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Abstract

Based on a variety of source material and previous research, this microhistorical study represents the first comprehensive history of the *IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling*. Established in late 1948, it was the central facility within the US Zone of Germany where unaccompanied children were cared for by the *International Refugee Organization* (IRO). Displaced during or after World War II, their fates were as varied as those of adults who had survived the atrocities of the Nazi regime. In total, over 2,000 children (representing more than 20 nationalities) passed through the Children's Village.

The early days were marked by a prolonged struggle to get the installation into running order, secure necessary supplies and hire qualified staff. Tensions which arose as a result of these problems culminated in violent episodes of unrest among the children. The administrative setup in Bad Aibling was reorganized, and the situation gradually improved.

With the help of various voluntary agencies such as the *American Friends Service Committee* (AFSC), an ambitious program was developed from 1949 onwards. It was inspired by contemporary trends in child welfare and aimed at developing an inclusive, international community consisting of family-like living groups. Through schooling and vocational training, recreational activities, psychological treatment and individual case work, the inhabitants were prepared for life after the Children’s Village. A decision regarding the future of each child had to be reached. In the majority of cases, the options were either repatriation or resettlement abroad. While the political friction of the Cold War had an undeniable effect on the IRO’s activities in Bad Aibling, it seems impossible to derive a universal set of beliefs guiding the work of relief workers from this fact. Despite occasional contact with the German population as well as international press coverage, the Children’s Village remained more or less isolated from the outside world.

The last months of the Children’s Village saw new challenges as the IRO slowly began to wind down its operations in Europe. A change in US occupation policy saw the introduction of new courts which would decide the cases of the remaining children. In 1951, the Children’s Village shut its doors, and its inhabitants were moved to Feldafing. By early 1952, the cases of the remaining children had been closed. It is believed that the history of the Children’s Village, as part of a broader narrative of humanitarian efforts and child welfare in the postwar period, is relevant to the sphere of international relief work today.
Deciding upon a PhD topic is a process influenced by many factors, including personal interests, current trends in scholarly research, the feasibility of an idea, and sometimes, sheer chance.

In 2011, when I was an undergraduate student of History and English at the University of Munich, I was given a copy of Gottfried Mayr’s book *Das Kriegsgefangenenlager Bad Aibling 1945–1946*. It documents the history of a prisoner-of-war enclosure which was set up by American troops during the final days of World War II. *PWTE No. 26* was located on the grounds of a German military airbase on the outskirts of Bad Aibling, a town in Upper Bavaria. Since I had grown up in the area, I flicked through the pages with great interest—not knowing that I was about to stumble upon a piece of information which would trigger my first original research as a budding historian. The book’s final chapter mentions that thousands of Displaced Persons (DPs) moved into the former airbase after the last German prisoners had been discharged in late 1946. The area was now home to one of the many DP camps operated by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) all across Europe. I had only given an in-class presentation on DPs a few weeks previously, so was curious to find out more about the DPs who had once lived in Bad Aibling.

A cursory investigation revealed that no one had so far carried out any significant research. I found this first disappointing, but then intriguing, and decided to embark upon my own quest for more information. Once I learnt that there had in fact been two DP camps in Bad Aibling, I went on to explore the history of the first in my *Zulassungsarbeit* (the equivalent of a Master’s thesis), submitted in 2013. When this camp closed in the fall of 1948, the barracks of the former airbase became home to a new institution, the *IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling*. For my PhD dissertation, I had originally planned to write a combined history of both camps. However, the more I delved into the matter, the clearer it became that this was not the most desirable approach. The two camps, decidedly different from one another in terms of their respective purpose and setup, demand (and deserve) separate narratives. I therefore decided to dedicate my dissertation exclusively to the history of the Children’s Village.

Writing a dissertation is a solitary activity. But without the support of many people, it would have been an impossible undertaking.
in the first place. I would therefore like to express my gratitude to everyone who, in one way or another, helped this study come to fruition. Any shortcomings are mine alone.

At the University of Munich, I am above all indebted to my longstanding academic teacher and doctoral advisor, Professor Hans-Michael Körner, for his continual interest, valuable input and critical feedback throughout the process. A sincere thank you also goes to Professor Andreas Wirsching and Professor Ulrich Baumgartner who kindly agreed to serve as co-examiners.

Historians depend on the skills and support of competent staff to guide them through the depths of historical archives and other institutions with relevant holdings. For providing information, valuable leads, or access to source material, I would like to express my gratitude to Amanda Leinberger and Remi Dubuisson (UN Archives, New York), Amy Schmidt and Miriam Kleiman (National Archives and Records Administration, College Park), Andreas Nestl (Staatsarchiv, Munich), Angie Brown (Conard House, San Francisco), Axel Braisz (ITS Archives, Bad Arolsen), Dr Christoph Bachmann (Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich), Claude-Alain Danthe (World YMCA, Geneva), Daisy M. Gould (The Bermudian Publishing Company, Hamilton), Donald Davis (AFSC Archives, Philadelphia), Dr Franziska Jungmann-Stadler (HVB Stiftung Geldscheinsammlung, Munich), Gunnar Berg (YIVO Archives, New York), Hannah Ratford (BBC Written Archives Centre, Caversham), Howard Falksohn (The Wiener Library for the Study of the Holocaust & Genocide, London), Josh Caster (Archives & Special Collections, University of Nebraska-Lincoln), Laurie Ellis (Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute, Cambridge), Manfred Schaulies, Dr Gottfried Mayr and Herbert Gornig (Historischer Verein für Bad Aibling und Umgebung, Bad Aibling), Dr Mary Brown (CMS Archives, New York), Misha Mitsel (AJDC Archives, New York), Rachel Bracha (World ORT Archive, London), and Solange Roussier (Archives Nationales, Paris).

I am also greatly indebted to the Bavarian American Academy, Munich, as well as Be&O Wohnungswirtschaft, Bad Aibling, for generously providing travel grants which enabled me to visit several US archives in late 2014.

Other historians dedicated to research on DPs in the aftermath of World War II have, over the last few years, provided additional source material and creative input. Not only have I had the privilege of engaging in much-appreciated discussions with these colleagues; they have also offered continued support and encouragement, both in written exchange and on the occasion of various conferences which have widened my perspective on my subject of
research. In particular, I would like to thank Anke Kalkbrenner, Ina Schulz, Jim G. Tobias, Dr Lynne Taylor, Marcus Velke, Dr Susanne Urban, and Dr Verena Buser. I am also grateful to my co-workers at the Bavarian State Library in Munich, Dr Eva Kraus and Dr Lilian Landes, for their indispensable advice on how to tackle the challenge of doing a PhD.

Special thanks goes to the following individuals for their willingness to share with me either their memories of life in the Children’s Village or material from personal family archives, all of which was invaluable. Thank you, Andrew Reeves, Barbara Brauer, Bernard Lefson, Bohdan (who wished not to be mentioned by his full name), Carolyn Campbell, Derrick Deane, Mitka Kalinski, Fatema Möring, Jan Kmenta, Matt Regan, Max Monclair, Natalie Kempner, Paul Bojko, Peter Demetz, Peter Kingsley, Richard Pur, Savoy Horvath, Terry Metcalfe, Valentine (who wished not to be mentioned by his full name), Victor Bojko, and Wasyl Palijczjuk. You have provided me with a vivid link to life in the Children’s Village. Without that, my understanding of its history would have remained superficial.

Finally, I would like to thank my friends and family for their love, kindness, encouragement—and also patience—over the course of a prolonged project which had me firmly glued to my desk on countless evenings and weekends, but which I also very much enjoyed.
On 7 July 1949, a 14-year-old Polish boy named Marian G. was removed from the home of his German foster parents in Esslingen and taken to Bad Aibling, where the International Refugee Organization (IRO) was running a Children’s Village. The IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling¹ was part of a relief mission accredited by the Allied authorities in control of occupied Germany. Marian had been a child victim of the Nazis during World War II. Like thousands of others, he was forcibly removed from Poland in 1943 (where he had been living with a foster family after the death of his mother) and brought to Germany for Germanization, as part of a program carried out by the Lebensborn organization.² Its victims, predominantly children from the occupied territories of Eastern Europe, were taken from orphanages, and even their own families, if they were thought to display the required Aryan characteristics. They were then placed in special Lebensborn homes where they would not only learn German, but where every effort was made to eradicate their true identity by suppressing their mother tongue and any other behavior related to their national and cultural background. Once the children were considered sufficiently Germanized, they were moved on. They were given new names, then placed and raised within foster families in Germany—helpless pawns in the Nazi plan for the creation of the so-called master race. At the same time, the program aimed to demographically weaken the populations of the occupied countries.³

After the war, and five years after Marian had been placed with a German family, his Polish aunt made an official request that Marian be returned to Poland, to live with her. However, upon his arrival in Bad Aibling, Marian became extremely upset. He protested against the move which both he and his foster parents in Esslingen regarded as cruel and unjustified. He refused to return to Poland, a

¹ From now on, unless otherwise stated, the installation is referred to as the Children’s Village.
² ‘Survey of Children Established in German Economy, U. S. Zone’, 7 February 1951, ITS Archives, 84238680.
³ On the Lebensborn program, see Volker Koop, „Dem Führer ein Kind schenken“. Die SS-Organisation Lebensborn e. V. (Köln 2007); Georg Lilienthal, Der »Lebensborn e. V.«: Ein Instrument nationalsozialistischer Rassenpolitik (Frankfurt am Main 2008); Thomas Bryant, Himmlers Kinder. Zur Geschichte der SS-Organisation „Lebensborn“ e.V., 1935–1945 (Wiesbaden 2011).
country from which he had become estranged, believing his home was in Germany with his foster family, to whom he felt a deep attachment. Marian’s feelings did not alter during his stay in the Children’s Village. His aunt, acknowledging the boy’s wishes and the fact that the foster parents appeared to be taking good care of him, finally agreed that she would not insist on Marian being repatriated, if this was not in his best interests. As a result, the boy was returned to Esslingen in December 1949, and his case was closed.4

The details surrounding Marian’s fate—among them multiple experiences of displacement, the repeated loss of (surrogate) parents and the questioning of identity—are of fundamental relevance to the experience of many children admitted to the Children’s Village after World War II. As a first step in this introduction, and in order to gain a better understanding of the context behind stories such as Marian’s, we need to take a look at the phenomenon of DPs in Europe after 1945 in general. In a second step, we will examine the challenges surrounding children as a special group within the overall DP population. Both sections will contain a literature review of previous research carried out by historians. Finally, in the third section, methodological considerations on the topic of microhistory will serve as a link to the actual subject of this dissertation, the history of the Children’s Village.

Introduction

Displaced Persons After 1945

Millions of Europe’s citizens were scattered across the war-torn continent, outside the borders of their home countries, when Germany was defeated in 1945. The survivors of Nazi persecution, most of them had lived through concentration camps and forced labor. Having foreseen this hitherto unparalleled crisis of displacement, the Allies had already put in place a strategy to gain control of the situation. In a central memorandum drawn up by the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force (SHAEF) in 1944, the term Displaced Persons was defined as referring to “civilians outside the national boundaries of their country by reason of war”, who were “desirous but unable to return home or find homes without assistance”.¹ This definition appears straightforward and clear-cut. However, contrary to the hopes of the Allies for a swift resolution of the problem, the care and reestablishment of DPs would remain a challenging task for many years to come.

First of all, there were the sheer numbers. The Allies had to deal with 10–12 million DPs, 4.5 million of whom were roaming the Western Zones of Occupation in Germany alone. The advancing armies and the soon-established military governments needed the help of international relief agencies to take on the enormous task of providing the DPs with shelter, food, and other services. UNRRA, founded in 1943, was the most important organization of this kind. In order to house and control the vast DP population, and to prepare repatriation transports, special assembly centers (camps) were set up all across the continent. After the first somewhat chaotic weeks, this system functioned quite efficiently: by the end of September 1945, millions of DPs had been successfully returned to their home countries. This meant that a relatively small number remained, and their repatriation was expected to be completed within a matter of months.²

However, after the winter of 1945/1946 had halted the majority of transports, the Allies were surprised to learn that most of the remaining DPs (many of whom were from Eastern Europe) were unwilling to return to their countries of origin. Their motivations

varied, but the fear of political persecution and concerns regarding the economic situation at home played a significant role. Borders had shifted, and political systems had been overthrown. Other DPs believed they would not be able to start over in their home countries, after years of captivity and hardship abroad. These people began to constitute, in the terminology of the military governments and voluntary organizations supporting them, the so-called hard core. But another major factor contributing to this state of limbo was the fact that repatriation continued to be the main option offered to the remaining DPs, as this was mandated by UNRRA’s constitution. This state of affairs continued until the organization was liquidated in the summer of 1947. In the words of historian Ben Shephard, UNRRA, in this respect, “never overcame its sickly childhood.”

At this point a successor organization, also based at the UN, entered the field: the IRO took on UNRRA’s responsibilities in the camps. It also continued to encourage the repatriation of DPs. However, one change in policy was crucial: the IRO was also able to set in motion resettlement schemes—meaning that DPs could start over in a new country—on a global scale. By the time the IRO ceased operations in 1951, more than 700,000 DPs had been resettled abroad, the majority in countries such as the United States (US), Australia or Canada. Those left in Germany were, for the most part, elderly or in poor health, and therefore not eligible for resettlement. The only remaining option was to permanently place this group of DPs in Germany. For this reason, the Allies demanded that the German government introduce a law which would ensure proper legal rights for the remaining DPs. In the wording of this law, the term DP was replaced with Homeless Foreigner. At the end of 2013, a little more than 2,000 people with this status were still living in the Federal Republic of Germany.

---

3 Ibid., pp. 370–371.
6 Bundesministerium des Innern, Migration und Integration. Aufenthaltsrecht, Migrations- und Integrationspolitik in Deutschland (Berlin 2014), p. 25.
Historian Daniel Cohen has rightly noted that “DPs constituted an absentee category throughout most of the post-war years.” and that they “almost entirely disappeared from the radar of public memory after the closing of nearly all DP camps in 1952.” The revealing title of an article by Tamara Frankenberger also indicates an “absence of remembrance”, and with regard to Jewish DPs, Laura Jockusch has linked the lack of Holocaust memorialization following the immediate postwar years to the fact that these DPs had “formed a society in transit during an interim period […] without leaving an indelible mark—both in the figurative as well as in the literal, physical sense.”

Whilst these observations are clearly valid, there were in fact early attempts to document the DP phenomenon. To begin with, there were the official UNRRA and IRO histories, both of which were published under the auspices of the UN. This raises unavoidable questions of objectivity, and perhaps this is one of the reasons why contemporary historians frequently do not rely on these works in their writings. However, it can be said that both histories do provide us with useful factual documentation regarding the work of UNRRA and the IRO. A comprehensive study of wartime and postwar refugee movements (covering forced labor, the history of concentration camps, DPs, and German refugees) was published by Malcolm J. Proudfoot in 1957. Although it does deal with the missions of UNRRA and the IRO, its focus is wider. This

---

8 Ibid., p. 91.
also applies to a book on European refugees written by Michael R. Marrus about 30 years later.\footnote{Michael R. Marrus, \textit{The Unwanted. European Refugees from the First World War through the Cold War} (Philadelphia 1985).}

The first historian to deal with the topic in greater depth was Wolfgang Jacobmeyer, who is considered a pioneer of research on DPs.\footnote{Stefan Schröder, ‘DP-Lager in requirierten deutschen Straßenzügen, Vierteln und Ortschaften. Ein Beitrag zur Systematisierung dieser Sonderform der Unterbringung von Displaced Persons’, in Sabine Mecking and Stefan Schröder (eds.), \textit{Kontrapunkt. Vergangenheitsdiskurse und Gegenwartverständnisse} (Essen 2005), pp. 113–126, here p. 125.} His book-length study was released in 1985 and remains an indispensable resource.\footnote{Wolfgang Jacobmeyer, \textit{Vom Zwangsarbeiter zum heimatlosen Ausländer. Die Displaced Persons in Westdeutschland, 1945–1951} (Göttingen 1985).} The fact that it was published in German is perhaps one of the reasons why subsequent research on DPs was at first largely carried out by German historians.\footnote{Joanne Weiner Rudolf, ‘Die Geschichte der Displaced Persons Camps. Forschungsprobleme und der Beitrag von Zeitzeugen-Interviews’, in Rainer Schulze and Wilfried Wiedemann (eds.), \textit{AugenZeugen. Fotos, Filme und Zeitzeugenberichte in der neuen Dauerausstellung der Gedenkstätte Bergen-Belsen} (Celle 2007), pp. 133–151, here p. 139.} Nevertheless, American historians soon started their own tradition of DP studies, with a monograph by Mark Wyman representing an important milestone in 1989.\footnote{Mark Wyman, \textit{DP. Europe’s Displaced Persons, 1945–1951} (Philadelphia 1989).} In general, the writings of Jacobmeyer and Wyman can be considered standard works which have significantly contributed to the ever-growing body of publications on DPs.
Much research propelled by these works has covered the story of DPs as it unfolded in individual regions, places, and assembly centers in postwar Europe. Although most of these studies deal with the situation in Germany, research has also been carried out on DPs in other countries, for example Austria. The fate of Jew-

---


ish DPs has received particular attention from researchers. An important early study was co-authored by Angelika Königseder and Juliane Wetzel in 1994.\(^\text{22}\) To date, an ever-growing number of articles and books\(^\text{23}\) have continued to explore the history of Jewish DPs who were, in the words of Jacqueline Giere, a “unique group of survivor migrants”.\(^\text{24}\) Not surprisingly, Jewish DPs are probably the best studied group of postwar DPs.\(^\text{25}\) Historians have also dealt

\(^{22}\) Angelika Königseder and Juliane Wetzel, Lebensmut im Wartesaal. Die jüdischen DPs (Displaced Persons) im Nachkriegsdeutschland (Frankfurt am Main 1994).


\(^{24}\) Jacqueline Giere, “‘We’re on Our Way, but We’re Not in the Wilderness’”, in Michael Berenbaum and Abraham J. Peck (eds.), The Holocaust and History. The Known, the Unknown, the Disputed, and the Reexamined (Bloomington 1998), pp. 699–715, here p. 712.

with other groups, often specific nationalities, and explored individual aspects of the DP phenomenon. These include, but are not limited to, the challenges surrounding the repatriation of East European DPs; the politics of resettlement in individual countries; reflections on how the definition and implications of the term DP have developed over time; structures of authority and leadership within DP communities; sport in the DP context; the work carried out by individual relief agencies; and


questions of internationalism as they informed the mission of relief agencies working with DPs.\textsuperscript{34}

Whilst this is by no means an exhaustive list, this overview hopefully demonstrates how the subject has developed into a diverse and multi-faceted area of historiographical interest. Research on DPs has, in the words of Wolfgang Jacobmeyer, “advanced in every respect”.\textsuperscript{35}


Victims of War: Displaced Children

Historians tend to view World War I as a turning point in the development of large-scale relief activities aimed at children affected by armed conflict (both at the national and international level). During this time, governments, charities and international organizations launched numerous initiatives to provide orphans or families in need with food and shelter. In Great Britain, for instance, material assistance was granted to the families of servicemen, while Herbert Hoover, later US president, played a pivotal role in ambitious relief programs established across the continent, such as the Committee for Belgian Relief, or the American Relief Administration, which succeeded in feeding over 10 million children during and after the war. These efforts were mostly limited to the provision of material aid. As Hugh Cunningham has pointed out, the “most urgent task at the beginning of the century was to ensure that children stayed alive.” Events surrounding World War I also triggered a continued period of experimentation, the testing of frameworks for effective relief through international cooperation. For example, the Declaration of the Rights of the Child was passed by the League of Nations in 1924, prioritizing children as the group of victims which should be the first to benefit from aid.

Therefore, when World War II came to an end, the field of international child welfare was not a tabula rasa. But the military and relief agencies in Germany soon began to realize that they were witnessing the after-effects of hitherto unparalleled crimes against children. This became increasingly evident after the majority of the DPs had been repatriated in 1945. There were many unaccompa-
nied children left in the camps, usually being looked after by adults of the same nationality. But the total number of these children did not match the numbers of children reported as missing in Germany by various governments. It was soon clear that in order to tackle the problem in the different Zones of Occupation, a careful strategy of searching for and looking after such children would have to be devised.\(^7\) This turned out to be a massive challenge which contemporary observers referred to as “a giant jigsaw puzzle”\(^8\) and “an almost hopeless quest”.\(^9\)

The reasons for the displacement of children during and after the war were manifold: there were Jewish child survivors liberated from the concentration camps; others, sometimes born in Germany, belonged to families deported from their home countries to be exploited as forced laborers for the Nazi economy; many children ended up being forced laborers themselves; and finally, thousands were kidnapped in their home countries (including Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia) as part of the Lebensborn program already described at the beginning of this introduction.\(^10\) Unfortunately, the Allies did not succeed in agreeing on a universal policy with regard to the search for and protection of missing children. Instead, different procedures were worked out in the individual Zones of Occupation. In the US and British Zones, UNRRA was directly involved in the search for children. In the French Zone, this task was primarily carried out by the French military government. The Soviet Zone was also a special case, since there was no agreement between the Soviet Government and UNRRA; therefore, the organization was not involved here at all. A major problem was the lack of documentation which would help facilitate the task of finding and identifying children. The Nazis had done a thorough job of destroying documents clarifying the true identity of their youngest victims.\(^11\)

\(^7\) Ibid.


\(^11\) Ibid., pp. 3–4.
The military governments tried to shed some light on this confusion by ordering German authorities to produce all available information pertaining to foreign children who fell within the UNRRA mandate. To the annoyance of UNRRA, cooperation on the part of the Germans was poor, and feedback unsatisfactory. The task of finding the children was ultimately left to special UNRRA search teams. Based on whatever information they could lay their hands on, the workers combed through a vast number of German institutions, including orphanages and hospitals. There, they looked for further clues and conducted interviews with children, hoping to find out whether they were in fact foreign children eligible for UNRRA care. Whenever this was the case, the relevant information was forwarded to the national government in question. If, for example, a child was thought to be Polish, the case was referred to a representative of the Polish government on duty in occupied Germany. If the national authorities were able to verify the information and wanted a child to return to its established home country, a request was placed with the military government to have the child removed from its current environment. Such children were then taken to special children’s centers run by UNRRA. Here they were prepared for repatriation and, provided that no further complications arose, ultimately returned to their home country. UNRRA’s final report on unaccompanied children in Germany states that there were 17 children’s centers operated by UNRRA in the US Zone (11 of which were designated homes for Jewish children). They housed an average of 150 children at a time. In the British Zone, there were smaller centers with an average population of 50. In the French Zone, there were only two such centers.

However, as with adult DPs, there were problems surrounding the repatriation of many children. A crucial point was the question of nationality. Determining a child’s nationality was by no means always an easy task. Generally speaking, it was not so hard to determine that a child possessed, for example, French, Belgian, or Danish nationality. Matters were a lot more complicated in the case of children believed to be from Eastern Europe. In several countries, the postwar era saw the reversal or creation of borders and the expulsion of ethnic minorities—particularly the so-called

---

12 Ibid., p. 7.
13 Ibid., p. 27.
14 Ibid., pp. 44–45.
Volksdeutsche, a contemporary term denoting ethnic Germans residing outside the boundaries of the Nazi Reich. What if, for example, the territory where a child was originally from no longer belonged to the nation-state in question? This made the determination of nationality a difficult exercise, not just for UNRRA workers, but also from the point of view of governments in Eastern Europe. Naturally, as time passed, and many children returned home, what remained was a growing number of controversial cases. Sometimes, the evidence provided by a national government demanding the repatriation of a child was deemed incomplete or unconvincing by the occupying authorities in Germany. Children would then not be released for repatriation and remained in Germany indefinitely. In other cases, forced laborers had their children taken away from them during the war (sometimes immediately after they were born, not seldom out of wedlock). The parents had signed documents releasing the children to German foster parents, often under duress. Now, after the war, the validity of the documents was questionable. Not surprisingly, national governments wanted most of their children to be repatriated. There were also children, usually older ones, who refused to be repatriated. As with adult DPs, UNRRA’s only option was to try and convince them to change their minds. At this point in time, there were hardly any resettlement schemes in place (with the notable exception that Jewish children were increasingly able to leave for Palestine). Since no children were forcibly repatriated, the result was that the children’s centers failed to empty in the same way as the adult DP camps did.

---

15 Ibid., pp. 21–22.
18 Ibid., p. 25.
19 Ibid., pp. 28–29.
20 Ibid., p. 39.
21 Ibid., p. 52.
22 Ibid., p. 44.
When UNRRA was shut down in 1947, it had taken care of almost 13,000 children in DP camps and special children’s centers across Germany. A little over 4,000 children were transferred to the care of the IRO in July 1947. In the US Zone alone, there were 2,814 unaccompanied children. Of these, 1,792 were scattered across 13 special children’s centers, while the rest were living in general DP camps with adults.

It is only in recent years that historians have started to turn their attention to displaced children, although Mark Wyman’s aforementioned pioneer study did contain one relevant section providing a good overview. This general trend is perhaps linked to the fact that for many years, the significance of children’s wartime experiences was downplayed on the assumption that children are too young to realize what is happening around them during times of crisis. However, research has shown that this is by no means the case. Following Wyman, several further books have touched upon children as DPs after World War II, albeit not as their main subject. An important contribution to the body of research was published in 2011 by American historian Tara Zahra. Her book aims at a general history of children in the aftermath of World War II. As it is a wide-ranging study, its conclusions are at times of a

---

24 Ibid., p. 495.
25 Ibid., p. 505.
somewhat general nature. However, Zahra has identified many of the central issues surrounding the care of displaced children. For this reason, her work constitutes an excellent starting point and serves as a reference for further studies. Using a more microhistorical approach, Lynne Taylor has provided us with a meticulous monograph chronicling the fate of one particular group of Polish children during and after the war. Other books have described the history of individual camps and centers housing displaced children.

In addition to books, a growing number of articles on displaced children has been published in recent years. They have explored various issues, including the care for displaced children in the British Zone of Germany as well as other parts of Europe, the fate of Polish orphans in Canada, and the fate of Jewish children in various camps and centers in Europe. The studies cover a range of topics, from the care and repatriation of displaced children to the challenges faced by relief workers in the post-war period.

---

of Jewish children,\textsuperscript{35} testimonies given by displaced children,\textsuperscript{36} the history of individual child care installations,\textsuperscript{37} or the question of available source material.\textsuperscript{38}

Further publications not primarily dedicated to the topic of displaced children are available, for instance on the subject of the \textit{Kindertransports} during the Holocaust,\textsuperscript{39} the struggle and survival of Jewish children in concentration camps,\textsuperscript{40} the kidnapping of chil-


\textsuperscript{40} Verena Buser, „Er hat nicht so fest gestochen und die Nummer auch ganz klein gemacht“. Jüdische Kinder in Konzentrationslagern’, in \textit{Medaon—Magazin für jüdisches Leben in Forschung und Bildung} 9, 16 (2015).
Introduction

dren for the sake of *Germanization*, the exploitation of children as forced laborers, and the cases of children born to German soldiers and local women in occupied territories.


Bad Aibling

Despite the number of publications which have appeared so far, the majority of studies on displaced children or children as victims of Nazi politics have tended to provide overviews rather than in-depth studies of a limited subject.\(^1\) Because top-down approaches illuminate many of the central frameworks, policies and individual areas of action within the history of DP child welfare, they are indispensable. In addition to this, they can also provide the supportive context for a different way of writing history which implements more of a bottom-up approach and is referred to as microhistory.\(^2\)

The theory and methodology behind microhistory are not clear-cut. One definition offered by a prominent German representative of microhistory, Otto Ulbricht, illustrates this rather well. Ulbricht concludes that “microhistory consists of a few basic principles, a good amount of theoretical reflection and great diversity in practical application”.\(^3\) Discussing the plethora of theoretical variations within microhistory would not be particularly helpful at this point. Instead, we shall focus on some of the more general features of this school of history and then look at its relevance for this study.

The key principle of any microhistorical study is that it narrows down the concrete subject of investigation to a manageable size and thereby ideally enables historians to take into account all of the available source material. The aim is to create not just a comprehensive, but also a nuanced narrative.\(^4\) Apart from the fact that the histories of individual DP camps can be of tremendous interest and relevance in their own right,\(^5\) microhistorical studies have the potential to make important contributions to broader narratives. They can support or contradict assumptions made by historians in wider


\(^{4}\) Ibid., pp. 13–14.
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contexts\(^6\), shedding a light on historical shades of grey instead of painting black-and-white images.\(^7\) This would appear to be a worthwhile aim, given that recent attempts at writing transnational and global accounts of migration and displacement have been said to be “strangely lacking in details, nuances and colours”.\(^8\) With regard to the history of DPs, Adam Seipp has even suggested that it “should in large part be written as microhistory”.\(^9\)

Based on these assumptions, the aim of this study is twofold: first, to document the history of the Children’s Village which is hitherto largely unknown; second, to both support and refine broader narratives concerning displaced children and international child welfare in the aftermath of World War II. Other studies have taken a similar approach. For example, Heide Fehrenbach, drawing on the pioneering research of Tara Zahra, has been “interested in exploring some significant exceptions” to previous interpretations and has referred to the “multiple ways that postwar notions of kinship and belonging were shaped as self-conscious responses to Nazi social ideology, policy, and practice”.\(^10\) Based on such an understanding, it is hoped that this dissertation can make a small contribution to an “integrated history”\(^11\) of displaced children which historian Verena Buser has rightly called for.

\(^6\) Mocek, Vergangenheit unter der Lupe, p. 54.
The Children’s Village, which was in existence from 1948 until 1951, was the main facility dedicated to the care of displaced children in the American Zone of Germany at the time, with the exception of smaller centers housing particular groups, for example unaccompanied Jewish children. Later, there were even plans to move all displaced children in the Western Zones of both Germany and Austria to Bad Aibling, but they were never realized. Within the three years of its operation, a total of 2,300 children passed through the Children’s Village. Until now, there has been no attempt to explore its history in full detail, and it has only been briefly mentioned in previous research. Holborn’s official IRO history contains some basic information about the Children’s Village. Lynn Nicholas mentions it in her study on child victims of Nazism. Jim G. Tobias has also included a brief summary of the history of the Children’s Village in a book on Jewish DP camps in Wasserburg. The history of Bad Aibling as a town has been the subject of several books published over the years, but local historians have merely pointed out the fact that the Children’s Village

16 Holborn, The International Refugee Organization, p. 505.
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Once existed.\textsuperscript{20} It has furthermore been mentioned in publications from other disciplines, including psychology\textsuperscript{21} and even notaphily.\textsuperscript{22} Finally, an online encyclopedia covering DP camps in the American Zone of Occupation also contains an entry about the Children’s Village.\textsuperscript{23}

Given that in many cases little documentation on individual DP camps has survived,\textsuperscript{24} a remarkable amount of material concerning the Children’s Village has been preserved. First of all, there are several archives with relevant holdings. We will not discuss all of these at this point, but two collections truly stand out with regard to their scope: the IRO records kept at the \textit{Archives Nationales} (AN) in Paris, and the archives of the \textit{American Friends Service Committee} (AFSC) in Philadelphia. In addition to such holdings, it has also been possible to locate private archives to which access was kindly granted. We can also turn to contemporary publications by staff members,\textsuperscript{25} as
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well as memoirs authored in later years. In addition, there are resources such as the blog of Max Monclair, an American in search of information regarding his father’s childhood, part of which was spent in the Children’s Village.

In an attempt to trace further contemporary witnesses who might be able to provide insights into the history of the Children’s Village, an article calling for submissions was placed in a local Bad Aibling newspaper. Unfortunately, this did not produce the hoped-for response. However, it was in the end possible to locate several people via other means—both former inhabitants and staff members of the Children’s Village. It should be pointed out that the resulting information (compiled via interviews and written exchanges) serves as a supplement to the archival records. It is not meant to live up to the expectations of a fully fledged oral history project.

However, this does not mean that the views and actions of individual persons are not important within this history of the Children’s Village. On the contrary, they are crucial to the microhistorical approach and give credence to the idea that generalizations regarding the motives and behavior of people who were involved in the care of displaced children are often more than inadequate. It is interesting to see, for example, how official IRO policies were interpreted and implemented at a personal level by the staff of the Children’s Village. And displaced children were, in the words of two microhistorians, “not merely puppets on the hands of great underlying forces of history, but […] active individuals, conscious actors”. Similarly, Adam Seipp has stressed “the pivotal role

---


29 A similar line of argument is offered in Schröder, *Displaced Persons im Landkreis und in der Stadt Münster 1945–1951*, p. 25.

played by foreign and international actors in the story of post-war Germany reconstruction”.

In order to do justice to the historical narrative, the main body of this study is divided into three chronologically arranged chapters, each of which begins with an overview. Subchapters then look into central issues surrounding the operation of the Children’s Village during the period in question. At times, it will be necessary to touch upon aspects which are primarily dealt with in other sections—the following timeline of the history of the Children’s Village inevitably remains somewhat crude.

The first chapter (“The First Days Were Grim”: Setting up the Children’s Village, 1948–1949) deals with the following aspects: the foundation and purpose of the Children’s Village; the international relief agencies involved; the physical shortcomings of the installation which hampered operations in the early days; the background of the children who were moved into the Children’s Village; the struggle for adequate staff and supplies; and the increasing tension among children and staff which led to an outburst of protests in the spring of 1949, endangering the program in its entirety.

The second chapter (“A Classic Experiment”: The Program at its Height, 1949–1950) describes the turnaround that took place from mid-1949 onwards under the leadership of a new director, Douglas Deane. Following an excursus about the broader child community movement in Europe after 1945 (which had a decisive influence on the Bad Aibling experiment), we shall take a closer look at the factors shaping everyday life and work in the Children’s Village during this period. These include the significance of familialism as represented in the Home Life program coordinated by the AFSC; internationalism as a pedagogical ideal; school and vocational training; recreational activities; the physical and mental health of the children and therapeutic treatment; the development of repatriation and resettlement plans (which grew increasingly controversial against the background of Cold War tensions); and the reporting on the Children’s Village in the international media.

The third chapter (“Get the Kids Out”: Winding Down, 1950–1951) focuses on the final months of the Children’s Village, with the liquidation of the IRO drawing nearer. This was yet another critical phase marked by a number of challenges—some new, and some already familiar. They included the gradual withdrawal of personnel; the transfer of decision-making authority regarding displaced children to newly-established US courts; negative publicity and criti-
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31 Seipp, “The Most Beautiful Spot on God’s Green Earth”, p. 239.
icism on the part of the Germans; and finally, moving the children out of Bad Aibling to a new center in Feldafing.

The study ends with a conclusion which reflects on the question of what the history of the IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling can tell us about displaced children and their care in the postwar period. And last but not least, it is worth reflecting on the relevance of this story to our own day and age.
In June 1948, Eleanor Ellis and Vinita V. Lewis of the IRO headquarters in the US Zone of Germany penned a frustrated letter to their supervisor Philip E. Ryan, Chief of Operations. Ellis and Lewis, as Child Care Officers, were unhappy with the current state of the IRO’s services towards displaced children in the US Zone. In their opinion, UNRRA had failed to establish appropriate guidelines for the efficient coordination of the program at a higher level, leaving too much responsibility and autonomy to the various UNRRA sub-districts. They also contended that little had improved since the IRO takeover. With a cynical undertone, Ellis and Lewis pointed out that “the methods employed at that time in transferring property and in transferring responsibility for children offer a tragic contrast”—while “jeeps, trucks and spare parts could be accounted for”, the Child Care division was now struggling to “locate children presumed to be under IRO care and, in addition, to locate the documents on their identity as to nationality, birth and movement through the Zone”. According to Ellis, this not only caused confusion within central administration, but also hampered the implementation of important repatriation and resettlement goals. Therefore, the fact that the Child Care program was “still too loosely knit” posed a real problem.

The difficulties were not limited to insufficient documentation and the immediate consequences thereof. The centers for displaced children operated by the IRO in the US Zone at the time were confronted with yet more challenges of a practical nature, which threatened to disrupt the entire mission. One center, for instance, was situated in Prien, Upper Bavaria. It was a decentralized installa-
tion consisting of eight requisitioned hotels (with a total capacity of 310) that were scattered across the town.\(^6\) This setup, in addition to a serious shortage of staff, meant that administration in Prien was difficult and unsatisfactory.\(^7\) When a voluntary agency, the AFSC, was deliberating whether it should support the center with a team of workers, one of them described the situation at Prien as “deplorable.”\(^8\) Staff shortage was also a problem in Aglasterhausen,\(^9\) where the IRO was running another children’s center with a capacity of 210.\(^10\) It also suffered from a lack of basic supplies, such as clothing or school material.\(^11\) A third center, situated in Wartenberg, was to all appearances more successful than Prien and Aglasterhausen: Ellis described the setup at Wartenberg as “more controlled, with good programs of school, sports and workshops”, and stressed that “there is an atmosphere of family life”.\(^12\) This illustrates that the standards of administration and care in the IRO children’s centers varied across the Zone, and that they were strongly influenced by the physical facilities that were available. Ellis was frustrated by the lack of a coherent program tailored to the specific needs of the children under IRO care. In a meeting held with various voluntary agencies operating in the US Zone in the fall of 1948, she frankly stated that the “program should not be based on the installation but rather [...] the installation should house the program”.\(^13\)

---


\(^8\) Carl Levine (AFSC) to Marjorie Hyer (AFSC, PCIRO Children’s Center Aglasterhausen), 5 March 1948, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/949.


