

Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

Persistent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/97676>

How to cite:

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk.

ABSTRACT 1

First published in German in 1937, Margaret Mitchell's *Gone with the Wind* was one of the most popular books in Germany throughout the Second World War and well into the occupation period. This article investigates why Mitchell's tale of the American Civil War, and the South's humiliating defeat and subsequent occupation by hostile powers, captured the popular imagination in occupied Germany. Drawing on the portrayal of women in the postwar German press, the article illuminates how Scarlett O'Hara's transgression of traditional gender roles offered female readers potential for identification with the central character. Through reading *Gone with the Wind* in relation to debates about women's behaviour, relationships, and bodies during the occupation period, it argues that the novel participated in the victim discourse arising within Germany immediately after the Second World War.

ABSTRACT 2

Nach seiner deutschen Publikation im Jahre 1937 avancierte Margaret Mitchells Roman *Vom Winde verweht* rasch zu einem der beliebtesten Bücher in Deutschland und büßte auch während der Besatzungszeit nichts an Popularität ein. Dieser Artikel erörtert, warum Mitchells Erzählung über den amerikanischen Bürgerkrieg und die demütigende Niederlage und Besatzung der Südstaaten die Phantasie der besetzten Deutschen anregte. Durch Vergleiche mit der Darstellung von Frauen in der deutschen Nachkriegspresse erläutert der Artikel, inwiefern Scarlett O'Haras Verstoß gegen traditionelle Geschlechterrollen weiblichen Lesern Identifikationspotential mit der Zentralfigur bot. Indem Bezüge zwischen *Vom Winde verweht* und Nachkriegsdebatten über Frauenverhalten hergestellt werden, wird argumentiert, dass der Roman einen Teil des Opfer-Diskurses bildete, der bereits während der Besatzungszeit in Deutschland entstand.

‘HEAVEN HELP THE YANKEES IF THEY CAPTURE YOU’:

WOMEN READING *GONE WITH THE WIND* IN OCCUPIED GERMANY

EMILY OLIVER

In 1945, with the Red Army advancing on Germany, thirty-five-year-old Erna Eschenburg and her sister Frieda decided it was time to flee back to their native Berlin from the Sudetenland, where Erna had been posted for work. Having been bombed out twice, they had few possessions left, but they piled what little they had onto a handcart along with Frieda’s 2-year-old son, Hans. Erna recalls:

Da hinein hatten wir auch unsere letzten guten Bücher gestopft, weil wir daran so hingen, ‘Vom Winde verweht’ und so. Diese Bücher haben wir unterwegs eingetauscht in Maggisuppen. Und mit diesen paar Maggisuppen und geklauten Kartoffeln haben wir uns durchgeschlagen bis nach Berlin. Außerdem hatten wir nur noch das, was wir am Leib hatten, leichtes Gepäck.¹

The image of two women and a child fleeing an oncoming army will be familiar to readers of Margaret Mitchell’s *Gone with the Wind*. The fact that two German women at the end of the Second World War considered this American novel one of their most prized possessions might encourage us to look more closely at the kind of imaginative fiction women engaged with at this time, and the aspects of their lives which gave it particular relevance.

When Margaret Mitchell died in 1949, the Berlin journalist Hellmut Jaesrich called her ‘die erfolgreichste Schriftstellerin Amerikas, der Welt, ja vielleicht aller Zeiten’. Although critical of *Gone with the Wind*’s style, Jaesrich’s article in the

Tagesspiegel praised Mitchell's talent for creating sympathetic yet ambivalent characters. In his view, Scarlett O'Hara exemplified this nuanced characterisation, since she was 'keine flache Schablone [...] ungut und doch sympathisch, egoistisch und doch von schneller, tatkräftiger Hilfsbereitschaft, strahlend schön und erfolgshungrig und doch immer wieder vom Leben genarrt und enttäuscht'. Jaesrich claimed that millions of female readers had secretly identified with Scarlett O'Hara. He also pointed out a further reason for the novel's enormous and continued popularity:

Das Urweibliche, zart, doch wider Erwarten elastisch, ja fast stahlhart, in einer Welt voller Schrecken, voll Krieg, Wirren und Unsicherheit – vielleicht hat dieses Leitmotiv des Buches den Hauptanteil an seinem Erfolg, als sei in der riesigen Schar seiner Leser schon die Ahnung vorhanden gewesen, daß sich etwas wie der grimmige, aber doch noch ein wenig biedermeierliche Krieg zwischen Nord- und Südstaaten bald in noch grausigeren Formen zutragen sollte.²

For Jaesrich, looking back from the perspective of 1949, it seemed as though fiction had become reality since the novel's publication in 1936. The other striking aspect of his article is its emphasis on resilience, determination, and adaptability as specifically *female* responses to the horrors of war and the hardships of postwar life.

Gone with the Wind was an extremely popular reading choice in Germany during and after the Second World War. First published in the United States in 1936, the novel was rapidly translated into German by Martin Beheim-Schwarzbach and appeared in Germany in September 1937.³ Within two days, *Vom Winde verweht* had already sold 12,000 copies, and by 1941 it had gone through sixteen print runs with a total of almost 280,000 copies.⁴ As John Haag points out in his study of the novel's

fate under the Third Reich, actual numbers of readers were probably even higher, since the large, expensive tome (selling at 12.50 RM) would have been circulated among family and friends, and ‘virtually every German lending library stocked one or several copies’. Although no further reprints were authorised after the US entered the war in 1941, the book was never removed from private households, and Haag estimates that it ‘may well have been read by as many as a million Germans by 1945’.⁵ The novel’s pre-war publication meant that surviving copies would have been available in all four zones of occupied Germany.

Gone with the Wind’s popularity among Germans continued unabated during the immediate postwar years. The first new edition to appear in 1946 sold out completely within a very short space of time, and throughout the occupation period the novel remained the most sought-after work of fiction in public lending libraries.⁶ In July 1949, a report on Berlin libraries noted: “‘Vom Winde verweht’ liegt noch immer an der Spitze der Publikumswünsche’. The author bemoaned the fact that books were still scarce in postwar Germany and could not keep pace with popular demand. She also reported that the library’s main user group had not changed over the past ten or even twenty years: ‘Die Frauen sind in der Überzahl’.⁷ Although not strictly a zero-hour text, *Gone with the Wind*’s availability during and after the war, as well as its subject matter, made it a book female readers could (re-)turn to at a time when its fictional content increasingly mirrored their postwar reality.

