

Germany

Wolfgang Trede

May 12, 2008

1 The Foundation of the National Section

This part of the history of the *IGfH*, the FICE Section of the Federal Republic of Germany, (1961-2001) comes from Trede (2001) with some additions reflecting material discovered in the course of compiling the history of FICE.

Forty years ago the West German National Section of FICE was founded by teachers, childcare workers and others interested in international exchanges in the area of childcare. The *Fédération Internationale des Communautés d'Enfants* itself came out of the work of UNESCO in 1948 to create a framework for European exchanges between the staff of children's villages and homes with the aim of professionalising the extra-familial care of war-damaged and orphaned children in the aftermath of the Second World War.

Until 1969 the international name remained unchanged; the *FICE-Sektion der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* appears rather unwieldy in translation — ‘you could imagine almost anything under “children’s community”’ Vogt (1987, p5 My translation); the founders, moreover, felt the term ‘community’ had been discredited by the Nazis. With a new constitution and infrastructure strengthened through the *Deutschen Paritätischen Wohlfahrtsverband* the Association gave itself then in April 1969 the name *Internationale Gesellschaft für Heimerziehung*, together with the abbreviation *IGfH*. Finally, in April 1992 the name was changed to *Internationale Gesellschaft für erzieherische Hilfen*¹

1.1 1956–1969: from a small international group of interested staff to a reforming association

The first contact between FICE and a German institution, *Odenwaldschule*, was initiated in the early 1950s by Ernest Jouhy. Jouhy was at the time head of a Jewish home for troubled young people in France and was commissioned by UNESCO to carry out a report in seven countries on the situation of child war victims in homes. Through this commission Jouhy came for the first time into the Federal Republic and found in *Odenwaldschule* (which because of its founder Paul Geheeb had been well known in international educational reform circles) the basis for a first FICE cell already in place. As head of the FICE International Camp at Sanem in Luxembourg in 1950 he welcomed a group of young people from *Odenwaldschule* and at the end they were one of three

¹There is further information on the history of FICE and the *IGfH* in Knöpfel Nobs (1992) and Issues 4–5/1987 of *Materialien zur Heimerziehung*; I am grateful to Anne Frommann, Gerhard Haag, Heinrich Kupffer und Eberhard Mannschatz for their information.

communities who agreed to be involved in the organisation of the camp the following year (General Assembly, 1950; Commission E: Commission des plans du Camp international d'Enfants de 1951, 1950). In the end, because FICE had failed to find a suitable host in Austria, Kurt Zier, who had been appointed head of *Odenwaldschule* early in 1951, arranged for the 1951 camp to be held at *Odenwaldschule*, once again under Ernest Jouhy's direction. The connection of *Odenwaldschule* to FICE was strengthened by the fact that Ernest Jouhy became a teacher at *Odenwaldschule* in 1952. So it came about that in 1956 the first FICE international conference in Germany took place at *Odenwaldschule*.

After this a provisional founding committee was created there which led to the formal foundation of a West German National Section only at the start of the 1960s, because the FICE activists in these early days were almost entirely teachers at *Odenwaldschule* and they found it difficult to represent German childcare formally so to speak on the international stage, in addition to which as a regional children's home their establishment was rather untypical of the German childcare scene. However, as members of the provisional committee staff from *Odenwaldschule* regularly took part in the international meetings of FICE in the succeeding years.

For the date recorded in paragraph 1 of the statutes for the foundation of the Association — 'The association was founded on the 26 June 1961' — there is no evidence and the effective start of a German (BD) National Section was March 1962. From a conversation with the first Secretary of the organisation, Dr Heinrich Kupffer, a former teacher at *Odenwaldschule*, Wolfgang Trede understands that, in order to prepare for the formal foundation of the National Section and to have a structure ready to present when they brought interested parties together, the provisional committee registered the statutes in 1961.

In that year more homes, children's villages and individuals over and above *Odenwaldschule* were recruited to membership. An important motivation for the foundation of a formal National Section had to be that there had already been a 'proper' FICE National Section for the DDR since the FICE Congress in 1956 in Heppenheim, which had as important Presidents first Prof. Dahlmann of Humboldt-University Berlin and then from 1966 Prof. Mannschatz, representing so to speak as the official agency abroad of the East German Youth Service². One would obviously not leave this section alone in the field at an international level.

On 31 March 1962 Dr Hannah Vogt, a journalist and consultant in political education to the State of Hesse, was chosen as the first President while Dr Heinrich Kupffer, as already mentioned, as founding Secretary. The main responsibility of the new President in the succeeding years would be, as Vogt (1987) remembers, to ensure in the international gatherings that took place for the most part with an annual frequency the largest possible West German delegation. Until 1969 the FICE Germany (BD) National Section was no more (and no less) than a small circle of child care workers, in total between 40 and 60 persons, who were interested in international exchanges. The internal issues of West German youth care played no part in the West German FICE National Section; neither the Youth Welfare Act which came into force in 1961 nor the constitutional law debate about providers in Youth Welfare nor the profes-

²Prof. Mannschatz recalls that both the East and West German FICE national sections were founded at the same time in the same place, namely in 1956 in Heppenheim; this would definitely have been unusual at that time for UNESCO organisations.

sional debates about the state of residential care which began to appear around 1965/66 would be picked up.

1.1.1 Learning about residential care abroad

Not surprisingly the eleven issues of *Mitteilungsblattes der FICE-Sektion Bundesrepublik Deutschland* which between 1962 and 1968 record the written communications between members contain above all reports of international meetings. What comes out of the written documentation is that at that time it was above all simply exciting (once again) to have contact with people ‘overseas.’ Besides, since from the very beginning western and eastern Europe had been represented in FICE, FICE meetings for staff in the west as well as in the east offered unique opportunities to look at the other side of the iron curtain.

The themes addressed until the mid-1960s concentrate relatively narrowly on childcare issues relating to work in children’s communities. There are numerous debates about the concept of the SOS Children’s Village from, one might say, a constructively critical perspective. On the one hand the SOS Children’s Villages belong to the ‘family’ of children’s communities but on the other hand reducing them to a single parent family and sentimentalising the idea of a children’s village was heavily criticised.

1.1.2 Sound professionalism, weak organisation

The FICE international conferences and exchanges were as professionally interesting and personally valuable as the organisation of the association was weak — at the international but even more at the national level. In the hope of anchoring the weak FICE Germany (BD) more firmly within the network of West German associations and giving it a full time organisation, in 1967 Hannah Vogt first knocked on the door of the AFET (*Allgemeinen Fürsorgeerziehungstag*, now: *Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Erziehungshilfe*) in Hannover, especially as contact already existed with their President, Pastor Dr Johannes Wolff, and AFET had been a corporate member of FICE Germany (BD) since 1965.

