

promoting access to White Rose research papers



Universities of Leeds, Sheffield and York
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

This is an author produced version of a book chapter accepted for publication in
Gender and the First World War.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/76508/>

Paper:

Sharp, IE (2013) *'A foolish dream of sisterhood': anti-pacifist debates in the German women's movement 1914-1919*. In: *The First World War in a Gender Context*. Palgrave (in press)

**‘A foolish dream of sisterhood’: Anti-Pacifist Debates in the German Women’s
Movement 1914-1919**

*Ingrid Sharp*¹

In 1914, before the outbreak of the First World War, the dominant discourse within the women’s organizations was of the natural pacifism and the international solidarity of all women, especially among those who were working to improve their social, professional, and political situation.¹ The women’s movement since the turn of the century had become increasingly international and even the German women, at first reluctant to cooperate beyond their own borders, had been drawn in.² International congresses were held in Berlin in 1896, 1904 – at which the International Women’s Suffrage Alliance (IWSA) was founded –, and 1912, with a further meeting planned there for 1915.³

Yet in all combatant nations, the majority of organized women supported the war policies of their government and suspended their international contacts for the duration of the war: only a very small minority of women in each nation opposed the war and retained or strengthened their international contacts. This was certainly the case in Germany, where the women’s coordinated war effort, the Nationaler Frauendienst (National Women’s Service, NFD) was controlled by the nationally-minded umbrella group of bourgeois women’s organizations, the Bund Deutscher Frauenvereine (Federation of German Women’s Associations, BDF) led by Gertrud Bäumer. In Germany, as elsewhere, the women most likely to maintain international links and to work for peace during the war

¹ Ingrid Sharp, **‘A foolish dream of sisterhood’: Anti-Pacifist Debates in the German Women’s Movement 1914-1919**, 2014, Palgrave Macmillan, reproduced with permission of Palgrave Macmillan.

This extract is taken from the author’s original manuscript and has not been edited. The definitive version of this piece may be found in *Gender and the First World War* Edited By Christa Hämmerle, Oswald Überegger and Birgitta Bader-Zaar which can be purchased from www.palgrave.com

were also the most enthusiastic suffrage campaigners such as Lida Gustava Heymann and Anita Augspurg of the Deutscher Frauenstimmrechtsbund (German Women's Suffrage Federation), who played an active role in the IWSA, and Helene Stöcker and Lili Jannasch of the pacifist organization Bund Neues Vaterland (New Fatherland League), formed in November 1914.⁴

Pacifist campaigners saw working for peace and the prevention of future wars and female suffrage as inextricably linked: without the influence of women in government the strongest moral impulse for peace would be lacking. On the other hand, political rights meant little if war was to be allowed to destroy any progress towards a fairer, more just and representative society. When it became clear that the meeting of the IWSA planned for Berlin in 1915 could not take place, an alternative congress was planned jointly by women from England, Holland, Belgium, Hungary, and Germany. In April 1915, nine months after the start of the First World War, over 1,000 women from combatant and noncombatant nations met at The Hague to discuss ways of mediating between the warring nations, stopping the war and finding ways of resolving future conflict without recourse to violence. At the Congress, the transnational organization the International Committee of Women for Permanent Peace (ICWPP), later renamed the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) was formed. The Congress brought the underlying divisions within the women's movement into sharp focus in many nations, dividing opinion in England and France as well as in Austria and Germany and creating a rift that continued well after the end of the hostilities. Nowhere was this more acute than in Germany, where the debate between the BDF and the congress organizers was played out in the public arena.

The Hague Congress has been widely discussed in feminist scholarship,⁵ and most women's historians have agreed with Leila Rupp's 1997 claim that 'the Congress of women, bravely convened in The Hague during the first year of the Great War, is probably the most celebrated

(and was at the time also the most reviled) expression of women's internationalism'.⁶ Most have also concurred with Jennifer Davy's 2002 assessment that the peace campaigners of the First World War provide a historic point of identification and a political legacy that is far more palatable than the patriotic war work undertaken by the majority of organized women.⁷ With the exception of Annika Wilmers, who offers a more even-handed account, most commentators writing about Germany have presented the controversy as the attempt by the powerful leadership of the BDF to crush dissent within its ranks⁸ and to 'denigrate the difficult attempt of courageous women to find a way of bringing the great slaughter to an end, by presenting them as a group without a mandate and lacking any expert knowledge'.⁹ For Sabine Hering, the BDF's cooperation with government policies during the war placed them on the side of might as opposed to right: '[t]he battle lines are clear. Socialist and pacifist women are on the other side. The BDF however is on the side of power and tries to couch even its criticism according to the rules of the powerful.'¹⁰ Yet hostility to Bäumer and condemnation of her stance often fail to take account of the fact that her position was shared by the majority of organized women in combatant and non-combatant nations – for example women within the Conseil national des femmes françaises (National Council of French Women, CNFF) were even more publicly outspoken in their criticism and even more ruthless in their expulsion of pacifist elements from their ranks.¹¹

As well as ignoring the international context, much of the criticism also fails to take account of the national context in which the women were operating, for example the particular pressure on the BDF caused by the fact that there were four German women among the Congress's organizing committee, making the need for distancing strategies especially acute.¹² Scholarship tends, too, to place the blame for a lack of sisterly solidarity entirely with the BDF, overlooking the highly limited sympathies and lasting resentment displayed by women from the pacifist camp to those who did not share their convictions. Davy states that '[t]he BDF publicly opposed the participation of German women in the Hague Congress and

condemned their pacifist activities',¹³ but it is equally true that the pacifist women condemned the BDF for their response to the war: in 1920 Heymann described them as 'chauvinistic women, steeped in the spirit of militarism, whose sense of true womanliness had been clouded by the war psychosis'.¹⁴

By examining the strategies and arguments employed by both groups of women to distance themselves from one another and to claim the exclusive right to represent German women, this chapter seeks to challenge the one-sided way the controversy has been received. Drawing on a wide range of contemporary German press responses to the Hague Congress and to the aims of the women's organizations before, during and immediately after the war, I will seek to show that the context in which the German women were operating was one of long-standing negative attitudes to feminist goals.¹⁵ I will argue that this climate of suspicion and disapproval reflected in and fostered by the mainstream press was a major factor in forcing the BDF into publicly adopting an anti-pacifist position over the Hague Congress, thus creating a dichotomy that had far-reaching and highly damaging consequences for the women's movement in the Weimar Republic.