This article investigates the reasons for *Gone with the Wind*’s popularity in postwar Germany, by examining the conditions of its re-publication under Anglo-American cultural policy on the one hand, and highlighting key points of appeal to female readers in occupied Germany on the other hand. It draws parallels between *Gone with the Wind*’s portrayal of women’s ‘survival work’ after the American Civil

War and press portrayals of the social, political, and economic issues affecting German women's lives in the wake of the Second World War. By highlighting the ways in which *Gone with the Wind's* fictional scenarios mirrored everyday life for women in occupied Germany, I argue that identification with Scarlett O'Hara offered female readers potential justifications for their behaviour at a time when women's choices, relationships, and bodies were subject to intense public scrutiny, and both Allied and German law makers proved unresponsive to their demands. Through its foregrounding of female suffering, the novel participates in the victim discourse which arose in the first decade after the Second World War, enabling German women to claim that they had been victims of the war instead of interrogating their own collusion with, or tacit acceptance of, the Nazi regime.⁸ Although both Allied cultural policy and women's everyday lives in occupied Germany have received considerable scholarly attention, there has so far been little effort to combine these two fields. By focusing on popular middle-brow literature with a predominantly female readership, this article examines the links between cultural consumption and socio-political context during the occupation period.

It is important to note that the equally popular film of *Gone with the Wind*, starring Vivien Leigh and Clark Gable, was not released in West Germany until 1953 – fourteen years after its US premiere in 1939. Since the focus of this special issue of *German Life and Letters* is the Allied occupation from 1945 to 1949, the article concentrates exclusively on the book as the only version available to German audiences in this period. I examine the specific set of circumstances which motivated women's choice of *Gone with the Wind* as reading material, and what the reading experience may have offered them in return. What parallels are there between Scarlett O'Hara's story and women's lives in postwar Germany? To what extent does *Gone*

with the Wind affirm or challenge prevalent gender roles at this point in time? What made this particular fiction the most popular reading choice among German women for over a decade, and what might explain its continued popularity from wartime to postwar era?

I. A Head Start: *Gone with the Wind* and the Postwar Book Trade

Although it was an American novel, the first postwar edition of *Gone with the Wind* was published in the British Zone. Following Germany's unconditional surrender in May 1945, the US and Britain had put in place broadly similar policies for controlling the German publishing industry. In the British Zone this was controlled by the Information Services Control Branch, while in the American Zone this task fell to the Information Control Division (ICD). Both were in charge of rationing and allocating paper, and both operated a licensing system, checking an applicant's political background before granting a licence to run a publishing house.

British policy makers emphasised the need for highbrow literature over light entertainment, since their policies aimed to reform German society by targeting its cultural and political elites.⁹ Meanwhile, American military government was concerned with promoting 'translations of American books which convey, factually and without propaganda, American life and democratic ideals'.¹⁰ Based on these criteria, *Gone with the Wind* was clearly not an ideal candidate for achieving American or British book policy goals in Germany. Instead of promoting democracy, the novel idealises the Old South with its rich white plantation owners and exploitation of slave labour. Far from portraying the US as a democratic nation, it shows a country divided by civil war, which practices racial segregation. In terms of

intrinsic literary merit, *Gone with the Wind* is not exactly highbrow literature, but a skilfully narrated page-turner.

Although *Gone with the Wind* did not meet most of the Allied selection criteria, its publisher did. The ideal applicant for a publishing licence was ‘one who possessed training and experience in publishing, sufficient financial resources or backing to assure his success, and who had actively resisted the Nazis’.¹¹ Henry Goverts, head of the Goverts publishing house which had published *Gone with the Wind* in 1937, proved to be this ideal candidate. The son of a Hamburg merchant family, Goverts had liberal and democratic sympathies, counted Carl Zuckmayer among his university friends, and had worked with both the theatre director Max Reinhardt and the sociologist Alfred Weber in the Weimar Republic. His business partner, Eugen Claassen, had been part of the liberal milieu of the *Frankfurter Zeitung* during this time.¹² Although founded in 1934, barely a year after Hitler came to power, the Goverts publishing house had avoided publishing national socialist literature in the ‘Third Reich’, focusing instead on novels, poetry, young authors, and translations of Italian and American literature. In March 1945, Goverts had been forced to flee to Liechtenstein, after the Nazis discovered his connection to the dissident Kreisau Circle.

This unblemished political record, and the fact that the Goverts publishing house had survived the ‘Third Reich’ without being closed down or subsumed into a larger business, gave Goverts and Claassen a head start over other postwar publishers. The licensing process implemented by the Allies turned out to be time-consuming, requiring several different levels of approval: from July to the end of September 1945, only eight publishers were licensed in the US Zone.¹³ Meanwhile, the British did not even have the requisite forms available until September 1945.¹⁴ Whereas other would-

be publishers got caught up in lengthy bureaucratic battles with the authorities, on 31 October 1945 Goverts and Claassen were among the first to receive a publishing licence from the British occupiers for their Hamburg business.¹⁵

A further advantage was that *Gone with the Wind* had already been translated and published before the war, meaning that Goverts neither had to wait nor pay for translation rights. This, again, gave it an important head start over other publishers, since the procedures imposed by the Allies in this area also proved lengthy and inefficient. Normally, in the case of American literature, the Civil Affairs Division in Washington would obtain translation rights for a particular book from the US copyright holder, before the German-based Information Control Division would offer a German publisher these translation rights.¹⁶ This system made German publishers unattractive to the American market, since the army could only offer a modest flat rate of \$250 for German-language rights, prompting many companies and authors to sell to Swiss publishers instead.¹⁷

A watershed moment for the German book market occurred in 1948 with the currency reform in the Western zones, turning it overnight from a seller's into a buyer's market. It marked an important change in the target market for books, since these no longer had to appeal to the Information Control officer in charge, but instead to the German public.¹⁸ The transition from Allied licensing monopoly to free market had some interesting consequences: 'demand increased for light fiction, travel, and other entertaining books', whereas interest in political and religious literature declined.¹⁹ As the US Military Governor noted in a 1948 report: 'Illustrative of this was the complete sale of the initial edition of Margaret Mitchell's *Gone with the Wind*'.²⁰ This was probably due to another factor working in *Gone with the Wind*'s favour: demographics.

Occupied Germany was populated mainly by women and children. Over three million German soldiers had been killed in the war, and seven million were still in POW camps, meaning that in 1945 the German population consisted of around seven million more women than men.²¹ Pejoratively known as the 'Frauenüberschuss', the shortage of men in occupied Germany created all kinds of problems and possibilities, temporarily changing women's roles in the economy and the family, and leading to frequent discussions of these effects in the postwar press.

Many of the German women forced to take men's place in society in 1945 were deeply traumatised by their experiences during the German defeat. Many will have shared Scarlett's experiences in some form or another: seeing their homes attacked or raided by a foreign army, suffering homelessness and evacuation, or being forced to flee (especially from the former eastern territories of the 'Reich'). In the Soviet Zone in particular, the occupation was initially also accompanied by mass rapes and looting.²² Once fighting had ceased, the most widespread problems in all zones of postwar Germany were hunger, poverty, homelessness, and disease. Those women lucky enough to survive the war now faced an even greater challenge: surviving everyday life in occupied Germany.

