



universität
wien

MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

„SOS Children's Villages Between Monastery Order and
Secular Organization“

verfasst von / submitted by

Cristian Pogolsha

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, 2020 / Vienna 2020

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme code as it appears on
the student record sheet:

UA 066 805

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme as it appears on
the student record sheet:

Masterstudium Globalgeschichte und Global Studies
UG2002

Betreut von / Supervisor:

ao. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Martina Kaller

Keywords/Schlüsselwörter

Care – domestic labour – Marxist-Feminism – welfare system – SOS-Kinderdorf – private/public dichotomy

Abstract

Die säkulare Kinderhilfsorganisation SOS-Kinderdorf wurde gegründet, um verwaisten und vom Krieg betroffenen Kindern in Österreich nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg zu helfen. SOS-Kinderdorfs Ansatz ähnelte der Arbeit der katholischen Gemeindeschwestern des 19. Jahrhunderts in den Deutschen Staaten/dem Deutschen Reich, insbesondere in den Anfangsjahren und in den Erwartungen an die erste Generation der Betreuer (SOS-Kinderdorf-Mütter). Die Hauptbeschäftigten im sich wandelnden Pflege- und Sozialsektor zwischen dem 19. und 20. Jahrhundert waren Frauen. Die Verbannung von Frauen in Hausarbeit und Pflegearbeit war Teil der Arbeitsteilung in der kapitalistischen Produktionsweise und stellte eine Dichotomie zwischen dem Privaten und dem Öffentlichen dar. SOS-Kinderdorfs Einstellungsstrategie zeigt wie Haus- und Pflegearbeit professionalisiert wurden.

Abstract

The secular child welfare organization SOS-Kinderdorf was established to help orphaned and war afflicted children in post World War II Austria. Specifically in its early years, and in the expectations from first generation care-givers (SOS-Kinderdorf-mothers) the organization's approach resembled the care-work provided by 19th century Catholic congregational sisters in the German states/German Empire. The key workers in the transforming care and welfare sector between the 19th and 20th centuries were women. The relegation of women to domestic labour and care-work was part of the division of labour in the capitalist mode of production and constituted a private/public dichotomy. SOS-Kinderdorf's employment strategy illustrates how domestic labour was professionalized.

List of Content

1. Introduction.....	2
Part I: State-of-the-Art Care.....	7
2. The Division of Labour.....	7
2.1 Motherhood and Care as a Vocation.....	7
2.2 Theoretical Discussion: Women and Work.....	9
2.3 Marxist <i>Social Reproduction</i> Debate.....	15
2.4 The Concept of Shadow Work.....	26
3. Womanhood, Imperialism, Motherhood.....	30
Part II: Religious Congregations in 19 th Century Continental Europe.....	38
4. Women's Ecclesiastical Congregations.....	38
Part III: SOS Children's Villages.....	44
5. The Situation in Austria at the End of World War II.....	44
6. Hermann Gmeiner's Story and the Soul Of SOS-KD.....	51
7. <i>Societas Socialis</i> and Creation of SOS-KD.....	55
8. In Search of the (SOS-KD) Mother.....	60
Part IV: Comparative Analysis and Conclusion.....	65
9. Comparative Analysis.....	65
9.1 SOS-KD Mothers and Deaconess Sisters.....	65
9.2 <i>The Division of Labour and SOS-KD's Employment of Women</i>	68
10. Conclusion.....	73
11. Bibliography.....	76
11.1 Sources.....	76
11.2 Secondary Literature.....	78
11.2.1 Academic Literature.....	78
11.2.2 Online Resources.....	82

1. Introduction

“All institutions are but homes on a large scale, and many philanthropic undertakings resolve themselves into a complicated form of housekeeping.”¹

A *The Times* correspondent illustrated with that idea in an article about women’s professional opportunities in home economics² that formerly domestic responsibilities could be directly translated/adopted into an institutional context. The article was published in a time when the welfare state was in its infancy. The responsibility for care-work as a ‘philanthropic undertaking’³ underwent a shift from a church-based venture to a secularized task. The practical examples of 19th century deaconesses and the child welfare organization SOS-Kinderdorf/SOS Children’s Villages (SOS-KD) mentioned in this work represent that transformation.

In 2019, the SOS-KD had two reasons for celebration: the platinum jubilee since its founding in 1949 and the centennial since the birth of one of its founding fathers and tireless leaders, Hermann Gmeiner (1919-1986). The aim of this paper is to initiate a discussion about the proliferation of the SOS-KD in the second half of the 20th century in Austria. My interest in this research stemmed from reading a book published by the

¹ From a Correspondent, “Home Economics as a Career for Women,” *The Times*, May 4, 1909. <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/archive/article/1909-05-04/14/3.html?region=global#start%3D1909-05-04%26end%3D1910-01-01%26terms%3Dhousekeeping%26back%3D/tto/archive/find/housekeeping/w:1909-05-04%7E1910-01-01/1%26next%3D/tto/archive/frame/goto/housekeeping/w:1909-05-04%7E1910-01-01/2>.

See also Anna Davin, “Imperialism and Motherhood,” in: *Tensions of Empire. Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, ed. Frederick Cooper (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 133.

² Home Economics was an early attempt, starting in the 19th century, to enhance women’s professional opportunities by creating an academic field for domestic work. See “Who We Are,” International Federation for Home Economics, accessed May 1, 2020, <https://www.ifhe.org/about-ifhe/who-we-are/>.

³ Philanthropy in this context means the endeavour to improve the well-being of people. See “Philanthropy,” in *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*, accessed May 1, 2020, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/philanthropy>.

organization in 1999, for its fifty-year anniversary.⁴ It refers to the history of the organization. The book *Tracing Our Roots* aimed to retell the history of the founding of SOS-KD in an objective light. That ‘objective light’ was an attempt to overcome a biased spotlight on the organization through the lens of Hermann Gmeiner from prior publications. That publication, as in the words of its authors Wilfried Vyslozil (*unknown), the executive chairman of the SOS Children’s Villages Germany, and Horst Schreiber (*1961), historian specializing in Austrian history, aims to right the history of the organization by coming to terms with its own past. Although Gmeiner’s impact was unquestionable, it was the team of people surrounding him that made the organization’s success possible. However, when decisions about where the organization should be led to were made, Gmeiner had the final word. A good example, and the main focus of this work, is the framework upon which the organization would employ SOS-KD-mothers.⁵ Gmeiner’s original plan was to create a monastery-like congregation. Despite objections from his colleague Franz Müller (*unknown) during the establishment of the organization’s statute, Gmeiner did put into practice elements of a congregation.⁶ The women sought after in the establishment phase of the organization were supposed to come from rural families. They should be young — in their mid-twenties, be good at household chores and most importantly — live in the children’s villages, thereby fusing the work part and the private (leisure) aspects of life.⁷

⁴ Horst Schreiber and Wilfried Vyslozil, *SOS Children’s Villages. Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler (Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003).

⁵ SOS-KD-mothers were the first care-givers in the organization. The employment used to be restricted to only women. Schreiber and Vyslozil, *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, 154.

Today, men and women can be SOS-care-givers. See “SOS-Mutter Und -Vater,” SOS-Kinderdorf Österreich, accessed May 1, 2020, <https://www.sos-kinderdorf.at/arbeiten-fuer-sos-kinderdorf/wen-wir-suchen/werden-sie-sos-kinderdorf-mutter-vater>.

⁶ Interview with Franz Müller, September 9, 1999, Schreiber and Vyslozil, *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, 50-51.

⁷ Ludwig Stadelmann, *Hermann Gmeiner - Ein Leben für die Mutterlosen. Leben und Werk meines Jugendfreundes*, 2nd ed., (Bad Godesheim: Verlag Neues Leben, 1970), 89, quoted in Horst Schreiber and Wilfried Vyslozil, *SOS Children’s Villages. Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler (Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003), 230.

The four principles of what the organization wants to provide for children have been ingrained into the fabric of SOS-KD since its founding years: a mother, siblings, house and village.⁸

What SOS-KD did, is offer employment opportunities for women in a society that otherwise pushed women back into ‘traditional’ gender roles, by professionalizing these roles and bringing them into the public eye. Essentially, what SOS-KD offered, in many ways, paralleled what the women’s Catholic congregations in German speaking countries in the 19th and 20th centuries did. Just like the religious institutions in the German states⁹ and then the German Empire, so did SOS-KD in Austria employ women and commodified the provision of services out of the aspects of care, nurture, welfare, and aid. The idea of a fused work-life style was part of the job as a deaconess sister and so it was for the SOS-KD-mothers in the first decades of the existence of SOS-KD. The exigencies in the deaconesses from women were similar to the ones in SOS-KD: long working hours, mainly due to the lack of separation of the work/life aspects and little pay.

Some of the questions which this paper is putting forward are: how did SOS-KD employ women and what did the administration expect from them? What were the similarities between the SOS-KD-mothers and the sisters of the religious congregations in the German states? Some keywords that will feature prominently throughout the paper are motherhood, care, care-work, womanhood. Those employment features changed throughout the 20th

⁸ “Über Uns,” SOS-Kinderdorf, accessed May 1, 2020, <https://www.sos-kinderdorf.at/so-hilft-sos/uber-uns>.

⁹ Between 1815 and 1871, the territory of what today constitutes the Federal Republic of Germany and the Austrian Republic was composed of a multitude of smaller principalities and kingdoms. The proclamation of the German Empire in January 1871 had altered the geopolitical scene of continental Europe whereby there were only two political German-speaking constituencies left from the former German Confederation, these were the German Empire and the Austro-Hungarian Empire. See The Editors of Encyclopædia Britannica, “German Confederation,” in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, accessed May 1, 2020, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/German-Confederation>.

century. Therefore, an analysis of the affects of societal development on the organization SOS-KD is necessary. Consequently, a focus of this work is the investigation of how the organization's administration applied those societal changes to their concept of women employees, and how they communicated that understanding via public relations. A fundamental aspect of the according investigation is an examination of the division of labour in the capitalist mode of production and a consideration of the related Marxist-Feminist debate.

Structurally, the paper is divided into four parts:

Part I will discuss the current state-of-the-art in feminist research regarding the concepts of care and care-related work, motherhood, and possible explanations as to their origins in Western-European, "traditional" gender roles, labour division and societal entrenchment of these concepts. How are those gendered notions of responsibilities connected to the welfare state? How did the provision of services relate to demographics (birth care, old-age care)? These questions are relevant against the background that the enterprise of social services was primarily endeavoured by religious orders but in the 20th century the state had slowly taken over most of the duties. In tandem, some of the theoretical concepts will be compared with examples from the welfare state reforms in Britain. The proto-welfare state of the 19th century represented a competition to the well-established church institutions that provided similar services. Care either had been facilitated at home or in church-run institutions. This thesis illustrates how the concept of care developed into a profession outside of the typical private/public dichotomy that is connected to the gendered division of labour.

Part II refers to the history of the women's Catholic congregations in the German states and subsequently the German Empire in the 19th and 20th centuries. The experience of women during that period is in many ways similar to the circumstances of the SOS-KD mothers in Austria who served in the institution in the middle of the 20th century.

Part III consults the history of the SOS Children's Villages, the founding years, and the years of the shift from the first generation of SOS-KD-mothers to the second generation. The changes that occurred in the organization reflected a tendency of the Austrian job market in general. Due to labour shortages, women were increasingly included into the prosperous postwar economy. Here, a comparison will be made with the deaconesses in Germany, where the experiences were similar to SOS-KD — the decrease in applications for membership in the organization led to reforms. These reforms in their breadth had similar outcomes like the ones applied at SOS-KD, chiefly, the separation of the work from the private life, and the option to have an own family. An example of a first generation SOS-KD-mother serves as point of discussion and comparison.

Part IV will conclude the findings and summarize how the history of SOS Children's Villages is exemplifying the transformation of child welfare between monastery orders and secular organization.

Part I: State-of-the-Art Care

2. The Division of Labour

2.1 Motherhood and Care as a Vocation

“Every woman who has the opportunity to live and to work according to her biological blueprint has a triple task to fulfill: that of a housewife, spouse and mother.”¹⁰

With those words Schreiber and Vyslozil have quoted principal psychologist at SOS-KD Vinzenz Neubauer (1899-1983). Neubauer, together with his wife Auguste (1907-2006), organizer and head of the SOS-KD mother training program, had been the masterminds behind the establishment of the training facility at SOS-KD in the mid-1960s for mothers and their psychological and pedagogical education. Schreiber and Vyzlozil develop Neubauer’s idea further,

“The related tasks – being the husband’s companion, raising the children and making the home a ‘place of well-being, peace and security’ - made up ‘the nature of a woman’. Women’s ‘ultimate fulfillment’ was starting a family of their own. Women who were denied this ‘can now fulfill their womanly vocation in the most beautiful of ways in Hermann Gmeiner’s SOS Children’s Villages. There they could perform their tasks ‘in an almost ideal manner.’”¹¹

Neubauer’s idea in the annual outlet of the German Family Association illustrated the features of an ideal SOS-KD-mother. What is interesting about that paragraph is the

¹⁰ *Die Familie. Jahresschrift Des Deutschen Familienverbandes*, no. X (1965): 21f., quoted in H. Schreiber and W. Vyslozil, *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler (Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003), 233.

¹¹ Schreiber and Vyslozil, *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, 233.

wording of ‘biological blueprint,’ ‘task,’ ‘nature of a woman,’ ‘ultimate fulfillment,’ ‘womanly vocation.’ Neubauer’s words show that, under the pretense of giving women ‘fulfillment’ for their ‘natural’ desires, gender stereotypes and inequalities are reinforced. The woman’s predestined role is seen as a wife, homemaker and mother. Those roles are furthermore ascribed to femininity. If a woman could not fill ‘her place’ in society according to this concept, she would still be able to get satisfaction by becoming an SOS-KD-mother as a substitute. On the one hand, that advertisement stems from hetero-patriarchal notions which were idealized in the postwar Austrian society.

On the other hand, it is the word ‘vocation’ that leads the analysis to a broader theoretical conceptualization. The word can be interpreted in two ways that are decisive for investigation of care work: 1. vocation can be understood as a destiny or religious calling or 2. as a profession or job.¹² It is necessary to analyze the shift in perceptions of care-work from an often religious calling or domestic affair to a paid profession. That shift is deeply intertwined with hetero-patriarchal gender roles, the division of labour and the concepts of productive and reproductive labour. Care and care-work are very much entangled with the economics within society. The literature consulted in this work speaks of the limitations of the capitalist mode of production in relation to the issues of ‘care’.¹³ Care and Care-work had been widely ignored as a professional vocation until the 19th century and only with the

¹² “Vocation,” in *Merriam Webster Dictionary*, accessed May 1, 2020, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/vocation>.

¹³ See Alexandra Scheele, “Arbeit Und Geschlecht: Erwerbsarbeit, Hausarbeit Und Care,” in *Handbuch Interdisziplinäre Geschlechterforschung*, ed. Beate Kortendiek, Birgit Riegraf, and Katja Sabisch (Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 2019), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-12496-0_49.
See Birgit Riegraf, “Care, Care-Arbeit und Geschlecht: gesellschaftliche Veränderungen und theoretische Auseinandersetzungen,” in *Handbuch Interdisziplinäre Geschlechterforschung*, ed. B. Kortendiek et al., vol. 65, *Geschlecht und Gesellschaft*, 2019, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-12496-0_172.

advent of the welfare state in the 20th century in many industrialized societies of Europe, the need to have a professionalized service of nurses and care professionals arose.

2.2 Theoretical Discussion: Women and Work

In an article published by sociologist Alexandra Scheele (*1969) from the University of Bielefeld in Germany, she talks about the paradox in modern German society, whereby the proportion of employed women involved steadily increased over the years while the total number full-time employed women had stagnated. That explanation is attributed to the increasing number of part-time employees. The ‘gig economy’¹⁴ is a peculiar feature for women in modern society as many more women than men are employed in positions with low-income or mini-job segments.¹⁵ Scheele points out that with the increased number of equally-qualified women filling the employment market and constitutional laws in place for sex and gender equality, discrimination went in stride, becoming more complex, differentiating itself into **vertical** as well as **horizontal** types of segregation. **Vertical** segregation or the ‘glass ceiling’ means the difficulty for women to climb the hierarchical ladder of the organization while at the same time the amount of women in positions of higher management and decision making remains drastically low. The **horizontal** segregation manifests itself into professions that are perceived as only meant for women while others are assigned to men. Care and care-work related professions are ascribed to

¹⁴ Bill Wilson, “What Is the ‘Gig’ Economy?,” *BBC News*, February 10, 2017, <https://www.bbc.com/news/business-38930048>.

¹⁵ Scheele, “Arbeit Und Geschlecht: Erwerbsarbeit, Hausarbeit Und Care,” 758.

women and with the data available to Scheele, she mentions that those employees earn less than in other industries.¹⁶

In trying to pinpoint the origins of the division of labour, Scheele mentions that already in ancient Greece, there was a clear separation of different fields of work. There was an understanding of work that comes from the soul or for the sake of doing work, known as 'Praxis.' Moreover, there is the 'Poiesis' or the mechanical or manufacturing work. The former, going by Aristotelian Ethic, is the 'Kingdom of Freedom' and the area of the Muses, arts, free speech and political dealings. Economy and work belong to the 'Kingdom of Necessity', Scheele paraphrases political science professor Ingrid Kurz-Scherf (*1949) from the university of Philipps-Universität Marburg.¹⁷

In her book *Wirtschaft ist Care: Die Wiederentdeckung des Selbstverständlichen* (own translation: Economy is Care: The Rediscovery of the Self-Evident) freelance writer and protestant theologian Ina Praetorius (*1956) also tries to go back in time and find the source of why modern Western society is constructed the way it is. Her paper is mostly formed around the idea of dichotomy. According to Praetorius, human nature and history is a permanent dichotomy.¹⁸ Praetorius points out that there are five strong points that crystallize from philosophical texts written throughout Antiquity in the eastern Mediterranean world:

¹⁶ Scheele, 759.