Different Responses to the War

The fundamental paradox facing the organized women's movements in wartime was how they could justify activities that would release more men to fight and be injured or killed. The BDF justified their war service by stressing the inevitability of war and its nature as a great test from which the nation would emerge stronger, as well as the redemptive nature of the deaths and the sense of service to a higher ideal that overrode individual concerns. From the outset, the women of the BDF laid claim to a parallel war experience in which women played a pivotal role. First, this was through their role as mothers and wives of the fighting men: 'We

mustn't ever forget that it is not just military training that is being put to the test out there in the trenches and at sea, at the gun emplacements and in the air, but also German mothers' upbringing and German wives' care.'¹⁶ Secondly, this was through a coordinated war effort captured in the expression 'seelische Mobilmachung' ('mobilization of the soul').¹⁷ Through the NFD, women schooled in the women's movement were able to apply their motherly care to the needs of the nation in the familiar fields of social welfare, employment, and education.¹⁸ The BDF believed they were laying down foundations for peacetime acceptance of women's competence, and it is clear that they set great store by the closeness to government and decision-making at state level that they achieved. As Alice Salomon put it: 'if these had not been times of war, the limitless power given to women would have fulfilled our wildest ambitions.'¹⁹ Despite this, the findings of my press survey show that there was little public sympathy for the women's movement during the war, and despite the women's integration into government policy, there is no evidence that this was seen as anything but a temporary arrangement with no expectation that it would be carried over into the post-war social order.²⁰ For example, the Kaiser's Easter Message of April 1917, in which he promised to repay the loyalty and courage of working class men with political concessions that would express the new bond of trust between the social classes, made no mention at all of the contribution made by women.²¹

The pacifists, however, did not accept the necessity or inevitability of this or any war, seeing it instead as a man-made disaster, a further instance of the failure of male government and demonstration of the necessity of women's involvement in the state. For Heymann and Augspurg: 'The world war has proved that the male state, founded and built up on force, has failed all along the line; we have never seen clearer proof of its unfitness. The male principle is divisive and, if allowed to continue unchecked, will bring about the total destruction of humanity.'²² In this context, deaths could not be meaningful or redemptive, they were merely pointless and all the more pitiable because they were unnecessary and avoidable. Pacifists

dwelt on the horror of war deaths in order to undermine the elevated language of redemptive sacrifice used by the women of the BDF and other supporters of the war.

In contrast to Bäumer's almost mystical connection with the German nation,²³ the pacifists felt strongly that internationalism in this context overrode the national interest: as war – a global phenomenon with national and local consequences – destroyed all that women's work had built in the local community, women must work together across national borders to oppose it. This remained the central pillar of their conviction, and the motivation for the Hague Congress and the activities of the ICWPP and WILPF.

Despite the BDF's increasingly direct involvement in the war, Bäumer was convinced that theirs remained a specifically womanly contribution motivated by love and saw no contradiction between women's nurturing role and the organization's success in fuelling the war machinery with workers and soldiers. For Bäumer, as for so many others, August 1914 was a shared emotional experience of great power and intensity which, she remained sure, revealed the underlying connectedness of German society. In 1915 she claimed that '[t]here is not one of us who doesn't feel that this time, whatever it may bring, whatever it demands of us, is for our generation the pinnacle of our existence'.²⁴

According to their own account, Heymann and Augspurg felt nothing of this elevated mood, feeling themselves clear-eyed yet isolated amidst all the fellow-feeling: '[t]he great crime, war, achieved in 24 hours a unity that had eluded the efforts of rational people for decades. This behaviour appeared repulsive to us, not glorious.'²⁵ A tiny minority within the women's movement, these women saw themselves as the voice of reason amidst a howling storm of insanity. While they saw their duty very clearly as trying to stop the war, they were realistic enough to realize that few would be willing to hear a dissenting voice in the early moments of 'war psychosis': 'The German people felt like a mighty Colossus, united in its purpose of defying the whole world. [...] Anyone who had dared to openly oppose this unity would have been trampled, crushed, lynched.'²⁶

Both groups used a discourse of motherhood to support their position; for Bäumer, it was precisely as a mother that a woman could ‘understand from the innermost depths of her heart that a generation has been granted the task of winning with their blood a richer and more worthwhile life for those who are to come’,²⁷ while for Heymann and Augspurg, women’s role as bearers of life made their implication in any aspect of war work that led to men’s deaths deeply unnatural and abhorrent: ‘Women are, just because they are women, against all forms of brutal force that seek to pointlessly destroy what has grown, what has become. They want to build up, to protect, to create anew.’²⁸ Even the fact that a majority of women worked for and supported the war did not shake this conviction: writing in 1919, Heymann refers to the BDF’s pro-war stance as ‘the aberration of a few women’ set against ‘millions and millions who turn away from these women in disgust and were, are, and remain opponents of this war out of the deepest conviction’.²⁹ While the women’s responses to the war and emotional connection with the nation were radically opposed, it is clear that there were sufficient similarities in the roots of their arguments to make the association highly problematic: both groups used maternalist discourse, and both claimed that their actions were motivated by a woman’s natural predisposition to love.

Context: Press Coverage of Women’s Role in Wartime

Although press reporting is by no means a fully reliable indicator of public opinion, it both reflects and forms it, and a consideration of the discourse in the media will give an indication of public attitudes.³⁰ This study therefore will use an analysis of German press coverage of the three key, interlinked ideas associated with the Hague Congress; suffrage, internationalism, and pacifism in relation to the activities of the women’s organizations between 1914 and 1919 to offer an insight into the public discourse surrounding feminist goals.³¹ I will argue that in this context, in order to remain true to her vision of national service and to protect the long-

standing goals towards which she was working, Gertrud Bäumer was compelled to distance herself and the organization she led from the wartime activities of German pacifist women. There were considerable restrictions placed on publication during this period: in effect, the German press and publishing policy was in the hands of the military, who determined whether a particular publication was harmful to the German war effort.³² These measures especially affected the pacifist women's writings, which could hardly be published or disseminated at all within Germany between 1914 and 1918, while the few pamphlets and publications expressing pacifist views that were produced in neutral countries such as Switzerland had a very limited circulation. In order to gain a better overview of their response, I will therefore consider publications from outside Germany, such as the IWSA's journal, *Jus Suffragii*, and post-war publications, in which the pacifist women were keen to give a delayed account of their anti-war activities.