II. 'As God is my witness, I am never going to be hungry again': Hunger and Loose Morals

The first and most pressing issue confronting the population of occupied Germany was food: women had to feed themselves, their children, and often relatives or in-laws sharing their cramped living space. The German defeat was followed by drastic food shortages, particularly in large cities like Berlin, where refugees from the East poured

in on a daily basis. In May 1945, the daily ration for Berlin housewives consisted of 312g of bread, 400g of potatoes, 30g of grain, 20g of meat, and 7g of fat.²³ This ration card was nicknamed the ‘Hungerkarte’ or ‘Himmelfahrtskarte’, since it was impossible to survive on it without supplementing the rations in some way.²⁴ Ten months into the occupation, the Allies still struggled to feed the population of their respective zones, and rations kept decreasing further: for the British Zone they lay somewhere between 1,050 and 1,591 calories; in the American Zone they were slightly more stable at 1,270 calories; and inhabitants of the French Zone were allotted a meagre 950 calories.²⁵ As the British campaigner Victor Gollancz pointed out in 1946, these figures were well below the 2,650 calories deemed necessary for daily subsistence by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA).²⁶ Even the few items listed on a ration card could only be obtained by long hours of queuing outside shops, with supplies frequently running out before one reached the front of the queue. Many women resorted in desperation to the black market or ‘Hamsterfahrten’ – laborious (and illegal) journeys out to the countryside on overcrowded public transport to barter their last belongings in exchange for food.

Hunger dominates the central part of *Gone with the Wind*. It acts as a turning point for the protagonist, drawing a sharp caesura between her carefree girlhood and her future role as provider: hunger becomes the catalyst for Scarlett’s subsequent actions. One of the novel’s most famous passages occurs when Scarlett is lying in the dirt behind the ruins of the neighbouring plantation, and is literally sick from hunger. However, she refuses to be defeated by this misery:

As God is my witness, as God is my witness, the Yankees aren’t going to lick me. I’m going to live through this, and when it’s over I’m never

going to be hungry again. No, nor any of my folks. If I have to steal or kill
– as God is my witness, I'm never going to be hungry again.²⁷

From this moment, Scarlett's behaviour and all her decisions are motivated by a compulsive striving for food, money, safety, and stability. Having vowed never to go hungry again and to provide for her 'folks' at any cost, Scarlett is as good as her word. She does, in fact, go on both to steal and to kill: When a lone Yankee soldier arrives at Tara intent on stealing their remaining belongings and food, Scarlett shoots him in the face, searches his pockets for money, and buries his body behind the house.

Occupied Germany saw a similar erosion of moral values driven by necessity. Shortages of food, fuel, and clothing were compounded by the coldest winter of the twentieth century in 1946-47, resulting in 60,000 deaths from hypothermia and malnourishment.²⁸ Stealing, bribing, forging documents, or working the black market became features of women's daily survival work. Evidence of these changing moral codes can be seen in a questionnaire produced for readers of the Berlin women's magazine *Sie* in January 1948 under the title 'Sind Sie moralisch noch intakt?'. Women were encouraged to assess their own moral standards by asking themselves questions such as:

- Sie fanden eine Lebensmittelkarte. Der Inhaber war nicht vermerkt. Würden Sie die Karte an das Amt zurückgeben?
- Würden Sie bei einer mehr als fünfstündigen Eisenbahnfahrt im Sommer einer siebzijährigen Frau, die auf dem Trittbrett reist, Ihren Platz im Coupé abtreten?
- Würden Sie das gleiche bei 5 Grad Frost tun?
- Halten Sie die Beteiligung der eigenen Kinder an einem Diebstahl für besonders verwerflich?

- Sie haben eine billige, wenn auch 'schwarze' Einkaufsquelle entdeckt. Nennen Sie diese Ihren Bekannten?
- Haben Sie niemals bei der Ausstellung eines Dokumentes, einer Reisebescheinigung, der Lebensmittelkarte, eines Zeugnisses und so fort sich einer noch so geringen Unwahrheit schuldig gemacht?²⁹

Interestingly, the magazine provided no key to the results of the questionnaire, refusing to judge its readers' morals, and tacitly acknowledging that the behaviours cited were necessary to get by. The scenarios depicted provide insights into the concrete situations faced by those trying to survive in the 'cigarette economy' of postwar Germany, where the Reichsmark was of little value and only labour or commodities had meaningful purchasing power.

One commodity which could be traded for food or clothing in this economy was a woman's body. Although the war had seriously depleted the German male population, there were large numbers of young foreign soldiers on German soil. Since Allied soldiers had better rations and access to such luxuries as nylons and cigarettes, several German women resorted to prostitution or entered into relationships with members of the occupying forces in return for food, shelter, or protection.³⁰

Although Scarlett never actually resorts to prostitution, and reserves nothing but contempt for Atlanta's 'bad woman' Belle Watling, she does not shy away from offering up her body in return for material gain. When she is in danger of losing Tara due to new taxation laws, and having heard that Rhett Butler has made a fortune on the black market, Scarlett makes herself a dress from her mother's curtains and offers herself to Rhett in return for his money. Initially, her plan is to persuade Rhett to marry her as a long-term solution to her financial woes:

Her mind ticked on steadily. Coldly and logically an idea grew in her brain. [...] ‘I’ll marry him,’ she thought coolly. ‘And then I’ll never have to bother about money again.’ (526)

However, remembering Rhett’s aversion to marriage, she is prepared to compromise on this: ‘if he would not marry her but still wanted her, there was a way to get the money. After all, he had once asked her to be his mistress’ (527). Having formulated this plan, Scarlett nevertheless wrestles with her conscience, since her behaviour constitutes a radical departure from everything she has previously believed in:

she fought a quick decisive battle with the three most binding ties of her soul – the memory of Ellen, the teachings of her religion and her love for Ashley. [...] But all these things went down before the merciless coldness of her mind and the goad of desperation. (528)

Scarlett is ruthlessly calculating and rational in her choice of partner. Despite her former attraction to Rhett, the decision to become his mistress at this point is motivated solely by economic factors. When her plan fails, Scarlett barely hesitates to marry the middle-aged Frank Kennedy instead, who is all but engaged to her sister Suellen. In doing so, she knows she is very probably depriving her sister of her only hope of marriage, since men of marriageable age are in short supply following the war.

III. ‘There’s no fun being married’: Marriage and Families in Occupied Germany

Despite the shortage of eligible German men, divorce rates soared during the occupation years. Around 88,000 marriages were dissolved in 1948 alone,

representing an 80 percent increase since 1946.³¹ Although divorce rates began to decline again in the 1950s, the ‘divorce epidemic’ of the initial postwar years sparked a public debate on the perceived crisis of the family. *Gone with the Wind* portrays a number of very different marriage models, whilst clearly highlighting Scarlett’s dubious reasons for entering into these unions.

One reason for many divorces in postwar Germany was the high number of hasty wartime marriages, which had not allowed partners to get to know each other for any length of time before the husband’s deployment. One journalist characterised these war marriages as nothing more than ‘legalisierte Urlaubsverhältnisse’.³² *Gone with the Wind* begins with just such a marriage: to spite Ashley, who has rejected her, Scarlett enters into a rash and loveless marriage with the feckless Charles Hamilton. Charles dies within days of the outbreak of war, leaving Scarlett to face the boredom and isolation of widowhood, and to raise an unwanted child.