¹⁷ Ingrid Kurz-Scherf, "Hauptsache Arbeit? Blockierte Perspektiven Im Wandel von Arbeit Und Geschlecht," in *Hauptsache Arbeit? Feministische Perspektiven Auf Den Wandel von Arbeit*, ed. Dagmar Baatz, Clarissa Rudolph, and Ayla Satilmis (Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot, 2004), 28-29, quoted in Alexandra Scheele, "Arbeit Und Geschlecht: Erwerbsarbeit, Hausarbeit Und Care," in *Handbuch Interdisziplinäre Geschlechterforschung*, ed. Beate Kortendiek, Birgit Riegraf, and Katja Sabisch (Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 2019), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-12496-0_49, 754.

See Aristotle, Benjamin Jowett, S. H. Butcher, and Leonard Baskin. *Politics & Poetics*. Norwalk, Connecticut: The Easton Press, 1979.

¹⁸ Ina Praetorius, *Wirtschaft ist Care oder: Die Wiederentdeckung des Selbstverständlichen*, vol. 16, Schriften zu Wirtschaft und Soziales (Berlin: Heinrich-Böll-Stift., 2015), 11.

1. There are two sorts of people, the free and the unfree, there are two genders: men and women.
2. Men are more important, smarter, stronger, freer as women.
3. The native adult male is the definition by which humanity is measured.
4. There are people – wives, children, slave women and men that from a legitimate standpoint are dependent on ruling individuals.
5. Due to the fact that there are free and dependent people living in this world, corresponds to the the natural or divine law and therefore is immutable.¹⁹

With the historical development of Western-European society and its transition through the Middle Ages, the division of work still persists but it changes its meaning, being more dependent on social rank and status of the working person. Nonetheless the idea of labour that is considered work and labour that is not considered work persists. With the transition towards the capitalist means of production, the perception and understanding of what constituted labour shifts towards a correlation with the volume of items produced in a given amount of time, thereby efficiency was a key factor. That time, according to the British philosopher and economist Adam Smith (1723-1790) in his magnum opus *An Inquiry into the Wealth of Nations*,²⁰ society is driven by self-interest. It seeks to accumulate wealth by creating goods and exchanging them on the market. Expanding the founding ideas of

¹⁹ Praetorius, *Wirtschaft is Care oder: Die Wiederentdeckung des Selbstverständlichen*, 13.

²⁰ Adam Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, 5 vols. (Metalibri, 2007), https://ibiblio.org/ml/libri/s/SmithA_WealthNations_p.pdf.

political economy, labour is considered productive, thus paid, and unpaid unproductive labour.²¹

“There is one sort of labour which adds to the value of the subject upon which it is bestowed; there is another which has no such effect. The former, as it produces a value, may be called productive; the latter, unproductive labour.”²²

By productive labour, Smith refers to goods created that can be exchanged in the market for other goods or for fiat money as an outcome of work. To unproductive labour he attributes the provision of services. But as labour studies scholar Eva Senghaas-Knobloch (*1942) from the university of Bremen and economics scholar Christel Kumbruck (*1952) from the University of Applied Sciences Osnabrück point out, it was unforeseeable for Smith, that his proposal of labour division would have far-reaching effects throughout the entire society, even affecting the constitution of family.²⁴ The notion of the division of labour productivity established with the industrialization and the urbanization of society. That spatial development lead to a labour division into the public and the private spheres. Scheele points out that with the privatization of the family household, what had been a household focused economy in the early modern period with a closely working couple now entailed a division, where the man was placed into the public sphere while the woman was relegated to the private.²⁵

²¹ Scheele, *Wirtschaft is Care oder: Die Wiederentdeckung des Selbstverständlichen*, 754-755. However, in a broader understanding, labour usually means paid work. See also Andrea Komlosy, *Arbeit. Eine Globalhistorische Perspektive. 13. - 21. Jahrhundert*, 4th ed. (Wien: Promedia, 2014), 44.

²² Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, 258.

²⁴ Eva Senghaas-Knobloch and Christel Kumbruck, “Zum Ethos fürsorglicher (Pflege-) Praxis. Dilemmata in der modernen Dienstleistungsgesellschaft,” *L’Homme. Europäische Zeitschrift für Feministische Geschichtswissenschaft* 19, no 1 (2008): 16.

²⁵ Karin Hausen, “Arbeit und Geschlecht,” in *Geschichte und Zukunft der Arbeit*, ed. Jürgen Kocka und Claus Offe (Frankfurt a. M./New York: Campus, 2000), 348, quoted in Alexandra Scheele, “Arbeit Und Geschlecht: Erwerbsarbeit, Hausarbeit Und Care,” in *Handbuch Interdisziplinäre Geschlechterforschung*, ed. Beate Kortendiek, Birgit Riegraf, and Katja Sabisch (Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 2019), <https://doi.org/10.1007/978->

The role of the woman in the private sphere entailed being a housemaid, wife and mother. Her influence was focused mainly on the family and the house and she was expected in her place in the passenger's seat, meaning in the shadow of the man and dependent on his decisions. According to University of Tübingen psychology professor Cornelia Klinger (*1953), as part of the principle of efficiency, the private sphere was specialized as a refuge of virtue and goodness and a place to grow humanity.²⁶ According to sociology professor from the university of Paderborn Birgit Riegraf (*1961) the family in a capitalist, industrialized society symbolizes "the central place for reproduction, emotionality, affection, recovery, and empathy" and as the place of care and care-work as 'love towards others' which develops into the idea that it would be the 'natural state' of the woman."²⁷ That runs diametrically to the realm of men, the public. As work done by men was coined as productive labour, men's place in society had been constructed as more valuable and along the lines of rationality, egoism, self-involvedness, assertiveness.²⁸

The private and public spheres were heavily challenged in the 1960s and 1970s. Feminist activist and Marxist scholar Silvia Federici (*1942) claims the private is a methodical way by the Capital to hide the actual work done by women.²⁸ German feminist historians Gisela

3-658-12496-0_49, 755.

Gisela Bock and Barbara Duden, "Arbeit aus Liebe – Liebe als Arbeit. Zur Entstehung der Hausarbeit im Kapitalismus," *Frauen und Wissenschaft. Beiträge zur Berliner Sommeruniversität für Frauen*, (1977), quoted in Alexandra Scheele, "Arbeit Und Geschlecht: Erwerbsarbeit, Hausarbeit Und Care," in *Handbuch Interdisziplinäre Geschlechterforschung*, ed. Beate Kortendiek, Birgit Riegraf, and Katja Sabisch (Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 2019), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-12496-0_49, 755.

²⁶ Cornelia Klinger, "Die Ordnung der Geschlechter und die Ambivalenz der Moderne," in *Das Geschlecht der Zukunft. Zwischen Frauenemanzipation und Geschlechtervielfalt*, ed. Sybille Beckar et. al. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2000), 29-63, quoted in Alexandra Scheele, "Arbeit Und Geschlecht: Erwerbsarbeit, Hausarbeit Und Care," in *Handbuch Interdisziplinäre Geschlechterforschung*, ed. Beate Kortendiek, Birgit Riegraf, and Katja Sabisch (Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 2019), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-12496-0_49, 755.

²⁷ Own translation, Riegraf, "Care, Care-Arbeit und Geschlecht: gesellschaftliche Veränderungen und theoretische Auseinandersetzungen," 765.

²⁸ Riegraf, 766.

²⁸ Silvia Federici, *Wages against Housework* (Bristol: Power of Women Collective/Falling Wall Press, 1975), 3.

Bock (*1942) and Barbara Duden (*1942), emphasize that such work was also seen as ‘labour of love—love as labour’ (Liebesdienst) and it was attributed to women due to their ‘social character.’²⁹ The European/US feminist debate of the period concerned itself with domestic unpaid labour that developed throughout the 19th and into the 20th century. The symbol of the housewife had become an “ideal of the bourgeois class”, a hallmark of richness.³⁰ As the article by British historian Anna Davin (*1940) shows, the more money a family earned, the more likely the wife would stay at home.³¹ Carol Gilligan (*1936), an American psychologist, feminist, ethicist came up with the hypothesis that women followed a different ‘inner judgment’ when it came to moral decisions. Whereas the masculine inner judgment was ‘logical and individualistic’, meaning that the emphasis in moral decisions was protecting the rights of people and making sure justice is upheld. The feminine voice accentuated on a domestic ground, protecting interpersonal relationships and taking care of other people. That voice focused on the ‘care perspective.’³² According to Riegraf, Gilligan advocates the necessity to accept the ‘voice of care’ in science and society, beyond the already accepted ‘voice of justice’ that was stereotypically associated with men. The ‘voice of care’ oriented itself rather on quality of relationships than on formal principles of justice and put emotions as well as social engagement in the centre of analysis.³³ Interpretations like Gilligan’s show how the gendered labour division, that is essentially a construct of

²⁹ Bock and Duden, “Arbeit aus Liebe – Liebe als Arbeit”, quoted in Helma Lutz, “Editorial. Domestic Work,” *European Journal of Women’s Studies* 14, no. 3 (2007): 187.

³⁰ Helma Lutz, “Editorial. Domestic Work,” *European Journal of Women’s Studies* 14, no. 3 (2007): 187.

³¹ Davin, “Imperialism and Motherhood,” 112.

³² See Carol Gilligan, *In a Different Voice Psychological Theory and Women’s Development* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press, 1993), 69, 101. See also Nancy Arden. McHugh, *Feminist Philosophies A-Z*, Philosophies A-Z (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), <http://www.credoreference.com/book/edinburghfem>, 39.

³³ Carol Gilligan, *In a Different Voice Psychological Theory and Women’s Development* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press, 1982), quoted in Birgit Riegraf, “Care, Care-Arbeit und Geschlecht: gesellschaftliche Veränderungen und theoretische Auseinandersetzungen,” in *Handbuch Interdisziplinäre Geschlechterforschung*, ed. B. Kortendiek et al., vol. 65, Geschlecht und Gesellschaft, 2019, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-12496-0_172, 767.

capitalist-industrial society, has been adopted by many as a ‘natural law’. Women are seen as predestined for care, whilst politics and decision-making is ascribed to men. Gilligan’s idea connects to Neubauer’s stance that domesticity and care were a woman’s natural calling.³⁶

2.3 Marxist Social Reproduction Debate

Published in 1983, Lise Vogel’s book *Marxism and the Oppression of Women*³⁷ represents a thorough analysis of the main founders of socialist theory Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Friedrich Engels (1820-1895) and exposes their views on women’s subjugation and place within the **capitalist mode of production**. We will proceed in explaining the main concepts of Marxism before returning to Vogel’s discussion on feminist contribution to Marxist theory.

Marx views **labour-power** as a characteristic attributable to all people. By labour-power he means capacity for labour as an aggregate of mental and physical activities whose end result are use-value goods.³⁸ Those use-value goods are in a sense the same goods Adam Smith talked about in his *Wealth of Nations*: “The word VALUE [...] has two different meanings[...].” By that he means the use value and the exchange value of things.³⁹ Conversely, Vogel paraphrases Marx “[use-value] by its properties satisfies human wants of some sort or another.”⁴⁰ In the words of Vogel “[l]abour-power is a latent capacity borne by

³⁶ See Chapter 2.1.

³⁷ Lise Vogel, *Marxism and the Oppression of Women. Toward a Unitary Theory*, vol. 45, Historical Materialism Book Series (Leiden: Brill, 2013), <http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/content/9789004248953>.

³⁸ Vogel, *Marxism and the Oppression of Women*, 68.

³⁹ Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, 26.

⁴⁰ Vogel, *Marxism and the Oppression of Women. Toward a Unitary Theory*, 143.

a human being”, the capabilities of labour-power are utilized when they are put to use — in a ‘labour-process’.⁴¹ Thus, by Marx’s definition, labour is when labour-power is in use. The labour-processes are never isolated and rather part of determinate modes of production. That production is a continuous cycle, repeating itself, renewing itself, hence a mode of reproduction. “Social reproduction” is therefore the “reproduction of the conditions of production”.⁴² In simpler terms, part of the outcome of production has to be redirected to the labour force to maintain its labour-power.

Social reproduction requires that some labour-power is constantly available to set and keep the labour-process in motion. Furthermore, the bearers of the labour-power (i.e. humans) are mortal and require ‘renewal’, regeneration. Some are too young to work, such as children, while others are too old, in the case of retirees. The process of maintenance and the replacement of labour-power is termed “**reproduction of labour-power**”.⁴³

There are some proponents of the idea that the family constitutes a place where that reproduction of labour-power is happening and is therefore a production process, but it is usually dismissed with the argument that instead of families, labour camps or dormitory facilities can be the place of labour-power reproduction through immigration or slavery. To further expand the concept of reproduction of labour-power, Marx defined the terms **individual consumption** and **productive consumption**. The former being the consumption of “products as means of subsistence for the living individual”, the latter being “the labour-power of the living individual”. Vogel does not concern herself further with the definition of productive consumption, rather shifting focus on the individual consumption, clarifying

⁴¹ Vogel, 143.

⁴² Vogel, 144.

⁴³ Vogel, 144.

“individual consumption concerns solely the maintenance of an individual direct producer already enmeshed in the production-process.”⁴⁴ The question of gender does not enter the equation until the discussion moves to the generational replacement of the carriers of labour-power. For that to happen, biological reproduction must take place. That is where men and women are different. Although in the concept of social reproduction, the family plays a central role, it is not the only way of representing generational replenishment, as it is evident from the aforementioned discussion about slavery, dormitory facilities, labour camps, immigration can also theoretically represent generational replenishment of the labour-force.⁴⁵ Thus related, Vogel introduces the differences in sex and their relationship to labour-power. According to Vogel, there are two distinctions between women and men in connection to the idea of child-bearing:

1. Socially constructed gender divisions and differing social standings of men and women are derived from “biological differences” which “constitute the material precondition”.
2. Differences between the sexes always have to be regarded in relation to the social systems in which they occur.⁴⁶

To come to the discussion related to **domestic labour**, Vogel shifts attention towards the essence of what, according to Marx, constitutes the foundation of class-relations: appropriation of surplus-labour. At its basic level of understanding, a class based society is composed of the ruling class and the exploited class. The exploited class consists of the bearers of labour-power — the workers, and it is the job of the ruling-class — the business

⁴⁴ Vogel, 147.

⁴⁵ Vogel, 147.

⁴⁶ Vogel, 147.

owners, to see that the renewal and reproduction of the labour-power happens so that the exploitation and appropriation of surplus-labour is possible. While renewal of the ruling-class also happens through similar processes as the renewal of the direct producers, only the renewal of the exploited-class is considered the reproduction of labour-power because they are directly involved in the process of production. Furthermore, two distinct types of wage-labour are performed:

1. **necessary-labour**, is the labour portion directly going towards the reproduction of the producer proper.
2. **Surplus-labour**, is the rest amount of labour performed that at the end of the day is collected by the ruling-class.

From the standpoint of wages both types of labour are the same. There is no differentiation between what portion of the total work converts into wages for subsistence and what portion is appropriated by the ruling-class. The worker gets payed one whole sum of money. It is important here to state that surplus-labour usually does not exceed the standard working hours while necessary-labour does. The necessary-labour portion done during the standard working hours translates directly into the wages that the worker gets payed, those wages are necessary for subsistence. Vogel terms the standard working hours the **social component** of necessary labour. But wage itself is not enough for the sustenance of the worker and usually additional work must be done such as cooking food, cleaning the house, washing clothes. That translates into the necessary-labour portion done outside the standard working hours and according to Vogel, Marx failed to identify. She coins it the **domestic**

component of necessary labour.⁴⁷ The relationship between the two components Vogel summarizes well:

“[t]he social and domestic components of necessary labour are not directly comparable, for the latter does not have value. This means that the highly visible and very valuable social component of necessary labour is accompanied by a shadowy, unquantifiable, and (technically) valueless domestic-labour component. Although only one component appears on the market and can be seen clearly, the reproduction of labour-power entails both.”⁴⁸

Elaborating the ‘necessary-labour’ terminology further, we can differentiate between necessary-labour and **individual consumption**. The former is only attributed to the immediate producer while necessary-labour covers the amount of labour needed for sustenance and renewal of the producer and the members of the exploited class (ie. household members of the producer). Within the necessary-labour concept, several events are taking place. One is the use of the labour performed for subsistence purposes via the wages received. This labour could further be subdivided according to the intent of the labour:

- One part goes to the subsistence of the members that are not part of the labour force: wife, parents, sick household members.
- The other part, if the producer so desires, goes to the generational replacement of members, in other words, the birthing and rearing of children.⁴⁹

The former is vital for this analysis as it constitutes the basic aspects of care in the domestic realm. The latter is furthermore decisive as it speaks to the necessity of women for biological reproduction (motherhood) and thus, the renewal of the labour-force.

⁴⁷ Vogel, 158-159.

⁴⁸ Vogel, 192.

⁴⁹ Vogel, 150.

