Edward Ross Dickinson

'Until the Stubborn Will is Broken': Crisis and Reform in Prussian Reformatory Education, 1900–34

I

On 1 April 1901, a new law on correctional education for wayward and delinquent children came into effect in Prussia. Under the previous correctional education law of 1878, children under the age of twelve, and those aged twelve to eighteen if they were deemed to have insufficient insight to be held legally responsible for their actions, could be removed by the courts from their families and placed in a reformatory or foster family only if they had committed a crime. §1666 of the national Code of Civil Law (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch or BGB), which came into force in 1900, also allowed children to be removed from their families if they were culpably neglected, abused or corrupted by their parents. The new law, in contrast, allowed the removal of children up to age eighteen from their families also if the 'insufficiency of the parents' . . . or the schools' pedagogical influence' made this step necessary in order to prevent the child's 'complete moral ruin'.[1] This step not only enormously expanded the number of children eligible for correctional education; in principle it changed the nature of the institution fundamentally. Correctional education was henceforth not merely a part of the state's defence of the legal order; it could now, in theory, be used to '*prevent*' crime, by securing the adequate socialization of all children. As the parliamentary committee considering the bill remarked in its report, the new law 'grants the possibility of correctional education not only on criminal-policy, but also on social-policy grounds'.[2] In fact, most fundamentally the law

European History Quarterly Copyright © 2002 SAGE Publications, London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi, Vol. 32(2), 161–206.
[0265-6914(200204)32:2;161–206;022498]

rested on a new conception of the state, and of the relationship between state and society. As J. Tews remarked in 1900, 'the modern state has proven itself capable of performing not only the rougher services of the soldier and the policeman, but also the finer, more delicate role of the bearer of culture [*Kulturträger*]';[3] the new law acknowledged this development, permitting the state to intervene in social life not only where its laws were contravened, but in order to compensate for failings of social institutions. This change was reflected in the title given to the law: whereas that of 1878 had been a law on 'compulsory education' (*Zwangserziehung*), that of 1900 was a law on 'welfare education' (*Fürsorgeerziehung*).

In this sense the law may be seen as expressing a fundamental optimism regarding the capacity of public policy to resolve the problems of children, of families, and indeed of modern society itself — an optimism that was characteristic of the period and, in retrospect, rather naïve. In fact, within a very few years correctional education in Prussia was mired in a severe and stubborn crisis. By 1910, policy-makers and practitioners were reeling under the impact of a series of spectacular revolts and scandals, and of a wave of popular outrage against the system. After a brief pause during the Great War, this crisis would continue and deepen through the 1920s, so that correctional education became a kind of hereditary curse of the German child-welfare system.

In the most widely read and influential study of German child-welfare policy yet published, Detlev Peukert used the story of correctional education to present a kind of cautionary tale about the 'inner, structural pathologies of social assistance' and the 'pathogenesis of modernity'.[4] He argued that the project of modern German child-welfare policy was essentially a form of 'inner colonialism', a bourgeois attempt to impose a set of alien norms and values from without and 'above'; indeed, it was guided by a 'totalitarian claim to validity' for bourgeois social and behavioural norms.[5] The ideal of 'education for all' expanded the opportunities open to poor and working-class children; but it 'meant also an even more determined declaration of hostility [*Kampfansage*] against those who . . . would not allow themselves to be educated'. There was no room in bourgeois reformers' 'utopian visions of seamless pedagogical control' for those who would or could not conform; 'for the "ineducable" beyond the pedagogical province, no right to life remained'.[6]

Peukert made it clear that these totalitarian and homicidal potentials of child-welfare policy were realized only in particular historical circumstances: the grinding fiscal constraints of the 1920s, the crisis of the Depression, and a series of revolts and scandals in reformatories broke the optimism of the child-welfare movement, encouraging the application of cost–benefit models and discussion of how to reduce the fiscal and pedagogical burden of the recalcitrant, 'ineducable', or 'defective' (*Minderwertige*). The 'cumulative radicalization' of the National Socialist regime translated such concerns, by 1939, into a programme for mass murder. That outcome was historically contingent, not inescapable; it would, therefore, be 'unhistorical' to see in the ambivalence of the reform project a 'continuous and unchanging repressive character'. And yet, the sense of Peukert's exposition was unmistakably that bourgeois social reform was in a sense doomed to arrive at a disastrous end. Again, the 'idea of the exclusion of the ineducable' was 'immanent' in the idea of the 'total' validity of bourgeois norms, in the goal of universal education, adjustment, and participation.[7] But that goal could never be achieved by modern, bureaucratic, rational means, which could not address the essential irrationality either of individual psychology or of the industrial capitalist social order. The 'birth defect' (*Geburtsfehler*) of the modern German child-welfare system was that 'deeply personal experiences, problems of life-world were subsumed into totalizing, systematic logics that argued from the premises of bureaucratic efficiency and regulation [*Erfassung*]'. At the same time, the industrial economic and social order constantly reproduced precisely those 'economically founded gaps in control', the independent, rebellious and disorderly youth, which and whom reformers regarded as pathological and dangerous.[8] Given the 'totalitarian claim to validity' of bourgeois norms, only the two 'strategies of pedagogical normalization or eugenic exclusion' were open to middle-class social reformers; when the one failed, as it inevitably must, only the other remained.[9] At the end of this process and of Peukert's book stood the National Socialist drive to pass a Law on Community Aliens which would have put the 'antisocial' completely at the mercy of the police, and the creation in 1940 of two special 'youth concentration camps' for 'ineducable' delinquents.[10]

In Peukert's account, the decade of the 1920s was the turning-point on the road to disaster. The Weimar constitution of 1919

mandated, and the National Child Welfare Act (Reichsjugendwohlfahrtsgesetz or RJWG) of 1922 sought to realize, the creation of a comprehensive national child-welfare system that would guarantee the right of every German child to 'education for physical, spiritual, and social competence [*Tüchtigkeit*]'. The completion of that system in the mid-1920s raised the problem of what to do with those who would not be integrated; and the fiscal constraints of the 1920s, on the other hand, slowed the development of concrete responses (such as specialized, intensive care for 'difficult' children). At the same time, the development of a self-consciously modern, democratic pedagogy, which emphasized respect for the autonomy of the individual young person, self-education, and even participation in collective self-government (for example within reformatories) exacerbated this problem still further, by raising the standard of self-control and rationality expected of children in care. Peukert used as a crucial illustration of this more general process Karl Wilker, a leading figure in the German youth movement who, as director of the Lindenhof reformatory in Berlin between 1917 and 1920, experimented with less authoritarian methods in correctional education. Wilker stopped shaving inmates' heads upon their arrival; allowed them to paint their rooms colours other than institutional green; removed the iron bars on the bedroom doors and windows; abolished the most boring and grinding work in the reformatory; read aloud not only from the Bible but from Lao-tzu, Nietzsche and Tagore; allowed inmates to organize their own recreational activities; and established a degree of representative 'self-government' (in consultation with himself) and a 'Boys' Court'. But the whole experiment was posited on the use of 'favourites' as leaders, and on the exclusion of the unco-operative — on making a careful 'selection' (*Auslese*) among inmates. 'Whoever suffers among his comrades, or causes them to suffer', he remarked, 'is better sent away.'[11]

By the late 1920s, faced with 'ineducable' children and reformatory revolts, discussion among pedagogical theorists centred on the problem of the 'limits of educability', while practitioners in correctional education increasingly focused on the idea of a grand 'cleaning up' (*Reinigung*) of the reformatories through the introduction of separate, permanent institutionalization (*Bewahrung*) for those whose biological makeup made them 'ineducable'. By 1933, the Nazis' promises of a bio-medical alternative to welfare

could appeal to child-welfare experts as a way to extricate themselves 'from the contradictions in which they had tangled themselves. The smooth transition, including the retention of most personnel, from pedagogical care [*Versorgung*] to racist extermination could not otherwise have occurred.'[12]

The story of correctional education between 1900 and 1933, then, was for Peukert a case-study in the homicidal 'pathology' inherent in the humane and liberal project of the welfare state. Nazi policy was the 'homicidal realization' of that concept of the 'exclusion of those who could not conform' that was 'immanent' in the ideas of modern child-welfare policy.[13] The closer the child-welfare system came to the goal of universal provision, and the closer it came to a genuinely democratic and liberal pedagogical method, the more it veered toward exclusion, coercion, murder.

The brilliance of Peukert's analysis was that it provided a persuasive explanation of the relationship between the social policy of the Weimar Republic and that of the Third Reich. Above all, his discussion of the way in which child-welfare policy itself generated the 'problem' of the 'ineducable' remains convincing, an elegant and telling example of a broader principle described by the older literature on 'social control' and by post-structuralists like Michel Foucault.

And yet, closer examination of the history of correctional education, and of child-welfare policy more broadly, reveals some critical flaws in Peukert's analysis. For one thing, he vastly exaggerated the importance of modern, 'scientific' child study, of pedagogical-reform ideas, and of new pedagogical practices, and failed to build the continued overwhelming dominance of conservative pedagogical and religious traditions in German correctional education — which he acknowledged — into his theoretical reflections. Second, Peukert's presentation of the connection between pedagogical reform and National Socialist child-welfare practice was misleading. With respect specifically — and, in the field of child welfare, almost uniquely — to pedagogical reform, there was no smooth transition, no widespread retention of personnel, and no intellectual continuity from the 1920s to the 1930s. And third, despite his repeated invocation of the idea of 'ambivalence', Peukert grievously neglected other, more positive aspects of the development of 'modern' child welfare in Germany in this period. Correctional education was indeed crisis-ridden, and one response to its problems was a turn

to exclusionary, bio-medical, hereditarian theories. But other child-welfare programmes were not in crisis at all; and many child-welfare advocates were hard at work in the late 1920s developing, partly on the basis of such successful programmes, a less coercive, more inclusive and more democratic response to the crisis of correctional education — a response that would become one of the pillars of child-welfare policy in the democratic welfare state after 1949. Again, Peukert was quite aware of these developments; but he did not reflect on their implications for his theory.

This article, then, will give a quite different account of the history of correctional education in Germany, and suggest some important modifications of Peukert's conclusions from it. The crisis of correctional education, it will argue, was the product not of 'modernity', but of a specific combination of an effort to achieve clearly modern *aims* — universal education, effective socialization for all children — with a *failure* to adopt modern *institutional forms* and modern *methods*. Central to the ongoing crisis of correctional education was a collision between forms and methods developed by early nineteenth-century conservative Christians, on the one hand, and the culture of the early twentieth-century urban industrial poor, on the other. Here as in so many other fields, the crisis of German institutions was the product of a failure to modernize institutional structures and practices in step with the modernization of German society and culture.[14]

II

For all the interventionist optimism it expressed, the Prussian correctional education law of 1900 was in fact part of a broad and varied social-reform response to what middle- and upper-class observers (and even many Social Democrats) perceived as an extremely dangerous crisis of working-class family life and socialization in the 1890s. It appeared to these critics that the conditions of life in an urbanizing, industrializing, commercial society were frighteningly inimical to orderly child-rearing and to the moral, physical and intellectual development of young people. Working-class fathers often worked twelve or more hours each day; and the terrible housing shortage in industrial centres,

along with the culture of drink and masculine solidarity, kept them out of the home even after work. Many working-class mothers, of course, also worked long hours outside the home; still more took in work as laundresses or pieceworkers, often enlisting their children's labour as well. Working-class children were thus very often neglected by their parents, and effectively raised by older siblings or by their peers. These conditions exposed them, in the eyes of observers accustomed to bourgeois domesticity, to terrible moral and physical dangers, and to intellectual atrophy. To make matters worse, lack of privacy and the practice of taking in boarders was believed to pose a threat to children's sexual morality; and the fact that working-class people often left their parishes and their faith behind them when they moved to the city seemed to endanger their religious training, and to deprive their parents of an appropriate sense of the legitimacy and function of their authority. The fact that a growing proportion of working-class adolescents were also in paid employment, and thus had appreciable financial leverage in the family, was also believed to be leading to a general decline of respect for parental authority, and hence for authority generally. This trend was reinforced by the decline of the institution of apprenticeship, which was believed to have formed a disciplining transitional stage from family to full independence. The cumulative effect was a 'loss of all sense for authority with respect to parents, superiors, employers, and adults', and by extension for the political and social order itself.[15]

By the 1890s, middle-class cultural conservatives believed that this decline of deference was at the root of two grave problems which seemed to many to pose, in the long run, an existential threat to the existing political and social order. On the one hand, juvenile delinquency seemed to be spiralling out of control, rising by about a third in the 1880s alone. Juvenile offending was growing faster than adult criminality; and among minors, crimes of violence were rising faster than less serious offences. On the other hand, the growing success of Social Democracy in winning over young voters obviously posed a more explicitly political threat. Johannes Corvey described the connection conservatives believed existed between social change and socialism in fairly moderate language in 1890, arguing that in industrial towns 'an ordered family life is usually very difficult to combine with earning one's daily bread', since both parents, and older siblings,

all worked. Unattended, children became 'street urchins' — and then went from this 'disordered street life' into the factory at the tender age of twelve. Surrounded by politicized workers, they soon came to believe that they had 'reason to quarrel with fate and with two . . . entities . . . which are called "state" and "capital" '.[16] Ernst Floessel was less sympathetic in an essay of 1893: 'Disobedience toward the parents', he held, 'expands into disobedience toward the employer, further toward the authorities, toward society itself', and the working-class youth ended up falling victim to the 'mad teachings of the seducers of the people'.[17] The result, according to a study by the Prussian Ministry of the Interior in 1892, was an 'ever-growing participation by wayward, ill-mannered, or poorly raised youths wherever there are disturbances of the peace, resistance to state authority, social democratic movements, revolts and disorders'.[18]

Middle-class reformers and the German governments responded to these threats with an outpouring of social-reform activity focused on young people, including a massive expansion of organized leisure-time activities for young people ('youth cultivation' or *Jugendpflege*); an expansion of the vocational continuation schools (*Fortbildungsschulen*); a campaign against trashy or indecent popular literature (*Schmutz* and *Schund*); the construction of public and private lending libraries; a major national child-labour law in 1903; the introduction locally of public, professional legal guardianship for illegitimate children (*Berufsvormundschaft*) and of special juvenile courts (*Jugendgerichte*); a massive efflorescence of private child-welfare organizations, and so forth.

