and social values; younger women began in increasing numbers to leave the sheltered environment of the family, to rebel against their parents, and to emancipate themselves, both in an economic and in a sexual sense. In the absence of effective contraception, this resulted in an explosion of illegitimacy rates. Shorter devotes much effort to assembling and processing statistical material indicating rising illegitimacy rates; but his explanatory model is not always directly related to his evidence. In places, indeed, it seems to rely rather on a series of a priori assumptions. Other research on the causes of illegitimacy seems to indicate, as Scott and Tilly have argued, that “illegitimacy rose at least partly as a consequence of a compositional change in population—i.e., the increasing presence of many more young women in sexually vulnerable situations as workers in cities, removed from family protection and assistance.”

Premarital intercourse was commonly practiced and socially sanctioned in preindustrial society; when it led to pregnancy, it was generally followed either by marriage or, if not, dealt with in the protective environment


of the family. Such safeguards became less available in the urban environment, while at the same time, falling death rates changed the age structure of the population and increased the proportion of sexually mature females. It was the continuation of traditional attitudes in an inappropiate urban environment, rather than any change in attitudes, which probably caused the rise in illegitimacy.

The debate will doubtless continue; meanwhile an increasing amount of empirical evidence is being accumulated as historians are beginning to employ the methods of historical demography as they have been developed and applied above all in France since 1945. This is now an advanced subject with a whole range of sophisticated techniques for the evaluation of what is often difficult and intractable material. Few attempts have so far been made to employ its methods in researching the history of German population and family structures in any depth. Though the abundant official printed statistics have naturally found their analysts, analysis has so far been at a fairly general level. There are signs, however, that this situation is now beginning to change. Recent articles by Robert Lee, Karin Hausen, and others have at last begun to introduce a German audience the modern techniques of historical demography; and it is to be hoped that these techniques will be to an increasing degree put to use in substantive research. The contribution that demographic history has to make to the historical analysis of women's place in society is fundamental; until we have more detailed knowledge of when women in different social, geographical, and regional groups married, how many children they had, what interval

30. Notable exceptions are John Knodel, The Decline of Fertility in Germany 1871–1939 (Princeton, 1974), technically sophisticated though based on official figures, but narrowly demographic in orientation; and above all Robert Lee, "Some Economic and Demographic Aspects of Peasant Society in Oberbayern 1752–1855, with Special Reference to Certain Estates in the Former Landgericht Kranzberg" (Oxford D.Phil., 1972), a detailed study in the classic French mold.

31. The pioneer of demographic history in Germany at this level has been Wolfgang Köllmann. See Wolfgang Köllmann, Bevölkerung in der industriellen Revolution (Göttingen, 1974).


lay between the births of their children, at what period of their life they worked, what roles they occupied within the family, and how these and many other features of women’s lives changed over time, we can only venture to generalize about a very limited proportion of women’s life experience in the past.\textsuperscript{34}

Nevertheless, statistical analysis is only one means of investigating the experience of women out of working hours. Of almost equal importance is the law; and here too we are confronted with several problems. Birth, childhood, marriage, childrearing, divorce, widowhood, inheritance, and other vital aspects of women’s life experience were governed by the provisions of the civil law. Before the \textit{Bürgerliches Gesetzbuoh} brought a unified system of civil law into effect all over Germany in 1900, legal practice was governed by a host of regional law codes and local customs. The provisions of the civil law varied widely from area to area, and were not without paradox. The older tradition of Germanic law was generally more favorable to women’s rights than the Roman law precepts spread by the influence above all of the \textit{Code Napoléon}. In some senses, even the authoritarian \textit{Preussisches Allgemeines Landrecht}, the creation of Frederick the Great, allowed more freedom to women to divorce, to remarry, and to enter into contracts safeguarding their property within marriage, for the governing principle here was not the morality or otherwise of marriage and divorce, but the utility of marriage in producing children for the state; and childless marriages could be ended not only by mutual consent, but even at the request of one of the partners. And if the \textit{principles} of the law, at least before 1900, were confused and contradictory, then the \textit{practice} of the law, though we know as yet very little about it, added even more complications to the picture. For legal codes, of course, are not necessarily carried out in practice; and their provisions can usually be interpreted in many different ways, however careful the drafting. During the debates on the \textit{Bürgerliches Gesetzbuoh} in 1895–96, for example, objections were raised to the proposed removal of the provisions in the \textit{Allgemeines Landrecht} giving a wife the right to conclude \textit{after she married} contracts regulating the control of the property she brought to the marriage. The Ministry of Justice, however, was able to present statistics showing that this right

