

Marko Zajc

ANDREJ GOSAR: The Woman Question

Author: Andrej Gosar

Title: The Woman Question

Originally published: *Za nov družabni red: sistem krščanskega socialnega aktivizma*, vol. 2 (Celje: Družba Sv. Mohorja, 1935).

Language: Slovenian

About the author

Andrej Gosar (1887, Logatec–1970, Ljubljana) was one of the most important Slovenian sociologists, economists, and political thinkers of the twentieth century. He dedicated his intellectual life to seeking a more socially just economic order, developing ideas grounded in Catholic social thought, the Church's social teachings, and Christian personalism. Gosar defies easy classification within traditional historical dichotomies such as liberalism versus Catholicism or socialism versus Christianity. A prominent Catholic intellectual known for his dedication to social justice and democratic principles, he played an active role in the conservative Slovenian People's Party (*Slovenska ljudska stranka*, SLS) and in the Yugoslav Professional Association (*Jugoslovanska strokovna zveza*, JSZ)—a trade union of Slovenian Catholic workers that served as the main platform for Slovenian Christian socialists.

Andrej Gosar was born in Logatec in 1887. After completing gymnasium in Ljubljana, he pursued legal studies in Vienna, graduating in 1916. Following the

establishment of the Yugoslav state, he joined the Commission for Social Welfare (*Poverjeništvo za socialno skrbstvo*) (1919–1920) alongside **Albin Prepeluh** and Anton Kristan and served as commissioner there in 1920.¹ The same year and again in 1925, he was elected as a representative of the Slovenian People's Party to the National Assembly (*Narodna skupština*) in Belgrade. In 1927 and 1928, he held the position of Minister of Social Affairs. For several years, he represented Yugoslavia on the Social Committee of the League of Nations in Geneva. Starting in 1929, he lectured on law, economics, and sociology at the Faculty of Engineering at the University of Ljubljana, within the Department of National Economy.²

Although he was loyal to Catholic doctrine and SLS party discipline, Gosar remained a democrat and advocate of parliamentarism throughout the interwar period. During the 1920s, he was recognized as one of the intellectual leaders of the Christian social movement. The movement's trade union wing, with which Gosar was closely aligned, grew increasingly radical. Unlike Christian socialist movements in other Central European countries, the Slovenian Christian socialists refused to submit to SLS party discipline following the papal encyclical *Quadragesimo anno* (1931). In 1932, they broke away from the SLS and turned to a more radical form of Christian socialism, which adopted certain features of Marxism. Gosar, however, disagreed with this direction and distanced himself from the movement. Slovenian historiography refers to his circle as the "Democrats" or the "Catholic Center." This stream of Slovenian Catholicism declined rapidly in the 1930s, as it was attacked both by the Catholic Right, which moved ever closer to fascism, and by the Christian socialists, who began to adopt Marxism.³

Although he devoted himself to an academic career in the 1930s, he remained active in political affairs, though his influence as a politician slowly diminished.⁴ Andrej Gosar played an important role in the public debate on the crisis of the Catholic cultural journal *Dom in svet*, which was triggered by Edvard Kocbek's 1937 essay *Premišljevanje o Španiji* (A Reflection on Spain).⁵ In the debate that led to Kocbek's expulsion from *Dom in svet*, Gosar took a middle course, though he defended Kocbek in public. Gosar remained part of *Dom in svet*'s consortium while also collaborating with Kocbek's new magazine *Dejanje*. Judging by his diary entries, the rebellious Kocbek was not bothered by Gosar's social and political ideas, but rather by his viewpoint that these ideas could only be implemented

1 See the entry on Albin Prepeluh in this volume.

2 Janko Prunk, "Gosar, Andrej," *Enciklopedija Slovenije*, vol. 3 (Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 1989), 302.

3 Egon Pelikan, "Andrej Gosar in znamenja časov," *Dr. Andrej Gosar (1887–1970)*, ed. Jure Gašparič and Alenka Veber (Celje: Društvo Mohorjeva družba – Celjska Mohorjeva družba, 2015), 147–61.

4 Jure Gašparič, "Andrej Gosar med Slovensko ljudsko stranko in Jugoslovansko radikalno zajednicno: o njegovem političnem položaju v tridesetih letih 20. stoletja," in *Dr. Andrej Gosar (1887–1970)*, 35–45.

