It was most of all the top performances of its women that in the course of the last three decades gave the German Democratic Republic, GDR, the prestige of a world-class sports nation and contributed to its international recognition.

The great successes of GDR women athletes seem to disprove the supposition that hierarchical gender arrangements had established themselves in sports, too. However, is it really true that gender played no role whatever in sport, as was repeatedly claimed in the literature as well as in the interviews we carried out with women athletes? Do the achievements of the women athletes accurately reflect the “equal status” of women in the GDR? Did women have an important role to play in the executive bodies of sport?1 Before I go into these questions by examining, among other things, the statistical data available, I would like to give a brief account of the sport system that existed in the GDR. The account is intended to provide a backdrop against which the development of women’s sport can then be described.2

**Basic principles of the GDR sport system**

Unlike sports officials in the Federal Republic of Germany, who for years had – unjustifiably – clung to the myth of “apolitical” sport, the leading functionaries in the German Democratic Republic invested sport with a social and political role from the very beginning. Indeed, physical activity and sport were given a prominent place in the ideology.
and politics of the country’s ruling party, the SED (die Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands), since sport was regarded as a social concern, a precept that was regularly emphasised in programmatic speeches held at party conferences. For one thing, it was hoped, through sport, to mould people into “socialist personae”, and sport was to become an integral part of the “socialist way of life” (Rossade 1987:74ff.; Teichler & Reinartz, 1999:29ff.). For another, in the course of the ‘cold war’ and the confrontation between the systems, sport was given a key political role to play: firstly, in undermining West Germany’s claim to be the sole representative of the German nation; secondly, in gaining international recognition for the GDR; and, thirdly, in increasing the country’s influence in the politics of sports as well as in world politics. Even after the GDR had become one of the world’s leading sports nations in the 1970s, political recognition abroad and the wish to present the system in a good light continued to be decisive factors in the promotion of sport (Cf. Teichler 1999:27-28). At home, too, it was hoped that sporting triumphs would help to strengthen people’s identification not only with the country’s sport idols but also with the system.

Indeed, Günter Erbach, from 1974 to 1989 State Secretary for Physical Culture and Sport, commented after the German reunification: “The social function of competitive sport, particularly top-level elite sport, was seen as a means of strengthening and presenting the political system of socialism and the state through the highest levels of sporting achievement” (Erbach 1996:77).

Sport was shaped by the policies of the SED. As formulated by a team of authors in a volume of “social science teaching materials” published in 1981, “physical culture and sport are firmly embedded in the structure of the developed socialist society. Their development takes place within the overall framework of SED policy as well as in the framework of a sports policy specially designed for this field” (Baur, Spitzer & Telschow 1997:371; see also Rossade 1987; Niese 1997). Erbach describes even more explicitly the power structures prevailing in sport (Erbach 1996:83): “Political and ideological targets, the contents of and directives for the training process and its structure, precise tasks for sports associations, sport science and sports medicine as well as the requirements for apparatus and the technical standards of competitive sport were laid down in special decrees of the politbüro of the Central Committee of the SED in its function as the highest political authority of the GDR.” The figures, institutions and organisations responsible for sport as well as the practice of sport were embedded in these structures, oriented as they were towards the aims and targets formulated by the SED and subjected to the political will of the leadership. The processes of planning and managing were determined at the top and followed a certain pattern: the overarching goals were operationalised and targets were formulated in one-year or five-year plans (not only for competitive sports but also for recreational sports and sport for all). These targets were then used to assess how well the German Gymnastics and Sports Federation (DTSB – Deutscher Turn- und Sportbund) and all its bodies and organisations had, in East German socialist terminology, “fulfilled the plan”. Thus, as Gieseler (1993) has remarked, among others, the principles of the planned economy were applied to sport, too,
and possibly even to sport in particular. The key concepts of the GDR’s sport policy were planning, management and control.\textsuperscript{5}

The control of sport was distributed among various SED committees, in particular the sport branch of the SED’s Central Committee, the State Secretariat for Physical Culture and Sport, a kind of sport ministry, and the DTSB, the executive body.\textsuperscript{6}

Since sport was a key concern of the SED, the objectives of physical culture, sport and tourism were anchored in the GDR’s constitution in 1968, which also laid down the encouragement and promotion of sport by the state and society (\textit{Kleine Enzyklopädie} 1979; 43; see also Ewald 1994:194; Gieseler 1993.). In the same year the “objectives of physical culture and sport”, i.e. the ideological and political precepts behind the practice of sport, were laid down in a resolution passed by the GDR’s Council of State (\textit{Staatsrat}).\textsuperscript{7} Thus, an important stage was reached in the development of sport into a vital subsystem of GDR society – a development which began in 1945, when the defeat of Germany and the collapse of the National Socialist regime made possible a political and social restructuring of society and sport.