\textsuperscript{34} Further recent German work on women and the family can be found in W. Conze, ed., \textit{Sozialgeschichte der Familie in der Neuzeit Europas} (Stuttgart, 1976), a collection of essays. See also Hans Medick, “The Proto-industrial Family Economy,” \textit{Social History}, no. 3 (1976), pp. 291–315.
had been exercised by only a small minority of women. Yet it would be interesting to know what kind of women had taken advantage of the law in this way, and why. Only a study of cases can really illuminate these problems and fully comprehend the relationship of law and society, and the influence of the one upon the other. And there certainly exists material to supplement case studies; one fascinating source, for example, is to be found in the files of the Rechtsschutzverein für Frauen, recording the details of the legal and personal problems and complaints brought to this voluntary association of middle-class women by women of all classes who found themselves in need of free legal advice.35

IV

The establishment of these legal advice bureaus (Rechtsschutzstellen) was one of the more enterprising features of the feminist movement in Germany. The insight many middle-class women gained into the interaction of law and society at a very basic level through founding, running, or serving in the legal advice bureaus undoubtedly helped at least some of them toward a radical and sympathetic attitude toward abortion law reform, and gave them a greater determination to resist the tightening of divorce provisions in the Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch. Such attitudes, however, were rare within the German feminist movement, as research is now beginning to reveal. The main task of the historians of German feminism has been to explain why it was in general so backward and so unsuccessful compared to its Anglo-Saxon counterparts, when so many of the conditions for an active feminist movement were present in German society: a large middle class, a predominantly Protestant culture, high standards of education, rapid industrialization, parliamentary institutions, and a recognition of the legitimacy of pressure-group politics. German feminism, however, did not organize nationally until 1894; did not demand the vote until 1902; did not campaign against the "double standard" of sexual morality for men and women until 1898; and never effectively advanced the demand for equal opportunities and treatment in education. Pressure for admittance to univer-

35. One complete set of case histories can be found in Staatsarchiv Hamburg, Archiv des Allgemeinen Deutschen Frauenvereins. Diligent investigation might well bring similar records to light elsewhere. Additional material can be found in the papers of Marie Munk, a prominent woman jurist of the Weimar Republic, some of which are housed in the Deutsches Zentralinstitut für Soziale Fragen, Berlin-Dahlem, and others in the Arthur and Elizabeth Schlesinger Library on the History of Women in America, at Radcliffe College, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
sities and the professions was hesitant and slow. The political weakness and late development of German feminism went hand-in-hand with exceptionally slow progress, measured by Anglo-American, and even, in some cases, by French or Russian standards, in securing equal rights for women. German women were granted the vote by the revolution of 1918, but they were not allowed to join political parties or attend political meetings in most parts of Germany, including Prussia, until 1908. German women were not admitted to the universities as full-time students until well after the turn of the century; the first state grammar school (Gymnasium) for girls was founded in Baden in 1893; it had few imitators. There were no German equivalents of the English Married Women’s Property Acts. The Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch of 1900 gave German husbands wide-ranging powers over wives and their property and children. The “double standard” of morality was officially sanctioned by the state regulation of prostitution. In the criminal law, women were treated as witnesses of inferior standing. In many other ways, too, German women failed to be “emancipated,” in the sense of the word used by nineteenth-century feminists, until the passage of the Equal Rights Act (Gleichberechtigungsgesetz) by the West German Bundestag in 1956.36

This state of affairs is interestingly reflected in the historiography of German feminism. The first histories, written by women active in the feminist movement, were generally inspired by a Whiggish spirit. They charted what they saw as the gradual emancipation of German women, listing a series of legislative and administrative reforms in various spheres, chronicling the growth and proliferation of women’s organizations, and pausing occasionally on the way to describe in terms of stereotyped and uncritical admiration the character and achievements of some of the most prominent feminist leaders. These works were in no sense scholarly, though they often accumulated in a careful and painstakingly thorough fashion a large amount of extremely useful information. The perspective from which they were written was one of complacency; they gave the impression that the battle had already been won.37 Yet this perspective was only possible because the movement in

37. The best of these older accounts are Agnes von Zahn-Harnack, Die Frauenbewegung –Geschichte, Probleme, Ziele (Leipzig and Berlin, 1928), and Frances Magnus–von Hau-
whose name these writers were speaking had in fact progressively reduced the scope of its aims and become increasingly conservative after its brief flirtation with radicalism in the years 1894–1908 when, as the summary given in the preceding paragraph indicates, the pace of change was most hectic. The radical feminists who pushed the movement to the left and effectively dominated its thinking in these years barely get a mention in the official accounts published in the Weimar Republic, save perhaps for a curt dismissal as undesirable agitators. Apart from anything else, strongly nationalistic authors such as Gertrud Bäumer or Agnes von Zahn-Harnack could hardly bring themselves to mention the names of Anita Augspurg, founder of the German Union for Women’s Suffrage, Lida Gustava Heymann, the most radical and active of the opponents of state-regulated prostitution, or Helene Stöcker, leader of a campaign against the abortion laws, because all of these more radical women were active pacifists. The radicals’ own historical accounts were suppressed, not least because most of them fled the country in 1933. Their names have since been largely forgotten in the country of their birth, while the ideals and attitudes of the “moderate” majority have found little resonance in postwar Germany, least of all among the young, and many of the leading women in the “moderate” women’s movement were tainted by their associations with the Third