Pre-war coverage of suffrage had been complicated by widespread reporting of suffragettes' violent actions in the UK, such as the slashing of Velasquez's Rokeby Venus by Mary Richardson on 10 March 1914. The destruction of the beautiful Venus by the 'ugly' feminist was presented as highlighting the contrast between 'deviant' suffragettes and 'normal' women. The suffragettes' tactics were reported as a seven year war against men, a 'Reign of Terror'³³ that led to questions about the masculinity of English men and the vitality of the English race: 'in powerlessly knuckling under they are showing a *slackness* that points to degeneration, a lowering of national willpower.'³⁴

This coverage also reflected and influenced attitudes to feminist aims and activities in Germany, as can be seen for example in the *Berliner Volkszeitung* on 11 March 1914, in which a report on English extremism was used to criticize what were seen as similar tendencies in German society: 'our entire public life is suffering from a sinister and generally damaging feminism.'³⁵ Writing in *Die Hilfe* on 10 June, Gertrud Bäumer complained that 'even liberal newspapers' were conflating the suffrage movement with the activities of one

extreme group and using this negative association to condemn the entire campaign for women's rights.³⁶ However, there are also examples where the negative coverage of English feminists had a positive effect on German women's feminist campaigns, as they were presented as moderate and unpolitical compared to the crazed English deviants.³⁷ Fears of suffragette extremism spreading to Germany could also be used to advance the German women's cause: for example Bertha von Kröcher-Winzelberg, president of the Association of Conservative Women, argued that Conservative parties should allow women more influence within their ranks in order to counter the appeal of the left, who were wooing women with 'false promises of political equality and the vote'.³⁸

Even before the outbreak of war, democracy itself was presented as a weak, unmanly form of government and many objected to female suffrage on the grounds that it would so compromise the nation's strength that it would not be able to defend itself against aggressors. Throughout the war, women's suffrage continued to be associated with the imposition of an alien, un-German form of government upon a nation proud of its military prowess. The English suffragettes were sometimes invoked to reflect badly on the enemy's military resolve: from September 1914 there were widespread reports of a suffragette battalion arming itself to defend England, supposedly because Lord Kitchener was unable to find English men to fight: '[i]n the English war ministry they are firmly convinced that German soldiers will be just as incapable of dealing with mad women as the gentlemen of the island realm.'³⁹

With the front soldier elevated in press coverage to the level of mythic hero, any assertion of women's rights or suggestion that women were seeking recognition for their wartime service was seen as distasteful and inappropriate. In the light of men's bravery and suffering, women could not credibly press their own demands: in 1917 the *Deutsche Tagesblatt* reminded readers that 'when the hour of danger for the nation strikes, everyone, men and women, do their bit and anyone crying out for a reward is not thinking like a German'.⁴⁰ In fact, the BDF believed that through organizational efficiency,

national-mindedness, and a rhetoric of service, women would demonstrate their value to society and fitness for civic and political rights, but these aims could not be openly articulated without negative response. Even as late as 1917, when constitutional reform was being openly discussed and the BDF had sent a position paper in favour of female suffrage to the Reichstag, female suffrage was presented in the press as a selfish, deeply unpatriotic demand, inappropriate during war time.⁴¹

The need for caution was exacerbated by the sensitivity surrounding women's moral behaviour, which took on national significance during the early war years. Press reports show that women and girls' education and behaviour, competence as mothers and housewives and their consumption habits (notably of unpatriotic luxuries like cake and international fashion items) were under close scrutiny throughout the war.⁴² As early as August 1914, the hysterical response to thinly-evidenced reports that some German women and girls had been approaching French prisoners of war and offering them food and comforts is a case in point: scores of articles appeared with variations on the title 'würdelose Weiber' ('shameless hussies') and the responses outdid themselves to condemn these girls and suggest increasingly harsh punishments for their transgression: For the *Berliner Tageblatt* their behaviour was 'nothing short of treason';⁴³ while the *Berliner Volksblatt* suggested a spell in the stocks for these 'Ungeziefer' ('pests') on the symbolic national oak.⁴⁴ Freifrau von Klöcker wrote that 'only harlots could do such a thing and harlots are international [...] we would like to publicly denounce ['brandmarken', literally 'brand'] those who through behaviour devoid of breeding and morality dare to cast doubt on our honour as German women!'.⁴⁵ It is likely that there was a strong class element to this aristocratic lady's condemnation of these women, but the opprobrium was in no way restricted to the lower classes. Although by 2 September 1914 the initial reports were seen to be greatly exaggerated, responses continued: on 10 September, the *Deutsche Tageszeitung* printed letters from serving soldiers under the

heading ‘Pfui Deibel!’ (‘For Shame!’) including one that urged: ‘pass the horsewhip and then harder, harder.’⁴⁶

Unsurprisingly, ‘German’ came to signify entirely positive attributes, while ‘international’ was purely negative. War was seen as a teacher, and its lesson for women was that they must learn ‘to feel and think in a German way again [...] drive everything foreign from your hearts [...] let the spirit of purity and nobility in once more, hold on to German simplicity, breeding, and morality’.⁴⁷ The *Berliner Lokalzeitung* spells out the task for women: ‘be national, think German, feel German, act German in everything, be aware of your Germanness in the smallest as in the biggest things.’⁴⁸ This recurs throughout the war – in 1917 there is a veiled threat in the *Hamburger Korrespondenz* about what might happen ‘when the men come back from bloody battles and deprivations and ask the first question in judgement: what were you doing while we bled, froze, huddled in dugouts, fought and – were victorious?’⁴⁹

Coverage of the Hague Congress, with its emphasis on international cooperation, was overwhelmingly negative: one response was mockery of the delegates, first as childless spinsters using the discourse of motherhood to claim their mission for peace; secondly as women trespassing on the domain of men, and thirdly as a sex deemed incapable of rational discussion attempting formal debate. The inability of 181 English women to secure papers or passage to attend the congress was also widely reported as hilarious.⁵⁰

Another response was outrage at the women’s lack of national feeling and especially at their analysis of the war as ‘mass psychosis’. This was seen as a particular betrayal of the soldiers, especially as it came from the very women they were defending with their lives. In response to an anti-war pamphlet by Frida Perlen, the *Hamburger Nachrichten* claims that while soldiers are in the field fighting for German women, ‘at home behind their backs a suffrage lady under the flag of peace is inciting the most abominable war of all, the war of the sexes’.⁵¹ The *Vossische Zeitung*, although not as hostile as many papers,

nonetheless expressed the suspicion that the women were more interested in securing political advantages for themselves than in world peace.⁵²

It is notable that neither the BDF nor the majority of the press felt obliged to engage with the content of the women's resolutions. Merely the fact of German women discussing the war with the women of enemy nations was enough to fuel the outrage.