**The GDR sport system in the 1980s**

After the Second World War sport in the GDR was effectively restructured following a number of organisational changes. At the same time the significance of and the concentration on top-level competitive sports grew continuously. Typical of this development was the centralisation and politicisation of sport which, partly because it was anchored in the leading committees of the SED, made it a political force (Niese 1997:116). “Sport functioned as part of the system of domination in which the will of the party was imposed entirely” (Niese 1997:115). Whether the long arm of the state and the party had the same access to all areas and all levels and how much scope the players had for individual decision-making is a question which is currently the subject of intense debate (cf. the bibliography in Baur & Braun 2000). In foreign policy the goals were integrating the GDR into international sports bodies, gaining influence in sport politics and favourably representing the socialist system. There is no question today that the “diplomats in tracksuits” were expected to represent the system at home as well as abroad, offering something for people to identify with and furthering the cause of socialism in all possible ways (Erbach, 1996).

The centralised control and management of sport through the SED, the state and the DTSB, as analysed by Baur, Spitzer and Telschow (1997) on the basis of systems theory, greatly contributed to the GDR’s success in competitive sports since, although the subsystem of sport had diversified, it was still embedded at the same time in the overall system as a result of counter-diversification processes and centralised supervision and control. Therefore, the sources of friction that were to be found in the West German sport system (where, for example, conflicts between sports training and school work had to be individually solved)
did not exist in the GDR “officially”. On the other hand, concealed behind the seemingly monolithic structure of sport were numerous complex disputes and power struggles, for example between the DTSB, which fought for an increasing amount and range of training, and the Ministry of Education, which was not always willing to give in to these demands (see, for example, Fetzer 1999).

Apart from competitive sport and its “basis”, i.e. the “sport of the younger generation”, as well as “pre-military and military exercising”, sport in the GDR was divided into two large categories: firstly, the “training, coaching and competition sector” at the sport-for-all (Breitensport) level and, secondly, “leisure and recreational physical activities” (Freizeit- und Erhouungssport), which were not attached to the traditional competition system. By providing recreational physical activities, the state endeavoured to motivate sections of the population that had so far abstained from physical activity to take up a sport and, in addition, to ensure continuity, regularity and achievement-orientation in sporting activities. Both sport-for-all and recreational physical activities were run by the sports groups (SG – Sportgemeinschaften) of companies or state institutions while elite sports were in the hands of children’s and youth sport schools and sports clubs. In the 1980s there were around 30 of these sport clubs in the GDR, in which roughly 11,000 athletes were supervised by about 1,900 coaches. They were the breeding grounds for the GDR’s elite sports and athletes were only admitted to them after a lengthy selection process, intensive training and fulfilment of the required standards of athletic performance.

Because of their links with funding organisations the sports groups had access to a great many resources with regard to equipment and staff. As a number of case studies have revealed, the affiliation of sports to the workplace had numerous other effects: it amalgamated the work sphere with people’s private lives, it forged bonds between groups of workers and it helped, among other things, to make ‘work brigades’ seem like closed societies or brotherhoods.

The centre of the GDR sport system was unquestionably occupied by top-level competitive sport, and even sport for all and physical education at school were dominated by traditional sport disciplines as well as competitive sports. Physical activities which combined different sports, which were oriented to a target group and in which the focus was on recreation and having fun were of minor importance in comparison. Sport was more or less synonymous with achievement (Baur, Spitzer & Telschow, 1997). In spite of its regulatory nature and its centralised and hierarchic structures, the GDR’s state-controlled sport system left a small amount of scope for interpreting, redefining and using state directives to suit one’s own purposes. Especially recreational and leisure physical activities provided opportunities for individual patterns of interpretation: caught up between authoritarian rule and everyday life and between being instrumentalised and existing in a world of their own, they proved to be a way “of being able to circumvent sporting practice and the formal structures if organised sport” (Hinsching 1998:29).
Numerous questions concerning women’s sport are raised by this brief account of the development of sport in the GDR. What effects did the objectives and the organisation of sport have on women and their participation in sporting activities? Did the affiliation of sport for all to the workplace mean that women were given the choice of a wide range of attractive sports? How great were the obstacles for women desiring access to sports? How was it possible to combine sporting activities with the multiple duties expected of women mentioned above? How were the gender arrangements and hierarchies in the organizations and institutions? Here I try to answer the question how women could and did influence the sport system and the sport activities in the GDR.