sen, “Ziel und Weg in der deutschen Frauenbewegung des XIX. Jahrhunderts,” in P. Wentzke, ed., Festschrift für Friedrich Meinecke (Munich and Berlin, 1923). It is precisely reliance on works such as these, more or less the only good historical accounts available at the time, which caused Kirkpatrick (Nazi Germany: Its Women) to give a relatively uncritical and oversimplified account of the history of German feminism, and which through his work has colored the interpretations of subsequent writers on the subject (e.g., Stephenson, Women in Nazi Society, pp. 17–32; Millett, Sexual Politics, pp. 159–60). For an example the complacency of the older accounts, see Hugh Wiley Puckett, Germany’s Women Go Forward (New York, 1930), published when Germany’s women were beginning to go rapidly backward.

38. Lida Gustava Heymann, in collaboration with Dr. jur. Anita Augspurg, Erlebtes-Erschaut: Deutsche Frauen kämpfen für Freiheit, Recht und Frieden, ed. Margrit Twelmann (Meisenheim am Glan, 1972 [written 1940–41]); Helene Stöcker, “Lebensabriß” (written 1939), ms. in Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Pennsylvania, U.S.A. Other important memoirs containing material on the middle-class radical feminist movement include Lily Braun, Memoiren einer Sozialistin, 2 vols. (Munich, 1908/9), which is cast in the form of a novel and is amplified and corrected in Julie Vogelstein, Lily Braun: Ein Lebensbild (Berlin, 1922); Käthe Schirmacher, Flammen: Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben (Leipzig, 1921); Else Lüders, Minna Cauer. Leben und Werk: Dargestellt an Hand ihrer Tagebücher und nachgelassenen Schriften (Gotha, 1925). See also n. 48 below.
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There is no feminist historical tradition in Germany as there is in Britain and the United States.

The first task of the modern historian of German feminism is therefore to break free from the view of the past imposed by the "moderate" feminist "establishment," rescue the radical feminists from the neglect into which they have fallen since 1918, and present a balanced view of the whole movement in which justice is done to all its various tendencies. Few modern studies measure up to this task. Most scholars have relied on the "official" histories, and the only study to present a satisfactorily balanced view is Irmgard Remme's excellent thesis on the international relations of the German feminists, based largely on unpublished material. Much of the value of what is by far the best generally available published account, the entry on the "bourgeois women's movement" in Dieter Fricke's encyclopaedic handbook Die bürgerlichen Parteien in Deutschland (Leipzig, 1968), derives from its use of Remme's work. Recently the pace of work has quickened. In 1972 a large two-volume work appeared on the German feminist movement before 1890, written by Margrit Twellmann. In many ways this is a useful compilation, drawing together a number of sources in a general summary. But its weaknesses are also too striking to overlook. The second, and much larger volume, consists of extracts from documents. Many of these are not given in full. Moreover, the inadequacies of the book's typography make it difficult to see where commentary ends and document begins. The material used for both volumes is drawn from a very narrow range of sources, essentially in fact from two magazines, Der Frauen-Anwalt and Neue Bahnen. These are eked out with a few contemporary literary feminist polemics. The long list of sources given in the bibliography bears almost no relation to the material used in the book; the bulk of it in fact relates to the period after 1890, not covered by Twellmann's account. Despite its appearance, then, this is a rather thin account that does not add a great deal to present knowledge as transmitted through the official histories written in the 1920s. More promising, and based on a wide range of published and unpublished

40. For examples, see G. Brandt et al., Die Frauenfrage im Kapitalismus (Frankfurt, 1973), pp. 15-20; and I. Menschik, Gleichberechtigung oder Emanzipation? (Frankfurt, 1971), pp. 51-55. See also above, n. 37.
41. See above, n. 7.
sources, is the work of Amy Hackett, so far available only in essay and dissertation form, on the period after 1890; taking full account of German feminism, Hackett’s work is based on an impressive amount of research and is adding greatly to our knowledge.42