Sadly the negotiations did not have the desired outcome. However, successful talks with the *Deutschen Paritätischen Wohlfahrtsverband* in Frankfurt begin in the Spring of 1968. By August 1968 discussions had taken place between the members of the Boards of FICE and of DPWV. They agreed that the DPWV would provide the secretariat for FICE Germany (BD) and draw up the outline of a constitution for a ‘new’ FICE National Section housed within the DPWV. There then had to be two General Assemblies to bring the reform project to a conclusion in April 1969: out of the *FICE-Sektion Bundesrepublik Deutschland* came the *Internationale Gesellschaft für Heimerziehung (IGfH)*.

Giving the association a German name and extending its scope from ‘children’s communities’ to the whole of childcare must be seen as integral to the process. The debates about the new constitution had already shown that, after the turbulent years of 1968–1969, the members were no longer going to be stolid representatives of West German residential child care but the basis for a reforming association stressing professionalisation and change in German youth care. ‘The membership wanted in the Statutes to stress that they wanted it to be clear that meaningful work in residential child care had to be aimed at reform’,

is what the minutes of the General Assembly of 30 November 1968 drawn up by Martin Bonhoeffer meant (Frommann and Becker, 1996).

1.2 1969–1982: In the *Home campaigns* and youth welfare reform years the *IGfH* becomes a significant professional organisation

1.2.1 The *Home campaigns* of 1969 as the start of more fundamental reform of Youth Welfare

The *Home campaigns* of 1969 would rightly be characterised as a break in the history of residential child care. Within a short time the political actions of the ‘extraparliamentary opposition’ against the repressive and inhuman practices in the ‘welfare prisons’ and the consequent public debate brought changes which still bring shivers to parts of the professional world: the institutional clothing would be abolished along with the roll call, the detention cell would no longer be used and there would no longer be fines taken from pocket money or the censoring of the mail. Moreover, with the flight of inmates from isolated homes into mostly student run ‘Young people’s communities’ in Frankfurt and other cities new forms of living came into being based on social pedagogical principles. The subsequent period of reform lasted until around 1982 (Arbeitsgruppe Heimreform, 2000) resulting in

- significant professionalisation of the field
- the democratisation of daily living in care settings and
- a distinction between what was on offer — inside and outside of residential care.

With one blow a small number of specifically political actions of 1969–1970 had broken the reform bottleneck, progressive staff in the homes and also a lot of youth authorities with committed staff could ‘at last’ realise their ideas for the reform of youth care, in which young people and their needs and not the state interest in law and order would be central to their work.

1.2.2 The *IGfH* becomes a reform association with new visions

It can perhaps be counted as a fortunate stroke of good luck that right at the time of a dramatic turning point in the politics of youth care and in the very place, the centre of the *Home campaigns* of the time, Frankfurt am Main, the FICE National Section was provided as the *Internationale Gesellschaft für Heimerziehung* with a new organisation and a reinforced infrastructure. At the first General Assembly on 26 April 1969 Dr Albert Scholl, who had accepted an important role in the transition from the ‘old’ FICE to the ‘new’ *IGfH*, was chosen as President. Because of his many roles — he was head of the Baden-Württemberg *Wohlfahrtswerks* in Stuttgart, as well as President of the *Albert-Schweitzer-Kinderdorfwerks*, Editor of *Blätter der Wohlfahrtspflege* and equally active on the Boards of the FICE National Section and the *Deutschen Paritätischen Wohlfahrtsverbandes* — Scholl was able to obtain valuable cooperation.

In addition he had made it a condition on the part of the DPWV that during the transitional arrangements a Board member of DPWV be President of the new and as yet unknown adoptive child, the *IGfH*. As with Dr Scholl the second personality also chosen from the Board in accordance with the arrangement with the DPWV would also be a great stroke of luck for the young association: Gerhard Haag had since 1968 been the full-time professional head of the department of the DPWV which had managed the transitional arrangements with FICE Germany (BD) and now undertook in the *IGfH* the function of managing director, which he held until 1993. Gerhard Haag was successful because of his knowledge of West German welfare services, his good relationships with the Federal Ministry of Youth (in 1969 *IGfH* put in their first request for resources from the youth budget), his organisational skill and his ideas for sponsorship, in giving the formerly weak FICE a lasting sound framework and in developing it also into a financially sound, fully equipped professional association for youth care.

It says much for the character of this so newly launched association that for the founding Board, besides Messrs Haag and Scholl, they also selected Dr Andreas Mehringer as first Vice-President; he was an early reformer of residential child care; after the second world war he had established at the Munich orphanage a family-like system of all-age living groups of manageable group size, a model that had decisively influenced many early reformers of the 1950s and 1960s. As second Vice-President Prof. Dr Andreas Flitner was chosen. As holder of the chair of pedagogics at Tübingen University he had in the 1960s taken the marginalised subject of social pedagogics in education and laid the foundations for the development of sounder scientific exploration of this discipline. Among the other members of the Board were Dr Erdmuthe Falkenberg, the charismatic, progressive and courageous head of the Hesse Youth Service (Schaletzky, 2001), Dr Wolfgang Bäuerle, at the time consultant on the principles of staff welfare, and Martin Bonhoeffer, who has already been mentioned above, who at the time was the chief reformer of residential child care on the staff of the Berlin Senate. These last two, Wolfgang Bäuerle (President 1971–1977) and Martin Bonhoeffer (long-term member of the Board 1969–1979), would with Dr Anne Frommann (who joined *IGfH* in 1971) ensure that the intrinsic focus of the work of *IGfH* in the succeeding decade was entirely directed to the welfare of children, stamping it decisively as a reform-friendly association.

This founding Board represented considerable expertise, indeed expert power, particularly when you think that among them were represented the editors and publishers of the key professional journals of the time — *Unsere Jugend* aimed at practitioners, the *Blätter der Wohlfahrtspflege* aimed at organisations and Flitner's journal *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik* aimed at educational institutions. On the other hand this diverse circle of well-known personalities makes sense in terms of an association in which there was going to be open and not always harmonious professional discussion about the professionalisation of residential child care. The *IGfH*, therefore, quickly became a melting-pot for the forces of reform providing opportunities for the exchange of ideas and support because, as a younger association for residential child care, it had less feelings of loyalty to the old style residential child care than the older professional associations and could be correspondingly freer to criticise and to act.

1.2.3 Reform themes of the seventies

The dominant themes of the association's work in the succeeding years were the critical debates about conventional residential child care, the development of newer, alternative concepts including, for example, foster care, the professionalisation of residential child care staff and the democratisation of daily living. These foci are already evident in the first activities of *IGfH* in 1969 and 1970: in November 1969 *IGfH* was busy with a day conference on communities for young people led by Prof. Klaus Mollenhauer with the aim of supporting these new developments. An international seminar on the subject of the initial and further training of residential child care staff in Berlin in February 1970 brought together experiences and ideas from Sweden, England, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Austria and Germany. A resolution of the 120 participants demanded that

- the number of children and young people taken into residential care must be reduced through the development of a range of community based forms of support
- the training of residential child care staff must lead to a formal qualification and
- continuing professional development must be guaranteed.