She was soon released from the bonds she had assumed with so much haste and so little thought, but she was never again to know the careless freedom of her unmarried days. Widowhood had crowded closely on the heels of marriage but, to her dismay, motherhood soon followed. (128)

With remarkable candour the novel shows Scarlett’s lack of attachment to her husband and child. Far from romanticising the dead war hero and the mother’s subsequent bond with his child, Mitchell stresses Scarlett’s resentment at having to mourn a man she never loved, and to raise a child she never wanted. In this sense, *Gone with the Wind* may have offered comfort and relief to German women struggling with feelings of resentment towards their husbands and children.

However, it was not just hasty wartime marriages which were in peril after the German defeat. Even more stable couples found that long separations and the

formative experiences of danger had so changed them that reunion was impossible. Cramped living arrangements, poverty, and the extreme difficulties of daily postwar life also combined to make married life intolerable for some. Writing for the *Nordwestdeutsche Hefte* in the British Zone, the columnist Walther von Hollander noted that Germany's defeat had damaged German men's pride and credibility, with the result that women were no longer willing to believe in male leadership. Like many commentators at the time, von Hollander attributed the marriage crisis to women's increased emancipation during and after the war:

Die Frauen haben sich während des Krieges in einem männlich todbedrohten und männlich beruherfüllten Leben großartig bewährt. Sie haben [...] oft im Sexuellen ein Leben geführt, das sich bisher der Mann, mit Recht oder Unrecht, vorbehalten hatte.³³

The journalist Annemar Hinrichs joined Hollander in the opinion that the war and its consequences had contributed to women changing faster than before. She concluded that some women 'sind in den Härteproben des Lebens der letzten Jahre so ausgeprägt selbständig geworden, daß es den Männern zumindest schwierig erscheint, sich neben der selbstsicheren Partnerin zu behaupten'.³⁴ Instead of embracing independence and self-sufficiency in a woman as useful qualities, a predominantly conservative press believed these traits threatened the stability of traditional marriage.

Although Scarlett's second marriage in *Gone with the Wind* does not end in divorce, it portrays exactly the kind of gender role transgression feared by postwar German commentators. Having married middle-aged Frank Kennedy for his money, Scarlett does not trust her husband to manage his business, since he is too lenient in extending credit to his customers. Upon discovering that she has a better head for

arithmetic than Frank, Scarlett wonders whether she might also be better at conducting business:

A startling thought this, that a woman could handle business matters as well or better than a man, a revolutionary thought to Scarlett who had been reared in the tradition that men were omniscient and women none too bright. Of course, she had discovered that this was not altogether true but the pleasant fiction still stuck in her mind. Never before had she put this remarkable idea into words. She sat quite still, [...] thinking that during the lean months at Tara she had done a man's work and done it well. (604)

Scarlett's emancipation astonishes even her, but having performed traditionally 'masculine' labour in the aftermath of the war gives her the confidence to stray further beyond traditional gender roles:

With the idea that she was as capable as a man came a sudden rush of pride and a violent longing to prove it, to make money for herself as men made money. Money which would be her own, which she would neither have to ask for nor account for to any man. (605)

When Scarlett proceeds to buy and manage a sawmill by herself, Frank finds her behaviour and public disregard for social conventions deeply embarrassing. Scarlett's independent actions increasingly isolate her from respectable Atlanta society, and although she is conscious of the difference between herself and others, she finds herself unable to revert to being the person she was before the tremendous social upheaval caused by war and defeat.

In addition to Scarlett's first two disastrous marriages, a large part of the novel is taken up with portraying a different kind of family unit: the female-headed

household. While the men are away, Scarlett assumes her new role as head of the household at Tara, driving her family and the remaining loyal slaves ever harder to contribute their share in working on the plantation and procuring food: 'She would hold Tara, if she had to break the back of every person on it' (426). Scarlett repeatedly emphasises her own fierce independence and resents the constant presence of her sister-in-law Melanie, who is physically weak and dependent on her for protection. It is only at the end of the novel, when Melanie dies following a miscarriage, that Scarlett realises just how much she has relied on another woman's strength and support since the war:

as Scarlett looked sadly back, she realized that Melanie had always been there beside her [...] unobtrusive as her own shadow, loving her, fighting for her with blind passionate loyalty, fighting Yankees, fire, hunger, poverty, public opinion and even her beloved blood kin. [...] Suddenly she was standing at Tara again with the world about her ears, desolate with the knowledge that she could not face life without the terrible strength of the weak, the gentle, the tender-hearted. (987-88)

Far from being supremely independent, Scarlett now recognises that she has in fact depended on Melanie through all the major crises of her adult life. For a long time during and after the war, Scarlett and Melanie jointly headed an almost entirely female household, with Scarlett acting as the material provider, and Melanie providing much-needed emotional support.

This model of a family centred on the mother was much discussed in postwar Germany as an alternative to the patriarchal nuclear family. With so many men lost or estranged from their wives by war, the female-headed household remained a widespread phenomenon well into the 1950s. Elizabeth Heineman's research shows

that, '[i]n 1950, one of every three West German households was headed by a woman, and [...] nearly twenty percent of urban children lived in female-headed households in 1953-54'.³⁵ In the late 1940s, this situation caused grammar school teacher Dorothea Klaje to spark a debate in the press by proposing radical social and legal reform to bring legislation of the future Federal Republic in line with the changed reality of German families.

In contrast to the traditional definition of family, with the father as breadwinner and the mother as child-minder, Klaje put forward the concept of the 'Mutterfamilie', redefining family as 'eine Gemeinschaft von Erwachsenen und Unerwachsenen zum Zwecke der Erziehung der Unerwachsenen'. According to this definition it was 'gleichgültig, ob der Vater des Kindes lebt oder tot ist, ob er in einer Ehegemeinschaft mit der Mutter zusammengeschlossen ist oder nicht', since the family's centre was the mother. In her proposal to the Parliamentary Council, which was at that time drafting the new West German constitution, Klaje argued that matriarchal families should be supported by the state, through taxes on single men and childless women.

Die Mutter ist Familienvorstand und bleibt es auch, wenn sie sich später verheiratet. Sie bestimmt den Wohnsitz der Familie, ihr gehört die Wohnung bzw. das Haus. Bei der Heirat behält die Frau ihren Mädchennamen bei [...]. Alle Kinder, auch die in der Ehe geborenen, tragen den Namen der Mutter.³⁶

Under these circumstances, in order to balance the demands of work, child care, and household chores, two or more women might opt to live and raise children together – which in many German families was already the case.