The correctional-education law was an important part of this deluge of reform initiatives. The new law inspired extraordinary enthusiasm among child-welfare activists and practitioners. It came at a critical moment for the Christian reformatories, which had suffered from declining enrolments for a decade or more. The official commentary on the law explicitly directed the courts to place children in private institutions; many reformatory administrators welcomed the flood of commitments it brought. Beyond that some Christian conservatives hoped the new opportunity to serve God and society created by the law would cause a religious revival: Martin Hennig, director of a leading Protestant reformatory in Hamburg, hoped for example that 'something like the spirit of the Inner Mission' — the national organization of lay

Protestant charities, founded in 1848 — would 'sweep through' congregations.[19] Others hoped that the law would frighten parents into more responsible behaviour; indeed, the leading Catholic child-welfare organizer Agnes Neuhaus believed by 1911 that it had had precisely this effect, forcing parents who were themselves merely 'big, irrational, unsocialized children' onto a 'relatively respectable path'.[20] Pastor Gustav von Rohden summed up the response of Christian child-welfare advocates by calling the law 'one of the great social and moral acts of our time'; the conservative publicist and social reformer Carl von Massow called the law 'one of the greatest social acts, if not the greatest of all those which the history of states and peoples records'.[21] But more liberal social reformers, too, saw the law for the most part in a very positive light; the child-welfare commission of the Union of German Women's Organizations (Bund Deutscher Frauenvereine), for example, regarded it and the national child-labour law of 1903 as 'the most important innovations in social policy' of the day.[22]

This enthusiasm inspired widespread, organized private efforts to encourage the use of the law by local authorities — for example through the formation of a large number of local child-welfare 'centrals', co-ordinating the efforts of many local charity groups to bring cases to the attention of local government (which then brought them before the courts). The result was an explosive expansion in the number of children removed from their families after 1901. In 1900, 1402 children had been removed from their families under the law of 1878; in 1901, under the new legislation, 7787 were removed. That number fell to only 6470 in 1903/4, but then rose steadily to 10,000 by 1913.[23] In 1900 there were 10,000 children in reformatories and foster families in Prussia (and only 30,000 had been removed from their families between 1878 and 1900); by 1914 there were 55,229.[24]

While child-welfare advocates regarded this development as a tremendous success, the new law in fact created a mire of intractable conflicts. First, the system was plagued from the very beginning by intragovernmental quarrels. Under the law, the provincial governments bore two-thirds of the costs of correctional education; and faced with a flood of children, they immediately appealed a large number of commitments. The locally funded poor-relief authorities continued to be responsible for the costs of foster care for children removed from their families due

to neglect or abuse (under §1666 of the Code of Civil Law), and the provinces reasoned that local governments were requesting commitments to correctional education *en masse*, merely in order to escape from this fiscal burden. In 1901, the *Kammergericht* (the highest Prussian civil court) ruled in the provinces' favour, holding that correctional education was only justified where 'special pedagogical measures' were necessary. The number of commitments of merely 'endangered' (that is, not criminal or obviously 'wayward') children immediately fell off — from 33.2 percent of commitments in 1901 to 18.5 percent in 1902 (and 17.5 percent in 1908).[25] The municipalities, however, thereupon appealed to the Supreme *Administrative* Court (*Oberverwaltungsgericht*) — which duly found in *their* favour, ruling that the 'artificial need' created by removing children to foster care under §1666 BGB did *not* qualify a child for poor-relief. Such removal, it held, was an 'educational' measure — and in Prussia the poor-relief system was not legally responsible for the costs of education. Thus, while many children could not be committed to correctional education due to the *Kammergericht*'s decision, the *Oberverwaltungsgericht*'s ruling meant that funds were also not available to remove those children to a foster family. Since there was no single supreme court in Prussia, the situation could not be resolved by appeal. Legislative changes intended to encourage the 'preventive' use of correctional education were not introduced until 1915.[26]

The results were frustrating for child-welfare advocates. Clarifying decisions by the *Kammergericht* did bring the number of commitments back up gradually after 1902, but the Guardianship Courts continued to refuse to commit younger, merely 'morally endangered' children. Only 170 of the 6650 children committed in 1905/6, for example, were under age six; about 30 percent were aged six to twelve, 55 percent were aged twelve to sixteen, and 13 percent were seventeen or eighteen.[27] The proportion over age fourteen rose from 40 percent in 1901 to 53 percent in 1913.[28]

In the eyes of those who ran the reformatories, the relatively advanced age of children in the institutions lay at the root of a problem which, by the middle of the decade, was coming to dominate all discussion of correctional education: the deepening unpopularity of the law and the growing resistance and rebelliousness of children in the reformatories.

Not surprisingly, many parents tried desperately to avoid losing their children, whom they often clearly loved and who also, especially after the age of twelve or fourteen, often made an important contribution to the family income. They appealed commitments, attempted to pressure local notables, and sought allies in positions of authority. In one celebrated case in 1908–10, a mother 'kidnapped' her child from the foster family in which it had been placed and kept it hidden for two years.[29] In another, in 1902, the seizure of two girls by the police sparked demonstrations in the industrial town of Moers.[30]

Much more disturbing for practitioners, however, was the resistance of the children themselves. In one instance in 1905, four inmates of an institution near Cologne trampled their overseer, beat him with boards, and stabbed him with his own sabre in order to secure their transfer from correctional education to prison, where they would have better-defined rights and receive better treatment.[31] Much more common was simple flight: in fact, of the 38,600 children in correctional education in Prussia in 1908, 3879 ran away in the course of the year; in 1912, some 6000 of nearly 50,000 children ran away. The proportion of children in correctional education who were at large at the end of each fiscal year was rising slowly but steadily, from 2.3 percent in 1904 to 3.5 percent in 1911 and 5 percent in 1914.[32] Those involved in correctional education, moreover, pointed out that such figures merely reflected a much more generalized oppositional attitude — reinforced by what one expert, in 1912, called 'the corporative resistance of the children' — which made their work extremely difficult.[33] By 1910 there was a semi-technical term for children who offered this kind of passive, internal resistance to institutional (re)education (as well as violent forms): they were referred to as 'difficult' to educate, 'incorrigible', or even 'ineducable' (*schwererziehbar*, *unerziehbar*).

This resistance was in part a natural response to incarceration; indeed, some observers admitted that one reason inmates ran away was that they simply grew bored in confinement. It was heightened, however, by the peculiar character of the reformatories. The private Christian institutions in which some 80 percent of children in reformatories were held were dominated by what one critic called an 'ascetic–methodistic spirit'; and the methods and structure of public institutions were conceived, and they were often staffed, largely by penal officials and retired military

men. Many reformatories were essentially gigantic children's prisons, in which life was boring, stifling, loveless and oppressive. Children in institutions usually slept and ate in large common halls; they were allowed few or no personal possessions, and often wore uniforms; the windows were often barred, the grounds fenced or walled and sometimes even patrolled by dogs; in many simple pleasures like smoking or reading a newspaper were forbidden. Food, clothing, beds, tools and equipment were often of poor quality or in short supply — partly because the reformatories were simply overwhelmed by the number of commitments under the new law.[34] Reformatory staff were often poorly paid and overworked, and most had no pedagogical or psychological training. In 1913 Pastor Knaut, an administrator in Berlin's correctional education system, remarked to a committee of the General Conference on Correctional Education (Allgemeiner Fürsorgeerziehungstag, or AFET) investigating the problem of staffing that reformatory personnel were often 'bad enough to make one want to run away' (*zum Weglaufen schlecht*).[35] Children placed in foster families — about half of all children in correctional education — seem to have been happier: in 1902, proportionally almost four times as many reformatory inmates ran away as did children in families.[36] Yet in at least some cases conditions in such families were not much better, since some apparently treated their charges as cheap labour, attempting to extract the maximum of work from them at a minimum expense.

But while these more concrete problems were certainly significant, the cultural chasm that separated middle-class reformers and administrators from working-class children was a more important cause of the troubles of correctional education. For one thing, the norms applied by middle-class social workers were often different from those prevalent within working-class communities. As Wilhelm Rhiel, director of the Association for Catholic Charitable Educational Activity, admitted in comments before the AFET in 1912, resistance within the reformatories was often grounded in 'embitterment', since many children who were judged to be neglected, wayward or even abused 'are very fond of their homes and parents' and believed that they had 'suffered an injustice' in being removed from them.[37] Furthermore, working-class children often had pressing family responsibilities: in one case in 1911, for example, a single mother

persuaded her son to escape from the reformatory so that his wages might allow her to 'eat her fill again'.[38] Since the vast majority of children in correctional education came from urban working-class and poor families, moreover, correctional education was perceived widely as a particularly crass case of class justice.[39] Working-class children also resented the fact that most reformatory administrators, because of their anti-urban and anti-industrial bias, gave their charges no useful vocational training beyond simple handicrafts or agricultural labour for boys, and housekeeping for girls — preparation for the least well-paid and least stable jobs in the German economy, and completely unrelated to the aspirations of urban working-class youth. As one reformatory director remarked in 1906, many inmates believed for this reason that the time they spent in the reformatories was time 'wasted'.[40] Finally, the stigma that attached to having been in correctional education made it still more difficult for ex-inmates to find employment after their release.

But worst of all, the pedagogy adopted in the reformatories was simply inappropriate for the children held in them. Reformatory staff usually took an uncompromisingly moralistic view of their charges. One list of the 'most common moral failings' of children in institutions published by a reformatory pastor in 1896 suggests how exacting the moral yardstick to which their teachers held these children could be: it included lying, thievery, laziness, dirtiness, disorderliness, disobedience, stubbornness, impoliteness, ungratefulness, intrigue, bragging, roughness, greed, vengefulness, cowardice, stupidity, and lack of self-discipline, fear of God, brotherly love or purity of heart.[41] Not surprisingly, Wilhelm Rhiel, for example, held that many reformatory inmates 'have no abhorrence of the bad, indeed they wish it'.[42] This was hardly an attitude calculated to win the sympathy and affection of their charges. Some aspects of the moral code to which middle-class Christians adhered, moreover, may have put them directly at odds with the culture and survival skills of working-class and poor children, which included for example aggression and combativeness, opportunism, the ability to focus one's energies on survival-related activities, and solidarity. All these were sometimes interpreted by middle-class moralists as evidence of moral corruption.