Another event represents the feminist discussion on the exploitation of women in connection to the sex-based division of labour. Women being the ones responsible for bringing children into the world, pregnancy followed by birth and the rearing of children entails that the new mother cannot contribute labour-power in a capitalist society because of the increased need for necessary labour. That diminished capacity for wage-labour affects the total amount of surplus-labour the ruling class can appropriate. At the same time, the production cycle is important for the ruling class because it is dependent on the social reproduction and generational renewal of the working-class for the continuous appropriation of surplus labour. That produces a dilemma whereby the limited capacity of a portion of the population to generate labour-power in the short-term is offset by the long-term regeneration of the working-class.⁵⁰ The methods with which the ruling-class have tried to minimize the necessary labour while maintaining and/or increasing the labour-power constitute the source of profits. There are two ways to accomplish that:

- By **absolute surplus value**, the amount of working hours are increased and the worker uses more labour-power for the same amount of income, thereby his/her work is depressed in value.
- By **relative surplus value**, new efficient methods for production processes are sought after by the capitalists. That makes the worker more productive requiring less labour-power and less time to accomplish labour.⁵¹

In the hetero-patriarchal family, during the period of generational replacement of labour-power, the biological father or a male kin of the biological mother was responsible for the provision of her needs. Vogel accentuates that the differentiation of labour along biological

⁵⁰ Vogel, 151.

⁵¹ Vogel, 191.

lines occurs only during the limited time until the offspring reaches a certain age. Once that is accomplished, the mother can return to the labour force. In capitalist societies, those roles get institutionalized to represent the family. From the theoretical point of view, within subordinate-class family structure, generational replacement takes place as well as maintenance in the form of necessary labour. Here is also where tasks or roles are divided between the members of the family. The woman gets tasks specific to necessary labour mainly due to the close association with child bearing. Having children and raising them, especially newborns, most of the time entails being at home. Doing the home chores or in Marxist terms, the necessary labour, is the labour component assigned to women. On the other hand, men are tasked with getting the means of subsistence through the surplus-labour component performed for the ruling-class.⁵²

An issue clearly arising from that arrangement of labour is the position of the woman within the household. It mimics very much the relationship between the classes but instead of the worker being at the mercy of the ruling-class, the woman is at the mercy of the man, whom she has to ask for the means of subsistence. If the woman is asking for more than what is required for her means of subsistence, that is a direct threat and demand on behalf of the worker towards the surplus taken by the ruling-class. Therefore, the male authority over women is supported by the greedy interest of the dominant class to seize as much surplus production as possible. In such a male dominated system, there are rules put in place upon men as a set of ‘responsibilities’, evasion is strongly discouraged. Those responsibilities are to provide the means of subsistence for women which translates in extra-wages but just enough to let them be able “to contribute to the reproduction of their

⁵² Vogel, 152.

class.” Vogel then sums up the idea “[i]t is the provision by men of means of subsistence to women during the child-bearing period, and not the sex-division of labour in itself, that forms the material basis for women’s subordination in class-society.”⁵³

The totality of what has been discussed up until this point sums up what comes to be known as the **Social Reproduction Theory**. The oppression of women which is based upon their necessity for the renewal of labour-power is part of the overall class struggle. Thus, class and gender oppression are intertwined.⁵⁴ The Social Reproduction theory stands in contrast to the prevalent academic theory in the area of Marxism and Feminism, **The Dual-Systems Theory** which understands the oppression of women as separate from class-oppression. Both oppressions exist but are not understood as interconnected historical developments. However, a further elaboration of that approach goes beyond the scope of this research.⁵⁵

With the theoretical knowledge that we armed ourselves thus-far, the contribution to the topic made by Vogel’s contemporaries becomes more clear now. She points out several scholars in the field who have contributed to the Marxist Feminist debate in the late 1960s and early 1970s, such as Canadian scholars Margaret Benston (1937-1991) and Peggy Morton (unknown). Benston exposed the reason for women’s secondary role in capitalist society was due to the unpaid domestic labour. In Benston’s view, the family is the unit of production for child-nurture and housework. Women undertake a great deal of economic activity that does not leave the household but is used internally, such as sewing, cooking, cleaning. Benston’s aim was to reassess the traditional Marxist view that the family is a unit of consumption and to see it rather as a unit of production as women are responsible for the

⁵³ Vogel, 153.

⁵⁴ Vogel, 135.

⁵⁵ Vogel, 134-35.

production of simple use-value goods.⁵⁶ Peggy Morton expanded on the work done by Benston to position the family as the centre of “‘maintenance and reproduction of labour power’”.⁵⁷ She asks if women constitute a class and should they be organized only through their household work? Women to Morton are the centre, not the periphery of the labour reserve force, and it is they that enable the functioning of sectors of the economy like manufacturing and service, where low wages are a priority.⁵⁸ Some of the limitations of the articles by both Morton and Benston include the over-simplistic interpretation of Marxist theory. Moreover, Morton’s argumentation generalizes the oppression of all women as a purely working-class concern.⁵⁹

Another scholar from across the Atlantic, the Italian feminist Mariarosa Dalla Costa (*1943), together with her US-American contemporary, Selma James (*1930) took the position that all women are ‘housewives’. Women produce not just use-values in the household for direct consumption but actual labour-power, they produce surplus-value. The surplus-value is generated by the wage of the husband who in turn exploits the wife, as she does not get wage for her domestic labour. The working class could not continue without this family model, in which the woman is exploited. In their 1971 pamphlet, Dalla Costa

⁵⁶ Margaret Benston, “The Political Economy of Women’s Liberation,” *Monthly Review* 21, no. 4 (1969): 13–27, quoted in Lise Vogel, *Marxism and the Oppression of Women. Toward a Unitary Theory*, vol. 45, Historical Materialism Book Series (Leiden: Brill, 2013), <http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/content/9789004248953>, 17-18.

⁵⁷ Peggy Morton, “A Woman’s Work Is Never Done,” in *From Feminism to Liberation*, ed. Edith Altbach (Cambridge: MA Schenkman Publishing, 1971), 214, 215, 216, quoted in Lise Vogel, *Marxism and the Oppression of Women. Toward a Unitary Theory*, vol. 45, Historical Materialism Book Series (Leiden: Brill, 2013), <http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/content/9789004248953>, 18.

⁵⁸ Morton, “A Woman’s Work Is Never Done,” 214, 215, 216, quoted in Lise Vogel, *Marxism and the Oppression of Women. Toward a Unitary Theory*, vol. 45, Historical Materialism Book Series (Leiden: Brill, 2013), <http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/content/9789004248953>, 18.

⁵⁹ Vogel, 19.

and James drastically describe the working class woman as “the slave of a wage slave” and points out how those forms of oppression are linked and reinforced each other.⁶⁰

A compatriot and fellow activist of Dalla Costa and James, Silvia Federici (*1942) wrote a political pamphlet in 1975 entitled *Wages against Housework*. It had the purpose to raise awareness about the socio-political movement of the same name that was unravelling at the time on both sides of the Atlantic, in the United States and Western Europe. At the core of the discussion raised by Federici are the same arguments brought up by Dalla Costa — the man in the working class household is, like the capitalist in society, the oppressor, although he himself is oppressed by the ruling class:

“At the same time, [capital] has disciplined the male worker also, by making his woman dependent on his work and his wage, and trapped him in this discipline by giving him a servant after he himself has done so much serving at the factory or the office. [...] the more blows the man, the more he is allowed to recover his ego at her expense.”⁶¹

The interesting aspect of the text by Federici which gives it an important historical significance is in the gradual development of her argument. She starts with the dialogue about the expectations put on women in the modern Western society with examples: to be good housewives, enjoying the housework, without receiving any payment in exchange. By that, she is trying to create a bridge with the reader who herself might actually not be aware that she’s living in such a milieu created by capitalism. Federici then slowly transitions to proposals for change but clarifies that not an actual overthrow of the system needs to be the aim, or giving women jobs in the marketplace but rather ‘structural’ changes. By that, she

⁶⁰ Mariarosa Dalla Costa and Selma James, “The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community” (Pétroleuse Press, December 29, 1971), [https://libcom.org/files/Dalla%20Costa%20and%20James%20-%20Women%20and%20the%20Subversion%20of%20the%20Community%20\(Pamphlet%20Layout\).pdf](https://libcom.org/files/Dalla%20Costa%20and%20James%20-%20Women%20and%20the%20Subversion%20of%20the%20Community%20(Pamphlet%20Layout).pdf), 2, 29.

See also Vogel, *Marxism and the Oppression of Women. Toward a Unitary Theory*, 19-20.

⁶¹ Silvia Federici, *Wages against Housework*, 4.

asks from women to think about their housework as a profession, to raise their self-esteem to make demands from the government and in turn to force the economy to restructure itself so everyone is included in the marketplace, everyone is paid for their work, no matter what that work is. While asserting the claim for “wages for housework”, Federici sees revolutionary potential in the idea of fundamental change of the social characteristics of work, the fight against Capital and the move towards a more united class.⁶² One critical aspect of Federici’s discussion important to stress is her message regarding the endgame of the demands for wages for housework:

“As for the proposal of socialisation and collectivisation of housework, a couple of examples will be sufficient to draw a line between these alternatives and our perspective. It is one thing to set up a day care centre the way we want it, and demand that the State pay for it. It is quite another thing to deliver our children to the State and ask the State to control them, discipline them, teach them to honour the American flag not for five hours, but for fifteen or twenty-four hours. It is one thing to organise communally the way we want to eat (by ourselves, in groups, etc.) and then ask the State to pay for it, and it is the opposite thing to ask the State to organise our meals. In one case we regain some control over our lives, in the other we extend the State’s control over us.”⁶³

By socialization and collectivization, Federici means the social services established by the state that would supposedly take over the responsibilities of the housewife, so women can get gainful employment in the marketplace. To put it differently, to move the private, the shadowy, the unseen, the unpaid work from the house and into the public into the open view of society. But this professionalization of the household carries with it a danger of further dependence on the state, on the wage-labour supplied by the state, which Federici is

⁶² Federici, 5.

⁶³ Federici, 7.

warning against. Here, the message is: although the battle will be won, the war not yet, as both men and women will still be dependent on the wages of the capitalists.

2.4 The Concept of Shadow Work

The idea of lost self-reliance as a hallmark of industrial development was explored by philosopher and Roman Catholic priest Ivan Illich (1926-2002) in his 1980 piece *Shadow Work*. Just like Vogel and her shadowy, unquantifiable component, Illich coins the term **Shadow Work** to those activities that are not remunerated for the hours of labour put into. But in contrast to Vogel, Illich does not differentiate between men and women or along children and adults. Anyone of any skin colour, religion, sex and age can be and is exploited with Shadow Work. But the poster-child for Shadow Work still remains the woman. According to him, wage-labour is to be applied and qualified for while Shadow Work one is born into, coerced by the circumstances in which one comes into this world.⁶⁴

The main point Illich is addressing is the seeming plundering of the common folk by the ruling class in the course of industrialization. That robbery manifests itself through the removal of self-subsistence methods and the introduction of wage-labour which used to be a punishment for sin and crime in the Ancien Regime in France.⁶⁵ To his surprise, France had only instituted forced labour shortly before the French Revolution 1789. The protestant countries in the north of Europe had done so a century earlier; most likely whoever suggested the idea in France looked upon the Netherlands or the German states for inspiration. In Illich's view, the transition to wage-labour did not occur without riots and

⁶⁴ Ivan Illich, "Shadow Work," *Philosophica* 26, no. 2 (1980): 8.

⁶⁵ Illich, "Shadow Work," 11, 13. Illich also mentions other examples from history which show that wage-labourers were seen as the lowest members on the margins of society, for example in medieval Florence.

resistance.⁶⁶ The transition occurred with the division of labour along biological lines with women relegated to the household, becoming the man's property, doing the Shadow Work. That state of affairs had not been contested until recently. According to Illich that is because of its mystification along four areas:

1. Alongside an imagination of pre-agrarian human life and the supposed roots of sex differences in biology, different roles were instilled into the members of the household. That new division was reinforced and argued by scientific anthropological studies to create a link of the human society with nature. Illich point out that the sex division for economic purposes had not have been possible in subsistence economy.
2. Illich argues with Marxists that the activities happening in the household for the sustenance of the family members are work and must be seen as productive. He mentions the examples of the teachers and social workers. This aspect is important to our discussion of Marxist feminism.
3. Measurement tools of society productivity are biased and geared towards ignoring the Shadow Work sector on purpose. According to Illich, "all unpaid activities are amalgamated into a so-called informal sector."⁶⁷
4. Illich debates that some feminists use terminology and measurement tools of productivity to create their own theories and thereby had flawed conclusions. By neglecting house-work as useless instead of arguing for the financial compensation for it, they were reinforcing an under-valuation of domestic work.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Illich, 14.

⁶⁷ Illich, 17.

⁶⁸ Illich, 16-18.

Illich proceeds to show the example of women in the United States at the turn of the 19th century being self-sufficient.⁶⁹ At that point both men and women were occupied in the household in the same processes and activities of producing, consuming and selling and were economically equal to men. Illich's main message can be captured here. He argues that once the transmogrification of women and the introduction of commercial farming take place, subsistence economy is relegated, independence is crushed, "the frustrating task of the housewife became the organization of compulsory consumption."⁷⁰ What Illich describes as "crude model of bondage to shadow-work" by founding labour division in the differences of sexes for economic purposes⁷¹ sums up an idea that went mostly untouched by the Marxist theory surrounding the oppression of women, including Social Reproduction Theory. Vogel in her desire to find a unitary approach compartmentalized the biological component as much as possible to not end up with another form of Dual Systems Theory. Vogel's findings allow the conclusion from a Marxist-feminist perspective that women were pushed into the domestic sphere and care and care-work as a consequence of the establishment of the capitalist-industrialized society. The biological component of women having the ability to bear children makes motherhood an essential aspect to Social Reproduction theory. What comes short in Vogel's theory is the forcing and restriction of women to the domestic sphere as a structure of oppression, which Dalla Costa describes in terms of inter-connected slavery relations of labour division between the sexes and what Illich connects to Shadow Work. An aspect that is nonetheless underrepresented in those theories is the transformation of the concept of motherhood from the domestic sphere into

⁶⁹ For example by producing shoes, rugs, soap, candles, preserving food, keeping small animals and gardens with money being made off selling the surplus.

⁷⁰ Illich, 20.

⁷¹ Illich, 20.

the public sphere. With that, I mean not only the financial compensation of the care-work of mothers but also the professionalization of motherhood outside of home. I argue, that the two historical examples of care-work in monastery orders, as well as the establishment of SOS-KD-mothers represent that even women who were not mothers were incorporated into the cycle of production. With the establishment of a secular welfare-system, professional care-takers were further integrated in the renewal of the labour-force.

As for Illich's fourth point, American feminist writer Betty Friedan (1921-2006), who coined the plight of the women secluded to a household life as the *Feminine Mystique*⁷² can be seen as an example. The issue of housewives being dissatisfied and unfulfilled at home, that appeared in the Western bourgeoisie after the end of World War II, was already analyzed with Lutz in Chapter 2.2. Davin, while looking through the diaries and experiences of commoners in early 20th century Britain, paints a tale of two worlds — the middle class and the working class. The idea that a woman should be a housewife and stay at home was clearly a privileged notion of the middle-class, as working-class women could not afford to not have employment as one income would not be enough to sustain a family.⁷³

⁷² See Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique* (London: Penguin Books, 2010).

⁷³ Davin, "Imperialism and Motherhood," 124-127.

3. Womanhood, Imperialism, Motherhood

The turn of the 20th century was a high point for imperialist expansion. Driven in part by industrialization and in part by the consolidation of new states in Europe such as the Kingdom of Italy and the German Empire in the second half of the 19th century. The rise of nationalism had brought with it a new perspective on what needs to be done to further the cause of the empires.⁷⁴ The question of expansion and the quality (health) of their citizens was on many statesmen's minds. Darwinist and Malthusian philosophy of the struggle for existence as a paramount importance for the survival of the race was zeitgeist. That entailed the perception that excessive population leads to exhaustion of resources and eventually to disease, conflict and other checks on growth. A common thought permeated through the Western powers – Britain, France, United States, German Empire – to gain new territories and ensure the sustainability of the nation.⁷⁵

In her debate about the genesis of women's roles in early twentieth century Britain, Anna Davin is juxtaposing the drive for hegemony by the state and how it formed the ideology of motherhood according to a Victorian family ideal which still prevailed in the society of England at the end of the century.⁷⁶ It was understood that the quality of the population and its eventual expansion relied on the quality of its children. Driven partially by the fear of being eclipsed by other powers such as Germany, children all of a sudden had become the focus of the British state. They had become a 'national asset', 'the capital of a country',

⁷⁴ When I use empire, I talk of a specific historical state empire and do not mean the concept Empire. The focus here lies mainly on the idea that the welfare of children and motherhood were seen as essential for the success of the imperialist project of expansion. For a theorization of the post-Marxist concept Empire, see Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, and Harvard University Press, *Empire* (Cambridge, Mass.; London: Harvard University Press, 2007).

⁷⁵ Davin, "Imperialism and Motherhood," 87.

⁷⁶ Davin, 92.

‘the future of country and Empire’.⁷⁷ All effort was put into curbing infant mortality — new societies sprung up with prominent members and many women working as volunteers: Institute of Hygiene (1903), the Infants’ Health Society (1904), the National League for Physical Education and Improvement (1905), the Food Education Society (1908), the National League for Health, Maternity and Child Welfare (1905), The Eugenics Education Society (1908), the Women’s League of Service for Motherhood (1910) among others. New checks and legislation were introduced, such as training for Midwives (1902), empowerment of local authorities to give meals to the needy children (1906), obligation to give medical inspection in schools (1907), duty to notify about new births so health inspections could occur (1907). The *Children Act* of 1908 — as a culminating point — represented a detailed law meant to protect children from harm by their own families and by law required their families to have proper care given to them.⁷⁸

The Boer War of 1898-1900 and the enrolment of recruits for the expedition opened the need to inquire into the quality of the British troops. It was found out that out of every 1000 people enrolled to serve the Army a third of them were found unfit for duty due to medical reasons — heart troubles, weak lungs, rheumatic tendencies, flat feet, bad teeth, too small or too slight.⁷⁹ Bad health conditions were seen as a result of insufficient parenting and care. The military high command found the culprit in mothers.⁸⁰ Parenting and the lack

⁷⁷ Davin, 88.