\(^12\) Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone), ‘Report of Field Visit to determine advisability of projected Move of Children from Prien to Wartenburg [sic]’, 26 January 1948, p. 2, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/927.

From the IRO’s point of view, there was only one way of solving the problem of multiple centers lacking in uniformity: to consolidate the existing installations into one single center and pull together the best available staff from throughout the Zone. That way, the IRO would finally be in a position to meet the requirements of its program and could actually get on with the job of making plans for the future of the children under its care.\(^\text{14}\) The search for a suitable site within the US Zone began. This did not take too long: it was soon officially announced that the new center was to be set up on the edge of Bad Aibling,\(^\text{15}\) a small town situated 40 miles southeast of Munich. With its famous mud baths, Bad Aibling had been a popular spa town since the second half of the 19th century,\(^\text{16}\) and had a population of around 8,000 in the immediate years following the end of World War II.\(^\text{17}\)

The purpose of the new installation (initially referred to as the Bad Aibling Children’s Center, but soon renamed IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling)\(^\text{18}\) was to continue the work of the previous centers in Prien, Aglasterhausen, and Wartenberg: to house and care for unaccompanied children and youth under IRO care in the US Zone and to work out plans either for their repatriation or resettlement abroad. In addition to this, the center would also take in so-called temporary care cases, meaning displaced children whose parents were in fact living in the US Zone, but unable to look after their children, for instance because they were ill in hospital.\(^\text{19}\) The term unaccompanied children was precisely defined: they were, in the understanding of the IRO, “(a) 16 years of age or under (i. e. a child who has not attained his or her seventeenth birthday); (b) outside of

\(^{14}\) Ibid., p. 2.  
\(^{16}\) John Schindler, Bad Aibling Station. A Legacy of Excellence (Fort Meade 2004), p. 2.  
\(^{18}\) See section ‘Excursus: Child Communities and Welfare Models in the Post-war Period’.  
their countries of origin or of that of their parents; (c) orphans, or children whose parents have disappeared or whose parents are unattainable, or who have been abandoned; (d) not provided with a legal guardian, or children whose guardian has disappeared or abandoned them, or who is unobtainable; (e) not accompanied by a close relative (adult brother, sister, uncle, aunt, or grandparents); (f) children in respect of whom there exists a presumption that they belong to one of the categories of refugees or displaced persons on whose account the IRO was established.”20 The term unaccompanied reflected the uncertainty surrounding the fate of a child’s family. Historian Susanne Urban has noted: “As long as the tracing process did not reach a dead end, the child was ‘unaccompanied’, not an orphan. On the one hand, the term mirrored the harsh reality, but on the other hand there was still a spark of hope for […] welfare workers and, above all, for the children, that perhaps somewhere would be alive to accompany the child in its new life, into the aftermath of destruction and desperation.”21 Apart from special installations that continued to exist throughout the Zone (for instance to house Jewish children), the Children’s Village would, as previously mentioned, become the only one of its kind in the US Zone.22

During the first months of its existence, the Children’s Village—contrary to the high hopes of the IRO—failed to bring about significant improvements regarding the many problems it was set up to solve. The official report of an early US Army inspection concluded that this was because it “was not properly prepared prior to the arrival of the occupants”.23 As the following sections of this chapter will show, this was indeed the case and had a detrimental effect on the efforts of the IRO to get their Child Care pro-

gram back on track. Generally speaking, the early history of the Children’s Village makes it clear that, as Lynne Taylor has rightly suggested, it was not only ideological or political issues that decisively shaped the way displaced children were cared for, but problems of a very practical nature.  

---

Administrative Setup

In the process of establishing an organizational framework for the operation of the Children’s Village, the first bone of contention was whether the installation would function under the administration of IRO Area 7, the office covering the region around Munich (as had been the case with the previous children’s centers), or whether it would directly report to Child Care at Zone level. Vinita Lewis, Deputy Child Care Officer in the US Zone, came down on the side of the second option. She maintained that the involvement of several different offices, all with differing views and approaches, would leave too little control to Zone Headquarters in terms of ensuring the success of the project in Bad Aibling. However, Philip Ryan, Chief of Operations in the US Zone, did not approve of this option. He decided that the Children’s Village, in accordance with past regulations, would be responsible to Area 7. Perhaps as a compromise, it was decided that Lewis and her colleagues should nevertheless be more directly involved with the program than in the previous children’s centers. Although this was not exactly what Zone Child Care had hoped for, it did at least mean they would have a tighter grip on the program than before. The IRO would be the chief organization running the Children’s Village, but other agencies were also involved, in one way or another. Among these, the most important were the AFSC, ORT, the JRU, and the YMCA.

The IRO’s organizational chart for the Children’s Village was to be tripartite. Three departments would respectively be in charge of a) the overall administration of the Village (headed by the Administrator); b) the educational and recreational program (managed by the Program Director); and c) the establishment of repatriation or resettlement plans on behalf of the resident children (overseen by the Case Work Supervisor). While the Administrator was to act as the general director of the Children’s Village, the heads of the other
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1 Vinita V. Lewis (Deputy Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone) to Ernest C. Grigg (Chief, Care and Eligibility, IRO, US Zone) and Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone), 29 October 1948, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.
3 Ibid.
The first Administrator was a British national, Otto Bayer. He was originally from Czechoslovakia and had worked as a lawyer in Prague. Bayer had been the last director of the Prien center before it was closed and transferred to Bad Aibling. The position of Program Director was filled by E. Nora Ryan. She had previously been the director of the Aglasterhausen center. Finally, the Case Work Department was at first headed by M. J. Matthews. Within this general structure, the Children’s Village employed a vast number of other staff, including supply officers, case workers and typists, a messenger, a janitor, an electrician, a locksmith, a carpenter, a barber, seamstresses, shoemakers, tailors, kitchen staff, bakers, and others.

While the staff in its entirety was essential to the operation of the Children’s Village, the most significant change—when compared to the organization of the previous children’s centers—lay with the Case Work Department, which now worked under the close direction of Zone Child Care. Despite this setup, the Case Work Department struggled to successfully carry out its task for quite some time. According to Theodora Allen, European Repre-
sentative for the *United States Committee for the Care of European Children* (USCOM), the most urgent task in the early days of the Children’s Village was to increase the number of staff in the Case Work Department. This area of action was “considerably hampered because there was no one to study the children to determine whether they should be resettled or repatriated”.

Although the IRO was the primary agency in charge of the Children’s Village, it was not without support in its efforts to provide for the children. A Quaker organization based in Philadelphia, the AFSC, also played a crucial role in running the installation. At the time of its founding in 1917, the AFSC offered conscientious objectors in the US an alternative to military service during the final stages of World War I. The organization was soon carrying out a substantial amount of humanitarian work in Europe: for example, the AFSC requested donations from the American public in order to carry out a mass feeding program for German children during the years following 1918. Above and beyond this, it was engaged in humanitarian work all across the globe, and also back in the US, where it launched numerous projects aimed at community building and peace education. After 1945, the AFSC returned to Germany. Not only was the organization concerned with the care and rehabilitation of Europe’s DPs: it also provided assistance to millions of German refugees and expellees who were flooding the country. By the time the Children’s Village was opened, the AFSC had already been engaged in the IRO’s Child Care program for

---

12 See section ‘Repatriation and Resettlement’.
quite some time, with teams working at the centers in Prien and Aglasterhausen.\textsuperscript{18}

Before taking on the new task in Bad Aibling, the Quakers submitted a proposal to the IRO that indicated two areas of action for which they were willing to assume responsibility—recreational activities and a special project aimed at the development of a family-like atmosphere amongst the children and staff.\textsuperscript{19} The IRO accepted the proposal, but initially limited the assignment of the Quakers to a period of three months.\textsuperscript{20} As it turned out, the AFSC was to remain an integral and essential part of the Children’s Village until it was closed in late 1951.\textsuperscript{21} We shall take a closer look at the exact nature of the work carried out by the Quakers later.\textsuperscript{22}

In the course of the winter of 1948/1949, more voluntary agencies started work at the Children’s Village. One of them was ORT (Organization for Rehabilitation through Training). Originally founded as Obshchestvo remeslennoy i zemledel’cheskogo truda sredi yevreev v Rossii in St. Petersburg in 1880, ORT had started out as an organization providing vocational training within disadvantaged Jewish milieus. Over time, ORT set up specialized schools all across Russia. Here


\textsuperscript{19} Marlis Gildemeister (Representative, AFSC, US Zone) to Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone), 17 November 1948, pp. 1–2, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.


\textsuperscript{21} ‘American Friends Service Committee Program on behalf of Refugees in Germany and Austria during IRO Operations’, 6 March 1952, pp. 1–2, AFSC Archives, Box: Foreign Service, 1952, Country—Germany & Austria (Refugee Services Program—Project Proposals #2) to Country—Germany (Refugee Services Program UNHCR & Ford Found. Grant), Folder: Country Germany, 1952, Refugee Services Program, Refugees (Misc.).

\textsuperscript{22} See section “The Children’s Village: International Families?".
applicants could learn a trade, mainly in the areas of agriculture and mechanics. During the interwar years, ORT extended its program on a global scale, establishing headquarters in Berlin, which later moved to Paris. The organization remained active during World War II, for example in the Warsaw Ghetto. After World War II, ORT also set up schools in many DP camps. They offered a variety of courses enabling DPs to learn a trade and in this way at least profit from their stay in the camps. Adults and children alike benefited from ORT’s activities. It is therefore not surprising that historian Sarah Kavanaugh has described ORT as “crucial in the rehabilitation of thousands of Holocaust survivors”. In Bad Aibling, ORT would also set up a school for vocational training. ORT was assisted in its efforts by the Jewish Relief Unit (JRU), an operational branch of the British organization Jewish Committee for Relief Abroad (JCRA).

Finally, the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA) was also asked to assign workers to the Children’s Village in early 1949. The YMCA, originally based in London, came into existence in 1844. The organization soon merged with similar associations from all around the globe, resulting in the establishment of the World Alliance of YMCAs. A plethora of national and regional offices operated under this umbrella. The work of the YMCA had an ecumenical foundation. Activities focused mainly on youth work, with an emphasis on fostering educational and recreational projects. Relief
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24 Sarah Kavanaugh, ORT, the Second World War and the Rehabilitation of Holocaust Survivors (London 2008), pp. 86–114; Historians have also dealt with the work of ORT in other individual DP camps. For instance, see Jim G. Tobias, Zeilsheim. Eine jüdische Stadt in Frankfurt (Nürnberg 2011), pp. 61–64.
27 Kavanaugh, ORT, the Second World War and the Rehabilitation of Holocaust Survivors, p. 133.
work represented another area of action. In Bad Aibling, the YMCA took over the organization of everyday recreational activities, a task that, up until then, had been handled by the AFSC.

Apart from these organizations, the Children’s Village employed a large number of adult DPs, for example as house parents in the individual living units. We shall learn more about these later.

---


Moving into the Former Airbase

The grounds on which the Children’s Village was set up had already been used for a variety of purposes over the years. In 1936, three years after the Nazis had risen to power, construction was started on a new military airbase, located on the outskirts of the town of Bad Aibling. A year later, the airbase was completed. It would house various German training and combat forces until the end of World War II.¹

When US forces rolled into Bad Aibling in the early days of May 1945, the remaining German troops quickly surrendered. The airbase was handed over to the Americans without armed resistance. With its extensive grounds, it was deemed suitable for a prisoner-of-war enclosure (PWE) for German troops. Vast numbers of men (some captured within the region, others transferred to Bad Aibling from further away) were huddled together on the airfield. There was not enough space in the garrison buildings of the airbase to accommodate all the prisoners. With winter fast approaching, simple wooden barracks were set up to provide basic accommodation. Because of the sheer number and constant fluctuation of prisoners, it is hard to say accurately how many passed through the Bad Aibling enclosure in total. Contemporary estimates vary from 65,000 to 100,000 men. PWE No. 26 was eventually closed in September 1946.²

For the next two years, the airbase became home to new residents: DPs. The first to arrive were a group of Jews fleeing violent outbursts of antisemitism in Eastern Europe. They only stayed for a couple of days, the airbase being used as a transit camp. In late 1946, another group of DPs moved into the PWE barracks. They were former members of the Royal Yugoslav Army who had been taken to Germany as prisoners of war between 1941 and 1944. Since most of these men refused to return to Yugoslavia, their stay in the Bad Aibling DP camp, initially administered by UNRRA, was prolonged.³ The men were eventually allowed to move into the

¹ Mayr, Das Kriegsgefangenenlager PWE No. 26, pp. 6–7.
² Ibid., pp. 7–42.
original garrison buildings, since the wooden barracks, hastily constructed for the German POWs, were considered inappropriate housing.\(^4\) In 1948 the IRO, which had by now taken over the administration of the camp, decided that the former airbase would be a suitable location for the planned new children’s center that was to serve the entire US Zone.\(^5\) Therefore, the remaining Yugoslavs were moved out to another camp in Munich.\(^6\)

Starting on 16 November 1948, the children from Prien, Aglasterhausen and Wartenberg were moved to Bad Aibling.\(^7\) This marked the birth of the Children’s Village, which was officially opened on 22 November.\(^8\) In addition, part of the airbase facilities would be used for another project—the central Motor Depot (responsible for the maintenance of the IRO’s fleet of vehicles in the US Zone)\(^9\) previously located in Ansbach.\(^10\)

The Children’s Village occupied several of the former garrison buildings. They were basically in good condition\(^11\) and situated on a

---


slightly elevated area of ground towards the northern end of the airbase.\textsuperscript{12} There were two larger buildings that could house up to 50 persons each, and several smaller ones.\textsuperscript{13} Most of the IRO staff did not live in the Children’s Village, but in billets on the other side of Bad Aibling.\textsuperscript{14} In addition to the quarters housing the majority of the children and youth, there were buildings for specific purposes. For instance, there was a baby-house\textsuperscript{15} and a reception cottage where, in an attempt to avoid the spread of diseases, new arrivals were isolated for a period of one to two weeks before they were moved in with the other children.\textsuperscript{16} Several smaller kitchens existed (the reception cottage, for instance, had its own), as well as a main kitchen serving most of the children and staff.\textsuperscript{17} There was a Kosher kitchen,\textsuperscript{18} but this was closed in late 1950.\textsuperscript{19} Finally, there was a hospital with room for 56 patients, staffed by four doctors and 46 nurses.\textsuperscript{20} As previously mentioned, one of the reasons why the IRO placed such emphasis on establishing a consolidated children’s center was that the existing physical facilities, particularly those at Prien and Aglasterhausen, were so unsuitable that it was not possible to implement the Child Care program in the way it was envi-

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{13} Ibid.
\bibitem{17} ‘Children’s Village Bad Aibling’, 17 December 1948, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932.
\end{thebibliography}
It was a sad irony, then, that the same kind of problems arose in Bad Aibling during the early days of the Children’s Village. To the astonishment of everyone involved, the US Army staff preparing the garrison buildings for the new occupants had done a questionably thorough job in stripping them of most of their interior fittings, leaving them practically unfurnished. Basic items such as electrical fixtures were missing, and even refrigerator motors had been removed. There was a shortage of bedding in the dormitories, and there were no tables to eat at in the dining room. AFSC team member Kathleen Regan would later vividly recall the total sense of helplessness when she arrived with the children from Prien: “To this day, all the particulars of our arrival in B.A. remain a big black smudge, a chaotic collage made up of iron gates, barbed wire fences, dun-coloured barracks buildings without heat—in most instances without plumbing, windows out, no electricity. Adults wringing their hands, children clinging to each other crying or wide-eyed staring, babies blue with cold.” The IRO appeared

21 See chapter “The First Days Were Grim”.
to be taken by surprise, but was in no position to alleviate the situation: there was hardly any furniture available from the Area 7 warehouse.\footnote{Field Visit to Area 7, Munich on 3rd and 4th of November 1948', n. d., p. 2, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.} Interestingly enough, several weeks into the operation of the Children’s Village, a representative inspecting the premises on behalf of the US Army (which after all was responsible for leaving the buildings in such a state) critically remarked that they were “not adequately equipped to meet minimum housing requirements”.\footnote{Joseph A. Walker (Chief, Field Inspection Section, EUCOM), ‘Field Inspection Trip, Munich Military Post’, 17 December 1948, p. 2, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.}

In the midst of this chaos—for which no one wanted to be held responsible—more complaints and accusations started pouring in from all sides: Marjorie Hyer, among the first AFSC workers assigned to the Children’s Village, vented her anger on the IRO, claiming that the move “has been marked by very bad handling and management at Zone level in contrast to sincerest attempts to straighten out the mess on the part of those people who actually do the job within the operation. […] We have been here more than three weeks now and to this day the only furniture the children—and personnel as well—have in their rooms is a bed to sleep on”\footnote{Marjorie Hyer (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Lili Koehler (Foreign Service Section, AFSC, Philadelphia), 15 December 1948, p. 1, AFSC Archives, Box: Foreign Service, 1949, Country—Germany (D. P. Program Numbered Letters from ML) to (Numbered Letters from COG Jan.–April), Folder: Country, Germany, 1948–1949, Displaced Persons Program, Letters, Bad Aibling, Letters to and from.}. The USCOM representative Theodora Allen also contended that “the children should not have been moved into this installation without having it better equipped.”\footnote{Theodora Allen (European Representative, USCOM) to Ingeborg Olsen (USCOM), 24 March 1949, p. 1, CMS Archives, CMS.024, Box: 28/31, Folder: 4.}

Administrator Otto Bayer defended himself against the conclusions of the US Army report, emphasizing that the “redecorating, disinfecting and adapting of the camp had to be done AFTER the child centers of Prien and Aglasterhausen had moved in.” Therefore, he claimed, the staff running the Children’s Village had faced “weeks and weeks of emergency operations and continuous shifting and rebilleting of the population”,\footnote{Otto Bayer (Administrator, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Earl Blake Cox (Director, IRO, US Zone, Area 7), 10 January 1949, p. 3, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.} making it impossible to
focus on any activities other than the struggle with the physical facilities. Another obstacle had been the fact that the departure of the Yugoslav DPs had overlapped with the transfer of the children to Bad Aibling. Finally, Bayer complained that the US Army report did not acknowledge the many improvements which had been brought about since the official opening of the Children’s Village.\textsuperscript{31}

Then again, problems related to the physical state of the premises would continue to hamper the overall program in Bad Aibling several months into the operation. In April 1949, the IRO’s Deputy Child Care Officer in the US Zone, Vinita V. Lewis, described her impression in blunt terms: “Sanitary engineering within the Children’s Village is totally inadequate at the present. Showers are not in order, garbage not emptied, pumps and gutters are not adequately drained.”\textsuperscript{32} Around the same time, an inspection of two kitchen buildings revealed that their basements were flooded, and furthermore “cluttered and filthy, being fire and rat hazards”.\textsuperscript{33} These observations illustrate that problems ran deeper than initial impressions might have indicated. Moving to Bad Aibling did not provide a swift and easy solution to the acute problems surrounding the Child Care program. Despite tremendous efforts by all the agencies involved, there was still a very long way to go.

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{32} Vinita V. Lewis (Deputy Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone) to A. C. Dunn (Chief, Care and Maintenance, IRO, US Zone) and Ernest C. Grigg (Chief, Care and Eligibility, IRO, US Zone), 11 April 1949, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.

The Children

Who were the children brought to Bad Aibling, and where did they come from? As Tara Zahra has rightly noted, the “postwar itineraries of lost children were as varied as those of adult refugees”.1 The majority of the inhabitants of the Children’s Village—those classified as unaccompanied children—had been found to be living in German families or institutions after the war. Writing about work in the reception house, Quaker Alice Roberts pointed out that “the first night is spent mopping up the tears of many children who have been removed from German foster homes”.2

As of 6 December 1948, the Children’s Village housed a total of 352 children, with a further 100 waiting for their admission throughout the Zone.3 Compared to the previous children’s centers, the overall population was therefore relatively high.4 By March 1949, the number of children had risen to 389. At that time, the children had been officially or tentatively identified as being of the following nationalities: 152 Polish, 58 Czech, 45 Ukrainian, 29 Lithuanian, 17 Soviet, 17 Yugoslav, 14 Latvian, 7 Hungarian, 6 French, 5 Estonian, 4 Austrian, 4 German, 4 Norwegian, 3 Bulgarian, 3 Romanian, 2 Swedish, 1 Greek, 1 Italian, and 1 US-American. For 10 children, the establishment of a nationality was still pending. A small group of 6 held Nansen passports,5 meaning that they were stateless.6 As these numbers show, the overwhelming majority was thought to have roots in Eastern Europe.

In Bad Aibling, the children were accommodated in groups according to age: there was a unit of care for infants and toddlers, a kindergarten, and living groups for children of school age, youth

---

2 Alice Roberts (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to her sister, 23 November 1949, p. 2, Personal Archives of Robin Powelson.
3 Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone) to A. C. Dunn (Chief, Care and Maintenance, IRO, US Zone), 6 December 1948, p. 2, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.
4 See chapter “The First Days Were Grim”.
and adolescents. These different groups confronted the staff with their own particular challenges, to varying degrees. The youngest children (some of them only a few weeks old) were mostly brought in from other DP camps. There were many reasons why these children had been abandoned. Some arrived as orphans following the deaths of their parents. In other cases, adult DPs had repatriated or resettled abroad and decided not to take their children with them. Poor health among DPs was another factor that frequently left parents in the position of not being able to look after their children.

In 1958, Natalie Kent (a former member of the AFSC team assigned to the Children’s Village) recalled her memories about “Six-To-Teners” who “were the children born in wartime when births were few and survivors fewer. These were the children who, lost, abandoned, surviving in the ruins of war, had at last been found. Now, four years after war’s end, for the first time in their lives they were settled where there was the certainty of heat in winter and beds for sleeping.” Many of these children had been born to women working as forced laborers in Germany. To Jack Bell, an American journalist reporting on the Children’s Village, this group appeared to be part of “a lost generation”, seemingly marked for ever by their experiences during such a formative period of their lives.

Bell also commented on the older children and youth, remarking that they “chafe under the restraints of what is a prison to them no matter how attractive it is made”—a valid observation, given the many problems which, particularly in the early days of the Chil-
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8 A. J. Wittamer to Gerda Schairer (Secretary, Committee on World Friendship among Children, New York), 29 June 1949, p. 2, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.
9 Natalie Kent, ‘Village Christmas’, in Friends Journal 4, 45 (1958), pp. 726–727, here p. 727; Patricia Heber has remarked that it is “impossible to ascertain with precision the number of young people who survived persecution by the Nazi regime or its allies in concentration camps and ghettos or in hiding.” Patricia Heberer, Children during the Holocaust (Lanham 2011), p. 376.
10 A. J. Wittamer to Gerda Schairer (Secretary, Committee on World Friendship among Children, New York), 29 June 1949, p. 2, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.
12 Ibid.
A particular challenge was posed by a certain set of boys, the so-called *GI mascots*: in the final stages of the war, these boys, roaming the country without anyone accompanying them, had been picked up by American forces moving into Germany. They had thus been exposed to (and were now, at the Children’s Village, displaying) a whole range of behaviors that the child workers were not at all happy about. In her memoirs, IRO worker Frances Berkeley Floore recalled that the boys “presented a real problem, for they were neither children nor adults. They smoked, drank, cussed like a GI, trying to imitate their benefactors, good or bad.” The boys also had a negative influence on the other children. There were instances in which they got some of their peers involved in black market activities, trading IRO goods (such as blankets) for liquor.

A US Army report quoted Program Director Ryan who described the boys as “not only difficult, but impossible to handle”.

One of them was a boy who had run away from a children’s home in France during the war, and was then picked up by American troops. Eventually, he ended up in the Children’s Village. The boy, now 14 years old, refused to be returned to France and instead, as a result of his wartime experiences, became obsessed with the idea of emigrating to the US: “I won’t go nowhere else. And I won’t marry noone but an American girl when I’m 21…” Other youth told different stories of displacement: one case was a 17-year-old boy from Poland who, after the death of his father, was brought to Munich as a forced laborer, where he had to work on locomotives, his hands “scarred and blue”.

After the war, the boy was able to trace several members of his family, including his mother and four siblings. But the mother died shortly after, and the children, now orphaned, ended up in Bad Aibling. The boy felt that

---

13 See section ‘Unrest in the Village’.
14 Floore, The Bread of the Oppressed, p. 263.
16 Ibid., p. 3.
18 Ibid., p. 1.
he was now “father and brother”\textsuperscript{19} to his siblings. They all hoped to be resettled in the US soon.\textsuperscript{20}

Jewish children made up a special group. Most Jewish children who had been taken to the concentration camps were either too weak to survive or were brutally murdered. Of those who made it through the camps, the majority were older children and those who had succeeded in lying about their age. For them, the key to survival was their ability to work. As a result, the majority of surviving Jewish children and youth in the years following the end of the war were 14 to 20 years old. Other Jewish children had been hidden during the war, for instance with gentile families or in Catholic orphanages.\textsuperscript{21} Like Jewish DPs in general, these children were soon regarded as a distinctive group with special needs. This was reflected both in the fact that Jewish was acknowledged as a category of nationality\textsuperscript{22} and in the fact that various Jewish organizations had extensive rights to a say in the care of and planning for Jewish children.\textsuperscript{23} In the words of historian Margarete Feinstein, the children represented “an important link between the Jewish community’s past and future”.\textsuperscript{24}

Accordingly, special community centers for Jewish children had soon been established after 1945, for instance in Strüth or Rosenheim.\textsuperscript{25} Jewish youth organizations taking care of the surviving children have been accurately described as “surrogate families”.\textsuperscript{26}

There were the so-called \textit{kibbutzim}, Zionist groups offering communal living to surviving Jewish youth, which also initiated and
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supported their emigration to Palestine. On the whole, they were a crucial element in the rehabilitation of children and youth in the years following the Holocaust.\textsuperscript{27} Having developed a general mistrust of adults, many Jewish children were not willing to reunite with their families (if indeed any relatives had survived) after the war ended.\textsuperscript{28} They frequently preferred the company of fellow child survivors, the kind of environment the Jewish groups were capable of offering them.\textsuperscript{29} However, the significance and number of Jewish DP camps and active communal groups dropped from 1948 onwards, after the founding of the State of Israel. Almost all Jewish installations in the US Zone had been closed by the late 1940s,\textsuperscript{30} as the majority of adult DPs and displaced children had been able to emigrate to Israel by then.\textsuperscript{31}

In the early days, the Children’s Village housed around 70–90 Jewish inhabitants.\textsuperscript{32} Unlike the gentile children, however, they did not remain in Bad Aibling for long, mainly because they soon emigrated to Israel.\textsuperscript{33} AFSC team member Kathleen Regan would later recall that many of the Jewish children were “the only family survivors who had come to us from Concentration camps like Auschwitz and Belsen: their names erased in those camps and replaced by the blue serial numbers tattooed onto their arms.”\textsuperscript{34} A kosher
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kitchen and dining room were temporarily set up in the Children’s Village. It is not entirely clear how or to what extent this really affected everyday life for the Jewish children and their relationship with the other inhabitants. While the IRO maintained that the kosher kitchen was to be “identified with religious ritual, not a segregated facility”, and that all dining rooms could be accessed by all children at any time, Quaker Natalie Kent was more skeptical: she observed that the Jewish children in the Children’s Village appeared to be “quite separate” and also noted that there was “considerable Jewish prejudice in the camp”, exacerbated by the fact that the physical setup contributed to a segregation of the Jewish children. This created resentment among the non-Jewish inhabitants. Later, Natalie Kempner would note that the Jewish children’s “food, supplemented by generous donations from world-wide Jewish organizations, was somewhat superior to that of the dreary camp fare. Their strict observation of the Jewish Sabbath meant that they did not participate in the Saturday clean-up/work day, could not even turn the light switch in their room. Because of such differences, the Jewish children were perceived by the others as privileged.” In addition to general tension, serious incidents also occurred. On one occasion, it was discovered that someone had baked needles into a cake that was just about to be served in the Kosher dining room. Episodes such as this were heart-rending echoes of antisemitism and the Shoah.

One of the Jewish children was Michael Pupa, originally from Poland. His parents had been killed in the Holocaust in 1942. Together with his uncle, four-year-old Michael managed to escape

36 Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone) to Earl Blake Cox (Director, IRO, US Zone, Area 7), 10 December 1948, p. 2, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.
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into the Polish forests, where they survived until the advance of the Russian army in 1944. Eventually, when the war came to an end, they found themselves in the US Zone of Germany, and moved from one DP camp to another. The uncle married and had a daughter, but his new wife passed away soon afterwards. Grieving for his wife, and with a motherless baby to look after, Michael’s uncle felt that he could no longer take care of his nephew. This resulted in Michael being transferred to the Children’s Village. From there, he eventually emigrated to the US to be raised by a foster family in Cleveland.41

Despite the diverse backgrounds and subjective experiences of the population of the Children’s Village, contemporary observations suggested that there were common features shared by most of the children. For example, Elaine Mikels, another member of the AFSC team, stressed her overall positive impression of the children, astonishing when viewed against the background of their tragic fate: “For children who have lost their parents, who have wandered about being continually uprooted and deprived, they have a miraculous quality for enjoying life and for getting along with one another. We feel they are better adjusted children than the general lot in America, who have a family and the security of a home.”42 Similar admiration was expressed by IRO worker Frances Berkeley Floore: “The Bad Aibling children are an exceedingly intelligent, alert, creative group of youngsters. Most of them speak 4 and 5 languages fluently, and much of their thinking is extremely adult.”43

The latter observation picks up on an aspect that has frequently been discussed by historians: Margarete Feinstein has described displaced children as “child-adults”,44 whilst Tara Zahra has referred to them as “unchildlike children”.45 In the Children’s Village, AFSC worker Alice Roberts was surprised to find that “children

44 Feinstein, Holocaust Survivors in Postwar Germany, 1945–1957, p. 163.
did not cry when their balloons—the first they ever had—popped. Why was it? Are they so used being without? Do they expect all things to break, as their families have been broken [...]? How much disappointment have they learned to expect of life? A poignant example is that of a 12-year-old girl who arrived in the Children’s Village with her 8-year-old brother. Taking notes on all new children in the reception house, AFSC team member Kathleen Regan remarked that the girl “is a rather delicate, extremely sensitive, quiet child who is very much attached to her brother—she mothers him, bathes him, undresses him, does his mending and is upset when he isn’t well or the boys tease him. She seems to prefer to sit in her room mending, sewing, doing laundry etc. rather than joining other children in play. [...] In many respects she is like a little old woman in her daily habits.” These characterizations reflect the fact that many had been robbed of their childhood years as a consequence of displacement and suffering. In order to survive, they had been forced to take on a degree of responsibility beyond their years, leaving them far ahead of peers who had not gone through a comparable ordeal. At the same time, their horrific experiences could generate a deep mistrust towards adults, and authority in general. In many cases, long-suppressed frustrations resulted in aggressive behavior and a single-minded focus on physical satisfaction, be it food, rest, or sexual activity. As historian Verena Buser has aptly noted: “Stealing, feeling forced to give false personal details, living in hiding or under a false identity and experiencing adults as a threat to their existence had a lasting impact on the children.” Because they instinctively felt that adults would not understand or condone the attitudes and behavior resulting from

47 Kathleen Regan (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), ‘A few informal comments from staff at Reception House re: children during 19 day period: Sept. 8 to Sept. 26th’, 26 September 1949, Personal Archives of Christian Höschler.
49 Zahra, Lost Children, p. 67; Feinstein, Holocaust Survivors in Postwar Germany, 1945–1957, p. 163.
this, many children and youth sought out the company of peers who had gone through similar hardship.51

The above observations certainly apply to many of the inhabitants of the Children’s Village: Natalie Kent described the children as “sometimes cynical, often mistrustful of anything adult, of adult authority—but nearly all are responsive, needing affection and love and understanding. Some act like big tough guys, but underneath are wistful little kids who’ve never had a chance to be children.”52

A contemporary study published by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in 1950 summarized these paradoxical characteristics of displaced children by contending that they “have acquired a precocious maturity which is in contrast with certain features too childish for their age.”53 Indeed, while some of the children in the Children’s Village actively assisted the staff in their everyday work,54 other incidents offered glimpses of how damaging the experiences of the war period had been.

A case in point is the story of Mitka Kalinski, a Ukrainian orphan whose family had been seized and murdered by the Nazis. Mitka survived the massacre of Babi Yar which took place near Kiev in 1941: the event is considered “the largest single massacre in the history of the Holocaust”.55 However, Mitka was recaptured by the Nazis and moved between various (concentration) camps, until he finally ended up in Pfaffenwald. Here, Mitka was appropriated by the camp commander to live and work on his farm as a child slave. For seven long years, Mitka—named Martin by the Nazi family keeping him prisoner—suffered greatly. He was alone and

51 Zahra, The Lost Children, p. 73.
neglected, beaten and starved. It was only when he was finally freed and taken to the Children's Village in 1949 that Mitka remembered his real name. He was “so out of touch with normal life that when they gave him toothpaste, he ate it.”

The age factor constituted another problem: AFSC worker Marjorie Hyer complained that the presence of older youth in the Children's Village was a complicating factor in an installation housing children and that additional and above all appropriate staff was needed—“not just someone who can play London Bridge with the little ones but someone who can command the respect of the big huskies and can organize them into something more constructive than blanket stealing.” Hyer also commented upon “a great deal of trouble with sexual promiscuity”, demanding “wholesome activities for these older kids to channel their energies.” These observations were also confirmed in a US Army inspection report. It specifically referred to the older boys and concluded that “most of them appeared to be loafing and idling in and around their rooms”. The staff was also facing serious problems of discipline in the living unit for the older girls. Some of them were repeatedly

---
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involved in acts of physical confrontation, vandalizing, binge drinking, and mutual stealing.\textsuperscript{64}

The issue was possibly complicated by the fact that in order to survive during the war years, many children and youth had, as previously indicated, developed the habit of systematically, yet flexibly, lying about their age. This was something they continued to do during the years following the war, if circumstances suggested it to be useful.\textsuperscript{65} It is not unlikely that many of the children in Bad Aibling were in fact older than their case records indicated.

\textsuperscript{64} Kathleen Regan (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), ‘Comments on Special Personality-Problems in Girls’ Block 32’, 4 January 1951, Personal Archives of Christian Höschler.

\textsuperscript{65} Zahra, Lost Children, p. 51.
A Struggle for Staff and Supplies

The deplorable state of the facilities in Bad Aibling was not the only problem interfering with the overall goal of expediting the repatriation and resettlement of the children. The early months of the Children’s Village were also marked by a struggle for sufficient and qualified staff as well as much-needed supplies.

Generally speaking, the fact that the airbase had been so poorly prepared for its new residents was an unexpected blow which dampened the motivation of the staff. Everyone had hoped that the problems previously encountered at other facilities with regard to the state of the buildings would not be repeated in Bad Aibling. Blaming the IRO for this state of disarray, Quaker Marjorie Hyer reported back to her headquarters in Philadelphia: “This totally disorganized situation and the general disappointment of the people did terrific things to the morale, of course. A number of employees resigned, while others just sort of hold on half-heartedly. There are very few who still have enough optimism and spirit left to pitch into the dirty mess wholeheartedly and try to straighten it out. The people responsible for the welfare of the kids, both DP and international staff, were so tied up with problems of bare physical existence in the beginning that there was no opportunity to develop any kind of program for the kids to even keep them busy, let alone give them any kind of security in the new situation.” On the other hand, IRO Zone Headquarters were very dissatisfied with the attitude of their workers in Bad Aibling, stating that there was “much to be desired in the staff’s way of working”. All the finger-pointing and blame-shifting did not help to improve the situation.