Finally, in April 1970, there was a great symposium under the title 'The plight of residential child care — important requirements'. In the invitation it said, in a way which looks to us today somewhat over the top: 'Since the establishment of the Federal Republic life has changed in all other respects. The plight of residential child care has not.' And at the end of the invitation: 'Complaints based on the usual anecdotes will do no longer. Unbiased assessments and diagnoses of each aspect are essential. The problem of residential child care is solvable.' In the plenary addresses — each with their different emphases — Messrs. Flitner, Mehringer and Bäuerle offered ways of differentiating and professionalising residential child care but always with the development of residential child care in mind. Three working groups discussed the topics 'Assessment and reception' (under Erdmuthe Falkenberg), 'Repression or emancipation?' (under Prof. Klaus Mollenhauer) and 'Teamwork and leadership style' (under Martin Bonhoeffer).

In this one symposium almost the whole of the *IGfH*'s reform programme of at least the next ten years was contained: to develop a radical child- and youth-friendly residential child care, to create democratic practice and to make it sufficiently varied that it can meet all the varied needs of children, for which a scientifically based diagnosis and assessment framework is necessary. Residential child care staff need sound, pedagogically informed initial training and further development. Alternatives to residential child care need to be created both in foster care and in support prior to the need for placement. These ideas for reform were drawn from what would now be seen as an early but then up-to-date mixture of child care and technological optimism, namely, that with a quickly put together programme of reform the 'problem' of residential child care could be solved.

1.2.4 Key events in the seventies

To go through this programme of reform, you would need to list countless symposia, congresses, Publications and Projects³. In addition, from the beginning of the 1970s there was a continuing debate about the reform of youth welfare law, whose own reform events need to be summarised in any account. From the entire list of activities each year a few deserve particular mention:

- the international FICE Congress in 1971 at Königstein (Keynote speaker: Anne Frommann: ‘The child between home, family and administration’), which attracted considerable public attention for the still young *IGfH*
- the 1973 exhibition in Darmstadt ‘Residential child care — planning care’, which, above all, argued for child care sensitive design in new buildings and in so doing made child care reform a reality
- the 1974 collection edited by Martin Bonhoeffer and Peter Widemann *Kinder in Ersatzfamilien*, which together with the identically named Berlin Congress of 1975 developed pioneering models for the development of a range of forms of foster care
- the well-known, oft-discussed and cited *Zwischenbericht* of the *Kommission Heimerziehung* of 1977, which both described an outstanding group of debates about reform from the middle of the 1960s and also with its outline of a differentiated, needs-based system of residential child care gave direction to the later debates right up the 1990s
- the beginning of and the increasingly criticised use of closed institutions for children and young people, as youth welfare measures of the last resort
- the 1981 *IGfH* Congress, which in a suitable ending to the ‘long’ decade of reform between 1969 and 1981 asked ‘What does a child cost?’.

By 1981 residential child care staff appeared to be much better equipped and more professional but their approach was somewhat disciplined. There was a variety of new forms of residential child care and of preventive care — for the time being though more on paper than in practice. But residential child care had also clearly become more expensive: in 1970 the daily cost of care in a home in Hesse had been 20.50 DM, in 1979 it had risen to 84.16 DM (*Arbeitsgruppe Heimreform*, 2000, p119). The German social-democratic model had reached its financial limits and residential child care experienced for the first time in a long time employment difficulties.

1.2.5 The development of the organisation in the 1970s

In these years rich in ideas for reform the *IGfH* grew into a well-known professional association, which would be heard in matters of residential child care. The formative personalities of this time who served as chairs of the Board were Wolfgang Bäuerle (President 1971–1977) and Anne Frommann (President 1977–1985). It is also time to introduce some of the many other important people for

³You can find a chronological account of national and international activities including all the publications of the yellow series 1970 — 1987 in the article by Gerhard Haag written for the 25th anniversary conference of *IGfH* (Haag, 1987).

IGfH, who were involved then on the Board, at the Delegates Assemblies or in projects and now as honorary officers.

However, one must mention that by 1970 the first full-time post in *IGfH* had been created through which thereafter and increasingly during the 1970s the full-time youth welfare consultant within the DPWV, Gesine von Uslar, had provided significant support to the association's work through his detailed and committed professional groundwork. From 1972 until his retirement in 1996 Hans-Walter Muth held the position of chief child care adviser. In 1980 the additional post of consultant was created which was held by the lawyer and child care expert Hannelore Häbel until 1986. In spite of this first professionalisation of the work of the Board between 1969 and 1981 one must still clearly point out the extraordinary significance of voluntary work within *IGfH*. It is a feature of this Board that a large number of volunteers far above the normal level became committed and remain committed to it; without them today's Board would be unthinkable.

These were on the other hand, as Anne Frommann remembers, the 'wild years', which, alongside the themes set out above, brought with them other intense debates — for example, about small homes which at the time seemed a progressive child care alternative to the large homes or about the effects of the then newly-introduced 40 hour week on continuity of care in homes.

Internally the association was also under strain. In particular, the undemocratic structure of the *IGfH* was criticised by one strand of the membership, because in the central decision making meeting, the Delegates Assembly, the three types of member (individuals, voluntary organisations and public bodies) are according to the statutes given equal representation of five delegates at any one time, even though by far the greatest number of members are the individual members. Nonetheless in spite of all the squabbles and constitutional debates the constitution has remained by and large unchanged.

1.3 1982–1989: *IGfH* concerns itself with distinguishing forms of support and rehabilitating 'modern' residential child care

By the end of the 'long' decade of reform between 1969 and 1981 residential child care had been through its first testing time, which in reality had been in part predominantly demographic since the simultaneous employment crisis and its accompanying challenge to the employment-centred welfare model had brought about greater uncertainty. What all the reform ideas of the 1970s could not do now developed on the back of economic pressures: homes developed new ways of helping alongside traditional placement practice. In particular 'day care groups' as they were called, or semi-residential care, and family based professional support spread considerably within a short time.

1.3.1 The development of needs-based residential child care and new social welfare agencies

At the height of this period the 1983 *IGfH* conference in Berlin asked the question: 'Is residential child care now needs-based?', which the participants discussed as much in relation to the new ideas inside and outside residential child care as to the new ways of organising social welfare. News had come of the

first attempts at localising services in Hamburg (district based neighbourhood residential child care on poor estates) and in Bremen (district based residential child care set up by the Hans Wendt Foundation). Kassel's 'Preventive youth care' reform programme was presented showing that by working on the basis of fairly intensive youth support a needs-based system of community care (courses, family aides and youth support workers) could be built. The overall impression was that, while it was possible in the meantime to see plenty of good ideas such as a needs-based preventive care getting mixed up with youth care, at the same time the youth offices could no longer wait for a new Youth Welfare Act (in fact the debates about reform of the Youth Welfare Act had already gone on for over twelve years!).