The Hague Congress as Catalyst

From the outset the plans for the Congress resulted in greater public activity by the pacifists and greater public notice of their ideas by the press.⁵³ The BDF was keen to downplay the significance of the Congress for the women's movement and did not wish to enter into a debate that attracted further attention to it, but this was difficult to sustain as German women were playing a well-publicized role in its organization. The call for Congress participation in February 1915, which was widely distributed and reproduced in the German press, set out the pacifist women's principles clearly, condemning the war as a product of male politics and openly demanding women's suffrage as the only way of preventing future wars:⁵⁴ 'We women declare the war, the last word in men's statesmanship, to be madness. War is only possible in the life of nations in the grip of a mass psychosis, for it seeks to destroy everything that the creative forces of humanity have built up over centuries.'⁵⁵

The Hague women's commitment to peace was not passive at all, nor was it domestic: instead it was confrontational, attacking the war, attacking men and their fitness to govern, and even attacking the nation state. Moreover, these women claimed the authority to speak for *all* women, undermining the BDF's careful public position of disinterested patriotic service to the *Volksgemeinschaft* and associating it with the highly negative concepts of suffrage, internationalism, and pacifism discussed above. The BDF

therefore felt compelled to distance itself from the pacifist women and vigorously assert their counter-claim that they were the sole authoritative voice of the organized women's movement in Germany. In fairness to the BDF, there was some justice to this claim. For one thing, the BDF was numerically far the biggest women's organization in Germany,⁵⁶ but more importantly its leadership of the NFD meant that at that time it could truly claim to be representative of the German women's movement. Working closely with the Red Cross, the NFD coordinated all women's activities, whether voluntary work, charity work, or paid employment and included socialist women's organizations in its ranks: the early months of the war saw a wave of 40,000 middle class volunteers but also of 1,400 working class women.⁵⁷ In contrast, the pacifist women failed to find support even from within the ranks of the German suffrage organizations and international as well as national women's organizations overwhelmingly rejected the idea of the Congress.

The BDF's own press release appeared in the national press in April 1915, and stressed that the Congress was neither organized nor endorsed by the women's movement and that it was 'absolutely out of the question for any serious women's organization to participate in this Congress'.⁵⁸ Bäumer was at pains to make clear that individual women attending did so without any representative function and that the German women's movement had 'no wishes other than those of our whole nation',⁵⁹ and therefore would not be associated with the 'special requests' (that is suffrage) demanded at the Congress. The BDF expressed its strongest objection to the analysis of the war as madness and mass psychosis, seeing in this a denigration of the soldiers' fighting spirit:

'Should German women deny the moral strength that is calling their husbands and sons to their deaths by declaring the courage and self-sacrifice of our menfolk to be 'madness' and 'psychosis'? Should we, whom they are defending, spiritually stab our men in the back by despising and denigrating the inner values that they are fighting to uphold?'

In her *Heimatchronik* of 28 April 1915, Bäumer makes clear that for her this moral duty applied to women in all the warring nations and that international discussions about the war were only morally possible for women of neutral countries.⁶¹ In her letter of refusal to Congress organizer Aletta Jacobs of 4 April, Bäumer repeatedly asserted her claim to speak for German women by using the formulation ‘die deutschen Frauen’: ‘German women’ could not attend a congress at the present time, ‘German women’, even those who supported the peace movement, were not in agreement with the Congress’ resolutions: ‘it is obvious to us that during a national struggle for existence we women belong to our nation and *only* to our nation.’⁶²

Behind the scenes, too, the struggle to assert the rival claims was being fought, each side accusing the other of being the first to go public.⁶³ In a letter to the BDF leadership of 29 March 1915, the organizing committee of the Congress decisively rejected ‘the example of the BDF leadership: to offer up the public spectacle of women squabbling at this time’. The committee also objected strongly to the BDF leadership’s claim to speak for all women in the combatant nations and their attempt to impose their ‘narrow-minded’ and ‘one-sided’ vision on other women: ‘they should however not judge others by their own lack of knowledge and understanding of broader affairs.’⁶⁴ During this time, an internal BDF memo was circulated, stating that attendance at or support for the congress was ‘incompatible with the patriotic sentiments and national duties of the German Women’s Movement’ and ‘with any position or area of responsibility within the BDF’,⁶⁵ effectively forcing members such as Alice Salomon to choose between their international connections and BDF office. To Bäumer’s irritation, this directive was leaked to the press and widely interpreted as a boycott of the peace conference and a slur on the patriotism of the organizers. Bäumer was in the difficult position of appearing to be against peace and found herself under fire from her fellow liberals, notably the pacifist Ludwig Quidde.⁶⁶ In a letter sent on 16 May 1915, he accused Bäumer of high-handedly restricting BDF members’ freedom of conscience. Referring to their shared pre-war

condemnation of *ad personam* political tactics, he went on: ‘and now out of our own ranks and even worse, out of the women’s movement, comes an attack against comrades and countrywomen that adopts these methods, just because these women have different views from the majority about their patriotic duty and what their patriotism demands of them.’⁶⁷ For Quidde, ‘the worst male organization could not have acted worse!’.⁶⁸

Throughout the war, Bäumer continued to stress that the women’s movement had not been represented at the congress. In a letter to the Silesian branch of the BDF, whose leader, Marie Wegner, was critical of the leadership’s response, she referred to ‘a congress of haphazardly thrown together individuals’ with no authority or competence to debate questions of international politics.⁶⁹ Bäumer’s article in *Die Frauenfrage* of September 1915 offered the most thorough and critical account, in which Bäumer attempted to clarify that it was not the pacifists’ desire to fight for peace that was ‘incompatible with national feeling’ but the form this took and the aims and timing of the Congress. In this article, she adopted a position similar to that of the IWSA, that the war had interrupted ‘but not destroyed’ international connections within the women’s movement and that ‘German women have no intention of seeking to disavow this common ground’, but that the Congress itself was ill-advised.⁷⁰ In support of her stance, Bäumer cited the views of a Dutch woman, Fräulein Dr von Dorp, who had attended the congress and concluded that ‘these women have not the slightest concept of their own superficiality’.⁷¹

In the BDF’s view, the pacifist women were lost in the realm of abstraction, their analysis naive and their responses sentimental and superficial. Even honest hatred of the enemy was preferable to the (to them) inauthentic expressions of sisterly love that characterized the pacifist discourse: ‘Love and hatred belong together. [...] The more we are capable of becoming one with our nation, the more we feel its enmities as our own. [...] It would be senseless, even cruel and inhuman, if we German women could [...] stand before Germany’s

enemies with the lacklustre objectivity of the neutrals.’⁷² Bäumer used words such as ‘blass’ (‘pallid’), ‘blutarm’ (‘anaemic’), or even ‘blutleer’ (‘bloodless’)⁷³ to stress the abstraction and intellectualism of the pacifists’ response in contrast to full-blooded emotions felt directly and passionately. Writing in *Die Frauenfrage*, Bäumer states: ‘We cannot make ourselves “international”! We cannot – we women least of all – cast off the deepest, strongest, warmest experiences that burn within us from 9 to 1 and from 4 to 8 and, theoretical ghosts of ourselves, ascend into an international fourth dimension.’⁷⁴ For the BDF, then, the ability to maintain international contacts suggested a lack of rootedness and an ability to intellectualize that denied real, that is patriotic, feeling. In October 1915, Bäumer accused the pacifists of seeking to avoid sharing Germany’s destiny, of wanting to breathe ‘rather than the bitter air of our German fate [...] the soft air of a shallow fraternization’.⁷⁵

