PROPUESTAS CRÍTICAS EN TRABAJO SOCIAL
CRITICAL PROPOSALS IN SOCIAL WORK
FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS SOCIALES UNIVERSIDAD DE CHILE
https://revistapropuestascriticas.uchile.cl

ARTICLE

German Social Work in totalitarian regimes: a comparison between the 'Third Reich' and the German Democratic Republic (GDR)

El trabajo social alemán en tiempos de regímenes totalitarios: una comparación entre el "Tercer Reich" y la República Democrática Alemana (RDA)

Carola Kuhlmann[1]
Evangelische Hochschule Rheinland-Westfalen-Lippe, Germany.

Received: 14/10/2021
Accepted: 27/01/2022

How to cite

Kuhlmann, C. (2022). German Social Work in totalitarian regimes: a comparison between the 'Third Reich' and the German Democratic Republic (GDR). *Propuestas Críticas en Trabajo Social - Critical Proposals in Social Work, 2*(3), 91-113.
DOI: 10.5354/2735-6620.2021.65164

Abstract

Can we learn from history, especially German history? The author agrees with Jill Lepore that the past is a legacy, a gift, and a burden and that it opens the prison of the present (Lepore, 2019). German history in the 20th century provides sufficient reason to reflect on the dangers of dictatorships and their influence on the history of social work. Given the growing influence of populist dictatorships

Keywords:
Germany; fascism; communism; social work history

[1]Contact: Carola Kuhlmann kuhlmann@evh-bochum.de

in the world and new right-wing movements, this debate is urgent. By way of introduction, the article describes the historical lines of the development of social work in Germany. It then focuses on two historical phases in which a dictatorship ruled. The de-professionalisation and political subservience of Social Work in the period of the National Socialists `Third Reich' (1933-1945) and the development in the eastern part, the German Democratic Republic, GDR (1949-1990) were traced. The National Socialists were a right-wing extremist movement that came to power in Germany under Adolf Hitler, destroying the democracy that had only existed since 1918 and establishing a fascist regime. In this context, the discipline and profession of social work were involved in the implementation of the eugenic policy and the enforcement of the associated new ideals of the unequal worth of human beings in many forms. The Nazi period was incomparable in its human rights violations to those of the GDR. But part of the ideology of this time was not only carried on in the West Zone of Germany, but also and again differently in the Russian-occupied East Zone. The GDR suffered from the ideologic continuity especially in the treatment of the so-called 'asocial' clients of social work. Finally, an attempt is made to understand the common ground of the regimes with the modernisation theory of Zygmunt Bauman.

Resumen

¿Podemos aprender de la historia, particularmente de la historia alemana? Concuerdo con Jill Lepore (2019) cuando plantea que el pasado es un legado, un regalo y una carga que abre la cárcel del presente. La historia alemana del siglo XX ofrece suficientes motivos para reflexionar sobre los peligros de las dictaduras y su influencia en la historia del trabajo social. Dada la creciente influencia de las dictaduras populistas en el mundo y los nuevos movimientos de derecha, este debate es urgente. A modo de introducción, el artículo describe las líneas históricas del desarrollo del trabajo social en Alemania. A continuación, se centra en dos fases históricas en las que gobernó una dictadura. Se traza la desprofesionalización y el servilismo político del Trabajo Social en el periodo del "Tercer Reich" nacionalsocialista (1933-1945) y en el desarrollo del comunismo en la parte oriental, la República Democrática Alemana, RDA (1949-1990). El nacionalsocialismo fue un movimiento de extrema derecha que llegó al poder en Alemania de la mano de Adolf Hitler, destruyendo la democracia que existía desde 1918 e instaurando un régimen fascista. En este contexto, la disciplina y

Palabras Clave:
Alemania; fascismo; comunismo; historia del trabajo social

la profesión del trabajo social se vieron implicadas en la aplicación de la política eugenésica y en la imposición de los nuevos ideales asociados a la desigual valía de los seres humanos. El periodo nazi fue incomparable en sus violaciones a los derechos humanos respecto a las sucedidas en la RDA. Pero elementos de dicha ideología emergieron también, aunque de forma diferente, en la zona oriental ocupada por Rusia. La RDA sufrió la continuidad ideológica del nacionalsocialismo especialmente en el tratamiento de los llamados "clientes asociales" del trabajo social. A partir de esta revisión, se intenta comprender la base común de ambos regímenes con la teoría de la modernización de Zygmunt Bauman. .

History of German Social Work up to the beginning of the 'Third Reich'

Social work in Europe and so also in Germany has its roots in Christian charity, Jewish teachings on justice, civic engagement, and socialist and feminist solidarity movements, as will be explained below. In the Middle Ages it had been done in Christian monasteries, hospitals and with almsgiving. Later on, communal care of the poor and orphans was created alongside state penitentiaries and poorhouses. With Juan Luis Vives (1492-1540) came a new idea in European welfare. In his book "On the Assistance of the Poor", he called on city leaders, especially the rich, to protect the weak and avoid oppression and injustice. This was also in their own interest, since failure to help could lead to thefts, robberies, civil wars, or epidemics. However, not all poor people should receive assistance. Giving money to "gamblers" and "whores" was like "throwing straw on the fire" (Vives, cited in Kuhlmann, 2014, p. 23).

So from about 1500 the idea spread that poor people had to be examined to see whether they were "worthy" of support. Honorary municipal officials proved the willingness to work and the way of life of the poor. The idea of dividing into "worthy" and "unworthy" clients has a long continuity – till today. However, the criteria by which worthiness was and is measured have changed throughout history. In the following we will explore two different historical phases with very different political ideologies. Before that, however, events from 1800 onwards should be presented in order to understand how the fascist dictatorship came about in Germany.