⁷⁸ British Parliament, “Children Act,” Pub. L. No. Chapter 67 (1908), https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1908/67/pdfs/ukpga_19080067_en.pdf. See Davin, “*Imperialism and Motherhood*,” 89.

⁷⁹ Davin, 93.

⁸⁰ Davin, 94.

thereof was taken as a scapegoat not only in the Army but in the medical community as well.⁸¹

Because the family was the backbone of society, its members and especially the mothers had become the object of fixation by the state. Indeed, comparing the common literature of the time with the one preceding some thirty years, there is a gradual shift in the advice given to young women in pursuit of a relationship and marriage. The emphasis being more put on the qualities as a mother rather than a wife. A 1914 book by British female physician and gynecologist Mary Scharlieb (1845-1930) on *What it Means to Marry or Young Women and Marriage* gave the three main reasons for marriage as: the reproduction of the race, the maintenance of social purity, and the mutual comfort and assistance of each married couple.⁸² Whereas in the 1882 book by British writer J. W. Kirton (1831-1892) on *Cheerful Homes and How to Keep Them*, Kirton advised women to seek life partners who would embody four characteristics: support, protection, help, and guidance for her.⁸³ The development of Eugenics during the turn of the century emphasized the importance of proper rearing of the children, good motherhood was an important part of the Ideology of the time about the quality of the race and its purity.⁸⁴ How to correctly raise children had become the preoccupation of the state. Legislation was enacted that made it possible to remove children from their parents if they were regarded as insufficient care-givers. Those children then were handed into the care of guardians. Further legislation gave maternity

⁸¹ Davin, 92.

⁸² Mary Scharlieb, *What It Means to Marry, or, Young Women and Marriage* (London: Cassell and Company, LTD, 1914), <http://wellcomelibrary.org/item/b28093306>, 36-37. See Davin, 91.

⁸³ John William Kirton, *Cheerful Homes How to Get and Keep Them: Or, Counsels to Those about to Marry, and Those Who Are Married : A Companion to "Happy Homes and How to Make Them."* By John W. Kirton. (London et. al.: Ward, Lock, and Co., 1882), 11-12. See Davin, 91.

⁸⁴ Davin, "Imperialism and Motherhood," 90.

insurance that covered the expenses of childbirth. A look into the governing structure of other successful nations such as Germany led to the mimicking of welfare policies at home. The British also looked closely to how the Japanese had medical supervision of schoolchildren and that they were taught first aid and hygiene. The German model of providing baths, food and medical provisions at school was taken more closely into consideration as in the eyes of the English, Germany quickly was becoming a formidable industrial power and rival.⁸⁵ In that sense, adopting foreign welfare structures was also part of the competition with other powers. Thus, the provision of care developed more into a secular service.

As a general rule of thumb, the more well off a family was, the less likely the wife would work. That mostly applied to the middle-class families, most attributable to urban dwellers. The ‘breadwinners’ of those families would be employed as artisans which represented stable jobs with decent income. The ‘housekeeper’ would be involved with raising the ‘dependent children’ and take care of the house. An interesting take by Davin is that the more the family ‘breadwinner’ would earn, the more items and possessions the family would have. The increased number of possession required more time to deal with, which fell on the hands of the ‘housekeeper’. The opposite was also true, the less money a family would make, the less of possessions it would have, the less time would be spent at home, the likelihood of both members of the household being employed was higher.⁸⁶ This relates to the findings of the previous chapter.

⁸⁵ Davin, 91–96.

⁸⁶ Davin, 112.

In her analysis of the diaries of the time, Davin points out that the majority of the working-class women welcomed the provision of state schools from the age of three as they could offload their children and then head out to work despite a report to the adverse affect of putting the children at such a young age.⁸⁷ If that was not possible then the parents or close relatives would take the child for daycare or at times even permanently. There was also the possibility that in a working-class family with sufficient income, the family would still be at risk to fall into poverty if the breadwinner (stereotypically the man) would get sick. In that case, pregnant women had to take work — washing, sewing — irrespective of how far into the pregnancy they were.⁸⁸ The work of charitable organizations such as the Charity Organisation Society served to alleviate the hardships of families in poverty but it reinforced the stereotypes such as the man being the breadwinner while the woman would stay at home and look after the house. Political discussions about the state's responsibility in relieving women's burdens resulted in legislation that allowed women to keep the earning from their jobs. That was as an outcome of the argument that the mothers are most likely to provide nurture and see that the children go through school rather than the father.⁸⁹ A strong push from organized groups such as the Women's Cooperative Guild and the stories told by the members about the conditions working mothers faced daily made the Liberal government in the period 1906-1914 enact a series of reforms. However, according to women studies scholar Jane Lewis (*1950), the Liberals mostly reinforced the same societal structure and understanding of relationships: women were still treated as

⁸⁷ Davin, 113.

⁸⁸ Jane Lewis, "Models of Equality for Women. The Case of State Support for Children in Twentieth Century Britain," in *Maternity and Gender Policies. Women and the Rise of the European Welfare States, 1880-1950s*, ed. Ann-Sofie Ohlander, Pat Thane, and Gisela Bock (London: Routledge, 1991), 76.

⁸⁹ Lewis, "Models for Equality for Women," 76.

dependants of men and the status-quo of their primary roles as wives and mothers were emphasized again.⁹⁰ One interesting aspect of the developments of the time was that the women's trade unionists, a body formed to promote the interests of women, had opined that it would be better that working-class women left work and focus full-time on the house and family for the reasons of increased male wages due to less competition in the workplace and better domestic management. One such proposal was to enact legislation that would prohibit women from working outside the home until their children would be able to look after themselves.⁹¹ There were proposals to introduce a family wage.⁹² Going back to Vogel, from the Marxist point of view, a family wage could be considered the 'just-enough' extra wage for the purposes of social reproduction.

One problem often overlooked for working-class women around the first decade of the 20th century is the dilemma faced around reproduction or rather, the struggle to control reproduction. Due to the lack of contraceptive possibilities, working class women were confronted with frequent pregnancies, ending up with families that counted four children or more. Due to the replacement of the sustenance economy by the capitalist mode of production and wage labour child-care without an external income (wage) was not sustainable. For most families, having many children entailed the risk of poverty and misery. According to Davin, women in post World War I Britain advocated for increased contraceptive measures despite the propaganda by the state for better motherhood. She quotes a mother of the time:

⁹⁰ Lewis, 77.

⁹¹ Lewis, 79.

⁹² Lewis, 78.

*“when at the end of 10 years I was almost a mental and physical wreck, I determined that this state of things should not go on any longer, and if there was no natural means of prevention, then of course, artificial means must be employed, which were successful, and am happy to say that from that time I have been able to take pretty good care of myself, but I often shudder to think what might have been the result if things had been allowed to go on as they were.”*⁹³

Another mother expressed her grief through the personal health torture experienced from consecutive pregnancies:

*“I do wish there could be some limit to the time when a woman is expected to have a child... Practically within a few days of the birth, and as soon as the birth is over, she is tortured again. If the woman does not feel well she must not say so, as a man has such a lot of ways of punishing a woman I she does not give in to him.”*⁹⁴

Those personal histories illustrate that the oppression of women in the capitalist mode of production, as explained in chapter 2.3, is not just a theoretical concept, but women very realistically felt oppressed by their ascribed role as mother and housewife. In the wake of the state’s increasing influence on care and care services, employed single women did not escape the idea that motherhood was ascribed a higher purpose. It is the physical motherhood that is separated from the foster-motherhood in the words of C. W. Saleeby (1878-1940).⁹⁵ The Eugenics supporter⁹⁶ connects motherhood with a racial significance,

⁹³ Margaret Llewelyn Davies and Women’s Co-operative Guild, *Maternity. Letters from Working-Women Collected by the Women’s Co-Operative Guild* (London: Virago, 1978), letter 33, 60-61, quoted in Anna Davin, “Imperialism and Motherhood,” in: *Tensions of Empire. Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, ed. Frederick Cooper (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 126.

⁹⁴ Davies and Women’s Co-operative Guild, *Maternity. Letters from Working-Women Collected by the Women’s Co-Operative Guild*, letter 21, 48-49, quoted in Anna Davin, “Imperialism and Motherhood,” in: *Tensions of Empire. Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, ed. Frederick Cooper (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 126.

⁹⁵ C. W. Saleeby, *Woman and Womanhood. A Search for Principles* (Project Gutenberg, 2006), 17. Initially, Saleeby’s book was published in 1911.

See Davin, “Imperialism and Motherhood,” 132.

⁹⁶ “Dr. C. W. Saleeby. A Pioneer in Eugenics,” *The Times*, December 12, 1940.

Eugenics was developed as a theory with the intent to improve the human race by selective breeding. Due to its deeply racist, discriminatory notions, and use in selective extermination structures (e.g. the Holocaust) the theory had

but points out that a foster-motherhood can also be essential to fulfill womanhood.⁹⁷ With regards to the need for care-workers in the newly establishing welfare system, alongside the imperialist notion of expansion and quality of the nation, Saleeby's calling for women to fulfill their motherly destiny illustrates the shift of motherhood from the domestic to the public sphere. The woman was not only supposed to be the woman for the family, but also for the nation.

Analyzing notions of motherhood in the German Empire and the Weimar Republic, women's studies scholar Irene Stoehr (*1941) differentiates *Mütterlichkeit* (from German: motherliness) from *Geistige Mütterlichkeit* (from German: spiritual motherliness). That 'spiritual motherliness' was by some considered even more important than the physical one.⁹⁸ The kindergarten movement in the German states around the middle of the 19th century is an example of how the idea of spiritual motherliness/motherhood was put into practice.⁹⁹ Those concepts are relevant in our discussion of care in monastery orders and emergence of SOS-KD.

been dismissed by the scientific community. See Philip K. Wilson, "Eugenics," in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, February 19, 2019, <https://www.britannica.com/science/eugenics-genetics>.

⁹⁷ Saleeby, *Woman and Womanhood*, 17.

⁹⁸ Irene Stoehr, "Housework and Motherhood. Debates and Policies in the Women's Movement in Imperial Germany and the Weimar Republic," in *Maternity and Gender Policies. Women and the Rise of the European Welfare States, 1880-1950s*, ed. Ann-Sofie Ohlander, Pat Thane, and Gisela Bock (London: Routledge, 1991), 222.

⁹⁹ See Ann Taylor Allen, "Spiritual Motherhood: German Feminists and the Kindergarten Movement, 1848-1911," *History of Education Quarterly* 22, no. 3 (1982): 321. The aim of Allen's article is to retell the history of the emergence of the kindergarten movement was an outcome of the women's movement of the 19th century. It gave women the opportunity to professionalize and create a career as a 'spiritual motherhood' instead of becoming a biological mother.

Part II: Religious Congregations in 19th Century Continental Europe

4. Women's Ecclesiastical Congregations

The establishment of the women's religious congregations was a phenomenon observed towards the end of the 18th century and received a large following in France and Belgium well into the 19th century. Those Catholic deaconesses represented a new model that did not follow the older established principle of monastic orders. Compared to their predecessors, they were less strict in following the canons established by the Vatican but still followed the principle of a fusion of living and working. The sisters of the congregations, unlike the older monastic cloisters, as part of a religious sisterhood that spanned countries, could travel internationally and do their religious deeds in multiple areas of the world. The sisters were employed in the provision of care services that included health-care and child rearing and education.¹⁰⁰

The organization of those congregations was structured with a General Matron as head of the congregation. The congregation had headquarters called the General Motherhouse (Das Generalmutterhaus) which was in charge of the professional training of the sisters, and looked after the sisters' religious matters and well-being. The General Motherhouse was responsible for the recognition of their profession and placement in a national or international branch for work where deemed necessary. According to German historian Relinde Meiwes (*unknown), that organization principle gave flexibility to the congregation to meet the challenges along the progression of the 19th century. Some of

¹⁰⁰ Relinde Meiwes, "Katholische Frauenkongregationen und die Krankenpflege im 19. Jahrhundert," *L'Homme. Europäische Zeitschrift für Feministische Geschichtswissenschaft* 19, no. 1 (2008): 41.

those challenges faced by the congregations was the the loss of the political power of the Papal states coupled with the increased secularization of the states and pressure to close or move their branch somewhere else. Despite difficulties, the opportunities to be part of a sisterhood, to receive an education and a place to sleep and the chance to travel and help those in need was an attractive model for many religious women. Another set of developments since the 1830s was the increased need for social workers. Meiwes points out that the founders of the congregations mostly came from the bigger cities while the recruitment — mostly searching for women in their mid 20s — was done in smaller towns or in villages, on farms or in artisan shops. That secured existence and living was coupled with a lifestyle that entailed being on the job all the time. There was no separation between work and the private and the severe demands of the job to help the injured, the physically and mentally weak. The Catholic Church regarded the work and sacrifice of the sisters as very prestigious. At their high-point before the institution of the *Kulturkampf*¹⁰¹ in the German Empire, there were an estimated 54 orders with 800 branches and some 8011 sisters.¹⁰² Despite the *Kulturkampf*, the number of congregation sisters continued to increase, registering some 36.000 women in Prussia alone by 1918.¹⁰³ One of the aims of Meiwes' article is to expose the importance of the congregations during the development of the 19th century. Despite their great number by the first decades of the 20th century, the

¹⁰¹ The *Kulturkampf* was a period in Imperial German politics after the proclamation of the empire in 1871 to 1887 when the state, under the chancellorship of Otto von Bismarck enacted a series of laws to curb the status of the Roman Catholic Church in the domains of the newly established state. To that end, the Roman Catholic Bureau within the ministry of Culture was abolished, all religious schools were up for state inspection, the religious educators were dismissed from state schools. The backlash that resulted from the Catholic minority within the empire had outmanoeuvred Bismarck by having politically organized themselves into the Centre Party. They gained more seats in the Reichstag and posed a challenge to the policies of Bismarck. In 1878, with the election of a new Pope in Rome, the policies were eased and by 1887 most of the anti-Catholic legislation was removed. See The Editors of Encyclopedia Britannica, "Kulturkampf," Encyclopedia Britannica, July 20, 1998, accessed May 1, 2020, <https://www.britannica.com/event/Kulturkampf>.

¹⁰² Meiwes, "Katholische Frauenkongregationen und die Krankenpflege im 19. Jahrhundert," 43.

¹⁰³ Meiwes, 43.

sisters shied away from much of the societal debates and discussions of the day. They were focusing more on the spiritual aspects of their work and introspective reflection on their lives and tasks.¹⁰⁴ During the process of industrialization and scientific discovery in the 19th century, the gap between the medical theoretical discipline and the practical application of care in the hospitals grew wider. Meiwes argues that there was a skeptical view on the new applications of medicine. In the 1870s, the use of non-traditional medicine was at a high point and many tried to avoid the hospitals. The hospitals at that time became the places where more people got interred for sicknesses not because they were poor but because they did not have someone at home for their care-taking — most of the times that would have been a female member of the household. One of the reasons for a lack of private, domestic care-giving was the increased mobility of the period due to industrialization leading to more people travelling for work. In the new workplace there would be no one from the family to take care of a sick individual or if there was a family, both partners would be employed and at work during the day and by extension have no time to take care of family members. For those reasons, deaconess sisters became more and more involved in patient care and care-giving. An interesting observation made by Meiwes about the congregations is how the sisters' experience was further deepened, expanded and then passed down to the younger members of the congregation. A lot of times, there was no need for a doctor's instruction for them to do their job in stationary care as the mode of life, being always available as part of the lifelong fusion of work with life meant also being involved in the administration of the hospice and/or hospital where they were employed. Sometimes an

¹⁰⁴ Meiwes, 43.

entire hospital could be served, up to 200-300 sick treated, by a deaconess as different sisters would be involved in different aspects of the care of the institution.¹⁰⁵

As mentioned previously, the international orientation of those orders meant that sisters would travel and gain experience in different places of the world. The *Boromärienen* from Nancy in France and the *Elisabethians* from Essen, and the *Clement Sisters* from Münster had a great influence on the Prussian congregations in the 19th century in the area of patient care and sick care. An important and often overlooked aspect of the care for the sick in the 19th century hospitals was the fact that the work of the sisters was vital for the functioning of the hospitals, where there were not many doctors. The absence or lack of care sisters would stop the operations of the hospital. As was pointed out previously, the experience of the sisters in the 19th century made the workings of the hospital more autonomous and the sisters had a freer hand in their daily activities. At the turn of the 20th century, the roles reverse. During that period, the scientific development and spread of medical education not only professionalized the work of the doctors but also the work of the sisters. The practitioners took more of the responsibilities of the sisters for the patients themselves. In regard to the competition with other organizations responsible for care and nurture, the congregations would be very competitive due to the fact that a deaconess could take care of the entire vertical structure of a hospital administration and the pay of the women involved would be small. The congregations in the 19th century were some of the largest employers of women.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁵ Meiwes, 46.

¹⁰⁶ Meiwes, 53.