The claim to true depth of feeling was an important element in the discourse of the BDF even before the Hague congress emerged. Writing in 1914, Helene Lange differentiated between women’s general peaceableness and ‘peace at any price’: ‘if the question is war or the stalemate of German development, death or the suffocation of German life, then the answer of German women is without question: war and death.’⁷⁶ Even before the war, Lange had expressed her discomfort with the ‘superficiality’ and the ‘empty phrases’ of international meetings, stating robustly in 1900 that ‘[t]rees need their own soil to take root in: only parasites can eke out their short-lived existence on alien organisms’.⁷⁷ For veteran campaigner Lily Braun, for whom the war meant the restoration of national strength and a strict gender hierarchy, too, the pacifists were unpatriotic sentimentalists, ready to accept a cringing peace at any price because of ‘their sentimental pacifism, their foolish dream of the sisterhood of all people of the female sex’.⁷⁸

For the pacifist women, however, the discourse of love between the international members was far from sentimental folly, but played a significant psychological role during the war years. Women pacifists were doubly isolated in their own community – by attitudes to nation

that saw pacifism and internationalism as unpatriotic, and by rejection by other women's groups – so the sense of belonging and shared values available through their international ties were especially important. For Heymann, the Hague Congress was 'a rest after months of anguish, a rest among those who felt the same',⁷⁹ and the Zurich Congress of 1919 'a delightful oasis amidst a vast desert', a respite among like-minded women from the hostility and isolation of everyday life.⁸⁰ Throughout the war, French, German, and English women exchanged emotionally charged greetings,⁸¹ for example in December 1915 French women wrote to German women: 'We know that the majority among you think as we do and that is why we want to say to you that we are sisters and that we love you.' German women replied: 'We think as you do! We feel as you do! We suffer like you with our hands tied and must, like you, remain silent!'⁸² As well as providing the women with vital emotional support, the deliberate stressing of ties of love maintained a sense of the shared humanity of the enemy, and women were thus able to maintain channels of communication not open to men both during and in the aftermath of the conflict. The warm messages and gestures of mutual support and understanding that reached these isolated women or were displayed during rare meetings served to create a network of personal friendships and trust amounting to a 'fictive kinship',⁸³ a dream of sisterhood that their opponents dismissed as 'foolish' but which sustained them in their vision of building a lasting peace in times of war.

The pacifists felt deeply hurt by the lack of recognition for their efforts at bringing peace, expressing particular bitterness that the BDF had organized a reception in Berlin in May 1915 for Congress President Jane Addams and Congress organizer Aletta Jacobs, while 'the German participants [...] were boycotted and declared beyond the pale by the very same women'.⁸⁴ While many of the pacifists had themselves been members of the BDF up until 1915, the controversy over the Hague Congress caused them to break their last ties with the organization.⁸⁵ The consequences of the rift continued into the post-war period, with Heymann and Augspurg taking every opportunity to scoff at and undermine the BDF's

attempts to bring women's influence to bear in the troubled waters of the Weimar Republic. Even in 1927, Heymann described the BDF as 'pathetic remnants of the women's movement' who were 'dragging out their fossilized existence'.⁸⁶ The rift never healed, and the pacifists' continued attacks on the BDF demonstrated little or none of the love, inclusion and mutual understanding that supposedly formed the basis of the universal female principle. In fact, the German women's movement emerged from the war more divided than it had ever been, and throughout the Weimar Republic, the BDF was squeezed between nationalist women on the one hand, who despised them for what they saw as their weak, conciliatory interaction with former enemies, and left-wing radicals on the other who condemned them for what they saw as their unquestioning, jingoistic response to the war.⁸⁷ In this climate, and with continued negative press coverage of female suffrage, it is not surprising that the women's movement failed to make full use of the enfranchisement of all German women over the age of 20 that came into effect in 1918.⁸⁸

Post-War Congress, Zurich 1919

In May 1919, at the same time as women were excluded from the actual peace negotiations in Paris, the pacifist women met again in Zurich to formulate their own vision for a sustainable peace and to offer a model for the peaceful and productive cooperation of nations.⁸⁹ However, even though the delegates were drawn only from among those women who had shown support for pacifist ideas during the war, the harmonious face they presented to the world hid tensions that threatened the unity of the congress.⁹⁰ For example, most of the Belgian women refused to attend the congress at all, stating that it was pro-German, and the belief that it was a 'Verliererforum' ('a forum for losers') was widespread.⁹¹ There were also tensions over the extent to which German women could be held responsible for German war crimes or blamed for their apparent

failure to speak out against the occupation of Belgium and France.⁹² Hidden, too, was the French women's organizations' refusal to intervene on behalf of the women and children affected by the starvation blockade that continued until the signing of the peace treaty, the physical effects of which were all too visible in the dramatic weight loss and fatigue of the German and Austrian delegates.⁹³ We have seen that much of the criticism leveled at Gertrud Bäumer was due to her intolerance of dissenting views within the ranks of the BDF and her 'ruthless exclusion of dissidents',⁹⁴ but it is evident that even the sustaining community of WILPF had to be artificially constructed by the exclusion of or refusal to acknowledge dissenting voices.