Beyond this tendency to moralism, however, Christian reformatory staff (particularly but not exclusively Protestants) were for

the most part guided by a very particular understanding of the proper place of authority in the life of the individual and of the community. Put simply, they assumed that the individual will was by nature egoistic, selfish and sinful; and that authority — political, social, institutional, legal, moral — was placed by God on earth in order to protect the individual and the community from the destructive consequences of this natural egoism. Without it, the individual would become an essentially anti-social and self-destructive slave to his or her own selfish urges, and society would degenerate into a war of all against all. As the educational theorist Friedrich Paulsen put it in 1908, therefore, the capacity to obey was the foundation and precondition of moral life (and of social order): the individual must 'learn to accept as your will the will of those better and more insightful than you', thereby choosing the 'path of discipline' which leads to 'the rule of the spiritual self', rather than the path of 'enslavement to pleasure'.[43] This theory led reformatory staff to assume that the best way to counteract the myriad moral faults of their charges, and to lay in them the most basic foundations for an autonomous moral sense, was to habituate them to unconditional obedience and to an ordered, disciplined way of life. The core of the pedagogical method of most reformatories was therefore above all the imposition of a strict routine, a strict code of discipline and unquestioning obedience to staff. The model was that of the patriarchal, consciously Christian family, in which authority, exercised in a spirit of love and understanding and guided by faith, shaped the child's character in a process of constant supervision and correction. Work — the development of habits of industry and disciplined labour — played an important part in this process; and so did the constant teaching of Christian dogma, Christian religious and moral precepts, and Christian practice. In many reformatories, as Friedrich von Bodelschwingh remarked in 1912, 'by day the tone of command is dominant, in the evenings the tone of care for the soul'.[44]

Many of the working-class children committed to correctional education were not accessible or responsive to these methods. Few poor children would, presumably, have shared the middle-class understanding of work as a 'calling' or a character-building exercise, regarding it instead as a bitter necessity. More important, by 1910 middle-class observers had, after all, been complaining for thirty years or more about the decline of religiosity

and of respect for authority among working-class youth. As Günter Dehn, a pastor who organized a youth club in the working-class suburb of Moabit in Berlin, wrote in 1913, in proletarian society 'religion has been discarded like a worn-out shirt'.[45] Nor did their experience in their own families and communities give working-class children a strong sense of the necessity and righteousness of authority. Johannes Trüper, editor of an early journal of child psychology, found 'little of the healthy relationship of super- and subordination' in working-class families, for example; and Dehn reported that working youth

> . . . really have no respect for anything at all. Whence should they get it? They have outgrown the schools, they are too good for the church, they lead their mothers and fathers around by the nose, in the factory only fear makes them obedient — in Berlin-Moabit everyone is a free citizen and does whatever he pleases.[46]

Rhiel expressed the puzzlement of Christian educators faced with such children in 1912: 'often', he wrote, the educator 'stands . . . helpless before the pupil, before this total lack of religious and moral foundation'.[47]

Many working-class children were no doubt equally nonplussed by the behaviour and demands of their educators. Yet the confrontation fostered by this misunderstanding was seen by reformatory staff as a stubborn refusal to bow to legitimate authority and to face up to one's own sins and weakness — as the unreasoning revolt of anarchic egoism against the moral order of the universe. Since conservative Christians believed confession, punishment, contrition and forgiveness to be central to moral development, reformatory staff responded sternly to their charges' stubbornness. As one speaker told the first AFET conference in 1906, 'refusal to obey and lack of respect for authority must, if earnest fatherly reminders of God's fourth commandment do not bear fruit, be punished with the necessary severity, until the stubborn will is broken'.[48] At the same time, the sheer practical problems and stress of keeping order in often overcrowded institutions virtually ruled out a more sympathetic and tolerant approach to individual children's failings and misdemeanours, encouraging staff to respond sharply to even small breaches of discipline. Most reformatories, therefore, developed a whole range of punishments (*Strafordnung*) including punitive labour, withdrawal of food, confinement in special cells, and

particularly corporal punishment — spontaneous blows (often referred to as 'little reminders' or *Denkzettel*) or beatings of varying severity.

As Rhiel remarked in 1912, however, in the already oppositional climate within the reformatories punishments and 'strict treatment' were likely to increase the bitterness and resentment of reformatory inmates, and 'only make things still worse'.[49] Particularly in reformatories run by conservative Protestants, who were often deeply committed to corporal punishment as a pedagogical method,[50] the result appears to have been an upward spiral of violence. Indeed, the frustration of reformatory staff sometimes gave rise to veritable orgies of violence. As Karl Krohne somewhat dryly remarked in a position-paper for the Prussian Ministry of Justice in 1910, the mass of 'deeply wayward elements' committed under the new law, those

> . . . who had strayed onto the path of crime, run wild in the big city . . . among pimps and prostitutes . . . posed special problems for correctional education; they were an element until then unknown to most educators, who had no understanding for the fact that they were the product of their social surroundings . . . The pedagogically unschooled officers of the reformatories believed that they had to break the evil which they suspected everywhere with violence, corporal punishment, prison-like lock-ups, and other, worse coercive measures. Crass excesses . . . were the result.[51]

Popular outrage over such 'excesses' broke in early 1911, when a revolt in an institution in Mieltschin, in the east of Prussia, sparked a sensational public scandal. In court it was discovered that in Mieltschin at least one child was beaten with a stick or whip each day; that children received up to 100 blows for minor infractions; that the other children had to watch, and that outsiders were invited as spectators; that children were locked in dark basements; that they were chained in such a manner that they could neither lie nor stand; that in one case a boy was tied to a tree, beaten unconscious, revived and beaten again.[52] This and a rash of lesser scandals — reported in spectacular detail by the mass press — convinced much of the general public that the system of correctional education was pedagogically bankrupt.

The Social Democrats were especially active in condemning correctional education, partly because they feared (and not without reason) that the law was sometimes used for political purposes. Karl Zielke, for example, referred to corporal punishment in 1911 as 'a barbarity, a form of brutality which begets

further brutality . . . lust for revenge, meanness, dishonesty, and low hypocrisy' and held that the whole system appeared 'suited to raising recidivists'; in January of 1913 the socialist deputy Stadthagen told the Reichstag that in the reformatories 'the humanity is beaten out of the good elements . . . they are really turned into criminals'.[53] But liberals too were increasingly alarmed by the development of correctional education. Johannes Trüper spoke angrily after Mieltschin of the 'complete fiasco of correctional education'.[54] And by 1911 the *Rettungshausbote* protested that 'all the liberal papers unanimously cry "away with this scandal!"'[55] In fact, even in government circles correctional education was regarded with growing scepticism: in the wake of Mieltschin, for example, a councillor (*vortragender Rat*) in the Ministry of Justice announced that 'correctional education is a fiasco!'[56]

Some critics, pedagogical theorists, and practitioners were well aware of the essential nature of the institutions' problems. The conservative Protestant judge J.F. Landsberg, who was active in child welfare in his district (Lennep) and nationally, pointed out for example that proletarian youths were more likely to come into conflict with the law because they were released from the discipline of the schools (and turned over to the police rather than teachers in cases of misbehaviour) much earlier than bourgeois children, and because the social order denied them the luxuries which the latter could take for granted. They were also more likely to outrage judges and reformatory staff, because they were more accustomed to fighting back both verbally and physically.[57] Others were concluding by about 1910 that the stubborn resistance of children in correctional education was symptomatic not of moral corruption or rebellion against God, but of a perfectly natural aspect of the process of growing up: the development of an autonomous will and an independent individuality. Such independence should not to be *crushed*, but rather merely *directed* toward constructive ends, toward *healthy* independence. And finally, some argued in the years just prior to the Great War that authoritarian methods were inappropriate for the modern age. Friedrich Zimmer stated this view with unusual clarity in 1910, holding that

> Our present pedagogy is no longer appropriate. An earlier age could accomplish something with the enforcement of authority, because that age believed in authorities and believed them willingly. Children called their parents 'Sir', and

> unconditional obedience to the parents was something self-evident. That is no longer so. There is no feeling for authority any more, and pedagogy can rely on it no more than can the social and political authorities.[58]

The effect of trying to impose authority upon modern people, therefore, would be not obedience but rebellion. Gertrud Bäumer, head of the National Federation of Women's Associations (BDF) from 1910, suggested in 1911 that in any case the social and political conditions of the modern age were such that 'the power of the independent conscience' had become more important than mere 'obedience'. The 'pedagogical reform movement', Gertrud Bäumer wrote, arose from the 'sense that a new age demands new *people*'.[59]

These conclusions were reinforced by Progressive democratic educational experiments in the USA, such as W.R. George's 'Junior Republic'; and some Social Democrats had long demanded the development of a pedagogy based on freedom and self-government, one that would heighten, rather than destroy, correctional pupils' 'strength of will', 'self-respect' and 'belief in . . . justice'.[60] But in the last years before the war a number of respected Christian conservatives, too, espoused relatively progressive pedagogical views. Pastor Knaut, a leading figure in correctional education in Berlin, told the AFET's conference in 1912, for example, that if one suppressed children's natural tendency toward collective activity, one would merely 'encourage secret plots and unhealthy cliques'. What was more, breaking the will of delinquent youth and enforcing unconditional obedience would only create 'dependent, weak-willed people'; whereas in contrast, if one directed the will 'into the correct paths, it will serve the education of happy, free, independent persons'. Only such autonomous persons would be capable of positive moral action and moral responsibility.[61] And Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster, who by 1914 was a leading conservative Catholic voice in child-welfare debates, told the same group in that year that 'if I educate my pupil for mere *passive* discipline, then my pupil will always be undisciplined in *action*'. The 'pedagogy of self government . . . alone', Foerster concluded, was 'capable of rescuing the authority of the educator from its modern crisis' while also preventing the emergence of a 'blind and unordered dictatorship of the mass over the individual' and 'injecting into the vital forces themselves a higher plastic principle, an organizing tendency'.[62]

And yet, before the First World War such ideas had almost no

influence on practices and methods in the reformatories. A very different conclusion was more popular: that the central problem was not that the methods of the educators were inappropriate, but that the children involved were fundamentally irredeemable. Exchanging Christian moral categories for those of psychiatric pseudo-science, some argued that children who made trouble in the reformatories suffered from organic brain defects which made them in fact 'defective' (*minderwertig*), or even 'ineducable' (*unerziehbar*). This response appealed to reformatory staff because it was comforting for people who otherwise would have had to admit their own failure and, more fundamentally, the class-specific nature of values which they regarded as universal. It was legitimated, moreover, by a psychiatric 'science' so primitive that almost any statistic or diagnosis, dressed up in the proper jargon, sounded plausible. Adalbert Gregor, who published early psychiatric studies of children in reformatories, posited for example the existence of an inherited organic brain defect called 'lack of discipline'.[63] In 1908 a psychiatric survey of the inmates of reformatories in Westphalia found that 26.3 percent were apathetic, 43.5 percent easily excitable, 34.5 percent irritable, 27 percent sensitive, 11.8 percent moody, 25 percent stubborn and rebellious, 47 percent had a poor store of ethical concepts, 58.8 percent had poor judgement, and so on and so forth — and concluded on the basis of such evidence that 69.7 percent of these children showed 'psychic peculiarities' derived from organic defects.[64] Not surprisingly, estimates of the proportion of reformatory inmates who were 'psychopathic' or at least 'hereditarily tainted' (*erblich belastet*) ranged from around 25 percent to around 75 percent (though the Prussian government itself, in 1906, held only 10 percent to be 'abnormal').[65]

Inspired by such numbers, some reformers suggested simply abandoning the project of resocializing 'defective' children in order to concentrate on those who were organically 'educable'. The idea was all the more attractive because practitioners increasingly insisted that these children were making it impossible for them to socialize properly those children who were normal, merely endangered or only mildly wayward. The 'bad' elements were not only 'ineducable', they also disrupted the resocialization of the 'good'.[66] The Saxon correctional education law of 1908 in fact included a clause to the effect that children over sixteen years of age 'should only be committed to correc-

tional education if there is the well-founded prospect that it will achieve betterment'.[67]

But Christian educators balked at the idea of declaring some people 'irredeemable'; as Hans Uellner argued in 1902, 'Christian optimism is unbounded.'[68] And of course older, more 'corrupt' children were precisely the ones who were most in need of 'saving', and who posed the greatest threat to society. More popular, therefore, were proposals for the refinement of coercive methods — the creation of special institutions for 'abnormal' children. By 1914, Berlin was in fact planning to build such a special institution for 'psychopaths'.[69] And the AFET conference of 1910 suggested legislation allowing for the indefinite incarceration, in special institutions, of 'difficult' children.[70] In some cases, advocates' conception of such institutions were rather draconian: Uellner, for example, suggested the creation of special institutions or of special 'punishment sections' where 'the pedagogical perspective can yield for a time' to simple drill, and the children be held in cells and put to work in 'mechanical repair work' under 'military supervision'.[71]

There were many Christians who explicitly rejected the materialism on which psychiatric theories rested. One Protestant reformatory director at the 1910 AFET conference, for example, warned that if psychiatry based itself

> . . . squarely on a materialist point of view and says 'there is no afterlife, there is . . . no God, there is no free will, but rather human beings are no more than a product of heredity and the milieu in which they live,' then, gentlemen . . . we must declare war on the psychiatrists.[72]

And yet in the 1910s conservative Christian reformatory administrators often appealed to the notion of 'ineducability', and were eager to exclude the 'defective' from the institutions they controlled. It was strikingly easy for conservatives to shift rapidly back and forth between Christian and psychiatric ideas, with organic brain defects standing in for the natural sinfulness of man's will. In fact, Protestant practitioners in particular were more often moved to criticize the incipient democratic ethos of modernizing pedagogical ideas than the materialism of psychiatrists — since for those who regarded the will and natural desires of the individual as inherently sinful, the strategy of tolerating and harnessing them was a recipe not for the release of constructive energy but for chaos. Wilhelm Seiffert, for example,

head of the AFET from 1906 until 1912, regarded pedagogical reform proposals as the pipe dreams of 'theorists' who had no experience of the realities of life in the reformatories, denounced the aping of 'foreignerisms' (*Ausländereien*), argued that the pedagogical methods appropriate to a republic like the USA could not be applied in Germany, and insisted that 'in certain cases it is really impossible to get by without the delivery of a few blows'.[73]