Whilst the work ethos suffered from the inadequate facilities, problems with staff ran deeper. First of all, there were simply not enough workers. With regard to the assignment of additional personnel, Administrator Otto Bayer accused the IRO of treating the Children’s Village as just another DP camp. As Bayer stressed, it was “a special installation which does not bear any comparison

---


with other installations or headquarters, where activities cease on week-ends and after office hours”. The ongoing resettlement of adult DPs employed in Bad Aibling was a further problem—with many of them leaving for new countries of residence, the Children’s Village was losing more and more nurses, secretaries, teachers and other workers who were urgently needed to successfully run operations. As a result, the existing staff struggled to carry out their work in an environment which required such work around the clock on seven days a week. As Bayer put it: “One nurse can handle only so many children”.4

Eager to realize its plans, the IRO decided to bring an expert on board to give an opinion on the situation in Bad Aibling. Philip Ryan (the IRO’s Chief of Mission in the US Zone) approached Hildegard Durfee, a psychiatric consultant who was employed with the US Army. Durfee contended that there was not only a need for a sufficient number of well-organized staff with a compassionate approach towards children. What was needed above all, she concluded, was staff who were professionally trained in the field of child care, which many—if not most—of the workers in Bad Aibling were not.5 Previous research has pointed to the fact that this was the situation in all of the Western Zones of Occupation.6

The shortage of staff had a particularly detrimental effect on what many regarded to be the core of the mission in Bad Aibling: the Case Work Department. Responsible for the planning of repatriation or resettlement activities, it was hopelessly understaffed. With only a handful of workers, it was not able to function in an efficient manner. In the words of IRO worker Dr. L. Findlay, it was “almost impossible for one social worker to carry the paper facts about 150 children in her mind”.7 Administrator Bayer foresaw a “complete disintegration of services”8 if the situation continued. Not surprisingly, other voluntary agencies involved in the
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4 Ibid.
6 Helbing, Die Fürsorge und Repatriierung polnischer Displaced Children aus der britischen Besatzungszone, p. 85.
8 Otto Bayer (Administrator, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Earl Blake Cox (Director, IRO, US Zone, Area 7), 2 June 1949, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932.
reestablishment of the children, such as USCOM, voiced similar complaints.  

The IRO was not alone in struggling with the issue of staff. Quaker Marjorie Hyer also felt the need to criticize her own organization: at the beginning of 1949, not all of the AFSC staff originally requested had actually started work in the Children’s Village. In addition to Hyer and Regan, there was one more Quaker member of staff, Wendy Elliot. It did not help that Hyer, who had already been working with the AFSC in Germany before she was transferred to Bad Aibling, felt increasingly burned out. In the end, she requested to have her assignment in Bad Aibling terminated: “I’m tired. My temper’s getting short. I scream at personnel and snatch the kids bald-headed”.

Despite the fact that improvements in the AFSC program were on the horizon, further incidents continued to disrupt the work of the Quakers who were desperately trying to bring about some improvement. Elaine Mikels, who had joined the staff of the Children’s Village in February 1949, was officially dismissed and sent back to the US after the State Department had discovered (on the basis of her psychiatric history) that she had a “record of homosexuality”. This was against official regulations governing the assignment of volunteers who were accredited to work in postwar Europe by the State Department. Mikels was only informed about her imminent expulsion from Germany after she had been taken

9 Charles E. Israel (Deputy Liaison Officer, Voluntary Societies Division, IRO, US Zone) to Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone), 21 June 1949, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932.
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15 Mikels, Just Lucky I Guess, p. 65.
away from the Children’s Village, believing that she was about to attend an external AFSC meeting. Devastated, she learnt that she would not be able to say farewell to the children to whom she had grown very attached.\textsuperscript{16} Nor were the remaining team members in Bad Aibling informed about the real reasons for their co-worker’s departure.\textsuperscript{17} As this episode illustrates, it was not only a lack of manpower, but also the discriminatory regulations of the time which impeded the work of dedicated volunteers.

Matters were further complicated by misunderstandings and subsequent conflict between the organizations involved in the operation of the Children’s Village. When representatives of the YMCA first arrived in early 1949, they felt that the administration under the leadership of Otto Bayer was not granting them sufficient autonomy with regard to the implementation of the recreational program they intended to launch. These limitations (about which few details are known) were apparently regarded as so severe that the YMCA took the decision to pull its staff out of Bad Aibling. Joseph Noia, the director of the YMCA in the US Zone, leveled heavy accusations at Otto Bayer, calling him an “obstructionalist”.\textsuperscript{18} Zone Child Care tried to mediate by explaining to Noia that any project in the Children’s Village proposed by any voluntary agency was required to be carried out under the supervision of Program Director E. Nora Ryan. Therefore, it was a basic regulation—and not specific disapproval of the YMCA project—that made it impossible to grant the desired autonomy. Since the YMCA workers were desperately needed, Eleanor Ellis asked for a definitive statement as to whether the IRO would be able to count on their availability.\textsuperscript{19} In the end, the YMCA did return to the Children’s Village and played a significant role in the organization of recreational and educational activities, which we will look at in more detail later.\textsuperscript{20}

Better staffing ratios and less conflict might have done much to remedy the situation. However, even additional workers would
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have found their efforts constrained by an “inaccessibility of material things”, as AFSC team member Natalie Kent put it. In the past, supply shortages had constantly been a problem in the children’s centers and DP camps run by UNRRA and the IRO. It has already been mentioned that the facilities of the Children’s Village had been stripped of most of their interior fittings before the children moved in. Administrator Bayer complained that the installation was “lacking every kind of furniture”, with the notable exception that everyone had a bed to sleep in. However, the bedding was of poor quality, and in many cases, sheets and pillows were missing. Apart from beds, the children would not find any other furniture (such as tables or chairs) in the rooms in which they were lodged. This hardly made for a welcoming atmosphere in their new home. Although it took the IRO several months, furniture was eventually provided. Hundreds of items were exclusively produced in a DP factory in Ingolstadt and shipped to Bad Aibling in the spring of 1949.

To some, problems like these appeared to be self-inflicted. The AFSC considered the official IRO tabulations (which specified the amount of supplies that would be provided for the Children’s Village and its residents) “completely unrealistic and absurd”. At the same time, the seemingly obvious solution (namely an alteration of said tabulations) was complicated by “a terrific battle with red tape

and bureaucracy”. The results were evident in everyday life. Reporting back to the AFSC headquarters in Philadelphia, Natalie Kent and her husband Oakie (who worked in the Children’s Village together) explained how the lack of essential goods jeopardized the implementation of meaningful activities: “We talk with a boy who refuses to go to school and find that his home was once a farm in Yugoslavia and that what he and a group of his truant friends really want is a garden project to work on full time. We think what a good idea and […] find the botany teacher […] and he wants to direct such a project but says ‘no tools’. So we find some shovel and spade heads and go to the carpentry classes to have some handles made, and ‘no wood’.” Other urgent needs included supplementary clothing for the children and proper heating systems for the various vehicles used by the Children’s Village. Again, months passed until matters finally improved, with significant contributions being made by organizations other than the IRO: the Church World Service (CWS) sent much-needed clothing that was of decent quality, considered crucial for a child’s sense of self-esteem. A great quantity of private donations (including toys and additional food) were also shipped to Bad Aibling, following a fundraising campaign.
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launched by the AFSC in the US. The American Women’s Group in Munich promised to provide additional furniture for two of the living rooms in the Children’s Village. The US Army began to collect toys and sweets that could be given to the children at Christmas. The AFSC joined in these preparations and rallied all of its resources back in the US, collecting additional materials. In the end, the Quakers were able to organize a fun-filled Christmas event and even provide all the children with several gifts each. Magic moments such as this were clearly the exception in the early days of the Children’s Village.


33 Theodora Allen (European Representative, USCOM) to Ingeborg Olsen (USCOM), 24 March 1949, p. 2, CMS Archives, CMS.024, Box: 28/31, Folder: 4.


Unrest in the Village

All of the aforementioned problems—the lack of appropriate furnishings, the challenging composition of children from various backgrounds, the crying need for more staff, and the insufficient provision of supplies—resulted in a less than promising start for the Children’s Village. While the IRO and the other agencies involved were struggling to improve the situation, it was the children who suffered the most. Tension among them and conflict with the staff were ultimately unavoidable. They would continue to grow during the following months, and finally culminate in an episode of upheaval and protest.

It has already been mentioned\(^1\) that the presence of youth in particular led to a whole array of problems. Because a meaningful program of educational and recreational activities could only be implemented gradually, the lack of stimulus soon had consequences. AFSC worker Marjorie Hyer regarded the mutual stealing, forbidden visits to dormitories at night, vandalism and “general demoralization”\(^2\) as manifestations of a deteriorating situation. One big problem was black marketing. Since the children had no personal money to spend, they began to trade the few items they possessed for additional food or, in the case of the older children, cigarettes.\(^3\) Ironically, the children did not even have to leave the boundaries of the former airbase in order to pursue such activities, as Natalie Kent reported in a letter to her mother: “There is a lot of black marketing among the adult employees around the camp and they deal with the children. [...] When I asked one boy where he got his American cigarettes, he said ‘At the Canteen.’ I asked where that was and he led me to a room in the building we live in on a floor where adult Yugoslav DP employees are living and there was
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1. See section ‘The Children’.
a regular little store with eggs and white bread and cigarettes—all things unavailable on the German market.”

Accommodation for the children continued to be problematic. The children were living in buildings which were barely furnished. AFSC worker Kathleen Regan referred to the quarters as “nothing but dirty, bare, unfriendly, cold places”. Nevertheless, the children tried to make the best of the situation. With all the material they could lay their hands on, they started decorating their practically empty rooms, in an attempt to create a homey atmosphere. As an incentive, there was a competition to see who would put the most effort into decorating the quarters (the prize being, fittingly, proper curtains). However, general rearrangements during the early months following the opening of the Children’s Village soon made it necessary to move children around within and between the various living blocks. It seemed that change continued to be a discouraging constant in the children’s lives, and they did not cope too well with the frequent moves. The Quakers were worried about the effect this could have on the general morale: “To some small extent they had ‘roots’ here […]. They had invested much work into intricate toilet tissue, crepe paper, Christmas cards, daisy chain decorations in their former house and now we found them sitting on bare mattresses in bare-walled rooms with their bundles of clothing beside them, trying to explain to their new housemother what it was like in their old ‘home’.” The fact that the children were not able to properly settle in did not contribute to a better atmosphere in the Children’s Village.

The situation was made worse by the fact that the children could not leave the installation to temporarily escape the chaos within. For their own safety, there were guards posted at the gates, instructed not to let any child exit the former airbase. There were few exceptions, for instance in cases in which a child had an official
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permit or was escorted by staff on small trips into Bad Aibling. Administrator Otto Bayer would have liked to organize more outings for the children, “to alleviate the psychological effects of living in a ‘camp’”, but again, the supply situation thwarted all good intentions: there was a lack of gasoline, bringing the fleet of vehicles used in the Children’s Village to a halt.

As the situation worsened, mounting frustration among the children resulted in actual acts of violence. AFSC worker Kathleen Regan reported that due to the small number of house parents, “the children, in general, have been shockingly neglected”. As a result, the relationship between them and the few house parents on duty deteriorated, even to the point that physical confrontation had become “too frequent”. In March 1949, Regan reported that “last week two of our best House-parents blew up completely due to extreme fatigue and in turn the House-father kicked one of the children who was sent to the Hospital. This resulted with a gang of the Youth threatening the life of the House-father, throwing led-pipes [sic] through his window, cutting all telephone wires in the Camp, and sabotaging him in every way.” The boys were arrested by the Children’s Village police, while Administrator Bayer (who appeared to be overwhelmed by the situation) turned to IRO Zone Headquarters for advice on how to further handle the matter. The administration of the Children’s Village was clearly beginning to lose control of the situation. But contrary to what Bayer might have hoped, the aforementioned incident would turn out not to be a one-time event.
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Unrest continued to seethe under the surface, until things really got out of hand in April 1949. At this point, yet more problems arose which exacerbated an already worsening situation and led to tremendous frustration among the children. One of the more critical issues was food, which was not only in short supply, but also of poor quality. This had a detrimental effect on the health and well-being of the inhabitants of the Children’s Village. Other, comparatively minor complaints added to this state of discontent. For example, the older children felt that they were not being issued with enough cigarettes.15 But then more serious problems emerged: the Children’s Village had to be placed under strict quarantine. Following the outbreak of a measles epidemic, eight babies had died within a short time. In order to prevent further contagion, the various groups of children were isolated from each other as much as possible and confined to their respective living quarters. No one was allowed to leave the Children’s Village, including the staff. The quarantine had a detrimental effect on the children’s routine; practically the entire vocational and recreational program had to be temporarily shut down. Children were forbidden to gather in larger groups, which meant that dances or the screening of movies—some of the few activities that had been preventing an already low morale from dropping even further—could no longer be organized.16 Together with all the other difficulties, this was the tipping point, as Quaker Alice Roberts remarked: “To take away their movies is the worst possible disaster.”17 Hearing about the cancellation, some of the boys reacted furiously and barricaded themselves in the movie-hall. They then proceeded to hold their movie event regardless, in defiance of all the rules.18

What followed was a veritable strike: “They marched [...] and blew the siren with a piercing unearthly shrill blast. They stormed the offices, but no one paid any attention to their racket, which quite disappointed them”.19 Administrator Bayer was away on vacation, while his deputy E. Nora Ryan was sick in bed, back at the IRO billets outside the Children’s Village. Some of the older chil-
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dren then decided to steal several vehicles and drove out of the former airbase. One jeep was stopped by the German police while it was cruising through Bad Aibling, and the driver (a 17-year-old Yugoslav boy) was arrested and handed over to the local military government. With the other vehicle, the children fetched Ryan from the IRO billets and took her back to the Children’s Village, where they gave voice to their complaints. Ryan remained calm and talked the matter over with the children: “She went on the assumption that the children had legitimate complaints, and a right to voice them, and a right to be answered. She also made this a lesson in democracy, accepting the responsibilities as well as the benefits. She addressed each problem right down the line, to the greatest extent possible.” The US Army also sent a representative to talk to the children. Making it clear that he decidedly disagreed with the way the children had chosen to express their frustration, he instructed them to bring any future complaints to the attention of the Children’s Village administration in a peaceful manner. He also stressed that “the quarantine has to go on until at least two more weeks, and that they should not consider all these measures as a punishment, but only as a necessity to prevent them from contracting the disease which already has cost several deaths among the population of this center.” The strike was called off, and the residents of the Children’s Village learnt to communicate their main points of complaint more constructively. The older boys finally got their cigarettes, and a group of children was granted access to the warehouse of the Children’s Village: here, they could see for themselves how limited the stocks of certain goods were, for example clothing. This proved to them that the underlying issue was one of supplies, and that the administration of the Children’s Village was not deliberately misleading them.

Reactions to these events varied, but all concurred in viewing the strike as an organized series of actions which had clearly left the
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administration of the Children’s Village out of its depth. Some observers, like Natalie Kent, regarded the strike as relatively harmless—or at least as an event which was not as critical as subsequent reporting suggested: “To people not there, not part of the situation, it sounds far worse than it really was... To IRO and voluntary agencies in Munich and elsewhere it sounded bad—rumors of riot etc. were passed around—actually the grievances which the children had were legitimate ones, and they wanted to bring them to the people they felt were responsible for bettering their conditions.” Similarly, Eva Kraft of the JRU thought the way the events had been depicted was blown out of proportion. On 13 April 1949, she wrote a report on how she had witnessed the events during her visit to the Children’s Village the previous day. On arrival, the camp guards did not let her into the installation, informing her about the ongoing strike. Somewhat baffled, Kraft nevertheless made her way in via a side entrance. Contrary to what she had been dreading, the atmosphere appeared to be settled. Kraft could not see that any damage had been done: “For a rioting camp, this surely was the most quiet riot anybody could wish to see.” In further defense of the children, she also maintained: “There is one thing that impressed me throughout the whole visit. The children talked quietly, their worries were serious and they did not go about shouting slogans.”

Others had a different impression, and indeed, Kraft’s observations were not entirely accurate, for the staff counted a total of 13 broken windows in the dining hall, police office, warehouse, and movie-hall; furthermore one broken door lock, scratches on a station wagon, and a tire that was cut open. In a report written by the representative of the local military government in Bad Aibling, Francis W. Schillig, it is mentioned that two members of the Chil-

---

25 Natalie Kent (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to unknown, 25 April 1949, p. 5, Personal Archives of Natalie Kempner.
27 Ibid., p. 3.
28 G. E. Iskauskas (Administrative Assistant, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to E. Nora Ryan (Deputy Administrator, Program Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), 12 April 1949, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.
dren’s Village police force were injured during the disturbances.\textsuperscript{29} Even the local German press reported on the events.\textsuperscript{30}

Of all observers, Schillig was perhaps the one most outraged by the events taking place in the Children’s Village: “From what the undersigned has personally seen, and from all reports received, in the interests of safety and security the undersigned recommends that all inmates of this camp be screened […]. It is also recommended that a change be made in the camp authorities, so that proper discipline can be installed and maintained, and that the undesirables be weeded out, and in no case be permitted to emigrate.”\textsuperscript{31} First and foremost, Schillig was blaming the children for the incident. The US Army launched its own investigations and reached a different, albeit similarly one-sided conclusion, namely that “the basic cause for the disturbance lies in the caliber of the police at this center. Although they are sufficient in number, they apparently do not know how to handle teenagers [sic], with the result that minor disturbances, through misunderstanding and mis-handling, develop into major disturbances. […] It is recommended that carefully selected and instructed police be placed on duty at this camp”.\textsuperscript{32}

This recommendation was justified, since other reports by Children’s Village staff confirm that the police did not have the requisite skills to handle the youngsters, and this led to incidents of physical confrontation. Just days after the events described above, several of the older boys spontaneously armed themselves with whatever they could lay their hands on, in readiness to fight the Children’s Village police who they felt were bullying them. In this volatile situation, Administrator Bayer threatened to call the American Military Police (MP), should the boys not refrain from their provoking behavior. But the agitated youngsters refused to give in. The MP were notified and raided the quarters of the boys in the
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middle of the night. Eight youth considered to have played a key role in the disturbance were arrested and locked up in jail.\textsuperscript{35}

Still, the problems were clearly not limited to the presence of a police force not tailored to the needs of the Children’s Village. Bayer was by now becoming accustomed to defending himself against one-sided reports regarding the installation he was managing. While he agreed that the police force, which had a dozen members,\textsuperscript{34} “could bear improvement”,\textsuperscript{35} he emphasized that the events which took place in April 1949 were rooted in a myriad of problems. At the time, the Children’s Village had, as Bayer remarked, “developed no tradition yet and was still labouring under a serious lack of equipment, very keenly felt by the children and youth in question.”\textsuperscript{36} He felt the need to reiterate the fact that the unrest among the children was also caused by the presence of troublemakers among the boys, and aggravated by both the food situation and the excruciatingly slow progress that was being made with regard to repatriation and resettlement, the latter resulting in a “feeling of hopelessness”\textsuperscript{37} among the children.

AFSC team member Alice Roberts made a basic distinction between the reactions of European and American staff members: “There is a most interesting contrast between the European and the American progressive school of discipline. All Europeans here were horrified that such a situation ever occurred. There were immediate cries of ‘Bolshevism’, and ‘Communism’. They recommended all sorts of severe action and punishment—lock them up, bring in the German police or the Military Police […]\textsuperscript{38} Similarly, AFSC colleague Natalie Kent felt that the European staff members were constantly
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stressing the importance of discipline, “a word repeated so much that we’re sick of it”.

In any case, the IRO was determined to tackle the problems. In reaction to both the protests and reports highlighting the critical food situation in the Children’s Village, the IRO sent Frances Berkeley Floore, who was the primary nutritionist in the US Zone, to Bad Aibling. Floore was soon able to confirm what former inhabitants of the Children’s Village still recall vividly today: that the quantity and quality of the food was in fact deplorable. Savoy Horvath, who had arrived in the Children’s Village at the age of 15, remembers that the food was “pretty bad”, and referred to the events of April 1949 as a decided “food strike”. Similarly, Peter Kingsley recalls that he and his friends were always “hungry to the point where we sometimes ended up stealing and eating horse turnips growing in a nearby field”. Contemporary accounts confirm these recollections: Eva Kraft had been collecting negative reports about the food situation since early 1949, while Natalie Kent and her husband Oakie also pitied the children because of their inadequate diet: “We would be hungry too if we did not have one meal a day at IRO billets and if we could not supplement our rations with PX [Post Exchange] food. We almost choke on the thick guey [sic] cereal which the children get sometimes for breakfast and often for supper, sometimes with no milk or sugar but with a few prunes on top; the damp black bread, the popcorn with sugar (for breakfast), the heaps of macaroni with apple sauce (to ease the swallowing process), the mountains of potatoes. [...] And we find ourselves wanting to wrap up the meat to take home to the ‘kids’, the way we
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used at home to wrap up the bones to take home to the dog.”

Likewise, fellow AFSC worker Elaine Mikels would later recall that “the inadequate meals […] could never have sustained us. How they [the children] survived was a miracle.” The inhabitants of the Children’s Village had in fact developed various strategies to counteract the food shortage. For instance, staff members were privately buying additional bread to supplement the children’s rations. And many of the children themselves were—as indicated earlier— resorting to trading personal belongings for additional food.

Based on her observation of the kitchen workflow, Floore was soon able to identify the main reason why the children had remained hungry all along. Her investigations revealed a new low point in the history of the Children’s Village: when Floore worked out the amount of food that was being delivered to the installation and compared this to the rations the children were receiving, she noticed a discrepancy—the children were getting less food than they should. Further detective work led Floore to the conclusion that there had to be a connection with the fact that workers of the IRO Motor Pool, with which the Children’s Village was sharing some of its kitchens, had access to the storage area where the rations for the children were kept. These individuals were stealing the food.

For the time of her visit, Floore took control of all kitchen activities and the distribution of food; this immediately resulted in bigger portions and more balanced dishes for the children. She also managed to organize additional rations from various sources, including much-desired treats such as ice cream.
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that the scandalous activities would not continue, Floore set up a food committee consisting of three boys and three girls. Apart from the fact that the children had now been given a representative voice, the committee members had permanent access to the kitchen. In Floore’s words, this made them “vigilantes” who would ensure that no more illegal activities surrounded the provision of food in the Children’s Village. The new control system rapidly brought about significant improvement. In the face of the shocking revelations which added to the sense that the Bad Aibling operation was spiraling out of control, senior staff members at IRO Zone Headquarters decided it was essential to permanently assign an experienced food supervisor to the Children’s Village. A few months later, the director of IRO Area 7 reported that the distribution of food in the Children’s Village was now “well organized”. However, there were still critical voices regarding the quality of the food served. One doctor working in the Children’s Village complained that it was “excessive in carbohydrate and calories”, but continued to be “grossly inadequate in vitamins and minerals”.

Floore’s main task had been the evaluation and improvement of the food situation, but she was also an avid observer in other ways: in her final report, she listed numerous problems which had come to her attention during her stay in the Children’s Village. Her devastating criticism reads like a summary of the pressing issues we have dealt with so far. It is worth quoting Floore at more length: “Children with police records in criminal courts placed with normal boys and girls. […] Alcoholic beverages sold to children at social gatherings. Several boys had to be helped home after the Easter dance, the youngest a boy of 12! […] Police guards given permission by the Director to use force on the boys if necessary. […] There are too few among the staff who have had training in normal
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and abnormal child psychology [...]. House-parents, who are supposed to guide their charges, overworked and with too little free time to ‘talk over things’ with their children. [...] Children known mostly as ‘cases’ or ‘names’ by most of the staff. [...] Children 18 years and over who are capable of hard work and need to be treated as ‘adults’ cooped up with younger ones and all considered ‘children’. [...] Lack of adequate provision made for recreation. [...] Children not stimulated to take pride in their village and to work to keep it in orderly condition. [...] To stimulate interest in good housekeeping we must see that broken windows are repaired, refuse removed, leaking water pipes and faucets fixed, and eating utensils provided.”

Believing that she had identified the underlying cause for all of these problems, Floore had nothing good to say about the administration of the Children’s Village: “There is one salient fact that must be glaringly apparent to the most casual observer at Bad Aibling, and that is lack of direction. This is evident from the top down, and at all levels.” Floore noted that the work of the individual departments had so far scarcely been coordinated, while the community-based, collaborative approach defining the concept of a modern children’s village had not yet been realized. She therefore concluded that “to motivate a group to action someone must serve as the catalytic agent to speed the group discussion, group thinking, group interest and group decision. Unless we have these, the project will fall by the way-side and grow weeds and riots. But with directed motivation, inspired by strong leadership, the Bad Aibling Children’s Village has untapped possibilities.”

Criticism of the situation in the Children’s Village had peaked, culminating in the devastating report which Floore submitted. This time, the IRO would take all the recommendations on board and take decisive moves towards revitalizing the Bad Aibling setup. Change was in the air.

---

59 Ibid., p. 1.
60 Ibid., p. 4.
63 Ibid., p. 3.
Major changes were to take place in the course of 1949. They would culminate in a new appointment in the summer of that year which heralded what can be considered the heyday of the Children’s Village. Conditions were still far from optimal in spring, as the physical setup still left much to be desired. And as seen in the previous chapter of this study, episodes of unrest had disrupted the operation of the Children’s Village. Progress had been made since the early days, but the establishment of a functioning administration and a successful program remained an ongoing process which only proceeded in fits and starts. By the summer months, the IRO—with the help of other voluntary agencies—had succeeded in bringing about considerable improvements in the day-to-day running of the Children’s Village. By September 1949, it was housing 482 children and youth.²

The AFSC reported in early 1949 that the furniture situation was finally beginning to improve.³ Also, in the face of the still appalling lack of supplies, various aid organizations had made generous donations. The *American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee* (AJDC: one of the most important Jewish relief agencies operating in postwar Europe)⁴ contributed blankets, and the YMCA arranged for additional chairs and benches for use in the dining room of the Children’s Village.⁵ The children were finally provided with a sufficient quantity of clothing, and were able to choose items from the Chil-

---


---
dren’s Village warehouse according to their personal taste. It also helped that the garrison buildings, with their camouflage patterns, were re-painted in a cream color which gave them a more cheerful look. As a result, the US Army rated the housing conditions as “excellent”. USCOM representative Theodora Allen concluded that the progress had been “quite remarkable”.

Important though the improvement in the physical facilities was, this was only one side of the coin. Quaker Wendy Elliott rightly maintained in May 1949 that there was “still a relief situation” at hand. Of great concern to the IRO at this stage were issues of authority and leadership in the Children’s Village. There was a lack of clarity with regard to staffing structures and responsibilities. Just as IRO worker Floore had indicated in the final report on her stay in Bad Aibling, Zone Headquarters were dissatisfied with the overall administration of the facility. There was doubt “as to whether the entire staff concurred” that Otto Bayer possessed the necessary authority, for some “felt that Miss Ryan acted quite independently”. In view of the challenges which still lay ahead and the urgent need to get the program back on track, the IRO could not tolerate any clashes of authority. Zone Headquarters saw a clear link between the “series of revolts” and the present administration which exhibited signs of “poor leadership”.

Bayer was thought to have “run into many difficulties”, and it was suggested that it would be
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“desirable to get someone in [...] with a proper background”.13 And so, in the early summer of 1949, Bayer was dismissed as Administrator of the Children’s Village. In the words of Natalie Kent, it was “a great shock and disappointment to him—after eight months of struggling, he has finally got the camp to a stage where it was ready for real growth”.14 Fortunately for the parting Administrator himself, he remained an employee of the IRO and later acted as a legal adviser at Zone Headquarters.15 Removing Bayer from his position was a risky decision at a point in time when conditions in Bad Aibling were just beginning to stabilize. Clearly, the IRO considered that the situation was sufficiently grave to warrant such a decision.

Everyone therefore had high hopes when Bayer’s successor, Douglas Deane, arrived in the early summer of 1949.16 There is no doubt that Deane’s professional background made him an excellent candidate for the job. A native Australian born in 1909, Deane had worked as a teacher at the International School of Geneva in the 1930s. During World War II he travelled overseas, joined the Canadian YMCA Auxiliary War Services, and eventually took Canadian nationality. Deane joined UNRRA in 1946 and continued to work for the IRO until 1948—during this time, he was stationed in various places in the US Zone. Following these assignments, he once again travelled overseas, this time to help set up the United Nations International School in Lake Success, New York. However, insufficient funding was jeopardizing the project. Soon after, Deane was offered the position of director in Bad Aibling.17
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From Deane’s journal, we learn that his first impression of the Children’s Village was far from positive. In one of the first entries written in Bad Aibling, he noted: “Internal administration is lousy. [...] Accommodations survey quite hopeless. No one seems capable of taking it. [...] No volunteers out for cleaning of grounds—Discipline is extremely low and while nothing bad goes on the children’s time is practically undirected”. Describing the Children’s Village police as “a farce”, Deane had nothing good to say about its members, mostly DPs with no professional background in child care. He remarked that “their case was rather sadly summed up when one of them said plaintively and without rancor: ‘But how can I be a policeman if I can’t hit them [the children]?’”. As a consequence, Deane requested to have the police force replaced by individuals more suited to an installation housing displaced children. Over time, the police were transformed into an informal unit, without uniforms, maintaining more of a friendly relationship
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with the children, rather than an authoritarian one. Recognizing that the tripartite administration of the Children’s Village was somewhat conflated, Deane also held a lengthy discussion with Program Director E. Nora Ryan and Case Work Supervisor Emmy Lefson, clarifying their respective responsibilities and making it clear that he was primarily in charge of operations.

While Deane would ultimately put a lot of effort into creating a specific kind of program which was inspired by the philosophy of modern child communities, his management was at the same time of a pragmatic nature. On the one hand, he possessed an excellent knowledge of contemporary theories surrounding child welfare and drew upon them in his work. However, at times he was skeptical with regard to their relevance for the immediate challenges which he and his co-workers were facing in Bad Aibling. This is, for example, reflected in a diary entry which Deane wrote after a meeting with Vinita Lewis, IRO’s Deputy Child Care Officer for the US Zone. Following their discussion of how to handle displaced children, he contended that Lewis was “too professional to see simplicity of our problems…” Rather than overly focus on the theoretical implications of contemporary child care debates, Deane was eager to see the Children’s Village fulfil its primary purpose.

Although his first impressions were mostly negative, Deane did take note of some of the more positive aspects of the Bad Aibling setup. For instance, he had nothing but praise for the AFSC team: “Special mention should be made of our five Quakers. Following the pioneer days when they pitched in, helping at all points, they […] at least represent stable points in the lives of the children.” Likewise, reactions to Deane appear to have been unanimously positive. Quaker Natalie Kent reported: “Our new director is energetic, active and good. He is all over the camp and is crying to

---

22 Ludovic Heuvelmans (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Elizabeth Brown (Chief, Welfare Division, IRO, US Zone), 1 August 1951, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932.
23 See section ‘Administrative Setup’.
24 Journal of Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), 29 July 1949, Personal Archives of Derrick Deane, Folder: Mr. Deane, Bad Aibling.
25 See section ‘The Children’s Village: International Families?’.
26 Journal of Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), 13 August 1949, Personal Archives of Derrick Deane, Folder: Mr. Deane, Bad Aibling.
27 Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Philip E. Ryan (Chief of Operations, IRO, US Zone), 10 August 1949, p. 6, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.
higher levels for things we need to make life more livable. He has a good background in things educational and we have hopes that the school will improve under his guidance.”

Earl Blake Cox, director of IRO Area 7, was also impressed by the speedy improvements brought about by Deane: “Much progress has been made by the new Director in the past month. His appraisals of the many problems and situations confronting the administration of the Children’s Village have been [guided by] consistently reflected sound judgement and not inconsiderable time, attention and thought.”

In the eyes of everyone involved, the right person had arrived at the right time. As historian Lynn H. Nicholas has pointed out with regard to the successful running of DP camps: “Much depended […] on the […] officials who were technically in charge. They […] varied enormously.” In the case of the Children’s Village, this observation was definitely borne out by the success of the appointment of Douglas Deane.

On the downside, staff problems would remain a constant source of concern—even after the early emergencies had been overcome and the program was finally up and running. Although the Children’s Village employed 323 workers in February 1950, Deane was still concerned that the installation was exhibiting “poor efficiency […] with a constantly changing staff”. A major factor adding to the fluctuation of workers was that the majority of adult DPs employed in the Children’s Village were due to emigrate to new countries of residence within the near future.

Another problem was that the AFSC was facing budget cuts and worried that it would ultimately have to pull its staff out of Bad

---

28 Natalie Kent (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to unknown, 8 August 1949, p. 2, Personal Archives of Natalie Kempner.
30 Nicholas, Cruel World, p. 470.
32 Ibid., p. 4.
Aibling. The Quakers therefore inquired whether the IRO would be willing to financially support the continued assignment of AFSC workers to the Children’s Village. Luckily, the IRO did grant the aid, which can be regarded as proof that the work of the Quakers in Bad Aibling—which we will deal with in detail in this chapter—was considered vital for the success of the program. In the words of Deane: “There is no need for me to say how delighted the team at Children’s Village is that our Friends will be remaining with us”.

Besides the staff, significant changes regarding the children themselves were taking place. To start with, the quarantine period for new admissions, meaning the time new inhabitants had to spend in the reception house, was raised from two to three weeks. This was a reaction to the fact that the Children’s Village had been facing continued outbreaks of disease ever since it...

---


35 Jane W. Bennett (AFSC, US Zone) to Ernest C. Grigg (Chief, Care and Eligibility, IRO, US Zone), 13 July 1949, pp. 1–2, AFSC Archives, Box: Foreign Service, 1949, Country—Germany (D. P. Program Numbered Letters from ML) to (Numbered Letters from COG Jan.—April), Folder: Country, Germany, 1949, Displaced Persons Program, Letters # from ML, 1 to 65.

36 Marlis Gildemeister (Representative, AFSC, US Zone) to Lili Koehler (Foreign Service Section, AFSC, Philadelphia), 7 December 1949, pp. 1–2, AFSC Archives, Box: Foreign Service, 1949, Country—Germany (D. P. Program Numbered Letters from ML) to (Numbered Letters from COG Jan.—April), Folder: Country, Germany, 1949, Displaced Persons Program, Letters # from ML, 66 to 126.

37 Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Marlis Gildemeister (Representative, AFSC, US Zone), 8 December 1949, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932.

opened its doors in the fall of 1948. As we have seen, this had resulted in many problems. There were also changes regarding the composition of the population of the Children’s Village. More and more younger children were being admitted, a trend that had started early in 1949 and continued well into 1950. The reasons for this development were manifold: the proportion of older children was falling because of increasing resettlement activities, and many of the infants and toddlers being transferred to Bad Aibling were illegitimate children abandoned by their DP mothers, who in turn were also emigrating to new countries of residence. Others were temporary care cases, a group we touched upon in an earlier section. The organization of the Children’s Village had to be adjusted to accommodate these demographic changes. In the end, there were so many children under 6 years of age that a separate unit was set up, with its own staff for administration, medical support and child welfare. Quaker Natalie Kent noted how work in the Chil-

39 Dr. Marjorie K. Smith (Health Advisor, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), 29 July 1949, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932.
40 See section ‘Unrest in the Village’.
42 Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Earl Blake Cox (Director, IRO, US Zone, Area 7), 25 May 1950, p. 2, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932.
43 Marlis Gildemeister (Representative, AFSC, US Zone) to Lili Koehler (Foreign Service Section, AFSC, Philadelphia), 17 May 1949, AFSC Archives, Box: Foreign Service, 1949, Country—Germany (D. P. Program Numbered Letters from ML) to (Numbered Letters from COG Jan.–April), Folder: Country, Germany, 1949, Displaced Persons Program, Letters # from ML, 1 to 65.
45 See section ‘The Children’.
Children’s Village changed as the number of children in this age group increased: “It is quite different from our older boys who knew why they were here, what had happened to their parents, where they hoped to go from here—and usually remembered their childhood in Poland or Russia or Latvia. These children have almost no understanding of what they are doing here or even of what this place is and of who all the people are. Many of them consider their life here quite a normal one, having no conception of a family as a family exists in Sidney, New York, or Philadelphia.”

Another development was the sudden influx of youth leaving Czechoslovakia in the aftermath of the Communist rise to power in 1948. With 150 individuals, Czech youth would constitute a majority group within the population of the Children’s Village by the end of 1949. At that time, the number of inhabitants still totaled roughly 500. As we shall see in a later section, the Czech youth would pose a particular challenge in terms of repatriation and resettlement goals. But despite this, the history of the Children’s Village under the direction of Douglas Deane can justifiably be described as the phase during which the program was at its height.

47 Natalie Kent (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to unknown, 6 September 1949, p. 3, Personal Archives of Natalie Kempner.
50 See section ‘Repatriation and Resettlement’.
Excursus: Child Communities and Welfare Models in the Postwar Period

Before we turn our attention to the program that was eventually implemented in the Children’s Village, it is worth taking a step back and touching upon some of the ongoing discussions about child welfare after 1945. First, we will look at some concepts which have been of particular interest in previous studies on displaced children. In theory, these concepts can be treated as antithetical. We will first examine familialism and collectivism, and then turn our attention to questions of nationalism and internationalism. Finally, against the background of child community experiments that were launched all across Europe during and after World War II, it will become apparent that any generalized conclusions regarding the care of displaced children are inadequate in the context of nuanced historical interpretation. Approaches to the rehabilitation of children were certainly more differentiated than any binary models would suggest.