5 See the entry on Edvard Kocbek in this volume.

under the auspices of Catholicism and under the leadership of Church hierarchy.⁶ By contrast, communist intellectuals at the time more fiercely criticized Gosar's ideas. As noted by Vida Deželak Barič, Edvard Kardelj described Gosar's influential work *Za nov družabni red* (For a New Social Order), an excerpt of which is translated below, as a scientific contribution to the development of Slovenian fascist thought.⁷

After the collapse of Yugoslavia and the Axis occupation in April 1941, Gosar initially attempted to assume leadership of the SLS and to steer it away from collaboration with fascist forces. He entered talks with the Liberation Front (*Osvobodilna fronta*, OF), but no agreement was reached. Realizing he could not regain control of the SLS, he chose to act independently, forming a small centrist group called *Združeni Slovenci* (United Slovenes). He established contacts with Draža Mihailović's Chetnik movement and secretly took over the role of chairman of the National Committee for Slovenia from Mihailović. As a political figure untainted by collaboration with fascism, Gosar was also of interest to the British. In September 1944, he learnt through British intelligence channels that the British were convinced of Tito's victory. Political groups outside the communist-dominated OF tried to take desperate measures to prevent this scenario. According to some accounts, Gosar took part in efforts to persuade the Slovenian quisling Home Guard forces to go underground and launch an uprising against the German troops in coordination with the Allies. However, these plans fell through. The German authorities arrested him and sent him to the Dachau concentration camp as a result.⁸

After the Second World War, the socialist authorities allowed Gosar to teach at the university, albeit not in law, economics, or sociology, but only in land registry and mining law. He was also prevented from publishing and engaging in public activities. In 1966, he received the papal honor *Pro ecclesia et Pontifice*. He retired in 1958 and lived in privacy until the end of his life in 1970.

In the 1990s, Andrej Gosar's political and social thought re-emerged as a topic of intellectual discussion, both within Catholic circles and the broader social sciences.⁹ In 1992, Tomaž Simčič—a Slovenian educator and Catholic cultural

6 Mihael Glavan, "Pričevanja o Andreju Gosarju v dnevnikih Edvarda Kocbeka," in *Dr. Andrej Gosar (1887–1970)*, 94.

7 Vida Deželak-Barič, "Dr. Andrej Gosar in slovenski komunisti v desetletju pred 2. svetovno vojno," *Krščanstvo in socialno gibanje: dr. Andrej Gosar, življenje – delo – pomen*, ed. Tadeja Petrovčič Jerina (Celje: Društvo Mohorjeva družba – Celjska Mohorjeva družba, 2014), 12.

8 Bojan Godeša, "Dr. Andrej Gosar v času okupacije 1941–1945," in *Dr. Andrej Gosar (1887–1970)*, 47–56.

9 Srečo Dragoš, *Katolicizem na Slovenskem: socialni koncepti do druge svetovne vojne* (Ljubljana: Krtina, 1998). Peter Kovačič Peršin, *Andrej Gosar – tretja pot v slovenski predvojni politiki* (Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti, 2007), 249–67.

worker from Trieste—published the first biography of Gosar, with a focus on his social Catholicism.¹⁰ At a 2014 symposium on Andrej Gosar, the legal expert and conservative politician Lovro Šturm contended that Slovenian communists had appropriated and altered Gosar's concept of self-management, thereby preventing its implementation in independent Slovenia.¹¹ At the same event, the sociologist Srečo Dragoš, despite his general criticism of the Catholic Church, highlighted Gosar's significant contribution to the development of the welfare state in Slovenia through Catholic social thought. Dragoš claimed that Gosar's ideas remain highly relevant today, particularly as a counterbalance to dominant neoliberal doctrine.¹² Andrej Gosar's legacy continues to spark debate within Slovenian public discourse.

MOST IMPORTANT WORKS: *Narodnogospodarski eseji* (Ljubljana 1920); *Odломki socialnega vprašanja* (Ljubljana, 1921); *Za krščanski socializem: pomislenki in odgovori* (Ljubljana, 1923); *Kriza moderne demokracije* (Ljubljana 1927); *Za nov družabni red: sistem krščanskega socialnega aktivizma*, 2 vols. (Celje, 1933–1935).