**Women and their (lack of) power in sport**

Studies of women’s politics and women’s roles in the GDR have revealed that, although opportunities in life differed according to one’s gender, the relevance of the differences between the sexes and the existence of gender discrimination were always denied (Dölling, 1990; Nickel, 1993; Diemer, 1994; Schwarz, 1997). Gender was not a category that needed any particular attention or that needed to be explained at any great length. As shown in East German writing on women’s sport, the question of the opportunities open to women in sport as well as the obstacles they met was regarded as a minor issue and consequently addressed in relatively few studies or articles. In keeping with the claim that the equality of the sexes had been achieved because of the large number of women in paid employment, the predominant view was that, in sport too, men and women had equal opportunities (even among many of the women we interviewed in the context of a project on women and sport in the GDR).

Whether equality exists or not can be seen above all in the distribution of power. Factors which can be considered to be prerequisites as well as consequences of the gender arrangements prevailing in sport include the participation of men and women in decision-making processes. Who walked the corridors of power in the field of sport? In this article I present a large amount of information and statistical data which can prove that the powerful ideology of gender equality in the GDR was an illusion.

An analysis of the various sport institutions and organisations as well as their executive bodies clearly reveals that women were not adequately represented in leading managerial positions. It is not possible to draw a complete picture but the numerous individual data can nevertheless be put together to give a good impression of who had the say in East German sports. The apex of the hierarchy was made up exclusively of men. The chairman of the State Committee or the State Secretariat for Physical Culture and Sport, for example, which was invested with the functions and tasks of a “sports ministry”, was invariably a man (Herbst, Ranke & Winkler, 1994:1007). Similarly, the presidents of the DTSB were exclusively male: Rudi Reichert (1957-1961), Manfred Ewald (1961-1988), Klaus Eichler (1988-1989) and Manfred Kilian (1990). Before 1990 the vice-presidents were also men,
with one small exception: the office was held by a woman in the one year from 1988 to 1989.

The DTSB’s leadership teams

Slightly larger ratios of women are to be found at the next level of management. In 1957, the year of the DTSB’s founding, its 27-member Executive Committee included two women (SAPMO Berlin, DY 12 /501, Bl. 6-7). In 1961, 16 women belonged to its National Council (Bundesvorstand) consisting of 158 members (i.e. 19.7%) while only three women were included in the Potsdam Regional Council (i.e. 5.2% of its members).  

In the early 1970s, too, women were greatly underrepresented in the highest bodies of sports organisations even though they may have made up over 20% of their regional management staff (cf. Bierstedt/Gummel 1976, p. 846). The small numbers of women officials in the main committees of the DTSB is documented in numerous other examples, which also clearly show that, with regard to men’s domination in the decision-making bodies of sport, little had changed by the end of the 1970s. In 1978, for example, there were only 23 women among the 150 members of the National Council (Bundesvorstand) (i.e. 15.3%).

The leading positions in the individual sports associations and at the level of the sports groups (Sportgemeinschaften)

A similar picture was to be found in the higher echelons of the individual sports associations. Detailed information is available on the composition of 31 out of the 32 East German sports associations which were active in 1961.  

Not one of the 31 associations was headed by a woman and in only three associations was the post of secretary-general filled by a woman. At the level of vice-president the ratio of men to women was 82:2, with only the fencing and the athletic associations entrusting a woman with this position. Out of a total of 416 executive committee members only 47 were women (11.3%). For the year 1978 figures on the distribution of men and women in leading committees are available for only 14 associations. Not one of these associations was presided over by a woman and only in two of them (badminton and German fistball (Faustball)) were the vice-presidents women. The book “How the GDR Functioned” (“So funktionierte die DDR”), published in 1994, lists 43 sports associations along with the names of all their presidents since the DTSB was founded in 1958. According to this list not a single woman succeeded in becoming president of an East German sports association (Herbst, Ranke & Winkler 1994:238ff.).

No information is currently available about the composition of the leadership of the sports groups on the local level (Sportgemeinschaften); however, a study undertaken in the 1990s on voluntary work in the new federal states of Germany (i.e. the former GDR) allows us to
make certain inferences about the situation in East Germany before 1989. The study, a representative survey of sports club members, revealed that women were greatly underrepresented in the leadership of East German sports clubs. 75% of all key positions were filled by men (cf. Baur & Braun 2000). Since the majority of the officials of sports clubs (which had often grown out of sports groups of the GDR (Sportgemeinschaften) had worked in a voluntary capacity before 1989, it can be assumed that there was a continuity of club leadership and thus of male domination in the decision-making bodies of GDR sports groups.