Industrialisation and social reforms

In the 19th century, educational institutions, nursing homes, asylums for the insane and asylums for drunkards developed. The emergence of a specific social profession is closely linked to the so called "social question" that had to be answered as a result of industrialisation. The communal care of the poor, which had come from the Middle Ages, was no longer able to cope with the misery of the growing class of workers. So new forms of organisation emerged to check the claims of those seeking help (Sachße & Tennstedt 1998). A multitude of private charitable associations took over most of the tasks of social work during the time of the politically emancipating bourgeoisie, which were initially mainly supported by private donations. Rescue associations for poor children, neglected youths, the elderly, the sick, prisoners, underage mothers or addicts came into being (Franke-Meyer & Kuhlmann 2018).

Private welfare work was influenced not only by Christian and civic, but also by Jewish and interdenominational associations, such as the "Deutsche Gesellschaft für Ethische Kultur" (German Society for Ethical Culture), founded in 1892, in whose framework Jeanette Schwerin (1852-1899) and other Jewish fellow citizens had a great influence on the society's welfare commission. Schwerin early on opposed thoughtless charitable women who would do great harm as "extras in charity" and founded a welfare information centre, where Alice Salomon (1871-1948) later gained her first professional experience. Schwerin rejected the concept of almsgiving and advocated a conception of welfare that "finds expression in the language usage of an ancient cultural people who would describe 'justice and benevolence' with one and the same word": the Hebrew word: "Zedakah" (which still shapes the Jewish understanding of welfare today). Schwerin became Alice Salomon's mentor and the concept of Zedakah implicitly exerted great influence on her work: shaping social vocational training in Germany after 1899 (Kuhlmann, 2000, p. 259).

A milestone in the development of social work was the social insurance and labour protection laws which arose very early in Germany (including the 1839 ban on child labour in mining and factories, 1878 factory inspection and first maternity protection regulations, 1883 health, 1884 accident, 1889 invalidity and old-age insurance, 1904 ban on child labour in the trades, commerce and load service, 1900 obligation of illegitimate fathers to pay alimony, 1911 employee, widow and orphan insurance, 1927 unemployment insurance). These insurance benefits ensured that many social risks no longer resulted in dependence on poor relief. However, it also meant that professionals

were increasingly needed who knew and could enforce these laws and entitlements, as this was often not the case for people in social distress (Kuhlmann, 2014).

Social Work as a profession begins

The first courses for so called "social helpers" emerged in connection with the women's movement and the movement for social reform (1899 for the "Girls' and Women's Groups for Social Help Work" led by Alice Salomon in Berlin), but also in Christian associations (1904 Women's School of the Inner Mission Berlin) (Reinicke, 2012). In 1917, Alice Salomon founded the "National Conference of Women's Social Schools" together with eleven other headmistresses in order to achieve a standardisation of the curriculum, training methods, job placements, salaries and state recognition of the profession, which succeeded in 1918. By 1925 the number of schools had risen to 27 (in 1945 there were a total of 73 in the German Reich). The main subjects of the curriculum were health care (infant care, tuberculosis care, housing care), youth welfare (work at municipal or church youth welfare offices, youth welfare, etc.) and general social and economic welfare (vocational office, work certificate, scientific assistance work in social organisations). The duration of the course was four semesters, three of which were devoted to theoretical instruction and one to practical training. The curriculum also included various factory and flat tours.

For Alice Salomon, social education always meant bringing concrete living conditions of classes, genders and one's own privileges and prejudices to consciousness. It meant giving the students not only the cognitive insight into social injustices, but also an emotional awareness of them. Through a concrete comparison between their own living conditions and those of the "needy", they should come to the realisation of an obligation to help. A "conscience" should emerge from the "knowledge" (Kuhlmann, 2000, p. 248). Salomon, who herself had a doctorate in national economy, saw economic and sociological knowledge about the origins of injustice as the basis of this formation of conscience (Kuhlmann, 2008).

World War I: Poor relief becomes welfare

The First World War and its consequences were a major factor in the development of Social Work. Women were supposed to defend the "home front". This included the provision of crèches for female munitions workers, care for war widows and orphans as well as the so-called war cripple care for wounded soldiers. With the deterioration of

April 2022. Vol. 2, Num. 3, 91-113, ISSN 2735-6620, DOI: 10.5354/2735-6620.2021.65164

living conditions, which now also affected the middle class, care for the poor changed into "war welfare": before 1914, those who had received poor relief had not only lost the right to vote but also the right to freedom of movement and were obliged to repay the relief (Sachße and Tennstedt, 1998). Now benefits were created that suspended these conditions and were not only oriented towards the necessities of life but were to have the preservation of the previous standard of living as a yardstick. However, many communities lacked money, so that support was often given in food, clothing donations and people's kitchens (Lindemann, 1917). Almost every second soldier died or was wounded in 1918. Thus, many families lacked income even after the war. Therefore, war welfare remained a component of public welfare. This contributed to the fact that the despised care for the poor became care for the "welfare" of the population. In addition, health care (tuberculosis, sexually ill and drunkard care), but also youth and housing care had acquired a political and demographic significance during the war that also lasted beyond 1918.

Weimar Welfare State (1918-1933)

With the Weimar Republic and the first participation of the Social Democrats in government, a "welfare state" emerged, which further expanded the state's obligation for individual emergencies with the introduction of the "Wefare Duty Act" (Reichsfürsorgepflicht-Verordnung 1924) and the "Youth Welfare Act" (Reichsjugendwohlfahrtsgesetz 1922). The primacy of private welfare work was enshrined in legislation - also for compulsory state tasks. The state was (and is) not allowed to provide social assistance on its own if there are smaller communities (i.e., welfare associations) that do so. However, the state must co-finance the activities of these associations. This "subsidiarity principle" is an internationally unique interweaving of private and public responsibility. It resulted in a great influence of the church, but also other civil society associations in social work (Hering and Münchmeier, 2000, p.125). During the Weimar Welfare State there were six welfare associations in Germany: The Protestant "Innere Mission" (since 1849), the German Red Cross (1869), the Catholic "Caritas" (1897), the Jewish "Zentralwohlfahrtsstelle der deutschen Juden" (1917), the Social Democratic "Arbeiterwohlfahrt" (1919) and the liberal "Paritätischer Wohlfahrtsverband" (1920). They were organised in an empire-wide association and had a great influence on legislation and social work practice (Kuhlmann, 2014, p.74).