The modern and 'scientific' ethos of psychiatry also attracted some on the left. The Social Democratic journal *Kommunale Praxis*, for example, suggested already in 1906 that the discovery that a large percentage of reformatory inmates were 'psychopathic' would hopefully lead to 'a complete transformation of the correctional education system' in a more humane direction.[74] And Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster explicitly held that his pedagogical programme was particularly appropriate precisely for 'abnormal' youths, because 'precisely the disorganized personality has a pathological drive for freedom . . . the reflection of a pathological drive for freedom in the subordinate nerve centres, against cerebral control'. It was thus these children who most needed to learn self-discipline, and who were least accessible to a pedagogy based on authority.[75] Nevertheless, liberal social reformers and those who favoured the new, 'freer' forms of education were more often sceptical about the claims of psychiatry, and about the idea of excluding the 'defective'. Christian Jasper Klumker, the dean of left-liberal child-welfare reform, pointed out for example that many 'normal' children were *also* 'difficult' (*schwererziehbar*), while most of those who were judged 'abnormal' could nevertheless be turned into 'something useful' to society. Rather than simply finding excuses for giving up on these children, he suggested, practitioners should 'find and test new methods'.[76]

III

The years of the Great War and the Revolution were extremely difficult ones for correctional education. Many institutions were expropriated for use as hospitals for wounded soldiers, their inmates crowded into other reformatories or into temporary buildings, orphanages, and the like. In most, hunger and its attendant diseases were a serious problem by 1916. Commit-

ments to correctional education dropped precipitously, from 10,358 in 1913 to 8789 in 1914; then they skyrocketed again, to 13,774 in 1917. During the revolutionary period, administrative chaos, popular resistance, and the loss of Prussian territory in the east created yet another precipitous drop in commitments, to 9258 in 1919. Commitments then surged once more, to 12,230 in 1923.[77] In both periods, rising commitments can be attributed to widespread hunger and attendant petty criminality among the young (including vagrancy, begging, and particularly theft of food and fuel), as well as to widespread concern over the moral health of youth in the context of political upheaval, the rapid development of commercial popular culture, and the moral anxiety generated by the black market and profiteering. The drop in commitments in 1914 and again in 1919–20 reflected the disruption of policing in these years; but in the latter period political concerns also played an important role, as the democratization of politics particularly at the municipal level gave popular resentment against the system a new significance. In a number of instances in late 1918, workers' and soldiers' councils even liberated inmates of private reformatories. Particularly in 1919 and 1920, socialists in the national and provincial parliaments repeatedly demanded the socialization and secularization of the private Christian reformatories.[78]

Despite these upheavals, however, there was a striking degree of continuity in correctional education across the revolutionary divide. The danger of socialization soon passed, and despite the building of a number of new public reformatories, in the late 1920s the overwhelming majority (over 85 percent) were still private, religious institutions.[79] What was more, the National Child Welfare Act of 1922 changed very little in Prussia's correctional education establishment, for the most part simply extending it to the whole country. The single most important change under the new national law was probably a clause which allowed the commitment of young people up to the age of twenty, if there seemed to be the prospect of successfully resocializing them; the Prussian revision of 1915, designed to encourage early commitment, was not adopted. Not surprisingly, the trend toward an older inmate population continued. The proportion of inmates under the age of six years did rise, to a peak of 10 percent in 1926; but it then dropped steadily to 3.6 percent in 1930. The proportion aged fourteen or over, meanwhile, rose from 55.2 percent in 1924 to

76.5 percent in 1930.[80] And the methods employed in the reformatories, finally, also changed very little. The focus on religion, work, routine, and discipline remained virtually unchanged; so did the recruitment, training, and working conditions of staff; the lack of appropriate vocational training was not at all corrected, with almost 90 percent of boys in Prussia receiving training in artisanal or agricultural professions in 1927; and while the anti-urban and class biases of correctional staff did not change, the proportion of children in reformatories who came from urban working-class backgrounds rose still further.[81]

As the example of Carl Wilker suggests, there were attempts in the 1920s to introduce reforms in correctional education. A number of practitioners drawn from the youth movement experimented with more liberal methods, and the Social Democratic welfare organization Worker's Welfare opened two reformatories in the late 1920s in which vocational training, integration into the community, short reformatory stays, and a degree of self-government were key features. Toward the end of the decade, moreover, a number of state governments introduced important reforms by law or regulation. Prussia restricted corporal punishments in reformatories already in the early 1920s, and banned it for all girls and for boys over age fourteen in 1929; mandated the introduction of training for reformatory staff in social work schools in 1930; and further limited the use of punishments such as solitary confinement or hair-shearing in 1931. Saxony and Hamburg pursued a similar course.[82] At the same time, often drawing on antecedents in the prewar period, a number of leading pedagogical theorists with ties to Social Democracy and the youth movement developed an aggressively liberal, democratic, and modernist 'reform pedagogy' that eschewed authoritarian character formation in favour of self-direction and the development of the child's innate gifts.[83]

Yet most of these practical reforms were too little and too late; and the theories of reformers had little impact on private, religious reformatories committed to a set of practices and traditions almost a century old. In 1926 an official in Berlin's self-consciously progressive Youth Bureau delivered a blistering attack on the traditional methods of most reformatories, remarking that most were 'ossified and rigid' in their pedagogical methods, entirely focused on imposing obedience and conformity, cut off from society and unaware of economic and social

realities, and had yet to make 'the step from discipline to actual education', and that a really modern approach had been developed only by a 'thin, shining upper layer' atop the mass of institutions. Even in 1932 Egon Behnke believed that only a few dozen of the hundreds of reformatories operated according to modern principles.[84]

In fact, along with the broader challenge posed by the expansion of public child-welfare programmes generally, the efforts of governments and pedagogical theorists to reform correctional education sparked an aggressive backlash among conservative Christian practitioners. Wilhelm Backhausen, for example, launched an embittered critique of Carl Wilker's ideas in the early 1920s, rejecting the optimistic vision of humanity at the root of the latter's pedagogical reform initiative. 'Moral freedom', he reiterated in 1921, 'can only come through obedience, that is by way of authority.'[85] And at the AFET's annual conference in 1926, Pastor Büchsel issued a virtual declaration of war against the new pedagogy, demanding that educators have the 'courage' to impose 'a strict and joyous discipline', denouncing 'democracy in the reformatory', and proclaiming his allegiance to 'patriarchalism'. Evil, he reminded his listeners, 'rules the world, and even children . . . in reformatories are subject to the mysterious and terrible power of evil and of sin' — from which they must be rescued through unconditional obedience to the director's will.[86] A number of Büchsel's colleagues and co-speakers, including the new chairman of the AFET, were clearly taken aback.[87] But many practitioners seem to have agreed with Büchsel: Otto Flug remarked of the AFET conference in the following year, at which the keynote speaker elucidated many of the arguments of reform pedagogy, that there was a 'broad undercurrent in the assembly . . . which hardly corresponded to the new pedagogical spirit and . . . the intentions of the leading personalities'.[88]

In a rapidly modernizing society, all of this meant that correctional education was increasingly out of step with the values prevailing in society at large. The central problem of the cultural divide between proletarian and middle-class society was increasingly unmistakable. By 1926, one Social Democratic official in Hamburg would remark flatly that the 'very different structure of the proletarian family', in which children had 'a quite remarkable independence', made them unreceptive to a pedagogy founded on

authority and discipline.[89] And in 1925 one leading Catholic child-welfare advocate observed that 'children of the lower classes who are, in the judgement of their families and members of their class, in no way wayward are often held to be so by members of the upper classes'.[90] In an economy in which skilled labour was increasingly at a premium and employment opportunities for young people desperately constrained, moreover, the failure to modernize vocational training was similarly a source of mounting resentment.[91] The fact that a growing proportion of urban youth belonged to essentially autonomous organizations, including particularly socialist and communist groups whose members would be ideologically resistant precisely to the methods and values of middle-class conservative Christian educators, made the commitment of a steadily rising number of 'children' of eighteen, nineteen or twenty years of age increasingly problematic. Berlin's State Youth Bureau reported in 1925, for example, that 'the great majority of minors committed after graduation from school are influenced by and oriented toward radical politics. In this orientation they often come into the reformatories with a fanatical hatred and deep-seated defensiveness toward their future teachers, and plot revolts and disorders.'[92]

In fact, even the courts and the Youth Bureaus created by the RJWG were, in the second half of the decade, clearly losing faith in correctional education — a development that was reflected, for example, in a steady decline in the number of commitments in Prussia, from 10,885 in 1925 to only 6626 in 1929, a drop of almost 40 percent.[93] Increasingly, reformatories faced a problem of underoccupancy; in the Rhineland, fully 22.1 percent of all available spaces in reformatories were unfilled in 1929.[94] In part, this decline reflects demographic trends — the number of Germans under the age of twenty fell by 11.7 percent between 1925 and 1933.[95] But it was a consequence also of the growing scepticism of administrators in more progressive branches of the child-welfare establishment. By 1930 the director of one county Youth Bureau asked whether the Youth Bureaus could still petition the courts to commit children at all, in light of the abuses which were coming to light and of the fact that they had no influence on the reformatories themselves.[96] This stance also helps to explain the rising average age of children in the reformatories, to which both courts and Youth Bureaus were reluctant to commit any but the hardest cases.

Correctional education was thus caught in a downward spiral, tormented by a steadily escalating level of confrontation between conservative educators and an increasingly older, more politicized and more resentful institutional population. Growing public criticism was given voice particularly by Social Democrats and Communists in press and parliament; in 1928 the Gilde Soziale Arbeit (Social Work Guild), a grouping of left-liberal, socialist and youth-movement social workers founded in 1925, formed a 'Task-Force for the Reform of Correctional Education'; in December of 1928 a play by Peter Martin Lampel titled 'Revolt in the Reformatory' became a *cause célèbre*, and sparked a wave of press coverage and public meetings at which former inmates told all; in 1929 the Social Democratic welfare organization Workers' Welfare published a proposal for a comprehensive overhaul of the entire correctional education system; and by June 1931 radical socialist and communist groups formed a 'Committee for Struggle Against Correctional Education'. Perhaps partly because of this public atmosphere, a wave of revolts rocked the reformatories. There were at least four such rebellions in 1927 and 1928, two in March of 1929 (including one at the Lindenhof), and one each in September and November 1929 and January, February, March, September and October of 1930.[97] The trials sparked by these uprisings, and sensational press coverage, brought to light widespread physical and even sexual abuse, financial exploitation, poor food and housing, and repeated cover-ups. By 1930, Gustav von Mann of the national association of Catholic charities, the Caritasverband, spoke of a 'frontal assault' on correctional education by the mass media, while the Inner Mission's Alfred Fritz admitted that the public seemed to think the staff in its institutions were 'idiots, sadists and hypocrites'.[98]

One response to this deepening, seemingly permanent crisis of correctional education was the widening adoption of the theory that organic defects were the cause of 'ineducability' among young people. This trend was reinforced in the later 1920s by a broader vogue for eugenics, and by the growing popularity of the concept of 'psychopathy'. In the course of the 1920s, a new sub-discipline of welfare work, 'psychopath welfare' (*Psychopathenfürsorge*), developed around this diagnosis, with a particular focus on young offenders. A 'National Association for the Care of Young Psychopaths', led by Ruth van der Leyen, had

been founded in October of 1918, and played an increasingly important role in debates about correctional education in the later 1920s, urging the development of separate facilities and treatment for 'psychopaths'. Between 1920 and 1927, in fact, 58 special homes, sections of existing reformatories, and clinics for 'psychopathic' youth were opened.[99] The work-shy, the vagrant, the politically radical, the sexually active, girls who dressed fashionably, or those who read too many detective stories were all liable to be branded 'psychopathic' or 'ineducable'; above all, psychopathy was used to label those who made trouble for reformatory staff. Some, in fact, even went so far as to suggest that reformatory revolts were caused by 'degenerates' who were drawn to radical political ideas precisely because they were by nature morally inferior. Estimates of the number of 'abnormal' or 'psychopathic' youths in reformatories reached new highs in the interwar period: in a classic study in 1918, for example, Adalbert Gregor and Else Voigtländer concluded that between 85 percent and 95 percent of all reformatory inmates were 'hereditarily tainted' (*erblich belastet*) and even the Prussian government conceded that 31 percent of those in correctional education were not 'normal'.[100] By the early 1930s, the idea that what was needed to save correctional education was the 'cleaning up' of the reformatories through the exclusion of the 'abnormal' and 'ineducable' was a central topic of discussion among child-welfare experts, and at the top of the AFET's agenda.

This concern generated new enthusiasm for the idea of *Bewahrung* among many in correctional education. As Peukert has shown, in some cases pedagogical reformers supported the idea of *Bewahrung* as a necessary consequence of their emphasis on individual autonomy. As one Hanoverian administrator pointed out at the 1927 conference of the AFET, if 'the formation of character can only be achieved through self-education', then clearly 'we must renounce this goal in . . . cases of abnormality', where the rationality (much less the good will) of the subject could not be assumed.[101] The exclusion of 'abnormal', 'psychopathic' children was therefore often seen as a precondition for a progressive reform of correctional education.