Although the history of German feminism must thus be reconstructed even in its basic outlines from primary sources, historians are fortunate in having a large amount of material at their disposal. The most important collection is the Archiv des Bundes Deutscher Frauenvereine, administered by the Berliner Frauenbund and housed in the Deutsches Zentralinstitut für Soziale Fragen, Berlin-Dahlem. It consists of material gathered by Alice Bensheimer, secretary to the Bund (Federation), the major women’s organization, from 1905 to 1930. It contains virtually complete sets of the correspondence of the presidents (Marie Stritt, Gertrud Bäumer, Marianne Weber, Emma Ender) who held office in Bensheimer’s years as secretary, with official and unofficial correspondence covering the entire period of the Federation’s existence (1894–1933), records, minutes, and verbatim reports of the general assemblies, committees, and commissions, and miscellaneous files relating to various individuals, policies, and organizations. The archive is remarkably full for the period corresponding to Bensheimer’s term of office (1905–30), but for the earlier and later periods (1894–1904 and 1931–33) it is, unfortunately, of more uneven quality, though there are several volumes of important material covering these years. Nevertheless, the archive as a whole is very extensive, and runs to well over two hundred boxes.

The same building also houses the Helene Lange Archiv, a collection of some sixty boxes containing papers gathered by Dorothee von Velsen for the Helene Lange Stiftung in Berlin. Most of the boxes contain printed or typed ephemera, pamphlets, and books. The private papers of Anna Papritz, one of the most influential women in the feminist movement before 1914, have found their way into this archive, and her letters, diaries, and manuscript autobiography constitute perhaps the most important items in the collection.\footnote{43} To complement these archival collections, there are also other groups of manuscripts,\footnote{44} sets of many of the major feminist periodicals, and a large number of books and pamphlets relating to feminism and female emancipation in Germany, and dating from the nineteenth century to the present day.

These archives are undoubtedly of quite fundamental importance for the student of German feminism. The extensive correspondence of the successive presidents of the Federation, together with the minutes of committee meetings and verbatim reports of general assemblies, give a fascinating insight into the shifting balance of political views within the movement. Behind the sober and decorous façade which the Federation presented to the outside world lay a mass of political infighting and personal intrigue. Most of this does not appear in the published sources. In addition, the various commissions and subcommittees on alcoholism, prostitution, legal rights, professional status, working conditions, and other subjects amassed a great deal of information on the social position of German women. Even after the commissions were wound up, this information continued to be collected. The archive is thus a valuable source for the social history of women in Germany during the Wilhelmine and Weimar periods, though its bias is naturally toward the concerns of middle-class women. For the history of German feminism, it is indispensable.

Nevertheless, the bias of this particular source material, like that of the older published accounts, is heavily on the side of the “moderate” or conservative wing of the feminist movement. For a detailed knowledge of the radical wing, the researcher must turn elsewhere; above all, perhaps, to the files of the political police in the Staatsarchiv Hamburg. These consist of three kinds of source material. First, and greatest in quantity, are large numbers of press clippings. The Hamburg political

\footnote{43} An account of the origins of these two collections can be found in Jahrbuch des Bundes Deutscher Frauenvereine 1927–8 (Leipzig/Berlin, 1929), pp. 46–52.
\footnote{44} Cf. nn. 15 and 35 above.
police had as their first object the observation, and, if necessary, the control, of political organizations active in the city. They were, however, also concerned to understand the role played by these organizations in a national and even an international context. Their collection of newspaper clippings thus covers not only what went on in Hamburg itself, but also the progress of feminism in Berlin and in Germany as a whole, and even in countries as far afield as Britain, Finland, and the U.S.A. Most German newspapers gave quite full coverage to the activities of the feminist movement, at least when it began to take on a more radical tone, from about 1896 onward. All German newspapers were locally based but carried national and international news as well, so that while local feminist activities were covered in full, national and international aspects of the feminist movement were not neglected. Some papers, mainly left-liberal dailies sympathetic to the women’s cause, began soon after the turn of the century to employ women reporters, sometimes themselves active members of feminist associations, and regularly devoted a column or even a page to the “woman question.” The Frankfurter Zeitung was the most sympathetic of the major newspapers; female emancipation was one of many advanced causes it championed in this period. The Berliner Tageblatt was more hesitant, but still basically favorable, and the liberal Hamburg General-Anzeiger and the rather more conservative Hamburger Fremdenblatt and Hamburgischer Correspondent also took a friendly interest. On the socialist side, the Hamburger Echo and Vorwärts were critical, while always encouraging radical tendencies within the feminist movement. Extreme right-wing newspapers such as Die Post, Hamburger Nachrichten, and Deutsches Blatt regarded the whole affair as a Jewish conspiracy to subvert society, morality, and the family. This last view was probably the one with which the police themselves felt most sympathy.45

Three questions of interpretation arise from all this—first, how complete is the police collection of newspaper clippings? It must immediately be conceded that it cannot provide an adequate substitute for reading the papers themselves. There are gaps. There is next to nothing, for example, on the internal struggles that were so important in both the history of the Berlin Frauenwohl in the 1890s and the Mutterschutz League in the 1900s, which did find some reflection in newspaper re-

