

Red Bowlby: Attachment Theory in Socialist Czechoslovakia

Frank Henschel

ABSTRACT

This paper explores how attachment theory was adapted and further developed in socialist Czechoslovakia. It analyses the scientific discussions and the influence of the theory on state care policies, especially in residential childcare.

KEYWORDS:

developmental psychology; attachment theory; residential childcare; knowledge transfer; Communist Czechoslovakia

“The home here assumes virtually all or most of the duties of the family [...]. We want the home to provide more than family care to children.”¹

In Czechoslovakia, ruled by the Communist Party since February 1948, residential care institutions such as infant and children’s homes, which housed children who could not or were not supposed to grow up in their families, were a central pillar of care policy.² Children would also be permanently separated from their parents in hospitals, psychiatric wards and care institutions. Although separation was applied as an exception, and not as a rule, the regime was convinced that these institutions could supplement and even replace the family and meet all the children’s needs.³ Physicians and educators also emphasised the efficiency of residential care institutions, as evidenced by the quote from a 1951 book on health care cited at the beginning of this paper.

However, in 1956 Vladimír Vojtík, head of a traditional psychiatric children’s home in the small South Bohemian town of Opařany, warned about the consequences of permanent institutionalisation for children’s psyche and personality in the country’s

1 Ladislav ŠTEJGERLE, *Mimoškolní péče a výchova mládeže vyžadující zvláštní péče* [Out-of-School Care and Education for the Youth in Need of Special Care], in: František Ludvík (ed.), *Mládež vyžadující zvláštní péče* [Youth in Need of Special Care], Praha 1953, pp. 106–112, here p. 109.

2 Frank HENSCHTEL, “All Children Are Ours”. *Children’s Homes in Socialist Czechoslovakia as Laboratories of Social Engineering*, *Bohemia* 56, 2016, No. 1, pp. 122–144.

3 IDEM, *Engineering Families for Children. Adoption and the State Child Welfare System in Socialist Czechoslovakia*, in: Martina Winkler — Frank Henschel — Jan Randák — Gabriela Dudeková Kováčová (edd.), *Variations and Transformations of Childhood in the Bohemian Lands and Slovakia*, Göttingen 2022, pp. 167–199; IDEM, *The Embodiment of Deviance. The Biopolitics of the “Difficult Child” in Socialist Czechoslovakia*, *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures* 34, 2020, No. 4, pp. 837–857.

most important paediatric journal *Československá pediatrie* [Czechoslovak Pediatrics]. “Today’s collective institutions for children are undoubtedly up to the mark in terms of hygiene and health care in the physical sense. However, this is not the case with regard to the psychological condition of institutionalised children in the sense of upbringing. There is hospitalism there already today. [...] As a result, these children often lack a close emotional connection to a single person — their mother.”⁴

This warning is remarkable in at least two respects. Firstly, Vojtík does acknowledge the efficiency of institutional care for children in socialist Czechoslovakia. But he disagrees with the assumption that providing hygiene and care is enough for a child’s well-being, and stresses the importance of close emotional relationships with the mother. Secondly, he argues that “modern psychiatry”⁵ supports his observations, but he does not cite any studies or papers. Yet, there are many striking parallels to Anglo-American psychoanalysts and developmental psychologists in his argumentation: William Goldfarb, René A. Spitz and John Bowlby had studied the consequences of the separation and permanent institutionalisation of children in the 1930s and 1940s.⁶ This paper will show that these parallels are neither coincidental nor singular.

In 1962, the Prague psychologist Josef Langmeier not only took up Vojtík’s warning, but also expanded on his critique of residential care. In doing so, he referred to Czechoslovak and Western research, by Spitz, Goldfarb and, especially, Bowlby: “Abundant evidence for mental disorders in institutionalised children has been presented since that time, in different countries and for different institutional conditions; in our country, too, there have been a number of detailed observations in the last decade.”⁷

Finally, in 1970, the Czechoslovak Ministry of Education justified reform of the children’s home system and adoption and foster care rules by citing research on the necessity to meet children’s emotional and psychosocial needs for attachment and closeness to a primary caregiver. “These principles are irrefutable, especially in early childhood (see the work of Bowlby, Ainsworth, Erickson, Spitz and, domestically, Langmeier, Koch, Matějček and Damborská).”⁸

These examples suggest that, firstly, a fundamental change in knowledge about children’s development and needs took place in socialist Czechoslovakia between

4 Vladimír VOJTÍK, *K otázce hospitalismu v dětských kolektivních zařízeních* [On the Question of Hospitalism in Residential Care Institutions for Children], *Československá pediatrie* [Czechoslovak Pediatrics] 11, 1956, No. 4, pp. 309–311, here p. 309–310.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 309.

6 Dennis THOMPSON — John D. HOGAN — Philip M. CLARK, *Developmental Psychology in Historical Perspective*, New York, NY 2011, pp. 90–91; Gerhardt NISSEN, *Kulturgeschichte seelischer Störungen bei Kindern und Jugendlichen*, Stuttgart 2005, pp. 275–283.

7 Josef LANGMEIER, *Otázka psychické deprivace a vývoj výchovných názorů u nás* [The Question of Psychological Deprivation and the Development of Educational Views in Our Country], *Československá pediatrie* 17, 1962, No. 7–8, pp. 646–652, here p. 646.