Tara Zahra has rightly noted that in the aftermath of Europe’s liberation there was a “widespread consensus that the Second World War had destroyed the family as completely as it had Europe’s train tracks, factories, bridges and roads.”¹ Based on this realization, an intense discussion emerged among relief workers “over the issue of whether displaced children needed a familial context, or whether some kind of collective solution might better meet the children’s emotional needs”.² Drawing on Zahra’s ideas, historian Anna Andlauer has referred to familialism and collectivism as cornerstones of “the two main pedagogical approaches […] applied to the rehabilitation of surviving children in the immediate postwar period”³. The concepts of familialism and collectivism are a useful starting point when it comes to examining individual relief efforts at the microhistorical level.

Both contemporary observers and historians other than Zahra and Andlauer have agreed that an orientation towards the family—

---

1  Zahra, Lost Children, p. 46.
2  Zahra, The Lost Children, p. 62.
or the desire to recreate family-like structures—was indeed a pivotal concept in the efforts to help and care for displaced children after 1945. In a report published in 1952, UNESCO contended, on the basis of experience gained in the postwar years, that “children who have been displaced with their family are generally infinitely less affected by the ordeals they have undergone, than children who have been separated from their family”.

This general tenor was widespread. It was backed by psychological research carried out during and after the war—the work of researchers such as Dorothy T. Burlingham and Anna Freud (which we will turn to in more detail later) had a great influence on relief workers.

Zahra has furthermore argued that “many humanitarian and political activists linked practices of politicized, collective education with totalitarianism and championed education in the family in the name of democratization and human rights”. The list of historians who have confirmed the importance of restoring the family in the postwar period continues. For example, Margarete Myers Feinstein has claimed that the “need for family was great”, while Jay Winter and Mathew Thomson have referred to “a revival of family life” and an “emphasis on security, protection, and the importance of attachment to home and family” respectively. Ivan Jablonka has even described the family as “the most legitimate authority for socialization” to have emerged over the course of the twentieth century. All of these views pinpoint the priorities that came to be prevalent in child welfare at the time.

---


5 See section ‘Medical and Psychological Support’.

6 Anna Freud and Dorothy T. Burlingham, War and Children (New York 1943); Anna Freud and Dorothy T. Burlingham, Infants Without Families. The Case For and Against Residential Nurseries (London 1965 [1944]).

7 Zahra, Lost Children, p. 54.

8 Feinstein, Holocaust Survivors in Postwar Germany, 1945–1957, p. 171.


What were the practical implications of this emphasis on the family with respect to the services rendered to children in the DP camps and children’s centers? First of all, it meant that both UNRRA and the IRO, through tracing activities, made an enormous effort to locate the members of families that had been divided and scattered across the continent, during and after the war.\textsuperscript{12} And even when family reunification was delayed—or turned out to be impossible—familialist thinking nevertheless influenced the way everyday care for children was organized in the installations run by UNRRA and the IRO. Here, relief workers tried to work out future plans for their wards on the basis of individual histories and interests, rather than viewing them as an abstract mass of small human beings for whom some sort of universal solution was needed.\textsuperscript{13} Simply put, familialism focused on the individual.

However, not everyone involved in the care of displaced children joined in the familialist refrain. Unlike those committing themselves to the crafting of an environment where the individual could be best taken care of, advocates of collectivist methods argued that it was best for displaced children to be cared for in settings which gave priority to the concept of group living. It was believed that a homogenous group of children, bonded by shared war experiences, would be able to offer one another mutual support and understanding.\textsuperscript{14} The familialist approach was furthermore highly problematic in the case of Jewish children—after the Holocaust, a substantial number of them “had neither families nor physical homes to which they could return.”\textsuperscript{15} While the latter was also true for many gentile children, Daniella Doron has rightly stressed that the institutions housing Jewish children were regarded as “necessary avenues through which to ensure the continuity of Jewish childhood, culture, and community”.\textsuperscript{16} Here, accentuation of Jewish heritage by means of education, religious instruction, and community life took priority over considerations of the individual characteristics and needs of a child.\textsuperscript{17} But there were also other limits to familialist-driven ideas that made it necessary to incorporate alternative approaches. As a result of traumatic experiences, adult

\begin{itemize}
  \item[12] Zahra, Lost Children, p. 59.
  \item[13] Ibid., p. 57.
  \item[14] Ibid., pp. 60–61.
  \item[15] Zahra, The Lost Children, p. 98.
  \item[17] Feinstein, Holocaust Survivors in Postwar Germany, 1945–1957, p. 179.
\end{itemize}
DPs were frequently incapable of taking proper care of their children. To the dismay of relief workers coming across such cases, the children were often grossly neglected. Not even those who believed in the familialist approach could seriously have considered biological ties to hold the only key to the rehabilitation of such children.\(^\text{18}\)

Although experts in child welfare might have theoretically come down on the side of either familialism or collectivism, in reality, concrete decisions regarding the care of children also depended on practical considerations born out of individual circumstances. And frequently, differences between familialist and collectivist agendas were blurred. In the words of Margarete Feinstein, for example, living in the aforementioned group settings “provided many children with familial relationships that facilitated their transition to life in freedom.”\(^\text{19}\) Likewise, Izio Rosenman has pointed to the special bonding that occurred amongst surviving Jewish children by using the term “neo-sibling”.\(^\text{20}\) Speaking of the family and institutions, Ivan Jablonka has contended that the “latter came into play when the former failed”.\(^\text{21}\) These observations would suggest that both the familialist and the collectivist approach had their limitations—not so much theoretically as in practical terms. Later in this section, we will see to what extent this was reflected in child community projects that sprang up in various European countries after the end of World War II.

The question of nationality was another issue preoccupying those concerned about the wellbeing of displaced children. In the aftermath of a devastating war which had engulfed the globe, and in view of the multitude of nationalities represented among the vast DP population, reflection on this matter was a pressing and inevitable necessity.\(^\text{22}\) Previous research has pointed to a resurgence of nationalism in postwar Europe—a development which also affected the field of humanitarianism. Historian Jessica Reinisch has, for example, described the DP camps as “nursing places of national


\(^{19}\) Feinstein, Holocaust Survivors in Postwar Germany, 1945–1957, p. 165.


\(^{22}\) Fehrenbach, War Orphans and Postfascist Families, p. 183.
traditions”, while Gerard Cohen has ascribed “an important nationalizing role” to the relief work carried out. Tara Zahra has concluded that “1945 was […] one of the most violently nationalist moments in European history”. And the view that “children were seen as the most valuable asset a nation had” has been expressed by Hugh Cunningham. These observations are valid, and certainly of relevance to the question of displaced children. Indeed, an emphasis on nationalism appears to have had a decisive influence on UNRRA’s early children’s centers. These installations frequently housed children of one particular nationality. As already mentioned, the primary goal of Allied DP politics in the immediate postwar period was repatriation. Based on this, historian Iris Helbing has convincingly come to the conclusion that renationalizing the children and youth—before they could return to their homeland—was one of the overall goals of child welfare workers stationed in Europe. The issue even found its way into the field of contemporary cinematography: in their analysis of Fred Zinnemann’s 1948 movie The Search (which tells the story of a displaced boy struggling to find his mother in postwar Germany) Sharif Gemie and Louise Rees have argued that the “reconstruction of national communities” is among the movie’s central motifs. Taking all of the aforementioned into account, Zahra’s observation that “a firm sense of national identity […] was essential to the psychological rehabilitation of displaced persons” would seem to hold true.

26 Cunningham, Children and Childhood in Western Society since 1500, p. 172.
27 Helbing, Die Fürsorge und Repatriierung polnischer Displaced Children aus der britischen Besatzungszone, pp. 85–86.
28 See section ‘Displaced Persons After 1945’
29 Helbing, Die Fürsorge und Repatriierung polnischer Displaced Children aus der britischen Besatzungszone, p. 87.
31 Zahra, The Lost Children, p. 129.
However, while the weight that was given to questions of national identity after 1945 is undeniable, it was in fact coincident with internationalist ambitions which were equally present both in post-war rhetoric and in efforts aimed at the protection of displaced children. In the words of Reinisch, “relief work became the testing ground for international co-operation”\(^{32}\), as was evident in the creation of large international bodies such as UNRRA or the IRO. For some historians, internationalist ambitions appear to be incompatible with the idea that a sense of reinforced nationalism was spreading across Europe after 1945.\(^{33}\) For instance, Zahra has dismissed such ambitions as “a wave of utopian internationalism.”\(^{34}\) This is a somewhat harsh conclusion.

Any reflection on the question of whether relief efforts were influenced by internationalist ambitions should start with a definition of the term *internationalism* in this context. It has often been used uncritically in the existing body of research on DPs. Reinisch’s observation that it is still a matter of debate among historians as to whether “collaboration in the field of relief formed a real moment of ‘internationalism’”\(^{35}\) is perhaps partly rooted in the non-specific and therefore inconsistent use of terminology. Conrad Hughes has rightly put this question up for debate: “By international do we mean that which links nation states or that which goes beyond them? Are we looking at a celebration of every nation and culture (multi-nationalism) or of none (supra-nationalism)? […] What does it mean to be internationally-minded?\(^{36}\) Indeed, we cannot pinpoint one specific concept of internationalism which dominated debate and action at the time.\(^{37}\)

---


\(^{34}\) Zahra, *The Lost Children*, p. 118.


Using the example of the international UNRRA University in Munich, historian Anna Holian has applied one specific definition of internationalism to the postwar period and the history of DPs in particular. She convincingly highlights the fact that the UNRRA University embraced a liberal form of internationalism which did not clash with coexisting national elements. On the contrary, in the case of the Munich experiment the two concepts were reconciled. In Holian’s words, “internationalism is not always the antithesis of nationalism. […] The liberal model of internationalism […] identified nations as the building blocks of the world community. It viewed peaceful coexistence between nations as the foundation of peace more generally.” 38 Such an understanding of internationalism does not aim to override or eradicate the concept of nationalism. Without nationalism, there could literally—etymologically, even—be no international order. 39 As Nobel Laureate Christian Lange suggested in 1921, internationalism “recognizes, by its very name, that nations do exist. It simply limits their scope more than one-sided nationalism does.” 40 In this sense, nationalism and internationalism do not stand in binary opposition, but overlap by their very nature. This insight, when applied to the study of humanitarian activities, provides us with a better understanding of how wide the range of approaches and individual projects can be. In postwar Europe, too, the spectrum was much more varied than any one-sided narrative might suggest. 41 As the example of child communities spreading across postwar Europe demonstrates, not all projects which labeled themselves as internationalist necessarily excluded nationalist elements. Some of these visions may have been overly ambitious, fueled by idealist thinking, and in many cases not entirely successful—however, historians should be cautious in concluding that they were intrinsically naïve or unrealistic to begin with. In this sense, it has been pointed out by Glenda Sluga that “the history of internationalism, regardless of its content, has been tainted as utopian in ways that nationalism, regardless of its content, has not.” 42

38 Holian, Between Nationalism and Internationalism, p. 111.
41 Holleuffer, Zwischen Fremde und Fremde, pp. 374–375.
It has already been mentioned that the Children’s Village in Bad Aibling was initially labeled a Children’s Center, not a Children’s Village.\(^{43}\) When B. J. Edwards, the IRO’s Accommodation Officer in the US Zone, learnt that the name had been altered, he wrote a sarcastic inter-office memo on behalf of his department: “We cannot imagine a Kaserne being referred to as a ‘Village’ since, according to Webster, a village is a small country town”.\(^{44}\) In spite of such mockery, the decision to change the name was in fact programmatic, for it was influenced by a broader movement promoting innovative forms of community living for children, with experimental projects spreading all over Europe in the years following World War II.

In 1944 the editor of the Swiss journal *Du*, Walter Robert Corti, published an article in which he described his thoughts on how the rehabilitation of Europe’s orphaned children could be achieved once hostilities ceased. Corti envisioned the construction of a village which would house these young victims of war. His idea was that the children should be treated as individuals and looked after in small living groups, rather than seen as a homogenous mass of inhabitants as in a traditional institution or orphanage. In an attempt to recreate structures of family life, house parents would live with these groups and take care of them as biological parents would. These surrogate families were one of the cornerstones of Corti’s vision, which did not limit itself to the provision of shelter, food and clothing. Corti suggested that the children should also attend school in the village, and—in the spirit of self-government—actively participate in the organization of everyday life, for example educational and recreational activities. This would promote the development of both a sense of community and an atmosphere of understanding among children from different national and cultural backgrounds.\(^{45}\) This vision might be considered to encompass a combination of collectivist and familialist elements, with small fam-

\(^{43}\) See chapter “The First Days Were Grim”.
\(^{44}\) B. J. Edwards (Accommodation Officer, IRO, US Zone) to M. Braude (Deputy Chief, Care and Maintenance, IRO, US Zone), 8 February 1949, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/857/39/1.
ily-like living groups forming sub-units within an inclusive community.

Following a horrific war during which authoritarian regimes had destroyed one of the main fabrics of society, the family, Corti’s plea struck home with the public and ultimately resulted in the founding of the Pestalozzi Children’s Village in the Swiss town of Trogen.\footnote{Johannes-Martin Kamp, Kinderrepubliken. Geschichte, Praxis und Theorie radikaler Selbstregierung in Kinder- und Jugendheimen (Wiesbaden 2006), p. 559. Available at: <http://www.paed.com/kinder/kind/kinderrepubliken.pdf>.


\footnote{Corti, Grundziele und Grundsätze der Kinderdorf-Arbeit, pp. 11–12.

\footnote{Kamp, Kinderrepubliken, p. 559.

\footnote{Elisabeth Rotten, Children. War’s Victims. The Education of the Handicapped (Paris 1949), p. 20.}} By taking in disadvantaged children from countries across the globe, its founders sought to make an impact beyond the boundaries of Switzerland, at the international level. Elisabeth Rotten, Corti’s co-worker,\footnote{Elisabeth Rotten, Children’s Communities. A Way of Life for War’s Victims (Paris 1949), p. 10.} stressed that “internationalism is an outstanding feature of the Pestalozzi Children’s Village […] developing from service to the miniature community to world-consciousness.”\footnote{Elisabeth Rotten, Children’s Communities. A Way of Life for War’s Victims (Paris 1949), p. 10.} Following their education and vocational training in Trogen, children were supposed to return to their home countries. The hope was that through their stay in the Village, they would be equipped with an understanding of the differences between and common elements of varying national and cultural traditions.\footnote{Corti, Grundziele und Grundsätze der Kinderdorf-Arbeit, pp. 11–12.} Modern research has acknowledged the Pestalozzi Children’s Village to have possessed a decidedly international outlook,\footnote{Kamp, Kinderrepubliken, p. 559.} and there was indeed more to its program than utopian rhetoric. Whilst the children lived in houses according to nationality and at school were taught the curriculum of their respective home countries, their nationality played less of a role in the shared workshops, recreational activities and mutual play.\footnote{Elisabeth Rotten, Children. War’s Victims. The Education of the Handicapped (Paris 1949), p. 20.}

It is worth mentioning that while the individuals behind the new communities no doubt had ambitious plans, they were also realistic in their approach and aware of their limitations. The author of a contemporary publication on child communities, Thérèse Brosse, made this clear: “No one would dispute the superiority of a good family environment if available. But it is often not available, and is sometimes open to definite objections. For these reasons, Children’s Communities must also be given their place. They must do
everything possible to reproduce features of family life…”52 In this sense, Michelle Mouton has rightly described child communities such as the Pestalozzi Children’s Village as offering “surrogate families”.53 As a report commissioned by UNESCO noted in 1952, they could “never quite replace family life, but […] offer certain compensations”.54 Elisabeth Rotten was also aware of the risks of internationalist ambitions, admitting that there were potential problems regarding the “readaptation of the boys and girls to their home countries”, once their stay in Trogen came to an end.55 This illustrates that the national identity of children was not necessarily given up or downplayed within agendas of this kind. If we recall Anna Holian’s thoughts on the concept of liberal internationalism (serving, in her words, as an “extension”56 of nationalism), some critical comments perhaps fall wide of the mark—for example the dismissal of the international character of the Pestalozzi Children’s Village because of the fact that its inhabitants were placed in blocks according to nationality.57

The conflation of familialism, collectivism, nationalism and internationalism in the Pestalozzi Children’s Village formed a flexible basis for the development of follow-up projects,58 while at the same time, similar communities aimed at the rehabilitation of war-affected children also sprang to life independently in other European countries.59 Generally, these projects did not remain in isolation, and the synergies which were soon gained incorporated individual experiments into the framework of a broader movement. Hugh Cunningham has rightly noted that “an initiative in child care in one country rarely remained confined within its borders”.60 In this
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55 Rotten, Children’s Communities, p. 10.
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57 Zahra, Lost Children, p. 73.
59 Ibid., p. 4.
60 Cunningham, Children and Childhood in Western Society since 1500, p. 171.
context, it is questionable whether a postwar emphasis on renewing the family was, as Tara Zahra has suggested, really to be seen as a predominantly Anglo-American phenomenon which was carried over to Europe through relief activities. Even though it is true that a particularly strong tendency towards familialist trends had been on the rise in the US since the beginning of the century, comparable developments had also been set in motion in Europe; some of them actually had an effect in their own right on the ongoing debates in the US. Ivan Jablonka has concluded that while it is “possible to identify child welfare models at national levels”, the “gradual convergence tended to blur their underlying rationale”.

As early as 1948, representatives of children’s villages and similar initiatives based in various European countries created an official network for the exchange of ideas and experiences. The International Federation of Children’s Communities was founded on the occasion of a conference which took place in the Pestalozzi Children’s Village. The fact that the association would be based in Trogen can be seen as yet another indicator of the mark Corti’s work had left on this emerging international movement. In any event, child communities which emerged in the wake of the liberation of Europe certainly made their impact: in her study on the fate of European children during and after the war, Irish writer Dorothy Macardle described the newly established children’s villages as being among “the successful and lasting achievements which have sprung out of spontaneous efforts”. Almost 60 years later, Klaus Esser also stressed that the children’s villages of the postwar period had a permanent
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influence on later institutions devoted to the care and education of children in need.\textsuperscript{67}

Returning to the main subject of this study, it will become apparent how the program of the IRO Children’s Village in Bad Aibling also conflated notions of familialism, collectivism, nationalism and internationalism, and how it was, in this sense, strongly influenced by the child community movement described in the preceding paragraphs.

\textsuperscript{67} Klaus Esser, ‘Die Kinderdorfbewegung in der katholischen Heimerziehung’, in Stephan Hiller, Eckhart Knab, and Heribert Mörsberger (eds.), \textit{Erziehungshilfe—Investition in die Zukunft: 100 Jahre BVkE} (Freiburg im Breisgau 2009), pp. 73–90, here p. 84.
In developing a program for the Children’s Village in Bad Aibling, the IRO was able to draw upon experience gained in previous children’s centers. The services provided by UNRRA at one of these installations, situated in the Bavarian town of Indersdorf, had already gone beyond the mere provision of shelter and food, with psychological support, schools, a library and the organization of recreational activities.\(^1\) And the administration of the children’s center in Müssen, located in the British Zone of Occupation, had successfully introduced principles of self-government into the lives of the children under its care.\(^2\) However, whilst there were antecedents within the history of UNRRA and the IRO, it was the postwar child community movement—as described in the previous section—which perhaps had the most decisive influence on the unique program eventually brought to fruition in Bad Aibling. Several sources point to such a connection. For example, the Children’s Village was featured in a UNESCO brochure which listed it among other institutions considered to be representative of the broader movement.\(^3\) It is also evident in a letter which John Troniak, an IRO Child Care Officer, sent to Eleanor Ellis at Zone Headquarters on 24 March 1949. Troniak informed Ellis that the French newspaper *Le Monde* had released an article on the Pestalozzi Children’s Village, and suggested that it “might be helpful for the Child & Youth Care Officers in their work in Bad Aibling”.\(^4\)

Director Douglas Deane played a decisive role in designing a program which incorporated many of the hallmarks of the child communities emerging all over Europe, a movement Deane clearly believed in.\(^5\) A close analysis of the program of the Children’s Village from mid-1949 onwards shows how it strived to take on the challenges which many of the newly-emerged child community
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\(^4\) John Troniak (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone, Area 1) to Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone), 24 March 1949, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/928.

projects were facing: to create as good a family atmosphere as possible; to take every child’s individual history and current situation into account, in order to hopefully make the right decisions regarding his or her future; to grant the children both an opportunity to live out their childhood—something many had never been able to do before—and to allow them to play an active and meaningful role in building and maintaining the community in which they lived, i.e. to allow for both play and self-government; to enable the children to recover from their terrible wartime experiences through counselling and appropriate modern psychological methods; and finally, to educate or train the children so that they would be able to live a full life and provide for themselves once their temporary stay in the community was over.6

Deane immediately set out to put his vision into practice and began making a number of changes in the area of day-to-day living. For example, shortly after starting his new post in Bad Aibling, Deane was struck by the idea that the Children’s Village would benefit from an internal monetary system, a currency of its own. The money, he hoped, would stop the children from selling personal belongings on the black market, reward efforts at school or in the context of vocational training, and generally contribute to overall discipline.7 In January 1950, the currency was introduced.8 There were two units called AIBI and CHVI. At the same time, a small shop (the Canteen) opened its doors. Here the children and youth could spend their new pocket money, choosing from an array of goods: cigarettes, chocolate, chewing gum, even additional clothing and toys.9 The money was also needed to acquire tickets for the weekly movie screenings.10 By introducing this currency system, the Children’s Village followed the example of other child
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6 Rotten, Children’s Communities, p. 2.
7 Journal of Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), 3 August 1949, Personal Archives of Derrick Deane, Folder: Mr. Deane, Bad Aibling.
10 Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Donald Kingsley (Director-General, IRO, Geneva), 27 September 1950, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/857/39/1.
communities with similar monetary systems of their own, such as the Children’s Village in Civitavecchia, central Italy.\textsuperscript{11}

Other measures were also aimed at the promotion of responsibility and a sense of self-government among the inhabitants of the Children’s Village. For instance, the children ran their own court and appointed representatives who played an active role in maintaining discipline among their peers. In his diary, Deane noted that the court was “well conducted”.\textsuperscript{12} On one occasion, it penalized a boy who had illegally sold off his winter coat. He was banned from attending movie nights and from leaving the Children’s Village for the duration of one month.\textsuperscript{13} On another occasion, a group of boys got into the car belonging to the Quakers and drove it into a tree. Despite being bruised and shaken, the boys were taken before the court, and as punishment, grounded and forced to clean the cellars.\textsuperscript{14} Again, there were parallels to other institutions: the existence of a children’s court is also documented for the Hungarian Children’s Town of Hajdubáňak.\textsuperscript{15}

Another new element was introduced in the form of committees created for and run by the children. They helped in the everyday planning for their living groups, assisting their house parents with various tasks.\textsuperscript{16} In March 1950, 12 of the older boys volunteered to serve as auxiliary camp guards, “controlling that order and security in the camp will be maintained”.\textsuperscript{17} These examples illustrate how the children were not merely regarded as passive recipients of shelter and goods. Involving the children in this manner contributed to a sense of partial autonomy and mutual cooperation between staff and inhabitants that was considered characteristic of a modern

\textsuperscript{11} Rotten, Children’s Communities, p. 6; Brosse, Homeless Children, p. 51.
\textsuperscript{12} Journal of Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), 23 September 1949, Personal Archives of Derrick Deane, Folder: Mr. Deane, Bad Aibling.
\textsuperscript{14} Diary of Natalie Kent (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), 23 May 1949, Personal Archives of Natalie Kempner.
\textsuperscript{15} Brosse, Homeless Children, p. 54.
\textsuperscript{17} ‘Village News’, 22 March 1950, p. 3, Personal Archives of Derrick Deane, Bound Copies of IRO Children’s Village Newspapers.
child community. The IRO emphasized this in an official press release that was issued when the Children’s Village closed in 1951: “The discipline of the children was left, as much as possible, in their own hands. […] According to his age, each child was expected to share in the duties of community living”.18

Like the population of institutions such as the Pestalozzi Children’s Village, the children in Bad Aibling belonged to a closed community which functioned as a whole, but was also broken down into subunits where they were taken care of in small groups by house parents,19 in an attempt to recreate the structure of a family.20 However, in the early days of the Children’s Village, problems regarding the physical setup of the former airbase21 rendered the formation of small family groups impossible, with the result that the children were accommodated in larger groups—contrary to the initial hopes that had accompanied the establishment of the Children’s Village. After the early difficulties had been overcome, the living units were finally organized.22 Program Director Ryan described in detail how the daily tasks of house parents were structured to resemble family life: “For each group […] a man and a wife are required to act as substitute parents. Their day begins with awakening the children and youth, seeing that they are dressed, leave rooms orderly, have breakfast and get off to school. Those needing medical attention are referred to the doctor. Houseparents eat all meals with the children and youth and are responsible for creating a family atmosphere, teaching table manners. After school they are ready to receive their charges and answer the many demands made on them. First are the material matters. Children and youth need clothing replacements, laundry has to be assembled for wash, distributed when clean, torn clothing and worn shoes sent to mending room and shoemaker, collected, re-distributed. […]

20 Hasselmann-Kahlert, Das entwurzelte Kind, p. 75.
21 See section ‘Moving into the Former Airbase’.
22 ‘American Friends Service Committee Program on behalf of Refugees in Germany and Austria during IRO Operations’, 6 March 1952, p. 1, AFSC Archives, Box: Foreign Service, 1952, Country—Germany & Austria (Refugee Services Program—Project Proposals #2) to Country—Germany (Refugee Services Program UNHCR & Ford Found. Grant), Folder: Country Germany, 1952, Refugee Services Program, Refugees (Misc.).
Houseparents should know each child well enough to be able to advise as to his schooling or vocational needs, recreational interests and general adjustment. Houseparents have the closest contact with the children and are the first liaison between them and all other departments.”  

The house parents were indeed a crucial element, for the IRO workers, predominantly occupied with the administration of the Children’s Village, were not able to maintain too close a contact with the children. In early 1950, the AFSC fiercely opposed a proposed staff cut which would have reduced the number of house parents, claiming that “they are not expendable—not one of them.”

The aim of recreating family structures in the Children’s Village also represented the sphere into which the AFSC itself channeled much of its energies. We will now finally look at the work of the Quakers in more detail. The research of historian Jenny Carson has revealed that “relief work undertaken by Quakers was often overshadowed by the substantial amounts of money donated by governments and other voluntary organisations”. This is true, and it cannot be emphasized enough that the contribution of the AFSC was vital to the growing success of the work carried out in Bad Aibling. The Quakers were particularly suited to the task, given that their philosophy went hand in hand with the program defining the Children’s Village. Anthropologist Ilana Feldman has described “dedication to pacifism […] and belief in the human capacity for goodness” as basic traits of Quakerism. This, in the words of Carson, had “profound implications” for the practical relief activities carried out by the AFSC. Offering its services to anyone in
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need of support—regardless of nationality, creed or political beliefs—the AFSC has traditionally embraced a pragmatic, and more importantly perhaps an inclusive approach in order to accomplish its ambitious goals.\footnote{Ibid.; Hildegard Feidel-Mertz, ‘Integration and Formation of Identity. Exile Schools in Great Britain’, in \textit{Shofar} 23, 1 (2004), pp. 71–84, here p. 74.} When interviewed in 1999, Robin Powelson (who worked for the Bad Aibling AFSC team under the name of Alice Roberts) emphasized that “a very basic tenet of the Quakers is simplicity”.\footnote{Nancy Smith, \textit{Summary of OH 0967}, recorded in 1999 for Frequent Flyer Productions and donated to the Maria Rogers Oral History Program (1999). Available at: \url{oralhistory.boulderlibrary.org/summary/oh0967s.pdf}.} This precept, banal as it may seem at first, actually had far-reaching consequences for the activities of the AFSC in Bad Aibling. To start with, the Quakers sought to act as intermediaries between the children and the various organizations involved in the operation of the Children’s Village.\footnote{Elaine Mikels (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to unknown, 29 March 1949, p. 2, AFSC Archives, Box: Foreign Service, 1949, Country—Germany (D. P. Program Numbered Letters from ML) to (Numbered Letters from COG Jan.–April), Folder: Country, Germany, 1948–1949, Displaced Persons Program, Letters, Bad Aibling, Letters to and from; Alice Roberts (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to unknown, 18 April 1949, p. 1, AFSC Archives, Box: Foreign Service, 1949, Country—Germany (D. P. Program Numbered Letters from ML) to (Numbered Letters from COG Jan.–April), Folder: Country, Germany, 1948–1949, Displaced Persons Program, Letters, Bad Aibling, Letters to and from.} As team member Elaine Mikels put it, they were “maintaining some sort of balance between groups and individuals”.\footnote{Elaine Mikels (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Lili Koehler (Foreign Service Section, AFSC, Philadelphia), 21 April 1949, p. 1, AFSC Archives, Box: Foreign Service, 1949, Country—Germany (D. P. Program Numbered Letters from ML) to (Numbered Letters from COG Jan.–April), Folder: Country, Germany, 1948–1949, Displaced Persons Program, Letters, Bad Aibling, Letters to and from.} In this respect, the Quakers regarded themselves as the glue which held together the various organizational elements of the Children’s Village—which at times could disintegrate, particularly when differences of opinion arose between the various agencies involved.\footnote{See section ‘Administrative Setup’.}

Before the Children’s Village opened its doors in 1948, the AFSC had proposed to contribute a program which would focus mainly on “recreational and free time activities”.\footnote{‘Report of American Friends Service Committee activities at Bad Aibling Children’s Center’, 20 January 1949, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.} But the initial shortage of staff meant that the Quakers were drafted in to help
out with other pressing issues—for example running the school, the organization of which still left much to be desired.\textsuperscript{35} This was not how the AFSC had originally envisioned its work in Bad Aibling. A few months into the operation, the AFSC, in a letter to Zone Child Care Officer Ellis, inquired about the possibility of shifting the emphasis of its activities in the Children’s Village. The question was whether “it might [...] now be possible that our workers can concentrate their efforts on working in the blocks and trying to meet the needs of the children there rather than spending the bulk of their time in the overall program planning”.\textsuperscript{36} Weighing up the needs currently prevalent in the Children’s Village, the Quakers came to the conclusion that the house parents, who were “heavily overburdened by their work”, were most in need of assistance, and that this would be the area to which the AFSC would be able to make the greatest contribution.\textsuperscript{37} The Quakers wanted to act as “Counsellors to the House-parents”, but also “bridge the gap between IRO Departments and the children, IRO and DP Staff, and also through individual counsel help the children to adjust better into their relations with each other, with the school program and with the Free-Time program”.\textsuperscript{38}

The IRO went along with the AFSC’s proposal. As a first step, it was decided that the Quakers, previously quartered in billets in the

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{36} Marlis Gildemeister (Representative, AFSC, US Zone) to Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone), 15 January 1949, AFSC Archives, Box: Foreign Service, 1949, Country—Germany (D. P. Program Numbered Letters from ML) to (Numbered Letters from COG Jan.–April), Folder: Country, Germany, Displaced Persons, 1949, Letters, UN # from.

\textsuperscript{37} Marlis Gildemeister (Representative, AFSC, US Zone) to Lili Koehler (Foreign Service Section, AFSC, Philadelphia), 17 January 1949, p. 1, AFSC Archives, Box: Foreign Service, 1949, Country—Germany (D. P. Program Numbered Letters from ML) to (Numbered Letters from COG Jan.–April), Folder: Country, Germany, 1949, Displaced Persons Program, Letters # from ML, 1 to 65.

town of Bad Aibling, would move into the Children’s Village, in order to be nearer to the children and thus facilitate their work in the living quarters. The AFSC then proceeded to put into practice a new program which was entitled *Home Life*—a turning point in the history of the Children’s Village. Each Quaker was assigned as counselor to one of the living blocks: Kathleen Regan was attached to the Reception House, Wendy Elliot to the Kindergarten, and Elaine Mikels focused on the children aged 6 to 10. Alice Roberts was responsible for the girls aged 10 to 21, while the Kents took care of the boys in that age group. The concrete objectives of the AFSC’s new program included the following: to “help bring into the Living Quarters a ‘family spirit’ and sense of order”, to “make the living Quarters less dismal”, to “learn to know the children within our groups as individuals”, to “assist them in their adjustment by informal counsel”, to “assist them in finding the proper sources […] that can give them help”, and to “help stimulate friendly spirit in Home-activities and activities out of the Home by participation”. In addition to the *Home Life* agenda, the Quakers
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41 Kathleen Regan (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to E. Nora Ryan (Deputy Administrator, Program Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), 7 March 1949, pp. 1–2, AFSC Archives, Box: Foreign Service, 1949, Country—Germany (D. P. Program Numbered Letters from ML) to (Numbered Letters from COG Jan.–April), Folder: Country, Germany, 1949, Displaced Persons Program, Letters # from ML, 1 to 65.

remained involved in other projects, for example in the organization of the library\textsuperscript{43} and religious activities.\textsuperscript{44}

Looking at the ideas defining the program of the AFSC in Bad Aibling, it is clear that they included familialist concepts, but also reflected the aim of building a community informed by mutual respect and support. Whilst mealtimes had previously mirrored the atmosphere of an institutional canteen, they were reorganized through the initiative of the Quakers. According to one report, all the children “used to flock into the dining room, stand in crowded lines, to have their food dished out by food handlers”, whereas after the AFSC had intervened to introduce “family eating”, “children were trained as waiters and groups are now eating in one shift together with their Houseparents and counsellors”.\textsuperscript{45} Establishing such routines had already proved successful in previous children’s centers.\textsuperscript{46} The Quakers attempted to not only recreate the friendly interaction and rituals underlying an ideal of family life, but also to improve the living quarters in a way that would provide more homey surroundings: “We also have, or are building, a living room

\textsuperscript{43} Kathleen Regan (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Lili Koehler (Foreign Service Section, AFSC, Philadelphia), 11 March 1949, p. 4, AFSC Archives, Box: Foreign Service, 1949, Country—Germany (D. P. Program Numbered Letters from ML) to (Numbered Letters from COG Jan.–April), Folder: Country, Germany, 1948–1949, Displaced Persons Program, Letters, Bad Aibling, Letters to and from.


\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., p. 6.

\textsuperscript{46} Anna Andlauer, \textit{The Rage to Live. The International D. P. Children’s Center Kloster Indersdorf 1945–46} (Weichs 2012, Kindle Edition), pos. 556.
in every house unit, where the children can play games, write letters, and come together in fellowship. It is a heart-warming sight to see our first completed living room, decorated with curtains, sofa, lamps, radio and girls, listening to music and enjoying themselves".47

As the Quakers strived to improve everyday life in the Children’s Village through the Home Life program, they became more and more conscious of how much the children yearned for more personal relationships with the adults entrusted with their care. As Kathleen Regan reported, her team was “impressed with the children’s need to be recognized as individuals in their daily living. In such a large mass of children we have been able to help give this need some recognition by living amongst the children, learning to know them by name and learning to know and appreciate their interests, dislikes, problems, moods, talents etc.”48 Regan was re-
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sponsible for typing up a profile of each new arrival in the reception house. These detailed character studies were intended to facilitate the integration of children into the main part of the Children’s Village, for the house parents there often struggled to develop close relationships with all the children under their care—which was not surprising, given the sheer numbers. As an example, Regan included the following lines in a profile of an 8-year-old girl: “She comes to all adults—sometimes for affection, but often for conversation […]. She plays well with the other children, though likes to be first and often tells on them. Is bright and quick and notices everything. Seems to have a well-balanced idea of right and wrong and seems like an average, normal youngster of eight years.”

The work of the AFSC helped provide the children with the stable and loving contacts they so desperately needed, and that many had been deprived of during and after the war. The long-term presence of the Quakers, a unique and crucial element of the Bad Aibling program, was a strongly stabilizing factor in the face of constant staff fluctuation. In 1952, after the Children’s Village had closed, an AFSC report would remark that its workers “were among the few who knew the children as individuals rather than as case numbers to be processed”.

At the same time, there were limits to putting the familialist ideal into practice. Above all, the groups that were cared for by house parents often exceeded the size of an average nuclear family. This naturally limited the amount of attention that could be given to one particular child at any time. With regard to the situation in the kindergarten, staff member Constance Brace concluded that “contact with or help from the adult must actually be ‘fought’ and competed for.”

The fact that the living quarters were segregated by age and


50 ‘American Friends Service Committee Program on behalf of Refugees in Germany and Austria during IRO Operations’, 6 March 1952, p. 2, AFSC Archives, Box: Foreign Service, 1952, Country—Germany & Austria (Refugee Services Program—Project Proposals #2) to Country—Germany (Refugee Services Program UNHCR & Ford Found. Grant), Folder: Country Germany, 1952, Refugee Services Program, Refugees (Misc.).