45. For the attitudes of the newspapers, see Evans, The Feminist Movement in Germany, pp. 74–75. For Jewish women, see Marion Kaplan, “German-Jewish Feminism: The Jüdischer Frauenbund 1904–38” (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1976).
ports. But in general the collection is astonishingly comprehensive. For the suffrage movement and the crusade against state-regulated prostitution, it is indispensable. It also covers most of the major conferences of the most important national women’s associations, including the Federation of German Women’s Associations. Moreover, the range of newspapers and opinions it covers could not be matched by the researcher, who would have to confine his search to one or two representative papers if he were to cover the whole period from, say, 1894 to 1918. And the collection does of course give a critical perspective lacking in the literature of the feminist movement itself. When we put it side by side with the reports in Die Frauenbewegung, the major literary organ of the radical wing of the feminist movement, we can see that, at least as far as the radicals are concerned, not only does it cover the same ground in more detail and with more color, it also covers much ground untrodden by the radicals’ own magazines.

The second problem of interpretation concerns the police reports of meetings. How accurate are they? They certainly vary greatly in length and detail. Some are mere summaries, while others, particularly those written by the indefatigable Wachtmeister Zufall, are almost verbatim reports. When put side by side with newspaper reports of the same meetings, they often seem more comprehensive, and they frequently contain more details of the speeches and discussion from the audience. Not every meeting was reported, however, and by themselves these reports are by no means a comprehensive account of the public assemblies of the women’s movement. It is also impossible to say exactly how accurate the attendance figures are. It could be argued that there was an inbuilt tendency for the police to underestimate the numbers attending, just as there was an inbuilt tendency for the feminists and the SPD to overestimate the numbers. On the other hand, where a policeman wished to demonstrate to his superiors how dangerous a movement was, he would have a strong incentive to exaggerate the numbers attending its meetings. Only in a few cases is it possible to compare police and press figures for attendance, and these cases are, in sum, inconclusive. Thus for October 17, 1912, the police reported that six hundred people attended an SPD women’s meeting in Hamburg; the Social Democratic Hamburger Echo gave the same figure. On October 23, 1912, however, the police estimated an attendance of five hundred women at another SPD meeting, while the Echo maintained that no less than one thousand, or exactly twice as many, had been present. On the
other hand, on March 19, 1911, at the first International Proletarian Women’s Day in Hamburg, the police reported that seven hundred people went to the meeting in Uhlenhorst, while the Echo gave the figure as only six hundred. In most cases, it is impossible to check. The reports, therefore, must be treated with caution—the larger the numbers, the greater the caution.

The third problem of interpretation is of a more general nature. Might the existence of such a large collection of material on the women’s movement distort the researcher’s view of German feminism through its very bulk, through the mass of detailed information it presents? Might it, for example, lead to an overestimation of the importance of Hamburg in the history of the women’s movement? Or might its compilation by the political police, whose job it was to pay particularly close attention to political radicalism, lead the researcher to exaggerate the importance of the radical feminists within the women’s movement, and the radicalism of the so-called radicals themselves, by leaving out newspaper reports relating to less radical or nonpolitical organizations and activities? It is undeniable that the researcher who read these files alone would gain a very distorted impression of the balance of strength within the German feminist movement, just as the researcher who relied upon the correspondence in the archive of the Federation of German Women’s Associations would receive a picture of the feminist movement distorted in the opposite direction. But the two collections go far toward compensating for each other in this respect. They are complementary, rather than contradictory. And the stenographic reports of the general assemblies in the Federation’s archive leave little room for doubt that the role played by the radicals within the German women’s movement was far more important than the “moderate” women’s leaders of the 1920s who wrote the history of the movement were prepared to admit. Moreover, the Hamburg police themselves appear to have been quite indiscriminate in their selection of newspaper clippings concerning the radicals. Anything that was remotely relevant went into the files, from reports of social evenings and singsongs to Christmas parties and walking weekends on the Lüneburg Heath. The police do not appear to have confined themselves to selecting reports that emphasized the radicalism of the societies they were studying. And even when the concentration of the files on Hamburg is compensated for by
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the use of other sources, particularly feminist magazines, the crucial role played, particularly at the turn of the century, by Hamburg in the radical feminist movement still seems undeniable.

At the other end of the political spectrum, the powerful German Evangelical Women's League (Deutsch-evangelischer Frauenbund) exerted strong pressure on the feminist movement to reject the radicals' ideas. This pressure met with growing success after 1908, though the Association (founded 1899) ultimately found the Federation of German Women's Associations too progressive for its taste and left in 1918, ten years after it had joined. The Evangelicals, who were led by Paula Müller and closely associated with the Conservative Party, and later with the Deutschnationale Volkspartei, its successor, survived through the Third Reich and kept their records and papers intact. They are preserved in the League's present-day headquarters in Hanover. The minute books and files of correspondence contain important material relating to the League's relations with feminist and political organizations, but the bulk of the League's records, so far unexplored by historians, are concerned with the League's charitable and social welfare activities. They open up to the historian an important aspect of the world of "Establishment" women.