Conclusion

During the war years, it was in the interests of both the leadership of the BDF and the pacifist organizers and supporters of the Hague Congress to distance themselves from the ideas and attitudes of the other, and both showed themselves to be equally intolerant of dissent and equally harsh in their judgement of those with different views. For the pacifist women, the existence of a majority of women who supported the war undermined their view of the innate pacifism of women, on which their own claims to full female citizenship rested. For the women of the BDF, association with suffrage, internationalism, and of course pacifism itself, threatened to undermine their own unstated war aims, tacitly geared towards demonstrating a fitness for involvement in the life of the state and full acceptance in the national community. The BDF leadership's high-handed stifling of open debate over the 1915 Congress was a bid to present a harmonious public front that precluded any expression of support within the organization for these unpopular ideas. However, their public display of animosity surrounding the Hague Congress and their apparent rejection of previously-professed ideals did much to

discredit the women of the BDF at home and abroad, compromised their ability to re-enter the community of the international women's movement after the war and undermined their attempts to maintain focus and unity within the German women's movement during the difficult post-war period. Post-war society in Germany was economically, politically, and culturally unstable, violent and traumatized by the defeat and the terms of the peace, and the BDF saw its primary post-war mission as overcoming these deeply damaging inner divisions.⁹⁵ In January 1919, Bäumer wrote that 'there is nothing more valuable than the creation of an inner unity of our people [...] no national demand is more important than this'.⁹⁶ In May 1919, she stressed community as the highest priority of public life, setting spiritual, inner values against the violence and materialism of the times and claiming a central role for women in this endeavour.⁹⁷ It is clear that the women of the BDF felt that the post-war inability to transcend personal interests and ambition, prejudices and political infighting represented the greatest threat to Germany's recovery, so it is ironic that they were hampered in one of their key aims by divisions within their own movement.⁹⁸

We have seen that the public discourse as reflected in and fostered by the German press was hostile to and highly suspicious of feminist, specifically pacifist, activities and aims, and that this was a major factor in compelling the BDF to distance itself so irrevocably and so publicly from the aims of the Hague women. We have seen that there were very real differences between the two groups' responses to war and their relationship to the nation state, but there is no doubt that the public controversy over the Hague Congress not only exposed but also deepened these divisions, forcing an irreconcilable rift with far-reaching consequences for the German women's movement.

Notes

¹ For more on pre-war pacifism and internationalism in the women's organizations, see A. Gelblum (1998) 'Ideological Crossroads: Feminism, Pacifism, and Socialism', in B. Melman (ed.) *Borderlines: Genders and Identities in War and Peace 1870-1930* (New York: Routledge), pp. 307-27; S. Cooper (1987) 'Women's Participation in European Peace Movements: The Struggle to Prevent WWI' in R. Pierson (ed.) *Women and Peace: Theoretical, Historical and Practical Perspectives* (London: Croom Helm), pp. 51-75; J. Vellacott (1987) 'Feminist Consciousness and the First World War' in Pierson, *Women and Peace*, pp. 114-36.

² When asked to join the International Council of Women (ICW) in 1888, the leading German women's organization at the time, the Allgemeiner Deutscher Frauenverein (ADF), had refused, stating that '[i]n Germany we have to work with great tact and conservative methods', but by 1897 the BDF, of which the ADF remained a leading member, was a member of the ICW and involved in international exchanges. Cited in U. Gerhard (1993) "'National oder International?'" *Frauengeschichte im Spiegel der internationalen Beziehungen der deutschen Frauenbewegung*, *Ariadne*, 24, p. 51.

³ Gerhard, "'National oder International?'" , p. 52.

⁴ Other key German pacifists were Frida Perlen, Emma von Schlumberger, Margarete Selenka, Auguste Kirchhof, and Getrud Baer.

⁵ See K. E. Gwinn (2011) *Emily Greene Balch: The Long Road to Internationalism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press); A. Wilmers (2008) *Pazifismus in der internationalen Frauenbewegung (1914-1920): Handlungsspielräume, politische Konzeptionen und gesellschaftliche Auseinandersetzungen* (Essen: Klartext); J. Vellacott (2001) 'Feminism as If All People Mattered: Working to Remove the Causes of War, 1919-1929', *Contemporary European History*, 10:3, pp. 375-94; L. J. Rupp (1997) *Worlds of Women: The Making of an*

International Women's Movement (Princeton: Princeton University Press); S. Hering (1990) *Die Kriegsgewinnlerinnen: Praxis und Ideologie der deutschen Frauenbewegung im Ersten Weltkrieg* (Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus); A. Wiltsher (1985) *Most Dangerous Women: Feminist Peace Campaigners of the Great War* (London: Pandora Press). There are some critical voices; A. Wilmers (2005) argued that we have to look beyond the Hague women's own assessment of the significance of the Congress: 'Zwischen den Fronten: Friedensdiskurse in der internationalen Frauenfriedensbewegung 1914-1919' in J. Davy, K. Hagemann and U. Kätzel (eds.) *Frieden – Gewalt – Geschlecht: Friedens- und Konfliktforschung als Geschlechterforschung* (Essen: Klartext), pp. 123-43, and S. Cooper pointed out in 'Women's Participation in European Peace Movements' that the women's ideas were not in themselves new, but rather built on a long tradition of peace activism and analysis.

⁶ Rupp, *Worlds of Women*, p. 3.

⁷ J. A. Davy (2002) 'German Women's Peace Activism and the Politics of Motherhood: A Gendered Perspective of Historical Peace Research' in B. Ziemann (ed.) *Perspektiven der Historischen Friedensforschung* (Essen: Klartext), p. 114.

⁸ M. Bereswill and L. Wagner (1998) 'Nationalism and the Women's Question – The Women's Movement and Nation: Orientations of the Bourgeois Women's Movement in Germany during the First World War', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 5:2, p. 242.

⁹ M. Walle (1993) 'Die Heimatchronik Gertrud Bäumers als weibliches Nationalepos', *Ariadne*, 24, p. 20.

¹⁰ Hering, *Kriegsgewinnlerinnen*, p. 104.

¹¹ Wilmers, *Pazifismus*, pp.169-70, discusses the treatment of pacifist women in the pages of *La Française*, journal of the CNFF.

¹² These were Heymann, Augspurg, Perlen, and von Schlumberger

¹³ Davy, 'German Women's Peace Activism', p. 115.

¹⁴ In Internationale Frauenliga für Frieden und Freiheit/Deutscher Zweig (ed.) (1920) *Völkerversöhnende Frauenarbeit während des Weltkrieges, Juli 1914 - November 1918* (Munich: Heller), p. 6.

¹⁵ My survey draws on the collection of newspaper cuttings held in the Federal archives (*Bundesarchiv*) at Lichterfelde, Berlin (R8034/II). These cuttings were collected between 1893 and 1945 by the Reichs-Landbund, a powerful, highly conservative agrarian lobby, with the aim of keeping a close eye on any potentially disruptive social movements. Ordered thematically, this comprehensive collection has the advantage over research in individual newspapers of breadth of coverage – the relevant articles have already been selected from a wide range of daily newspapers–, but the disadvantage of possible selector bias and incompleteness, not to mention the missing page numbers and handwriting problems that make attribution problematic at times. For this chapter, I particularly consulted volumes 11-19 (7965-7973) that deal with the topic ‘Stellung der Frau/Frauenbewegung’ between 1914 and 1921.