A more common motivation among practitioners, however, was sheer frustration and the desire to be rid of children who disrupted and discredited their institutions. As the keynote speaker at the same conference noted, emphasis on hereditary abnormal-

ity could easily lead to 'pedagogical nihilism'; and he remarked upon 'how often already today the slogan "hereditary defect" serves as a disguise for the neglect of pedagogical duties'.[102] A good example might be the psychiatrist Otto Mönkemöller, whose list of those who should be excluded from correctional education included those with 'insufficient ethics and morals', the 'eternal runaways', the 'born whores' and the 'eternally discontented elements who always feel discriminated against and insulted, who secretly and openly oppose their own education'.[103] In a notorious essay of 1931, similarly, the conservative Protestant Helmuth Schreiner blamed political agitators, liberal pedagogues and the 'corrupt hereditary material' (*zerstörten Erbmasse*) of reformatory inmates for the revolts in Protestant reformatories.[104]

Leading reformist child-welfare advocates continued to be more sceptical. Christian Jasper Klumker remarked at the 1925 AFET conference that if ordinary methods failed with a particular group of children, then extraordinary ones must be developed; and at the organization's 1929 conference the director of the Lindenhof held that so-called 'ineducability' was actually simply a product of 'the application of mistaken pedagogical methods'.[105] Even some who embraced the idea of 'psychopathy' and 'abnormality' were sceptical about the direct connection between such conditions and behaviour. Werner Villinger, head of the medical section of Hamburg's Youth Bureau, remarked in 1927 that while certain nervous disorders were heritable, behaviours were not, so that 'with respect to heredity there are only potential criminals, potential ineducables'.[106] And Ruth van der Leyen, for all her commitment to 'psychopath welfare', was able to discern the social origins of 'abnormal' behaviour, discovering that children who wet the bed, ate food found on the streets, tortured animals, or ate their own excrement — behaviours some regarded as hereditary — were often the victims of frequent moves from one foster family to another, of 'poor socialization, a lack of love, a bad environment'.[107] The leading pedagogical reformers and reformist practitioners, in any case, had no doubt where the fault for reformatory revolts lay. Heinrich Webler recommended radical measures such as closing or boycotting poor reformatories, and immediate dismissal of incompetent staff. Lene Mann remarked that many reformatories 'contradict the pedagogical and humanitarian sentiments of the twentieth century in the

grossest manner'. And Curt Bondy summed up the general mood on the left in 1930: 'Better no reformatories', he concluded, 'than bad ones.'[108]

Such doubts were one important reason — along with a struggle over financing and fear of abuses — for the failure of efforts to introduce *Bewahrung* in the late 1920s. The Depression, however, finally did create an opportunity to 'clean up' the reformatories. In Prussia, funding for correctional education fell from 41 million Marks in 1928/9 to 15 million in 1932/3 (with annual expenditure per pupil dropping from 683 Marks in 1929/30 to 570 Marks in 1932/3), and there were similar cuts elsewhere.[109] Faced with the imperative of saving money and with agitation by the AFET for the removal of the 'ineducable' from institutions, in early November of 1932 the national government promulgated a decree that mandated the termination of correctional education at age nineteen (rather than at twenty-one), prohibited the commitment of children in whose cases there was 'clearly no prospect of success' for correctional education, and allowed the immediate release of eighteen-year-olds if it was judged that correctional education could not help them, and of children of any age who showed 'considerable intellectual or mental abnormalities'. At the same time, the decree attempted to restore the idea of 'preventive' commitment of younger children by ruling that children could be committed wherever removal from the family was necessary to prevent their becoming 'wayward', but was not possible 'without the use of public monies' — the phrase used in the Prussian revision of 1915, and dropped from the RJWG.[110]

In its outlines, this decree could be seen as a reasonable response to the problems of correctional education. The undertone of the discussion was, however, hardly enlightened. A proposal to allow the transfer of 'ineducable' youths to the work-house, advanced by some in the government and the charities in late 1931, was defeated by more progressive child-welfare advocates; but the idea of *Bewahrung* clearly lurked in the background. And the growing preference for transferring 'treatment' of young offenders from 'welfare' to criminal authorities was clear in changes in the practice of the children's courts: they imposed no punishment in 20.7 percent of all cases in 1931, but only in 18.2 percent in 1932 and 16.5 percent in 1933; and the percentage of convictions that resulted in imprisonment

fell from 56.8 in 1925 to 48.6 in 1929, then rose to 57.4 in 1932.[111]

Some pedagogical reformers tried to move with the tide. At a conference in October 1932, for example, Hermann Nohl, the leading theorist of 'social pedagogy', announced that the age of 'liberal individual' and 'democratic-social' pedagogy was giving way to that of 'the idea of service' and of the 'commitment [*Bindung*, or 'binding' — ERD] of the liberated energies'; and Curt Bondy gave a confused speech in which he denounced authoritarian methods, but conceded that the sentimental spirit and extravagant individualism of the youth movement were not suited to a new, harder era.[112] To little avail: by 1932, leading spokespeople for liberalizing reforms were already being purged from their positions in the public child-welfare system; and already in early 1932 Egon Behnke remarked that the Depression had encouraged a determined 'return to the "good old"' methods in correctional education.[113] Reform pedagogy and progressive child-welfare advocates would fare even worse under National Socialism, which struck an unabashedly reactionary pedagogical posture in the early 1930s. Bondy was relieved of his position as director of a prison for juvenile offenders in Thuringia by the new Nazi government of that state in late 1932. Christian Klumker was forced into retirement in 1933, when he called for a boycott to protest the cashiering of Jewish professors at his university, in Frankfurt. Gertrud Bäumer lost her post as privy councillor in the national Ministry of the Interior.[114] The 'Guidelines' put out by the Nazi Party's own welfare organization (the National Socialist People's Welfare, or Nationalsozialistische Volkswohlfahrt, NSV) in July 1933 held that

> . . . the position of the reform pedagogues in the last few years led to negation, to disintegration and dissolution. National Socialist child welfare must be built up against waywardness and rebelliousness, on the basis of the will of youth to discipline, to community, to honour.[115]

Lothar Koepchen, director of the Provincial Youth Bureau of Hanover, voiced central themes in Nazi discourse when he held a year later that the crisis of correctional education had been the product of 'agitation' by the left and 'sentimental and liberal pedagogy', that 'no new pedagogical truths can or should be discovered', and that Nazi principles demanded a return to 'education for inner discipline, that is, for obedience, conformity,

reliability, and love of work'.[116] And while Weimar reform pedagogy had argued for an approach that 'starts with the child' (education *vom Kinde aus*), Ernst Krieck, the leading Nazi pedagogical theorist, observed that Nazi educational methods must proceed not 'from the child, from his needs or even wishes . . . but from the *Volk*. For the goal is not the little individualistic personality, but membership in the *Volk*, in the great whole.'[117] The Prussian ban on corporal punishment in the reformatories was officially rescinded by a decree of July 1935; it and similar measures had in any case been ignored since 1933.

Many Christian and particularly Protestant conservatives in the correctional education establishment welcomed much of this with enthusiasm. Alfred Fritz, director of the Protestant National Education Association, welcomed the 'earnest and determined will of the new regime to stop up the wellsprings of waywardness', while for his assistant Ina Hundinger the seizure of power was 'liberating'.[118] And Elisabeth Zillken, director of the largest Catholic child-welfare organization, proclaimed in May of 1933 that if 'the state combats godlessness . . . if it wants to use its power to end the impudent immorality of the past few years, then we have reason to be thankful to it'.[119] Within correctional education, in 1934 the director of the most prestigious Protestant reformatory celebrated the 'overthrow of Bolshevism' by the 'fists of the SA' as a great contribution to the work of the reformatories; another Protestant reformatory director remarked in 1935 that she saw it as 'the almost unique claim to honour of correctional education that . . . it fit into the Third Reich as it was. Its earlier problem was that it was born too early'; and the AFET, in a position paper of July 1933, even persuaded itself that the new state would recognize that the 'deepest content and essential foundation of correctional education is religious education'.[120] Most conservative Christians were soon disillusioned, and Zillken, Fritz, and Hundinger published courageous public criticisms of the Nazis in 1934 and 1935; but in early 1933, many conservative Christians did not yet understand the real nature of the Nazi regime.

IV

While there certainly was an exclusionary logic to 'reform pedagogy', then, the appeal of early Nazi policy in correctional-education circles was more a product of a reactionary defence of authoritarian practices than of the onward march of child-welfare 'reform'. It is also important to understand, however, that even as the number of children in public programmes expanded rapidly in the later 1920s, correctional education had actually been in decline since 1925, as child-welfare policy shifted toward a less intrusive and coercive approach. In 1925 there had been 64,384 children in correctional education in Prussia; by 1930, there were only 50,197.[121]

One means of accomplishing this shift was to seek to lower rates of institutionalization through the use of 'protective supervision' — a kind of probationary system in which juvenile delinquents or 'wayward' children were assigned social workers, often after being given a suspended sentence. Already an important alternative to correctional education in some cities in the 1910s, protective supervision was given legal form by the RJWG, and expanded rapidly in the 1920s — often as a less intrusive alternative to correctional education for children judged less 'wayward'. By 1930 there were 73,000 children under protective supervision.[122] Another method was to attempt to reduce the level of confrontation with families by adopting 'voluntary educational assistance' (*Freiwillige Erziehungshilfe* or FEH), under which parents placed their children in the care of the correctional education authorities or of the local Child Welfare Office (Jugendamt) without a court order, often at somewhat younger ages. In Hamburg, where it had been used since 1910, FEH was the dominant form by the mid-1920s, and in the Coblenz district of the Rheinprovinz, where FEH was introduced in 1927, the number of children committed voluntarily was already greater than those committed by the courts by 1930.[123] In 1956, one leading socialist child-welfare advocate recalled that the Youth Bureaus' use of FEH in the 1920s had amounted to 'something like a boycott against correctional education'.[124]

Still more important was a long-term shift in the direction of a preventive strategy, rather than of intervention. The massive expansion of child-welfare programmes since 1900 had brought a growing number of social workers and officials into contact with

working-class families. One result was a growing understanding of the *social* (rather than moral or biological) origins of 'waywardness'; another was a growing understanding of the connections between the various problems addressed by separate programmes — juvenile delinquency and waywardness, infant mortality, abuse and neglect, illegitimacy, poor vocational preparation, and so forth. Particularly as the problems of correctional education deepened, the ideal of a unified preventive and compensatory — rather than corrective — child-welfare system, one that would avoid confrontation with parents and children, was increasingly advocated as an alternative to correctional education. The idea of offering parents preventive advisory 'services', moreover, gradually emerged as central to this approach. Already in 1905 Wilhelm Polligkeit had explicitly presented the idea of a comprehensive public child-welfare system centred on public legal guardianship over illegitimate children as a superior alternative to the expansion of correctional education and juvenile justice. In a seminal essay of that year, he remarked that repressive measures would always remain largely 'a treatment of symptoms, a treatment of the consequences rather than the causes'. Since it was largely limited 'merely to censure of . . . the abuse of parental authority', it was also coercive and confrontational. What was lacking in the emerging child-welfare system of the day was 'above all an *advisory* function in cases where the child's education is endangered not by bad behaviour, but merely by lack of understanding'. In a second essay in the following year, pointing to a well-known private advice, career-guidance, and placement programme for school-leavers in Berlin, he suggested that a similar system centred on public legal guardianship (and drawing on teachers to refer cases) would 'present the picture of that regular, organized, preventive supervision which alone, in contrast to the repressive methods of our criminal and correctional education laws, seems suited to work prophylactically against waywardness and crime', and welcomed the great 'transition from repressive to preventive treatment of moral degeneration' accomplished by the emergence of public guardianship.[125] In 1910 Herbert Kraus, similarly, explicitly warned that the centrality of criminal and wayward youth to child-welfare policy was dangerous, since 'a public reaction must set in' against 'the tactics of modern child welfare'; and he observed that public legal guardianship did not share this drawback.[126] By 1916, Aloys

Fischer proposed the creation of a network of 'educational counselling stations' (*Erziehungsberatungsstellen*) to assist parents in raising particularly difficult children.[127]

While psychiatry formed the 'scientific' basis for strategies of stigmatization and exclusion in correctional education, psychology and particularly psychoanalytic theory increasingly emerged as the foundation for this alternative approach. In the 1920s psychological theory was still in its infancy, and 'educational counselling' (*Erziehungsberatung*), as it came to be called, was not widespread; there were about eighty educational counselling clinics in the country at the end of the decade, established mainly by socialist-dominated big-city child-welfare offices.[128] But educational counselling was important because it offered a very different model for child-welfare services as a whole. In an article of 1928, Lene Mann of the Frankfurt Youth Bureau outlined the role that educational counselling might play in bringing about a fundamental shift in child-welfare policy. With leading 'social pedagogues' like Hermann Nohl, she insisted that the work of the Youth Bureaus must become more preventive if the public child-welfare system were to be effective, and if it were to escape from the immediate crisis which threatened it. The problems the reformatories had with older children, she pointed out, indicated that the Youth Bureaus were not identifying early enough, cases in which socialization by the family was failing. At the same time, late intervention meant that the Youth Bureau had to use the most draconian measure at its disposal, correctional education. As a result, 'the activities of the Youth Bureaus are easily judged, in the eyes of the parents, as an attack on their rights, as an often arbitrary coercive measure which is directed only at a certain class of the population'.[129] The obvious response to this double crisis, she argued, was simply to transform the Youth Bureau into an 'educational counselling station'. Mann's views were prescient: after 1945 educational counselling, strongly backed by US and British occupation administrations familiar with the very similar models dominant in the USA and the UK, became a central feature of the German child-welfare system.