As far as care providers were concerned day care groups in particular developed into a booming market. The demand for places in these 'homes without beds' rose crazily; the new part-community services required (and facilitated) new attitudes to work and new skill sets such as working with children's families, working with schools and — in the case of life skills based day groups — with the social environment to be added to the fundamentals of child care. By April 1982 the *IGfH* had together with *Diakonischen Werk Westfalen* in Münster (the youth care consultant and head of administration at the *DWW* at the time was Dr Klaus Münstermann, who from 1985–1989 and from 1993–1996 would be the President of *IGfH*) and the *Institut für Erziehungswissenschaft* at Münster, organised the first national conference for staff from day care groups, which thereafter has taken place with increasing attendance at least every two years (at the eleventh national conference in Oldenburg in 2000 there were 675 participants!). As a result a national special interest group for day care groups developed under the aegis of the *IGfH*, which — with the support of Alfred Köth as its consultant from 1985 to 1989 — would become the first specialist group of the *IGfH*.

Differentiating the range of provision had also now affected the structure of the association and began, bit by bit, to broaden the range of work of the residential child care association that was the *IGfH*. In addition the specialist group on 'gender issues in child care' founded in 1988 had appeared in the eighties (gender issues had until then been relatively little in evidence though they had been a focus of meetings organised by Hannelore Häbel from the beginning to the early 1980s) along with the special interest groups on 'small homes' and 'mobile/flexible care'.

1.3.2 Residential care as a worthwhile type of life

Alongside participating in the development of a needs-based differentiation of child care the *IGfH* fought in the 1980s for the rehabilitation of residential child care. Modern homes could really be a 'worthwhile form of living' (as the title of an annual conference in 1985 in Münster sought to demonstrate), they had changed significantly in the course of the previous fifteen years and their purpose had been clarified and professionalised. Homes or, as we now commonly call them, *Jugendhilfeverbände* had little in common with the old, musty, barrack-like type of institution. Residential child care within the community would no longer be tarnished with negative associations and children from homes would equally no longer be stigmatised. That the defence of modern residential child care had much to do with the economic circumstances of the time can be seen most clearly

in the 1985 ‘Münster Declaration’ of the *IGfH* (it would incidentally be adopted almost literally in 1986 as the ‘Malmö Declaration’ by FICE International). It took a strong line against a ‘fiscally motivated anti-residential care campaigns from above.’

1.4 1990–2001: Diversification of its activities and ‘INTEGRA’

Though the opening paragraph of the *IGfH* Annual Report for 1987/1988 had begun with the observation that in the year under consideration ‘neither radical changes nor completely new developments’ had taken place, this turned out to be the calm before the storm when one looks back to the early nineties:

1. as early as autumn 1989 there had been indications from the authorities that a new child and youth welfare act might be introduced into parliament and in early 1990 it had been passed
2. similarly in autumn 1989 the peaceful protests that brought the end of the DDR had begun; on 9 November 1989 the wall was opened and, eleven months later, in October 1990, the DDR ‘joined’ the Federal Republic
3. likewise in 1990 the government had tabled the Eighth Youth Act, which with its developmental and basic themes of youth support for life in the everyday world — prevention, localisation, involvement in everyday life, integration and participation — set the agenda for the direction of reform for the rest of the 1990s

1.4.1 Putting ‘support for life in the everyday world’ into practice

The proposals in the Eighth Youth Act were discussed intensively in the *IGfH* and put into practice in the field of child care. They fell on particularly fruitful soil, because the ideas of the Eighth Youth Act had a close affinity to the longstanding conceptual debates people had had within the association. For example, since the 1970s the chair of the *Berichtskommission* and spiritual father of the concept of residential care for life in the everyday world, Hans Thiersch, an active member of *IGfH* since the 1960s and a member of the Board throughout the 1970s, had brought his theoretical reflections and practice experience to bear on developing child care in everyday life for the *IGfH*. Vera Birtsch, active on the Board since the end of the 1970s and between 1989 and 1993 the President, had argued since her research for ISS (for example, into independent living groups) at the beginning of the 1980s for the development of decentralised residential child care and for local youth care agencies. Friedhelm Peters, on the Board of *IGfH* since 1989 and first Vice-President since 1991, brought his critical instincts to the reform of care in Hamburg. Wolfgang Trede — a student of the ‘Tübingen School’ (Messrs Frommann, Liegle and Thiersch) — chose to focus his full-time efforts from 1989 on the development of an integrated, sociologically informed approach to child care.

From the 1991 paper ‘Accept differences of view — Prevent exclusions — Participation is possible. Perspectives on child care in the 1990s’ (Peters and Trede, 1992, p168ff) through the 1996 annual conference in Dresden with its central theme ‘Life in the everyday world in practice — youth care on the

road to changes in practice' and the Board's preparatory position paper "Life in the everyday world in practice: child care re-established!" (Wolff et al., 1997, p274ff) to the government's model project INTEGRA, which since 1998 under the overall control of the *IGfH* has professionally supported the development of an integrated, localised care framework in five areas, the *IGfH* has been able to extend discussion of the subject throughout the whole association, as a result of which the *IGfH* has effectively carried out an important development exercise for child care (Koch and Peters, 2004; Deutschendorf et al., 2006).

1.4.2 *IGfH* and German union

Fortunately the biggest tasks for the *IGfH* concerned the political changes in the DDR and the other Eastern European countries, taking, in the case of the DDR, a somewhat sceptical view of the apparently rapid union of two states, because this would have as its consequence a *de facto* colonialisation of the east by the west. In a distinct contrast to the political posturing, at the beginning of 1990 there was no serious consideration being given to resuscitating an East German National Section. There had been very important contacts between people, lay and professional, and these meant that on the one hand with the earlier personal contacts (until the 1970s FICE Germany (DDR) had been active in FICE but had then withdrawn mostly because of lack of foreign exchange) and on the other with the *IGfH* as the more progressive, internationally organised professional association for many professionals it appeared more attractive to east Germans. One should also note that Hans-Ullrich Krause, head of an East Berlin children's home, on the *IGfH* Board from 1991 and its President from 1996, had joined two organisations in December 1989: Amnesty International and (as the first East German citizen!) *IGfH*.

The inclusion of colleagues from the east and their concerns were seriously addressed in the years up to around 1995. One recalls, for example, the East-West Encounter of November 1990, where all the companies, pressure groups etc. were together equally representing colleagues in the east and the west. During the Board's period of office from 1991-1993 colleagues from the new states were co-opted as guests to the Board. In April 1992 a three year project started in which, primarily under the supervision and direction of Mechthild Wolff, a considerable number of local courses and conferences for professionals from the new states were put on and in which new local groups from the new states were stimulated.