Context

The source below is Andrej Gosar's chapter on the woman question from the second volume of his major work *Za nov družabni red* (For a New Social Order, 1935), in which Gosar sought to understand social, economic, and political phenomena as a whole. Although women were not among Gosar's primary concerns, we chose to include this source in the reader for several reasons. As noted in the introduction, this collection aims to highlight often overlooked yet significant dimensions of political thought—such as nationalism among feminists or the agrarian question among communists. Gosar's perspective as a centrist Catholic thinker, who embraced certain aspects of women's emancipation while rejecting others, offers valuable insight into the complex position of women and feminism in Slovenian society. Additionally, it provides a comparative lens through which to examine the important issue of women's roles in interwar Catholic intellectual milieux in East Central European societies. Female intellectuals played an important role in shaping the Catholic public sphere, accepting feminist demands

10 Tomaž Simčič, *Andrej Gosar, krščanstvo in socialno gibanje* (Trieste: Mladika–Ljubljana: Slovenec, 1992).

11 Lovro Šturm, "Kako si je partija prilastila Gosarjev koncept samoupravljanja, ga popačila in naposled preprečila, da bi po osamosvojitvi zaživel v demokratični Sloveniji," in *Krščanstvo in socialno gibanje*, 50.

12 Srečo Dragoš, "Ignoriranje Gosarja," in *Dr. Andrej Gosar (1887–1970)*, 247–66.

and principles, but adapting them to established Catholic beliefs about the role of women in society. The idea of “social motherhood”—the extension of the traditional role of caring for family and society—was the dominant ideological foundation of Catholic women’s movements.¹³ Ivanka Anžič Klemenčič—the former editor of the feminist magazine *Slovenka* (1897–1902) and later one of the editors of the leading Catholic newspaper *Slovenec*—wrote in 1932 that the mission of the modern, free woman was “to be a mother to human beings in whatever form, in whatever profession, and to carry her motherhood into the social and political structure of society.”¹⁴

To understand Gosar’s position on the so-called woman question, it is essential to examine first the main trajectories of his political and social thought. In 1926, as many other thinkers at the time, Gosar wrote about the crisis of modern democracy and parliamentarism in the journal *Čas*.¹⁵ According to Gosar, parliaments made decisions without sufficient knowledge. Although committed to democracy and the market economy, Gosar rejected the liberal model of parliamentary democracy. He referred to Carl Schmitt’s idea that “democracy”—since it is used by all political “directions”—has no political content in itself,¹⁶ and quoted the Austrian legal theorist Hans Kelsen, who suggested that political parties appoint experts to parliament instead of electing representatives.¹⁷ Despite its crisis, he believed parliamentarism should be reformed, not abolished. The central idea was autonomy: people deciding their own affairs. He proposed a bicameral parliament, with one political and one socio-economic chamber, but saw its success as dependent on proper cultural and social conditions.¹⁸

Gosar’s social theory of the 1930s remained fundamentally consistent with its core principles from the mid-1920s, despite the dramatically different political climate at the time of the publication of his monumental two-volume work *Za nov družabni red* in 1933 and 1935. Following the collapse of Yugoslav parliamentarism in 1928 and the establishment of the royal dictatorship of 1929, Yugoslavia adopted a post-democratic, restricted representative system. Meanwhile, Pope Pius XI’s encyclical *Quadragesimo anno* (1931) galvanized the Catholic Right,

13 Gabriela Pošteková, “*Katolická jednota* Magazine as an Intellectual Source of Catholic Women,” *Forum Historiae* 19, no. 1 (2025): 80.

14 Ivanka Klemenčič, “Beseda ženske urednice ‘Slovenca’,” *Slovenec* 60, no. 238, October 16, 1932, 7.

15 For example, a former social democrat and one of the leading Yugoslav feminists, Alojzija Štebi, also criticized parliamentary democracy at the time. See Andělová and Grubački, “Crises of Feminism and Democracy in the Interwar Period: Yugoslav and Czechoslovak Entanglements,” in *East Central European Crisis Discourses*, eds. Trencsényi et al., 159–82. Trencsényi, “Crisis of Democracy,” in *Intellectuals and the Crisis of Politics*, 167–93.

16 Carl Schmitt, *Tri razprave* (Ljubljana: Študentska organizacija Univerze, 1994), 23, 90.

17 Hans Kelsen, *The Essence and Value of Democracy* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), 62.

18 Peter Vodopivec, “O Gosarjevi kritiki parlamentarne demokracije,” *Prispevki za novejšo zgodovino* 49, no. 1 (2009): 247.

while authoritarian regimes based on Catholic corporatist ideology emerged in European Catholic countries, such as the Salazar Oliveira regime in Portugal in 1932 and Engelbert Dollfuß's regime in Austria in 1934.