Ultimately, Klaje's proposal was not taken into consideration by the Parliamentary Council, but discussion of her ideas continued in several publications, particularly women's magazines. A number of female commentators dismissed Klaje's claims as too radical, but joined her in demanding reforms of marriage and divorce law, as well as an improved standing for illegitimate children.³⁷ While most participants in the debate considered the suggestion of two women heading a family as laughable or impractical, an article in the *Tagesspiegel* advocated the legal sanctioning of families composed of two or more women with children:

Vielleicht sollte man die Frauen, die sich ernsthaft zu einer solchen Gemeinschaft zusammenschließen wollen, als Familie anerkennen und ihnen bestimmte Vorrechte einräumen. Man könnte ihnen bevorzugt eine Wohnung verschaffen [...]. Die Behörden könnten ihnen Steuererleichterungen gewähren und ihnen die gleichen Versicherungsrechte geben wie anderen Familien, und schließlich sollte vielleicht jene [...], die die Aufgaben der Hausfrau übernimmt, nach einer gewissen Zahl von Jahren ebenso eine Rente [...] bekommen wie eine Ehefrau.³⁸

Although both public opinion and the postwar press seemed at least balanced in their discussion and at best supportive of reforms of family structure and women's rights, this had little discernible effect on actual policy decisions in the early Federal Republic. When discussing Klaje's proposals, Robert Moeller calls it 'remarkable' that 'by the early fifties not even muted variations on these themes resounded in women's magazines, sociological literature, or the halls of parliament'.³⁹ Far from redefining social order, Konrad Adenauer's Christian Democratic Union (CDU)

promoted a conservative image of the family and narrowly defined gender roles within it, apparently closing down the short-lived debate on women's rights.

III. 'Why had God invented children?': Motherhood and Reproductive Politics in Occupied Germany

One potential consequence of both marriage and fraternization was, of course, motherhood. Debates raged in the German postwar press over the mother's position in the family, over illegitimacy, adoption, and abortion. In 1946 the rate of illegitimacy in Germany was more than twice that of 1939.⁴⁰ Whether legitimate or not, at a time when women were struggling to feed and clothe their existing families, pregnancy could amount to disaster. Although expectant mothers received increased rations from the fifth month of pregnancy onwards, this did little to ease their material woes. There were hardly any baby clothes or diapers available.⁴¹ Statistics compiled by local health insurance providers (*Ortskrankenkassen*) show the effects of women's constant hard labour inside and outside the home: in 1947, 12 per cent of mothers were found to be suffering from exhaustion, and 14 per cent from insomnia and stress due to overwork. Within two years, these figures had increased to 59 per cent and 43 per cent respectively.⁴² In light of these difficulties, Victor Gollancz claimed that German women no longer wished to have children: 'Instead of desiring a child many women are now succumbing to a deep despondency, thus the diagnosis of a new pregnancy often arouses fits of despair'.⁴³

Consequently, abortion rates in occupied Germany increased dramatically. Whereas during the war there had been one abortion for every twenty live births, in 1945 the figure was estimated at one for every 3.3 live births.⁴⁴ However, poverty was

not the only reason for this peak in abortions. Following the mass rapes by the Red Army during the conquest of Berlin, medical abortions were permitted for Berlin women who testified that they had been raped by a member of the occupying forces (usually Russian soldiers, but there were also isolated reports of rape by American and French soldiers).⁴⁵ Berlin health records show that between 8 November 1945 and 1 February 1946 over 250 pregnancies were approved for termination – some as late as the seventh or eighth month.⁴⁶

This practice amounted to a *de facto* suspension of paragraph 218 of the German ‘Strafgesetzbuch’, which forbade abortion in most cases. Although the Allies tolerated the practice, they did not go so far as to remove this paragraph from German law.⁴⁷ The instances of rape decreased significantly after the initial weeks of the occupation, but due to widespread poverty, the legal status of abortion remained a hotly contested topic in the German press. In Berlin, both the British-licenced *Telegraf* and the US-licenced *Tagesspiegel* devoted full-page spreads to the issue, printing opinion pieces by doctors, biologists, legal experts, and social workers, and also featuring *vox pop* interviews and letters to the editor.⁴⁸

Although still opposed to fully legalising abortion, by March 1947 the Control Commission had put forward proposals for minor reforms as part of the new German penal code. These permitted medical abortions if the mother’s life was in danger or the pregnancy had resulted from rape.⁴⁹ However, despite these suggestions paragraph 218 was eventually adopted without changes in the new penal code for the West German Federal Republic and the German Democratic Republic in the East. It wasn’t until the 1970s that feminist campaigners succeeded in forcing through significant changes to this law.⁵⁰

Gone with the Wind may have provided some reassurance to women opposed to pregnancy in postwar Germany, since Scarlett's attitude towards motherhood is anything but conventional. Instead of regarding the role of mother as a woman's true fulfilment, Scarlett abhors it. She is disgusted by the physical process of pregnancy and childbirth, lamenting that it ruins her figure. Shortly after her first husband dies in the army, Scarlett is horrified to learn that she is pregnant:

Scarlett had wept with despair at the knowledge that she was pregnant and wished that she were dead. [...] She felt little affection for the child, hide the fact though she might. She had not wanted him and she resented his coming and, now that he was here, it did not seem possible that he was hers, a part of her. (133)

Although over the course of the novel Scarlett gives birth to three children by three different men, they are hardly given much of an interior life within the narrative, being presented chiefly through Scarlett's eyes as an inconvenience and an imposition on her life. Indeed, Scarlett's and Melanie's perilous flight from Atlanta to Tara is considerably hampered by the presence of Scarlett's son Wade:

Why had God invented children, she thought savagely as she turned her ankle cruelly on the dark road – useless, crying nuisances they were, always demanding care, always in the way. In her exhaustion, there was no room for compassion for the frightened child [...] – only a weariness that she had borne him [...]. (394)

Following her second child's birth, Scarlett vows not to have any more children, since this would hinder her from running her lumber business, thereby limiting her

independence. When she does fall pregnant again after her marriage to Rhett, Scarlett briefly considers an illegal abortion. However, Rhett warns her of the dangers of this procedure and forbids her to risk her life in such a manner. Once their daughter Bonnie Blue is born, Rhett's excessive care, pride, and interest in the child contrast sharply with Scarlett's failure to nurture her children.

IV. 'I'll think about that tomorrow': Victimhood and Complicity in Postwar Women's Narratives

It is difficult to write about German women's suffering after the Second World War without questioning the legitimacy of such an undertaking. After all, Nazi Germany had just inflicted the worst suffering known to humanity on most of its neighbours and large parts of its own population. Given the atrocities perpetrated prior to 1945, it may seem petty to point out hunger, poverty, and other hardships endured by Germans during and after defeat. Can we really consider the former perpetrators as victims after the Second World War?

Since the 1980s, increased research in German feminist history has identified women's previously ignored contributions to economic, political, and social life after the war.⁵¹ However, the emphasis on German women's suffering, particularly striking in several oral history collections, threatens to displace memories of the suffering endured by victims of the Holocaust and those subjected to German invasion and occupation before 1945. The question whether to consider German women as victims in the aftermath of the Second World War depends on 'the degree of continuity or rupture with the era before 1933 and after 1945', and the German self-perceptions this enables.⁵²

In her seminal essay 'The Hour of the Woman', Elizabeth Heineman argues that female postwar experience played a crucial role in shaping West German collective memory of the occupation years. According to Heineman, certain aspects of stereotypically female experience were universalised to form some of the Federal Republic's founding myths. Thus, female victimhood at the hands of the occupying forces became 'generalized into stories of German victimhood'; the 'Trümmerfrau' became the symbol of West Germany's remarkable recovery and heroic reconstruction efforts after defeat; and stories of female sexual promiscuity were seen to indicate a general moral decay during the occupation period rather than the Nazi period.⁵³ Appropriating female experience enabled Germans to memorialise the hardships of the postwar years without enquiring too deeply into the events which had led to this situation.