¹⁶ G. Bäumer (1914) ‘Der Krieg und die Frau’ in E. Jäckh (ed.) *Der deutsche Krieg: Politische Flugschriften* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt), p. 11.

¹⁷ G. Bäumer (1914) ‘Zur seelischen Mobilmachung der Frau’, *Die Frauenfrage*, 16 (October), pp. 105-6.

¹⁸ G. Bäumer (1915) ‘Die Frauen und der Krieg’ in E. Altmann-Gottheiner (ed.) *Kriegsjahrbuch des Bundes Deutscher Frauenvereine 1915* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner), p. 2.

¹⁹ Cited in B. Clemens (1988) “*Menschenrechte haben kein Geschlecht!*” *Zum Politikverständnis der bürgerlichen Frauenbewegung* (Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus), p. 107.

²⁰ For a discussion of the extent of women’s integration into government policy during wartime, see U. Daniel (1997) *The War from Within: German Working Class Women in the*

First World War (Oxford: Berg), pp. 73-80, and M.-E. Lüders (1937) *Das unbekannte Heer: Frauen kämpfen für Deutschland 1914-1918* (Berlin: E. S. Mittler & Sohn)

²¹ H. Lange (1917) 'Der Oster-Erlaß des Kaisers und die Frauen', *Die Frau*, 24 (May), pp. 449-54.

²² L. G. Heyman (1980) [1917/22] 'Weiblicher Pazifismus' in G. Brinker-Gabler (ed.) *Frauen gegen den Krieg* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer), p. 65.

²³ See A. Schaser (1996) "'Corpus mysticum': Die Nation bei Gertrud Bäumer' in *Frauen und Geschichte Baden Württemberg* (ed.) *Frauen und Nation* (Tübingen: Silberburg), pp. 118-32.

²⁴ Bäumer, 'Die Frauen und der Krieg', pp. 6-7.

²⁵ L. G. Heymann and A. Augspurg (1992) [1972] *Erlebtes Erschautes: Deutsche Frauen kämpfen für Freiheit, Recht und Frieden 1850-1940* (Frankfurt am Main: Ulrike Helmer), p. 137.

²⁶ Heymann and Augspurg, *Erlebtes Erschautes*, p. 138.

²⁷ Bäumer, 'Der Krieg und die Frau', p. 10.

²⁸ L. G. Heymann and A. Augspurg (1919) 'Was will "Die Frau im Staat"?', *Die Frau im Staat*, 1 (February), p. 1.

²⁹ L. G. Heymann (1919) *Völkerverständigung und Frauenstimmrecht* (Leipzig: Verlag Naturwissenschaften), p. 12.

³⁰ J. Verhey (2000) states in his influential study of press response to August 1914 that 'the press could with some justice be considered the voice of public opinion', in *The Spirit of 1914: Militarism, Myth and Mobilization in Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), p. 15.

³¹ See note 15 for details of the sources used.

³² See K. Kosyk (1968) *Deutsche Pressepolitik im Ersten Weltkrieg* (Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag), pp. 20-30, and J. Horne (2012) 'Public Opinion and Politics' in J. Horne (ed.) *A Companion to World War One* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell) pp. 279-94.

³³ *Berliner Volkszeitung*, 13 March 1914, and *Berliner Tageblatt*, 10 June 1914.

³⁴ *Leipziger neueste Nachrichten*, reported in *Deutsche Tageszeitung*, 9 June 1914. See S. Adickes (2002) 'Sisters, Not Demons: the influence of British suffragists on the American suffrage movement', *Women's History Review*, 11:4, pp. 675-90, for an account of how the suffragettes were reported in the American press and the negative effect of this on the domestic campaign for female suffrage.

³⁵ *Berliner Volkszeitung*, 11 March 1914.

³⁶ *Die Hilfe*, 10 June 1914.

³⁷ *Kreuzberger Zeitung*, 10 June 1914.

³⁸ *Hallesche Zeitung*, 13 March 1914.

³⁹ *Berliner Lokalanzeiger*, 5 September 1914.

⁴⁰ *Das Deutsche Tageblatt*, 14 January 1917.

⁴¹ This paper *Die Stellung der Frau in der politisch-sozialen Neugestaltung Deutschlands* was sent to the Reichstag and regional parliaments in October 1917. For a discussion of press coverage of female suffrage during and after the war, see I. Sharp (2014 forthcoming) 'Post suffrage strategies in the organised German women's movement', *Women's History Review*.

⁴² B. Davies (2000) discusses the negative views of the *Kriegerfrauen* (warriors' wives) who, supposedly made rich by the money paid to their husbands, wasted national resources by eating cake, while their poor cooking skills also made them dependent on bread for family meals: *Home Fires Burning: Food Politics and Everyday Life in World War I Berlin* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press), pp. 22-45. This is also discussed by B. Kundrus (1995) *Kriegerfrauen: Familienpolitik und Geschlechterverhältnisse im Ersten und Zweiten*

Weltkrieg (Hamburg: Christians), while U. Daniel provides evidence of working class women's actual economic situation in *The War from Within*, pp. 24-32.

⁴³ *Berliner Tageblatt*, 18 August 1914. U. Daniel also discusses the negative press reaction to German women's alleged soft treatment of French prisoners in *The War from Within*, pp. 23-4.

⁴⁴ *Berliner Volksblatt*, 19 August 1914.

⁴⁵ *Deutsche Tageszeitung*, 21 August 1914.

⁴⁶ *Deutsche Tageszeitung*, 10 September 1914.

⁴⁷ *Thüringer Landeszeitung*, 15 August 1914.

⁴⁸ *Berliner Lokalzeitung*, 3 May 1915.

⁴⁹ *Hamburger Korrespondenz*, 14 April 1917.

⁵⁰ See, for example 'Der Friedenskongress ohne "Ladies"', *Rheinisch Westfälische Volkszeitung*, 2 May 1915. See also Wilmers, *Pazifismus*, p. 230, for a discussion of press responses.

⁵¹ *Hamburger Nachrichten*, 23 March 1915.

⁵² *Vossische Zeitung*, 30 April 1915 and 1 May 1915.

⁵³ Gelblum, 'Ideological Crossroads', p. 312

⁵⁴ As well as writing reports for *Jus Suffragii*, in February and May 1915, Heymann published a direct appeal to German women as mothers to resist the man-made war in: 'Frauen Europas, wann erschallt Euer Ruf?', *Die Frauenbewegung*, February 1915, p. 14. In consequence, Heymann's activities were severely restricted.

⁵⁵ Anita Augspurg et al. (February/March 1915) 'Call for Attendance at the Women's International Congress', *Landesarchiv Berlin*, Helene Lange Archiv, microfiche 2754.