Gosar's *Za nov družabni red* aimed to encompass the full spectrum of social issues. The first volume (1933) delved into the philosophical, sociological, and economic foundations of Christian social activism, whereas the second volume (1935) extensively addressed the issue of general welfare. He devoted significant attention to the socialization of the national economy, which he defined as the continuous intervention of social authorities in the natural course of economic life.¹⁹ Societies could achieve this in two ways: through nationalization and communalization or through an intensive national economic and social policy. Gosar primarily supported the latter, although he advocated for the nationalization of key economic sectors such as railways, power plants, and significant mines.²⁰

In the context of the anti-democratic trends of the 1930s, Gosar's steadfast commitment to democracy, parliamentarism, and private property is particularly noteworthy. While in 1925 he proposed resolving the relationship between political and social democracy through the aforementioned scheme of an expertise-based bicameral parliament, he left the issue of a parliamentary corporatist chamber as the second (socio-economic) chamber of parliament open. In his view, the necessity of such a chamber depended on the structure of the relationship between parliament and professional or vocational chambers. The greater the indirect influence of these chambers, the lesser the need for their direct representation in parliament.²¹ The overarching principle linking Gosar's political and social thought in the decade-long period between 1925 and 1935 was the idea of self-governance. Gosar emphasized that democracy was not doomed to extinction but rather destined to be subsumed within the broader social principle of general self-governance.²²

Gosar addressed the "woman question" as the first topic in the chapter "The Resolution of Other Pressing Issues." He derived the causes of this issue from the German Jesuit theologian Victor Cathrein (1845–1931), who attributed women's "departure" from the domestic sphere to industrialization.²³ The fundamental problem, according to Gosar, lay in men's insufficient earnings to support their families, necessitating women's participation in the workforce.²⁴ In his reflections

19 Andrej Gosar, *Za nov družabni red: sistem krščanskega socialnega aktivizma*, vol. 2 (Celje: Družba sv. Mohorja, 1935), 333.

20 Ibid., 369.

21 Ibid., 533.

22 Ibid., 494.

23 See, e.g., Victor Cathrein S.J., *Die Frauenfrage* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1901).

24 Gosar, *Za nov družabni red*, vol. 2, 828.

on the position of women in society, Gosar acknowledged gender equality from the perspective of Christian doctrine, asserting that both men and women are created in the image of God. However, he emphasized the natural physical and spiritual differences between the sexes, which, in his view, dictated distinct social roles.²⁵ He argued that these differences facilitated the harmonious coexistence and functioning of society by contributing to the stability of the family and community. Consequently, Gosar rejected strict advocates of gender equality, particularly Marxist theorists such as Friedrich Engels, August Bebel, and Karl Kautsky.²⁶

In Gosar's view, women should have full access to all professions for which they were qualified. Nevertheless, he envisioned a social order in which men would be able to support their wives financially, rendering women's employment unnecessary. He described female labor as a temporary and unfortunate necessity that would become redundant in an ideal future society. This could be the main issue differentiating him from the contemporary feminist thinkers of the time, for whom women's employment was the key issue; even the more conservative thinker **Minka Govekar**, who also put emphasis on the importance of the nation and the family, prioritized women's professional independence, even arguing for the professionalization of housework.²⁷ At the same time, he supported women's participation in public life and women's suffrage, arguing that general political matters were equally significant for both genders. Women, according to Gosar, should also have an appropriate voice and influence under the principle of self-governance. While he emphasized the importance of women's engagement in legal and economic matters, he remained ambiguous about whether he endorsed complete gender equality. He believed that a self-governing societal structure would grant women greater influence than before but cautioned against their premature advancement in public life. Women, he argued, should be gradually introduced to various public and political responsibilities. He justified his "middle ground" approach between full women's equality and women's traditional exclusion from politics by asserting that women in countries where they had obtained voting rights often did not know how to use them and voluntarily renounced them.²⁸ Notably, he cited as a source the book *Žena v sedanjji družbi* (Woman in Contemporary Society, 1934) by the communist intellectual Angela Vode, who wrote about how women with higher educations in Germany had turned their backs on feminism and voted for Hitler.²⁹