The union of the two Germanies has in Wolfgang Trede's opinion been a reasonable success. Many professionals from the new states have found a professional home in the *IGfH* and the Board's efforts since the beginning of the 1990s have clearly been stamped 'Made in the East.' One can name here alongside current President Hans-Ullrich Krause his colleague from Dresden, Sigrid Möser, who as second Vice-President has been heavily involved in the INTEGRA-Project for many years and Katrin Schröter, the first honorary officer who since 1997 has been active as a full-time training consultant and adviser and demonstrated some years ago some of her leadership skills in the expert group 'Principles of placement.' After ten years the union was sufficiently established, that few professional differences remained between east and west and many lasting, specifically local, professional relationships appear to have been developed — like the one which certainly exists between Niederbayer and Ham-

burg.

1.4.3 From an association for residential child care to a child care association

In April 1992 the Delegates' Assembly decided to change the name of the *IGfH* to *Internationale Gesellschaft für erzieherische Hilfen* while retaining the abbreviation. Its activities in the succeeding years would be broader, more varied and residential child care would be one way of helping children alongside others in the association's deliberations. A 'narrow' approach to lobbying such as had been evident in the 'Münster Declaration' would no longer be possible.

One realises from this that in the 1990s alongside the cross-section of themes which were intensively addressed, such as children's rights, racism, drugs and gender issues, expert and working groups addressed the various types of care, such as care centres, 'classical' residential child care, independent living, day care groups and guardianship. While these specialist groups became important bases for professional exchanges and conceptual developments in the field at the time, they also led to the fragmentation of the association's deliberations, which really went against the focus of youth care policy on greater integration of child care. But these are contradictions which a forty year old, now grown up, association must sort out.

2 Organisation and finance

2.1 The *IGfH* as a child care network

The *Internationale Gesellschaft für erzieherische Hilfen (IGfH)* is a nationally and internationally active association for child care, which above all seeks according to its constitution 'the support and reform of child care in particular residential child care in the spirit of the Children's Charter and the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. In order to reach this goal, the *IGfH* organises contacts and exchanges of experience between staff and also between young people, supports projects to investigate particular problems in child care, publishes information and documentation, advises and supports care establishments on practical problems, seeks to cooperate in the development of preventive youth care and takes public positions on issues of social policy with the aim of raising the significance of child care and those who work in it in public consciousness.'

The *IGfH* is however no anonymous organisation, but above all an experienced network of diverse initiatives and voluntary commitments, which seeks through democratically chosen committees and local amalgamations to establish and support professionally motivated national working groups and through the combination of a few full-time and 'professional volunteers' from social welfare to support the identification of professional and social policy issues on which to concentrate.

2.1.1 The basics: voluntary commitment

Naturally a considerable amount of the work of *IGfH* is carried out through the voluntary work of the active members of its professional associations, such as in the elected committees and in the expert and local groups, but also through

the activities of the consultants, presenters and seminar leaders of *IGfH* events. They receive professional and organisational support from the full-time members of the administrative office. In 2005 the administrative office was staffed with five paid staff (four full-time and one part-time).

One must stress time and time again the close collaboration between the honorary and the paid members of *IGfH* in particular in the area of professional events and focused expert discussions. In addition the areas of training and development in relation to involvement in the model project, testing out new ideas and re-evaluating well-established ones are substantially enhanced by the commitment of volunteers.

The structure of the *IGfH* supports this high level of voluntary contributions to the work of the association. The General Assembly, the Delegates' Assemblies and the Board as the formal organs of the association decide on the direction and content of key deliberations and develop strategies to put them into practice. In local and expert groups, which also meet on a voluntary basis and independently determine the content of their own deliberations, activities in the shape of expert seminars, position papers and statements are for the most part initiated and developed. About 180 professionals from child care are currently working on the committees of the *IGfH* (excluding local groups) on a voluntary basis.

At present the following specialist groups are active in the *IGfH* with at any one time two meetings a year lasting two or more days: Drugs, Child Care Centres, Integrated Care, Gender Issues, Residential Child Care and other forms of care such as Day Care Groups. As a rule the spokespersons for the members of the specialist groups take part as guests at the Delegates' Assemblies and report there on the activities of their group. Besides this nine local groups are active in *IGfH*: Baden-Württemberg, Bayern, Berlin, Brandenburg, Hessen-Nord, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Westfalen-Lippe, Hamburg and Sachsen-Anhalt.

(1) The income of the *IGfH* comes primarily from members subscriptions, the sale of publications, conference fees, the proceeds of the 'Lucky spiral' lottery along with funds from the federal child and youth care budget. With currently around 1650 members a substantial part of its activities are financed through members' subscriptions.

3 Membership

IGfH is a nationally and — as the German section of the *Fédération Internationale des Communautés Éducatives* (FICE) — also internationally active professional association for child care. It sees itself as a lobbying organisation in the service of the welfare and rights of children who live outside their family of origin.

The *IGfH* is independent of any sectional or religious affiliation. With around 1,650 members the *IGfH* is one of the largest professional associations in youth care. *IGfH* members can be individuals, educational establishments, institutions and youth service providers along with public providers and youth care authorities.

By way of clarification this is what the constitution says:

1. Members of the association may be:

(a) individuals,

- (b) voluntary providers and associations for youth care along with educational establishments,
 - (c) national and local authority providers of youth care.
2. The *Deutsche Paritätische Wohlfahrtsverband* (as a whole) and its state associations have membership rights.
 - (a) membership rights and duties apply only to direct members.
 - (b) legally independent entities of voluntary providers and associations for youth care along with educational institutions and national and local authority providers of youth care must be members in their own right to exercise the rights of direct membership.
 3. Applications for membership are made to the Board. They must be made in writing to the Board.
 4. Honorary members may be appointed.
 5. Membership subscriptions are payable every year in the first three months of the calendar year or within three months by new members. New members in the first half of the year pay the whole subscription; new members in the second half of the year pay half the subscription.

3.1 Bodies

The bodies of the association are:

1. the General Assembly
2. the Delegates' Assembly
3. the Board

3.1.1 General Assembly

1. The General Assembly has the following responsibilities:
 - (a) to chose delegates.

Each membership group set out above chooses at any one time up to five delegates and four substitutes for a period of three years. Only members with at least one year's membership of the association can be chosen as delegates. Gender parity is sought in the nomination of candidates. If a group cannot reach its maximum number of delegates, the other groups can send an equal number of further delegates. The election takes place in a single secret ballot.
 - (b) It receives the report and accounts and approves the work of the Delegates' Assembly.
 - (c) It advises on the programme of work
 - (d) It decides on the dissolution of the association.

2. The General Assembly meets once every three years. An extraordinary General Assembly can be called at the request of at least 20% of the members. The notice together with the agenda must be sent at least six weeks before the meeting.
3. The General Assembly is summoned and chaired by the President. A duly summoned General Assembly is quorate regardless of the number of members present.
4. Decisions are taken with a simply majority of the members present. A decision about the dissolution of the association must be supported by at least 75% of the members present.