From the beginning, the workers' movement in Germany represented competing utopias of a more just society; at first it was oriented towards the Marxist idea that only

revolution and the nationalisation of the means of production could bring about the liberation of the working class and that "bourgeois" welfare was an obstacle on this path (Klönne, 1989). After advocating the first World War, the communists split from the Social Democrats (SPD). The SPD took the path of social reform and founded its own welfare association, the Arbeiterwohlfahrt (AWO), in 1919. In contrast to the other welfare associations, the AWO advocated the priority of state or municipal aid over private. From a communist perspective, both political social reforms and social work were further rejected. Only self-help (Red Aid) for persecuted comrades was considered legitimate. In the Weimar Republic, the institutions of the AWO and politically committed social democrats brought a reformist impulse with many progressive ideas to social work (f. e. democratic group work).

However, social work was still most strongly influenced by the women's movement. In the 1920s, the concept of women's "social mission" (Alice Salomon) and "cultural mission" (Gertrud Bäumer) changed the idea of "spiritual motherliness" (Schrader-Breymann, 1868) and called for active socio-political intervention. They criticised the one-sided male politics primarily determined by power interests and too little by social responsibility. Most of the protagonists of the newly emerging women's social profession saw welfare work as an area in which they wanted to contribute their special female responsibility and competence. In the Weimar Republic, women increasingly occupied leadership positions in welfare associations, in ministries and in educational institutions and had thus achieved an important step on the path of their "cultural mission": to make welfare a publicly respected and responsible field. Both progressive concepts of social work, the social democratic and the feminist, ended in 1933.

The increasing legalisation and institutionalisation of social work and the differentiation of the fields of action had ambivalent consequences for the professional social workers and their clients. On the one hand, the process enabled greater social security for the population and more efficient methods of help; on the other hand, it also led to stronger state control of the former private welfare work. In larger cities, the newly created welfare offices after 1918 increasingly employed full-time social workers. Family welfare - as presented by Marie Baum in 1927 in the book of the same name - considered that complex problems from professional experience in the areas of health, housing, education or unemployment often existed as one and the same family. From a professional point of view, "social diagnosis" (Salomon, 1926) became more and more prevalent as a method for analysing complex connections between environmental and personal problem situations. The first reformist concepts were tried out in many

fields of social work, especially in youth welfare under the influence of the "social pedagogical movement". But democratic projects were rare and short-lived, and largely ended by the Great Depression.

About one third of Germans became unemployed between 1929 and 1932. Unemployment insurance, which had just been introduced in 1927, collapsed. By 1930, impoverishment had reached large sections of the population, including the bourgeoisie (Sachße and Tennstedt, 1992).

This became the breeding ground for the acceptance of the "brown revolution" of the Nazis - also in the field of welfare work. In addition, however, decades of anti-Semitism, education in Prussian obedience and an increasingly influential ideology of the importance of Germany and of the superiority of certain "races" played important roles (Kuhlmann, 1989, p.78).

National Socialist 'Volkspflege' (People's welfare) 1933-1945

As early as 1927, Hitler had left no doubt about his position on welfare. In his book "Mein Kampf" (My Struggle) he criticised the "humanity" of welfare work, which he considered to be a mixture of "stupidity, cowardice and imaginary knowledge" (Hitler, 1934, p.148). He thought that mankind had become great in an eternal struggle for survival. For this reason, Hitler also opposed avoidance of procreation, as proposed by Thomas Malthus in the 19th century. Hitler advocated a "natural", i.e., cruel, "selection" so that one's own race would become "superior" (Hitler, 1934, p.144). Following this ideology, later on after 1933 the head of the Main Office for People's Welfare, Erich Hilgenfeldt, demanded that people be made to understand that struggle and suffering are the necessary conditions for the higher development of one's own people, and that those who are too weak have no right to life:

> *"Everything that survives the time of adversity is the selection of the people, selection that we find everywhere in life. Everything that is alive is tested by life and is rejected if it is weak." (Hilgenfeldt, quoted in Althaus, 1937, p.5)*

The possibility of a National Socialist seizure of power was underestimated by other political parties as well as by critical intellectuals as late as 1932. But a few months later it became clear in which direction the National Socialists wanted to expand their rule.

The banning of magazines, the burning of books, the dissolution of democratic bodies and committees at the state, provincial and municipal levels, the smashing of the trade unions through the open terror of the "auxiliary police" force, the 'Sturmabteilung' (SA), the organised boycott of Jewish shops, the law on forced sterilisation, the establishment of the first concentration camps (which was even mentioned in the newspapers) and last but not least the brutal persecution of the opposition - all this happened in the first half of 1933 and would not have been conceivable at this speed without the public support of established elites and power groups. Despite these events, the conservative bourgeois milieus, which included many people working in welfare, welcomed the new state because it would restore conservative values and save them from a supposedly threatening communist takeover (Roth, 2015).