V

None of the ideas, approaches, or institutional forms central to this alternative strategy in child-welfare policy were necessarily or intrinsically democratic and humane. In fact, most of them were also adopted by Nazi child-welfare policy makers and organizations. The idea of 'prevention' lay at the root of the Nazis' mass sterilization programme; perhaps more to the point, Nazi theorists constantly stressed the need for preventive care for the healthy ('Vorsorge' or provision for the future, rather than 'Fürsorge' or welfare), and the NSV translated that commitment into institutional forms and programmes that echoed and built on those of the 1920s. It created some 130 'Youth Homes' (*Jugendheimstätten*) which in many respects resembled the experimental reformatories created, for example, by Workers' Welfare — stressing earlier commitment, integration into the community, short stays, the 'rehabilitation' of the family and the return of the child to its parents, and even (in an authoritarian, ideologically monolithic, and disciplinarian form) a degree of self-government.[130] Particularly after 1940, it also developed an extensive system of 'educational counselling' (though not on a psychoanalytic basis).[131] The Nazi regime gave FEH legal form by a decree of 1943.[132] Of course, many of those involved in these initiatives were not Nazis at all, but child-welfare administrators and advocates who had been active in municipal and state government well before 1933 and continued their work as best they could under the new regime. But in the Nazi system as a whole, such programmes were predicated on the exclusion of the 'abnormal' or 'defective' — who received very different treatment at the hands of the Nazi medical and internal 'security' establishments. The point, again, is not that these ideas *could not* be part of a totalitarian, exclusionary, and murderous policy structure.

Quite aside from the problem of National Socialism, furthermore, it should also be clear that more modern and progressive models for child-welfare policy certainly did not represent a retreat from social intervention. In fact, of course, probation, legal guardianship, pedagogical counselling, and so forth actually generated a *more* ubiquitous system, touched *more* lives, often for longer periods. By the late 1950s, for example, some prominent child-welfare advocates argued that up to one-third of all children should be under the care of public programmes of various

kinds.[133] What is more, while these programmes were much less overtly coercive than correctional education, parents and children were in many cases no less obliged to tolerate them; where they refused to do so, forcible removal of the child from its family often remained an ultimate sanction, and an implied or explicit threat.[134] Correctional education shrank substantially in the first two postwar decades, but did not disappear; in fact, it passed through yet another cycle of scandals and revolts in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

Nevertheless, close examination of the history of correctional education suggests that Detlev Peukert's interpretation of that history must be modified in two fundamental ways. First, to the extent that Peukert's reasoning implies that there was a crisis of confrontation and resistance — much less a logical progression toward exclusion or murder of those who could not be 'normalized' — pre-programmed into the theory or practice of modern child-welfare policy, it is clearly incorrect. The child-welfare system built up after 1945 on the same progressive principles Peukert found so ominous was neither totalitarian nor crisis-ridden, nor was it exclusionary, nor did it appeal in the face of difficulty and resistance to eugenic or psychiatric science. This was true not despite, but rather precisely because of the seemingly relentless expansion of social-managerial ambition among progressive child-welfare advocates in the 1920s, and again after 1949. The goal of progressive child-welfare reformers was, after all, in part to avoid confrontation and crisis by managing more lives less intrusively. Securing the effective social integration and inclusion of more people, they believed, would *prevent* the emergence of the kinds of 'deviance' or social disorder that correctional education had been intended to *correct*. That strategy appears to have functioned well — at the very least rhetorically, regardless of its actual social effect. Focused on prevention and inclusion rather than selection and correction, and structured by the twin discourses of democracy and psychoanalysis, the postwar project of managing social problems did not develop a confrontational or exclusionary logic with respect to its targets.

Again, this is not to say that Peukert was incorrect in arguing that the ideal of effective socialization and education for all posed the problem of the 'ineducable', of those who could not or would not conform and participate, with new urgency; and he was also correct in seeing an exclusionary potential in the 'reform peda-

gogy' of the 1920s. But his fixation on the 'pathology' of the modern led him to focus almost exclusively on the 'crisis' of child welfare, and on the ways that crisis fuelled escalating coercion and exclusion. He was strangely blind to the fact that only one part of the German child-welfare system was in crisis; that in other parts of that system alternative approaches were emerging that were progressively less coercive and more inclusive; and that even within correctional education solutions pointing toward a building-down of coercion and confrontation were emerging already in the 1920s. In short, there were coercive and totalitarian solutions to the problems social policy created for itself; but there were also more inclusive, less coercive solutions. As a whole, the German child-welfare system was moving toward the adoption of the latter, more than the former, in the 1920s.[135]

Second, what brought about the crisis in correctional education was the failure of that institution to adjust to the cultural, social, and political changes that characterized the emergence of urban industrial society. Legislators who built the ethos and methods of nineteenth-century Christian reformatories into the new compulsory public correctional education system in 1900 — to which masses of working-class youth were committed, against the will of their families — failed to take into account the fact that in the working classes men and women of fourteen, fifteen, or nineteen or twenty years of age simply were not 'children'; and most of those who operated those reformatories failed to revise their methods to suit the new institutional population. Accordingly, they also failed to develop pedagogical methods (or even merely attitudes) appropriate to the children confined in their institutions.[136] As Dietrich Oberwittler's masterful comparative study of Prussian and English correctional education before 1914 has shown, the English system abandoned the attempt to 're-educate' older youth in the two decades around the turn of the century, and was in any case less beholden to conservative Christian conceptions of moral order; in consequence, it did not suffer the same kind of crisis.[137]

This, then, was the actual content of the collision between bourgeois reformers and the 'life-worlds' of working-class youth. The problem was not a generic one, it did not derive from the irreconcilable clash of 'totalizing, systematic logics' and the 'premises of bureaucratic efficiency' with the complexities of individual experience or capitalist social development. The crisis

of correctional education derived, instead, concretely from the clash of divergent values and expectations rooted in radically different class cultures. The popularity of psychiatric models of organic mental and moral deficiency within the correctional education establishment was less a response to an irreconcilable conflict between bureaucratic rationality and subjective life-worlds than the product of the constraints imposed on a particular set of institutions by the particular class culture dominant among those who controlled them. The problem was that both correctional education itself and the methods used in the reformatories were rooted in the patriarchal culture of early nineteenth-century conservative Christianity and of the old middle classes, and were progressively more at odds with modern cultural and social conditions among the urban poor and working classes. It may or may not be appropriate to use the metaphor of 'colonialism' to describe modern social policy; in any case, it was the specific values shaping the methods of the 'colonizers' that made Prussian correctional education so unstable.

If there was a 'pathology' in German child welfare, then, it was a pathology of anti-modernism, not of modernity; not of reform, but of the failure to reform; not of the Enlightenment and rationalism, but of the failure of authoritarian, anti-Enlightenment, conservative religious traditions and institutions to adjust to the conditions of modern life. And the solution did not lie, as Peukert put it, in 'personal experience, individual actions of the righteous [*individuelle Handlungen des aufrechten Ganges*]',[138] but in the development of institutional forms and methods that were appropriate to the modern age and to the needs and wants of the targets of policy. Those forms and methods were being developed even as correctional education ran up against insurmountable contradictions at the end of the 1920s. After 1945, in a political and intellectual context shaped by the emergence of modern Christian Democracy and by the new legitimacy of Social Democracy, they formed the foundation for a remarkably comprehensive and stable child-welfare system in West Germany.

Notes

1. *Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch vom 18. August 1896 nebst Einführungsgesetze vom 18. August 1896* (Munich 1900), 398; *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des preussischen Herrenhauses*, vol. 439, document no. 8. On the history of the law, see Marcus Gräser, *Der blockierte Wohlfahrtsstaat. Unterschichtsjugend*

und Jugendfürsorge in der Weimarer Republik (Göttingen); Christa Hasenclever, *Jugendhilfe und Jugendgesetzgebung seit 1900* (Göttingen 1978); Derek S. Linton, *'Who Has the Youth, Has the Future': The Campaign to Save Young Workers in Imperial Germany* (Cambridge 1991); Detlev J.K. Peukert, *Grenzen der Sozialdisziplinierung. Aufstieg und Krise der deutschen Jugendfürsorge, 1878–1932* (Cologne 1986); Hans Scherpner, *Geschichte der Jugendfürsorge* (Göttingen 1969); Antonius Wolf, *Zur Geschichte der Sozialpädagogik im Rahmen der sozialen Entwicklung* (Donauwörth 1977); Andreas Wollasch, *Der katholische Fürsorgeverein für Mädchen, Frauen, und Kinder (1899–1945)* (Freiburg 1991); and above all now Dietrich Oberwittler, 'Von Strafe zur Erziehung? Zur Entwicklung der Jugendkriminalpolitik in England und Deutschland, ca. 1850–1920' (disseration, Trier 1998), and *Von der Strafe zur Erziehung. Jugendkriminalpolitik in England und Deutschland 1850–1920)* (Frankfurt am Main 2000). The present article is based largely on chapters from my own book *The Politics of German Child Welfare from the Empire to the Federal Republic* (Cambridge, MA 1996).

2. *Stenographische Berichte*, vol. 439, document no. 31, 292.
3. J. Tews, 'Sozialpädagogik', *Die Jugendfürsorge*, Vol. 1 (1900), 259.
4. Peukert, *Grenzen*, 21, 309.
5. Ibid., 311, 307.
6. Ibid., 309, 19, 67, 307.
7. Ibid., 295.
8. Ibid., 294–5, 312, 67.
9. Ibid., 77.
10. For similar readings of Peukert's argument, see Young-Sun Hong, *Welfare, Modernity and the Weimar State* (Princeton, NJ 1998), 4, and Gräser, *Der blockierte Wohlfahrtsstaat*, 13.
11. Quoted in Peukert, *Grenzen*, 203.
12. Ibid., 300.
13. Ibid., 301.
14. For the *locus classicus* of this argument, see Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *The German Empire*, trans. Kim Traynor (Leamington Spa 1985). For a contrasting view, see Geoff Eley, 'What Produces Fascism', in *From Unification to Nazism: Reinterpreting the German Past* (New York 1986). The term 'crisis of classical modernity' is from Peukert's *The Weimar Republic: The Crisis of Classical Modernity*, trans. Richard Deveson (New York 1992).
15. Quoted in Ulrich Hermann, 'Der "Jüngling" und der "Jugendliche": Männliche Jugend im Spiegel polarisierender Wahrnehmungsmuster an der Wende vom 19. zum 20. Jahrhundert in Deutschland', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, Vol. 11 (1985), 212. On the problem of working-class youth, see also, among others, John Gillis, *Youth in History* (New York 1974), esp. 37–66; Linton, *'Who Has the Youth'*, 19–72; Peukert, *Grenzen*, 37–68; Jürgen Reulecke, 'Bürgerliche Sozialreformer und Arbeiterjugend im Kaiserreich', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, Vol. 22 (1982).
16. Johannes Corvey, 'Die heutige Arbeiterjugend', 192–3.
17. Quoted in Peukert, *Grenzen*, 55–6.
18. 'Erläuterungen zum Entwurf eines Gesetzes betr. die Zwangserziehung verbrecherischer und verwahrloster Jugendlicher', Zentrales Staatsarchiv Merseburg (hereinafter ZSAM), Rep. 191, Preussisches Ministerium des Innern, no. 1995, fol. 271 (3).

19. Martin Hennig, 'Zum neuen Jahre', *Fliegende Blätter*, Vol. 59 (1902), 3. On the situation of the Christian reformatories, see 'Die alte Gefahr — erneuert sich wieder', *Rettungshausbote*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1896), 17–19, and *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des preussischen Herrenhauses*, Vol. 439, document no. 8, 31.

20. Agnes Neuhaus, 'Die praktische Bedeutung des §1666 BGB', in Vorstand des Caritasverbandes, ed., *Die staatliche und gemeindliche Jugendfürsorge und die Caritas* (Freiburg 1912), 176, 177.

21. Gustav von Rohden, 'Von der prinzipiellen Tragweite des Fürsorge-Erziehungs-Gesetzes', *Jugendfürsorge*, Vol. 2 (1901), 68; Carl von Massow, *Das preussische Fürsorgeerziehungsgesetz vom 2. Juli 1900 und die Mitwirkung der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft bei seiner Ausführung* (Berlin 1901), 3.

22. 'Flugblatt herausgegeben von der Kommission für Kinderschutz', Landesarchiv Berlin, Helene-Lange-Archiv, Film 51-236, 2.

23. Aschrott, 'Das preussische FEG. in der Praxis', *Jugendfürsorge*, Vol. 4 (1903), 129–36. For a compilation of figures for correctional education, see Peukert, *Grenzen*, 328.

24. *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des preussischen Landtages. Herrenhaus*, vol. 439 (1901), document 8, 31. Figures for 1914 from Fr. Recke, 'Die Durchführung der Fürsorgeerziehung in Preussen', *Concordia*, Vol. 15 (1908), 1–6, 48–54.