3.2 Delegates' Assembly

1. The Delegates' Assembly has the following responsibilities:
 - (a) It chooses the Board to serve for a period of three years. The President is chosen in one vote and the remainder of the members of the Board all together in another vote. The details concerning the organisation of the vote are decided within the Delegates' Assembly by a two-thirds majority of those present and entitled to vote.
 - (b) It approves the work of the Board.
 - (c) It decides on the programme of work.
 - (d) It sets the membership subscriptions.
 - (e) It decides changes to the constitution.
 - (f) It appoints two auditors who may not be members of the Board.
 - (g) It can appoint ordinary members of the Board.
2. The members of the Board in principle have the right to vote in the Delegates' Assembly. They do not have the right to vote in matters pertaining to (a), (b) and (f) above.
3. Should a member of the Delegates' Assembly be elected to the Board, his membership of the Assembly ceases and s/he takes no part in elections from the Delegates' Assembly. In this case — and in the case of an absence during the election process — one of the substitutes from the corresponding group takes her/his place.
4. The Delegates' Assembly will be summoned and chaired by the President of the Board at least once a year. At the request of at least half of those entitled to vote a Delegates' Assembly must be called.
5. The Delegates' Assembly is quorate if at least half the delegates representing half those entitled to vote are present. Decisions are made with a simple majority of those present and entitled to vote. Decisions about changes to the constitution require a two thirds majority of those present and entitled to vote.
6. Delegates remain in office until there is a new election.

3.3 The Board

1. The Board consists of the President, two Vice-Presidents and four other members. The newly chosen President chooses the Vice-Presidents in a formal session from his circle. The individual members are represented on the Board by two members and the voluntary and public sector members by one member each. Only members of the association can be chosen as members of the Board. Gender parity is encouraged. The Board remains in office until there are new elections.
2. The Board carries out the business of the association within the terms of the constitution and the decisions of the Delegates' Assembly. It determines the budget and approves the accounts.
3. The President and Vice-Presidents constitute a board according to § 26 BGB; each of them alone can stand in for the other.
4. The Board is called at least once a year by the President. It is also called if two other members of the Board request it with a statement of an urgent matter to be discussed. The Board is quorate if at least four members are present. It decides on a simple majority. In the case of an equality of votes the proposal is lost. A decision of the Board can also be made in writing.
5. The minutes of the meetings of the Board, the Delegates' Assembly and the General Assembly must be signed by the chair and the minute taker.

The Board can transfer the management of ongoing business to managing director. He has voting rights on the Board. The managing director is responsible for the administration of records. He prepares the budget and annual accounts.

4 Activities

IGfH sees itself as a platform for professional dialogue in the widest possible terms about child care. Alongside the activities of members in committees, there is the work undertaken by the association through seminars and symposia, training and study trips, publishing advice for all parts of the membership, the development of policy statements and the carrying out of projects. *IGfH* publishes professional texts alongside the journal *Forum Erziehungshilfen*.

4.1 Events

An important concern of the *IGfH* now as ever is to make a specific contribution to the professional development of staff in child care practice through further training. All courses seek above all to support or further develop in child care staff an approach to those with whom they are working which is respectful towards and encourages sharing with them. On the basis of such an approach the development opportunities offered by *IGfH* are intended to support the broadening of practice skills in child care through the provision of knowledge and in particular professional methods of child care. In all events value is placed on the use of the experiences and resources of the participants and on

effective transfer from theory to practice. The content and methods included are supported by theory and based on research.

With symposia the aims are pursued of promoting dialogue between theory and practice in child care, of creating awareness of modern developments, of providing opportunities to analyse and critically examine, for example, initiatives for new ways of thinking and new approaches to practice. At each event selected experts in particular subjects are invited to discuss a new or newly reformulated topic with a view to further work by the association.

In 2005 the *IGfH*'s nationally published programme of events consisted of:

- a national conference
- four multi-part professional development programmes
- twenty development seminars
- two study trips
- six symposia.

4.2 Publications

The *IGfH* is actively involved in a range of publications for its members and interested professionals: the association maintains its own small publishing house which on average each year publishes between three and five books in two series (the 'Yellow Series' and the 'Blue Series'). The series appear in association with the Regensburg publisher *Walhalla-Verlag*. The 'Yellow Series' has print run of about 2,700 and the 'Blue Series' of about 800.

The series 'Basic child care texts' and the journal *Forum Erziehungshilfen* have been published since the end of 2003 by *Juventa-Verlag* of Weinheim. In addition the *IGfH* does one-off publications on completed projects (for example, in 2004 on the project 'Integrated child care' with *Juventa-Verlag*) or publishes with partners conference papers in book form (for example, in 2006 with the Rheinland-Pfälz Ministry) as well as policy papers and position statements.

One should also mention materials with more limited interest (for example, an annual bibliography of periodicals). Another significant development as a medium for up to the minute information is the Internet (conference proceedings and conference papers on the homepage). In addition project reports (for example, on the the project 'Families in youth welfare') can be made available over the Internet or as CD-ROMs and distributed to all interested parties. Each year the *IGfH* draws up an extensive catalogue of its available publications, which goes out as an insert in the journal *Forum Erziehungshilfe*.

Since 1997 we have aimed to present and to document the work of the *IGfH* (seminars, books, *Forum Erziehungshilfen*, policy documents etc.) on the Internet through our website. At the same time we intend the homepage to be information source (jobs, professional material, links).

4.3 Projects

We seek through the initiation and management of projects to bring greater focus to the area of child care. For professional associations such as the *IGfH*

it is important to be able to put professionally advocated ideas (about the development of inclusive youth care, about putting the principles of the Eighth Youth Act and involvement in everyday life into practice and about strengthening of the rights of the child and their opportunities for participation) into practice using a variety of means including conferences and symposia, courses and study trips, the development of expert policy documents and publications as well as testing them in projects. This is clear when the things professionals are convinced about in areas of national interest are also workable in practice. For this purpose models (such as Project INTEGRA: the organisation, development and implementation of flexible child care to those in need in a locality) have been tested and the results fed into professional discourse. Critical issues, which appeared in the translation of a concept into a practice and development model (be they of a professional, financial or legal nature) could be more clearly recognised and understood or, in short, empirically tested.

Above all the model projects and their outcomes aim to raise public consciousness of the importance of child care and those who work in it in people's minds and to demonstrate the reasons for and the consequences of the neglect of child care. A key focus for these activities is to make sure that they address the rights of the child, child protection and information for adolescents, their families and staff.

As a nationally active professional association for child care the *IGfH* gets involved in the politics of youth welfare. So it creates and cultivates contacts with political decision makers. Through policy documents and position papers it has been active, for example, in bringing influence to bear on the passing of legislation.