These findings are consistent with Robert Moeller's research, which shows a victim discourse already emerging among Germans during the occupation period. Far from turning German suffering into a taboo subject, in the first decade after the Second World War, Germans 'devoted considerable energy to assessing their losses and incorporating their victim status into public memory and politics', so that by the 1950s, 'rhetorics of victimisation were central parts of the civic culture of the early Federal Republic'.⁵⁴ According to Moeller, focusing exclusively on their own suffering was a way for Germans to ignore the events which had led to this situation.⁵⁵

Contemporary press reports support Moeller's contention that during the occupation period Germans did not want to be confronted with their recent past. Several newspapers remarked on Germans' unwillingness to engage with the

‘Zeitstück’ or ‘Zeitroman’, the topical contemporary play or novel. As a journalist for the monthly theatre journal *Die Bühnenkritik* put it in 1947,

das aktuelle Zeitstück braucht uns keine Spiegel mehr vorzuhalten oder Fragen zu stellen, die haben wir selbst genug auf dem Herzen und in welcher Situation wir leben, wissen wir leider zu deutlich.⁵⁶

In the same year, a survey conducted among Berlin women summarised answers to the question ‘Welche besonderen Liebhabereien haben Sie?’ thus:

Fast alle antworteten: lesen, lesen! Geben Sie uns Bücher, nicht nur Broschüren. Richtige große Romane, Biographien. Viele wollen die Zeit vergessen. [...] ‘Unsere Probleme sind so nackt und nüchtern’, urteilte eine Befragte für viele. ‘Wir wollen keinen Zeitroman, aber auch keine romantische Verlogenheit, wir wollen Romane, in denen große Seelen leben, die noch intakt sind, die uns ein Leben zeigen, das noch wirklich Leben genannt werden kann.’⁵⁷

This frame of mind goes some way towards explaining *Gone with the Wind*’s enormous popularity among German women during and after the Second World War: the novel occupies the middle ground between realism and escapism.

While *Gone with the Wind* contains vivid descriptions of postwar suffering and survival work, its nineteenth-century American setting is at several removes from German women’s immediate experience between 1945 and 1949. Moreover, it is surprisingly easy to read the book without confronting the issues of race and slavery. Narrated largely from the point of view of a white upper-class protagonist, the novel seems curiously untroubled by the causes of the American Civil War, and more concerned with the difficulties in race relations *after* the abolition of slavery. Mitchell mourns the ‘Old South’, its values, and its society, presenting the efforts of the

emerging Ku Klux Klan as chivalrous and gentlemanly behaviour, necessary to right the wrongs done to Southerners (particularly to Southern women). African-American characters such as Mammy, Prissy, Pork, and Uncle Peter are presented as loyal but somewhat stupid, and a pervasive unreflective use of racist vocabulary ('darkies', 'free issue niggers' etc.) indicates that Scarlett does not consider events from the perspective of someone racially and socially disadvantaged by the antebellum regime.

In the rare instances where issues such as slave-owner relations are debated, it is to demonstrate that the Yankee occupiers are far more racist than their Southern counterparts, who supposedly have a better understanding of how to treat African Americans. When a Yankee woman rejects Scarlett's advice to employ a freed slave as a nurse, saying that she would not 'trust [her] babies to a black nigger' (656), and subsequently insults Uncle Peter, Scarlett's reaction is indignant, even violent:

the knowledge that they had hurt the faithful old darky with their stupid remarks fired her like a match in gunpowder. [...] They deserved killing, these insolent, ignorant, arrogant conquerors. (657)

However, even Scarlett's protective reaction betrays her inability to consider former slaves as humans with equal rights. While claiming superior knowledge and a kinder, more liberal attitude over the Yankees, she simultaneously others and infantilises all African Americans:

They did not know that negroes had to be handled gently, as though they were children, directed, praised, petted, scolded. They didn't understand negroes or the relations between the negroes and their former masters. Yet they had fought a war to free them. And having freed them, they didn't want to have anything to do with them, except to use them to terrorize Southerners. They didn't like them, didn't trust them, didn't understand

them, and yet their constant cry was that Southerners didn't know how to get along with them. (658)

Scarlett continues to regard herself as benevolent towards the African American characters in her life, while maintaining that they should not be free or have the right to vote. Failing to acknowledge her complicity in and benefit from a social system which treated certain minorities as less than human, Scarlett is outraged at the Yankees' ignorance of 'how it really was'.

MGM's 1939 film of *Gone with the Wind* faithfully portrays the race relations as they appear in the novel, similarly characterising the black figures as unintelligent and infantile, and their white masters as necessarily harsh with them. This proved to be the key reason why the film was deemed unsuitable for screening in occupied Germany by the US Information Control Division. Given the novel's established popularity in Germany, and the fact that *Gone with the Wind* was the highest-grossing picture of all time, the film would have offered considerable entertainment value to Germans whilst simultaneously demonstrating American technical superiority. However, in a 1947 *Hollywood Quarterly* article, Robert Joseph, a former Film Officer for Berlin and Deputy Film Officer for Germany, pointed out the difficulty in finding film content suitable both for reforming German minds and presenting the US in a favourable light:

Objectivity is a quality which is not characteristic of the Germans. *Gone with the Wind* [...] might have been selected to show (1) the excellence of American color film, (2) the epic sweep of the story, and (3) the intelligent acting and direction. Yet, the Negro incidents in the picture were found objectionable.⁵⁸

Although neither book nor film reflects on its inherent racism, a decade after the novel's original publication US authorities were clearly aware of the negative light it shed on their country. With a considerable number of black GIs stationed in Germany, and aware of the hypocrisy of preaching racial equality to Germans whilst implementing segregation at home and within its own troops, the US found itself unable to export one of its prime cultural products, which would almost certainly have been guaranteed German box office success.

The fact that the novel was not banned, but in fact re-released in postwar Germany demonstrates the inconsistencies in Allied cultural policy during the occupation. While the Allies were attempting to implement a programme of re-education and reform, in this case there was an unofficial process of counter-cultural exchange going on, by which German women continued to cherish a racist American narrative which spoke to some of their most pressing concerns.