51 Hasselmann-Kahlert, Einige Beobachtungen bei entwurzelten Kleinst- und Kleinkindern, p. 17.

52 Constance Brace (Kindergarten Area Educational Supervisor, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), ‘Suggestions of important problems, in regard to 3 to 5 age group, that I think would profit by being considered in Kindergarten meeting on Wednesday, June 14th 1950’, 13 June 1950, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932.
sex was also not considered ideal with regard to the goal of recreating an authentic family-like environment. Nevertheless, in many cases the living units had a positive effect on the behavior and well-being of the children who had found refuge in Bad Aibling. With regard to one 9-year-old girl, the following was noted: “She came […] as an untamed little creature. She was aggressive with other children, took from other rooms whatever pleased her, and often ran away from the house so that the houseparents had to search for her. She would destroy things to show her anger and vengeance. […] After 6 months at the Village she has changed tremendously. She has become very much a member of the family, has learned to give and take, is accepted by the other children and they play and tease very happily and normally together. She is very close to the houseparents, does not get as angry and very rarely takes anything that doesn’t belong to her.”

Familialist experiments in the Children’s Village were also developed and refined over time. In 1950, a new living unit called the Cottage was set up for a limited group of younger children. It was staffed with a higher number of house mothers, with the result that they could take care of 5 to 9 children, full-time. Previously, house mothers had been forced to assume responsibility for up to 25 children per group. In some cases, it had been necessary to assign several house mothers to one and the same group, and have them work in shifts. In the Cottage, this was no longer the case. When the children returned from school, it was now easier for the house mothers to fully engage in guided play, story-telling, outings, and other activities. Quaker Kathleen Regan contended: “The mamas agree in principle that this is better mother care to the child, and practice has shown that the children respond favorably to this scheme rather than the former mass scale handling and changing mama figures.”

Director Deane, as enthusiastic as he was about the program of the Children’s Village, could not hide his frustrations in the face of the ongoing staff fluctuation which compromised the chances of successfully creating a modern child community: “Educators, psy-

53 Bennett, The Story of Bad Aibling, p. 442.
54 Hasselmann-Kahlert, Einige Beobachtungen bei entwurzelten Kleinst- und Kleinkindern, p. 17.
55 Kathleen Regan (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), Notes on individual children and youth, 7 November 1949, Personal Archives of Christian Höschler.
Psychologists and all those concerned with the rearing of children are agreed about one thing—if little else—a child has its best chance of achieving proper development in a stable atmosphere. This stability should begin in the home with the child secure in the constant love and protection of its parents; sympathetic, understanding neighbours and playmates; a good school, teachers; family doctor, minister and all the other ingredients of a well-balanced society. [...] Under this definition our Village is about the opposite of what it should be. [...] We have to work with a Displaced Persons staff which is largely harried by fears and distractions as to each individual future [...] and which changes at the rate of 20% a month. [...] The children themselves are in many cases disturbed and difficult; a natural result of years of upset if not tragedy—and they too change at the rate of not less than 12% monthly. [...] The inevitable result of these factors alone is to breed an atmosphere of instability and constant change.”

Deane’s observations were a reflection of the very real practical limitations in Bad Aibling. As Jane Bennett, who was employed with the AFSC at Zone level, pointed out in retrospect, constraints as described were unavoidable in “an artificial community where physical facilities discourage any attempt at a normal family life”. But with tireless zeal and unconditional pragmatism, the staff in Bad Aibling strove to make the best of a challenging situation. It is therefore not surprising that Marlis Gildemeister, representative for the AFSC in the US Zone, described the activities of her agency in the Children’s Village as “Quaker work in the fullest meaning of the word”.

There is also a connection between the philosophy of the AFSC and the second cornerstone of the program developed in Bad Aibling—the internationalist spirit which the staff of the Children’s Village sought to foster among its inhabitants. Referring to Quaker relief activities, historian Peter Gatrell has aptly pointed to their

58 Bennett, The Story of Bad Aibling, p. 442.
“potential for national reconciliation and internationalism”, while the research of Jenny Carson has looked at how Quakers aimed at “reconciliation between the defeated and persecuted peoples of Europe”. James Tent has even gone so far as to suggest that nationality is “irrelevant” to Quakers. These are observations which resonate with the approach taken up by AFSC workers in the Children’s Village. Writing about the Home Life program, team member Alice Roberts explained that it “involves a lot of national and religious conciliation and understanding,” while her colleague Elaine Mikels noted that one of the major challenges in the Children’s Village was to tackle the “great division between the Jewish and the Christian groups and between the different nationalities…” The approach of the Quakers emphasized mutual tolerance and compassion and also echoed the concept of liberal internationalism as discussed in the previous section of this study.

Emphasizing internationalism was an integral part of the overall program of the Children’s Village. This was possibly the single most important feature of its agenda setting it apart from earlier children’s centers. From one of UNRRA’s final reports, we learn that “practice has been to place children in Centres by nationality groups where possible.” The report continued: “This has definite advantages. It makes it possible for the child to become re-oriented to his own language and cultural patterns more quickly and it
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65 See section ‘Excursus: Child Communities and Welfare Models in the Post-war Period’.
makes possible the assignment of staff on the basis of nationality. Polish Children’s Centers, for example, have Polish teachers, recreational leaders, priests and other adult Polish staff provided by the Polish Red Cross or from among the Displaced Persons”. This focus on renationalization has been dealt with in recent historiography on displaced children in the postwar period. For instance, it played an important role in the program of the first international children’s center set up by UNRRA, located in the Bavarian town of Indersdorf. When the center moved to Prien in 1946, it was considered an advantage that it would now be possible to separate the children by nationality groups, scattered across the various German hotels which formed this new, decentralized installation.

The weight given to the preservation and forming of national identity in the immediate years following the liberation of Europe has been well researched by historians. Tara Zahra has stressed “the nationalist underpinning” of humanitarian efforts, while Gerard D. Cohen has concluded that the “liberal internationalist fervor noticeable among […] relief workers should not […] be overstated.” It is important to note that these observations primarily refer (or apply) to the years during which UNRRA was operating the DP camps. But in contrast, as Cohen has also remarked, the IRO as an organization did in fact represent “a remarkable example of efficient international cooperation.” The internationalist zeal behind this was noticeable in the field. This is clearly evident when we look at the history of the Children’s Village. Transferring responsibility for Europe’s DPs from UNRRA to the IRO appears to have had an effect on the attitude of relief workers regarding the role of nationalism and, at the same time, internationalist efforts.

When, in September 1948, a preliminary meeting to discuss the establishment of the Children’s Village took place, spokespeople of various voluntary agencies working in the US Zone were present. In contrast to what had been described as best practice in UNRRA’s aforementioned report, a representative of ORT pointed
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out that “in setting up a program, nationality segregation should be definitely omitted as this had caused much trouble in the past between the different nationality groups”.\footnote{‘Council of Voluntary Agencies. Child Care & Youth Committee. Meeting held 24.9.48.—1000 hours.’, n. d., p. 3, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/928.} And indeed, it was decided that the inhabitants of the Children’s Village would only be segregated on the basis of age and sex. Regardless of their national background, the children shared their quarters and formed small living units under the guardianship of their house parents.\footnote{IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling, ‘Capacity Report’, 29 July 1949, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.} In the liberal sense then, these groups constituted international families. The importance of not separating the children by nationality is emphasized in the writings of those who were employed in the Children’s Village. From the point of view of one senior staff member, “a child’s plight should constitute the primary factor affecting its admission, while race, nationality, and religion should be secondary”.\footnote{“Die Not des Kindes sollte in erster Linie der ausschlaggebende Faktor für seine Aufnahme sein, Rasse, Nationalität und Religion erst in zweiter Linie kommen.” Hasselmann-Kahlert, Das entwurzelte Kind, p. 75.} This was a significant departure from common practice during the immediate postwar years, indicating a change in priorities informing the care of displaced children.

The personal background of IRO worker Douglas Deane predestined him for the role of director in Bad Aibling. He had, as already mentioned,\footnote{See chapter “‘A Classic Experiment’”.} spent some of his formative years of professional training as a teacher at the International School in Geneva—an institution that, ever since its foundation in 1924, had dedicated itself to child-centered pedagogy and an open-minded attitude towards internationalism.\footnote{Hughes, Child-Centred Pedagogy, Internationalism and Bilingualism at the International School of Geneva.} Deane came to the Children’s Village as a committed proponent of this tradition of thought. For him, the microcosm of the Children’s Village offered a unique opportunity to introduce cosmopolitan thinking into the lives of the minor DPs who had found refuge in Bad Aibling: “Think what could be done in the way of developing a truly international curriculum for these children. They could be taught first to become world citizens and then as they were resettled to become citizens of their adopted country, but they would never forget their first lesson”.\footnote{Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Philip E. Ryan (Chief of Operations, IRO, US Zone), 22 December 1949, p. 5, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.} Again,
this reflected a liberal approach to internationalism—certainly progressive and idealistic, yet at the same time cautious and realistic.

Deane’s impassioned plea, pointing to the idea of world citizenship, was very much in tune with contemporary notions of cosmopolitanism which were widely propagated in an effort to reinforce new forms of international cooperation. The cause had the dedicated support of prominent advocates such as Julian Huxley, the first director of UNESCO. The research of historian Glenda Sluga has revealed that the range of cosmopolitan beliefs held by Huxley and his associates has often been misunderstood or interpreted unilaterally. Sluga: “The aim was not world government, but rather world citizenship—that is, the constitution of new forms of individual subjectivity within the existing forms of political organization. A subsequent new sense of world community would exist through and across national borders and empires, not as their replacement.” In this sense, the fact that Deane referred to the ideal of raising world citizens should not be interpreted as a denial of the importance of national identity.

The balanced approach demonstrated by the staff of the Children’s Village soon left its mark on the thinking of the children. A commentary written by a 16-year-old boy in Village News (the newspaper of the Children’s Village which we will look at in more detail later) demonstrates this: “Everybody of us has to know that we all are one family and a great part of us are good people and for this reason it has no purpose to form any national barriers. We live in this camp like brothers and sisters.” At the same time, national elements were not suppressed in the Children’s Village, but lived out and celebrated in a spirit of harmony and reconciliation. Once a month, for example, the AFSC team organized a joint birthday party in each of the living blocks, for all inhabitants who had recently celebrated their birthdays. For this, the Quakers had to rely on the generosity of donors back in the US, asking for “a few inexpensive gifts for the four or five birthdaysees with wrappings and cards, and refreshments, for instance cake and icing mix, raisins, powder for fruit punch or lemonade, paper cups, plates and nap-
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kins, candles, all the gay things that make a party.” At these parties, the guests not only enjoyed cake and juice, but also displays of national traditions on the birthday stage: “Czech, Polish, Hungarian, Russian boys and girls sang their songs, danced their dances, displayed their special talents.” Fittingly, in 1950, a Munich newspaper reporting on the Children’s Village described it as a “colorful family of nations”.

An interest in individual countries and recent developments affecting various nations also prevailed in other contexts. During her visit to Bad Aibling, Zone Nutritionist Floore noticed how the radio devices in the living rooms attracted the attention of the children—here, they could “listen to broadcasts in their native tongues and hear news from what was once their homeland.” The fact that the children were not segregated by nationality therefore did not result in an abandonment of national identity. It did however have an effect on everyday communication: German was the primary language spoken among the inhabitants of the Children’s Village, for it was the common denominator in an environment representing more than 20 different nationalities. All the children had, in one way or another, been exposed to the German language during the war or in the years that followed.

Ultimately, whether or not the internationalist vision in Bad Aibling had a lasting impact on the children depended largely on their individual attitudes. The staff of the Children’s Village tried to monitor the children’s relations with one another with regard to this specific issue. It was found that differences of nationality meant “nothing” to some children, or that “friendships [were]...
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86 Floore, The Bread of the Oppressed, p. 263.
88 Kathleen Regan (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), Notes on individual children and youth, 7 November 1949, Personal Archives of Christian Höschler.
formed along compatibility lines rather than nationality lines.”

Other inhabitants of the Children’s Village, however, appeared to make friends “mostly along nationality lines.”

When Deane resigned as director in January 1951, he wrote a farewell letter to the staff. Looking back on his time in Bad Aibling, Deane expressed satisfaction with what had been achieved, despite all the difficulties. He concluded that the Children’s Village had “pioneered in community living and is a valid ‘pilot’ for the shaping of other communities.” A reasonable conclusion, if one considers the extent to which relief workers involved in the Bad Aibling mission consciously reflected on the potential and limitations of familialist and internationalist ideas.

---
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Medical and Psychological Support

Whilst the initial shortage of basic supplies in the Children’s Village was greatly frustrating for staff and children alike, the consequences of the lack of medical items were far more drastic, as is evident from the warning issued by IRO Child Care at Zone level: “It can be regarded as criminal negligence when necessities from soap to serum can only be obtained after every child’s head is filled with lice…”

This was not how things were supposed to be. As a self-contained installation, the Children’s Village was equipped with a comprehensive medical unit consisting of a hospital and a dispensary. Prophylactic measures included vaccinations, a health program at school, and the quarantine period maintained for new admissions in the reception house. However, this proved inadequate for avoiding the spread of diseases which at times led to tragic consequences. The outbreak of measles in the spring of 1949 not only contributed to unrest among the children and disrupted the general operation of the Children’s Village, but also exacted a heavy toll: before the quarantine could finally be lifted, the epidemic, which had affected more than 100 individuals, had claimed the lives of eight children. According to Quaker Alice Roberts, the victims were all babies, and this contributed to a state of “general alarm”, as her colleague Natalie Kent noted. The shortage of supplies,

1 See section ‘A Struggle for Staff and Supplies’.
2 Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone) and Vinita V. Lewis (Deputy Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone) to Philip E. Ryan (Chief of Operations, IRO, US Zone), 15 April 1949, p. 2, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/856/39/1.
5 See section ‘Unrest in the Village’.
8 Alice Roberts (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to unknown, 17 May 1949, p. 1, Personal Archives of Natalie Kempner.
9 Natalie Kent (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to unknown, 25 April 1949, p. 3, Personal Archives of Natalie Kempner.
which hampered so much of the relief work in Bad Aibling, had in this case resulted in actual loss of human life. It was only thanks to a donation of preventative injections, provided by the AJDC, that the situation was gradually brought under control.\textsuperscript{10}

Whilst such a large number of fatalities would thankfully remain a unique event in the history of the Children’s Village,\textsuperscript{11} it proved necessary to introduce further periods of quarantine.\textsuperscript{12} The IRO also tried to stabilize the health situation by assigning additional medical staff who were to focus on specific groups or areas of action. The remit of a new worker, Dr. Marjorie K. Smith, included “the general fields of public health supervision, sanitation, [and] health education of staff workers and children”.\textsuperscript{13} A constant source of concern was the fact that many children were admitted to the Children’s Village without their medical records.\textsuperscript{14} This added to the risk of contagion. For this reason, director Deane issued an urgent memo in August 1949, reminding IRO staff outside of the Bad Aibling operation that the “foundation of good medical procedure is based upon adequate medical histories. It is incumbent upon each worker sending a child to Bad Aibling to explore carefully all resources from which medical information can be obtained.”\textsuperscript{15}

The treatment of physical illness was only one aspect of the health program carried out in the Children’s Village. As a result of their often horrific wartime and postwar experiences, minor DPs were in many cases psychologically disturbed, even traumatized,

\textsuperscript{10} Dr. Margaret Hasselmann (Chief Medical Officer, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Dr. B. Santa Marina (Medical Officer, IRO, US Zone, Area 7), 26 April 1949, pp. 1–2, AJDC Archives, NY AR194554/4/32/10/362 (Item ID: 677771).


\textsuperscript{13} Dr. L. Findlay (Chief Medical Officer, IRO, US Zone) to Dr. B. Santa Marina (Medical Officer, IRO, US Zone, Area 7), 24 June 1949, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.

\textsuperscript{14} Hasselmann-Kahlert, Observations on Whooping Cough and Aureomycin Treatment, p. 160.

\textsuperscript{15} Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), ‘Need for Medical Documents on all Children and Youth being submitted to Bad Aibling’, 9 August 1949, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.
and in need of professional support to overcome—or at least come to terms with—their suffering, past and present. In this respect, historians have looked to the theories and methods behind the field of psychoanalysis (which had been on the rise since the 1930s). Psychoanalysis had a fundamental effect on contemporary approaches to child welfare.\textsuperscript{16} The tragic reality of World War II provided researchers with the unique possibility of systematically exploring the immediate and lasting effects of war experiences on the mental constitution of children.\textsuperscript{17} Prominent analysts such as Anna Freud, her colleague Dorothy Burlingham, and John Bowlby were at the forefront of such research.\textsuperscript{18}

During the war, Freud and Burlingham ran institutions housing evacuated children in Britain. They came to some important conclusions regarding the impact of traumatic events experienced by these children, in particular with regard to the deprivation of parental care. Based on their observations, the main thesis of Freud and Burlingham was that the separation of children from their parents during a period of crisis—the “shock of the breaking up of family life”\textsuperscript{19}—was the most devastating single event that could possibly affect their mental well-being. This paradigm would have a significant influence on postwar relief activities.\textsuperscript{20} Thérèse Brosse echoed the views of Freud and Burlingham in 1950: “It is not, as with adults, the grim spectacle of war’s murderous sights which upsets children: it is the rupture of family ties and the social abnormalities that war brings in its train. One may compare the child victims of war with any children anywhere who have suffered from family disruption or are orphans. The same mechanism is responsible in both cases for the disturbance of psychological and spiritual health.”\textsuperscript{21} Irish author Dorothy Macardle picked up on the same argument one year later: “The power of young children to sustain crises of hardship and violence proved remarkable. A succession of nights spent under ground while guns thundered and bombs burst overhead was not enough, as a rule, to cause a small child grave disturbance, provided that no physical injury was suffered and pro-

\textsuperscript{16} Cunningham, Children and Childhood in Western Society since 1500, pp. 175–176; Zahra, The Lost Children, pp. 70–71.
\textsuperscript{18} Zahra, The Lost Children, pp. 64–65.
\textsuperscript{19} Freud et al., War and Children, pp. 186–187.
\textsuperscript{20} Zahra, The Lost Children, pp. 61–62.
\textsuperscript{21} Brosse, Homeless Children, p. 49.
vided that the adults in charge of him showed no fear. […] To feel secure in his place within the family group has once again been proved to be the child’s best protection against ill effects from all misadventure.”

While modern researchers have been somewhat more cautious in their conclusions as to how children are affected by experiences of war in their various manifestations,23 the views advocated by postwar psychoanalysts became firmly established in the decades following World War II.24 In the foreword to the 1965 edition of their co-authored book Infants Without Families, Freud and Burlingham emphasized that their “verdict of to-day is more condemning even than the one pronounced twenty years ago. Our advances in knowledge of child development, whether gained in the field of education, of childcare, or of child analysis, all point towards […] the need for intimate interchange of affection with a maternal figure; the need for ample and constant external stimulation of innate potentialities; and the need for unbroken continuity of care.”25 Following the end of hostilities in Europe after 1945, these observations were integral to the familialist ideals previously mentioned26 and had a fundamental impact on the care of displaced children in the aftermath of a war that had destroyed innumerable families.27

The Children’s Village too was influenced by contemporary trends in child psychology and welfare theory. The effects of traumatic experiences of war and separation on the children manifested themselves in various ways. According to one IRO worker, the “disorders” ranged “from complete withdrawal from social contacts to the most aggressive behaviour patterns.”28 A typical example was a 6-year-old girl whose behavior was observed by Quaker Kathleen Regan: “Her relationships with the other children are temperamental—sometimes she clings to one and in the next mo-

22 Macardle, Children of Europe, pp. 252–253.
24 Boothby, The Care and Placement of Unaccompanied Children in Emergencies, ii.
25 Freud et al., Infants Without Families, ix.
26 See section ‘Excursus: Child Communities and Welfare Models in the Post-war Period’.
ment she will say ‘fooly on you’ and spit on her. In play she destroys everything the other children are building or making (i.e. jumping on their sand villages, tearing up the flowers, messing up their puzzles) […]. When she chose a new doll at Rec.House, she immediately beat the doll, jumped on it, poked a pencil in the eyes and put it under the bed—this beating she does regularly.”

About 40 years after his stay in Bad Aibling, another former inhabitant, Richard Kniebe, remembered that suppressed memories of previous horrors particularly haunted the children at night—a phenomenon that has also been documented in other research on displaced children. Kniebe: “These people saw their parents murdered […]. A little kid would sit up screaming (in the middle of the night) and we’d all jump into the bed and comfort each other.”

IRO staff member Dr. Margaret Hasselmann, a German national in charge of the medical department of the Children’s Village, authored several publications documenting her observations of the psychological behavior of displaced children, many of which were made in Bad Aibling. In one case, an illegitimate child, just 10 months old, was brought to the Children’s Village from a hospital where she had remained more or less since birth, abandoned. The biological mother, a DP, had not once returned to visit her daughter. Pale and apathetic, the girl hardly displayed any emotions and made no effort to move or sit upright. The child was brought to Bad Aibling with an accompanying diagnosis of borderline mental handicap. Based on this assumption, it was intended that the girl would recuperate temporarily in Bad Aibling and then be placed in an institution for mentally disabled children. However, during her stay in the Children’s Village, everything changed: placed in a group of just four babies who were continually looked after by one and the same nurse, the girl’s condition rapidly improved, both in body and mind. She began to increasingly interact with the other children and express emotions through laughter and crying. She made initial attempts at standing up, and eventually produced her first words. Before being transferred to the Children’s Village, this

29 Kathleen Regan (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), Notes on individual children and youth, 18 October 1949, Personal Archives of Christian Höschler.
30 Dietrich, w… ich wundere mich, dass ich überlebt habes, p. 44.
31 Heyser, A Reunion of Children of the War.
32 Dr. Margaret Hasselmann (Chief Medical Officer, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Dr. B. Santa Marina (Medical Officer, IRO, US Zone, Area 7), 26 April 1949, AJDC Archives, NY AR194554/4/32/10/362 (Item ID: 677771).
abandoned child had been neglected and was in desperate need of the physical contact and affection of a mother figure. By the time the girl was two years old, she had integrated well, and in the end, was resettled in the US where she was adopted by a foster family.\textsuperscript{33} The story of this child bears out the comments of Child Care Officer Marie B. Wills, who stated that the “mental problems” of displaced children often “may be situational rather than basic. Many of them have not had opportunities to learn.”\textsuperscript{34}

Similarly, drawing on the example of one adolescent boy staying in the Children’s Village, Wills pointed to the difficulties of determining a cause for mental health issues: “At the Village, where he has been living for about a year, his workers find him a restless, anxious, insecure child who has already become a chain smoker and who tries to obtain alcohol. They find that his attention cannot be held, and that he is failing to make use of educational and recreational opportunities at the Village. However, caseworker’s observation alone cannot determine whether this boy is mentally limited or if his life experiences have left him in such a state of conflict that he is unable to use the normal intelligence which they suspect he possesses.”\textsuperscript{35} Wills also quoted psychiatrist Hildegard Durfee who, with regard to a client she had seen in the Children’s Village, expressed a pessimistic view regarding the question of diagnosis: “Mentally deficient? Emotionally blocked? In need of glasses? Or physical attention? Never given adequate schooling? Who can say?”\textsuperscript{36}

According to Hasselmann, one of the most significant characteristics of displaced children separated from their mothers lay in problems of speech development. As a result of long-term neglect, the children lagged behind their peers whose language acquisition had not been disrupted by the events of war. Most of the children encountered by Hasselmann in Bad Aibling only entered early phases of speech production around the age of 3; in some cases, first words were only uttered around the age of 4,\textsuperscript{37} whereas chil--

\textsuperscript{33} Hasselmann-Kahlert, Das entwurzelte Kind, pp. 46–47.
\textsuperscript{34} Marie B. Wills (Associate Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone), ‘Survey of Mentally and Physically Handicapped Children and Rehabilitation Program, Child Care Section, January to March 1950’, n. d., p. 5, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/856/39/1.
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., p. 10.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., p. 4.
\textsuperscript{37} Hasselmann-Kahlert, Das entwurzelte Kind, p. 48.
dren usually produce their first words around their first birthday. Hasselmann also documented other peculiarities: “A further—not all that infrequent—disturbance affecting [...] displaced toddlers is the ‘banging of the head against the wall or the crib posts’. [...] In the baby-house, actual ‘room epidemics’ have emerged, always starting with a child which had only been visited very irregularly. Sometimes the mother—and in one case the widowed father—would visit two to three times a week and demonstrate the most intense display of affection, and then not visit the child for months. In all [...] cases, the entire room in the baby-house was infected within 3–4 days, and all children were banging their heads against the wall or the cribs. It was striking how contagious this obsession was with the 1–2-year-olds in particular, and how much faster and more devastatingly it spread than many an infectious physical illness.”

The problems surrounding the speech development of the smaller children significantly improved after a change of shift schedules in the kindergarten: instead of letting nurses rotate, as had been common practice, small groups—families, as it were—were formed, consisting of one nurse and a maximum of 4–5 children each. That way, the children were always, or at least most of the time, looked after by one and the same person who was considered to represent a substitute mother. In Hasselmann’s opinion, this was what these neglected infants and toddlers were in dire need of: “Sitting it [the child] on one’s lap, embracing it, lovingly and kindly engaging with it, playing with it, speaking to it while it is fed, feeding it slowly and in an unhurried fashion, all this was nec-

---
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ecessary to give the child the certainty that it was fully appreciated and loved…”

Possibly as a result of violence witnessed during the war, some of the older children displayed other forms of behavioral disorders, including disobedience and bouts of aggression. Recounting his memories, 65 years after his time in the Children’s Village, former inhabitant Peter Kingsley described a particularly sadistic episode he had witnessed while he was exploring the extensive grounds of the former airbase. His “attention shifted to the nearby swift moving river, into where barbed wire and all sorts of other metal junk had been thrown. A dog, apparently snagged, was desperately trying to swim to shore, yelping cries that ended when he drowned. The older boys laughed because they had rigged a hooked wire unto the dogs neck and then threw the dog in with the hope, apparently, that he would be caught by the metal junk. It worked and they were pleased with the result. I was frankly stunned, mystified at such wanton cruelty.”

Other serious incidents occurred. In March 1951, staff members of the Children’s Village found a bomb, constructed out of a bottle filled with gunpowder and electric wiring. It is unclear whether the device was functional, but the fact that it had been built and placed beneath the bed of one of the houseparents caused considerable alarm among the employees of the Children’s Village. Because the offender could not be identified during the course of the investigation carried out by the DP police, all the staff could do was issue a serious warning to the children.

The IRO deliberated the possibility of seeking psychiatric help for their charges in late 1949. A memorandum prepared at Zone Headquarters bore witness to the need for such services in Bad Aibling: “There is no question that many of the children are suffering from psychological damage.” Emmy G. Lefson, Case Work Supervisor at the time, confirmed “the need of the service of a psychiatrist and psychologist who could be called in for consultation.

---

41 „Auf den Schoß nehmen, es in die Arme schließen, liebevoll und freundlich auf das Kind eingehen, mit ihm spielen, beim Füttern mit ihm sprechen und langsam und gemächlich füttern, mit all dem mußte dem Kind die Sicherheit gegeben werden, daß es voll und ganz gewürdigt und geliebt war…“ Ibid.
43 Ludovic Heuvelmans (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Mordecai E. Schwartz (Deputy Director, IRO, US Zone, Area 7), 14 March 1951, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932.
on individual children.” The IRO proceeded to set up a psychiatric team specifically dedicated to the treatment of displaced children in the US Zone. This unit consisted of two German consultants—Dr. Rudolf Werner and Dr. Renate Sprengel—who visited the Children’s Village on a regular basis. The staff gratefully drew on their services, and by June 1950, Werner and Sprengel had seen a total of 34 patients.

Some of the observations Sprengel made during her Bad Aibling sessions were documented in a 1952 UNESCO publication dealing with displaced children. Sprengel divided her cases into different categories, providing details of the behavior patterns she encountered. For instance, she wrote about children “born in Germany after 1945, mostly abandoned, unwanted illegitimate children. These children have never known affection or ‘nest warmth’, and are characteristically apathetic and taciturn, or markedly aggressive and unruly.” Sprengel then went on to describe children “born before 1945. Some of these arrived with their parents and have known something of ‘nest warmth’. The others, now between 8 and 11 years of age, arrived alone as deportees, so that their origin, exact date of birth, name, nationality and religion are unknown; they are completely without roots, and are by far the more threatened of the two groups. They have experienced constant danger, cruelty and murder, and have been deprived of practically everything that children need. They lack spontaneity and have no confidence in others or themselves. Their sense of insecurity is increased by having no mother tongue, and not knowing any language well. Their care calls for the utmost patience and tact, and an undemanding, selfless affection.”

These descriptions resonate with much of what we have learnt about the inhabitants of the Children’s Village so far. Again, while

45 Emmy G. Lefson (Case Work Supervisor, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Dr. Marjorie K. Smith (Health Advisor, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), 14 November 1949, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.
46 Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone) to Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), 24 January 1950, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933; Dr. L. Findlay (Chief Medical Officer, IRO, US Zone) to Earl Blake Cox (Director, IRO, US Zone, Area 7), 16 December 1949, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.
47 Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Marie B. Wills (Associate Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone), 1 June 1950, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932.
48 International Union for Child Welfare, How Best to Promote the Psychological, Educational and Social Adjustment of Refugee and Displaced Children in Europe, p. 38.
we do not know the specifics of the psychiatric services down to the last detail, Sprengel’s analysis clearly shows that familialist views—as encapsulated here in the main point of reference, the term *nest warmth*—played a crucial role. Four years after the Children’s Village was closed, Medical Officer Hasselmann stressed how important it had been to provide an above-average number of workers in order to try and live up to the goal of providing substitute families, supporting the children in their mental recovery. Hasselmann specifically referred to the work of Freud and Burlingham,\(^49\) and in December 1949, one IRO physician at Zone Headquarters even proposed to approach Anna Freud to ask whether she herself would be willing to visit the Children’s Village as a temporary advisor.\(^50\) There is no indication, however, that the IRO went through with this.

The security and warmth of the (simulated) family was considered a vital key to treating psychological disturbances. But other therapeutic tools were also applied. Hasselmann, for instance, was a proponent of art therapy.\(^51\) As she would later recall: “Over and over again, it was a special experience for me to be able to witness how such a mute, helpless, and disturbed being would stand in front of the easel, all of a sudden entirely self-absorbed and unconscious of its surroundings, swinging its arm, holding the brush in sharp concentration, often following the brush strokes rhythmically, with the entire body.”\(^52\) Hasselmann found that drawing in particular was an excellent initial activity for new admissions or children who were especially shy and introverted. Through art therapy it was in many cases possible to revitalize activity and self-expression, and thus facilitate integration into the community of the Children’s Village.\(^53\)

---

\(^49\) Hasselmann-Kahlert, *Das entwurzelte Kind*, p. 43.

\(^50\) Dr. L. Findlay (Chief Medical Officer, IRO, US Zone) to Earl Blake Cox (Director, IRO, US Zone, Area 7), 16 December 1949, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.

\(^51\) Hasselmann-Kahlert, *Das entwurzelte Kind*, pp. 96–108.
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Education and Recreational Activities

Working out repatriation or resettlement plans for the inhabitants of the Children’s Village was, as we shall see later, more often than not a complicated process involving painfully long delays. While the Case Work Department was absorbed in tackling this challenge day after day, hundreds of children had to be kept appropriately occupied. For this reason, a comprehensive educational and recreational program for all age groups was set up under the direction of the Program Director. As mentioned earlier, this position was initially held by E. Nora Ryan until the beginning of 1950. Ryan was succeeded by American Jack Schneiker who had previously acted as her assistant. In addition to keeping the children occupied, it was hoped that through integrated classes and joint activities, “a better nationality relationship between the children would be extended”. The educational and recreational programs in the Children’s Village thus also contributed to the internationalist spirit which the workers strived to foster among its inhabitants.

This is evident in the concepts behind the individual units of learning. The fact that the kindergarten, initially coordinated by Quaker Wendy Elliott, deliberately blended features of preschool systems from different countries can be regarded as a testimony to

---

1 See section ‘Repatriation and Resettlement’.
3 See section ‘Administrative Setup’.
the spirit of internationalism informing the Bad Aibling setup. With regard to the older inhabitants, the staff sought to develop a carefully-tailored educational program that would contribute to preparing the children for their future—whether this meant returning to their former homeland or starting over in a different country altogether. The goal was to provide them with knowledge and skills that would enable them to make their way in life after their stay in Bad Aibling. However, like many other things which did not go according to plan during the early days of the Children’s Village, the introduction of school services and vocational training courses initially had to be postponed. According to AFSC team member Marjorie Hyer, there had been a misunderstanding regarding the responsibilities of the various agencies involved in the operation of the Children’s Village. Hyer was unable to curb her frustration: “IRO seemed to assume that AFSC people would take over the school in the new Center and it came as something of a blow to them when, in a conference with Miss Ellis, Miss Ryan and Mr. Bayer, I told them quite definitely that we were not doing the school. [...] Result—no school. And when children have no school, they have free time. Free time—that’s taken care of by the Quakers, so, willy-nilly, we seem to be trying to develop a program to occupy the kids as least destructively as possible for the entire day.” The results were sobering. Aware of their responsibility towards the children, the Quakers did not consider themselves sufficiently qualified to set up a professional curriculum or efficiently run an entire school. Also, the lack of furniture that was hampering many spheres of work in the Children’s Village also had an effect on the feasibility of making arrangements for the educational
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9 See section ‘Moving into the Former Airbase’.
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program. As a result, no proper schooling took place until the end of 1948.

Fortunately, an adult DP with the necessary background was soon found, and the school program was successfully launched. By March, 40 students were attending an elementary school, while 74 were enrolled in the high school. However, there was a critical shortage of suitable teaching staff. According to Quaker Natalie Kent, many of the DPs employed as teachers were “very skilled, but still with the DP attitude of not really wanting to be here, just waiting”. Hence, there was a constant fluctuation among the school staff, with individuals leaving at intervals for resettlement abroad. This resulted in a serious disruption of the educational program. In May 1949, Administrator Otto Bayer was still appealing to his IRO superiors for additional, professional personnel. Bayer insisted that a dozen qualified teachers were desperately needed. At this point, the Children’s Village had resorted to the employment of local Germans who—unlike many of their DP colleagues—were in fact teachers by profession. The latter was an advantage in itself; also, the German teachers were less likely to unexpectedly up and leave. According to Program Director E. Nora Ryan, they were “well accepted by DP staff and children”.

---

However, most of the teachers continued to be DPs who, in one way or another, were only in transit in Bad Aibling. One of them was a young academic of Czech-German descent, Peter Demetz. He would later become a professor of Germanic languages and literatures at Yale University. In 1949 Demetz, together with his girlfriend (and later wife) Hana, decided to flee Communist Czechoslovakia. After crossing the border into Bavaria, the couple found themselves in a DP camp in Munich. Here they were recruited to work as English teachers in the Children’s Village. Demetz also became involved in the general coordination of the educational program. Following a one-year assignment—and their marriage at the Bad Aibling town hall—the couple left the Children’s Village and took on new jobs at Munich-based Radio Free Europe before they were finally able to emigrate to the US. The journey of Peter and Hana Demetz represents a typical example of the fluctuation taking place among the teaching staff.

The children certainly profited from the educational program that had been put into place. Despite the challenging circumstances, it was hoped that the students would receive as comprehensive an education as they would at a regular school. The subjects taught included mathematics, geometry, geography, history, physics, chemistry, natural history, botany, zoology, arts, religion and sports. Perhaps the most important subject was English. Given that many of the children would eventually be emigrating to English-speaking countries, English lessons were compulsory for all.