Besides the previously mentioned functions of the General Motherhouse, it was also the place where the sisters would spend their retirement days after a life dedicated to the care of others. Here they would get quarters to rest and sleep and be cared for by younger sisters. The Motherhouse is a topic of discussion about the idea that within the deaconesses, the fusion of life and work had the impact on the idea that caring for retired sisters. However, during their working life, the sisters' care-work was not really seen as a job and wasn't much paid for. The sisters were exposed to harsh working conditions for extended hours. Exhaustion and sleep deprivation were part of the job. Due to a weakened immune system because of stress and care of the sick, the sisters could represent a danger to themselves and to the patients. Nevertheless, in the first decades of the 20th century there was no better alternative for single, religious women coming from working families, especially from the space where the congregations would promote and enrol new members.¹⁰⁷

The model of the sisterhood congregations was a sought after system to replicate by several state actors who desired to see the services supplied by the deaconesses taken over by the state. This aimed transformation of care-services included the idea that care-work did not have to be seen as a religious calling and that this work should be further professionalized and paid for. One of the challenges of this transformation of care-work was to ensure the passion and motivation for care without the religious aspect.¹⁰⁸

Meiwes points out that the feminist activists of the early 20th century pushed for the secularization of care institutions. The inclusion of women from urban circles into the care professions actually had an unprecedented effect. It led to the further entrenchment of the

¹⁰⁷ Meiwes, 54.

¹⁰⁸ Meiwes, 57.

idea that the care professions should not be paid for. The idea that care-work should be paid work did not take footing with the secularization of care-work.¹⁰⁹

The evolution and transition from the ecclesiastical institutions responsible for the care of the needy and sick in Germany had a very similar trajectory as did the evolution of the pedagogy in Austria after the Second World War. Especially in the change of women's mentality and acceptance of work-load and stress for the benefits of the job they were receiving in return. In the case of the SOS-Kinderdorf, the 1970s saw the fall in the number of women that fit the expectations of the organization. SOS-KD, similarly to the religious congregations of the 19th century, had high expectations in terms of self-sacrifice for care-work. The next chapter will talk about the emergence of SOS-KD and the structure of the organization that led to its "crisis" of the 1970s.

¹⁰⁹ Meiwes, 58.

Part III: SOS Children's Villages

5. The Situation in Austria at the End of World War II

The emergence of SOS-KD organization was shaped by the personal experiences of its founders, expressively as that of Hermann Gmeiner. In the book published around the 50th celebration of the organization, *Tracing our Roots*, as the name suggests, is a recollection of the history of the establishment of the organization and the most memorable and fate changing events that happened to the organization within those fifty years. The authors of the book Horst Schreiber and Wilfried Vyslozil, besides accessing the records of the state of Tyrol, municipalities of Innsbruck and Imst, had taken interviews with the surviving founding mothers and fathers of the organization in the hopes of getting a new outlook on the history of the organization. The aim was to retell the history in a different light. For many years the poster-child of the organization had been Hermann Gmeiner due to his charisma and relentless, unbound energy, and lifelong dedication to the cause of the organization. At one point, it seemed that he was the sole decision maker within the organization. Schreiber and Vyslozil set off on a journey to dispel that myth and unveil those people, that just like Gmeiner, sacrificed and worked tirelessly for the organization. Another purpose of their work is to confront the organization's own dark past. As in the words of Helmut Kutin (*1941), the honorary president of the organization and the successor of Hermann Gmeiner:

“This book is... to speak very frankly and honestly about our past... to render visible the devastating conditions of the post-war period... to describe Hermann Gmeiner in his circle of friends... to convey the dynamism of the team our founders... to highlight striking moments of change in the later history of our organisation.”¹¹⁰

This paper will employ many of the findings of the book to dissect and analyze the transition from the first generation of SOS-KD-mothers to the second. Especially the shift of gender and sex ascribed stereotypes in the motherhood profession are the focus of this analysis.

Despite the west of the country not being militarily occupied, many Austrian cities, including Innsbruck, had not been spared from allied bombing. The capture of Sicily in August 1943 brought the cities of South Tirol and Tirol such as Bolzano, Trentino and Innsbruck under the area of strategic allied bombing. Beginning with that period and leading up to the conclusion of World War II (=WWII) in 1945, a total of 22 aerial bombings of the region took place. Some 60% of the hospitable buildings of the city were destroyed. Some 500 of a total of 1500 victims of the air raids in the administrative district (*gau*) of Tyrol-Vorarlberg were from Innsbruck. Although Innsbruck was not the only city to be bombarded, 80% of the inflicted damages were suffered by the provincial capital. The American troops entered the city on May 3rd without much resistance after the Wehrmacht crumbled following the news of Adolf Hitler’s death on April 30th.¹¹¹

¹¹⁰ Schreiber and Vyslozil, *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, Back Cover.

¹¹¹ See Horst Schreiber, “Innsbruck Im Bombenkrieg,” in *Luftschutzzoll aus Dem Zweiten Weltkrieg. Das Beispiel Innsbruck. Von Der Geschichte Zur Rechtlichen Und Technischen Problemlösung in Der Gegenwart*, ed. Konrad Arnold (Innsbruck: Veröffentlichungen des Innsbrucker Stadtarchivs N.F. 27, 2002), 15–98.

Austria, just like Germany, followed an allied partition into zones of control. The administrative unit of Tyrol and Vorarlberg fell into the French sphere of control. By July 1945 the French took over from the already present US-Americans in the region. From the beginning, the French undertook an active campaign of denazification and re-establishment of diplomatic ties specific to an Austrian identity, promoting an Austrian image, in the hopes of separating and preventing any thoughts of pan-Germanism which was feared of creeping back into the mindset of the population. The destruction and collapse of infrastructure at the end of the war was very soon followed by the emergent problem of how to supply the local population with food and medicine as well as housing after the destructive allied bombing. The problem was exacerbated also by the retreating US-American troops, who — upon the realization that they were replaced by the French — decided to loot whatever they could get their hands on.¹¹² The French troops found themselves confronted with a starving population. Many Austrians in that occupation zone, having been supposedly rationed a daily allowance of 1500 calories via a food stamps system, received in reality food with as little as 1300 calories, according to Austrian historian Klaus Eisterer (*1956).¹¹³ Meanwhile Schreiber and Vyslozil point out that the rations were even as low as 1000 calories.¹¹⁴ The French also had to take into account the issue of their own country and population facing shortages of supplies and food after the liberation from the Nazis. The French government in Paris thought that the wartime established UNRRA (United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration)¹¹⁵ would

¹¹² Klaus Eisterer, *Französische Besatzungspolitik. Tirol und Vorarlberg 1945/46* (Innsbruck: Haymon, 1992), 33.

¹¹³ Eisterer, *Französische Besatzungspolitik. Tirol und Vorarlberg 1945/46*, 47.

¹¹⁴ Schreiber and Vyslozil, *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, 8.

¹¹⁵ Grace Fox, "The Origins of UNRRA," *Polisicquar Political Science Quarterly* 65, no. 4 (1950): 561. The UNRRA was created for the purpose of fighting famine and epidemics through relief by supplying food, transportation equipment, industrial machinery and agricultural tools necessary to restore economic self-reliance to war-affected nations.

deliver as much as three quarters of necessary food supplies. One remark pointed out by Eisterer was that the newly installed French administration tried to implement a trading mechanism in which they would exchange food, that was mainly distributed to the population by the Allies, in exchange for resources and materials such as: electricity, copper sulphate, textiles, cheese, medicine, lumber. That material would add to the resources necessary for the reconstruction of France.¹¹⁶ The increased tension and pressure on the French to secure enough provisions for the population of their occupation zone was observed by an UNRRA working party that was dispatched in November 1945. The calorie intake was noted to be much lower than in the US-American and British zones. The UNRRA advised the British and US-American zonal authorities to dispatch resources for the French until UNRRA programs began their work on the Austrian territory in March 1946.¹¹⁷ The bad state of affairs manifested also on the infant mortality rate, which doubled in 1945 compared to the year before, 9 out of 100 children died.¹¹⁸ A study done on the health of school children for that period in Innsbruck saw half of 9000 sampled being chronically undernourished.¹¹⁹ Due to the extensive bombing, housing was the second biggest issue. People, numbering in the thousands, had to live in refugee camps. There the mouldy and damp rooms were a breeding ground for sicknesses such as Tuberculosis (=TBC), and simple colds due to insufficient medicine available and overcrowded shacks. It wasn't uncommon for two rooms to be filled with 8-16 people due to the shortages of living space. The most vulnerable to these adverse effects were the children and elderly.

¹¹⁶ Eisterer, *Französische Besatzungspolitik : Tirol und Vorarlberg 1945/46*, 46.

¹¹⁷ George Woodbridge, *UNRRA : The History of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration*, vol. 2 (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1950), 297.

¹¹⁸ Eisterer, *Französische Besatzungspolitik : Tirol und Vorarlberg 1945/46*, 54.

¹¹⁹ Schreiber and Vyslozil, *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, 8.

The high casualty rate of men during the war saw a preponderantly female society in both Germany and Austria. As much as half of the working age population of Austria were women. The reconstruction of the Austrian society was mostly a female enterprise. The *Trümmerfrauen* (Rubble women) found themselves in charge of pretty much everything: house, work, raising children, taking care of parents and maybe the parents-in-laws. For those families in which the husband would return from the front or Prisoner of War (=POW) camps, taking care of the often mentally or physically disabled men would also be a wife's responsibility. The idea of a vacation or weekend leisure was out of the question for most of these women.¹²⁰ Despite the increased strain on them, their increasingly visible and important role in society gave women independence and self-assurance. That had a reverse effect in the husbands becoming suspicious and jealous. Jealous because they were now forced to accept a reality in which they felt their manhood was taken away from them, their energy had been sapped by the war and their health deteriorated. They had lost in the war and their home was now occupied by foreign powers. The suspicion manifested itself through the fact that now the Austrian men saw themselves competing with the occupation force. The allied soldiers represented a hard to overlook opportunity for Austrian women to escape poverty and misery by marrying them and leaving Austria. The long years of men's absence from home manifested in increased alienation between the father and the children. The children grew up mostly under the supervision of the mother and did not come to understand what it meant to have a father figure in the house. The increased independence of the wife and the increased alienation of the children had a direct impact on the demographics of the country. Furthermore, 1948 recorded the highest number of divorces

¹²⁰ Schreiber and Vyslozil, 11.

on record in Austria. It was not to be broken again until 1978. The increased presence of a foreign force also resulted in the increased number of out-of-wedlock pregnancies.¹²¹ The war-orphaned children, the divorced families and the babies born out-of-wedlock put a strain on the social services sector of Tyrol. Normally, the welfare departments would try and minimize expenditure as their resources were stretched thin. They forced fathers to pay for the care of the children if they happened to be foreign soldiers by not giving any money to the mother who happened to have the child with said soldier. Many divorced fathers left the country for Switzerland which had been untouched by the war and prospects of work and salaries were much higher than in Austria.¹²² The welfare departments at one point took over children from their mothers that resulted in mothers' complaints: "Earlier, when we suffered terrible hardship, no one from the youth welfare department cared about our children. Now that we've worked ourselves up with our own efforts they want to take our children away from us."¹²³ Many times, the families of the fathers that could not or did not want to pay for raising the children took over for their education. According to Schreiber and Vyslozil, the number of foster placements had grown by 60% from 1937 to 1946. The authors found a report of Caritas, an international Catholic aid and development organization¹²⁴ in the *Tiroler Tageszeitung* in 1949: "Every year, 500 babies are born in the Tyrol who rely on outside help! 500 children are in that world who are helpless and lack the love of a mother!"¹²⁵ Because many people lived on farms in the rural setting of Tyrol, it

¹²¹ Schreiber and Vyslozil, 12.

¹²² Schreiber and Vyslozil, 15.

¹²³ Dora Pichler, "Einflüsse der Kriegs- und Nachkriegszeit auf Kinder und Jugendliche" (Phil. Diss., Innsbruck, 1950), 159, quoted in Horst Schreiber and Wilfried Vyslozil, *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler (Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003), 14. The Authors quote a mother from Dora Pichler's dissertation about postwar children and youth.

¹²⁴ Caritas, "Caritas," Humanitarian Aid, History, accessed April 28, 2020, <https://www.caritas.org/who-we-are/history/>.

¹²⁵ *Tiroler Tageszeitung*, August 1, 1949, 2, quoted in Horst Schreiber and Wilfried Vyslozil, *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler (Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003), 16.

wawas physical help that was sought after by many families. Those families that took up fostering, besides getting money for taking in children, looked for children of appropriate age that could already help around the house and farm. Girls would help looking after the toddlers.¹²⁶ The situation of fostering children in the cities proved more complicated. If it was not possible to find families for children, they would be put in boarding schools that ended up overcrowded, understaffed with one poorly trained educator for 50 children. In their description of the conditions of those houses, Schreiber and Vyslozil state that they “were characterized by sterility, resounding stairwells, huge dormitories, dismal refectories, military drill, unkindness, shouting and corporal punishment.”¹²⁷ The aforementioned ‘medieval conditions’ of child-care institutions and some harsh examples of physical violence against children were among the main reasons for the founding ideas of SOS-KD were. The children in boarding schools were mostly kept isolated from the outside world and education was limited to only eight years of primary school with no possibility of secondary school attendance. An example of a boarding school for girls tells the story of labour exploitation in the state-run borstal of St. Martin. Furthermore, a TV program presented on the main country broadcaster Österreichischer Rundfunk (=ORF) showed young people being kept in isolation cells with straitjackets, given cold showers and sedative injections. The notorious conditions of the St. Martin institution as well as one in Kleinvolderberg became known to not only by the population at large but also the state welfare departments. Local welfare departments came to the conclusion that a family education of children, even if not perfect, was to be preferred to institutional child-care.¹²⁸

¹²⁶ Schreiber and Vyslozil, 18.

¹²⁷ Schreiber and Vyslozil, 18-19.

¹²⁸ Schreiber and Vyslozil, 19-20.

6. Hermann Gmeiner's Story and the Soul Of SOS-KD

Back from the front-line Herman Gmeiner found himself amid the poverty and destruction of postwar Austria, where next to the infrastructure, societies and lives had to be rebuilt. Son of a farmer family in rural Vorarlberg, Gmeiner was left half-orphaned from a fragile age of five. His mother died in child labour whilst giving birth to the family's youngest brother, Anton. The Gmeiners were a big family, the siblings were nine in total. After the death of his mother, Hermann's oldest sister Elsa, 14 years at the time, took over as the motherly figure in the family. According to Gmeiner, it was overwhelming for his sister at first but then the role would grow unto her. Gmeiner would always highly regard Elsa as she would become the role model for the SOS-KD-mother concept of the organization.¹²⁹

Gmeiner had a difficult relationship with his father characterized by his absence from the house. When his wife was still alive, Gmeiner senior would be vested on the farm from the break of dawn till sunset. He would be of little words and emotionally distant. It was his way of grieving but it was something his son would never understand. They never had casual conversations, barely any at all, it would be the father that would initiate conversation always. That can be evidenced by Gmeiner's speculation as to what his father would say as to the loss of his wife. The son never dared to ask. There was most likely a clash of strong stubborn personalities as young Gmeiner was forced to assert his position against his father's wishes for him to stay on the farm when departing for education to Innsbruck.¹³⁰

¹²⁹ Hermann Gmeiner, *Father of the SOS Children's Villages* (Innsbruck; Munich: SOS-Kinderdorf-Verl., 1987), 8, quoted in Horst Schreiber and Wilfried Vyslozil, *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler (Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003), 27.

¹³⁰ Vinzenz Neubauer and Hermann Gmeiner, "Kinder Vieler Völker Nennen Ihn Vater ... Den Mann, Den Ich Als Psychologe 25 Jahre Lang Begleitete" (hand-written, n.d.), 6f., quoted in Horst Schreiber and Wilfried Vyslozil, *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler (Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003), 24.
Hermann Gmeiner, *Eindrücke-Gedanken-Bekenntnisse*, 7th ed. (Innsbruck; Munich, 1989), 5, quoted in Horst Schreiber and Wilfried Vyslozil, *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler (Innsbruck:

The experience of his younger brother Anton's adoption by his uncle had a formative effect on Gmeiner's idea that each child should live and grow with the company of their siblings. The adoption had a traumatizing effect on his brother on the one hand because he learned only late in life that he was adopted, and on the other hand because he retrospectively understood that a life without siblings was lonesome. Anton blamed his siblings for giving him up to another household where he grew up without any siblings.¹³¹

After Gmeiner's return from the war, he matriculated at the university of Innsbruck to finish his studies in medicine. While in the city, Hermann noticed the amount of destitute, abandoned orphaned or half-orphaned boys and girls and he immediately personally connected with their experiences. He was worried that the lack of a parent would affect their lives as adults forever and that they would become unfulfilled and like him, restless, constantly in need of motion, escaping depression. Gmeiner was a strong believer and attended church services regularly. In 1947, when asked by the chaplain of the parish of Innsbruck-Mariahilf Simon Mayr (unknown) to establish a youth group, Gmeiner responded enthusiastically and threw all his efforts into the new leadership role. In 1948, Gmeiner was entrusted responsibility for a youth group for his remarkable qualities as leader of the group and being responsible for getting youngsters under control who had otherwise presented as difficult to connect with. He aspired to become an arduous worker who would give anything to succeed in supporting the youth, with the divine support of prayer.¹³² That increased participation in the parish activity affected his university studies,

SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003), 24.

¹³¹ Claudio Honsal, *Für die Kinder dieser Welt. Hermann Gmeiner. Der Vater der SOS-Kinderdörfer. Die Biografie* (München: Kösel, 2009), 58, quoted in Oresta Karpenko, "Hermann Gmeiner. The Founder of SOS-Children's Village," *Human Studies*, Series of «Pedagogy», 8, no. 40 (2019): 163.