**Action and reaction**

In the DTSB itself the lack of women in the leadership and management of sport was never a subject of debate. In the same way as it was ‘natural’ and taken for granted that men made the decisions in politics, the party and the state, it never occurred to people that women were missing from the key positions in the DTSB. And if the domination of men was ever criticised, then the criticism came from below. At the inaugural meeting of the founding committee of the DTSB on 13th April 1957, for example, a complaint was made that women were “virtually non-existent” in the higher echelons of the sports associations and called on the DTSB leadership to “make efforts to recruit women for administrative posts”. At the founding session of the DTSB one of the delegates even commented: “At today’s meeting, and also in the proposals put forward by the National Council (Bundesvorstand), I am disappointed that women have not been given greater consideration – almost all the delegates are men! If one third of all members are women, then it is necessary to involve women more in our work than we have done up to now.” In 1970 Ingeburg Wonneberger, a scientist at the sport university of the GDR, the German College for Body Culture (Deutsche Hochschule für Körperkultur, DHfK) who was active in the promotion of women’s sport, wrote in the “Calendar Leaves” printed in the “German Sport Echo” magazine: “There are too few women by far in executive posts in the field of sport. Where do you find women as BSG leaders or DTSB district chairpersons?” (7th March 1970, p. 3). Demands like these were the exception; and when they were raised, they were considered irrelevant and were of no consequence.

Random searches in the files of the DTSB and especially the systematic processing of the files on cadre work in the DTSB from 1967 to 1986 have revealed that, although the absence of women in leading positions was a known fact, it was not regarded as a serious problem. On several occasions it was tersely stated that the number of women in management positions was to be increased.
From the State Secretariat for Physical Culture to sports medicine – the relative numbers of men and women in executive positions

In other sports bodies, too, women in executive positions were rare exceptions. The State Secretariat for Physical Culture and Sport, which had replaced the state Committee on Physical Culture and Sport in 1970 and which, being accountable to the GDR’s Council of State, was responsible for “planning and supervising the tasks of the state in the area of physical culture and sport and implementing the state’s directives”, was headed by three men, the state secretary and his two deputies. At the head of just one of its numerous sections was a woman, at least in the early 1980s. Other executive bodies, too, for example the Scientific Council of the State Secretariat for Physical Culture and Sport, which had four members, were entirely made up of men. Among the 16 members of the influential Commission on Sports Performance, instigated by the DTSB president, Manfred Ewald, there was not a single woman. The directors of the Sports Medicine Service and the department heads of the Central Institute for Sports Medicine Services as well as the chairman of the executive board of the Society for Sport and Technology were exclusively male ever since these organisations were founded (Herbst, Ranke & Winkler 1994). The GDR, finally, was represented in the IOC by two men and the executive board of East Germany’s National Olympic Committee (with 11 members and 5 honorary members) was exclusively a men’s affair (Krebs, 1994:11).

Power and influence in sport are not only linked to membership of the decision-making bodies of sports organisations; important roles are also played by such groups as sport scientists, coaches and journalists. However, there is scarcely any information available on the relative numbers of men and women employed in these particular areas. An analysis of East Germany’s “sport science elite” carried out in the Federal Republic of Germany revealed that women were greatly underrepresented in both East and West Germany among sport scientists with a doctorate degree. Only 9% of the 181 scientists who had gained a doctoral degree from East Germany’s sport university DHfK up to the year 1980 were women (Weißpfennig 1983:85). Small wonder, then, that all the heads of the Sport Science departments of the GDR’s universities and colleges of higher education were male professors or that not a single woman was appointed to the 14-member editorial committee of the “Theory and Practice of Physical Culture” magazine. Nevertheless, the “Secretary General” of the Scientific Advisory Board of the State Secretary for Physical Culture was a woman and, working under two leading (male) editors, the “Physical Culture” magazine employed a woman as one of its two sub-editors. By contrast, the editorial staff of the “German Sports Echo” magazine was made up entirely of men.