Vocational training, like the schooling program, initially had to be postponed against the background of the supply situation. However, by January 1949, the ORT school had been set up under the leadership of director Stefan Morowitz. JRU representative Eva Kraft participated by organizing a limited range of makeshift

---

20 Interview with Peter Demetz, 11 June 2013, Personal Archives of Christian Höschler.
courses on baby nursing, sewing and cookery classes.\textsuperscript{23} As Kraft pointed out, material restrictions hindered the establishment of a wider curriculum: “The first question about any new project is supplies, and for many days, I have been busy trying to find out the needs and getting the goods.”\textsuperscript{24} However, the situation soon improved, and in March 1949 a ceremony celebrating the official opening of the ORT school took place.\textsuperscript{25} Over the following one-and-a-half years the vocational training program in the Children’s Village was continually extended and refined: by September 1950, a total of 125 students were enrolled in 9 different courses—with 82 boys training as auto mechanics, electrical engineers, radio technicians, shoemakers, and bricklayers, and 43 girls taking courses in dressmaking and domestic science. This part of the educational program was very intensive, for the trainees attended courses for 40 hours a week, the workload being split into theoretical instruction and practical units.\textsuperscript{26} Despite the fact that these were ORT courses, the majority of students was non-Jewish.\textsuperscript{27} At the end of each course, the students sat examinations and, if everything went well, received a diploma.\textsuperscript{28} According to the annual ORT report for 1950, the vocational school in Bad Aibling had been “perfected […] to a point that has given us an enviable reputation throughout the zone.”\textsuperscript{29} For older youth who had already completed their academic or vocational training, the Children’s Village set up additional workshops to keep them occupied and further enhance their

\textsuperscript{23} Mia Fisher (Field Director for Germany, JCRA) to Rose L. Henriques (Chairman Germany Department, JCRA), 12 January 1949, Wiener Library, HA16-4/2/P3/18-118; Mia Fisher (Field Director for Germany, JCRA) to Rose L. Henriques (Chairman Germany Department, JCRA), 17 February 1949, p. 1, Wiener Library, HA2-1/6/53/11.
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\textsuperscript{29} ‘One Year ORT Activities. Report for 1950’, 1951, p. 42, World ORT Archive, d05a020.
skills. For example, they could be employed as groundskeepers, “landscaping and keeping the place clean”.30

After school, the children could engage in various kinds of recreational activities. This was the area in which the YMCA—represented by a team of 6, later 12 workers—played a prominent role.31 The YMCA launched its various projects in the Children’s Village in March 1949.32 This was yet another part of the Bad Aibling program that only got under way months after the move into the former garrison buildings. The YMCA organized a variety of free time activities, for example youth clubs.33 One of these was entitled the Black Hawk Club, a place for the older children to meet up with friends, hang around, listen to music, dance or play games.34 The organization of outdoor activities was another responsibility of the YMCA. For example, 27 Czechoslovakian boys formed a group of scouts, another indicator of how activities based on national groups were not regarded as irreconcilable with the internationalist agenda prevailing in the Children’s Village.35

In addition to such groups, the former airbase, with its extensive grounds, offered plentiful space for the children to run about and play.36 This was fortunate, as excursions were hard to organize—the prime reason was a shortage of gas.37 The children thus spent

31 Theodora Allen (European Representative, USCOM) to Ingeborg Olsen (USCOM), 24 March 1949, p. 2, CMS Archives, CMS.024, Box: 28/31, Folder: 4; Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone) to K. Okkenhaug (Voluntary Societies Liaison Officer, IRO, US Zone), 15 December 1950, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/949.
33 Ibid., p. 2.
35 Vladimir Balejka (YMCA, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), ‘Form of Application for Registration’, 9 May 1949, Archives & Special Collections, University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries, Spec MS 123 / Box 4 / Folder 1.
most of their free time in the Children’s Village, and could engage in a variety of sports, with basketball and football being among the most popular activities. In May 1950, the Children’s Village even hosted its own Olympic Games. These took place outside of the former airbase, on the local sports ground in Bad Aibling. Children and youth from other IRO installations in the US Zone travelled to Upper Bavaria in order to take part in the event, and interestingly, a team of local German children also joined in the activities. The young athletes competed in sprinting, relay races, broad jump, and discus throwing.

Besides sports, some of the children spent their free time looking after pet dogs in kennels behind the living quarters. The Children’s Village also offered indoor playrooms, a drama group, and movie screenings in the cinema hall. Western movies were particularly popular among the children who, according to Alice Roberts, had “a rosy picture of wonderful America—to them the land of two-gun galloping cowboys and whooping Indians”.

---

Over time, excursions appear to have become more frequent. There were several trips to Munich, including visits to the zoo, the Deutsches Museum, the Haus der Kunst, and the Amerikahaus. As former inhabitants of the Children’s Village recall, hiking and camping were also very popular. One lucky group of boys got to spend two weeks in the Bavarian Alps. Such extended outings were clearly the exception and made a welcome change to the children’s daily routine. As Quaker Natalie Kent noted: “If only all our kids could have such a two weeks.”

Today, surviving copies of Village News vividly illustrate the scope of educational and recreational activities taking place in the Children’s Village. Village News was a newspaper that was put together by the children themselves, even though it had to be reviewed and approved by IRO staff prior to publication. Articles

5 Training courses offered the older children and youth the possibility of obtaining vocational qualifications during their stay in the Children’s Village.

---


49 Natalie Kent (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to unknown, 8 August 1949, p. 1, Personal Archives of Natalie Kempner.
were submitted to a small editorial team, and written in various languages. If accepted, the items were translated into English and included in the following issue.\(^{50}\) *Village News* was published for the first time on 31 August 1949.\(^{51}\) For a period of four months, the paper was even released in three languages—English, German, and Czech.\(^{52}\) Both an internal forum and an unofficial mouthpiece of the Children’s Village,\(^{53}\) *Village News* contained content of every description. A detailed analysis cannot be provided here, for it would probably form a small study of its own. The newspaper featured, among other items, articles about the organizations involved in the operation of the Children’s Village,\(^{54}\) news regarding important staff changes\(^{55}\) and upcoming events,\(^{56}\) reports on excursions,\(^{57}\) ongoing exams in school and the vocational training classes,\(^{58}\) as well as statistics regarding repatriation and resettlement movements from Bad Aibling.\(^{59}\) Poems and miscellaneous pieces of art were also included,\(^{60}\) as were letters received from former inhabitants, describing to the readers their experiences in their new home countries.\(^{61}\) One article critically reflected on how the Children’s Village was gradually transforming from a chaotic installation into a functioning community: “When the children […] came to Bad Aibling […] they saw a deserted camp with bare rooms and

\(^{50}\) *Village News*, 21 November 1949, p. 3, Personal Archives of Derrick Deane, Bound Copies of IRO Children’s Village Newspapers.

\(^{51}\) *Village News*, 31 August 1949, Personal Archives of Derrick Deane, Bound Copies of IRO Children’s Village Newspapers.


\(^{53}\) See section ‘Public Relations’.

\(^{54}\) *Village News*, 21 September 1949, pp. 2–4, Personal Archives of Derrick Deane, Bound Copies of IRO Children’s Village Newspapers.


\(^{58}\) *Village News*, 5 April 1950, p. 4, Personal Archives of Derrick Deane, Bound Copies of IRO Children’s Village Newspapers.


a ghastly appearance compared with the centres they had lived in. We were left with our houseparents who didn’t know when we were supposed to go to bed or get up. The consequences of this was that we did what we wanted to do and there wasn’t much to do either. […] Every day one can see progress in everything. There are less and less children who don’t attend school and there is much hope that there won’t be any such children in a short while. We have some children’s committees and we publish and print our own newspaper…”

The desire to set up a program that would integrate, as far as possible, children from different national and cultural backgrounds was also reflected in the range of religious services provided in the Children’s Village. In the words of Child Care Officer Eleanor Ellis, the aim was to “develop acceptance and respect among individual children for the culture and religion of each other.”

This desire was partly rooted in past experience. Referring to the IRO children’s center in Prien, AFSC team member Kathleen Regan recalled that there had been “sad experiences of Religious and National Groups tending to segregate their special flock rather than fostering understanding of Brotherly love.” In order to counteract such a development in Bad Aibling, Ellis had envisioned setting up a joint committee of different religious leaders, representing all faiths and denominations among the population of the Children’s Village.

Again, as a result of the initial staff shortage, this plan had to be postponed. In December 1948, a representative of the US Army noted that there was “no provision made for religious services with
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63 Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone) to Earl Blake Cox (Director, IRO, US Zone, Area 7), 10 December 1948, p. 2, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.
65 Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone) to Earl Blake Cox (Director, IRO, US Zone, Area 7), 10 December 1948, p. 2, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.
the exception of utilizing churches of nearby towns.”

But eventually, the religious leaders did arrive. Four priests (Roman Catholic, Greek Orthodox, Protestant, and Lutheran) and one rabbi were permanently assigned to the Children’s Village. The aforementioned committee was finally formed with the assistance of the AFSC, which acted as a go-between by balancing the interests of the individual committee members. By now very much accustomed to functioning as the mediators in the Children’s Village, the Quakers considered themselves to be “in the role of interpreting the international, interfaith flavor of our family of children and youth”. As of February 1949, the breakdown of children housed in Bad Aibling according to religion was as follows: 223 were Roman Catholic, 79 Jewish, 49 Greek Catholic, 48 Protestant, 28 Greek Orthodox, two Buddhist and one Baptist.

Appropriate schedules could now be organized. In addition to services and ceremonies such as First Communion, religious instruction took place in school. In the end, each faith and denomination represented in the Children’s Village was allocated a room for their exclusive use. These rooms were transformed into provi-

---

71 Interview with Fatema Möring, 11 April 2013, Personal Archives of Christian Höschler.
sional houses of worship. According to a former IRO staff mem-
ber, there were honest attempts to foster an interfaith spirit. For
example, Jewish children were invited to join a Christian choir,
while gentile children were encouraged to take part in the Passover
meal (Seder). 73

---

73 Hasselmann-Kahlert, Das entwurzelte Kind, p. 75.
Repatriation and Resettlement

The paramount aim in the Children’s Village was the establishment of plans for the future lives of the children. It was the responsibility of the Case Work Department to document each child’s individual history, monitor behavior and development over time, weigh the pros and cons of all feasible options and finally lay the groundwork for either repatriation or resettlement by recommending the one or the other.¹ Before we take a closer look at how this vital task was carried out, it is important to consider some of the legal, political, and ethical questions which at the time preoccupied governments, occupying authorities, and humanitarian workers, but also relatives of displaced children, and the minor DPs themselves. Some of the following issues have briefly been touched upon in the introduction to this study,² but are nevertheless included in this section, for the sake of coherence.

The authorized history of the IRO concerns itself mainly with the legal issues that complicated the question of what to do with the thousands of children who were stranded in Europe’s DP camps and children’s centers after the end of World War II. Because of conflicting laws and traditions defining the legal systems of various countries—whether or not they were member states of the IRO—it was often hard to reconcile divergent opinions on whether to repatriate or resettle displaced children. Whilst there was a general consensus (outwardly at any rate) that family reunification was the common goal, there were differing views on many questions—the devil was in the details. For example, the governments of the Soviet Union, Belorussia and Poland were determined to have all children repatriated whom they considered to be their nationals, regardless of whether the parents were still resident in those countries, or even still alive.³ But the very act of determining a child’s nationality could open a Pandora’s box. It was the first step on the long trail of individual case work, and was complicated by factors such as the death of parents or other family members, the remarriage of widowed parents, the shifting of national borders and, in many cases, a lack of reliable documentation regarding a

² See section ‘Victims of War: Displaced Children’.
child’s personal history. There was also dispute about who had the right to appoint a legal guardian eligible to represent a child. Should it be the right of the (assumed) country of origin to take such a measure, or should jurisdiction fall within the territory in which the child was residing? Given that the legal guardian would be closely involved in the establishment of future plans for any of his or her wards, this question was by no means a mere formality. Furthermore, if the parents could be traced, they naturally had to be considered, as well as any other relatives. The birth families of displaced children often engaged in lengthy and sometimes bitter custody battles, particularly in those cases where children were living with foster parents in Germany. Finally, to what extent should the opinion of the children themselves be taken into account, based on their relative maturity?

These thorny questions seldom arose in isolation, and were more often than not intertwined. They added to the challenge of establishing clear procedures on the part of occupying authorities and voluntary agencies. As a result, the activities surrounding the repatriation and resettlement of displaced children continued to be a matter of debate—and therefore protracted—after the IRO took over from UNRRA. This remained the case throughout the history of the Children’s Village. Child Care Officer Eleanor Ellis repeatedly complained that due to difficulties in getting final clearance from military authorities—which in her opinion was a result of inconsistent or non-existent policies—the repatriation or resettlement of many children had been delayed for as long as one to three years.

Over time, the situation was only remedied by pragmatic and sometimes radical changes in policy. For instance, in 1949 it was decided that resettlement was no longer to be dependent on

---

4 Holborn, The International Refugee Organization, pp. 504–505.
6 Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone) and Vinita V. Lewis (Deputy Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone) to Philip E. Ryan (Chief of Operations, IRO, US Zone), 15 April 1949, p. 3, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/856/39/1; Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone) to A.C. Dunn (Chief, Care and Maintenance, IRO, US Zone), 11 June 1948, p. 4, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/856/39/1; ‘Staff Conference’, 21 April 1949, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/856/39/1.
the approval of the child’s established country of origin,\(^7\) so long as both the occupying authorities and the IRO considered emigration “to be in the best interests of the child”.\(^8\)

Officially, despite the increase in resettlement activities, repatriation was still referred to as “the most desirable solution for the plight of these unfortunate children”.\(^9\) This tenet has been looked upon critically by historians who have identified a political dimension to the treatment of child victims of World War II. A few historiographical quotes may serve to illustrate what researchers have more or less unanimously agreed upon: Jason M. Pobjoy has written that the IRO’s work with displaced children represented one of its “most politically contested tasks”,\(^10\) while Lynn Nicholas has argued that it was “subject to changing political winds”.\(^11\) Displaced children have been described by Tara Zahra as “pawns in an escalating Cold War”.\(^12\) According to her, child workers “linked the psychological rehabilitation of individual children to a broader campaign to cultivate democratic values in postwar Europe”.\(^13\) In not dissimilar vein, Daniella Doron has come to the conclusion that although the “concern for children was genuine and eminently reasonable, it also served a political agenda”.\(^14\) In an article dealing with Royalist and Communist interest groups battling over the fate of displaced children in the aftermath of the Greek Civil War, Loukianos Hassiotis has noted that the “political vocabulary of both belligerents was built largely on the children’s case”.\(^15\)

Was the Cold War the fundamental factor influencing the politics of repatriation and resettlement? Indeed, contemporary observers also picked up on this connection: in August 1950, follow-
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\(^7\) Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone) to Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), 10 August 1949, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932.

\(^8\) B. G. Ferris (Director, Civil Affairs Division, EUCOM) to William Hallam Tuck (Director-General, IRO, Geneva), 10 June 1949, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/926.

\(^9\) Ibid.


\(^11\) Nicholas, Cruel World, p. 511.

\(^12\) Zahra, The Lost Children, p. 198.

\(^13\) Ibid., p. 93.


\(^15\) Hassiotis, Relocating Children During the Greek Civil War, 1946–9, p. 284.
ing a visit to the Children’s Village, American journalist William Stevenson reported on the development of the IRO’s services towards displaced children in Germany. One fact in particular astonished Stevenson: although thousands of children—many of whom might have been eligible for assistance—were still in the process of being traced, the IRO decided to officially terminate its search program. In his newspaper column, Stevenson referred to interviews he had conducted with workers of the Child Search Branch: “The explanation they offer for cessation of their activities is that, in many cases, their investigations indicated a child still had distant relatives in Communist countries. Claims followed from the governments concerned for the return of such children. IRO was under an obligation to comply.” The implication here is clear—was the IRO prematurely ending its search operation because of anti-Communist resentments? Was the organization reluctant to send children behind the Iron Curtain? Judging from conclusions that other historians have reached, it would appear that antipathy towards Communism was a major factor. For Michael Marrus, the IRO “became the instrument of the Western powers, chiefly the United States, which contributed over half of its operating funds.” Bob Reinalda, in his overview of the history of international organizations, has concurred in this finding: “The replacement of the UNRRA by the IRO demonstrated the perseverance of the US, whose policy to prevent the spread of communism […] also had an impact on the UN.” Historian Lynne Taylor has argued that from the point of view of American relief workers, repatriating children to countries in Eastern Europe “would condemn them to a life under communism, and ‘condemn’ is the word they would use.” And according to Tara Zahra, the furthering of resettlement schemes for displaced children was an affront to govern-

---


18 Stevenson, *Child Refugees in Germany*.

19 Marrus, *The Unwanted*, p. 343.


ments of countries in Eastern Europe. The list could go on: other historians have reached similar conclusions.

What is clear from the numbers alone is that the IRO helped more people resettle than repatriate over the years of its existence. This is also evident in the statistics on unaccompanied children as a particular group within the overall DP population: in the period July 1947 through December 1951, 573 children under IRO care in the US Zone were repatriated, while 1,628 were resettled abroad, mostly in the US, Canada, Australia, Sweden and Israel. Children who were resettled thus formed 74% of the total case load. An even higher ratio was reached in Bad Aibling, where the number of children resettled abroad was more than five times the number of children repatriated. But to conclude that the entire staff of the Children’s Village simply rejected repatriation would be too simple an explanation. In the following paragraphs, we will explore in more detail how overall procedures and individual case work activities focusing on repatriation and resettlement were organized in the Children’s Village—and the extent to which the aforementioned political dimension was reflected in this work.

The Case Work Department was not only responsible for the documentation of the children’s individual case histories, but also oversaw admissions to and discharges from the Children’s Village. In order to reach a considered conclusion about each case presented to the Case Work Department, a dossier of information had to be compiled. Could the identity of a child be established

22 Zahra, The Lost Children, p. 207.
26 Ibid., p. 514.
27 Ibid., pp. 509–511.
beyond doubt? When and under what circumstances had a child been separated from its parents? Were mother and/or father still alive? Was any information available regarding other relatives? Where had this child been prior to admission, where had it been in previous years? How had its personality developed under the care of UNRRA and/or the IRO? Could any behavioral peculiarities be observed? Were there any medical issues? Was the available documentation complete? Did it appear advisable to return a child to its country of origin? Or was resettlement more likely to be the best solution?

Because the Children’s Village was not the first institution taking care of displaced children in postwar Europe, the case workers in Bad Aibling did not have to start from scratch: ideally, new arrivals were accompanied by their existing case records. Contrary to official policy, however, these documents were often incomplete. As staff member Marjorie K. Smith pointed out: “With the records arriving in their present state, it is a wonder that the child workers know anything about their clients”. On the other hand, even when records were complete, the quantity and scope of the reports, forms and correspondence presented a challenge in itself. AFSC member Alice Roberts noted that the case workers had to laboriously work their way through a “mountain of red tape”. Similarly, a journalist reporting on conditions in Bad Aibling concluded that the children were “dizzily watching the papers accumulate in their dossiers like characters in a Kafka novel”. And Yvonne de Jong, responsible for Child Care at the IRO’s headquarters in Geneva, also maintained a sympathetic stance on the challenges confronting the staff in the Children’s Village: “The amount of paperwork required from the case-workers is tremendous—formulas, state-

For a long time, the Case Work Department struggled with the ongoing problem jeopardizing the operation of the Children’s Village at so many levels: the shortage of staff. The insufficient number of case workers not only hampered the planning of repatriation and resettlement activities, but had a wider impact on the efficiency of the Bad Aibling operation, as the flow of admissions and discharges gradually came to a halt. In March 1949, Quaker Kathleen Regan reported that the current staff situation “has caused a terrible stand-still in the emigration and resettlement of the children and is the chief reason we are swelling all the time, as only a few dribble out each month. The [IRO] Areas inform us that there are more and more kids waiting to come in”.

Two months later, things had not improved. While the number of children had risen to more than 480, the Case Work Department only had three staff members on duty, resulting in an unworkable case load of 160 clients per worker. This made planning for children on an individual basis practically impossible, even though the staff were tirelessly working extra hours to try and cope with the cases they were assigned. An IRO official working for Area 7 reckoned it was realistic for one case worker to oversee a maximum of 70 cases.

As Emmy G. Lefson, Case Work Supervisor in May 1949, pointed out to her superior, Administrator Bayer: “I do not feel that I can take the responsibility for the highly important service which IRO is


38 Mordecai E. Schwartz (Deputy Director, IRO, US Zone, Area 7) to Philip E. Ryan (Chief of Operations, IRO, US Zone), 8 June 1949, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932.
obligated to give the children and youth in Bad Aibling, without
the workers I have requested.”

Area 7 subsequently requested more workers from IRO Zone
Headquarters, where two additional lines for the Case Work De-
partment were granted in the early summer of 1949. However,
this only alleviated the problem to a certain extent. Director Doug-
las Deane gave vent to his frustration in a letter to Chief of Opera-
tions Philip Ryan: “Of the 5 over-worked caseworkers, one resigna-
tion becomes effective this week, while another was signaled for
transfer a month ago. Despite the weighty recommendations […],
our caseworkers are being reduced instead of increased. […] We
have need of at least five more caseworkers together with support-
ing clerical staff if the basic problem of the center is to be even
scratched.” Despite Deane making his needs extremely clear,
months went by without improvement. It was only in December
1949 that the number of case workers was finally increased to
nine. Following a prolonged period of serious staff shortage,
Deane was now optimistic that the Children’s Village would at least
be able to “satisfy all demands for speed”.

Documenting and analyzing the individual history of each child
was by no means a clear-cut procedure. While it was important to
Deane that the staff of the Children’s Village make a “sincere effort
to achieve objectivity”, case work in Bad Aibling was ultimately a
decision-making process which involved a high degree of uncer-
tainty, and at times dispute, in terms of what was considered to be
in the best interests of a child. Also, organizations and individuals
from various backgrounds put forward different recommendations
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concerning the rehabilitation of displaced children, adding to the complexity of the task at hand.

As we have already seen, nationalist beliefs (as well as consideration for nationalist agendas) and the ideal of familialism resulted in the widespread repatriation of displaced children to their countries of origin during the immediate postwar years. But the topic of repatriation was growing increasingly controversial as the decade drew to a close. In July 1949, Paula Halpern, Repatriation Officer with the IRO in the US Zone, criticized the fact that all unaccompanied children had to go through the Children’s Village before any final decision regarding their future could be made. This also applied to cases in which biological parents had already been traced and now demanded the return of children to their former homeland. Suspicious of this general rule, Halpern remarked: “I personally think that if a mother asks for her child, any ‘final’ planning is a complete waste of time and money.”

Elizabeth Brown, who was in overall charge of the IRO’s Repatriation Division in the US Zone, critically remarked in September 1949 that her staff “has been concerned for some months past with the fact that repatriation figures for children from this zone continue to be low, […] and has for this reason been negotiating with Child Care for the assignment of a worker to the Children Center [i.e. the Children’s Village] staff, either as Repatriation Officer or in a less identifiable role, as house-mother.” Brown’s proposal to employ an additional worker for the sake of subtly, subversively even, furthering the cause of repatriation in Bad Aibling suggests that opinions on this matter were divided.

There were other parties with a vested interest in facilitating the repatriation of children from Bad Aibling, and the IRO did try to show consideration for their wishes. For example, the Polish Red Cross (PRC) succeeded in having one of its workers permanently assigned to the Children’s Village. As one IRO staff member explained, the PRC worker would “act as a teacher for Polish children from 6 years upwards. Classes are to be conducted in Polish. […] He plans the organization of a Polish recreational program

---

which will include the teaching of Polish dances and songs”. The intention of the PRC was clear: in a letter to Philip E. Ryan, a senior representative of the agency had previously referred to “the opinion of the Polish Red Cross that, as far as Polish Orphan Children are concerned, all of them should be repatriated to Poland, because that is really in their best interest.” Another PRC official levelled serious accusations at Eleanor Ellis with regard to the care of Polish children in the Children’s Village: “We don’t know why our Polish children are kept unnecessary long at Bad Aibling. We believe however that you will agree that our Polish children should return to […] the only country where Polish children belong […]. It would be very much appreciated if you could let us know the reasons of the delay and use all your influence and authority at Bad Aibling”.

In response to such requests, Repatriation Officer Elizabeth Brown supported the suggested assignment of a PRC worker to the Children’s Village and advocated cooperation with the Polish officials: “Criticism of Polish Authorities in regard to our work with children has never been so marked. We will probably never persuade them that there are not hundreds here being deterred from repatriation, but the more open and frank we can be in allowing them to have access to the true situation, the stronger our position is.” Records pertaining to Polish children in the Children’s Village indicate that repatriation and resettlement were in fact both being considered as options, often in accordance with what the minor DPs themselves had expressed as wishes for their future. Nevertheless, the PRC was convinced that the IRO was favoring reset-
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tention over repatriation, and adamant that the latter had to become the main focus in Bad Aibling.

Accordingly, measures to this end were put into effect when the PRC worker arrived in the Children’s Village. A reading room with Polish literature was opened, and the screening of Polish newsreels was organized. Language classes were offered to those children wishing to repatriate. According to Deane, this forceful approach evoked “fears [...] that undue pressure in the matter of repatriation might be exercised”. Tensions were rising. The frustration of those fighting for the repatriation of children was vented at those who were “allegedly brainwashing and sequestering” their wards. In a letter to Deane, the PRC expressed its concerns that the environment of the Children’s Village and its special program represented an obstacle to repatriation efforts: “The fact that Bad Aibling is an International Children’s Village, for all children, irrespective of race or religion, does not have influence on the necessity to treat each national group according to national needs and national interests of that group.” The PRC was obviously not a supporter of the internationalist ideal prevailing in Bad Aibling.

On the other hand, it seems clear that some of the staff of the Children’s Village did in fact harbor a negative view of repatriation. Events which took place in July 1949 clearly demonstrate this: several of the case workers issued complaints to Area 7, accusing their supervisor, Emmy Lefson, of taking “forceful Repatriation decisions”. Alarmed, Area 7 immediately took up the matter with the administration of the Children’s Village. A meeting was arranged, with all members of the Case Work Department present. However,
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contrary to the fears of the workers who had originally made the complaints, the investigating IRO officer, François Della Torre, found that Lefson had “an excellent knowledge of IRO directives and policies”\(^{60}\), and that she had always gone through proper channels—i.e. Zone Headquarters—when making suggestions for the repatriation or resettlement of children under IRO care.\(^{61}\) In defense of the Case Work Supervisor, Della Torre therefore put an end to the discussion: “When our findings were explained to the case workers they of course had nothing to say nor other complaints to formulate. […] I drew the attention of the case-workers to the fact that it was their duty to discuss cases with the Case Work Supervisor, that in some cases different opinions might be expressed but that final decision was always the responsibility of Zone Headquarters.”\(^{62}\)

This was not the only incident indicative of negative views towards repatriation. In September 1949, Douglas Deane informed his immediate supervisor, Area Director Earl Blake Cox, that “the case work supervisor sensed that the workers in the Department were unwilling to utilize repatriation as a constructive resource in reestablishment”, and that they even showed “intense emotional blocking”.\(^{63}\) Deane went on to describe a typical example: “A case in point is that of the Polish child, born November 1, 1933 who was removed from the German economy on September 1, 1946 and brought to a Children’s Center. Under the heading ‘If No Plans For Reestablishment Have Yet Been Formulated Give Reasons Why’, worker notes the following: ‘EUCOM [European Command] release for emigration [i.e. permission from the military authorities] not possible to obtain. […]’ Under heading ‘If Youth Wishes Resettlement and Is Not Eligible For Any Available Plan What Is His Attitude Toward Repatriation?’ Worker writes: ‘Refuses repatriation’. Under heading ‘What is Workers [sic] Plan For Dealing With Youth’s Feelings In Response To Above Question’ worker has put nothing but a dash. This is not an isolated example but reflects the manner in which many of the forms are filled out.”\(^{64}\) As a result, Deane’s conclusion was sobering: “In failing to come to grips with the individual situations of specific children for

\(^{60}\) Ibid., p. 2.

\(^{61}\) Ibid.

\(^{62}\) Ibid., p. 4.

\(^{63}\) Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Earl Blake Cox (Director, IRO, US Zone, Area 7), 6 September 1949, pp. 3–4, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.

\(^{64}\) Ibid., pp. 9–10.
whom repatriation should have been considered two or three years ago the agency in many instances has jeopardized the possibility of having the youth consider repatriation in a positive way at present.” 65 Due to the passage of time, many of the children no longer showed any significant sign of attachment to their former homeland. 66

Following a visit to Bad Aibling in October 1949, Child Welfare Consultant Yvonne de Jong found even more drastic words when she ascribed the primary cause of the situation to the atmosphere prevailing in the Children’s Village. She concluded that it had “failed to become a neutral community where, according to the policy of IRO, children, and especially those who should be prepared for repatriation, can live in an unbiased environment”. 67

Concurring in the findings of Deane, de Jong was not satisfied with the fact that the case workers “sometimes showed a certain reluctance and emotion in applying strictly to [sic] IRO’s policy.” 68

While Deane suggested bringing in qualified staff with a more open attitude towards repatriation, 69 de Jong, in an attempt to limit the damage already done, put forward a more radical plan for consideration, suggesting that those children who were thought likely to repatriate should be segregated from the remaining population of the Children’s Village. This, de Jong argued, would keep them from preoccupation with talk and activities surrounding resettlement. 70

In the eyes of the Children’s Village administration, however, this proposal went too far. While acknowledging the validity of de Jong’s arguments, Deane referred to the limitations imposed by the fact that the IRO would be ceasing its operations in the foreseeable future. Realistically, Deane pointed to “the harsh necessity of consolidating a dying agency by putting in one Village potential re-
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69 Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Earl Blake Cox (Director, IRO, US Zone, Area 7), 6 September 1949, p. 9, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.
patriants, resettlers, and temporary care children”. At the same time, Deane reassuringly stated that “any antirepatriation tendencies” had, in the meantime, “been corrected by changes of personnel.”

Despite official policy and the goodwill shown by the administration of the Children’s Village, as well as the firm pro-repatriation line taken by Polish officials and other parties of interest, the possible return of children to their former homeland was and would remain a delicate matter. It was not just a question of whether the staff, or even a certain proportion of them, was open towards repatriation. A basic tenet was that the opinions of the children themselves had to be taken into account, and many of them fiercely refused repatriation. Former inhabitants remember how national delegations visited the Children’s Village in order to persuade the children to return to Eastern Europe. But the efforts of the officials travelling to Bad Aibling were of no avail. On one occasion, they were first ignored, and then driven out by the children who saw no future for themselves in countries from which they were estranged, and where recent events had overturned the political and social order. An angry mob of older children even torched the car of one visiting delegation.

On the whole, however, the children and youth in Bad Aibling did not have to resort to such drastic measures, for every effort was made to take their individual opinions and wishes into account. A case in point was the story of one boy, Valentine, who arrived at the Children’s Village when he was 14 years old, together with two younger sisters. Their family, originally from Romania, had been forced to flee their heavily-bombed home country during the war. While on the move, temporarily finding shelter in camps across Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Germany, the siblings were separated from their parents, grandparents, and two uncles. Only one uncle remained. With four children of his own, he did not feel himself in a position to also assume responsibility for his nephew and nieces. And so the siblings eventually found themselves in Bad Aibling. One day, a message was received from their father who in

72 Ibid.
73 Zahra, Lost Children, p. 83.
the meantime had been released from a Russian military prison in Romania. He was asking for his children to come home. While the sisters went along with their father’s request, Valentine was unwilling to return to a country under Communist control. His wish was respected, and he was not forcibly repatriated. Following his stay in Bad Aibling, he successfully emigrated to the US, where he resides to this day. Valentine’s case illustrates how the much-advocated reunification of families could fail in those cases in which the children themselves refused to return to their country of birth.

Another inhabitant of the Children’s Village, a 16-year-old girl from Latvia, had found her way to Bad Aibling after being abandoned by her father, a DP himself. One year after he had left Europe for emigration to Canada, the father requested that his daughter join him there. However, citing their dysfunctional relationship in the past—which included a lack of affection and actual physical abuse—the girl refused. Instead, she wished to be resettled in Australia. After securing statements from other relatives and taking as close a look as possible at the family’s history, the IRO assented to the girl’s wish: “A bright future of a very competent, intelligent and morally high-minded girl should not be jeopardized by resettlement in a father’s home where unkindness and brutality may prevail.”

At the start of the new decade, world politics was making it increasingly difficult for the administration of the Children’s Village to fulfil the IRO’s official policy, in terms of giving genuine consideration to repatriation as a means of reestablishing the children under its care. Between June 1949 and June 1950, 108 unaccompanied children had been repatriated from Bad Aibling, while 189 had been resettled abroad. This meant that a relatively large number of individuals was still, at this point, returning to countries in Eastern Europe. But by the summer of 1950, the realities of global confrontation were starting to have a real impact on the world of the Children’s Village. In three confidential letters to Philip Ryan, Douglas Deane voiced his concerns about the ramifications this could have for the everyday work with the children: “Now that the

77 Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone), 28 August 1950, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932.
‘cold war’ has become hot in Korea and the Russian propaganda line completely reverses the true state of affairs [...], I would like to ask directions as to our continued acceptance of Polish, Czech or other propaganda material”.

Deane furthermore requested instructions for a hypothetical worst-case scenario: “This question is not raised in any alarmist spirit but, given the present world situation and some preparations made among Military communities, I would like a little guidance as to the planning for our children should a breakdown in international relations occur.”

In his third letter, Deane inquired whether it was really necessary to even consider repatriation in all cases: “We have endeavored in the past to deal impartially with repatriates but there is now one category which raises a point of principle. I speak of the very young children born of mothers who fled from behind the ‘Iron Curtain’ and have since died and whose children, taking the nationality of the mother, are slated for automatic repatriation to ‘Iron Curtain’ countries. [...] Are we now expected to continue with the repatriation of these children?”

Deane’s words spoke volumes: the Children’s Village was clearly, and inexorably, caught up in the threats posed by the new dichotomy of world order. Deeply concerned about whether the Korean War could turn into a new world war, Quaker Alice Roberts wrote to her family: “One feels as if one is leaning over a great, dark abyss, and absolutely powerless to do anything but read or tune in to the latest news. We are asking what will happen to the children, should a real catastrophe occur. [...] We are right next to the [IRO] Motor Pool, where there are always trucks in readiness, but where could one run to? Where would be safe, should a war come?”

As we have seen, much of the criticism pertaining to the handling of repatriation in Bad Aibling suggested that the return of children to Eastern Europe was being gratuitously delayed and even prevented. Interestingly, there were also commentators who
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considered the Children’s Village to be guilty of the very opposite. A case in point were the views expressed by Łucjan Zbigniew Królikowski, a Polish priest. In 1949, Królikowski was accompanying a group of Polish children on their journey through Europe. After a long experience of displacement following the mass exodus of Poles out of Gulags in Siberia, this group of children was scheduled to emigrate to Canada. As the children travelled towards their embarkation port, there were plans to (temporarily) house them in the Children’s Village. But their guardian, Królikowski, was skeptical of the intentions of those running “the famous children’s camp in Bad Aibling”. He was convinced that if his charges were to enter the former airbase, they “would sooner or later have been taken to Poland”. Against the background of what we know, this accusation appears to have been unwarranted. It does however illustrate the nature of some of the stories circulating about the Children’s Village.

Despite the fears expressed by individuals such as Królikowski, more and more of the work carried out in Bad Aibling was in fact geared towards the resettlement of children. This is demonstrated in the way that contemporaries would later reflect on the purpose of the Children’s Village. Erna Deiglmayr, one of the IRO’s Child Care Officers employed by Area 7, would recall that the “objective at Bad Aibling was to place as many children as possible with suitable adoptive parents”, while former English teacher Peter Demetz also agrees that resettlement was given priority. In addition to the aforementioned anti-repatriation tendencies harbored by some staff members, the tendency towards resettlement was reinforced by adult DPs in the Children’s Village who had plans to emigrate themselves. According to a report by IRO representative Yvonne de Jong, this had an effect on the children’s attitude towards resettlement, an issue they were increasingly preoccupied with: “When DP house-mothers and fathers are so insecure themselves, so upset about their future, and so frequently removed and replaced because of emigration, how could their communicating
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their distressed state of mind to the children they have to care for be avoided?"86

A growing sense of enthusiasm for resettlement also had an effect on children who had only been brought to Bad Aibling as a temporary measure. Douglas Deane picked up on this phenomenon in a letter to his supervisor: “One of our most difficult problems in the Village now concerns a young woman of 15 placed three years ago for temporary care. She has been ‘caught’ in the ‘glamor’ of going to the United States with the friends she has made here, completely rejecting her mother with whom she had a warm relationship prior to her admission to a Children’s center.”87

To the dismay of the parents, some inhabitants, socialized anew88 in a community of peers who were bound for a new life abroad, were swayed into pursuing similar dreams.

As mentioned earlier,89 one of the major developments affecting the agenda of the Children’s Village from 1949 onwards was the influx of a significant number of Czech youth, mostly male and unaccompanied.90 Were they, in the words of historian Jayne Persian, all “attempting to escape the encroaching Iron Curtain”?91 Judging from a newspaper article by American journalist Ray Sprigle, this would appear plausible. The headline of the story certainly gave it a sensationalist air—“Youths Who Fled Red Terror Live Again in DP Camp”.92 Following his visit to the Children’s Village, Sprigle retold the stories recounted by the new Czech inhabitants who, Sprigle excitedly reported, were “seeking refuge from Red tyranny” in Bad Aibling.93 One youth told him how scout activities

87 Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Earl Blake Cox (Director, IRO, US Zone, Area 7), 6 September 1949, p. 9, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.
88 Buser, Children’s Center in der US-amerikanischen Besatzungszone, p. 5.
89 See chapter “A Classic Experiment”.
91 Persian, Displaced Persons and the Politics of International Categorisation(s), p. 487.
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in Czechoslovakia had been banned\(^\text{94}\) after the Communist takeover: “So all over the country the Boy Scout movement went underground. Our own council got out a little secret newspaper. It was very much anti-Communist. The secret police traced it back to some of us and I had to get out.”\(^\text{95}\) Sprigle also referred to an incident involving a correspondent of the Soviet newspaper Pravda. According to the children Sprigle spoke with, the Soviet journalist had visited the Children’s Village with the intention of speaking to some of the inhabitants—with no success. Sprigle: “He was there with American army credentials. Forthright Nora Ryan, one of the camp officials, decided he should at least get reasonably courteous treatment and managed to round up 12 youngsters who agreed to listen to him. They did. […] When he got no response to his suggestions that Poland and Russia were waiting for them with welcoming arms he asked for names and addresses of parents— ‘Maybe I can do something to help them and I’ll tell them you are well.’ Nobody was fooled by that either.”\(^\text{96}\) Two years after Sprigle’s newspaper item appeared, Josephine Ripley, a journalist writing for the Christian Science Monitor, told the story of a 17-year-old Czech girl who had found refuge in Bad Aibling, “because she was afraid she would be arrested for passing along anti-Communist literature. […] After one of her friends was apprehended, young Eliska lost no time in seeking the ‘underground’ route to safety in the American zone of Germany.”\(^\text{97}\) According to these testimonies, the Czech youth pouring into the Children’s Village were politically persecuted dissenters who had no other choice but to flee their home country in search of a safe haven.