5 Future

The *Internationale Gesellschaft für erzieherische Hilfen (IGfH)* is a nationally and internationally active professional association for child care which above all intends publicly to pursue its constitutional aim 'the support and reform of child care in particular residential child care within the framework of the Children's Charter and the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.' In order to attain this goal, *IGfH* organises contacts and exchanges between both staff and young people, supports research into the particular problems of child care, disseminates information and publications, gives advice and support in relation to practical problem, seeks to contribute to the development of preventive youth care and publishes statements on social policy issues with the aim of raising the profile of child care and its staff in public consciousness.

The *IGfH* is however no anonymous organisation, but above all an experienced network of diverse initiatives and voluntary commitments, which seeks through democratically chosen committees and local amalgamations to establish and support professionally motivated national working groups and through the combination of a few full time and 'professional volunteers' from social welfare to bring social issues to life. One report cannot cover all these types of cooperation and involvement adequately but only convey a part of the the breadth of ideas and activities shared by active *IGfH* members.

The annual activity reports show that shared involvement under the umbrella of a professional organisation even in more difficult times (in brief, economies and cutbacks, increasing local differences and the lowering of professional standards of care, competition between different forms of care and disregard for clients' rights) can definitely draw attention to these things.

5.1 Lobbying in the service of the welfare and rights of young people

The most important aim of the professional association, the assumption of responsibility for representing the rights of young people who need anything from support to care, who live in foster families or in any other form of care in the community, will only be put into practice through the involvement of many members. It was successful together with the national organisation of state Youth Offices in bringing out a completely updated version of the guide 'Having rights and exercising them' which all Youth Offices make available and almost two thirds of whose print run of 10,000 has already gone. The topics of 'Rights to complain' and 'Complaints handling' found expression in thematic issues of the association's journal *Forum Erziehungshilfen* and in symposia and were regular themes of basic and advanced courses. Together with other professional associations the *IGfH* raised the issue of child abuse in institutions. A working group was brought together and prepared the position paper 'Children's rights in child care' for the *IGfH*.

5.2 Creating and developing a culture of cooperation in inclusive youth care

With large demonstration projects like INTEGRA (a demonstration project for the development of integrated flexible child care) there also was and will be in the future, alongside the practical collaboration of staff, support for professional initiatives in youth care through network building and formal local cooperation agreements. Organised and (individually) professionally managed child care can be a way of understanding and handling situations, environments and social issues, as well as economic and local political conditions. We have sought to set out clearly an outline for cooperation in youth care and its benefits and disadvantages in a variety of one-off seminars (for example, on recording in child care) and in publications and policy statements (for example, on child care reports). As a starting position *IGfH* takes a firm stance against closed youth care and against measures which restrict the freedom of young people in care. The actual question we ask is: How can it be judged ethical or legal to have set up practice within forms of closed institutions without professional assessment, without permits to operate and without the knowledge of the supervisory authorities? How are we to think about the so called 'space for reflection,' the 'time out room,' the holding and restraint measures, the 'optional isolation' and the artificial 'tough love' camps which flourish underground, so to speak, when these things are never discussed publicly? This sort of practice is common at least according to information from an *IGfH* symposium which took a look at the so called 'grey areas.'

Furthermore there is a need for action here in view of the debate over a professional stance which creates opportunities for and legitimates repressive

measures and ‘grey zones’ in the field of child care. We believe that we need to keep an eye on the increasing amount of practice which falls back on ‘simple’ and repressive solutions. This practice though possibly an expression today of nascent public attitudes needs critical analysis of its grounds and forms of expression.

We also ask — even in a self-critical way — whether the care system has become (or feels its has become) so helpless that it can help with the costs of locking up young people. We believe that ‘time out rooms’ can never be a legitimate response from institutions that feel so helpless. They demonstrate illegitimate reactions — particularly if they have nothing to do with a method or existing law.

A further ‘proliferation of measures’ against young people will be no solution. Child care practice must always take the difficult route of seeking and finding new, more appropriate and effective ways of caring for their clients. The responsible authorities must put their cards on the table in relation to these issues and specifically in relation to the ‘grey zones’ bring into operation safe methods for professionals. Unambiguous methods of handling are also in the interests of the young people concerned and can guarantee their protection and their rights.

5.3 Protecting professional standards and encouraging reflection among staff

Currently members of *IGfH* and youth care as a whole in Germany are confronted with a widespread tendency towards allowing national standards for care provision to ‘crumble.’ Draft bills on relieving the strain of social welfare on local authorities and the discussion about the standard regulation of minimal public care within the context of the parliamentary commission on modernising the federal rules (the so called ‘Federalising Commission’) show evidence of endeavours to make the provision of child care dependent only on the financial resources of local authorities. The *IGfH* has drawn public attention to this in policy papers and at conferences.

At the same time in the view of the *IGfH* the public reasons and justifications for professional standards in child care can only be sustained if they are regularly informed by relevant knowledge from theory and research, if they are guaranteed by mutual professional exchange and if it is possible for an independent profession to reflect on them in an organised way in order to develop some agreement about child care. Accordingly the *IGfH* has contributed to and will continue to advocate for this particularly through tailor-made in-house seminars (for example, in the shape of a year long professional development process for homes in Munich), expert forums on standards in child care and the establishment and maintenance of a separate introductory series of books in association with *Juventa-Verlag* (Basic texts in child care).

5.4 Political responsibility reinforces and includes taking public positions

The professional debates about the content of standards for work in youth offices, in advice centres and in community care, in all forms of residential child care, in day care and in the area of full-time care will not get anywhere in the face the

economic pressures on child care and the withdrawal of public responsibility for care and support. The *IGfH* and its active members have and will continue to develop an even greater level of involvement in social and public policy. The association is seeking through parliamentary receptions and social policy forums — through connections with politicians — to become involved in selected topics and to emphasise for politicians and interested citizens other aspects of youth care and so build a pressure group for questions relating to public responsibility for adolescents. Fora for political commentators, for example, at congresses such as the German Youth Care Day, and regular political commentaries in our nationally regarded journal *Forum Erziehungshilfen* from *Juventa-Verlag* complement the social policy initiatives of the *IGfH*, which must become an even greater concern for the active members of *IGfH* in the coming years.

5.5 Clarifying the international picture and learning about difference

Since FICE Germany was established in 1961 as an opportunity for the peaceful international exchange of experience among interested parties, *IGfH* has always had and continues to have a commitment to and interests in the area of international networks of NGOs in child care such as FICE to promote regular overseas study trips about the forms and development of extra-familial care and preventive and community care and to support staff exchanges (for example, through PEP). The *IGfH* organised 2002 FICE Congress in Berlin under the title ‘In the Jungle of the City ... Growing up in Urban Environments’ was the first time this international Congress had taken place on German soil in over 30 years and demonstrated the shape of good practice and policies for the development of children and young people in cities.