The other sections of the women's movement, as far as can be ascertained, have left no records. The situation as far as personal papers is concerned is little better. The papers of most leading feminists have been lost. It seems certain beyond all doubt that the private papers of Gertrud Bäumer and Helene Lange were lost during the war, though some of their letters have been preserved in the Bundesarchiv, Koblenz; those of Anita Augsburg and Lida Gustava Heymann were seized by the Nazis, and probably destroyed. Minna Cauer's papers passed on Cauer's death into the hands of Else Lüders, who survived the Second World War; I have been unable to trace them beyond this point. Käthe Schirmacher's papers have been stored in Rostock University Library since her death. Apart from these, other important surviving papers include those of Helene Stöcker, stored in the Swarthmore College Peace Collection on the outskirts of Philadelphia. These papers, with a few exceptions of a personal nature, date from the last years of Stöcker's life, 1939–43, when she was an exile in Stockholm and New York. Stöcker was obliged to leave her pre-1933 papers in Berlin, where they were destroyed on the orders of the Nazis; the records of her Swiss exile 1933–39 were lost in an air raid in London during the Second World War. The most
important item in the Swarthmore collection is Stöcker’s autobiography, dictated in Stockholm. It only takes us up to 1918, and Stöcker did not have a chance to revise the manuscript before her death in 1943. It is in fact most useful for Stöcker’s early life, about which comparatively little is known. The other papers in the collection consist of correspondence, notably with Ludwig Quidde, and published material. For the full details of Stöcker’s career as a leading feminist before 1914, we have to turn to the papers of Adele Schreiber, secretary of the Mutterschutz League until her violent quarrel with Stöcker in 1909–10, and editor of a women’s suffrage magazine, kept in the Federal Archive in Koblenz. Although incomplete they are very voluminous, consisting of twenty-five uncatalogued brown paper parcels, all in a state of considerable disorder.

The most valuable part of the papers is the collection of documents relating to the Mutterschutz movement contained in the first four packets. The minutes, letters, circulars, etc., in the collection appear to have been extracted by Schreiber from her files, typed out and carbon-copied or duplicated, and sent to various interested parties as documentary evidence against Helene Stöcker in the controversies which eventually destroyed the movement. The originals, certainly, are in the vast majority of cases missing, and the researcher has therefore to rely on the copies. This is in fact the collection of evidence which Schreiber insisted that all committees of arbitration in her dispute with Stöcker should read through, and whose sheer volume prevented the conciliators such as Minna Cauer and Marie Stritt from completing their job successfully. Although the documents are copies, they appear to be accurate copies; Stöcker would have been the first to complain had they been “doctored,” and there is no such complaint in any of her publications on the controversy. The documents are, of course, a selection designed to show Stöcker in the worst possible light; but they do include much of Stöcker’s own propaganda, and a great deal of other evidence that hardly relates at all to the quarrel. The bias of the documents can also be corrected by Stöcker’s own accounts of her conduct. And the bias lies of course in the selection, not in the documents themselves. The major interest of the papers lies in a numbered collection of 367 letters and 183 minutes and protocols of committee meetings and assemblies. Since the originals have in all probability perished, these copies offer an unrivaled insight into the internal affairs of the organization. In form they resemble the records of any conventional German
voluntary organization. But their content is quite extraordinary. Meetings were often heated; the exchange of insults and even of blows was not unknown, and all were recorded in the minutes if they had been no more than the dry details of a treasurer’s reports. Beyond recording in great detail the impossibly protracted and hopelessly involved course of the disputes that convulsed the League from 1910 to 1914, and gave rise (among other things) to no less than seven lawsuits, the minutes also reveal fascinating disputes over the formulation of policy. Such luminaries of the Wilhelmine world as Werner Sombart, Anton Erkelenz, and (from further afield) August Forel can be observed arguing over problems of sexual morality, illegitimate birth, and free love.47