However, those involved in the operation of the Children’s Village questioned the motives which led some of these young people to leave their home countries. Marlis Gildemeister, representative for the AFSC in the US Zone, discerned that “some are political refugees, some are adventurers, some are delinquents, some come from good homes, some have been public charges all their lives,


\(^{95}\) Sprigle, Youths Who Fled Red Terror Live Again in DP Camp, p. 2.
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some have had an education or training, some have not.”98 Deane’s predecessor Otto Bayer gave a more candid assessment: “In view of their tender years, their stories of Communist persecution must be considered somewhat unrealistic”.99 In many cases, it was impossible to verify the credibility of individual stories, so the Czech youth presented the staff with another special challenge.100 Eleanor Ellis of IRO Zone Headquarters considered the group to constitute one of the “greatest problems” in Bad Aibling.101 Ultimately, some sort of reestablishment in Germany appeared to be the only feasible option for this group. Most of the boys, despite the fact that they had parents in Czechoslovakia, were unwilling to repatriate; at the same time, their chances of being accepted for one of the resettlement schemes were limited. As Ellis noted: “It has not been possible in most instances to refer these children […] as they have objected to having releases requested from their government representatives for fear of reprisals to their families.”102 This was a dilemma which left the IRO in the unfavorable position of “leaving the children in limbo”103 until a solution could be sorted out.

In an attempt to counteract some of the “demoralising effects”104 in Bad Aibling, de Jong recommended a reduction in daily activities that solely focused on resettlement, including orientation


100 Marlis Gildemeister (Representative, AFSC, US Zone) to Lili Koehler (Foreign Service Section, AFSC, Philadelphia), 7 December 1949, p. 2, AFSC Archives, Box: Foreign Service, 1949, Country—Germany (D. P. Program Numbered Letters from ML) to (Numbered Letters from COG Jan.–April), Folder: Country, Germany, 1949, Displaced Persons Program, Letters # from ML, 66 to 126.
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activities\textsuperscript{105} which, in addition to English language classes,\textsuperscript{106} were intended to familiarize children with the culture of countries to which they might emigrate. However, contrary to this advice, the Children’s Village continued to organize events of such a nature. On several occasions American staff members gave talks on specific regions and places in the US where some of the children might end up if they were to be accepted for one of the resettlement schemes.\textsuperscript{107} These activities, by late 1950, had taken on an intensity which signified how the goalposts had shifted: in most cases, repatriation was no longer considered as a solution, and efforts were increasingly concentrated on preparing the remaining children for resettlement. A new living block was set up in which only English was spoken. The 25 boys who moved in attended language lessons every morning, followed by school or vocational training, and in the evening gathered at informal discussion rounds with British or American staff members, all in English. In addition to this, a special reading room was opened, offering English books, newspapers and magazines. It also included a radio broadcasting American programs.\textsuperscript{108} Recreational activities, for instance classes where children were introduced to “the good old American square dance”,\textsuperscript{109} rounded off these orientation efforts.

But despite the fact that children in Bad Aibling were increasingly steered towards emigration, things did not proceed as smoothly as hoped. One basic problem was that very few of the children could be referred for resettlement straightaway.\textsuperscript{110} Most of the case records did not contain sufficient or reliable information regarding their personal backgrounds: sometimes not even a confirmed name

\textsuperscript{105}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{110}Katherine Wolcott Toll, ‘Bad Aibling’, 11 November 1950, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute, MC 611, Folder: 12.3.
or date of birth was available. There were also health obstacles: acute illnesses like tuberculosis, chronic conditions such as epilepsy or hearing and speech impediments made some of the children ineligible for resettlement, at least for the time being.\footnote{Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Earl Blake Cox (Director, IRO, US Zone, Area 7), 6 September 1949, p. 6, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/933.} And finally, age was another factor—the older a child was, the more difficult it was to find a sympathetic foster family abroad.\footnote{Kriste Lindenmeyer, “A Right to Childhood”. The U. S. Children’s Bureau and Child Welfare, 1912–46 (Urbana / Chicago 1997), p. 213.} As one contemporary journalist put it: “Teen-agers are a particular problem, because although families all over the world are ready to adopt healthy, curly-haired little two- and three-year-olds, nobody wants the older children.”\footnote{Clipping from unknown newspaper—Don Cook, ‘Last “Hard Core” Refugees. Kalmuks and Children in I. R. O. Bavarian Village’, July 1949, Personal Archives of Natalie Kempner.} While this is probably an exaggeration, there was a kernel of truth to this observation.

At the organizational level, various agencies were involved in the process of resettling displaced children. The placement of selected candidates in the US, for example, was mainly the responsibility of two organizations: the first was USCOM, an agency founded in 1940, with First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt as honorary president. During the war, USCOM launched several initiatives to rescue European children from the events of the war engulfing the continent.\footnote{Michal Ostrovsky, “‘We Are Standing By’. Rescue Operations of the United States Committee for the Care of European Children’, in Holocaust And Genocide Studies 29, 2 (2015), pp. 230–250.} After 1945, the agency expedited the emigration of displaced children (up to the age of 18, regardless of religion or creed) and arranged for their adoption by American foster families.\footnote{Theodora Allen (European Representative, USCOM) to Charles S. Miller (Chief, PCIRO, Austria), 9 July 1947, p. 2, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/389/VS166; Holborn, The International Refugee Organization, pp. 509–510.} The second organization was the National Catholic Welfare Committee (NCWC) which, from 1950 onward, assumed responsibility for the referral of Catholic children.\footnote{Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone), ‘US Resettlement Programme’, 29 March 1951, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/948.} The US became a particularly popular destination for emigrating DPs after the so-called \textit{DP Act} had been passed in Congress in 1948. This legislation also provided for the resettlement of an increased number of displaced children.\footnote{Holborn, The International Refugee Organization, p. 509.}
the words of one historian, the DP Act put an end to the nation’s “laissez-faire policy and introduced planned mass immigration”.\(^\text{118}\)

Other children, mainly the older boys, were accepted for resettlement in Australia.\(^\text{119}\)

Later interpretations of the motives that were behind resettlement schemes on the part of receiving countries have varied. While historian Henriette von Holleuffer has credited the US, Canada, and Australia with being prepared to run the risk of disrupting the existing social and political order, yet living up to their tradition as countries of immigration,\(^\text{120}\) other researchers have critically pointed out that the rationale behind accepting DPs as immigrants was often economic, heavily race-biased, and not founded on genuine humanitarian concern.\(^\text{121}\) AFSC team member Natalie Kent made a similar comment regarding the attitude of receiving countries in May 1949. From her point of view, governments were mainly “considering children from the work standpoint”.\(^\text{122}\) Kent critically remarked on some of the questions which appeared to be at the center of the selection process for child immigrants: “Are they strong and healthy? Will they add to our economy and our population?”\(^\text{123}\)

Indeed, not all inhabitants of the Children’s Village were given equal treatment. A good example of this are the four Kalmyk children who had found refuge in Bad Aibling. Today, Natalie Kempner recalls that the Kalmyks “were known to all, partly because they were just always there. […] Their dark skin, Oriental appearance and Buddhist religion made immigration difficult. One after-
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noon, after yet another group left for new homes, I found [one of the Kalmyk children] sitting alone by a tree, crying. Through the tears: ‘Others come and go and I stay on…”¹²⁴ This was the bitter reality for the Kalmyk inhabitants of the Children’s Village. A contemporary newspaper even named the children in the same breath with “the tuberculars, the aged, the physically unfit or maimed, the undocumented and the undesirables”¹²⁵ whose resettlement would prove extremely difficult, if not impossible. This was the result of heavily racialized immigration regulations. Due to the Asian exclusion laws in existence at the time, the Kalmyk children could not be resettled in the US. As historian Suzanne Brown-Fleming has made clear, “physical appearance mattered to the degree that it could determine one’s chances for repatriation or emigration.”¹²⁶ In the end, the group staying in Bad Aibling was transferred to a DP camp in Munich-Schleissheim. Here they were taken care of by a Kalmyk couple, their collective fate remaining uncertain.¹²⁷ This only changed in 1951, when the US Congress ruled that Kalmyks should be formally classified as European, and not as Asian.¹²⁸ Suddenly, the gates to the US were opened to the Kalmyks awaiting their fate in Europe’s DP camps,¹²⁹ including the four children who had waited for so long in Bad Aibling.¹³⁰

In some cases, it was possible for staff members of the Children’s Village to assume permanent responsibility for one of their charges. Together with her husband Leon, Case Work Supervisor Emmy Lefson went on to adopt a boy, 8-year-old Bernard. It was a happy arrangement for all, and the family returned to the US after Lefson’s assignment in Bad Aibling had ended.¹³¹ A different case is that of Donald Kingsley, the director-general of the IRO. Following his official visit to the Children’s Village, Kingsley arranged

¹²⁴ Natalie Kempner to Christian Höschler, 5 February 2016, Personal Archives of Christian Höschler.
¹³⁰ Natalie Kempner to Christian Höschler, 5 February 2016, Personal Archives of Christian Höschler.
to adopt two siblings, Klaus Peter Heinze and his younger sister Christine. Today, Peter Kingsley does not recall the moment he learnt about his adoption as a happy one. Rather, it was presented to him as a fait accompli, in a manner he found extremely upsetting: “Riding in the back of a streamlined Ford car late at night on the way to what turned out to be Geneva, Switzerland, I was informed that my name would be changed, that I no longer would be Klaus Peter Heinze but Peter John Kingsley. […] My sister burst into tears and I joined her a few seconds later. We wanted to be back in Bad Aibling, to be with our friends […]. This was not a good idea at all. What is happening to us?”

Clearly, the journeys of those who found themselves displaced in the aftermath of the war were as varied as the experiences many lived through in Nazi Europe, and the placement of unaccompanied children with new families evoked very differing reactions.

Recapitulating the different views on repatriation and resettlement we have encountered in this section, it is clear that there were considerable differences of opinion between agencies and individuals with an interest in the future of the inhabitants of the Children’s Village. Even within the various organizations the staff members held a wide range of opinions. Attitudes were certainly influenced by ideological convictions, but also by issues of a practical nature. The DPs of Europe experienced unique stories of displacement.

6 For some children, like this Kalmyk boy shown with Quaker Oakie Kent, emigration was not possible due to restrictive immigration laws.

which called for personalized assistance and individual planning. It would therefore appear impossible to define a universal set of beliefs guiding relief workers in their goal of reestablishing displaced children at the time. What Lynne Taylor has rightly noted with regard to UNRRA’s activities in the immediate postwar years certainly also applies to the work of its successor agency, the IRO. According to Taylor, UNRRA “found itself torn in two, caught in the middle of the growing struggle between West and East. In many instances that resulted in paralysis at the upper levels of the organization, and ad hoc crisis management at the lower levels. The result was little consistency in policy.”\footnote{Taylor, Polish Orphans of Tengeru, p. 102.} Likewise, in the case of the Children’s Village, no one-sided narrative or interpretation would do justice to the complexity of the situation faced by the children and those whose task it was to look after them.

The realities of case work in the field were often a far cry from the ideals and theories informing international relief agencies. Individual workers constantly juggled the requirements of official regulations, the frustration of day-to-day restrictions, the influence of the contemporary zeitgeist, and their own ideals and expectations.
Public Relations

The Children’s Village was a gated community that was largely isolated from the outside world in its everyday operation. But considering the importance of its purpose—laying the foundations for the future lives of displaced children—it was necessary to remain in the public eye, in order to sustain awareness of and approval for the work carried out by the IRO and other agencies in Bad Aibling. This was even more important in the face of repeated propaganda campaigns launched in Soviet-dominated countries, accusing the IRO of systematically kidnapping children who, it was felt, should in fact be returned to their homelands.1 According to the IRO’s official history, the agency was therefore “content to publish truthful and unsensational news, confident that in the long run the human fairness of ordinary people would vindicate it.”2

But the chaotic circumstances which marked the establishment of the Children’s Village, as well as the endless hold-ups in getting the installation into working order, did not make for positive publicity. A memo drafted by IRO Child Care in the US Zone in January 1949 remarked in strong terms that the Children’s Village was “in danger of generating repulsion in its relations with the public”.3 Indeed, conditions in the Children’s Village at that time4 were perceived by outside observers to be appalling. A case in point was the Council of Voluntary Agencies (CVA) in the US Zone. Its members represented the AFSC, ORT, USCOM, and others. The CVA was frustrated by the IRO’s apparent inability to rectify the situation. It therefore formed a committee which was specifically appointed to look into the affair and provide constructive guidance with regard to the improvement of conditions in the Children’s Village.5 In the end, the committee took the matter to the IRO’s headquarters in

1 Holborn, The International Refugee Organization, p. 546.
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4 See chapter “‘The First Days Were Grim’”.
5 Theodora Allen (European Representative, USCOM) to Ingeborg Olsen (USCOM), 24 March 1949, p. 1, CMS Archives, CMS.024, Box: 28/31, Folder: 4; Marlis Gildemeister (Representative, AFSC, US Zone) to Lili Koehler (Foreign Service Section, AFSC, Philadelphia), 17 January 1949, pp. 2–3, AFSC Archives, Box: Foreign Service, 1949, Country—Germany (D.P. Program Numbered Letters from ML) to (Numbered Letters from COG Jan.–April), Folder: Country, Germany, 1949, Displaced Persons Program, Letters # from ML, 1 to 65.
Geneva, initiating an official meeting to discuss the Bad Aibling situation. The fact that the CVA had to resort to this—because it had not been possible to solve the underlying problems either directly in Bad Aibling or at higher levels—was a huge embarrassment for the IRO’s senior representatives in Switzerland. According to an AFSC report, they “reacted rather violently, one of the reasons being that none of them were in any way prepared for the meeting”.\(^6\) While the newly established committee believed that “the very effect the meeting had on the Geneva people will result in some action on their part for the benefit of Bad Aibling”,\(^7\) damage to the IRO’s reputation as a professional organization had been done.

It is unclear whether it was this specific episode that prompted a desire to raise the profile of the Children’s Village, but in any case, the IRO was, in the following months, anxious to increase its visibility and acceptance in the public eye. In June 1949, a group of American journalists was officially invited to visit Bad Aibling, to tour the Children’s Village and talk to some of the inhabitants.\(^8\) Several articles, published in various American newspapers, resulted from this tour.\(^9\) The reports featured descriptions of everyday life in the Children’s Village, as well as human interest stories—usually a few lines of information on individual children and their previous hardships. A recurring theme was the emigration of children from Bad Aibling to the US: One article read: “There’s 7-year-old Terese Strasinokaite, smiling and lovable—now. But in 1944 Mrs. Strasinokaite found a tiny child toddling along the street in a small town in Lithuania, with only a dress, no shoes and feet frozen. She and her husband took the child, just before they were picked up by the Nazis and brought to Germany as slaves. In Germany Mrs. Strasinokaite died in childbirth, leaving her husband with his own infant and Terese, in a D. P. camp. He turned Terese
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over to I. R. O. after exacting a promise that this beautiful, homeless waif get a chance to become the adopted child of Thomas Miller of Chicago. Her papers are in order and she may be there soon.”10 Another article made an appeal for higher immigration quotas on the part of receiving countries: “It is to be hoped that children and adolescents up to 18 years will continue to receive special treatment—for hundreds of [...] war orphans and ‘unaccompanied children’ now gathered at the Children’s Village of Bad Aibling still wearily wait for some country to take them in. How much ‘sacrifice’ does it involve for us to open our doors and take them now?”11 Writing about some of the older children in Bad Aibling, Gertrude Samuels of the New York Times Magazine commented sadly on the discrepancy between immigration policies and humanitarian need: “For years past, however, it is this desperate adolescent group that has not sufficiently interested governments and individuals. For years now, boys like Leopold and Edward, and girls like Eleanor, have been submitting to tests, inspections, examinations…”12

Over the years, the Children’s Village mainly received favorable responses from the press. There was occasional criticism, but it was frequently unfounded and based on misinformation. In one case, a periodical entitled Our Emigration, published by the Polish Union in the US Zone of Germany (an organization representing the interests of Polish DPs)13 put out an alarming report which claimed that the IRO was engaged in illegal activities: “An I. R. O. children’s center is located in Bad Aibling, in southern Bavaria. We have learned that Polish children living in the center are in many instances repatriated to Poland, often without the knowledge or consent of their mothers who are living in Germany.”14 Douglas Deane was exasperated by “this gross distortion of the truth” and vehemently rejected the accusations: “As is well known, there is no forcible repatriation
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12 Samuels, They Call It ‘Home’.
practiced by IRO and least of all from this establishment. The Editor has shown great irresponsibility in not checking the facts.\textsuperscript{15}

In celebration of the first anniversary of the Children’s Village, Grete H. A. Frank, the IRO’s Child Care Officer responsible for Area 7, wrote the lyrics for a piece entitled \textit{The International Children’s Song}. The music was arranged by the head of the Children’s Village YMCA team, Julius Zsako. An ensemble of 60 children was selected to study and perform the song which was then broadcast on several radio stations, including \textit{Radio Munich} (a station monitored by the US authorities)\textsuperscript{16} and AFN (\textit{American Forces Network}, a military radio station),\textsuperscript{17} in January 1950.\textsuperscript{18} The lyrics encapsulated the internationalist spirit behind the Bad Aibling program: “We children, children from the world, we live here in our Bad Aibling / We learn to think and we learn to know / That there is a World understanding.”\textsuperscript{19}

Newspapers were thus not the only medium through which the fate of displaced children was made public. Nor would this be the last musical performance to find its way from Bad Aibling to the listeners’ radios—in December 1950, the \textit{British Broadcasting Corporation} (BBC) visited the Children’s Village with a sound unit and recorded a set of Christmas carols which were broadcast soon afterwards.\textsuperscript{20} Also in 1950, the BBC featured the Children’s Village in a semi-fictitious piece about the \textit{International Tracing Service} (ITS; the IRO’s official bureau for the tracing and registration of missing individuals, including DPs)\textsuperscript{21} and its work with displaced children. This radio program was entitled \textit{The Greatest Detective Story in Histo-}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{17} Anja Schäfers, \textit{Mehr als Rock ’n’ Roll. Der Radiosender AFN bis Mitte der siebziger Jahre} (Stuttgart 2014).
Finally, in July 1951, BBC producer Alan Burgess revisited Bad Aibling in yet another feature, *The Village of Children*, exploring the history of the Children’s Village, its educational and recreational program, and the fate of its inhabitants.

There were even plans to capture the Children’s Village on film as part of a professional production. In March 1949, a representative of *This Modern Age*, a British cinemagazine produced by the well-known *Rank Organization*, approached the IRO with an inquiry as to whether it would be possible to film some of the displaced children under the organization’s care. The material was to be used in the context of an episode with the working title *Orphans of the World*. The IRO agreed, and Eleanor Ellis replied that the Children’s Village would offer “by far the best opportunities” for the proposed project. Chief of Operations Philip E. Ryan agreed that the Children’s Village offered “exceptional opportunities for a documentary of world-wide interest”. However, this is where the known correspondence ends. There is no indication that this particular episode of *This Modern Age* was ever actually produced. For whatever reason, it appears that the project was called off.

Press reports on the Children’s Village were accompanied by a growing number of fundraising activities, particularly in the US: donations on behalf of the children living in Bad Aibling were raised through a variety of charitable events. In the weeks leading up to Christmas 1950, the *General Federation of Women’s Clubs* rallied its members to provide toys, clothing, and additional food rations that could be shipped to Bavaria, calling for generosity in the spirit of the season: “The International Refugee Organization is meet-
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ing the basic needs for the children in this village, [...] but a true Christmas is needed and can be created if our clubwomen will not delay in sending gifts.” Similarly, in 1951, the American Legion (a long-established veterans’ organization) organized mass donations of toys from all across the US, resulting in an impressive total of 115 tons of gifts that were sent to Europe and distributed to children in West Germany. Some of the toys were forwarded to the Children’s Village.

A particularly creative means of collecting goods was thought up by the Candor Central School in the state of New York. On the occasion of the upcoming Halloween celebrations of 1949, one of the teachers took the initiative of introducing a special project. Talking to her students, the teacher commented “on several occasions as to the sheer insanity of soaping windows and other so-called ‘pranks’ at Halloween. Why not have a real Halloween party that would do people good instead of harm?” And so the Candor students decided to “channel their Halloween high spirits into collections for orphan DPs.” The school’s Halloween party was a tremendous success: a total of 1,700 pounds of food and clothing was collected and sent off to Germany, where it was taken to Bad Aibling. According to a representative of the IRO, this was “the first effort of its kind undertaken by American schoolchildren.” Some of the Candor students and inhabitants of the Children’s Village became pen pals, the charitable activities thus leaving a lasting mark on young lives.

34 ‘Candor School Hijinks on Halloween Turned to Aid for Refugees. 400 Orphans ‘Adopted’’, in Binghamton Press, 1 November 1949, p. 3.
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Finally, donations were also brought to the Children’s Village in unusual ways, including special airborne delivery: the IRO arranged for a plane which circled the Children’s Village in October 1949 and dropped little parachutes carrying candy. Again, the gifts had been provided by donors in the US. The event was attended by radio representatives and members of the IRO’s public information staff. To this day, former inhabitants of the Children’s Village have vivid memories of that day. Peter Kingsley recalls that the “drone of the airplanes came before the tiny parachutes descended in clusters, each carrying a bundle of sweets and landing in the open fields, in the trees, in the bushes as children and adults alike scrambled for the prizes of hard candy, chocolate and gum.” Special events of this nature were intended to capture public attention in a way that went beyond the usual press releases and visits by journalists. Looking back in 1956 on the considerable amount of media coverage of the Children’s Village, former Case Work Supervisor Joan Aitken would contend that it had been “destined to become world-famous [...] as [...] a classic experiment in the rapidly-developing science of international welfare work.”
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The Children’s Village was never intended to be a permanent installation, and as the IRO started to wind down operations in Europe, plans had to be made for its closure. This chapter will explore the main factors which defined the final phase of the relief work in Bad Aibling, up until the Children’s Village closed in late 1951.

At the time when the organization was created, no one had envisioned that the IRO would continue its work indefinitely. As a successor agency to UNRRA, it had been set up to meet the pressing needs of an acute crisis rooted in the events of World War II. Given that the number of DPs requiring care and assistance had considerably shrunk over the years, the governments contributing the bulk of the IRO’s budget “did not wish to give further funds for material assistance after the basic emergency problem had been solved.” With this in mind, plans for the termination of the IRO had already been established well before it finally ceased its operations in postwar Europe. The future of the Children’s Village, and of its remaining inhabitants, was therefore uncertain. Just as the deadline for the liquidation of the IRO was repeatedly extended so that the agency could conclude its work, so the closure of the Children’s Village was announced several times. First, it was scheduled to be closed in June 1950. This deadline was subsequently moved to December 1950, and then to March 1951. But all along, there was doubt as to whether any of these dates would allow for a satisfactory conclusion to the IRO’s mission in Bad Aibling. The idea of transferring responsibility for the remaining children to a welfare
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organization in Germany was repeatedly contemplated. But there were serious reservations about this. In 1949, Douglas Deane wondered “how Madame Roosevelt and a few other people will feel about this idea of giving back to the Germans their own victims.” But regardless of how much the staff in Bad Aibling might have disapproved of handing over the children to the German authorities, it was the IRO’s shrinking budget that set the agenda. It was ultimately decided that the Children’s Village would continue to be operated under the existing administration for as long as possible, until finances were completely drained. This period, referred to by a representative of the AFSC as the “last upsetting days”, would prove to be more challenging than expected.

Significant changes occurred during the final year of the Bad Aibling mission. It began with Deane’s resignation—“rather reluctantly”—as director of the Children’s Village. He had been offered a promotion to the post of Voluntary Societies Officer with the IRO in Italy and left for his new position in January 1951. Luckily, Deane’s replacement went smoothly: a Belgian national, Ludovic A. Heuvelmans, took over as director of the Children’s Village and remained in this position until it was closed. Heuvelmans had already been on the staff on a temporary basis in
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14 Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Ludovic Heuvelmans (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), 6 January 1951, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932.
However, the remaining records provide us with no additional information on Heuvelmans’ biographical background.

The main challenge confronting the new director was to ensure that the Children’s Village remained fully functional during the winding-down phase, despite the drop in budgetary allocation and staff numbers. In order to finalize the case work for the remaining children, Zone Child Care recommended that no further admissions should be accepted to the Children's Village after 30 June 1951. Again, this deadline was too optimistic, for children continued to pour into Bad Aibling in the summer months. To complicate matters, the number of staff steadily dwindled, despite the fact that the influx of children did not die down as expected. Because it was necessary to “marshal the resources of the IRO”, more and more workers were being discharged. Under these circumstances, it became increasingly difficult, and ultimately impossible, to maintain the standards of the ambitious program which had characterized the Children’s Village at its height. As one AFSC report put it: “A lot of our work now will be how to juggle things around so as to maintain the standards of care […]. The ‘forward’ work of trying

15 Ludovic Heuvelmans (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to N. G. Lanser (Supply and Transport Officer, IRO, US Zone), 4 September 1951, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/857/39/1.
18 Ludovic Heuvelmans (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to P. H. Quallo (Employment Officer, IRO, US Zone), 10 July 1951, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932.
to individualize each child by knowing him better and planning better for him will necessarily fall down a good deal.” Not only was the IRO cutting back on its international staff, but in July 1951, director Heuvelmans noted that the Children’s Village was struggling due to the fact that “many of the key employees” among the DP staff were leaving for emigration. Three months previously, it had already been reported that most of the house parents “could be expected to leave in the next month or two, which is [...] very unsettling, disturbing, and discouraging to the children.” These circumstances possibly explain the far from positive impression gained by Andrew Reeves, a DP, when he began to work as a teacher in the Children’s Village in March 1951. Reeves later referred to it as “a strange establishment” and concluded: “Babysitting with some disjointed exercises or storytelling during each period was the only realistic way of handling classes and eventually I had no choice but to conform to the general pattern.” These recollections make it clear that the educational program was beginning to fall apart.

As of 15 June 1951, the Children’s Village was no longer directly responsible to Area 7, but to IRO Zone Headquarters. The AFSC—which had always been an indispensable anchor for the Bad Aibling mission—would play even more of a crucial role dur-
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ing the final stages of the Children’s Village.\textsuperscript{28} The Quakers agreed to take on additional responsibilities, although they did not approve of the drastic staff cuts the IRO was carrying out, especially in an installation such as the Children’s Village: “Against the realities, we cannot imagine that staff reductions can be made without resultant confusion and consequent delays in the actual processing of children out of this camp. Such a situation would be no economy.”\textsuperscript{29}

At this critical point, AFSC team member Kathleen Regan (who had returned to the US in the summer of 1950)\textsuperscript{30} came back to Bad Aibling to rejoin the staff in the closing period.\textsuperscript{31} As she had previously worked in the Children’s Village for two years, Regan’s return was “received with jubilation on all fronts.”\textsuperscript{32} Her expertise was indeed indispensable, for the remaining AFSC team, consisting of four workers,\textsuperscript{33} had no choice but to take on an even more demanding workload. The Quakers were in charge of the kindergarten, the organization of educational activities, and the coordination of day care in the houses accommodating the babies and toddlers. Furthermore, the AFSC continued to run the \textit{Home Life} program for all age groups, and served as counselors to the few remaining house parents, nurses, teachers, and recreational staff. Regan and her colleagues also continued to provide the all-important liaison between the general administration, the case workers, the medical

\textsuperscript{28} Barbara Graves (AFSC, Central Office for Germany) to Thams Jamieson (Chief, Field Operations, IRO, US Zone), 31 May 1951, p. 2, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/857/39/1.


staff and the supply department. By July 1951, the AFSC team had shrunk to just two members, Regan and Dorothy Park, a new worker who had arrived in May.

As already noted, the number of children in Bad Aibling continued to remain high. In March 1951, the Children’s Village still housed 315 children, a total that dropped to 303 by May, 256 by July, and 174 by September of that year. One of the most pressing issues was the relatively high number of children constituting temporary care cases. In June, 137 children falling within this category were being cared for in Bad Aibling, their future still doubtful, with more arriving every admission day. For years, the temporary care cases had been placed in the Children’s Village indefinitely. De facto, many became permanent cases, for instance when their DP parents were, for whatever reason, found to be unable to look after
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them in the long term. But with the liquidation of the IRO drawing closer, it was clear that a swift solution was needed for those children for whom neither repatriation nor resettlement had ever been considered. These options were now no longer feasible, due to the lack of time and resources.

The IRO decided to go ahead with a plan which the AFSC disapproved of: “Anyway, now, in the big push, the goal is to find German agencies who will accept these 137 or so kids, and turn them over without further responsibility. IRO’s plan doesn’t even call for responsibility for casework involved in making intelligent placements, nor for follow-up with existing parents or relatives. In fact, in the existing plan, IRO relinquishes all responsibility for temporary care children other than ‘a roof and food’ until German agencies are found to take them over.” But protest was to little avail; by July 1951, the Children’s Village was no longer accepting new temporary care cases. The IRO then sent an additional worker to Bad Aibling: Mathilde Perez de Silva would put together a review of the remaining temporary care cases, in preparation for referring them to German agencies. In the end, the IRO was able to hand over all the remaining cases to the German welfare organizations Caritas and Innere Mission. Both would place the children in their own institutions, if possible somewhere close to the parents. What became of these children, following their departure from Bad Aibling, we do not know.

Other challenges confronted the remaining staff and children: new legislation regarding displaced children in the US Zone seriously complicated matters just months before the IRO’s mission came to an end; also during this period, negative reporting in the German press peaked; and finally, finding a new temporary home for the remaining children was the final task to be completed.
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A controversial subject was the removal of displaced children—considered to come under the mandate of the IRO—from German foster families. In many cases, these children were *Lebensborn* victims, or children born to forced laborers in Germany and subsequently placed with foster families by the German officials. The issue of retrieving these children was once again one of conflicting interests, with the US officials caught in the crossfire. According to UNRRA worker Eileen Blackey, the occupying authorities were “oriented primarily to the rehabilitation of Germany”, the implication being that they increasingly acted on behalf of German citizens and as defenders of their rights and interests. For this reason, it was impossible to avoid “conflicts […] as to what decision should be taken on these children”.¹ While the international relief agencies involved were aware of the tremendous suffering that separations could bring,² they were at the same time determined—from their point of view—to rescue foreign children from German homes. After all, these children had been displaced, in one way or another, as the result of German action.³

For a long time, the occupying authorities had been reluctant to establish any binding regulations regarding the removal of such children from their German environment. Officials successfully avoided taking on any definite responsibility, and thus accountability, in this matter.⁴ Speaking of relief workers who struggled with their task of tracing and retrieving displaced children, historian Ben Shephard has concluded that “their real anger was vented at the military authorities who […] were very half-hearted in pushing the German authorities for records and information.”⁵ Up until 1950, the commitment of the occupying authorities was largely limited to either granting or denying the IRO final permission to remove a child from a German family or institution.⁶

---

² Nicholas, Cruel World, p. 510.
⁴ Nicholas, Cruel World, p. 510.
was avoided as much as possible, but sitting on the fence was not an option in the long term. During the final stage of the IRO’s existence, the office of the American High Commissioner for Germany (HICOG) took matters firmly into its own hands. HICOG had succeeded the Office of Military Government, United States (OMGUS), when the Federal Republic of Germany was founded in 1949.7

The legal basis was HICOG Law No. 11: Repatriation and Resettlement of Unaccompanied Displaced Children,8 which became effective on 20 November 1950.9 The law determined that in future, HICOG courts in the US Zone would determine whether displaced children should be repatriated, resettled abroad, or established in Germany, for example by remaining with their German foster family.10 This system was put in place specifically to handle the remaining cases of children for whom final plans were pending.11 The IRO case workers were required to gather detailed information on each child and present the courts with all available documentation.12 In other words, the preliminary requirements remained much as before, as did the potential options for each case. But the transfer of authority to a court, on the basis of a law that was passed especially for this purpose, represented a crucial change of practice—from non-existent regulations and inconsistent action on the part of OMGUS and HICOG to a more controlled approach based on binding legislation. HICOG Law No. 11 aimed to consider the views of all parties with an interest in the potential best solution for each child appearing in court. These included the international agencies entrusted with the task of caring for displaced children, relatives, foster parents, and any German welfare services with a connection to the case at hand.13 Importantly, the wishes of the child itself were also to be taken into account, in so far as it was “sufficiently ma-
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ture to be able to formulate and express a rational opinion and desire as to its custody”. In determining a child’s best interests, the HICOG courts were also required to consider “the existence or absence of a wholesome relationship between the child and its foster parents or other persons, [...] the likelihood that the child will secure an adequate education, [...] the physical and moral welfare of the child including the probability of its obtaining adequate food, clothing, medical care and a desirable home atmosphere, [...] the legal and economic protection of the child” and “the desires of a natural parent, foster parent, or other near relative by consanguinity.”

The cases presented to the HICOG courts were often complex, and decisions inherently difficult, regardless of the legal or moral framework applied. Ultimately, what constituted a child’s best interests—a “contentious concept”, according to historian Diana L. Wolf—remained highly subjective, despite all efforts to define these interests in legal terms. This is also reflected in the opinion of Leo M. Goodman, one of the American judges commissioned and authorized to implement HICOG Law No. 11: “No hard and fast rule can be laid down as to what is in the best interests of the child, but each case must be determined upon its own peculiar facts and circumstances.”

The new court system was by no means met with enthusiasm by all parties of interest. In late 1951, a Soviet delegation called for a press conference in Munich, in the course of which they made it clear that they did not intend to acknowledge the HICOG courts. In response to verdicts denying the repatriation of children, the Soviet representatives accused the Americans of perpetuating crimes carried out under the regime of the Nazis: “The misdeeds of the Fascist tyrants and slaveholders shocked all peoples of the world. Now the American Occupation Forces are following the ways of the Germans in separating children from their parents, taking advantage of the children’s present residence in that part of
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Germany under American control. [...] Neither the now-established court nor any other American court has the right to decide cases that concern the fate of Soviet children. No decision of an American court will be recognized by the Soviet authorities.  

Previous research has linked HICOG Law No. 11 to the growing tensions between the world's rival superpowers. According to Tara Zahra, it “clearly reflected deepening Cold War antagonisms”, because “American occupation authorities were dismayed by the IRO’s favorable stance toward the repatriation of unaccompanied children to the Eastern Bloc.” Growing Cold War resentments are indeed evident in the above statement of the Soviet representatives. And in the case of one child brought before the court, American judge Goodman made it clear what future scenario he preferred for the child appearing before him: “In the United States the child will grow up in a country where the guarantees of individual liberty are not empty phrases, but are living rights which may be enforced by each citizen even against the State. There he will learn the true meaning of personal freedom—freedom from fear and want, freedom of individual enterprise, freedom to express one’s thoughts and freedom to worship one’s God.”

That being said, the same judge, in the case of a girl named Johanna, decided that repatriation to Russia was in fact in the child’s best interests. Goodman conceded the fact that courts “cannot subordinate justice to politics, or permit political consideration to influence their judgements.” Whether or not this was always possible may be debatable, but statements such as the above suggest an awareness that the officials were dealing with human beings, and not pawns in a political game of chess. It is perhaps questionable, then, whether through the passing of HICOG Law No. 11 “American occupation officials put Communism itself on trial in occupied Germany”, as historian Tara Zahra has suggested. When IRO worker Marjorie M. Farley pointed out that the remaining children...
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included “some of the most controversial cases registered”, this had little to do with ideological antagonism, but rather with genuine human tragedies.