¹³² "Gmeiner to Baier," March 8, 1947, Stadelmann file, Austrian Association of Children's Villages (Hauptgeschäftsführung des SOS-Kinderdorfes Innsbruck), quoted in Horst Schreiber and Wilfried Vyslozil, *SOS*

which he eventually abandoned. In a personal correspondence with Paul Baier, Gmeiner wrote:

“I clearly believe that the day and hour will come, which I have always felt but never believed, when I will start to work on a specific project. I now believed in what God wants to achieve through me, ... through me as a tool. I will not become a scientist, I will carry out a mission of a social and religious kind in our country.[...] I want my personal life to be a chain that solely serves mankind ... And the wreath of my life should wreath the people. My own self can, however, be considered a failure.”¹³³

Gmeiner’s activity with the Tyrolean parish might have been the inspiration for his later proposal to establish SOS-KD as an organization with a religious aspect. It should be no surprise that Gmeiner linked humanitarian activities meant for children with religious congregations as he was for two years involved with the youth groups. Proposing such an idea during the establishment of the statutes is exemplifying for, that even in the middle of the 20th century, it was hard for people to imagine the separation of care-work from the ecclesiastical realm.

While working at the parish, Hermann Gmeiner met Maria Hofer (1913-1997), a fellow care-taker at the youth Catholic department. She opened Gmeiner’s eyes about the horrible

Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler (Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003), 38-39.

“Gmeiner to Baier,” April 8, 1948, Stadelmann file, Austrian Association of Children’s Villages (Hauptgeschäftsführung des SOS-Kinderdorfes Innsbruck), quoted in Horst Schreiber and Wilfried Vyslozil, *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler (Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003), 38-39.

The authors had access to the Stadelmann file in the archive of SOS-KD, which is managed by the Austrian Association of SOS Children’s Villages in Innsbruck. Due to the current travel restrictions with regards to the COVID-19 crisis, I was unfortunately not able to retrieve this file myself. I mention Gmeiner’s correspondence from the Stadelmann file only in cases where its conveyed message is vital to describe the historical background of SOS-KD.

¹³³ “Gmeiner to Baier,” June 12, 1948, Stadelmann file, Austrian Association of Children’s Villages (Hauptgeschäftsführung des SOS-Kinderdorfes Innsbruck), quoted in Horst Schreiber and Wilfried Vyslozil, *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler (Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003), 40.

boarding school conditions that we mentioned in an earlier paragraph.¹³⁴ That awareness, together with the experience accumulated in his youth group encouraged Gmeiner to step away from his church duties to consecrate his life to the establishment of a new organization. He did this together with Hofer and other individuals: Josef Jestl, Hedwig Weingartner, Ludwig Kögl, Herbert Pfanner, Hertha Troger, Franz Müller. They began to create a new organization for a greater cause. An organization that would look after socially vulnerable children and give them a roof over their heads.¹³⁵ The process of combining their ideas to a mutual conceptualization for the new organization — which would end up being called SOS-Kinderdorf — and the fundamental thoughts concerning the desired role of the organization in society are discussed as follows.

¹³⁴ Hansheinz Reinprecht and Hermann Gmeiner, *The Hermann Gmeiner Book - The Story of the SOS Children's Villages and Their Founder* (Vienna, 1989), 61-66.

See Horst Schreiber and Wilfried Vyslozil, *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, 47-48.

¹³⁵ Schreiber and Vyslozil, 50.

7. *Societas Socialis* and Creation of SOS-KD

“’Cut out the rubbish, we want a worldly organisation and not an order’ I told Gmeiner who had a strong affinity for the establishment of a society with a monastery-like organisational structure.”¹³⁶

The establishment of a children’s village was not a new concept. The first such village was already opened and operating in Switzerland from 1945 under the guidance of the Swiss philosopher and publicist Walter Robert Corti (1910-1990). The Pestalozzi children’s village¹³⁷ opened its doors in the town of Trogen in 1946. The idea of the village was to help children from all over Europe, affected by WWII, to come to the neutral Switzerland.¹³⁸ Similarly to Hermann Gmeiner, Corti saw the destruction of all the countries surrounding Switzerland as a call for action. In 1944 he published the work *Das Echo* (The Echo) a call-for-action for the establishment of a home for the orphaned. Its impact was instant and raised awareness in the country that lead to the outpouring of funds necessary for the construction of the village in 1946. The town of Trogen was generous in donating the plot of land on which the first children’s village in the world was built.¹³⁹

During the formative months of SOS-KD, Gmeiner visited the Pestalozzi village but was not fond of the organizational structure and the approach taken by the administration, he

¹³⁶ Interview with Franz Müller, September 9, 2009, Schreiber and Vyslozil, *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, 51.

¹³⁷ The village was called after 19th century Swiss paedagogical writer Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi. See Allen, “Spiritual Motherhood. German Feminists and the Kindergarten Movement, 1848-1911,” 319–39.

¹³⁸ “About Us”, Pestalozzi Children’s Foundation, accessed May 1, 2020, <https://www.pestalozzi.ch/en/about-us>.

¹³⁹ E.E., “Walter Robert Corti: Der Weg zum Kinderdorf Pestalozzi,” *Schweizerische Lehrerinnenzeitung*, (1955-56): 81-82.

had other ideas as to the direction of pedagogy.¹⁴⁰ The details of that direction will be further clarified in the employment of the first SOS-KD mothers as care-takers that would end up living in the villages alongside the children in care. At that point it should be noted that SOS-KD was also not the first organization in Austria dedicated to the creation of children's villages. That had already been attempted by the joint Austrian-Swiss venture "Österreichische Pro Juventute Kinderdorf-Vereinigung". In 1946, a group of school teachers from Salzburg, visited the Pestalozzi village in Trogen just like Gmeiner but unlike him, were very much impressed by the facility and the idea that on their return to Austria sought to imitate the model. They established the Austrian Children's Village Association (Österreichische Kinderdorfvereinigung) in 1947 headed by Matthias Laireiter (1910-1990). The association was supported by the private Swiss relief organization "Pro Juventute" whose goal was to aid families and youth and to protect children. In 1953, the association erected their first village in Rottenmann, Styria. The main idea behind the Pro Juventute villages was that married families would educate the children.¹⁴¹ The authors point out that through the complete commitment of the leadership of SOS-KD to their organization, the publicly perceived ideal model for such a children's village was the SOS-KD model. The relentless campaigning of SOS-KD in the public sphere and its quickly growing popularity, threatened other care organizations, such as Pro Juventute and Caritas. They were concerned, that SOS-KD's aggressive public engagement would leave the other

¹⁴⁰ "Report by Helene Didl on the Years 1949-1963," n.d., Stadelmann file, Austrian Association of Children's Villages (Hauptgeschäftsführung des SOS-Kinderdorfes Innsbruck), quoted in Horst Schreiber and Wilfried Vysložil, *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler (Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003), 59.

The authors Schreiber and Vysložil were also informed about Gmeiner's rejection of the Pestalozzi village by co-founder Franz Müller. Interview with Franz Müller, September 9, 1999, Schreiber and Vysložil, *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, 59.

¹⁴¹ Schreiber and Vysložil, 59-60.

organizations not only unknown but also underfunded as the public would donate only to SOS-KD.¹⁴²

On April 25th, 1949 the young founding members of SOS-KD met to establish the statute of the organization. In the previous year the back and forth about the statute of the organization had led to strong criticism from some of the group members. Chemistry student Franz Müller responded to the draft of the statute made by Gmeiner as being akin to a congregation, in which Gmeiner had been involved just half a year prior. Müller remembers his reaction “Cut out the rubbish, we want a worldly organization and not an order.”¹⁴³ It comes as no surprise that Gmeiner got the inspiration from previous experience with youth groups. It also is interesting to state here the research done by pedagogic scholar Oresta Karpenko in which she discusses that Gmeiner actually faced resistance from the Catholic Congregations when on duty promoting the organization as they were not interested in helping an entity that was not affiliated with the church.¹⁴⁴ Imst in Tyrol was to be the first location where a children’s village was built. The construction of the first SOS-KD house began in December 1949, in 1951 the first “families” moved in.¹⁴⁵

The aims of SOS-KD as outlined by Schreiber and Vyslozil were to create an institution which would help and take in orphans, unmarried mothers and their children. This help and care-taking was supposed to be facilitated by “a team (...) of care-givers, nurses and doctors.”¹⁴⁶ The founders planned to form a “mothers’ house” for retired SOS-KD-mothers.

¹⁴² Schreiber and Vyslozil, 61

¹⁴³ Interview with Franz Müller, September 9, 1999, Schreiber and Vyslozil, *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, 51.

¹⁴⁴ Oresta Karpenko, “Hermann Gmeiner. The Founder of SOS-Children’s Village,” 164.

¹⁴⁵ Schreiber and Vyslozil, *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, 54, 76–78.

¹⁴⁶ “Statutes of Societas Socialis (SOS),” March 6, 1949, SOS Children’s Village Imst (minutes 1950-1956), Austrian Association of Children’s Villages (Hauptgeschäftsführung des SOS-Kinderdorfes Innsbruck), quoted in Horst Schreiber and Wilfried Vyslozil, *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler (Innsbruck:

Their care was to be provided by a congregation-like “SOS sisterhood” of unmarried caregivers and nurses between 18-30 years of age.¹⁴⁷ Such a sisterhood, however, has not been established, but there are houses to take care of retired SOS-KD-mothers.¹⁴⁸

After differing ideas about the intended direction of the organization, one of the first goals was recruitment of new members, which proved to be difficult. Many people were freshly scarred from the experience of the state intervention in the lives of people as was the case with national-socialism and wanted to be left alone. A difference was made by the idea that every woman who signed up had to recruit ten other women.¹⁴⁹ By then, Gmeiner had crystallized his thoughts on what the organization should focus on at first; from his youth group days he decided abandoned/orphaned children should not only receive care but also a mother-figure.¹⁵⁰ The four founding principles had become clear: the care SOS-KD wanted to provide were based on giving them a mother, siblings, a house and a village.¹⁵¹ This thesis focuses on the principle of the mother.

The SOS in the organization’s name does not stand for the international radio distress signal, but is originated in the “Societas Socialis” (Latin for social society), the precursor of SOS-KD, founded by Gmeiner to accumulate donations for orphans.¹⁵² “Societas Socialis” refers to the social responsibility in society. It can also be understood as the social calling

SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003), 51.

¹⁴⁷ Schreiber and Vyslozil, *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, 51.

¹⁴⁸ Schreiber and Vyslozil, 239.

¹⁴⁹ Schreiber and Vyslozil, 52-54. The founders of SOS-KD had the impression that women were more successful in social mobilization and thus, the recruitment of supporters focussed mainly on women.

¹⁵⁰ “Report by Helene Didl on the Years 1949-1963,” n.d., Stadelmann file, Austrian Association of Children’s Villages (Hauptgeschäftsführung des SOS-Kinderdorfes Innsbruck), quoted in Horst Schreiber and Wilfried Vyslozil, *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler (Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003), 54.

¹⁵¹ “Über Uns,” SOS-Kinderdorf, accessed May 1, 2020, <https://www.sos-kinderdorf.at/so-hilft-sos/uber-uns>.

¹⁵² “The Meaning of SOS,” SOS Children’s Village British Columbia, accessed May 1, 2020, <https://www.sosbc.org/who-we-are/the-meaning-of-sos/>.
See Schreiber and Vyslozil, *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, 8.

for care-taking in a society where members are responsible of the well-being of each other. This calling is not necessarily a religious one. That Gmeiner and the co-founders incorporated that notion into the name of the organization with the acronym SOS illustrates their idea, that care-taking should be an occupation someone had felt to be destined for. It is, however, also exemplifying the confusions in the shift of care-taking from a church institutional responsibility to a secular welfare service. Gmeiner's aim to stress religion and faith in the organization illustrates well that the transformation was hard for him to make. Schreiber and Vyslozil emphasize that the establishment of SOS-KD with its founding principles has to be analyzed while keeping the social repercussions of postwar Austria in mind. While, during the war, women became vital in continuing industries replacing men's positions in wage-labour, when the men came back from the war, women were pushed back into their "traditional", unpaid roles at home.¹⁵³

The creation of a job market for women by SOS-KD represents a two-sided sword: On the one hand, an opportunity for women was created to be professionally successful in a period of reinforcement of a hetero-patriarchal gendered division of labour after WWII, on the other hand, women were still and again pushed into care-taking which strengthens the notion of gendered labour division. However, that the task of care-taking turned into a secular wage-labour was a turning point.

¹⁵³ Schreiber and Vyslozil, *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, 21-22.

8. In Search of the (SOS-KD) Mother

The initial recruiting of SOS-KD mothers was done directly by Gmeiner and Fritz Haider (1932-2011) — the successor to Gmeiner as village director in Imst. Neubauer retells the following story in a recollection manuscript about Gmeiner. Using Fritz's old moped, both Gmeiner and Haider went through the surrounding villages and asked parish priests of those villages for names of families with unmarried young women. They visited those families and had conversations to find out the suitability of the young women for the mother position.¹⁵⁴ The important factors sought after where:

- Relative youth. The mother was supposed to be between 25 and 40 years of age.
- Unmarried. Hence for the youth, or widowed.
- Childless.
- Housekeeping skills.
- Sound religious background.
- Excellent health. Hence the sought after youth.¹⁵⁵

For Gmeiner, training was not important in those days, what was important was the commitment from the SOS-KD-mother. Most of the time, simply an informal discussion with the young women would be enough to decide if she would fit the job or not.¹⁵⁶

Preference was for young women from the countryside rather than those from the urban

¹⁵⁴ Vizenz Neubauer, "Hermann Gmeiner. Kinder Vieler Völker Nennen Ihn Vater ... Den Mann, Den Ich Als Psychologe 25 Jahre Lang Begleitete" (hand-written, n.d.), 47, quoted in Horst Schreiber and Wilfried Vyslozil, *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler (Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003), 230.

¹⁵⁵ Ludwig Stadelmann, *Hermann Gmeiner - Ein Leben Für Die Mutterlosen. Leben Und Werk Meines Jugendfreundes*, 89, quoted in Horst Schreiber and Wilfried Vyslozil, *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler (Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003), 230.

¹⁵⁶ Vizenz Neubauer, "Hermann Gmeiner. Kinder Vieler Völker Nennen Ihn Vater ... Den Mann, Den Ich Als Psychologe 25 Jahre Lang Begleitete" (hand-written, n.d.), 54f and 61, quoted in Horst Schreiber and Wilfried Vyslozil, *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler (Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003), 232.

areas.¹⁵⁷ The authors of *Tracing Our Roots* conducted several interviews with Gmeiner's contemporaries to find out more about the untold history of SOS-KD. One of the interviewees was Johanna (pseudonym), an early SOS-KD-mother. She remembered immediately getting enormous responsibility upon her employment. She had to take care of several tasks at the same time including raising up to 9 children at a time.¹⁵⁸ Despite training being initially ignored, the urgent need of a system to be put in place soon became apparent. The psychologist Vinzenz Neubauer and his wife Auguste set-up a training program for the new SOS-KD-mothers in 1952. Together they developed the educational theory and the selection criteria for new SOS-KD-mothers that included a two to three month training period. Auguste's work was critical as she was the one conducting the interviews with the prospective mothers using the prepared psychological questionnaires developed in tandem with her husband.¹⁵⁹

At this juncture the investigation shifts its attention to a closer look at the first generation SOS-KD-mothers, based on Johanna's memories. She was employed in 1951, after reading a newspaper article about the SOS-KD. At the time of application she was 25 years of age. Although she fit the age requirements, she was advised to wait for another 5 years and reapply.¹⁶⁰ This event conveys that the organization made sure that no woman would make the decision to become a SOS-KD-mother lightly, as it meant a lifelong commitment. That is surprising because the need for care-takers was immense. However, once a mother was chosen after a thorough selection process, she was immediately given a lot of responsibility, as Johanna's experience illustrates.

¹⁵⁷ Schreiber and Vyslozil, *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, 232.

¹⁵⁸ Horst Schreiber, Interview with Johanna (Pseudonym), August 25, 1999, Schreiber and Vyslozil, 235.

¹⁵⁹ Schreiber and Vyslozil, 232-233.

¹⁶⁰ Schreiber, Interview with Johanna (Pseudonym), August 25, 1999, Schreiber and Vyslozil, 234.

Johanna felt a strong sense of duty, despite what she was told. After receiving the letter to come to the children's village in Imst, she visited it and realized how badly understaffed it was. She returned promptly home to grab her belongings and went back to the children's village.¹⁶¹ After the care-giver that she was supposed to assist left the village upon her husband's return from a POW camp, Johanna's employment was made permanent. In her recollections of the time, she mentioned that one of the toughest tasks was securing things for the children, they were barely getting by. Because the village was remote, the baker was the only delivery service. All other supplies were supposed to be brought from Imst city centre, which was around two kilometres away. The early years of the organization were marked by severe shortage of funds.¹⁶² At that time, most of the funds from donations were directed towards the technical upkeep of the facilities and the construction of new ones. In the words of Johanna "There was never any money around, often we got money only for a few days to do the shopping for the kids."¹⁶³ Johanna had to supply herself and her family with vegetables from the private garden she looked after. Winter was harsh not only from the standpoint that food deliveries were difficult but also was washing the clothes which had to be done in a separate hut with a petroleum lamp. The firewood for heating had to be collected from the neighbouring forest. Many times during her career she was about to quit, which many mothers like Johanna actually did. Nevertheless, according to Johanna, when she was confronted by one of her children to not leave them, her sense of duty overpowered the difficulties. She put a lot of focus on her devoutness and the help of God in hard times, as Gmeiner had advised the mothers to. Johanna remembers Gmeiner stressing the need for

¹⁶¹ Schreiber, Interview with Johanna (Pseudonym), August 25, 1999, Schreiber and Vyslozil, 234-235.

¹⁶² Schreiber, Interview with Johanna (Pseudonym), August 25, 1999, Schreiber and Vyslozil, 234-235.