25 Ibid., 831.

26 Ibid., 836.

27 See the entry on Minka Govekar in this volume.

28 Gosar, *Za nov družabni red*, 844.

29 See the entry on Angela Vode in this volume.

Gosar's approach to accommodating women's demands can also be viewed through the lens of the "leap forward"—a metaphor introduced into Slovenian historiography by the historian Egon Pelikan to describe Catholicism's adaptation to modernity. Initially, political Catholicism rejected social innovations as a threat, only to later gradually appropriate or actively promote them. Although Catholic politicians and theorists opposed women's participation in public life, they recognized the necessity of organizing women in the modern era; otherwise, other ideological movements would mobilize them against the Catholic cause.³⁰ Overall, however, it remains doubtful whether Gosar's efforts to reconcile Catholic teachings with feminist ideas really represent a significant step towards gender equality. According to the Slovenian sociologist Maca Jogan, Gosar's view of women hardly differs from that of traditionally more conservative Catholic sociologists such as Aleš Ušeničnik. Gosar, like other Slovenian Catholic thinkers of the first half of the twentieth century, adhered to the concept of natural gender determination, wherein a woman's primary role was that of wife, mother, and housewife. Gosar, Jogan claims, framed the "woman question" as an economic issue, asserting that it would be resolved if men earned sufficient wages. Gosar emphasized the importance of motherhood and domestic work, maintaining that women should be wholly devoted to these roles, thereby reinforcing their economic dependence on men.³¹

Acknowledgement

This contribution is a result of the research program Political History (P6-0281) funded by the Public Agency for Research and Innovation of the Republic of Slovenia (ARIS).

³⁰ Egon Pelikan, *Akomodacija ideologije političnega katolicizma na Slovenskem* (Maribor: Obzorja, 1997), 12.

³¹ Maca Jogan, "Natura habet sexus: produkcija moškosrediščne kulture kot nature v slovenski katoliški sociologiji," *Znamenje* 20, no. 2 (1990): 105–19.

ANDREJ GOSAR

Chapter 6, “Addressing Other Pressing Social Issues”

Section 1, “The Woman Question”

b) Women’s Equality Issues and Solutions

1. General Issues

The fundamental problem of the woman question and the modern women’s movement is ensuring that men and women are entirely equal or fully equitable as society’s constituent parts. All the social differences that still separate women from men today must disappear. Instead, the principle of full equality and the equity of men and women must prevail.

It goes without saying that based on our Christian worldview, it is absolutely impossible to challenge this demand in principle, as both man and woman are created in the image of God, and both possess an immortal soul that is to fulfill its true and final destiny with God. In this crucial respect, not even the slightest difference exists between men and women. Therefore, it is also perfectly clear and beyond any doubt that both men and women are, in principle, absolutely equal in terms of their personal or, so to say, human worth and should therefore also be completely equitable.

Naturally, equality and equity do not imply sameness. On the contrary, there are so many physical and spiritual differences between men and women that it would be ridiculous to hide and belittle them. It is also not enough to acknowledge only those differences between men and women that have been so deeply ingrained in the physical and spiritual nature of one and the other that they cannot be even remotely equated. Such an action would be manifestly excessive and would represent a sin against the very foundations of a healthy social order. Precisely because men and women are not identical but rather visibly different in many ways, they are called and destined to fulfill different social tasks and functions by their nature. This is precisely why they can mutually serve the common and communal goals of family, community, nation, state, the Church, etc. ...

2. The Issue of Women's Equality in the Family

It goes without saying that such an idea of women's emancipation is, at its very core, anti-social and distinctly non-communal. A new generation raised and educated in such circumstances would not even know true motherly love, let alone have any sense of true love for one's neighbor or even homeland. This would undermine one of the most essential foundations of true communal coexistence between people in general. *Therefore, we must say that even the most ideal equality of wife and husband, gained and redeemed at the price of motherhood and proper family life, would entail inestimable social damage and loss.*

There is no other choice: *either we opt for family and family life with the inevitable dependence of the wife on the husband, or we give up in advance the idea of true communal coexistence in general. There is no other way, and there cannot be any other way according to the natural conditions of human life. ...*