25. Figures from Peukert, *Grenzen*, 330; *Rettungshausbote*, Vol. 25 (1904/5), 5, and *Rettungshausbote*, Vol. 29 (1908/9), 5.

26. See *Stenographischer Bericht über die Verhandlungen der 23. Jahresversammlung des Deutschen Vereins für Armenpflege und Wohltätigkeit* (Berlin and Leipzig 1903), and *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Preussischen Hauses der Abgeordneten*, 1903, Vol. 1, 1146–70.

27. Franz Recke, 'Die Durchführung der Fürsorgeerziehung in Preusen', *Concordia*, Vol. 15 (1908), 1.

28. Oberwittler, 'Von Strafe zur Erziehung?', 238.

29. 'Paragraph 1, Ziffer 1 preussisches Fürsorgeerziehungsgesetz. Begriff der Verwahrlosungsgefahr', *Zentralblatt für Vormundschaftswesen, Jugendgerichte, und Fürsorgeerziehung* (hereinafter *Zentralblatt*), Vol. 2 (1910), 285–6.

30. Oberwittler, 'Von Strafe zur Erziehung?', 313.

31. See 'Eine tieftraurige Nachricht', *Rettungshausbote*, Vol. 26 (1906), 30; 'Die preußische Fürsorgeerziehung', *Kommunale Praxis* (hereinafter *KP*), Vol. 5 (1905), col. 867; von Baehr, 'Die Furcht vor der Erziehungsanstalt', *Jugendfürsorge*, Vol. 7 (1906), 297–301.

32. Wilhelm Backhausen, 'Das Entweichen der Fürsorgezöglinge', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 2 (1911), 244–5; Oberwittler, 'Von Strafe zur Erziehung?', 273.

33. *Bericht über die Verhandlungen des Allgemeinen Fürsorge-Erziehungs-Tages vom 24.–27. Juni 1912 zu Dresden* (Halle 1912), 42.

34. See 'Zur Abwehr und Klärung', *Rettungshausbote*, Vol. 24 (1903), 118; *Bericht über die Verhandlungen des Allgemeinen Fürsorge-Erziehungs-Tages am 23.–27. Juni 1910 zu Rostock* (Berlin 1910), 116; Ernst Seidemann, 'Fürsorge-Erziehung und staatsbürgerliche Erziehung', *Jugendfürsorge*, Vol. 4 (1903), 258–9; *Bericht über die Verhandlungen . . . 1912 zu Dresden*, 42–7; and J. Chr. Hagen, 'Zur Anstaltlichen Behandlung unserer sittlich gefährdeten Jugend', *Zeitschrift für Kinderforschung*, Vol. 8 (1903).

35. Knaut quoted in Gräser, *Der blockierte Wohlfahrtsstaat*, 114.

36. Kauder, 'Was ist gegen das Entweichen der Zöglinge zu tun?', *Bericht über die Verhandlungen des Allgemeinen Fuersorgeerziehungs-Tages am 11.–14. Juni 1906 zu Breslau*, (Strausberg 1906), 99.

37. *Bericht über die Verhandlungen des Allgemeinen Fürsorge-Erziehungs-Tages . . . 1912*, 44.

38. Jean Ritzert, 'Zur Frage der Fürsorgeerziehung', *KP*, Vol. 11 (1911), col. 1526.

39. See *Bericht über die Tagung . . . 1912 zu Dresden*, 109; Karl Zielke, 'Strafe oder Erziehung?', *KP*, Vol. 11 (1911), col. 1640; Hans W. Gruhle, *Die Ursachen des Jugendlichen Verwahrlosung und Kriminalität. Studien zur Frage: Milieu oder Anlage* (Berlin 1912), 95, 243.

40. *Bericht über de Verhandlungen . . . 1906* (Strausberg 1906), 101; for an example, see 'Überweisung männlicher Fürsorgezöglinge in die Lehre', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 1 (1909), 212–13.

41. Paul Walther, 'Welches sind die in den Zwangserziehungsanstalten und Rettungshäuser am meisten vorkommenden sittlichen Fehler und Vergehungen der Zöglinge und wie sind sie zu beseitigen?', *Rettungshausbote*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1896), 13–16, 27–32, 42–8, 61–4, 75–80.

42. *Bericht über die Verhandlungen des Allgemeinen Fürsorge-Erziehungs-Tage . . . 1910*, 116.

43. Friedrich Paulsen, *Moderne Erziehung und geschlechtliche Sittlichkeit* (Berlin 1908), 88, 92.

44. *Bericht über die Verhandlungen des Allgemeinen Fürsorgeerziehungstages . . . 1912*, 43.

45. Günter Dehn, 'Grossstadtjugend', *Ratgeber für Jugendvereinigungen*, Vol. 8 (1914), 106.

46. Johannes Trüper, 'Die Gestaltung des Zwangserziehungswesens in Preussen im Jahre 1897/98', *Zeitschrift für Kinderforschung*, Vol. 5 (1900), 30–31; Dehn, 'Grossstadtjugend', 98, 102–3.

47. Rhiel, 'Die Vereinigung für katholische caritative Erziehungstätigkeit', *Jugendwohl*, Vol. 1 (1912), 3.

48. *Bericht über die Verhandlungen . . . 1906*, 101.

49. *Bericht über die Verhandlungen . . . 1912*, 44.

50. See, for example, 'Vorwort. Unsere Grundsätze', *Rettungshausbote*, Vol. 32 (1911), 1.

51. Krohne, 'Zur Frage der Abänderung des Gesetzes über die Fürsorgeerziehung Minderjähriger vom 2. Juli 1900', Geheimes Staatsarchiv preussischer Kulturbesitz (hereinafter GSAPKB), Rep. 84a, no. 10985, fol. 252.

52. See J. Trüper, 'Mieltschin', *Zeitschrift für Kinderforschung*, Vol. 16 (1911), 129–42, and 'Fürsorgeerziehung', *KP*, Vol. 9 (1909), col. 1041–7.

53. Zielke, 'Strafe oder Erziehung?', *KP*, Vol. 11 (1911), col. 1643; *Verhandlungen des Reichstages*, Vol. 286, 2901.

54. Trüper, 'Mieltschin', 139.

55. 'Unerhört' and 'Das Unheil geht weiter', *Rettungshausbote*, Vol. 32 (1911), 91–2.

56. 'Vorwort', *Rettungshausbote*, Vol. 31 (1911), 4.

57. J.F. Landsberg, 'Die Psychologie der normalen Jugendlichen', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 5 (1914), 219.

58. Friedrich Zimmer, 'Lebenserziehung', *Zeitschrift für Jugendwohlfahrt*, Vol. 1 (1910), 392, 393.

59. Gertrud Bäumer, 'Das Autoritätsproblem', *Zeitschrift dür Jugendwohlfahrtspflege/Der Säemann*, Vol. 2 (1911), 261, 257. Bäumer's liberal anti-Catholicism was central to her thinking on this point.

60. See, for example, 'Über die Jugendrepublik (George Junior Republic)', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 2 (1910/1911), 153–154; E.N., 'Fürsorgeerziehung im 'Jahrhundert des Kindes', *KP*, Vol. 5 (1905), col. 535; 'Von der Fürsorgeerziehung' *KP*, Vol. 12 (1912), col. 1260.

61. Knaut, 'Die Selbstverwaltung der älteren Fürsorgezöglinge', *Bericht über die Verhandlungen . . . 1912*, 159.

62. Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster, 'Autorität und Selbstregierung in der Leitung der Jugendlichen', *Zeitschrift für Kinderforschung*, Vol. 20 (1915), 388, 390–1, 387, 394–5, 388.

63. Adalbert Gregor, 'Zur Abgrenzung von Stufen moralischer Entwicklung und Verwahrlosung', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 9 (1917), 5–7.

64. Dr. Rizor, 'Bericht an den Landeshauptmann der Provinz Westfalen über die Ergebnisse der psychiatrisch-neurologischen Untersuchung der in den Anstalten befindlichen über 14 Jahre alten Fürsorgezöglinge Westfalens' (Münster 1908), also in *Zeitschrift für die Erforschung und Behandlung des jugendlichen Schwachsinns*, Vol. 3 (1909–10), 119–45.

65. Even the Social Democratic *Kommunale Praxis* published the figure 70 percent. See Gustav Major, 'Die Statistik sagt's — und trotzdem ist's nicht wahr', *KP*, Vol. 14 (1914), col. 648. For the estimate of 10 percent, see 'Statistik über die Fürsorgeerziehung Minderjähriger für das Rechnungsjahr 1906. Bearbeitet im Königlich preussischen Ministerium des Innern. Besprochen von Julius Moses', *Zeitschrift für Schulgesundheitspflege*, Vol. 21 (1908), 373.

66. So, for example, 'Die Erziehung erwachsener Fürsorgezöglinge', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 1 (1909), 117–18, or Agnes Neuhaus in *Bericht über die Verhandlungen . . . 1910*, 47.

67. 'Das neue Fürsorgegesetz im Königreich Sachsen', *Rettungshausbote*, Vol. 28 (1908), 188; Blochwitz, 'Soll das preussische Fürorgeerziehungsgesetz geändert werden?', *Innere Mission*, Vol. 5 (1910), 321.

68. Hans Uellner, 'Was sollen wir mit den sog. "Unverbesserlichen" machen?', *Jugendfürsorge*, Vol. 3 (1902), 525.

69. Gustav Major, 'Eine Anstalt für psychopathische Fürsorgezöglinge', *KP*, Vol. (1914), col. 707–10.

70. Seiffert, 'Allgemeine Fürsorgeerziehungstag (Rostock, 27. bis 30. Juni 1910)', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 2 (1910), 124.

71. Uellner, 'Was sollen wir', 526.

72. Pastor Siebold in *Bericht über die Verhandlungen des Allgemeinen Fürsorge-Eziehungs-Tages . . . 1910*, 117. See also 'Kampf der Ärzte gegen die Pädagogen?', *Rettungshausbote*, Vol. 29 (1909), 28–9.

73. Wilhelm Seiffert, 'Konferenz der Deutschen Zentrale für Jugendfürsorge über Probleme der Fürsorgeerziehung', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 2 (1910), 20; Wilhelm Seiffert, 'Bemerkungen zu dem Erlass vom 25. Dezember 1910', ZSAM, Rep. 191, no. 2718, fol. 85.

74. 'Aus den Gemeinden: Gross-Berliner Rundschau', *KP*, Vol. 6 (1906), col. 1224.

75. Foerster, 'Autorität und Selbstregierung', 399.

76. Klumker, 'Das Hauptproblem in der Fürsorgeerziehung', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 5 (1913/14), 93–4.

77. Schlegtendahl, 'Der Kampf wider die konfessionelle Jugendfürsorge', *Rheinische Jugendfürsorgeblatt*, Vol. 19 (1921), 21; Peukert, *Grenzen*, 327, 349.

78. See Elizabeth Harvey, *Youth and the Welfare State in the Weimar Republic* (Oxford 1993), 233.

79. See Peukert, *Grenzen*, 219.

80. Figures in Gräser, *Der blockierte Wohlfahrtsstaat*, 109.

81. See Gräser, *Der blockierte Wohlfahrtsstaat*, 112, 115, 116, 120; Peukert, *Grenzen*, 210–29. The expansion of the female profession of social work meant that girls' reformatories benefited increasingly from the presence of trained staff; still, the religious orders provided the majority of staff even there.

82. Prussian Ministerium für Volkswohlfahrt, *Erlass* of 10.2.1923, ADW, EREV 100, and *Evangelische Jugendhilfe*, Vol. 5, No. 8 (1929), 259–60; Heinrich Webler, 'Prügelstrafen und Beschwerderecht in den FE-Anstalten', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 21 (1929), 234; Gräser, *Der blockierte Wohlfahrtsstaat*, 114, 117, 137–9.

83. See Dickinson, *The Politics*, Chapter 7.

84. Helene John, 'Disziplin und Erziehung in den Fürsorgeerziehungsanstalten', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 17 (1925), 8, 6, 9; Egon Behnke quoted in Gräser, *Der blockierte Wohlfahrtsstaat*, 98.

85. Schlegtendahl, 'VII. Tagung des Allgemeinen Fürsorgeerziehungstages in Köln am 19. Mai 1921', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 13 (1921), 62.

86. 'Tagung des Hauptausschusses des Allgemeinen Fürsorgeerziehungstages in Hildesheim am 23. und 24. September 1926', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 18 (1926), 243.

87. Hertz, 'Nachklänge vom AFET in Hildesheim', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 18 (1926), 245.

88. Otto Flug, 'Der Allgemeine Fürsorgeerziehungstag', *Erziehung*, Vol. 3 (1928), 255; Christian Schrapper and Martin Scherpner, *75 Jahre AFET* (Hannover 1987), 48–53.

89. Bertha Paulsen, quoted in Gräser, *Der blockierte Wohlfahrtsstaat*, 102.

90. Karl Neundörfer, 'Die gefährdete Jugend und die Ordnung in Staat, Gesellschaft und Kirche', *Jugendwohl*, Vol. 14 (1925), 116.