There is no systematic data on women in coaching positions. Since successful top-level athletes were often rewarded with careers in sport and since a great number of coaches were needed for the GDR’s sport system, it must be assumed that there were good employment prospects for women coaches in East Germany. This is not in keeping, however, with the
account given by Dagmar Hase, a world-class swimmer, who reported: “For the first two years I had a woman coach but after that I only had men as coaches. In coaching you mostly have men. For a woman, perhaps one with a family … standing around in the baths all the time … the working hours are sometimes very long. I can’t really imagine it for a woman. Perhaps it’s easier for a man” (quoted in Szepanski, 1995:308).

The marginal role that women played in the higher echelons of sport is also reflected in the honours and awards that were presented by the state such as the Fatherland Award (Vaterländischer Orden) or the GDR Service Medal (Verdienstmedaille der DDR). This is clearly documented in the DTSB’s award lists which are available for the years 1961 – 1975. In 1964, for example, 15 coaches and sports officials received the Fatherland Award, all of them men. In 1968, in the wake of the summer Olympics, the names of 40 individuals were put forward to receive the GDR Service Medal; just one of them was a woman (SAPMO Berlin, DY 12/3074). The list of honours awarded in 1987 also largely contains the names of men, with 22 men and a single woman receiving the Friedrich-Ludwig-Jahn Medal (SAPMO Berlin, DY 12/3073). Without wanting to overestimate the significance of such honours, the actual practice of awarding medals and the relative numbers of men and women who received them clearly point to the marginal role played by women in sport outside the stadium. Those who ‘pulled the strings’ behind the scenes were almost exclusively men.

Summary

Taking all things into consideration, there is only one way of interpreting the lists of high offices, posts and honours: women were greatly underrepresented in the decision-making bodies of organised sport. As mentioned above, Bierstadt und Gummel (1976:846) referred to the fact that “in the regional management of the sports organisations 20% of the elected members were girls and women. This ensures that in sport the interests and wishes of women are always given suitable consideration”. Apparently, it was not a problem for them that at the very top of organised sport men were completely on their own and that even at the lower levels of management men dominated the executive committees, forming 80% of their membership.

Reunification failed to change the hierarchical structure of organised sport, at least as far as gender ratios are concerned. At the DTSB’s Special Assembly in March, 1990 still only 9% of the 1,067 delegates were women (Teichler/Reinartz 1999:465). Thus, in spite of the restructuring of sport, the underrepresentation of women continued to exist at the higher levels of the sports associations. According to an analysis of organised sport in the federal state of Brandenburg carried out in the early 1990s, only two women held seats in the 11-member presiding committee of the Regional Sports Federation and the percentage of women in the leading committees of the individual sports associations amounted merely to roughly 12%. Of the 54 women who held seats in the decision-making bodies of the sports
associations 14 were treasurers, eight were responsible for women’s affairs and five worked as youth managers.23

Thus, the balance of power between the sexes in society and sport is not a problem which is specific to the GDR. Nevertheless, one is entitled to ask how such a glaring discrepancy between claim and reality could come about in a society which had so ostentatiously taken up the cause of gender equality.

This description of the gender arrangements in sport organizations and institutions raises the issue of the reasons. Why did men dominate the decision-making committees in sport? Why did women accept this situation? Why was the marginalisation of women looked upon self evident and “natural”? The discussion of the reasons behind the gender hierarchy in the GDR inside and outside of sport must be the topic of another article.
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It is impossible here to draw a comparison with the development and the politics of sport in the Federal Republic of Germany, even though developments in both German states strongly influenced each other and numerous decisions taken in the GDR were reactions to events and processes taking place in inner-German and/or world politics. Nor can any consideration be given to inner-German sports relations and disputes (see, for example, Hozweisig 1981, Kühnst 1982 and also Rossade 1987, who has analysed the programmatic writings of the state and party). On the development of sport from the GDR’s perspective, see also the Kleine Enzyklopädie 1960; 1979 or the Illustrierte Geschichte der Körperkultur (Illustrated History of Physical Culture) published by an authors’ collective (Eichel et al. 1983). On the functioning of the sport system and the individual organisations, see the book So funktionierte die DDR (How the GDR Functioned), Herbst/Ranke/Winkler 1994).

See also the documents compiled by Rossade 1987, especially the passages related to sports in the key addresses and the minutes of each of the party conferences; see also most recently Teichler/Reinartz 1999, where the “leading role” of the party is documented by means of the resolutions on sport passed by the politburo. These resolutions consisted of directives, targets, procedures and implementation measures. See also Krebs 1994.

The sport system and political power in the GDR are also dealt with in detail by Krebs (1994).

The whole development of the DTSB was to take place “according to the schedule based on sport plans” which was to be passed at the Gymnastics and Sport Congress held every four years; cf. the quotations in Gieseler 1993, p. 118.