It is clear from these very examples that it is impossible only to arrange these matters externally so that wives and husbands are guaranteed full equality in every case. First and foremost, the practical arrangements of this relationship depend, and will always do so, on the personal relationship and the personal qualities and abilities of the husband and wife. In particular, it would be futile to look for such an external solution to the problem that would guarantee the wife's complete financial independence from her husband. Such a thing would only be possible at the cost of motherhood and family life in general. In short, something like that could only be achieved *if the wife were no longer a wife, mother, and housewife but, at best, merely a companion to her husband. This would mean the complete triumph of the most selfish individualism over the communal idea of a harmonious society. ...*

3. The Issue of Women's Equality in Gainful Activity

... Indeed, we can see that most such barriers have already been eliminated in modern life. Nowadays, women can be found in professions where they truly belong according to all their qualities and abilities. Only very few cases exist where women are denied access to a profession simply because of their gender,³² and even these obstacles, insofar as they still exist, will undoubtedly also disappear.

Of course, as we have seen, this represents the source of many problems and inconveniences. These developments have many negative consequences,

³² In our country, women generally have access to all public services, except that they cannot become judges. Original footnote from the source text.

particularly for family life. However, in principle, it would be impossible to argue against women taking up gainful employment. The only remedy for this is to introduce appropriate social reforms to create suitable conditions for men to be able to start their own families in time and assume most of the responsibility for their financial well-being.

As soon as this happens, most women would quickly find their way to their most natural and vital vocation. After all, there is no denying that for the vast majority of women, the ideal is to be a wife, mother, and home-maker. Even among the most prominent and determined champions of the modern women's movement, there is no shortage of those who are struggling hopelessly just because they themselves have not found their proper place in society.

Of course, it is different for women who devote themselves entirely to spiritual life—for example, art, science, humanitarian work, etc. A woman who sacrifices herself entirely to her spiritual work and aspirations and fully devotes her life to her ideals may completely forget the original and most universal of women's vocations. Their numbers will increase as more and more women educate themselves and open their paths into the most diverse spiritual spheres. However, they still represent only a few cases, which are not decisive for the resolution of the women's question in the usual sense.

4. The Issue of Women's Equality in Public Life

... In the first years after the war, women's suffrage was greatly expanded and became common in democratic countries. At first glance, it already seemed that women would soon gain the same influence in public life as men. However, in reality, it soon became clear that "for most women, the path to public life was not a conscious one."³³ For this reason, the practical success of the women's suffrage struggle has been relatively modest and will undoubtedly remain limited for a long time. The fact is that "to this day, most women have an outright aversion to anything that requires direct political participation."³⁴

Recently, these circumstances have been exacerbated by the anti-democratic developments in most European countries. The severe crisis of democratic parliamentarianism has pushed the issue of women's equality in political life so far into the background that it is hardly discussed any more. On the contrary, in the European countries considered to be at the forefront of

³³ Vode, *Žena v sedanji družbi*, 53.

³⁴ Ibid.

new political ideas and forms (Italy and Germany), all progress is headed in the opposite direction. The new fascist stance that prevails in these countries is diametrically opposed to women's political participation and encourages them to return to family and family life. However, it is even more characteristic that women themselves cling to these attitudes and willingly give in to the tempting hopes of a happy family life.³⁵ ...

To summarize briefly, all general civic or political matters carry, at least in general, the same relevance for women as for men. Therefore, in the sense of the self-government principle, which the organization of the new communal order has been based on, it is certainly necessary—at least in principle—that women also have a proper say and influence in all these matters. ...

However, all this is not enough. So far, we have discussed the need for women's representation in public life, mainly in terms of their own needs and benefits. In reality, women's access to a proper voice and influence in public life is also vitally and indispensably in the interest of the entire community—or, more precisely, in the interest of the various community groups in which women often play a prominent role and are more familiar with their real needs than men.

We only need to think of family life, the various issues of social protection for adolescents, especially young male and female workers, the issue of youth justice, etc. In all such matters, a truly satisfactory and adequate arrangement is almost unthinkable without women's participation. Therefore, it is also in the entire community's interest that women should have a proper say and influence in all such and similar matters, whether regarding their general organization or concrete decision-making related to these issues.

.....

³⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, 78, where the author complains: "Even those women who were college and university graduates turned their backs on feminists and followed Hitler. The fact that these so-called intellectuals fell for it just as much as the simple petty-bourgeois wives who followed their emotional proclivities is deplorable." Original footnote from the source text.