91. Marcus Gräser even argued that this was the central cause of the wave of revolts at the end of the 1920s (see below); see *Der blockierte Wohlfahrtsstaat*, 125–6.

92. Landesjugendamt Berlin, *Fünf Jahre Landesjugendamt Berlin. Arbeit an der Jugend einer Millionenstadt* (n.p. n.d. [Berlin 1925?]), 27.

93. See Peukert, *Grenzen*, 349, and 'Statistik über die Fürsorgeerziehung in Preussen für das Rechnungsjahr 1931', ZSAP, Rep. 30.01, no. 1518, fol. 185–94.

94. 'Die Belegung der Fürsorgeerziehungs-Anstalten', *Wohlfahrtspflege in der Rheinprovinz*, Vol. 5 (1929), 173.

95. B.R. Mitchell, *European Historical Statistics, 1750–1950* (New York 1975), 37.

96. Leo Pelle, 'Können die Jugendämter noch Anträge auf Fürsorgeerziehung stellen?', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 23 (1930), 210–12.

97. This list is taken from Jacob Hein, 'Kampf dem Fürsorgeerziehungsskandal!', *Proletarische Sozialpolitik*, Vol. 4 (1931), 240: it is most probably incomplete.

98. Gustav von Mann, 'Um die Zukunft unserer Anstalten', *Jugendwohl*, Vol. 19 (1930), 2; Alfred Fritz, 'Zur Fürsorgeerziehung der Inneren Mission', *Die Erziehung*, Vol. 5 (1930), 352.

99. On *Psychopathenfürsorge*, see the brief discussion in Paul Weindling, *Health, Race, and German Politics Between National Unification and Nazism, 1870–1945* (Cambridge 1988), 381–3 (figures 382).

100. Adalbert Gregor and Else Voigtländer, *Die Verwahrlosung. Ihre klinisch-psychologische Bewertung und ihre Bekämpfung: Für Pädagogen, Ärzte, und Richter* (Berlin 1918); Peukert, *Grenzen*, 250.

101. Hartmann in *Die Fürsorgeerziehung in ihren Beziehungen zur modernen Paedogogik, Psychologie, und Soziologie Berufsprobleme der Fuersorgeerziehung Bericht über die Tagung des Allgemein Fuersorge-Erzie hungstages in Hamburg, 22. bis 24. September 1927* (Hanover 1927), 25–26. See Peukert, *Grenzen*, 202–3.

102. Ibid., 9.

103. Mönkemöller, 'Die Sonderbehandlung der schwersterziehbaren Fürsorgezöglinge und der Geschlechtskranken innerhalb der Anstalt', *Verhandlungen der Tagung des Allgemeinen Deutschen Fürsorge-Erziehungs-Tages zu Dresden am 12. und 13. Oktober 1925* (Hannover 1925), 4–5.

104. Quoted in Peukert, *Grenzen*, 250.

105. See Mönkemöller, 'Die Sonderbehandlung', and Klumker's comment, 43; Gräser, *Der blockierte Wohlfahrtsstaat*, 149.

106. Quoted in Peukert, *Grenzen*, 248.

107. Ruth van der Leyen, 'Wege und Aufgaben der Psychopathenfürsorge', *Zeitschrift für Kinderforschung*, Vol. 28 (1923), 39.

108. Heinrich Webler, 'Prügelstrafe und Beschwerderecht in den Fürsorgeerziehungs-Anstalten', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 21 (1929), 234; Lene Mann, 'Kritisches zur Fürsorgeerziehung', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 22 (1930), 232; Curt Bondy, 'Kritisches zur Fürsorgeerziehung', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 22 (1930), 148.

109. Figures from ibid., 299, and Peukert, *Grenzen*, 258.

110. See Peukert, *Grenzen*, 259; Gräser, *Der blockierte Wohlfahrtsstaat*, 17; Harvey, *Youth and the Welfare State*, 256–8.

111. See Harvey, *Youth and the Welfare State*, 210–11.

112. Fritz, 'Pädagogische Bewegung oder Pädagogische Reaktion?', *Evangelische Jugendhilfe*, Vol. 8 (1932), 306–7; Fritz to Wolff, ADW, EREV 98, cited in Carola Kuhlmann, *Erbkrank oder Erziehbar? Jugendhilfe als Vorsorge und Aussonderung in der Fürsorgeerziehung in Westfalen von 1933–1945* (Weinheim and Munich 1989), 40.

113. Egon Behnke, '"Alte" und "moderne" Erziehungsgrundsätze in der Fuursorgeerziehung', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 24 (1932), 54.

114. Harvey, *Youth and the Welfare State*, 261–2; Kuhlmann, *Erbkrank*, 59;

115. Reproduced in Vorländer, *Die NSV*, 198–200 (quotes 199).

116. 'Ausschnitt aus der Niederschrift über die Verhandlungen der Arbeitsgemeinschaft der preußischen Fürsorgeerziehungsdezernenten am 28. Juni 1934 in Berlin' (12–13), in BAK, Rep. R36, no. 1953.

117. Quoted in Hermann Althaus, *Nationalsozialistischer Volkswohlfahrt: Wesen, Aufgab Augbau* (Berlin 1941), 31.

118. Alfred Fritz, 'Evangelische Jugendfürsorge in der nationalen Umwälzung', *Evangelische Jugendhilfe*, Vol. 9 (1933), 74; Ina Hundinger, 'Arbeitsbericht des Evangelischen Reichs-Erziehungs-Verbandes eV. für die Zeit vom 1.

April 1932 bis 31. März 1933', *Evangelische Jugendhilfe*, Vol. 9 (1933), 102.

119. Quoted in Wollasch, *Der Katholische Füsorgeverein*, 258.

120. D. Engelke, 'Freudiges Erziehen im starken Staat', *Evangelische Jugendhilfe*, Vol. 10 (1934), 159; Oberin Kessler quoted in Kuhlmann, *Erbkrank*, 51; AFET, 'Die Gestaltung der Fürsorgeerziehung', 26 July 1933, in BAK, Rep. R36, no. 1953.

121. Peukert, *Grenzen*, 349; 'Statistik über die Fürsorgeerziehung in Preussen für das Rechnungsjahr 1931', ZSAP, Rep. 30.01, no. 1518, fols 185–94.

122. Die öffentliche Fürsorge im Deutschen Reich, 246.

123. See 'Zahl der gestellten Anträge betr. Freiwillige Erziehungshilfe (FEH) und Zahl der Überweisungen in Fürsorgeerziehung (FE) in den Regierungsbezirken auf 100,000 Einwohner', 'Zahl der gestellten Anträge betr. Freiwillige Erziehungshilfe (FE) und Zahl der Überweisungen in Fürsorgeerziehung (FE) in Stadt- und Land-kreisen auf 100,000 Einwohnern', and 'Der Stand der Freiwilligen Erziehungshilfe in der Rheinprovinz', all in ADCV, Rep. 319.4 (SKF), no. E II.12a, fasc. 1.

124. Christa Hasenclever, 'Zur Neuordnung der öffentlichen Erziehungshilfe', *Neues Beginnen* 1956: 3, 34.

125. Wilhelm Polligkeit, *Strafrechtsreform und Jugendfürsorge* (Langensalza 1905), 7, 13; Polligkeit, 'Die Bedeutung der Berufsvormundschaft im Kampfe gegen Verwahrlosung und Verbrechen', *Monatsschrift für Kriminalpsychologie und Strafrechtsreform*, Vol. 3 (1906), 216, 217.

126. Herbert Kraus, 'Probleme der Berufsvormundschaft', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 2 (1910), 160.

127. Aloys Fischer, 'Erziehungsziele nach dem Kriege', in *Zur Frage der Berufsvormundschaft 10: Berichte der zehnten Tagung Deutscher Berufsvormünder . . . 1916* (Berlin 1917), 97.

128. See Anne Marie Kadauke-List, 'Erziehungsberatungsstellen im Nationalsozialismus', in Renate Cogoy, Irene Kluge and Brigitte Meckler, eds, *Erinnerungen einer Profession: Erziehungsberatung, Jugendhilfe und Nationalsozialismus* (Münster 1989), 183.

129. Lene Mann, 'Zur Krisis der Jugendämter', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 20 (1928), 240. For similar views, see Ruth von der Leyen, 'Die Gefährdung der vorbeugenden Erziehungsfürsorge', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 22 (1930), 41–5; Adalbert Gregor, 'Revision der Anstaltserziehung', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 20 (1928/9), 186; Richard Paul Frank, 'Jugendberatungsstellen', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 20 (1928/9), 16–18.

130. See 'Stellungnahme der NSV. zur Reform des RJWG', ADCV, Rep. 319.4 (SKF), no. E.II.6, fasc. 4; 'Ergebnis einer Rundfrage des AFET zur Frage der Abänderung der die Fürsorgeerziehung betreffenden Bestimmungen', September 1933, BAK, Rep. R36, no. 1953, 12; Heinrich Pohlmann, 'Plan einer künftigen reichseinheitlichen Fürsorgeerziehung', *Nationalsozialistischer Volksdienst*, Vol. 5 (1938); Alfred Späth, 'Wie lange soll die Anstaltserziehung für einen normalen Jugendlichen dauern?', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 28 (1936); idem, 'Anstaltserziehung und Elternhaus', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 29 (1938); Kotthaus, 'Die Arbeit der Jugendheimstätten der NSV', *Nationalsozialistischer Volksdienst*, Vol. 7 (1940). Christoph Sachsse and Florian Tennstedt (in *Der Wohlfahrtsstaat im Nationalsozialismus. Geschichte der Armenfürsorge in Deutschland*, Vol. 3 (Stuttgart 1992), 164) hold that there were only fifteen *Jugendheimstätten* by 1939; Kuhlmann, in *Erbkrank oder Erziehbare?*, counts thirty-one by 1937 and 130 by 1943 (184, 220).

131. See Kadauke-List, 'Erziehungsberatungsstellen', esp. 184–7, and, for example, Frieda Ott, 'Die Erziehungsberatung des Stadtjugendamts Karlsruhe i. B.', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 27 (1935), and Paul Thomas, 'Erziehungsberatung', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 27 (1935); Hildegard Hetzer, 'Die Erziehungsberatung als Mittel der NSV-Jugendhilfe', *Zentralblatt*, Vol. 32 (1940).

132. *Runderlass* of the national Ministry of the Interior, 25 August 1943, BAK, Rep. B153, no. 108, fol. 384.

133. Gerhard Wurzbacher, 'Die Jugend in der Gesellschaft nach dem ersten Weltkrieg und heute', *Mitteilungen der Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Jugendpflege und Jugendfürsorge*, Vol. 25 (July 1958), 4.

134. On this point, see David Crew, '"Eine Elternschaft zu Dritt". Staatliche Eltern? Jugendwohlfahrt und Kontrolle der Familie in der Weimarer Republik 1919–1933', in *'Sicherheit' und 'Wohlfahrt'. Polizei, Gesellschaft und Herrschaft im 19. Und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Alf Lüdtke (Frankfurt am Main 1992), esp. 286; for a contemporary critique, see Elke Fluk, *Jugendamt und Jugendhilfe im Spiegel der Fachliteratur — Analyse und Kritik der Diskussion 1950–1970* (Munich 1972).

135. It is worth noting that most of the recent literature has stressed discontinuities, rather than continuities, between Weimar and Nazi policy, stressing the democratic and inclusionary tendencies inherent in welfare policy before 1930. See particularly Christoph Sachsse and Florian Tennstedt, *Der Wohlfahrtsstaat im Nationalsozialismus. Geschichte der Armenfürsorge in Deutschland*, Vol. 3 (Stuttgart 1992), 277; Hans-Uwe Otto and Heinz Sünker 'Volksgemeinschaft als Formierungsideologie des Nationalsozialismus. Zur Genesis und Geltung von "Volkspflege"', and Stephan Schnurr, 'Die nationalsozialistiche Funktionalisierung sozialer Arbeit. Zur Kontinuität und Diskontinuität der Praxis sozialer Berufe', both in Hans-Uwe Otto and Heinz Sünker, eds, *Politische Formierung und soziale Erziehung im Nationalsozialismus* (Frankfurt am Main 1992), 68, 138–9; Marcus Gräser, *Der blockierte Wohlfahrtsstaat*, 13; Michael Prinz, 'Wohlfahrtsstaat, Modernisierung, und Nationalsozialismus. Thesen zu ihrem Verhältnis', in *Soziale Arbeit und Faschismus* (Frankfurt 1989); and Hong, *Welfare*, 276.

136. Peukert certainly recognized and discussed this problem (see *Grenzen*, 217–41); but his focus on the — again, quite real — 'pathologies' and 'birth defects' of modernity was so intense that he simply failed to build these observations into his theory.

137. Oberwittler, 'Von Strafe zur Erziehung?', passim.

138. Peukert, *Grenzen*, 317.

Edward Dickinson completed his doctorate at the University of California at Berkeley in 1991. He taught for ten years at Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, and is currently at the University of Cincinnati. He is the author of *The Politics of German Child Welfare from the Empire to the Federal Republic* and of numerous articles on social policy and the history of the policing of sexuality.