The director of a Protestant reformatory wrote in his newsletter in 1933:

> *"Wherever an educator attempted to cultivate patriotic feelings ... or even to adorn the rules of the home with strict military forms, not only did the Marxist press revolt every time, but also the state moved away from such an educator as a 'reactionary' and 'militarist'". (Paul Bellingrodt, quoted in Kuhlmann, 1989, p.58)*
> *And he ended in expressing that the seizure of power by the National Socialists had brought about better conditions for his work.*

"Nationalsozialistische Volkswohlfahrt" (NSV) - "National Socialist People's Welfare"

From the very beginning, the National Socialists tried to eliminate free welfare and the principle of subsidiarity and undermined the latter by founding their own welfare association. Even if they rejected "welfare", they believed solidary help for innocent families of "Aryan" origin in need (e. g. through unemployment) should be supported. They called this not welfare, but "Volkspflege" (People's care), which should be characterised by prevention on the one hand and leadership on the other. The association "Nationalsozialistische Volkswohlfahrt" (NSV) was recognised as a party organisation on 3 May 1933 and established throughout the Reich.

Immediately after its foundation, it claimed the leading role in the association of the welfare organisations, but that was not all. The Workers' Welfare Association (AWO) was banned, and the Jewish Central Welfare Office was excluded from the association; the liberal association was forcibly dissolved, and its assets confiscated. Only the church associations and the Red Cross (which operated exclusively in the health sector) were

able to maintain their influence on further developments, partly because they were very cooperative (Hammerschmidt, 1999).

The NSV was to focus on preventing social emergencies and in particular on strengthening the health care of the population. Employees of the NSV took over the collections for the "Winterhilfswerk" (Winter-help) and the relief organisation "Mutter und Kind" (Mother and Child). These funds were used to finance soup kitchens, heating material, convalescent cures, and family counselling. The central starting point of the NSV activities was the more than 6,000 community care centres, which offered antenatal and maternity counselling and care services. All these measures had already existed during the Weimar period; what was new, however, was the extent and the comprehensive expansion. The self-declared aim was to build up a close-meshed observation network (Sachße and Tennstedt, 1992, p.177).

Particularly in maternal counselling, the aim was to enforce a specifically National Socialist infant care, which aimed at a "maternal front" against the child. They campaigned against "monkey love" and propagated a schematic and child-hostile four-hour "breastfeeding rhythm" that was supposed to lead to an early habituation to obedience (Dill, 1999). In addition to counselling mothers, the NSV was involved in the kindergarten sector (permanent, harvest, auxiliary kindergartens), especially during World War II, when many mothers were needed in the armaments industry.

There are retrospective studies from the 1990s in which former social workers were asked about their memories of their professional activities during the Nazi era. It is noteworthy that many of them were subjectively convinced that they were to implement reform projects from the Weimar Republic (maternity counselling, recreational care, health education for the rural population, Schnurr, 1997; Haag, 2000). The year 1933 marked the beginning of an improvement in the social situation of the clients and the professional framework conditions. What happened to non-Aryans and disabled people during this time was not approved of in retrospect but was hardly ever discussed. So, we have to discuss it here.

Youth Welfare

The Nazis claimed that children should no longer be educated according to their needs "or even wishes", but from the people (Ernst Krieck, quoted in Althaus, 1937, p.31). In order to realise this educational goal, politically left-wing youth associations were

banned, and all the others were transferred to the Hitler Youth, which all children over the age of 10 had to join from 1936. This process took place without major disruptions, as the Hitler Youth had already adopted many forms of youth movement: tent camps, singing together around the fire, home evenings, etc. Also, the majority of the youth associations that had emerged from the youth movement (e.g. the Boy Scouts) had already developed increasingly in a militaristic direction around 1930 (Giesecke, 1981). In addition to paramilitary exercises, the Hitler Youth also offered sports and training in National Socialist ideas. The girls had their own association, the "Bund deutscher Mädel" (BDM), which focused on educating them to become German housewives and mothers.

In contrast to the nationalised youth work, most of the youth welfare continued to take place within the framework of Catholic and Protestant institutions and associations. The Nazis believed children with educational difficulties were hereditary ill and therefore hardly usable for a national socialist education.

The reasons for being judged as hereditarily ill were different for boys and girls. Repeated theft crimes and oppositional behaviour was more often the reason for the boys, the so-called sexually conspicuous behaviour for the girls. While aggressive sexual behaviour in boys was judged normal, girls were assumed to have sexually abnormal development if they had once had premarital sexual intercourse. And if there was sexual violence in the family, they were also treated as a hereditary sick person, because the "immorality" of the father was hereditary and therefore also affected girls (Kuhlmann, 1989, p.95).

In the widely distributed brochure by Albert Friehe "What must the National Socialist know about heredity?" it was claimed that half of the children in reformatories were uneducable. They should not only be sterilised, but "after the end of their compulsory education, they should preferably be placed in preventive detention before they cause mischief". An adoption from an orphanage with an unhappy outcome served Friehe as proof that even philanthropists and do-gooders cannot do anything against the "hereditary power" of an inferior clan (Friehe, 1935, p.41).

About 12% of the inmates were forcibly sterilised and those who were considered completely uneducable – even in the reformatories of the churches - were sent to youth concentration camps from 1942 onwards. Also, young people who loved jazz and swing music were sent to those camps (Kuhlmann, 1989, p.202).

The function of these camps consisted primarily in the threat of being sent there, as well as in being the "final stop" for those who no longer seemed to be tolerable in the reformatories. In Moringen, a camp for boys, there were six different blocks, from the block for the so-called unfit to the so-called permanent and occasional failures to the block for those "capable of being educated". Differentiation was apparently such a necessary part of the National Socialist educational system that even in the "final station", in the youth concentration camps, it was not dispensed with. Boys who were considered uneducable as an adult were sent to the concentration camp (Kuhlmann, 1989, p.221).

Welfare – now called 'Volkspflege'

Just as national economics around 1890 and social pedagogy around 1925 had exerted a decisive influence on the theoretical debate and on the patterns of interpretation of social work, medicine became the new leading discipline after 1933.