With its consistent emphasis on female suffering and resilience, *Gone with the Wind* arguably offers scope for identification to women in any context of trauma – irrespective of geographical location, though not irrespective of race or class. However, it seems particularly pertinent to the German postwar case in being narrated from the point of view of the losing side whilst avoiding any confrontation with the losers' tacit collusion with the former regime. Scarlett resolutely refuses to look back, thereby absolving herself of all responsibility:

‘I don't know why we fought and I don't care,’ said Scarlett. ‘And I'm not interested. I never was interested. War is a man's business, not a woman's. All I'm interested in now is a good cotton crop.’ (480)

It does not make much difference to Scarlett under what regime she exists, so long as she is able to earn money, have nice things, retain ownership of Tara, and provide for her family.

Gone with the Wind's riches-to-rags-to-riches narrative of economic success and security echoes the German postwar founding myths identified by Moeller, in which 'East and West German victims alike established their identities as survivors, and survivors became the shapers of their own destinies, able to return Germany to the proper path'.⁵⁹ The rhetoric of victimisation thus became a prerequisite for Germans' subsequent emphasis on their triumph over postwar hardships: 'On both sides of the Cold War divide success was measured in reconstructed cities, economic recovery, the provision of adequate housing, and a sense of security'.⁶⁰ Surveying more recent examples of German memory culture, Helmut Schmitz agrees with this assessment, stating that 'German wartime suffering is re-inscribed into a narrative of the economic miracle and the successful overcoming of hardship while being politicised and instrumentalised into a foundational myth of the young Federal Republic'.⁶¹ This fiction neatly eluded any consideration of what had caused postwar hardship in the first place.

As the economic and social issues raised in this article show, women in occupied Germany certainly had good reasons for adopting Scarlett's self-perception as victim of the war. However, several scholars of the occupation period have stressed the need to move beyond a perpetrator/victim dichotomy when discussing women's changing roles in the final war and early postwar years.⁶² While Moeller sees part of the problem in historical accounts 'that end some stories too early and start others too late',⁶³ Heineman calls for an acknowledgement of 'a more complicated relationship between vulnerability and privilege' in German women's histories. In her view, a

crucial point ‘to such historical writing is the recognition of women’s agency, which permits us to see both troubling and admirable choices, even by subjects with a limited range of motion’.⁶⁴ The enthusiastic reception of *Gone with the Wind* in occupied Germany indicates that perhaps Margaret Mitchell’s fictional narrative accomplished what historical scholarship is still struggling to achieve: a nuanced account of women’s wartime and postwar lives, whose protagonist makes both troubling and admirable choices, and is by turns privileged, humiliated, vulnerable, resilient, and above all, identifiably human.

¹ Erna Eschenburg, quoted in Sibylle Meyer and Eva Schulze, *Wie wir das alles geschafft haben: Alleinstehende Frauen berichten über ihr Leben nach 1945*, Munich 1984, pp. 74-5.

² Hellmut Jaesrich, ‘Margaret Mitchell gestorben’, *Der Tagesspiegel*, 17 August 1949, p. 5.

³ Margaret Mitchell, *Vom Winde verweht*, tr. Martin Beheim-Schwarzbach, Hamburg 1937.

⁴ See Anne-Marie Wallrath-Janssen, *Der Verlag H. Goverts im Dritten Reich*, Munich 2007, p. 447.

⁵ John Haag, ‘Gone with the Wind in Nazi Germany’, *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 73 (1989), 278-304 (279).

⁶ See Wallrath-Janssen, p. 447. See also Eva Siewert, ‘Wie der Roman *Vom Winde verweht* entstand’, *Telegraf*, 4 October 1946, p. 5; unknown author, ‘Mit den Augen einer Frau...’, *Telegraf*, 2 August 1949, p. 5.

⁷ Charlotte Fang, ‘Hier Wunschzettel, dort Zufallstreffer: Wer liest was in der Volksbücherei? Berlinerinnen sind lesehungrig’, *Sie: Die Wochenzeitung für Frauenrecht und Menschenrecht*, 3 July 1949, p. 6.

-
- ⁸ For an overview of the debate on German victim discourses, see Helmut Schmitz, 'Introduction: The Return of Wartime Suffering in Contemporary German Memory Culture, Literature and Film', in *A Nation of Victims? Representations of German Wartime Suffering from 1945 to the Present*, ed. Schmitz, Amsterdam 2007, pp. 1-30.
- ⁹ See Gabriele Clemens, *Britische Kulturpolitik in Deutschland 1945-1949: Literatur, Film, Musik und Theater*, Stuttgart 1997, pp. 68-9.
- ¹⁰ OMGUS, 'Functional Report Information Control', no. 42, 20 December 1948, p. 14, Institut für Zeitgeschichte (Munich), Microfilm MA 560.
- ¹¹ Edward C. Breitenkamp, *The US Information Control Division and its Effect on German Publishing and Writers 1945-1949*, University Station, ND 1953, p. 40.
- ¹² See Wallrath-Janssen, *Der Verlag*, p. 5.
- ¹³ John B. Hench, *Books as Weapons: Propaganda, Publishing, and the Battle for Global Markets in the Era of World War II*, Ithaca 2010, p. 231.
- ¹⁴ See Breitenkamp, *The US Information Control Division*, p. 40.
- ¹⁵ See Wallrath-Janssen, *Der Verlag*, p. 6.
- ¹⁶ Hansjörg Gehring, *Amerikanische Literaturpolitik in Deutschland 1945-1953: Ein Aspekt des Re-Education-Programms*, Stuttgart 1976, p. 37.
- ¹⁷ Hench, *Books as Weapons*, p. 250.
- ¹⁸ See Gehring, *Amerikanische Literaturpolitik*, pp. 29-30.
- ¹⁹ Hench, *Books as Weapons*, p. 255.
- ²⁰ OMGUS, 'Monthly Report of the Military Governor', no. 41, November 1948, p. 38, IfZ (Munich), Microfilm MA 560.
- ²¹ See Maria Höhn, 'Stunde Null der Frauen? Renegotiating Women's Place in Postwar West Germany', in *Stunde Null: The End and the Beginning Fifty Years Ago*, ed. Geoffrey J. Giles, Washington, D.C. 1997, pp. 75-87 (76).

²² See Norman M. Naimark, *The Russians in Germany: A History of the Soviet Zone of Occupation, 1945-1949*, Cambridge, MA 1995, pp. 69-140. For further discussion of rape in the context of the occupation, see Atina Grossmann, 'A Question of Silence: The Rape of German Women by Occupation Soldiers', *October* 72 (1995), 42-63.

²³ See Elizabeth Heineman, 'The Hour of the Woman: Memories of Germany's "Crisis Years" and West German National Identity', *The American Historical Review* 101 (1996), 354-95 (374).

²⁴ See Höhn, 'Stunde Null', p. 85; Leonie Treber, *Mythos Trümmerfrauen: Von der Trümmerbeseitigung in der Kriegs- und Nachkriegszeit und der Entstehung eines deutschen Erinnerungsortes*, Essen 2014, p. 217.

²⁵ See Giles MacDonogh, *After the Reich: From the Liberation of Vienna to the Berlin Airlift*, London 2007, p. 363.

²⁶ See Victor Gollancz, *Leaving Them to their Fate: The Ethics of Starvation*, London 1946, p. 5; and Gollancz, *In Darkest Germany*, London 1947, p. 29.