Also, in May 2004 ten new countries joined the European Union. A union of states with 455 million citizens came into being. Admittedly the social and youth care organisation of the EU is in its infancy compared to the framework of economic and competition law. The *IGfH* has and will concentrate its work on contributing to shaping a European perspective, in the course of which, for example, it has dedicated a special issue of its journal to child care in the new EU countries, it has mounted with the University of Trier and the Ministry in Rheinland-Pfalz international seminars on European comparisons in residential child care in 2003, 2005 and 2007 and it has also discussed the repercussions of judgements from the European Court (for example, about the organisation of working time guidelines in children’s homes) in expert seminars.

The elected, active and full-time representatives of the *IGfH* today manage national and international projects created to encourage the participation of children and young people in residential child care and to ensure child protection in association with secondary schools. One should mention here for example projects such as the practice and research project: ‘International Child Protection — The significance of the Brussels II a Decision and the Hague Convention on Child Protection for child care’ (In short: Transnational cooperation between youth care authorities; Aim: Development of recommendations for staff) or the practice and research project: ‘Participation — Quality standards for children and young people in residential child care’ (with the Landshut Polytechnic and SOS Children’s Villages). The *IGfH* will further sharpen its European focus through planned publications on child care structures in the new EU countries

and on overseas casework in youth care.

Also for the future the *IGfH* will as a professional association continue to try through such initiatives and through international expert seminars and symposia organised by ourselves or in cooperation with others to highlight in comparative and contrasting ways the perspectives of children, young people and their families on residential child care and the different ways in which child care is managed and organised and not to overlook European competence regulations.

Discussions about the future that have taken place within FICE Germany can be summarised through using the topics highlighted in a summary paper for the Board. These summary points read:

1. To spell out what residential child care involves today
(To develop some advanced courses as a result of this, to think about new qualifications; to test new types or aspects through demonstration projects, to further develop some aspects, etc.)
2. To create and clarify a European picture
(Motto: Learn from difference: FICE members to initiate seminars on an international comparison of residential child care and on EU enlargement and youth care, collaboration on European standards, special issues of *Forum Erziehungshilfe* etc.)
3. To strengthen the rights of children and young people (through lobbying)
(Children's Rights plc, to spell out ways in which children, young people and their families can participate, to introduce rights as a quality standard within wider standards, to introduce child care into discussions about children's rights, for example, through a statement of principles etc.)
4. To support integrated and inclusive ideas about youth care (to demonstrate, develop, implement and support them professionally and publicly)
(To think about and spell out aspects of child care for example through conferences, publications and projects and to demonstrate new forms of cooperation between providers: to enable an ethos of cooperation to be established in youth care, to test integrated care in the context of residential child care: state project INTEGRA, expert groups etc., to reactivate the debate about GU with the 'new' arguments publicly explained alongside the 'old new' arguments etc.)
5. To strengthen political responsibility for children and young people and ensure the basic conditions for 'Adolescents in public care'
(Active involvement in amending Social Code Book VIII through policy statements, to create publicity for changes in social policy (the repercussions of Harz IV, the repercussions of the federalising commission etc.), to find positions on issues: What must be definitely safeguarded through federal law in youth care?, to create a pressure group with other social organisations such as *Gewerkschaften* and *Attac*, not to give up attempting to give policy advice: to target politicians at parliamentary receptions or other types of event and to develop themes in a comprehensible and clear way: for example, what child care does etc.)

6. To democratise child care, its institutions and the ways in which those who work in it are able to participate
(To support self-organised amalgamations, to demonstrate ideas for staff development, flexible working time models, types of professional development between organised self-supervision and professional knowledge etc.)
7. To make ourselves as a Board competent in foster care issues
(To organise conferences ourselves, cooperation with self-help organisations, to provide a platform for discussion, a basic text on foster care, a basic text on child care centres etc.)
8. To develop reflective professionals
(To make it a lynch-pin for understanding a case, to develop reflective professionals, to promote professional debates about standards, to represent the issues in seminars, basic and advanced courses, to initiate projects etc.)
9. To take a firmer grip on gender issues in child care and to spell them out
(Actively to promote debates about gender issues in the Board; to make people aware of the issues through special issues of *Forum Erziehungshilfe* (for example, on working with young people) and basic and advanced courses that reflect gender issues, to combine debates about gender issues and about staffing in child care etc.)

References

- Arbeitsgruppe Heimreform (2000). *Aus der Geschichte lernen: Analyse der Heimreform in Hessen (1968–1983)*. Internationale Gesellschaft für erzieherische Hilfen, Frankfurt/Main.
- Commission E: Commission des plans du Camp international d'Enfants de 1951 (1950). Camp international 1951. FICE/AG.2/SR 3 Annexe IV.
- Deutschendorf, R., Hamberger, M., Koch, J., Lenz, S., and Peters, F., editors (2006). *Werkstattbuch INTEGRA: Grundlagen, Anregungen und Arbeitsmaterialien für integrierte, flexible und sozialräumlich ausgerichtete Erziehungshilfen*. Juventa Verlag, Weinheim, München.
- Frommann, A. and Becker, G., editors (1996). *Martin Bonhoeffer: Sozialpädagoge und Freund unter Zeitdruck*. Talheimer, Mössingen-Talheim.
- General Assembly (1950). Compte rendu provisoire de la première séance plénière tenue le mercredi 27 septembre 1950 à l'Ecole Normale d'Institutrices de Lyon. FICE/AG.2/SR 1.
- Haag, G. (1987). Ein neuer Anfang — Chronik der IGfH-Aktivitäten. *Materialien zur Heimerziehung*, 3:12–16.
- Knöpfel Nobs, I. (1992). *Von den Kindergemeinschaften zur ausserfamiliären Erziehung: Die Geschichte der Fédération Internationale des Communautés Educatives (FICE)*. FICE Verlag, Zürich.

- Koch, J. and Peters, F., editors (2004). *Integrierte erzieherische Hilfen: Flexibilität, Integration und Sozialraumbezug in der Jugendhilfe*. Juventa-Verl., Weinheim; München.
- Peters, F. and Trede, W., editors (1992). *Strategien gegen Ausgrenzung. Politik, Pädagogik und Praxis der Erziehungshilfen in den 90er Jahren*. Internationale Gesellschaft für Erzieherische Hilfen, Frankfurt/Main.
- Schaletzky, H. (2001). Nachruf: Dr. Erdmuthe Falkenberg ist tot. *Forum Erziehungshilfen*, 7(1):28.
- Trede, W. (2001). Zur Geschichte der IGfH — FICE-Sektion Bundesrepublik Deutschland (1961–2001). *Forum Erziehungshilfen*, (4):196–208.
- Vogt, H. (1987). Zur Geschichte der FICE-Sektion der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. *Materialien zur Heimerziehung*, 3:4–10.
- Wolff, M., Schröer, W., and Möser, S., editors (1997). *Lebensweltorientierung konkret: Jugendhilfe auf dem Weg zu einer veränderten Praxis*. Internationale Gesellschaft für Erzieherische Hilfen, Frankfurt/Main.