Other than these, there are no major collections of personal papers available, though a few collections of letters and diaries have been published.48 The remaining manuscript sources are widely scattered and fragmentary, often providing only interesting sidelights or little scraps of additional evidence. For the attitude of the Progressive Party to female suffrage, however, the party’s papers in the Zentrales Staatsarchiv in Potsdam are essential, just as the War Ministry files in Munich are vital for the feminist peace movement in World War I and the papers held in various archives dealing with the SPD women’s movement are important for the relations between the SPD women and the feminists. The private papers of leading politicians also give several indications of the development of the women’s movement, including those of Friedrich Naumann (Zentrales Staatsarchiv Potsdam), Conrad Haussmann (Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart), Karl Kautsky, and Georg von Vollmar (International Institute for Social History, Amsterdam).49 Next in importance after the manuscript sources are the various periodicals issued by the women’s movement. In general, these magazines, published once or twice every month, contain articles and discussions on “the
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woman question" and other social problems, news and reports of the campaigns, congresses, and controversies of the organizations they represented, and usually a literary section with poems, short stories, and serialized novels. Periodical publications of this sort are valuable not only for their indication of the ideology of the movement; even more important are the detailed reports of the activities of local branches. Unfortunately, they were often short-lived, and they underwent an extremely complicated development, reflecting the constant splits and secessions that bedeviled the women's movement up to 1914.50 Nevertheless, these magazines contain essential information on the ideas and activities of a whole range of feminist organizations. This information can in its turn be supplemented by the mass of pamphlets and books produced by the feminists, and by debates on feminist issues in literary, cultural, and political journals and in legislative assemblies.51

VI

The wide range of sources for the history of German feminism has already attracted the attention of a number of historians.52 Even more interest, however, has been shown in the history of women in the Third Reich. Here too, as in other areas of investigation, historians have come to very different conclusions from one another. Since Clifford Kirkpatrick's pioneering work in the 1930s,53 the basic outlines of the problem have been well established. Subsequent research has tended in most respects to confirm the conclusions reached by Kirkpatrick. Put briefly, these are that although the Nazis destroyed the feminist movement and attempted to put women back in the home, they were unable to carry out their program because of social and economic pressures. The writers who followed Kirkpatrick tended however to put very different interpretations on his findings. Feminists and socialists em-

50. See the appendix to the present article.
52. Apart from work already cited, research is in progress on the early German feminist Louise Otto-Peters by Sigrid Wiesenstein (Berlin) and on the development of German feminism 1860–86 by Ulrike Bussem (Berlin). Ute McNab (Wolfson College, Cambridge / Wilfred Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada) is working on literary aspects of German feminism. Hans-Günter Zmarzlik (Freiburg) is studying the relationship between German feminism and social change.
53. See n. 5 above.
phasized the Nazis’ hostility to women’s equality and women’s rights.54 But other historians have argued that women in the Third Reich were no worse off than women in other industrialized countries at the same time, and even, possibly, better off than they had been in the Weimar Republic.55 Much depends here on the analysis of statistics of employment, pay differentials, birth and marriage rates, and so on;56 even more, however, rests on the meaning which individual authors attach to the concepts of women’s emancipation and women’s rights, and the criteria by which they judge the position of women in society. Here, too, in addition to this problem, the same difficulties in generalizing about women as a whole arise as occur in the wider field of the history of women in modern Germany. The nature of the historian’s interpretation of the general context also plays an important role. Those who regard Nazism as an advanced form of monopoly capitalism will take a different view of the position of women in the Third Reich from those who view Nazi society in the light of the theory of totalitarianism. In resolving questions such as these, it is not enough to base arguments and conclusions on the accumulation of empirical data; general criteria of a theoretical nature must be employed in evaluating Nazi society and women’s place in it, though of course detailed research is also required to substantiate, test, or modify the theories employed.

It is likely that the next few years will see a growing number of publications not only on German feminism but also on other aspects of the history of German women. At the same time, it is becoming more difficult for historians to ignore the significance of women’s history for the study of German history in general. Any general account of German society in the past which leaves the female half of the population out of account must now be regarded as inadequate. The history of German women is only now beginning to be explored; the available material is rich enough, and the unanswered questions numerous enough, for even more intensive work on the topic than is taking place at the moment. The present article has tried to suggest a number of aspects of women’s history that would repay investigation; and it has attempted to point out some of the problems involved in exploring them, as well as the resources available for the interested historian.

54. E.g., Millett, Sexual Politics; Müller-Planthenberg, “Zur Geschichte” (see n. 5 above).
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Many of these problems are not difficult to overcome. The principal danger lies perhaps in the tendency of women's history to develop into a separate discipline, with little reference to or impact upon the wider aspects of historical research. The most fruitful approach lies in the integration of women's history and general history, in an interdisciplinary approach which enriches our knowledge of economy, society, and politics in the past at the same time as rediscovering the history of women and their struggle to emancipate themselves.