⁵⁶ Hering gives figures of 46 member organizations and 500,000 members, *Kriegsgewinnlerinnen*, p. 100.

⁵⁷ See M.-E. Lüders, *Das Unbekannte Heer*, pp. 21-2; Hering, *Kriegsgewinnlerinnen*, pp. 48-9, and Daniel, *The War from Within*, pp.73-80.

⁵⁸ *Die Frauenfrage*, 17, 16 March 1915. It was followed up in April 1915, printed in the press on 29 April and appeared in translation in *Jus Suffragii* in June 1915, alongside the other reports on the Congress.

⁵⁹ G. Bäumer (April 1915) 'Zum internationalen Frauenkongreß im Haag', BDF Press release, *Landesarchiv Berlin*, Helene Lange Archiv, microfiche 2753.

⁶⁰ Bäumer, 'Zum internationalen Frauenkongreß im Haag'.

⁶¹ G. Bäumer (1915) 'Heimatchronik, 28 April 1915', *Die Frau*, 23 (June), pp. 559-60.

⁶² Letter to Aletta Jacobs, 4 April 1915.

⁶³ For a full account of the debate, see Wilmers, *Pazifismus*, pp. 110-2.

⁶⁴ Letter from the organizing committee to G. Bäumer, 29 March 1915, *Landesarchiv Berlin*, Helene Lange Archiv, microfiche 2753.

⁶⁵ Reprinted in G. Bäumer (1915) 'Zu dem Plan eines internationalen Frauenkongresses', *Die Frauenfrage*, 17 (16 March), p. 82.

⁶⁶ L. Quidde (1979) *Der deutsche Pazifismus während des Weltkrieges 1914-1918* (Boppard am Rhein: Harold Boldt), pp. 297-302.

⁶⁷ Quidde, *Der deutsche Pazifismus*, p. 299.

⁶⁸ Quidde, *Der deutsche Pazifismus*, p. 299.

⁶⁹ Letter to the Silesian Women's Associations, 19 January 1916. See also Wilmers *Pazifismus*, pp. 116-7.

⁷⁰ G. Bäumer (1915) 'Der Bund deutscher Frauenvereine und der Haager Frauenkongreß', *Die Frauenfrage*, 17 (1 September), p. 83.

⁷¹ Bäumer, 'Der Bund deutscher Frauenvereine und der Haager Frauenkongreß', p. 84.

⁷² G. Bäumer (1915) 'Vaterlandsliebe und Völkerhass', *Die Frauenfrage*, 17 (1 January), p. 1.

- ⁷³ Bäumer, 'Der Bund deutscher Frauenvereine und der Haager Frauenkongreß', p. 83.
- ⁷⁴ Bäumer, 'Der Bund deutscher Frauenvereine und der Haager Frauenkongreß', p. 83.
- ⁷⁵ G. Bäumer (1915) 'Zwischen zwei Gesetzen', *Die Frau*, 23 (October), p. 39.
- ⁷⁶ H. Lange (1914) 'Frauen und Friede', *Die Frau*, 22 (November), p. 66.
- ⁷⁷ H. Lange (1928) [1900] 'National oder International' in H. Lange *Kampfzeiten*, vol. 1 (Berlin: Herbig), p. 271, cited in Gerhard, "'National oder International?'" p. 52.
- ⁷⁸ L. Braun (1915) *Die Frauen und der Krieg* (Leipzig: E. Hirzel), p. 11.
- ⁷⁹ L. G. Heyman (1915) 'A German View of the Congress', *Jus Suffragii*, 9 (June), p. 304.
- ⁸⁰ Heyman and Augspurg, *Erlebtes Erschautes*, pp. 197 and 241.
- ⁸¹ Wilmers, *Pazifismus*, p. 43.
- ⁸² See Heymann, *Völkerversöhnende Frauenarbeit*, pp. 23-4.
- ⁸³ J. Winter (2006) discusses his concept of a 'fictive kinship', whereby familial bonds are echoed within a community of individuals who share the same sorrows in *Remembering War: The Great War Between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press), p. 136.
- ⁸⁴ *Mitteilungen des deutschen Frauenstimmrechtsbundes* (May-June 1915), nos. 5 and 6, pp. 5-6; see also Wilmers, *Pazifismus*, pp. 161-6.
- ⁸⁵ See Hering, *Kriegsgewinnlerinnen*, p. 110.
- ⁸⁶ L.G. Heymann (1927) 'Freie Menschen', *Die Frau im Staat*, 9 (January), p. 1.
- ⁸⁷ For a discussion of right wing women's opposition to the ideals of the BDF see C. Streubel (2007) 'Raps across the knuckles: The extension of War Culture by Radical Nationalist Women Journalists in Post-1918 Germany' in A. S. Fell and I. Sharp (eds.) *The Women's Movement in Wartime: International Perspectives, 1914-19* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), pp. 69-88. Women within the Socialist parties were also reluctant to make common cause with the liberal Bäumer.

⁸⁸ For a detailed discussion of post-war press response to the women's movement and to suffrage in particular see Sharp, 'Post suffrage strategies in the organized German women's movement'.

⁸⁹ See E. Kuhlman (2008) *Reconstructing Patriarchy after the Great War: Women, Gender, and Postwar Reconciliation between Nations* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), and E. Kuhlman (2007) 'The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and Reconciliation after the Great War' in Fell and Sharp, *The Women's Movement in Wartime*, pp. 227-43.

⁹⁰ See Wilmers, *Pazifismus*, pp. 181-7.

⁹¹ Wilmers, *Pazifismus*, p. 187.

⁹² Wilmers, 'Zwischen den Fronten', pp. 129-30.

⁹³ The French women's refusal was published in *La Française* on 30 November 1918 and makes clear that German women were being punished for their stance during the war. See Wilmers, *Pazifismus*, pp. 188-9.

⁹⁴ Bereswill and Wagner, 'Nationalism and the Women's Question', p. 233.

⁹⁵ See I. Sharp (2011) 'The Disappearing Surplus: The Spinster in the Post-War debate in Weimar Germany 1918-1920' in I. Sharp and M. Stibbe (eds.) *Aftermaths of War: Women's Movements and Female Activists, 1918-1923* (Leiden: Brill), pp. 152-3.

⁹⁶ G. Bäumer (1919) 'Die Frauen in der deutschen Demokratie', *Die Frau*, 26 (January), p. 105.

⁹⁷ G. Bäumer (1919), 'Hoffnungen und Aufgaben', *Die Frau*, 26 (May), pp. 230-3.

⁹⁸ Helene Lange (1920), 'Politische Zerstörungsmethoden', *Die Frau*, 27 (April), p. 194.