Welfare administration was now under the rule of the health department. The family welfare workers, who were working with the municipality created files that traced "hereditary health" back to the grandparents' generation. If someone in the family had committed suicide or had been in prison, this was considered an incriminating hereditary disease. Thus social workers did their part in denunciation of the poor. In many cases their records became the basis for forced sterilization and later in 1938 it became the basis for classification as an 'asocial' person (above all addicts and prostitutes). 'Asocial' persons were no longer subordinated to the municipal welfare offices but directly to the police (Ayass, 1995, p.224). Many of them were transferred to concentration camps with a black triangle on the convict's clothing. So-called non-Aryans (Jews and Gypsies) were also excluded from welfare benefits and locked up in concentration camps as a deterrent (Gruner, 2002).

The mentally ill and disabled were the main target of National Socialist propaganda against the so-called "ballast existences". From 1939 onwards, many of them were killed in so-called Euthanasia programmes. Beforehand, they were assessed to see if they were still fit for work and if they required a lot of care. 250,000-300,000 adults and children of the so-called insane asylums or idiot asylums or sanatoriums were gassed or poisoned. The Nazis later used the experience of gassing to set up the extermination camp at Auschwitz. There was only rare resistance (Kuhlmann, 2020). In this context, two people must be remembered who paid for their resistance with their lives or

imprisonment: Cathedral Provost Bernhard Lichtenberg and Pastor Paul Gerhard Braune, who sent letters of protest to responsible authorities and refused to transfer the sick. In recent research we found about one hundred people who had resisted in the form that is called 'rescue resistance', what meant organising help for refugees or children of persecuted people. Half of them were professional social workers, others were pastors, lawyers or Kindergarten teachers (Amthor, 2017). At that time, the fields of work described above were largely not yet staffed with trained social workers; this did not happen until the 1970s, so the role of social work in (youth) welfare was a subordinate one and they had to follow instructions from doctors, lawyers, theologians or teachers. In addition, the education at the schools of "Volkspflege" no longer met the standards of 1918, since the curriculum had been changed in 1934 and now subjects such as racial studies were placed in the foreground.

Social welfare in the GDR

After the end of the war, Germany was divided into different occupation zones. The Eastern zone, occupied by the Russian army, became the German Democratic Republic (GDR) in 1949 and from 1951 pursued the "construction of socialism" according to the doctrine of Josef Stalin. In 1961, a wall was built across the entire country, it was strictly guarded, and no one was allowed to leave. Welfare or people's care was considered obsolete under socialism, since in the planned economy there could be neither unemployment nor poverty and - so the erroneous conclusion - no social problems. (Kuhlmann, 2014, p.114). Therefore, there were no more associations dealing with the classical field of "welfare", but only a kind of welfare association, the "Volkssolidarität" (People's Solidarity), which dealt mainly with problems in old age. Just as the Nazis, the SED left the care of the disabled to the churches.

Youth welfare

Like all other party organisations, the Hitler Youth had been banned by the victorious powers in all occupation zones. Democratic youth organisations were soon allowed back in the Western zones, but not in the Russian-occupied zone.

In the GDR, the "Free German Youth" (FDJ) was founded in 1946, which after 1949 became obligatory for all as state youth. The FDJ was subordinate to the Socialist Unity Party (SED). This party was founded through the forced unification of the communist and social democratic parties under the clear leadership of the communists. It represented

April 2022. Vol. 2, Num. 3, 91-113, ISSN 2735-6620, DOI: 10.5354/2735-6620.2021.65164

the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and was made up of many communists who had fled to the Soviet Union during the Nazi era and now wanted to advance the construction of German socialism. But also, former members of the Nazi party NSDAP could become members of the SED after a few years.

The FDJ was given far-reaching competences in education and upbringing (but also representation of young people's interests in the workplace). They organised tent camps, holydays, concerts, and other cultural activities. The FDJ should also – like the Hitler Youth – educate the young people in the spirit of the state party. Leading goals were also obedience to the leadership. But we should not forget that the spirit was one of humanity and equality of all people: diametrically opposed to the values of the Nazis. Because the SED had an absolute claim to education, the reformatories of the churches (and the kindergartens) were nationalised until the mid-1950s and pedagogically oriented towards collective education according to Anton Semyonovich Makarenko (1888-1939)

Makarenko was a teacher from the Ukraine who, after the Russian Revolution, ran a rural educational institution for several years in which juvenile lawbreakers, some of whom had already been homeless for months, were committed. He was a socialist of the first hour of the Russian revolution. With Marx, he assumed that the material situation in which man finds himself essentially shapes consciousness. He was convinced that only the implementation of a socialist mode of production would produce morally responsible people. So, he built a factory with the young people, where they later produced cameras and other technical equipment together (Makarenko, 1980).

Collective education - according to Makarenko - is something like, but in one crucial point different from, group pedagogy or community education. A collective is more than a group, a collective is defined by the fact that the members work together. By giving the young people a perspective and addressing them in a humorous tone, the project succeeded - at least in his own presentation. However, despite the self-administration and the comradeship court, the education was only conditionally democratic, as Makarenko decided when a collective was mature enough to make its own decisions. Democracy was therefore only an apparent one, co-administration allowed as long as it did not contradict the educational goals of work and school discipline, conformist fashion and cultural regulations.

Eberhard Mannschatz, advisor in the People's Education Ministry and (later) the only professor of social education at Humboldt University in Berlin, owed his career to the

implementation of collective education, according to Makarenko, into the institutions of Germany. At the beginning of the GDR, he made it clear that the "planned, systematic progress" towards socialist attainment required "the leading role of the educator" (Mannschatz, 1951, p.20).

In the decision of the People's Education Ministry of 9.5.1951 on the "reorganisation of work in the field of youth welfare" it was stated that residential care education had lagged behind in terms of success. The reason given was the orientation towards reform pedagogy: this was without a plan, idealistic, and open to "reactionary influences of objectivism, cosmopolitanism, social-democratism as well as the various pseudo-sciences" (Krause, 2004, p.77). The attachment theory, for example, was judged to be such a pseudoscience.