APPENDIX

FEMINIST PERIODICALS IN GERMANY 1866–1944

The oldest feminist magazines, _Neue Bahn_ en, Vol. 1 (1866–67) – Vol. 54 (1919), the organ of the General German Women's Association, edited in succession by Louise Otto-Peters, Auguste Schmidt, Elsbeth Krukenberg, Gertrud Bäumer, and Elisabeth Altmann-Gottheiner, and _Der Frauen-Anwalt_, Vol. 1 (1870–71) – Vol. 6 (1875–76), succeeded by the _Deutscher Frauen-Anwalt_ (1878–79), both edited by Jenny Hirsch and representing the _Lette-Verein_, form the basis for Margrit Twelmann's study of the women's movement up to 1889, published in 1972. Far more important than these in the period 1890–1944, however, is _Die Frau: Monatsschrift für das gesamte Frauenleben unserer Zeit_, Vol. 1 (1893–94) – Vol. 51 (1943–44), edited by Helene Lange and [later] Gertrud Bäumer, organ of the "moderates." The official organ of the Federation of German Women's Associations was the _Centralblatt des Bundes Deutscher Frauenvereine_, Vol. 1 (1899–1900) – Vol. 14 (1912–23), edited by Marie Stritt, except for Vol. 1, which was edited by Jeannette Schwerin. It was later renamed _Die Frauenfrage_, Vol. 15 (1913–14) – Vol. 22 (1920), also edited by Marie Stritt, with a number of supplements. In the Weimar Republic the Federation of German Women's Associations also circulated a news-sheet (_Mitteilungen_) to member unions. The organ of the German Evangelical Women's League was the _Evangelische Frauenzeitung_, edited by Paula Müller. The major periodical on the radical side was _Die Frauenbewegung_, Vol. 1 (1895) – Vol. 25 (1919), edited by Minna Cauer, and, for Vol. 1, by Lily von Gizycki. It was preceded in 1893–94 by two volumes of _Frauenwohl: Zeitschrift für Fraueninteressen: Herausgegeben von Verein "Frauenwohl,"_ also edited by Cauer. From 1900 onward the magazine was accompanied by a political supplement edited by Anita Augspurg, under the title of _Parlamentarische Angelegenheiten und Gesetzgebung_, succeeded in 1907 by the _Zeitschrift für Frauenstimmrecht_, which acted as the official organ of the _Deutscher Verband für Frauenstimmrecht_, and was issued in six volumes from 1907 to 1912. From 1913 to 1918, the _Zeitschrift für Frauenstimmrecht: Monatsschrift für die staatsbürgerliche Bildung der Frau_, edited by Minna Cauer, continued to be issued as a supplement to _Die Frauenbewegung_, and represented the _Deutscher Frauenstimmrechtsbund_. It was replaced as the official organ of the _Deutscher Verband für Frauenstimmrecht_ in 1912 by
Frauenstimmrecht! Monatshefte des Deutschen Verbandes für Frauenstimmrecht, edited by Anita Augspurg and published as a separate magazine, Vol. 1 (1912–13) – Vol. 2 (1913–14). When Augspurg left the Deutscher Verband für Frauenstimmrecht this magazine was renamed Die Staatsbürgerin and edited by Adele Schreiber from Vol. 3 (1914–15) to Vol. 8 (1919). From 1916 onward it was the organ of the Deutscher Reichsverband für Frauenstimmrecht. In 1916 this in turn replaced Frau und Staat, Vol. 1 (1912–13) – Vol. 5 (1916), edited by Ida Dehmel, organ of the Deutsche Vereinigung für Frauenstimmrecht. It was issued as a supplement to Die Frauenfrage. All these various magazines ceased publication on the foundation of the Weimar Republic, and the sole representative of radical feminism in the 1920s was Die Frau im Staat, edited by Augspurg and Heymann, and founded in 1919. The Bund für Mutterschutz, however, continued to publish a magazine throughout this period. Mutterschutz: Zeitschrift zur Reform der sexuellen Ethik, Vol. 1 (1905) – Vol. 3 (1907), edited by Helene Stöcker, was succeeded by Die Neue Generation, Vol. 4 (1908) – Vol. 15 (1919) and subsequent volumes to 1933, also edited by Stöcker. During a quarrel between Stöcker and Max Marcuse over editorial policy in 1907, Marcuse brought out his own version of the periodical, under the title of Mutterschutz, and this is listed in most of the standard bibliographies, although it does not really belong to the series, but stands on its own. Those who campaigned for the abolition of the state regulation of prostitution (the Deutscher Zweig der Internationalen Abolitionistischen Föderation) also had their own, rather specialized magazine, Der Abolitionist, published from 1899 onward and edited by Anna Pappritz. The SPD women’s magazine, Die Gleichheit, Vol. 1 (1891) – Vol. 23 (1917), edited by Clara Zetkin, has much to say on the bourgeois women’s movement. Until 1896 Emma Ihrer was nominally responsible for publication. The magazine continued from 1917 until its demise in 1923 in other hands. Finally, some local or specialist women’s organizations issued privately circulated Mitteilungen; these fall more into the category of archival sources, and have not been preserved in any great number, as far as it has been possible to ascertain.