The aforementioned girl, Johanna, was born in Krakau in 1943. At the time, the city was under German occupation. Because the mother was ill, the girl was placed in a local German nursery. However, when the battlefront was drawing near during the final stages of the war, all inhabitants of the nursery were evacuated and moved from one transitory stop to another. Johanna ended up in Bavaria, in a children’s home in Regensburg. Through the initiative of UNRRA, she was taken to the children’s center of Aglasterhausen in 1946. Finally, in March 1949, following treatment in a tuberculosis hospital, Johanna arrived in the Children’s Village. Over the course of the same year, her biological mother, who was by now residing in the Russian city of Lwow, and who—tirelessly, but unsuccessfully—had spent years trying to trace her daughter, finally managed to track her down with the help of the IRO. The mother exchanged letters with the administration of the Children’s Village, and then directly with her daughter: “Dear Johanna, I send you a photo of your loving mother. It was taken in the middle of the town. Far behind you see a large building—it is the theater to which we shall go together. […] My dear, beloved Johanna, ask that they send you as soon as possible to your dear mamma; she is longing for you.” Luckily for the mother, Johanna too was enthusiastic about the prospect of family reunification. But because of irregularities and contradictions in the limited documentation available, the HICOG court requested that IRO workers undertake additional investigations, in order to establish beyond doubt that the woman so desperately seeking Johanna’s repatriation was in fact the biological mother. This took a considerable amount of time, but in the end, the mother’s claims were verified. It was decided that Johanna would be repatriated to Soviet Russia.

The political dimension of Johanna’s case was not swept under the table. Goodman: “One aspect of the case has given this Court deep anxiety and concern. As an American court it abhors any ideology which glorifies the police state and forces the individual to
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submerge himself and his personal liberties in the interests of a dictatorship. In order to be reunited with its mother the child must of necessity be returned to a country whose regime cannot be acquitted of unfriendliness to the spirit of democracy.” However, Goodman went on to raise what in his opinion was the decisive question: “Can we properly deny this mother her child, because we condemn the regime under which she lives? If we were to do so, would we not be introducing a highly novel and dangerous principle into the law by permitting a court to bar an individual who is temporarily within its jurisdiction (whether he be minor or adult) from returning to his mother country simply because we are opposed to the political philosophy which prevails therein?” While the Cold War was clearly present during the court proceedings, the rights of the biological parents, at least in this case, came first. Hence, the decision was in line with the principal views held by many international relief workers operating in postwar Europe.

In other instances, however, the court’s verdict was not supported by the IRO. In one session, the case of a 10-year-old Yugoslav boy was heard. In 1941, German troops had swarmed into the small town in which the boy’s family lived. His father, the leader of a local resistance group, was brutally executed by the Nazis. Together with his mother and sister, the boy was forcibly removed from his home. The mother was deported to a concentration camp, while the sister was placed in an Austrian children’s home. The boy, however, was picked up by a German soldier, a member of the execution squad responsible for the father’s death. Together they returned to Germany, where the new foster father took the boy into his family, based near Kassel. After the war, the child’s mother, having survived the concentration camp, successfully located her daughter with whom she was duly reunited. With the help of UNRRA and the IRO, she ultimately also tracked down her son, and with the backing of the Yugoslav government, requested his release from the German family with which the boy had by now been living for several years. The case was brought before the HICOG court. But the IRO’s petition—to have the boy repatriated and thus reunited with his mother—was turned down. The court ruled that the boy would suffer too much if he was removed from his German foster family, and that he should not be returned to
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Yugoslavia. With this verdict, the case was considered closed. The IRO objected strongly to the decision and noted that “it was brought to the Court’s attention that the impact on this little boy’s mind [if he were repatriated] would not be so great as the impact on the mind of a man if he ever did discover that his foster-father was even remotely connected with the violent death of his natural father.” In the face of such decisions, an IRO official predicted that the new court system would “undoubtedly continue to lead to friction” and concluded that “the hearings are potentially explosive.”

Another case brought before the court demonstrates that the judges tapped the full potential of Law 11 by also granting the resettlement of children. A boy thought to have been born in 1938 claimed that his parents had been executed by Russian troops when he was 6 years old. The boy then went into hiding in a forest near Odessa. German forces eventually discovered him, and took the boy with them when they started their retreat towards the end of the war. The boy was brought to Silesia, where he was placed with a German foster family. This family had to flee to the Bavarian town of Dillingen in 1945, where the foster parents handed the boy over to a local children’s home. In 1950, the boy was transferred to the Children’s Village. Efforts to trace any surviving relatives proved unsuccessful. During the court hearing, the boy stated that he was determined not to return to Russia. Instead, he wished to emigrate to the US. The court considered the boy mature enough to produce a qualified and rational opinion: “Observing and talking to the boy it was apparent that the shock of seeing his parents killed by the Russian authorities had had a profound and lasting effect upon him. It had developed in him a hatred and hostility towards the country which had made him an orphan at a tender age and instilled in him a fear of being sent back there.” In the end, it

---

33 Ibid.
35 Goodman, Selected Opinions of Leo M. Goodman, United States Judge for Germany, pp. 111–119.
36 Ibid., p. 112.
was decided that the boy would be resettled in the US, in accordance with his own wishes.\footnote{Ibid., p. 119.}

From the point of view of the workers in Bad Aibling, the court procedure was slow, lengthy and jeopardizing the children’s emotional stability. Since the closure of the Children’s Village was drawing nearer, it was a race against time. Quaker Alice Roberts, frustrated by the delays, wrote angrily in a letter that the “damn Youth Court has so stymied all emigration that it is absolutely criminal.”\footnote{Alice Roberts (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Kathleen Regan (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), 26 February 1951, p. 1, Personal Archives of Christian Höschler.} Four months after \textit{HICOG Law No. 11} had been passed, hearings for individual children had still not commenced.\footnote{Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone) to B. J. Edwards (Accommodation Officer, IRO, US Zone), 12 February 1951, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932.}

In June 1951 the AFSC reported that the judges were “moving the children only at a rate of 4 or 5 at the most per week although over 100 children still must go through the Court.”\footnote{Maria Luisa Gildemeister (Representative, AFSC, US Zone), ‘Monthly Report for May, 1951’, 8 June 1951, p. 2, AFSC Archives, Box: Foreign Service, 1951, Country—Germany (Numbered GOC Letters, Jan. to May) to (Project—Gedat Project), Folder: Country Germany, 1951, Project Centers—Bad Aibling, Munich—D. P. (Displaced Persons) Area.} By the time the hearings finally got under way, the case workers of the Children’s Village had sent a formal letter of complaint to Zone Child Care Officer Ellis, explaining that they were “deeply concerned with the manner in which the HICOG Law No. 11 has drastically affected the future welfare and resettlement of the unaccompanied children.”\footnote{Kristine Eliasson, Loukie Wijsmuller, Bette R. Sprung, Aase Gregersen, and Joan W. Aitken (Child Care Department, Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone), 10 April 1951, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/856/39/1.}

The children, accustomed to confidential relationships with their familiar case workers, were put on public display during the court hearings. This, “in the case of a five year old boy, resulted in serious nightmares and a hysteria, at the point when it was necessary for him to finally depart from the Children’s Village. A fourteen year old girl, having been branded in the court as an illegitimate child, had crying fits on her return to the Village.”\footnote{Ibid.}

A further IRO official similarly aired her feelings: “It is believed that every professional worker would disapprove of the wave of publicity dur-
ing the past four months and would protest against the presence of newspapermen who were permitted to take pictures, make verbatim notes of any part of the proceedings and to interview the children [...] at the first hearings.  

As a result of the subsequent delays in the repatriation and resettlement of the remaining children, the general mood in the Children’s Village deteriorated. The AFSC reported that “the children just sit, and become more and more discouraged, and their behavior becomes more unsettled and destructive.” As the days wore on, the court procedures also had their effect on the Bad Aibling staff: while the number of case workers continued to drop, the number of children assigned to each worker remained high, and in some cases increased. The workload was as intense as ever, and with many of the DP workers emigrating, the children felt “they are being left on a sinking ship.” As frustrations mounted, the Children’s Village put together a special guidance commission, consisting of staff members from all departments. The commission would discuss problematic behavior among the inhabitants of the Children’s Village, then invite to the table those children involved, and try to find a reasonable solution to the most pressing prob-


45 Ludovic Heuvelmans (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Earl Blake Cox (Director, IRO, US Zone, Area 7), 17 April 1951, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932; Marlis Gildemeister (Representative, AFSC, US Zone) to Jessie Poesch (AFSC, Philadelphia), 17 October 1951, p. 1, AFSC Archives, Box: Foreign Service, 1951, Country—Germany (Finance—Statements) to (Numbered GOC Letters, June to Dec.), Folder: Country Germany, Letters # from COG, 1951, July to December.

46 Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone) to Elizabeth Brown (Chief, Welfare Division, IRO, US Zone), 13 April 1951, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/857/39/1.

47 Alice Roberts (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Kathleen Regan (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), 26 February 1951, p. 2, Personal Archives of Christian Höschler.
lems.\textsuperscript{48} According to director Heuvelmans, the aim was “to help the children and not […] punish them systematically”.\textsuperscript{49} In “giving the children the necessary guidance they need in facing their behavior problems”,\textsuperscript{50} the staff, despite the difficult conditions they had to function under during the final months, were still trying to maintain the participatory spirit that had previously prevailed in the Children’s Village.

As the hearings continued into the summer of 1951, things began to improve. The court held sessions more frequently, and the first verdicts were expected to be delivered soon.\textsuperscript{51} The IRO now acknowledged that the judges were trying their best to be “meticulous in handling every case”.\textsuperscript{52} One IRO lawyer noted how they had, over time, grown accustomed to their task: “Some comment, it is believed, should be made concerning the Judges who handled these cases as they did a very great service to the children, and one of the Judges, Leo M. Goodman, handled the bulk of the cases. He was untiring in his effort to obtain the truth and unswerving in his desire to look out for pitfalls which might render the child a disservice. At the start none of the Judges were sure of their ground, but at the close of the operation, as far as IRO was concerned, they had, without exception, become very skillful [sic] in the handling of the cases.”\textsuperscript{53} However, the official IRO history would later paint a

\begin{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{49} Ludovic Heuvelmans (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Earl Blake Cox (Director, IRO, US Zone, Area 7), 17 April 1951, p. 1, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932.


\textsuperscript{52} ‘Minutes of the Child Care Meeting held at Zone Headquarters’, 17 May 1951, p. 3, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/928.

\end{flushleft}
more critical picture, stating that the procedure introduced by
*HICOG Law No. 11* “might have been more ‘legal’, but in practice
could often not avoid delay and harmful publicity of the case which
were contrary to the best interest of the child.”

---

The Children’s Village and the Germans

Historian Jan-Hinnerk Antons has pointed out that “DP camps were true ‘parallel societies’”,¹ while Kristina Dietrich has noted that there was “practically no connection”² between the installations housing displaced children and German society in the aftermath of World War II. Given its location on the outskirts of Bad Aibling, within the confines of the former airbase that was closed off to the outside world, these observations also apply to the Children’s Village. In the words of IRO official Frances Floore, the installation was “completely independent of the town”.³ This was generally true for most DP camps not situated within the heart of German communities.

Despite this, there was occasional contact with the local population,⁴ although encounters between the people of Bad Aibling and the inhabitants of the Children’s Village were infrequent and limited. In one case, a group of children affected by the quarantine measures introduced in April 1949⁵ gathered at the town square in Bad Aibling and staged a public protest.⁶ But the only Germans who really had any insight into life inside the Children’s Village were those who worked there.⁷ Several locals were on the staff, working not only as teachers or as part of the medical department⁸ but also as drivers, kitchen staff or security guards.⁹ On occasion, there was also contact between the minor DPs and the local German children. As far as we know, this mostly occurred within the context of sports events. On one occasion, boys from the Chil-

³ Floore, The Bread of the Oppressed, p. 262.
⁵ See section ‘Unrest in the Village’.
⁶ Gornig, Bad Aibling nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg, p. 131.
⁸ See section ‘Medical and Psychological Support’.
dren’s Village played football against a team of youngsters from Bad Aibling,\textsuperscript{10} and on another occasion a boxing match was organized.\textsuperscript{11} As previously mentioned,\textsuperscript{12} juvenile \textit{Olympics}, in which local children also participated, took place in the summer of 1950. In 1951, during a week of carnival festivities in Bad Aibling, the Children’s Village was invited to participate in the parade, and had its own floats. For a period of two days, the Germans even granted the children exclusive access to the carousel that had been installed on the main festival square.\textsuperscript{13} It is also worth mentioning that the local German newspaper, the \textit{Mangfall-Bote}, published a number of favorable articles about the Children’s Village. These included, for example, a report commending the Children’s Village for its ambitious educational and recreational program.\textsuperscript{14} Similarly, in 1949, several representatives of the town of Bad Aibling were impressed by what they saw after being invited for a tour of the Children’s Village on the occasion of its first birthday.\textsuperscript{15} Another article appearing in the \textit{Mangfall-Bote} reported that the inhabitants of the Children’s Village were engaged in physical education on a daily basis, contending that “the German authorities responsible [for German youth] could well follow this example.”\textsuperscript{16}

But despite friendly contacts of this nature, the relationship between the Children’s Village and the people of Bad Aibling was not without its tensions. These were mainly rooted in the fact that Bad Aibling had been forced to take in a considerable number of Ger-


\textsuperscript{11} Natalie Kent (AFSC, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to unknown, 15 May 1949, p. 5, Personal Archives of Natalie Kempner.

\textsuperscript{12} See section ‘Education and Recreational Activities’.


\textsuperscript{14} ‘Waisenkinder von 22 Nationen warten auf eine neue Heimat. Besuch im Kinderlager der IRO—Sammelpunkt für die Auswanderung nach Australien, Kanada und den USA’, in \textit{Mangfall-Bote}, 8 April 1950, p. 5.


man refugees and expellees after the war came to an end in 1945. In a letter to the local representative of the US authorities, Francis W. Schillig, the Germans expressed their frustration regarding the housing situation: “Before the war 5000 people were living in Bad Aibling, today Bad Aibling has 8144 residents, thereof 2827 refugees and expellees. 540 of this number are still living in hotels, 5–6 persons in one room. Bad Aibling has about 400 families (1000 persons) who are looking for living quarters. [...] As the total release of the air base Aibling will probably not be approved as long as IRO exists, we ask for the release of at least some buildings...”

The fact that the former airbase buildings were not at the disposal of the town’s administration was, under the circumstances, a source of great resentment.

Other events demonstrated that limited knowledge of what went on in the Children’s Village could result in negative rumors and considerable prejudice among the local population. In January 1950, a particularly tragic event occurred: a two-year-old boy in the Children’s Village, while briefly left unsupervised in the bath tub by the nurse on duty, accidentally turned on the hot water, “scolding [sic] both feet”. Despite his immediate transfer to a Munich hospital, and even though the boy temporarily rallied, he “suddenly collapsed [...] and all efforts to revive him failed.” Following this event, the German police began “quizzing nurses” in the Children’s Village. Because a coroner had reached the conclusion that the child’s death had been “caused by negligence”, director Douglas Deane arranged for a meeting between senior Children’s Village staff and German officials, the latter group including a judge and a representative of the Bad Aibling police station. The administration of the Children’s Village was determined not to let the story spiral out of control, and the circumstances leading to the tragic death of the boy were discussed in detail. As a result, local US representative Schillig came to the conclusion that the Children’s Village staff could not be accused of negligence. The German police officer

18 ‘Freigabe des Fliegerhorstes könnte das Wohnungsproblem lösen’, in Mangfall-Bote, 8 April 1950, p. 5.
20 Ibid.
21 Journal of Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), 27 February 1950, Personal Archives of Derrick Deane, Folder: Mr. Deane, Bad Aibling.
“then came in and justified his actions because of many rumors” going around in Bad Aibling. Although the exact nature of these rumors is unknown, the very fact that they led to an investigation on the part of the German police indicates that a certain degree of mistrust existed between the Children’s Village and the population of Bad Aibling.

Moreover, inaccurate information and rumors were not only a local problem. The IRO’s services to displaced children, and its related work in Bad Aibling, also came under strong criticism in other parts of Germany. Letters of complaint were written by various frustrated individuals which reflected a sense of grievance among some sections of the German population, as did negative reporting in the German press. The main bone of contention was the removal of individual children from German families and institutions. In November 1948, Franz Müller of the Catholic welfare organization Caritas sent a complaint to the US military government, accusing the IRO of systematically and illegally kidnapping children: “The German Caritas Federation has recently noticed that the removal of supposedly Polish children by the IRO has reached a frightening level. Recently, such cases have also been reported in Regensburg and Passau. […] In order to justify their actions, the IRO representatives consistently refer to instructions given by the military government. The German Caritas Federation is skeptical as to whether such approval has been granted in each case by the military government. In our opinion, delivering up these young human beings to the Bolshevik East, with all its cruel methods, cannot possibly be in line with the wishes of the military government. This would be a slap in the face to all notions of humanity.”

In a follow-up letter nine days later, Müller reported that he had been in

22 Journal of Douglas Deane (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling), 28 February 1950, Personal Archives of Derrick Deane, Folder: Mr. Deane, Bad Aibling.

touch with the Catholic parish in Prien. He was shocked when he learnt that the IRO was not allowing any local Germans into their children’s center, to which some of the children Müller was referring to had been moved. Clearly assuming that the Germans had every right to enter such centers in their own communities whenever they wished, Müller pleaded with the military government to launch an investigation into the matter.  

He also forwarded his findings to the Bavarian State Government (BSG), which echoed Müller’s concern regarding the legitimacy of removing the children in question. Similarly distrustful of the IRO, a representative of the BSG requested more binding information regarding the procedures and legal foundations of these particular IRO actions.

The military government took a hard line in the face of such complaints and was at pains to assure the German authorities that the IRO was only acting in accordance with regulations: “This Headquarters would like to bring to your attention that representatives in IRO dealing with the problems of locating, identifying, and repatriating unaccompanied Allied nations children, are given credentials by this Headquarters […] showing that they are approved for this work.”

Perhaps sensing that Müller was oblivious of the crimes that the Nazis had committed against foreign children, the US authorities added: “there are currently approximately 20,000 requests for the return of Allied nations children. These lists result from the finding of Nazi documents giving the original name of the child, some information on the displacement, and in some instances the German name given to the child.” While the military government clearly backed the IRO, it was perhaps events such as these which would ultimately convince the US authorities that more precise regulations governing the removal of displaced children from German homes and institutions were required.

Individual citizens joined in the fray. In April 1951, a furious letter arrived at the Children’s Village from a German woman who had read a magazine article reporting on the removal of a displaced child from a German foster family: “Again, thousands of mothers were horrified […] when they heard that children who for eight

24 Franz Müller (Deutscher Caritasverband, Munich) to OMGB, 29 November 1948, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/956.
26 Albert C. Schweizer (Director, Civil Administration Division, OMGB) to Franz Müller (Deutscher Caritasverband, Munich), 13 December 1948, p. 5, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/956.
27 Ibid.
long years had been taken care of well, perfectly well even, by their foster mother, were simply snatched away by the IRO, and placed in a camp.” The woman furthermore raised the question of whether “such action is justified on the basis that [...] German women are not worthy of raising such children? Are the Germans really a second-class people?”

Disgusted at these allegations and the implication of racist discrimination, director Heuvelman’s reaction was blunt: “For me, letters of this kind are reminiscences of a terrible period, and only my waste-paper basket should deal with them.”

In addition to criticism voiced by individuals, the German press also added to the atmosphere of tension by reporting about the fate of individual children brought to Bad Aibling, particularly during the final days of the Children’s Village, which were dominated by the hearings initiated under HICOG Law 11. That the newspaper *Hamburger Abendblatt* inaccurately described the Children’s Village as a “children’s repatriation camp?” was one of the more harmless distortions of truth. That being said, there was at times a certain degree of sympathy towards the activities of the IRO, or rather acknowledgement of the fact that the cases of the remaining children considered to fall within the organization’s mandate were particularly complicated and thus controversial. One German reporter, for example, conceded that “without doubt, the children’s fates we reported about are individual cases in which particular hardship occurred.” At the same time however, it was these very cases which were at the center of German press coverage, at least in the case of tabloid newspapers that were less discerning in their

---


29 Ludovic Heuvelmans (Director, IRO Children’s Village Bad Aibling) to Eleanor Ellis (Child Care Officer, IRO, US Zone), 17 April 1951, Archives Nationales, AJ/43/932.


reports on the Children’s Village than other, more serious publications.\textsuperscript{32} The fates of minor DPs were frequently exploited for the sake of sensationalist reporting, casting an overall shadow on the IRO and its work with displaced children. This is most evident in a series of articles that was published in the German magazine \textit{Badische Illustrierte} in 1951.\textsuperscript{33} It told the stories of children who in most cases had been abandoned by or separated from their biological parents during or after World War II, and subsequently taken in by German families. Now, years after the liberation of Europe, the biological parents unexpectedly reappeared on the scene and wanted their children back. This presented a real dilemma, for the children, most of them very young at the time of their displacement, had no memories of their biological parents nor of their homeland or native language. The IRO and the occupying powers were caught in the crossfire of biological parents and foster families who argued fiercely over the fate of the children involved.

One story caused particular controversy in 1951. It was the story of 6-year-old Karin, born out of wedlock to a Belgian woman employed as a kitchen assistant in Esslingen, Baden-Württemberg, during World War II. Shortly after Karin’s birth in August 1944, the mother decided to hand her daughter over to a German foster family. Karin remained with her new parents for the next six years. In 1950, the biological mother—having returned to Belgium and remarried—decided she wanted her child back. Following an official request, IRO representatives eventually removed Karin from her foster family and brought her to Bad Aibling. But Karin was not happy in the Children’s Village: being separated from her foster family upset the child deeply. The foster parents too were devastat-


ed that Karin had been taken away from them. Taking legal advice, they brought a case against the IRO and the Belgian authorities, determined to have Karin returned to them. Just before Christmas 1951, after more than a year, the foster parents finally won their case. A HICOG court decided, after consideration of all the factors, that Karin should not be repatriated, but returned to her foster family in Esslingen. From the German point of view, this was a sensational outcome which hit the headlines of newspapers across the nation.

While stories such as this one were indeed tragic and complicated, it is important to bear in mind that the *Badische Illustrierte* did not report all the facts. The articles covering the Children’s Village were, for instance, noticeably silent on the question of victims of the *Lebensborn* program, children whose parents had perished in the concentration camps, or children who had been taken to Germany as forced laborers. Journalists therefore, on the whole, painted a distorted picture of a reality that was far more complex than their reporting suggested. The first article in the series published by the *Badische Illustrierte* commenced with a string of provocative questions: “Is the International Refugee Organization (IRO) really ‘abducting children on a legal basis’? Have children been forcefully seized from their mothers’ arms? How did the German authorities react? Are children who have been raised as Germans being deported behind the Iron Curtain? Does national hatred play a role? Are actions ‘in the best interest of the child’ merely a pretext for political goals?”

---

34 Beko, … aber nicht vor einem Notar!

As indicated, other journalists were more discerning. Two reporters writing for the *Münchner Illustrierte*, for example, visited the Children’s Village and came to a more differentiated conclusion regarding the IRO’s activities: “We came across shocking cases. But we also encountered the honest intention of putting things right.”38 They reported on the case of a boy whose mother, a Ukrainian DP, had died during childbirth in Germany after the war. Following this, the father, also a DP, handed the child over to a German foster mother who took care of him for 4 years. In 1951 the boy’s father, who by then had remarried and relocated to England, wanted his son back. While the German foster mother was reluctant to hand the child over after all these years, the *Münchner Illustrierte* pointed out: “The rights of the father come first. The foster-mother has acknowledged this.”39 Serious conflict did not always arise. Lynn Nicholas has noted that many foster-families did in fact hand over their wards of their own accord. In the words of Nicholas: “Not all the situations were so nasty.”40

In some instances children happily left their German foster families, despite initial protest. The aforementioned41 BBC feature entitled *The Greatest Detective Story in History* told the story of a Polish girl who had been traced and brought to Bad Aibling by the IRO. This new inhabitant, who had not wanted to be parted from her German foster family, “made it quite clear that she wasn’t going to stay” in the Children’s Village. However, things changed in the weeks following her admission. According to the BBC, the girl was now amongst girls in her own age group for the first time in her life: she “began to talk to them, to play games, to understand leisure.” Then, for a period of two weeks around Christmas, the girl temporarily left the Children’s Village to visit her German foster family. By the time she returned to Bad Aibling, she had had a complete change of mind. Her “daily existence [living with the German foster family] she said was occupied only with work with no concern for her personal or social needs. She had never questioned the life before, because she had known no other. At the Children’s Village she had come to know other interests, and

40 Nicholas, Cruel World, p. 509.
41 See section ‘Public Relations’.
learned the meaning of recreation.” In the end, the girl remained in Bad Aibling, hoping that she would be able to emigrate to the US.42

---

42 ‘The Greatest Detective Story in History’, 17 May 1950, pp. 41–45, BBC Written Archives Centre.
Leaving for Feldafing

Although the IRO would continue its services to DPs until the end of January 1952,\(^1\) it was no longer possible for the organization to care for the remaining children on the former Bad Aibling airbase. The US military was eager to take over the installation for their own purposes (much to the disappointment of the town of Bad Aibling).\(^2\) During the final days of the Children’s Village, the military dispatched a preparatory unit to Bad Aibling; the handover was imminent and could no longer be postponed. The cost of running an installation as large as the Children’s Village, given the relatively small number of children still there, was considered no longer justifiable. Also, some of the remaining cases were so complicated that a definitive decision might not be reached before the IRO ceased its operations. The children would have to be handed over to a German agency, and the transfer of the Children’s Village to another installation was unavoidable.\(^3\)

It was therefore decided that the Children’s Village and its population, a total of 80 children\(^4\) representing all age groups,\(^5\) would be moved to the town of Feldafing, situated about 20 miles southwest of Munich. Here the IRO had been able to requisition two villas, *Haus Maffei* and *Haus Maria*.\(^6\) There were only two Quakers remaining at this stage, Dottie Park and Jacoba van Schaik, the latter re-

---

placing Kathleen Regan who left Bad Aibling for the final time in October 1951. The Quakers continued to play a crucial role in the administration of the Children’s Village in the days preceding the move and would eventually accompany the children to Feldafing. Together with Marjorie Farley, formerly Casework Supervisor in the Children’s Village and now transferred to an AFSC line, they would take care of the overall administration of the new center.

Just a few days before the move, Heuvelmans sent a formal letter of farewell to the town of Bad Aibling, thanking the mayor and local population for their “support and cooperation” which had been “given at all times”. The letter was published in the Mangfall-Bote on 13 October 1951. On 18 October, the staff and inhabitants of the Children’s Village left Bad Aibling: “The actual transfer of children took place very smoothly. At 1000 hours all of the children over three with their escorts climbed into the two passenger cars of the train standing on the motor pool siding. Amid much amateur photography, they waved goodbye to the crowd assembled, and by 1030 hours were on their way. [...] The train made good time and by 1430 hrs. was in Feldafing. [...] The train was met by a whole fleet of vehicles—IRO trucks and station wagons and several private cars—and the children were taken to their new home. The smaller children under 3 years were brought by ambu-
lance from Aibling […] late in the afternoon.” It was expected that all of the children would eventually be successfully resettled. The staff at Feldafing, which included a limited number of house parents, continued a skeleton program similar to that implemented in Bad Aibling, including the areas of education and medical support. However, due to the reduction in staff, it was not possible to supervise the children to the same extent as in the Children’s Village: “Two of the boys were arrested in the nearby Feldafing DP-camp, one for not having proper identification and the other for pulling a knife on a policeman. They were kept under guard overnight, then the one boy was released to return here, the other was placed in another home.”

While the IRO initially continued as the agency officially in charge, responsibility for the remaining children was, as planned, transferred to a German welfare agency in November 1951, the Paritätischer Wohlfahrtsverband. The casework for the children would still be dealt with by IRO Child Care in Munich. For Eleanor Ellis, responsible for the bulk of the remaining documentation, it was

a race against time, but by March 1952, all of the former Bad Aibling children had been “resettled in some way”.

---

19 Kardorff, Neues Leben für Kinder aus 17 Ländern.
Conclusion

After three turbulent years, the Children’s Village, a unique project in the history of the IRO, was closed down. As a result of the widespread press coverage during the preceding years, its closure hit the headlines of various newspapers worldwide.¹ The IRO’s official press release stated that a total of 2,320 children had passed through the Children’s Village over the three years of its existence; 165 were repatriated, 895 resettled abroad. The remaining 1,260 were children who constituted temporary care cases.² It is significant that the AFSC described the move to Feldafing as “the transition from a village to a children’s center”.³ This can be seen as another indicator that the project set up in Bad Aibling had gone beyond being a consolidated, expanded version of the previous centers housing displaced children.

The complexity of individual cases, and the accompanying dilemmas, as well as the conflicting views of various parties of interest, did not always allow for perfect solutions. The very fact that the children had to be cared for in Bad Aibling in the first place was rooted in historical events beyond the control of those who passionately and tirelessly cared for them in the years after the liberation of Europe. Against this background, it is all too easy to point to the alleged weaknesses of child welfare at the time, which frequently had to be carried out under challenging conditions such as those encountered in Bad Aibling. As Richard B. McKenzie has noted: “Institutional care has always been and will continue to be an imperfect substitute for loving biological, adoptive, or other

substitute parents.” But in the words of Ilana Feldman, “doing something is better than doing nothing”, and Quaker Natalie Kent made a similar point when she noted that the dedicated workers assigned to the Children’s Village were “working full time to make the situation here as pleasant as such an abnormal situation can be”.

It is hoped that this microhistorical study of the Children’s Village was able, in addition to documenting its full history for the first time, to shed some differentiating light on existing research regarding displaced children and their care in the aftermath of World War II. In the Children’s Village, a genuine attempt was made to foster an internationalist spirit among the staff and children. Whether or not such efforts were always successful, it would appear that not all “humanitarian organizations and child welfare activists […] followed the lead of nationalist pedagogues, insisting that children without a clear sense of national identity were doomed to become psychologically and morally defective adults.”

7 The majority of the buildings which used to house the Children’s Village are now part of a new hotel complex (photo taken in 2016).
At the same time, there was an awareness on the part of the Children’s Village staff of the limits of such ambitions.

Whilst familialist ideas, together with individual casework and counselling, clearly informed the mission in Bad Aibling, the concept of community living in a larger setting was also central to the program of the Children’s Village. The philosophy which inspired the work in Bad Aibling was certainly more multifaceted than is indicated by any one-sided views of child welfare in the postwar period. With regard to the possible conflation of motives behind the activities of child welfare workers, historian Sara Fieldston has suggested the following: “Since familial love, individualized attention, and creative play were considered to be conducive both to healthy personality development and to the promotion of democracy, American organizations were able to serve at once as apolitical child savers and as Cold Warriors and modernizers.”\(^8\)

Whether or not one is inclined to agree with this interpretation, the bottom line is that it seems impossible to pinpoint any one humanitarian or political agenda guiding the work of those caring for the inhabitants of the Children’s Village, above and beyond the overriding desire to always act in the best interests of the children. There were, as the aforementioned BBC feature \textit{The Village of Children}\(^9\) concluded, “no easy superficial answers”\(^10\) to the human tragedy encountered in Bad Aibling. Beliefs as to the right course of action varied, not just between, but also, and significantly, within the numerous organizations involved.

The history of the Children’s Village would seem to be very much relevant in our modern day and age, particularly in light of the recent surge in refugee movements around the globe. In the past, war and migration have not been limited to specific periods, but have rather remained a constant in world history.\(^11\) As Marianne Kröger has pointed out, “the current situation of unaccompanied minor refugees is still characterized by hardship in many countries.”\(^12\)

\(^9\) See section ‘Public Relations’.
\(^12\) „Was die aktuelle Dimension betrifft, so ist die derzeitige Situation minderjähriger Flüchtlinge in vielen Staaten nach wie vor von Missständen geprägt.“ Kröger, Kindheit im Exil, p. 17.
Reinisch has suggested that historical precedents “should inform the work they do in the present and in the future.”\textsuperscript{13} And Ilana Feldman has argued that humanitarianism “requires an understanding of developments over time, not simply in policy and legal frameworks, but also of the personal experiences and on-the-ground challenges humanitarian workers have confronted as they have pursued their work.”\textsuperscript{14} In this sense, the story of individual relief workers and the places where they left their mark, such as the Children’s Village in Bad Aibling, has a special value not only in a documentary sense, but also with regard to how challenges of a comparable nature are approached today.\textsuperscript{15}

The findings of this study will hopefully find their way into historiographical discourse and themselves become subject to verification. And indeed, in terms of future research on displaced children in postwar Europe, there is still much to be done. Additional (microhistorical) studies would be highly useful, for instance if they were to explore the history of other centers run by UNRRA and the IRO, or to focus on particular groups of displaced children. These could serve as the basis for comparative studies, which again have the potential to contribute to a more nuanced synthesis. Several projects intended to enrich our knowledge about children in the postwar period are currently in progress. For example, Lynne Taylor is working on a general overview of unaccompanied children in Germany after World War II.\textsuperscript{16} The PhD research of Ina Schulz aims to explore the history of displaced Jewish children and their rehabilitation in the British and American Zones of Germany,\textsuperscript{17} and Anke Kalkbrenner is working on Jewish children in Eastern Germany after 1945.\textsuperscript{18} These efforts are all the more important in view of the fact that a considerable number of child survivors of

\textsuperscript{13} The Reluctant Internationalists. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oZfPNwHQsno>.

\textsuperscript{14} Feldman, The Quaker Way, p. 692.


\textsuperscript{16} Lynne Taylor, Biography. Available at: <https://www.uwaterloo.ca/history/people-profiles/lynnetaylor>.

\textsuperscript{17} Ina Schulz, Forschungsschwerpunkte. Available at: <http://www.zentrum-juedische-studien.de/person/schulz-ina/forschung/>.

the Nazi period are now, decades after the liberation of Europe, only just starting to explore their own stories of displacement in more detail. They are seeking answers to questions which are crucial to the understanding of their past roots and current identity. As former AFSC team member Kathleen Regan put it, “the human stories, the memories, the vanished family members left behind in Europe […] will be scars that […] remain for a lifetime.”

The experience of living, recovering, learning, and working in the Children’s Village had a lasting effect on those who spent time in Bad Aibling. In 1955, former Medical Officer Margaret Hasselmann-Kahlert reported that some of the children she stayed in touch with had sadly failed to build successful new lives. She did however stress that the majority of the children appeared to have adjusted quite well; some of the older ones had already married and were now parents themselves. Personal recollections of the time spent in Bad Aibling differ, although a number of former inhabitants appear to look back on those days with gratitude and a sense almost of nostalgia. In her autobiography, Marie Brandstetter wrote: “Those were some of the best times in my life. I was happy there.” Vic Bojko considers himself “fortunate” to have spent time “in Bad Aibling with some of the most caring individuals that took time out of their lives to help those of us who had no place to go.” Likewise, Vic’s brother Paul remembers: “My memories are good of Bad Aibling and the people who cared for us. After being cold, hungry and very scared during the war and in the forced labor camps I found Bad Aibling a wonderful secure place where I was cared for in body, mind and spirit.” Morris Silver recalls “being there with satisfaction compared to my previous experiences of fear, starvation, abandonment, antisemitism. The volunteers offered us love, caring. We had a very positive relationship.” However, not all had such positive memories. Remembering his Bad Aibling days, Bernard Lefson wrote: “The atmosphere for me was

19 Buser, „Mass detective operation“ im befreiten Deutschland, p. 358.
21 Hasselmann-Kahlert, Das entwurzelte Kind, p. 76.
22 Brandstetter, Mania’s Angel, p. 110.
one of loneliness [...] By loneliness, I mean I was not where I wanted to be and primarily kept to myself. The Village for me was a prison from which I wanted to escape.”

Quaker Natalie Kent reflected in 1952: “When one has lived and worked in a place, known it well, shared in the life of its people, one usually thinks of returning. It is odd, and a little painful then, to remind oneself that there can be no return to Bad Aibling. To go back now would be to go to empty corridors or to U.S. Army barracks. And that, of course, is good. It means the job of resettlement and repatriation that was Bad Aibling’s purpose has been completed.” Nevertheless, a spirit of solidarity, rooted in the mutual experiences of those extraordinary years in Bad Aibling, continued to prevail, even several decades down the road. In 1992, over a dozen members of the Children’s Village staff, including Kathleen (Regan) Burgy, Douglas Deane, Wendy Elliott, Natalie (Kent) Kempner, Joan (Aitken) Metcalfe, and Marjorie Smith put together a travel fund; the money went to one of the former Kalmyk inhabitants who wished to be reunited with his family in Russia after the breakup of the Soviet Union.

Over 40 years after the Children’s Village closed its doors, those who had lived and worked in it still cared for their former wards and their struggle to know their roots.

Episodes such as these are testimonies to the lasting bonds that were created in Bad Aibling. As former inhabitant Richard Kniebe put it: “We’re all members of a unique family. […] There’s nothing like it in the world.”

27 Kent, A. F. S. C. Home Life Unit at Bad Aibling, p. 455.
29 Heyser, A Reunion of Children of the War.
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