A closer look at the practice in the 1950s and 1960s shows that the reasons for placement into residential care on the one hand ("work dodging", "sexual conspicuousness", neglect) and the authoritarian educational practice on the other hand differed little from the West – and also was not very different from the Nazi era. In the GDR, as in the FRG, there was a differentiation of the institutions according to the degree of educational difficulties (frequency of running away, "bed-wetters") as well as similarly humiliating punitive practices, compulsory work and sexual violence, especially in the so-called special homes and "Jugendwerkhöfe" (Youth working camps). These institutions were for young people who showed deviant behaviour, which was attributed to influences from the "West" and was rigidly punished by incarceration (Zimmermann, 2004).

Welfare – now called *'Sozialfürsorge' (social welfare)*

According to the state constitution, those unable to work, war wounded, widows, orphans and refugees could receive "social welfare benefits". However, this support was to be cut back in favour of a socialist labour and social policy. In the GDR, the granting of benefits was decided by social commissions staffed by volunteers like before 1900, this time with a party-political influence by the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED). Fearing being considered "asocial", many took up working in a factory instead of applying for social welfare. This was also more likely to be possible in the state-owned enterprises, especially for disabled people, since here, despite propaganda to the contrary, the productivity of the labour force had little relevance in everyday life (Willing, 2008).

Leisure time and social activities as well as social assistance and support were arranged through the workplaces (company social work). Social workers were mainly employed in the health sector and had preventive and accompanying tasks in schools and factories (e.g. vaccinations).

In the GDR's Family Code, the educational goal was prescribed, which did not focus primarily on the well-being of the child, but on the "socialist personality". This included education in work, love of the Soviet Union and the willingness to defend the borders with weapons. Like the Nazis, the SED tried to intimidate those who questioned these educational goals or their order by denying them the ability to educate, since they (like Jehovah's Witnesses before 1945) offered no guarantee that they would bring up their children in the regime's interests. Especially if the parents had attempted "Republikflucht" (escape from the Republic) and therefore had to go to prison, children were even forcibly given up for adoption (Warnecke, 2009). Others were placed in foster families. The families in which the children then lived mostly belonged to the SED. The children were told that their parents had voluntarily given them up for adoption. The exact number of children is not known, but it is estimated at several hundred. Research on this is still ongoing.

The term "asocial" continued to be used in both German states as a "mental remnant" after 1945. In the FRG, this term and the concept behind it were abandoned in the 1960s, while in the GDR there was a simultaneous tightening of the treatment of so-called 'asociality' (Lorke, 2015, p.100, see also Benz and Distel, 2016).

Punks, "tramps" ("vagabonds") and "beatlers", "people willing to leave the country", drug addicts, homosexuals (till 1968) and parents who neglected their children were treated as criminals. They were forcibly committed to workhouses and later according to the "Asocial Paragraph" of 1968 to psychiatric wards, where they had to perform forced labour. Military drill and rigid rules prevailed in the workhouses, which were intended to re-educate the inmates into socialist human beings (Willing, 2008, p.316). This also applies to the corresponding institutions for young people, the "Jugendwerkhöfe". Just as there were no more youth and social services offices, volunteers had taken over their former tasks. And also work with the "Asocials" was not a field for social workers but for prison wardens. In 1958, only 40% of the full-time staff had pedagogical training and there were nine volunteers for every full-time youth welfare worker (Zimmermann, 2004, p.32).

April 2022. Vol. 2, Num. 3, 91-113, ISSN 2735-6620, DOI: 10.5354/2735-6620.2021.65164

The academisation of social work, which took place in the West around 1970, was not carried out in the East and thus no new fields of action developed there; for example, while social psychiatry developed in the West, the treatment of the mentally ill in the GDR concentrated on medication and "work therapy" (Gross, 1996).

Nevertheless, there was a profession of "social welfare worker" who was trained in the subjects Marxism/Leninism, cultural theory, health and social policy, hygiene, nutrition, socialist leadership, statistics and Russian, but also sociology and psychology (Glimm, 2006). Social workers should always educate their clients on socialism as well. This always meant education for work readiness in socialist production. They worked primarily in the health and education sectors. After the reunification of East and West Germany in 1991, many social welfare workers had to catch up on their university of applied science education.

Conclusion

The Nazis claimed to be creating a 1000-year 'Third Reich' in Germany, but they were only in power for 12 years. Nevertheless, during this time, they changed the political situation in Germany and later in Europe radically and lastingly. They killed six million Jews in an industrially organised mass extermination camp in Auschwitz, Poland, millions of civilians and prisoners of war during World War II, mostly in the Soviet Union, hundreds of thousands of other groups such as the disabled, Sinti and Roma, Jehovah's Witnesses, homosexuals, recidivist criminals and so-called "asocials".

The historical uniqueness of a planned, industrial mass extermination of millions of people must remain in historical memory. It cannot be separated from the moral appeal that Auschwitz must not be repeated (Adorno 1966).

National Socialism was not a relapse into anti-modernism, but a culmination of the projects of modernity: the fulfilment of the Enlightenment dream - at least of the part that strived for rational efficiency and functionality. The eugenic utopia that the National Socialists adopted had the goal of creating "better, more social, healthier and happier people" through rational human production (Auguste Forel, quoted in Dörner, 1988, p.32).

Tragically, the totalitarian regime of the National Socialists was indeed able to realise this social-technological "utopia", which had already been developed in the 19th century,

with cruel consistency. The Nazi state became the "Great Gardener" and "eliminated" "disturbing" population groups previously defined as "weeds" in order to give more space to the "useful plants", obsessed by the awareness that the existing "chaos" had to be defeated (Baumann 1995). The "Volkspflege" (Peoples' Care) played a prominent role in this, as it was supposed to push back the so-called inferiors for the good of the people through "eradicating hereditary care" (Althaus, 1937, p.8).