¹⁶³ Schreiber, Interview with Johanna (Pseudonym), August 25, 1999, Schreiber and Vyslozil, 235.

religiousness and faith as pillar of support in all the difficulties. But the religiousness would not be shared by all members of the family and many times Johanna had to fight with some of the children about going to service.¹⁶⁴

The absence of items around the house such as radio or television proved to be of benefit as it served to strengthen the bonds with and between the children by talking about the personal troubles and experiences as well as play games in the evening, singing and playing the guitar. She also was thankful for Gmeiner's support who said that the most important thing was that she enjoyed taking care of the children, everything else would resolve. Most of the time, he would be understanding, listening to and supportive of the needs of Johanna. At the same time, she was critical of Gmeiner in some circumstances including his stubbornness and resoluteness.¹⁶⁵

During her interview, Johanna was asked what she felt about the new generation of SOS-KD-mothers. At time of the interview, SOS-KD went through the institutional reforms of care-taking and the professionalization of the job. From Johanna's remarks, apparently there were generational divides and understandings of what motherhood constituted but in her view she thought that there was nothing wrong in how her generation approached the task of raising children and how the newer generation was doing it, "My time was different, was beautiful too."¹⁶⁶

Towards the approach of the retirement age, Johanna decided, at 50 years, not to take more children into the family. The options available upon retirement were either to move to live

¹⁶⁴ Schreiber, Interview with Johanna (Pseudonym), August 25, 1999, Schreiber and Vyslozil, 235-236.

¹⁶⁵ Schreiber, Interview with Johanna (Pseudonym), August 25, 1999, Schreiber and Vyslozil, 237-238.

¹⁶⁶ Schreiber, Interview with Johanna (Pseudonym), August 25, 1999, Schreiber and Vyslozil, 238-239.

with her parents or to move to the home for retired SOS-KD-mothers, which she did. The house for retired SOS-KD-mothers was usually found next to the family houses in the children's village. From time to time, the retired SOS-KD-mothers would give advice and help to incoming SOS-KD-mothers and also be helped by the younger generation of care-takers. Furthermore, many children that have already grown up would come for visits and help. From the frugality of Johanna, she was shy of accepting help and gratitude from her children "because it was only natural for her to do what she did."¹⁶⁷ Her retirement was a possibility to travel more, which she did by visiting her children living all over the world. Having worked at SOS-KD gave Johanna the possibility, after retirement, to take in her mother and take care of her until she passed away. In the village she was known as the granny.¹⁶⁸

The analysis of Johanna's experience as a SOS-KD-mother serves as an example to compare to 19th century congregational sisters' experience in care-work, which will be done in chapter 9.2.

¹⁶⁷ Schreiber, Interview with Johanna (Pseudonym), August 25, 1999, Schreiber and Vyslozil, 239.

¹⁶⁸ Schreiber, Interview with Johanna (Pseudonym), August 25, 1999, Schreiber and Vyslozil, 240.

Part IV: Comparative Analysis and Conclusion

9. Comparative Analysis

9.1 SOS-KD Mothers and Deaconess Sisters

When posed with the question which similarities existed between the religious deaconesses in the German states and the SOS-KD mothers, the link inadvertently leads to Hermann Gmeiner's idea of professionalized motherhood. His religious devoutness, frequent visits to churches/parishes and his acquaintance with priests and bishops as well as his involvement in youth groups most heavily influenced his look on the 'natural state' of things. His upbringing was mentioned previously, but it is not known if Gmeiner visited or had been involved in cooperating with sisterhoods of deaconesses in Austria. Despite that fact, it might have influenced heavily his views of the need for mothers to have a sound religious background. Most likely, the two prerequisites for the early SOS-KD mothers: religious background and countryside provenance went hand in hand. His staunch belief in predestination, the idea that he had a goal to accomplish and that he was supposed to do something good for the world instilled in him the notion that the same would be true for the SOS-KD mothers. As long as they believed and had faith, as long as they were religious just like he was, their work with the children would fulfill their destiny. Only religious people from the country-side, from the same environment as he was from, would understand, how to 'properly' take care of a family. The most striking similarity between the congregations and SOS-KD was the fusion of the work/life spheres. Just like the congregations would give the sisters a place to sleep and food to eat in exchange for the provisions of care services, the mothers at SOS-KD would live, feed, educate and entertain

the children within their own household. From the experiences of Johanna we know, that she had to take care of up to nine children at once and several generations of children throughout her career. From her experiences we know, that as a religious SOS-KD-mother, faith helped her go through hard times and surmount difficulties. We also know from Johanna that the first years of her career, there was very little money provided. That was also true for the sisters, where frugality was the norm, underpayment was normal and overtime hours were considered a given. But here, it should be also stated that the difficulties of the first years of the SOS-KD-organization required personal sacrifices of all employees and shortage of money was chronic.¹⁶⁹

Gmeiner's successor as village-director in Imst Fritz Haider was in awe of the sacrifices done by the first generation of SOS-KD-mothers and workers at SOS-KD. In his speech at the celebration of the SOS-KD's 40 year-existence in 1989, he remembered the challenges the organization faced in its first years of existence. Haider was of the opinion that SOS-KD's survival through the hardships had been a miracle.¹⁷⁰ That miracle could be also explained with the societal structure of the organization built upon the philosophical-religious mentality of Western civilization.

However, what needs to be stressed is that the deaconesses as well as SOS-KD reinforced the notion that care-giving was a 'womanly' task. While, the congregational sisters occupied care-work as the response to a religious calling, even secular organization like SOS-KD applied ideas of a predestination of women for care-work in the employment process of the early years. Connecting to Vogel, SOS-KD's provision of orphan care

¹⁶⁹ Schreiber, Interview with Johanna (Pseudonym), August 25, 1999, Schreiber and Vyslozil, 235.

¹⁷⁰ Fritz Haider, *40 Jahre im SOS-Kinderdorf. Betrachtungen eines Langgedienten* (Innsbruck; München: SOS-Kinderdorf-Verl., 1990), 31.

ensured the generational renewal of labour-power. In the understanding of the SOS-KD founders, they helped women to fulfill their ‘womanly’ calling for being mothers. Neubauer’s quote about the ‘womanly vocation’ represents interpretations like Gilligan’s about the gendered ‘inner voices’. Gendered labour division as a construct of capitalist-industrial society, has been adopted by many as a ‘natural law’. Women are seen as predestined for care, whilst politics and decision-making is ascribed to men.

The other aspect closely resembling the SOS-KD-mothers’ experiences and the congregation sisters is the Motherhouse of the deaconesses. It was the place where the sisters would retire and live their lives in old age. That was also the place where the younger sisters would gain wisdom from the older generation. The same was true of the SOS-KD-mothers, who would have an apartment after they would retire as evidenced in Johanna’s story.

The development of the four concepts of the organization from the personal experiences of Gmeiner could also be an explanation as to why within these four rules — a mother, siblings, house, community — there is hardly any mention as to the position of the father. Within the original statute of SOS-KD, the father figure is relegated to the village director. Gmeiner’s take on the need for religious SOS-KD-mothers from the countryside we can see that by doing so, his work would be cut-out for him, meaning, the mothers brought up in religious families would be aware that there is a hierarchical structure and that they would see their work as a task that was entrusted upon them by God via Hermann Gmeiner, the patriarch of the organization. Deaconess sisters in their faith, also dedicated their lives to a godly calling.

9.2 The Division of Labour and SOS-KD's Employment of Women

In their analysis of the period and the circumstances under which women were employed by SOS-KD, Schreiber and Vyslozil point to the societal difficulty women found themselves in in postwar Austria. For most women, the probability of becoming married and establishing a family was low, as the proportion of women to men in society was disproportionately high. The societal expectations that women were supposed to be stay-at-home wives was also true. The notion was, that women without a husband were not fulfilled. They were seen as not being able to 'reach their full potential' if they did not marry and have a family.¹⁷¹ That idea actually persisted for more than a generation and was also still often entrenched in society in the 1970s Austria. At that juncture in time, when first generation SOS-KD-mothers were slowly replaced by a second generation, tensions arose between those women. The role of women had changed and they could seek self-fulfillment outside of family and house. The employment conditions had to be adapted, otherwise not enough new SOS-KD-mothers could be recruited. More SOS-KD-mothers of the new generation had educational training and jobs and the organizational structure had to shift accordingly. The founding principles of giving children siblings and a village to live with and in were weakened as a consequence.¹⁷² In their analysis of the period, as part of the political biography of the former Austrian minister for women Johanna Dohnal (1939-2010) *Johanna Dohnal: Ein Politisches Lesebuch*, Claudia Schneider and Renate Tanzberger describe that despite the global "same pay for same work" movement of the time, the girls in Austrian families were still not treated equally to the boys. In families with difficult material situation, if there was any money for the education of the children, it was

¹⁷¹ Schreiber and Vyslozil, *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, 231.

¹⁷² Schreiber and Vyslozil, 241.

given to the male children. Education in Austria in the 1970s was not yet a state enterprise and was expensive. Those families that could not afford to pay the education for all the children in the household would prioritize on the boys. There was also a discrepancy in the education quality and material. Girl/women-focused programs were oriented towards care and pedagogy, mostly family-oriented. Science and engineering was discouraged and mostly directed towards boys/men.¹⁷³ We can see here the division in the private and public spheres as pointed out by Scheele.¹⁷⁴ Also going back to Scheele's argument, the horizontal segregation was evident in Austrian society up to the 1970s. Sectors of employment are ascribed specifically for women and others tailored specifically for men. Although women more and more left their assigned domestic roles as mothers and wives, a majority of their job opportunities were related or similar to the formerly domestic tasks. The private/public dichotomy was deconstructed partially but a gendered division of labour still strongly existed. SOS-KD's employment model gave women opportunities to escape the domestic sphere. However, especially in the organization's early years, it still strongly applied notions of what a stereotypical womanly profession would be like. Only for the later generations of SOS-KD-mothers, their training went beyond housework skills and also included psychology and pedagogical aspects.¹⁷⁵

In an article published in the 1968 as part of a series of books related to Austrian Politics titled *Probleme der Österreichischen Politik* (own translation: Problems of Austrian Politics), journalist, lawyer, and close confidante of former Austrian justice minister Christian Broda (1916-1987) — Elisabeth Schilder (1904-1983) addresses the perceived

¹⁷³ See Claudia Schneider and Renate Tanzberger, "Feministische Schulpolitik," in *Johanna Dohnal. Ein Politisches Lesebuch*, ed. Maria Mesner and Heidi Niederkofler (Wien: Mandelbaum, 2013), 169–86.

¹⁷⁴ See Chapter 2.2.

¹⁷⁵ Schreiber and Vyslozil, *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, 249.

problems of the contemporary legislation surrounding families and the authority in the family. Her research corroborated much evidence found by SOS-KD workers during the 1950s and 1960s. Schilder points out the predominance of male authority in the family for the upbringing of the children in Austrian law. Social reforms in the UK after the Second World War gave way for secondary education for youth from working class families which previously was available only to the middle class. That led to the substantial improvement of the quality of the families' living conditions. Increased education affected the size of the family and the income. That in turn lowered the incidents of violence in the household and increased health of the average citizen. In West Germany and Austria, those kind of policies had yet to materialize and that is where Schilder is drawing the line. Compared to the UK at the time of writing in 1968, in Austria only 7% of school pupils came from worker families, while that number in Sweden was 20% and in the UK was 25%. Similarly, university students comprising the proletariat were 25% of the student population in the UK and 30% in the USA and only 5% in West Germany.¹⁷⁶ The main message of Elisabeth Schilder is that the integrity of the family should be the focus and attention if one is to have a well-brought-up young generation and future. The future of the Austrian society, in that framework, falls on the state to secure the possibility for families to raise their children.

The interesting aspect of the Schilder's article stems from her description of the importance "father figures" in the family.¹⁷⁷ The premises of the author very much support the philosophical foundations of the SOS-KD organization. Hermann Gmeiner clarified, that for the proper upbringing of a child, for it to become life-loving and good-hearted with a

¹⁷⁶ Elisabeth Schilder, "Autorität und Familie," in *Probleme der Österreichischen Politik*, vol. 2 (Wien: Verlag der Wiener Volksbuchhandlung, 1968), 105-126.

¹⁷⁷ Schilder, "Autorität und Familie," 122-125.

proper psychological standing, it is important for it to grow-up in a familial setting. It needs first of all a mother, or a 'motherly figure'. A mother that would take care of the child and be there in the moment of need, when it is scary for the child and when the child feels lonely. Second, the child needs brothers and sisters which will help develop societal skills such as sharing and taking care of others, in that case his/her siblings. The child then needs a roof under which it will live with its family. A place where one can call home is primordial for the proper instalment of those values that will in the future be responsible for the establishment of the family for that child. Furthermore, the child needs a village, a proverbial community. So as the brothers and sisters are elements within the family responsible for the socializing of the child. The village, or community is responsible for educating in the child the feeling of belonging to a greater body.¹⁷⁸ Elisabeth Schilder's article sums up very well what are the needs of the society of 1960s Austria with what the SOS-KD had been doing and securing for children and women for some two decades already.

Recapitulating, SOS-KD's early concept of professionalized motherhood can exemplify many aspects of the theoretical discussions in part one of this thesis. As Vogel analyses a Marxist perspective for the woman's place in the capitalist mode of production, she detects, that women are oppressed by being restricted to two aspects of social reproduction. The woman is responsible for the generational replacement of labour power. That often leads to socially constructed gender division that is derived from biological differences between the sexes. Based on the distinction between necessary-labour and surplus-labour, which are usually seen as types of wage-labour, Vogel concludes that domestic labour is a form of

¹⁷⁸ See Schreiber and Vyslozil, *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, 144-152.

unpaid necessary labour. Thus, those two aspects of the reproduction cycle — generational renewal of labour power and domestic labour — are ascribed mostly to women. That restriction of women to a specific part of the cycle of reproduction mimics the class relations, where the woman is the oppressed and the man is the ruler. This Social Reproduction Theory understands the struggle of women as part of the overall class struggle. While Illich does not differentiate between men and women, a majority of *Shadow Workers* are women. With Shadow Work, he means work that is not paid for, therefore undervalued. In Illich's opinion, women represent the typical Shadow Worker because of the mystification of labour division, such as the imagination of biological roots of labour division, the idea that domestic work was not productive work, biased measurement tools of productivity. All of that, according to Illich, lead to the relegation of the self-sustenance economy and thus, to an increased dependence on the capitalist mode of production.

Vogel's theory covers the restriction of women to the domestic sphere only briefly. That restriction needs to be seen as structural oppression which Dalla Costa has described as slavery and Illich has connected to Shadow Work. An aspect that all of the above insufficiently discuss is the establishment of motherhood as a profession via its shift from the domestic to the public sphere. That also served the purpose of including women, who did not inhibit 'traditional' roles as mothers and wives into the renewal of the labour force. Care-work in monastery orders and the creation of professionalized motherhood in SOS-KD organization represent those inclusive strategies.

10. Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to show the history of the SOS Children's Villages as a post-child of the recovery of a nation from rumbles. It is a history of success of saving a generation and its childhood. A generation that was given the possibility to experience what every child should have, a family, friends, siblings and a roof above the head. Today, SOS-Kinderdorf is found in 132 countries world-wide and is at the forefront of new research into pedagogy and family sociology. However, a glorification of the significance of the organization in postwar Austria needs to be prevented. Especially, the history of the first generation SOS-KD-mothers shows that Gmeiner and the co-founders instrumentalized conservative ideas about the role of women in society for their goals, although those were noble ones.

The investigation showed that the concepts of domestic labour, labour of love and shadow work all serve the purpose of relegating women to the private sphere. That relegation can be translated to the exploitation of women as part of the capitalist mode of production. From the standpoint of Marxist-Feminism, welfare systems, the establishment of care institutions by the church and welfare organizations such as SOS-KD served as new methods to support social reproduction outside the stereotypical European family ideal, while at the same time reinforcing the mirroring structures of labour division. That is part of the overall class struggle. That represents an oppression of women by men as part of the overall class struggle.

The examples of welfare systems developing in the 19th century Britain, along with imperialist notions of the health of nation and family were starting point of the shift from care work as domestic labour to a profession.

The aim of this analysis was to show that elements of a Christian congregation were still inscribed in SOS-KD, despite being a secular organization. A comparison between the care-work of Catholic congregations in 19th century German Empire and the early generation of SOS-KD mothers showed that the ideologies of care were built upon similar structures: care-work induced a woman's self-sacrifice, it brought along the fusion of work-life spheres and the idea of a higher calling as motivation for the care-work was a foundation of both organizational ideas. The decisive differences were the focus on motherhood by SOS-KD and its professionalization and remuneration.

Furthermore, exploring the theme of Hermann Gmeiner as a patriarch of SOS-KD should be another research direction. The centre of the SOS-KD analysis was the investigation of one of the four founding principles: the mother. The other three principles of siblings, house and village each deserve the attention of further exploration.

Unfortunately, my research fell in the period surrounding the global COVID-19 pandemic. Due to the restrictions imposed on travel and public resources access, I faced severe limitations in the amount of primary resources available for inquiry. Thus, further research directions would be promising extensions to this thesis. More thorough exploration of the arguments set forward by Ina Praetorius about the meaning of care in the history of human societies and its importance for a successful economy might lead to a better understanding of why care-work still today severely undervalued and underpaid. The current COVID-19

crisis proves once more how crucial care-work is to uphold social life. It seems to be one of the dilemmas of modern capitalist society, that it does not appreciate the fundamental work that is needed to sustain it. In this sense, one could argue that although paid labour, the entire sector of care-work mirrored the concept of shadow-work on a broader scale.

11. Bibliography

11.1 Sources

“Dr. C. W. Saleeby. A Pioneer in Eugenics.” *The Times*. December 12, 1940. The Times Online Archive. <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/archive/article/1940-12-12/7/18.html?region=global#start%3D1938-05-04%26end%3D1942-01-01%26terms%3Dsaleeby%26back%3D/tto/archive/find/saleeby/w:1938-05-04%7E1942-01-01/1%26next%3D/tto/archive/frame/goto/saleeby/w:1938-05-04%7E1942-01-01/2>.