²⁷ Margaret Mitchell, *Gone with the Wind*, London 1971, p. 419. All further page numbers in brackets refer to this edition.

²⁸ See MacDonogh, *After the Reich*, p. 374.

²⁹ Unknown author, 'Ein Fragebogen: Sind Sie moralisch noch intakt? Ein völlig inoffizieller Fragebogen, den Sie nur sich selbst beantworten sollen', *Sie*, 4 January 1948, p. 5.

³⁰ See Robert Moeller, *Protecting Motherhood: Women and the Family in the Politics of Postwar West Germany*, Berkeley 1993, pp. 23-5; Heineman, 'The Hour of the Woman', 380; Michaela Freund, 'Women, Venereal Disease, and the Control of Female Sexuality in Post-War Hamburg', in *Sex, Sin and the Suffering: Venereal*

Disease and European Society since 1870, ed. Roger Davidson and Lesley Hall, London 2001, pp. 205-19 (207).

³¹ See Heineman, 'The Hour of the Woman', 380.

³² Unknown author, 'Andere Zonen – gleiche Probleme', *Sie*, 15 December 1946, p. 2.

³³ Walther von Hollander, 'Wie überwinden wir die Ehekrise?', *Nordwestdeutsche Hefte* (April 1946), 26-7.

³⁴ Annemar Hinrichs, 'Gibt es wirklich zu viele Frauen?', *Sie*, 1 May 1949, p. 11.

³⁵ Elizabeth Heineman, 'Complete Families, Half Families, No Families at All: Female-Headed Households and the Reconstruction of the Family in the Early Federal Republic', *Central European History* 29 (1996), 19-60 (19-20).

³⁶ Dorothea Klaje, 'Auch ein Vorschlag: die Mutterfamilie', *Sie*, 27 February 1949, p. 5. For further discussion of reactions to the 'Mutterfamilie' proposal in several postwar women's magazines, see Angela Seeler, 'Ehe, Familie und andere Lebensformen in den Nachkriegsjahren im Spiegel der Frauenzeitschriften', in *Frauen in der Geschichte V: 'Das Schicksal Deutschlands liegt in der Hand seiner Frauen' – Frauen in der deutschen Nachkriegsgeschichte*, ed. Anna-Elisabeth Freier and Annette Kuhn, Düsseldorf 1984, pp. 102-13.

³⁷ See Agnes von Zahn-Harnack (Weimar-era women's rights activist and co-founder of the 'Berliner Frauenbund 1945'), Nora von Kapp (Chairwoman of the 'Antifaschistische Frauenliga Bayerns'), and Lucia Finger, 'Nochmals: die Mutterfamilie', *Sie*, 20 March 1949, p. 8.

³⁸ Bvm, 'Familie – ohne Mann', *Der Tagesspiegel*, 24 April 1948, p. 3.

³⁹ Moeller, *Protecting Motherhood*, p. 78.

⁴⁰ See Heineman, 'Complete Families', 21.

⁴¹ See Katharina Luthardt, 'Wollen Frauen heute Kinder? – Beobachtungen in einer Berliner Klinik', *Telegraf*, 29 March 1947, p. 5.

⁴² See Maria Höhn, 'Frau im Haus und Girl im *Spiegel*: Discourse on Women in the Interregnum Period of 1945-1949 and the Question of German Identity', *Central European History* 26 (1993), 57-90 (65).

⁴³ Gollcancz, *In Darkest Germany*, p. 43.

⁴⁴ See Heineman, 'Complete Families', 21.

⁴⁵ An estimated 500,000 women in Berlin were raped at the end of the war, many during the height of the violence, from 24 April to 5 May 1945. However, estimates vary considerably (from 20,000 to almost a million women), and since many women were raped more than once, the actual incidence of rapes was much higher. See Grossmann, 'A Question of Silence', 46; Erich Kuby, *Die Russen in Berlin 1945*, Bern 1965, pp. 312-13.

⁴⁶ See Grossmann, 'A Question of Silence', 55-6.

⁴⁷ Unknown author, 'Für und Wider des Paragraphen 218', *Telegraf*, 25 October 1946, p. 8.

⁴⁸ See 'Diskussion um den Paragraphen 218', *Telegraf*, 21 December 1946, p. 5; 'Der umstrittene Paragraph: Diskussion um die Frage der Schwangerschaftsunterbrechung', *Der Tagesspiegel*, 9 March 1947, p. 2.

⁴⁹ See Dr Franz Neukamp, 'Schwangerschaftsunterbrechung und Adoption', *Der Tagesspiegel*, 9 March 1947, p. 2.

⁵⁰ See Dagmar Herzog, *Sex after Fascism: Memory and Morality in Twentieth-Century Germany*, Princeton, NJ 2005, p. 205.

⁵¹ See Meyer and Schulze (eds), *Wie wir das alles geschafft haben*; Beate Hoecker and Renate Meyer-Braun (eds), *Bremerinnen bewältigen die Nachkriegszeit*, Bremen

1988; Margarete Dörr (ed.), *‘Wer die Zeit nicht miterlebt hat...’: Frauenerfahrungen im Zweiten Weltkrieg und in den Jahren danach*, Frankfurt/Main 1998.

⁵² Atina Grossmann, ‘Feminist Debates about Women and National Socialism’, *Gender & History* 3 (1991), 350-8 (350-1).

⁵³ See Heineman, ‘The Hour of the Woman’, 355.

⁵⁴ Robert G. Moeller, ‘The Politics of the Past in the 1950s: Rhetorics of Victimisation in East and West Germany’, in *Germans as Victims: Remembering the Past in Contemporary Germany*, ed. Bill Niven, Houndmills 2006, pp. 26-42 (27 and 33).

⁵⁵ Moeller, *Protecting Motherhood*, p. 14.

⁵⁶ R. L., ‘Kurz und kritisch’, *Die Bühnenkritik* 1/3 (May 1947), 26.

⁵⁷ Unknown author, ‘Wie leben sie?’, *Sie*, 5 January 1947, p. 3.

⁵⁸ Robert Joseph, ‘Our Film Program in Germany: How Far Was It a Success?’, *Hollywood Quarterly* 2 (1947), 122-30 (126).

⁵⁹ Moeller, ‘The Politics of the Past’, p. 35.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ Schmitz, ‘Introduction: The Return of Wartime Suffering’, p. 11.

⁶² See Atina Grossman, ‘Trauma, Memory, and Motherhood: Germans and Jewish Displaced Persons in Post-Nazi Germany, 1945-1949’, *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 38 (1998), 215-39; Elizabeth Heineman, ‘Gender, Sexuality, and Coming to Terms with the Nazi Past’, *Central European History* 38 (2005), 41-74; Robert G. Moeller, ‘Germans as Victims?: Thoughts on a Post-Cold War History of World War II’s Legacies’, *History & Memory* 17 (2005), 147-94.

⁶³ Moeller, ‘Germans as Victims’, 176.

⁶⁴ Heineman, ‘Gender, Sexuality’, 62.