Also the GDR had a dream of a better society, created not from the struggle against a race, but from the struggle against a class. The 'new human being' in the socialist vision was not the biological superman, but a human being in solidarity. Nevertheless, there were parallels, which were particularly evident in the area of education and social work. Discipline and obedience to the leadership of a party remained important educational goals. Social conformity was also required here, as non-conformist behaviour was defamed as a lack of class consciousness. Enemies in the Nazi era were other races - especially in the East; in the GDR, it was the capitalist class in the West and its sympathisers in the East.

State education had a particularly high priority in the GDR - as it had in the Nazi era - because the state appeared with the claim that it wanted to educate children differently than parents had done before and as they might therefore continue to do. The GDR saw itself doubly justified in continuing this primacy of state education, since only in this way could the struggle against fascism and capitalism be waged consistently. Overlooked in this were latent continuities in their understanding of society:

Both systems were about the primacy of the community over the individual, the glorification of the "worker" and the military, the rejection of the "intellectual" and the stigmatisation and persecution of the "work-shy", the "asocial" and the "uneducable". And in both regimes, a de-professionalisation of social work took place because volunteer help from comrade to comrade was preferred. According to today's definition, there was no "social work" either in the Nazi- era or in the GDR. However, it would be too easy to simply free ourselves from the legacy and burden of this past with this claim. In fact the fields of work and target groups have remained similar, only answered with inhumane methods of "elimination" or barracking.

What are the reasons for these similarities despite the obvious different political goals of the Communists and the Nazis?

In his book “Modernity and Ambivalence”, Zygmunt Bauman sees the common ground between communism and National Socialism in the fact that both are gripped by the modern idea of bringing order into a supposed chaos. After the “collapse of the divine world order”, chaos and order have become modern twins (Bauman, 1995, p.17). He calls socialism the last project of modernity (Bauman, 1995, p.320). As a counterculture to modernity, it remained bound to its logic and, like capitalism but also like Nazism, claimed to create a better life: it was about further increasing the productive forces, improving technology, conquering nature. Under socialist, not capitalist auspices, modernity was led to its limits, among other things, by unlimited social technology:

> *“Communism was modernity in its most determined mood and most resolute attitude; streamlined modernity purged of the last vestige of the chaotic, the irrational, the spontaneous, the unpredictable.” (Bauman, 1995, p.326)*

As the capitalist West reformed, communism wasted its energy fighting “loose trousers, long hair, rock music” etc. (Bauman, 1995, p.327). The notion of equality had increasingly become close to uniformity, “fraternity too often smacked of enforced unity and a demand that the supposed siblings sacrifice their individuality in the name of a supposedly common cause”. (Bauman, 1995, p.333) The postmodern consciousness that characterises many western countries today is - according to Bauman - tolerant. It no longer tries to convert people. Its freedom, however, is only the freedom of consumption. And the irrelevance of cultural otherness is also an expression of indifference.

Social work however cannot be indifferent towards social injustice because the struggle against social inequalities is one of its roots and part of its identity (Kuhlmann, 2008). Neglecting that would mean a new de-professionalization. Countering indifference is today’s task. And there is a new danger posed by right-wing and other fundamentalist movements, which again calls into question the tolerance we have acquired.

We can learn from history about what happens if individual problems do not count; or even worse, when the right to live is denied by state policy. The history of the 20th century teaches that the dignity of a human being is undividable, like it is after World War II written in the Code of Ethics of social work. However, this is not enough: We need to create historical awareness in the training of social work to prevent a repetition of collaboration with dictatorship.

References

Adorno T.W. (1966). Erziehung nach Auschwitz. In T. W. Adorno (1981), *Erziehung zur Mündigkeit* (pp. 88-104). Suhrkamp.

Althaus, H. (1937). *Nationalsozialistische Volkswohlfahrt. Wesen, Aufgaben und Aufbau*. Junker & Dünnhaupt.

Amthor, R. C. (Ed.) (2017). *Soziale Arbeit im Widerstand! Fragen, Erkenntnisse und Reflexionen zum Nationalsozialismus*. Beltz Juventa.

Ayaß, W. (1995). *Asoziale im Nationalsozialismus*. Klett-Cotta.

Baum, M. (1927). *Familienfürsorge: eine Studie*. Braun.

Bauman, Z. (1995). *Moderne und Ambivalenz. Das Ende der Eindeutigkeit*. Clausen.

Benz, W., & Distel, B. (2016). *“Gemeinschaftsfremde”: Zwangserziehung im Nationalsozialismus, in der Bundesrepublik und der DDR*. Metropol.

Dill, G. (1999). *Nationalsozialistische Säuglingspflege. Erziehung zum Massenmenschen*. Enke.

Dörner, K. (1988). *Tödliches Mitleid. Zur Frage der Unerträglichkeit des Lebens oder: Die Soziale Frage. Entstehung, Medizinisierung, NS-Endlösung, heute, morgen*. Jakob van Hoddis.

Franke-Meyer, D., & Kuhlmann, C. (Ed.) (2018). *Soziale Bewegungen und Soziale Arbeit. Von der Kindergartenbewegung zur Homosexuellenbewegung*. VS.

Friehe, A. (1935). *Was muß der Nationalsozialist von der Vererbung wissen. Die Grundlagen der Vererbung und ihre Bedeutung für Mensch, Volk und Staat*. Diesterweg.

Giesecke, H. (1981). *Vom Wandervogel bis zur Hitlerjugend. Jugendarbeit zwischen Politik und Pädagogik*. Juventa.

Glimm, K. (2006). *Die Ausbildung von Gesundheits-, Sozial- und Jugendfürsorgern in der ehemaligen Deutschen Demokratischen Republik (DDR)*. Diploma thesis University o. a. S. Neubrandenburg, unpublished.