“Gmeiner to Baier,” March 8, 1947. Stadelmann file. Austrian Association of Children’s Villages (Hauptgeschäftsführung des SOS-Kinderdorfes Innsbruck), quoted in Schreiber, Horst and Wilfried Vyslozil. *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler. Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003.

“Gmeiner to Baier,” April 8, 1948. Stadelmann file. Austrian Association of Children’s Villages (Hauptgeschäftsführung des SOS-Kinderdorfes Innsbruck), quoted in Schreiber, Horst and Wilfried Vyslozil. *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler. Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003.

“Gmeiner to Baier,” June 12, 1948. Stadelmann file. Austrian Association of Children’s Villages (Hauptgeschäftsführung des SOS-Kinderdorfes Innsbruck), quoted in Schreiber, Horst and Wilfried Vyslozil. *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler. Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003.

“Report by Helene Didl on the Years 1949-1963,” n.d. Stadelmann file. Austrian Association of Children’s Villages (Hauptgeschäftsführung des SOS-Kinderdorfes Innsbruck), quoted in Schreiber, Horst and Wilfried Vyslozil. *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler. Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003.

“Statutes of Societas Socialis (SOS),” March 6, 1949. SOS Children’s Village Imst (minutes 1950-1956). Austrian Association of Children’s Villages (Hauptgeschäftsführung des SOS-Kinderdorfes Innsbruck), quoted in Schreiber, Horst and Wilfried Vyslozil. *SOS Children’s Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler. Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003.

Aristotle, Benjamin Jowett, S. H. Butcher, and Leonard Baskin. *Politics & Poetics*. Norwalk, Connecticut: The Easton Press, 1979.

British Parliament. Children Act, Pub. L. No. Chapter 67 (1908). https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1908/67/pdfs/ukpga_19080067_en.pdf.

Die Familie. Jahresschrift Des Deutschen Familienverbandes, no. X (1965): 21f., quoted in Schreiber, Horst and Wilfried Vyslozil. *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler. Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003.

E.E. "Walter Robert Corti. Der Weg zum Kinderdorf Pestalozzi." *Schweizerische Lehrerinnenzeitung*, 1955-1956.

Federici, Silvia. *Wages against Housework*. Bristol: Power of Women Collective/Falling Wall Press, 1975.

Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. London: Penguin Books, 2010.

From a Correspondent. "Home Economics as a Career for Women." *The Times*. May 4, 1909. The Times Online Archive. <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/archive/article/1909-05-04/14/3.html?region=global#start%3D1909-05-04%26end%3D1910-01-01%26terms%3Dhousekeeping%26back%3D/tto/archive/find/housekeeping/w:1909-05-04%7E1910-01-01/1%26next%3D/tto/archive/frame/goto/housekeeping/w:1909-05-04%7E1910-01-01/2>.

Dalla Costa, Mariarosa, and Selma James. "The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community." *Pétroleuse Press*, December 29, 1971. [https://libcom.org/files/Dalla%20Costa%20and%20James%20-%20Women%20and%20the%20Subversion%20of%20the%20Community%20\(Pamphlet%20Layout\).pdf](https://libcom.org/files/Dalla%20Costa%20and%20James%20-%20Women%20and%20the%20Subversion%20of%20the%20Community%20(Pamphlet%20Layout).pdf).

Gmeiner, Hermann. *Eindrücke-Gedanken-Bekenntnisse*. 7th ed. Innsbruck; Munich, 1989, quoted in Schreiber, Horst and Wilfried Vyslozil. *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler. Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003.

———. *Father of the SOS Children's Villages*. Innsbruck; Munich: SOS-Kinderdorf-Verl., 1987, quoted in Schreiber, Horst and Wilfried Vyslozil. *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler. Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003.

Haider, Fritz. *40 Jahre im SOS-Kinderdorf. Betrachtungen eines Langgedienten*. Innsbruck; München: SOS-Kinderdorf-Verl., 1990.

Kirton, John William. *Cheerful Homes How to Get and Keep Them: Or, Counsels to Those about to Marry, and Those Who Are Married. A Companion to "Happy Homes and How to Make Them."* By John W. Kirton. London et. al.: Ward, Lock, and Co., 1882. <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015064810248>.

Neubauer, Vinzenz. "Hermann Gmeiner. Kinder Vieler Völker Nennen Ihn Vater ... Den Mann, Den Ich Als Psychologe 25 Jahre Lang Begleitete." Hand-written, n.d., quoted in Schreiber, Horst and Wilfried Vyslozil. *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler. Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003.

Saleeby, C. W. *Woman and Womanhood. A Search for Principles*. Project Gutenberg, 2006.

- Scharlieb, Mary. *What It Means to Marry, or, Young Women and Marriage*. London: Cassell and Company, LTD, 1914. <http://wellcomelibrary.org/item/b28093306>.
- Schilder, Elisabeth. "Autorität und Familie." In *Probleme der Österreichischen Politik*, 2:105–26. Wien: Verlag der Wiener Volksbuchhandlung, 1968.
- Schreiber, Horst. Interview with Franz Müller, September 9, 1999, Schreiber, Horst and Wilfried Vyslozil. *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler. Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003.
- Schreiber, Horst. Interview with Johanna (Pseudonym), August 25, 1999, Schreiber, Horst and Wilfried Vyslozil. *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler. Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003.
- Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. 5 vols. Metalibri, 2007. https://ibiblio.org/ml/libri/s/SmithA_WealthNations_p.pdf.
- Tiroler Tageszeitung*, August 1, 1949, quoted in Schreiber, Horst and Wilfried Vyslozil. *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler. Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003.
- Woodbridge, George. *UNRRA. The History of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration*. Vol. 2. 3 vols. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1950.

11.2 Secondary Literature

11.2.1 Academic Literature

Allen, Ann Taylor. "Spiritual Motherhood. German Feminists and the Kindergarten Movement, 1848-1911." *History of Education Quarterly* 22, no. 3 (1982): 319–39.

Benston, Margaret. "The Political Economy of Women's Liberation." *Monthly Review* 21, no. 4 (1969): 13–27, quoted in Vogel, Lise. *Marxism and the Oppression of Women. Toward a Unitary Theory*. Vol. 45. Historical Materialism Book Series. Leiden: Brill, 2013. <http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/content/9789004248953..>

Bock, Gisela, and Barbara Duden. "Arbeit aus Liebe - Liebe als Arbeit. Zur Entstehung der Hausarbeit im Kapitalismus." *Frauen und Wissenschaft*, 1977, 118–86, quoted in Lutz, Helma. "Editorial. Domestic Work." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 14, no. 3 (2007): 187–92.

Bock, Gisela, and Barbara Duden. "Arbeit aus Liebe - Liebe als Arbeit. Zur Entstehung der Hausarbeit im Kapitalismus." *Frauen und Wissenschaft*, 1977, 118–86, quoted in Scheele, Alexandra. "Arbeit Und Geschlecht: Erwerbsarbeit, Hausarbeit Und Care." In *Handbuch Interdisziplinäre Geschlechterforschung*, edited by Beate Kortendiek, Birgit Riegraf, and Katja Sabisch, 753–62. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-12496-0_49.

Davies, Margaret Llewelyn, and Women's Co-operative Guild. *Maternity. Letters from Working-Women Collected by the Women's Co-Operative Guild*. London: Virago, 1978, quoted in Davin, Anna. "Imperialism and Motherhood." In *Tensions of Empire : Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, edited by Frederick Cooper, 87–151. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.

Davin, Anna. "Imperialism and Motherhood." In *Tensions of Empire : Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, edited by Frederick Cooper, 87–151. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.

Eisterer, Klaus. *Französische Besatzungspolitik. Tirol und Vorarlberg 1945/46*. Innsbruck: Haymon, 1992.

Fox, Grace. "The Origins of UNRRA." *Polisicquar Political Science Quarterly* 65, no. 4 (1950): 561–84.

Gilligan, Carol. *In a Different Voice Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press, 1982, quoted in Riegraf, Birgit. "Care, Care-Arbeit und Geschlecht. Gesellschaftliche Veränderungen und theoretische Auseinandersetzungen." In *Handbuch Interdisziplinäre Geschlechterforschung*, edited by B. Kortendiek et al., 65:763–72. Geschlecht und Gesellschaft, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-12496-0_172.

———. *In a Different Voice Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press, 1993.

Hardt, Michael, Antonio Negri, and Harvard University Press. *Empire*. Cambridge, Mass.; London: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Hausen, Karin. "Arbeit Und Geschlecht." In *Geschichte Und Zukunft Der Arbeit*, edited by Jürgen Kocka and Claus Offe, 343–61. Frankfurt a. M./New York: Campus, 2000, quoted in Scheele, Alexandra. "Arbeit Und Geschlecht. Erwerbsarbeit, Hausarbeit Und Care." In *Handbuch Interdisziplinäre Geschlechterforschung*, edited by Beate Kortendiek, Birgit Riegraf, and Katja Sabisch, 753–62. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-12496-0_49.

Honsal, Claudio. *Für die Kinder dieser Welt. Hermann Gmeiner. Der Vater der SOS-Kinderdörfer. Die Biografie*. München: Kösel, 2009, quoted in Karpenko, Oresta. "Hermann Gmeiner. The Founder of SOS-Children's Village." *Human Studies*, Series of «Pedagogy», 8, no. 40 (2019): 158–72.

Illich, Ivan. "Shadow Work." *Philosophica* 26, no. 2 (1980): 7–46.

Karpenko, Oresta. "Hermann Gmeiner. The Founder of SOS-Children's Village." *Human Studies*, Series of «Pedagogy», 8, no. 40 (2019): 158–72.

Klinger, Cornelia. "Die Ordnung Der Geschlechter Und Die Ambivalenz Der Moderne." In *Das Geschlecht Der Zukunft. Zwischen Frauenemanzipation Und Geschlechtervielfalt*, edited by Sybille Beckar, Gesine Kleinschmidt, Ilona Nord, and Gury Schneider-Ludorff, 29–63. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2000, quoted in Scheele, Alexandra. "Arbeit Und Geschlecht. Erwerbsarbeit, Hausarbeit Und Care." In *Handbuch Interdisziplinäre Geschlechterforschung*, edited by Beate Kortendiek, Birgit Riegraf, and Katja Sabisch, 753–62. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-12496-0_49.

Komlosy, Andrea. *Arbeit. Eine Globalhistorische Perspektive. 13. - 21. Jahrhundert*. 4th ed. Wien: Promedia, 2014.

- Kurz-Scherf, Ingrid. "Hauptsache Arbeit? Blockierte Perspektiven Im Wandel von Arbeit Und Geschlecht." In *Hauptsache Arbeit? Feministische Perspektiven Auf Den Wandel von Arbeit*, edited by Dagmar Baatz, Clarissa Rudolph, and Ayla Satilmis, 24–46. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot, 2004, quoted in Scheele, Alexandra. "Arbeit Und Geschlecht. Erwerbsarbeit, Hausarbeit Und Care." In *Handbuch Interdisziplinäre Geschlechterforschung*, edited by Beate Kortendiek, Birgit Riegraf, and Katja Sabisch, 753–62. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-12496-0_49.
- Lewis, Jane. "Models of Equality for Women. The Case of State Support for Children in Twentieth Century Britain." In *Maternity and Gender Policies. Women and the Rise of the European Welfare States, 1880-1950s*, edited by Ann-Sofie Ohlander, Pat Thane, and Gisela Bock, 73–92. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Lutz, Helma. "Editorial. Domestic Work." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 14, no. 3 (2007): 187–92.
- McHugh, Nancy Arden. *Feminist Philosophies A-Z. Philosophies A-Z*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007. <http://www.credoreference.com/book/edinburghfem>.
- Meiwes, Relinde. "Katholische Frauenkongregationen und die Krankenpflege im 19. Jahrhundert." *L'Homme. Europäische Zeitschrift für Feministische Geschichtswissenschaft* 19, no. 1 (2008): 39–60.
- Morton, Peggy. "A Woman's Work Is Never Done." In *From Feminism to Liberation*, edited by Edith Altbach, 211–27. Cambridge: MA Schenkman Publishing, 1971, quoted in Vogel, Lise. *Marxism and the Oppression of Women. Toward a Unitary Theory*. Vol. 45. Historical Materialism Book Series. Leiden: Brill, 2013. <http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/content/9789004248953>.
- Pichler, Dora. "Einflüsse der Kriegs- und Nachkriegszeit auf Kinder und Jugendliche." Phil. Diss., 1950, quoted in Schreiber, Horst and Wilfried Vyslozil. *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler. Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003.
- Praetorius, Ina. *Wirtschaft is Care oder. Die Wiederentdeckung des Selbstverständlichen*. Vol. 16. Schriften zu Wirtschaft und Soziales. Berlin: Heinrich-Böll-Stift., 2015.
- Reinprecht, Hansheinz and Hermann Gmeiner. *The Hermann Gmeiner Book - The Story of the SOS Children's Villages and Their Founder*. Vienna, 1989.
- Riegraf, Birgit. "Care, Care-Arbeit und Geschlecht. Gesellschaftliche Veränderungen und theoretische Auseinandersetzungen." In *Handbuch Interdisziplinäre Geschlechterforschung*, edited by B. Kortendiek et al., 65:763–72. Geschlecht und Gesellschaft, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-12496-0_172.

- Scheele, Alexandra. "Arbeit Und Geschlecht. Erwerbsarbeit, Hausarbeit Und Care." In *Handbuch Interdisziplinäre Geschlechterforschung*, edited by Beate Kortendiek, Birgit Riegraf, and Katja Sabisch, 753–62. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-12496-0_49.
- Schneider, Claudia and Renate Tanzberger. "Feministische Schulpolitik." In *Johanna Dohnal. Ein Politisches Lesebuch*, edited by Maria Mesner and Heidi Niederkofler, 169–86. Wien: Mandelbaum, 2013.
- Schreiber, Horst. "Innsbruck Im Bombenkrieg." In *Luftschutzstollen Aus Dem Zweiten Weltkrieg. Das Beispiel Innsbruck. Von Der Geschichte Zur Rechtlichen Und Technischen Problemlösung In Der Gegenwart*, edited by Konrad Arnold, 15–98. Innsbruck: Veröffentlichungen des Innsbrucker Stadtarchivs N.F. 27, 2002.
- Schreiber, Horst and Wilfried Vyslozil. *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler. Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003.
- Senghaas-Knobloch, Eva, and Christel Kumbruck. "Zum Ethos fürsorglicher (Pflege-)Praxis. Dilemmata in der modernen Dienstleistungsgesellschaft." *L'Homme. Europäische Zeitschrift für Feministische Geschichtswissenschaft* 19, no 1 (2008), 15–37.
- Stadelmann, Ludwig. *Hermann Gmeiner - Ein Leben Für Die Mutterlosen. Leben Und Werk Meines Jugendfreundes*. 2nd ed. Bad Goisern: Verlag Neues Leben, 1970, quoted in Schreiber, Horst and Wilfried Vyslozil. *SOS Children's Villages Tracing Our Roots*, trans. Anita Wilson-Kofler. Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2003.
- Stoehr, Irene. "Housework and Motherhood. Debates and Policies in the Women's Movement in Imperial Germany and the Weimar Republic." In *Maternity and Gender Policies. Women and the Rise of the European Welfare States, 1880-1950s*, edited by Ann-Sofie Ohlander, Pat Thane, and Gisela Bock, 213–32. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Vogel, Lise. *Marxism and the Oppression of Women. Toward a Unitary Theory*. Vol. 45. Historical Materialism Book Series. Leiden: Brill, 2013. <http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/content/9789004248953>.

11.2.2 Online Resources

“Philanthropy.” In *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. Accessed May 1, 2020. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/philanthropy>.

“Vocation.” In *Merriam Webster Dictionary*. Accessed May 1, 2020. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/vocation>.

Caritas. “Caritas.” Humanitarian Aid. History. Accessed April 28, 2020. <https://www.caritas.org/who-we-are/history/>.

International Federation for Home Economics. “Who We Are.” Accessed May 1, 2020. <https://www.ifhe.org/about-ifhe/who-we-are/>.

Pestalozzi Children’s Organization. “Über Uns.” Accessed May 1, 2020. <https://www.pestalozzi.ch/en/about-us>.

SOS Children’s Village British Columbia. “The Meaning of SOS.” Accessed May 1, 2020. <https://www.sosbc.org/who-we-are/the-meaning-of-sos/>.

SOS-Kinderdorf Österreich. “SOS-Mutter Und -Vater.” Accessed May 1, 2020. <https://www.sos-kinderdorf.at/arbeiten-fuer-sos-kinderdorf/wen-wir-suchen/werden-sie-sos-kinderdorf-mutter-vater>.

SOS-Kinderdorf Österreich. “Über Uns.” Accessed May 1, 2020. <https://www.sos-kinderdorf.at/so-hilft-sos/uber-uns>.

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. “German Confederation.” In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Accessed May 1, 2020. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/German-Confederation>.

The Editors of Encyclopedia Britannica. “Kulturkampf.” Encyclopedia. Encyclopedia Britannica, July 20, 1998. Accessed May 1, 2020. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Kulturkampf>.

Wilson, Bill. “What Is the ‘Gig’ Economy?” *BBC News*, February 10, 2017. Accessed May 3, 2020. <https://www.bbc.com/news/business-38930048>.

Wilson, Philip K. “Eugenics.” In *Encyclopædia Britannica*, February 19, 2019. Accessed May 1, 2020. <https://www.britannica.com/science/eugenics-genetics>.