Sport policy and the ideological and political guidelines of the SED leadership related to it is laid down, for example, in a resolution of the GDR’s Council of State from 1968 on the “Tasks of Physical Culture and Sport”, cf. Rossade 1987, p. 9. On the organisation of sport see most recently Teichler/Reinartz 1999.

Extracts of the Council of State resolution are reproduced as Document 97 in the “Study Materials for Sport Science. Extracts of Sources on East German Sport History”, published in hectographed form by Frost/Heise/Melchert in 1990. In this resolution the positive effects of sport were called to mind numerous promises given for the “focused development of physical culture and sport”. See also Gieseler 1993.

See the diagram in G. Wonneberger 1982, p. 267. Up until the 1960s the term “people’s sports” (Volkssport) was also common, and largely used as a synonym of “mass sports”. From the 1960s onwards it was replaced by “recreational and leisure sports”. This can be seen as a reaction to the social developments and changes which took place in the 1960s and 70s and the greater significance given to leisure time resulting from these changes; cf. Hinsching 1998; Hennig 1998. The question of the extent to which the lofty gaols of the FES ?? were achieved cannot be gone into here; cf. Hinsching 1998.

There are numerous references to this question in this volume.

"Recreational and leisure sports” were especially encouraged by the “Joint Sports Programme” agreed upon in 1970 by the DTSB and the GDR’s trade unions (the FDGB – Freier Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund), and later also by the East German youth organisation (the FDJ – Freie Deutsche Jugend). In this way the company sports groups (BSG – Betriebssportgemeinschaften) could also be involved in the organisation of recreational sports. Numerous campaigns, tests and fitness programmes were brought into being as “people’s sports contests” and company sports festivals; cf. Hennig 1998.

On the sports clubs in the GDR see, for example, Teichler/Reinartz 1999, pp. 187ff. With few exceptions several sports were practised in sports clubs. Four sports clubs were located in Berlin and the rest in other large cities of East Germany. The case study undertaken by Anke Delow in Teichler/Reinartz 1999, pp. 217ff (in which she presents TSC Berlin) provides a good account of the running of a sport club.

The DTSB’s National Council (Bundesvorstand) was made up of a total of 158 members, the Potsdam Regional Council of 58 members (SAPMO Berlin, DY 30/IV 2/18/8, Bl. 171 (reverse) [probably 1961]) (ibid., Bl. 216). According to another source the DTSB’s National Council (Bundesvorstand) only included 11 women (i.e. 8.5%) (SAPMO: DY 12/896, Files of the DTSB’s National Council (Bundesvorstand) / Office of the Executive Committee).

On the representation of women in various bodies of the DTSB as per 22. 5. 1978, see SAPMO: DY 12/629 (from DTSB, National Council / Office of the Executive Committee). See, for example the Heads of Children and Youth Sport Schools (May 1978): Total: 12 persons, including one woman (Office of the DTSB Executive Committee, typed list dated 22. 5. 1978, no page numbers).

In 1961 there were 32 individual sports associations altogether. No information was available about one of them.

This is a representative survey of sports club members in eastern Germany.
15 This comment was made by Elfriede Fichtner, who described herself as a “representative of women, who are unfortunately only represented here to a very small degree” (SAPMO Berlin, DY 12, 501, Bl. 38-40).

16 A comment made by Erich Röchler, a delegate at the DTSB’s founding conference on 27/28. 4. 1957 in Berlin: (SAPMO Berlin, DY 12/501, 19). See also the criticism of the scant participation of women “in leadership and management positions” in the Potsdam district of the DTSB. The “involvement of women in the previous period” was described as “completely inadequate” Only three women, it was reported, were among the 58 members (SAPMO Berlin, DY 30/IV 2/18/8, Bl. 171 (reverse) [probably 1961] ) (ibid., Bl. 216).

17 Sport groups connected with the working places (Betriebssportgemeinschaften).

18 See, for example, SAPMO Berlin, DY 30/IV 2/18/8, Bl. 171 (reverse): demand for increased provision of sports for women in the works sport groups and in other sports groups and criticism of the DTSB leadership in the district [of Potsdam – the author], which had “underestimated the development of women’s sport”.


20 Cf. a hectographed manuscript dated 1981, published by Gesamtdeutsches Institut.

21 His findings are largely based on an analysis of the contents of the CVs appended to the doctoral degrees.

22 Cf. the hectographed manuscript which resembles a “Who’s Who” of GDR sport.