Gross, F. (1996). *Jenseits des Limes. 40 Jahre Psychiater in der DDR*. Psychiatrie-Verlag.

Gruner, W. (2002). *Öffentliche Wohlfahrt und Judenverfolgung. Wechselwirkungen lokaler und zentraler Politik im NS-Staat (1933 - 1942)*. Oldenbourg.

Haag, L. (2000). *Berufsbiographische Erinnerungen: von Fürsorgerinnen an die Zeit des Nationalsozialismus*. Lambertus.

Hammerschmidt, P. (1999). *Die Wohlfahrtsverbände im NS-Staat. Die NSV und die konfessionellen Verbände Caritas und Innere Mission im Gefüge der Wohlfahrtspflege des Nationalsozialismus*. Leske & Budrich.

Hering, S., & Münchmeier, R. (2014.) *Geschichte der Sozialen Arbeit: Eine Einführung*. 5., überarb. Juventa.

Hitler, A. (1934). *Mein Kampf*. Erster Band: Eine Abrechnung, 2. Bd.: Die nationalsozialistische Bewegung. Franz Eher.

Klönne, A. (1989). Die deutsche Arbeiterbewegung: Geschichte, Ziele, Wirkungen. Dt. Taschenbuch-Verl.

Krause, H.U. (2004). *Fazit einer Utopie. Heimerziehung in der DDR – eine Rekonstruktion*. Lambertus.

Kuhlmann, C. (1989). *Erbkrank oder erziehbar? Jugendhilfe zwischen Zuwendung und Vernichtung in der Fürsorgeerziehung in Westfalen 1933-1945*. Juventa.

Kuhlmann, C. (2000). *Alice Salomon. Ihr Beitrag zur Entwicklung der Sozialen Arbeit in Theorie und Praxis*. Deutscher Studien-Verlag.

Kuhlmann, C. (2008). Alice Salomon (Germany), President 1928/29-1946, In F. Seibel, (Ed.), *Global Leaders of Social Work Education: The IASSW Presidents 1928-2008* (pp.29-55). Brno (Czech Republic). https://ejournals.bib.uni-wuppertal.de/index.php/sws/article/download/99/388?inline=1

Kuhlmann, C. (2014). *Geschichte sozialer Arbeit: eine Einführung für soziale Berufe*. Wochenschau-Verl.

Kuhlmann, C. (2020). Social Work in Nazi Germany – why resistance would have been necessary. *Social Dialogue*, (The International Association of Schools of Social Work, 22,27-30. https://www.iassw-aiets.org/de/get/social-dialogue-magazine-issue-22

Lindemann, H. (1917). *Die deutsche Stadtgemeinde im Kriege*. Mohr.

Lepore, J. 2019. *Diese Wahrheiten. Geschichte der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika*. Beck.

Lorke, C. (2015). *Armut im geteilten Deutschland. Die Wahrnehmung sozialer Randlagen in der Bundesrepublik und der DDR*. Campus.

Makarenko, A. S. (1980). *Ein pädagogisches Poem. Der Weg ins Leben*. Ullstein.

Mannschatz, E. (1951). Kollege Mannschatz nimmt abschließend Stellung zur Selbstverwaltungsgruppe . *Neue Erziehung in Kindergarten und Heim,* 4(6), p. 20.

Reinicke, P. (2012). *Die Ausbildungsstätten der sozialen Arbeit in Deutschland 1899–1945*. Lambertus.

Roth, M. (2015). *Ihr wißt, wollt es aber nicht wissen. Verfolgung, Terror und Widerstand im Dritten Reich*. Beck.

Sachße, C., & Tennstedt, F. (1992). *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge in Deutschland: Der Wohlfahrtsstaat im Nationalsozialismus*. Kohlhammer.

Sachße, C., & Tennstedt, F. (1998). *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge in Deutschland Band 1: Vom Spätmittelalter bis zum 1. Weltkrieg*. Kohlhammer.

Sachße, C., & Tennstedt, F. (2012). *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge in Deutschland: Fürsorge und Wohlfahrtspflege in der Nachkriegszeit 1945–1953*. Kohlhammer.

Salomon, A. (1926). *Soziale Diagnose*. Carl Heymanns.

Schnurr, S. (1997). *Sozialpädagogen im Nationalsozialismus. Eine Fallstudie zur. Sozialpädagogischen Bewegung im Übergang zum NS-Staat*. Juventa.

Schrader-Breymann, H. (1868). Zur Frauenfrage. In: Kleine pädagogische Texte 5, p. 8-18.

Warnecke, M.L. (2009). *Zwangsadoptionen in der DDR*. Wissenschaftsverlag.

Willing, M. (2008). *“Sozialistische Wohlfahrt” – Die staatliche Sozialfürsorge in der Sowjetischen Besatzungszone und der DDR (1945-1990)*. Mohr Siebeck.

Zimmermann, V. (2004). *”Den neuen Menschen schaffen”. Die Umerziehung von schwererziehbaren und straffälligen Jugendlichen in der DDR (1945-1990)*. Böhlau.

About the author

Dr. Carola Kuhlmann holds a diploma in social pedagogy, a PhD in Educational Science, did her post-doctoral thesis on Alice Salomon and is a Professor in the Department of Social Work at the Protestant University of Applied Science In Bochum (Germany). She studied social pedagogy, educational science, Protestant theology and sociology in Göttingen and Münster (1980-1989). Her research lines are history of social work, life and work of Alice Salomon, history of residential care, education and violence, social work and gender (women’s movement and social work), educational disadvantage and social inclusion. She is a member of the German Association of Social Work, of the Department of Social Pedagogy in the German Association of Educational Science and of the Phd College North_Rhine-Westfalia.

E-mail address: kuhlmann@evh-bochum.de

ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0524-4293

April 2022. Vol. 2, Num. 3, 91-113, ISSN 2735-6620, DOI: 10.5354/2735-6620.2021.65164