8 Josef MUSIL — Marie BUŠKOVÁ, *Koncepce dětských domovů (Ideový záměr ministerstva školství ČSR)* [The Concept of Children’s Homes (Ideological Plan of the Ministry of Education of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic)], Praha 1970, p. 10.

1950 and 1970, resulting in care policy reforms.⁹ Secondly, this change was, it seems, stimulated by the transfer and adaptation of developmental psychology knowledge, especially Anglo-American hospitalism and attachment theory. This transfer needs to be both explained and understood, in order to shed new light on the temporal, spatial and discursive dimensions of the psychologization of childhood in the second half of the 20th century.¹⁰

Attachment theory is one of the most discussed and influential concepts in developmental psychology of the second half of the 20th century.¹¹ Since the early 1950s, British psychoanalyst John Bowlby, “the main architect of the most successful theory about the biological roots of mother love and love for mother,”¹² had argued, based on previous research into phenomena such as maternal deprivation and hospitalism, that there needs to be a close and uninterrupted emotional relationship between mothers and their children, especially in the early years of life, and had thus formed a controversial approach.¹³ His attachment theory has “become a major paradigm of child development and has influenced educational counselling and family therapy, custody and adoption decisions, such as mother-infant attachment programmes.”¹⁴ A number of studies have explored the emergence of attachment theory and emphasised its importance for child-centred parenting, which was considered “democratic”, in Western Europe and the US in the post-war period.¹⁵ However, little is known about the extent and contexts of the reception and adaptation of this theory

9 For more details on the reform see: Frank HENSCHER, *Projektování sociálního rodičovství. Osvojení, pěstounská péče a SOS dětské vesničky v socialistickém Československu* [Designing a Social Parenthood System. Adoption, Foster Care, and SOS Children’s Villages in Socialist Czechoslovakia], *Soudobé dějiny* [Czech Journal of Contemporary History] 24, 2017, No. 4, pp. 582–610.

10 André Turmel, among others, has described this fundamental paradigm shift in the US and Western Europe in his *A Historical Sociology of Childhood. Developmental Thinking, Categorization and Graphic Visualization*, Cambridge [and elsewhere] 2008.

11 Marga VICEDO, *The Nature and Nurture of Love. From Imprinting to Attachment in Cold War America*, Chicago — London 2014, pp. 2–11.

12 EADEM, *Cold War Emotions. Mother Love and the War over Human Nature*, in: Mark Solovey (ed.), *Cold War Social Science. Knowledge Production, Liberal Democracy, and Human Nature*, Basingstoke 2012, pp. 233–250, here p. 241.

13 Claudia MOISEL, *Geschichte und Psychoanalyse. Zur Genese der Bindungstheorie von John Bowlby*, *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 65, 2017, No. 1, pp. 51–74; Erica BURMAN, *Deconstructing Developmental Psychology*, London [and elsewhere] 2008, pp. 130–133; Jeremy HOLMES, *John Bowlby and Attachment Theory*, London 2014.

14 Marga VICEDO, *Bindungstheorie*, in: Franz Kasper Krönig (ed.), *Kritisches Glossar Kindheitspädagogik*, Weinheim — Basel 2018, pp. 48–54, here p. 48.

15 Felix BERTH, *Discovering Bowlby. Infant Homes and Attachment Theory in West Germany after the Second World War*, *Paedagogica Historica* 53, 2021, No. 3, pp. 1–17; C. MOISEL, *Geschichte und Psychoanalyse*; Mathew THOMSON, *Lost Freedom. The Landscape of the Child and the British Post-War Settlement*, Oxford 2013; Julia GRANT, *Raising Baby by the Book. The Education of American Mothers*, New Haven 1998; Nikolas S. ROSE, *Governing the Soul. The Shaping of the Private Self*, London 1999, pp. 167–170.

in socialist societies. This blind spot is certainly due in no small part to the persistence of stereotypical ideas about the division between East and West in European (contemporary) history. While there have been repeated calls for overcoming this division, its existence is also perpetuated by questions and analytical contexts focused on the “Eastern Bloc”.¹⁶

However, this blind spot also exists because aspects related to the history of knowledge and science have so far played a subordinate role in the now extensive research on the history of childhood under socialism.¹⁷ Martina Winkler recently emphasised the importance of “the axiom of a general social responsibility for children, the basic concept of a childhood of development and the idea of the need for a scientific, expert-led approach to bringing up children” in socialist Czechoslovakia.¹⁸ On the other hand, while the history of knowledge and science has, in recent times, examined the multitude of psychological, psychoanalytical and psychotherapeutic approaches and practices under state socialism,¹⁹ the psychology of childhood in general and attachment theory in particular remain largely unexplored, although there are important indications that both have had an important impact.²⁰

-
- 16 Most recently pointedly criticised in Markus Krzoska’s review essay on Włodzimierz BORODZIEJ — Stanislav HOLUBEC — Joachim VON PUTTKAMER (edd.), *The Routledge History Handbook of Central and Eastern Europe in the Twentieth Century 1–3*, New York 2020: *Rezensionsessay: Auf der Suche nach dem verlorenen Raum? Das östliche Europa im “Handbuch”*, *H-Soz-Kult*, 4. 4. 2023, online: www.hsozkult.de/publicationreview/id/reb-29738 [retrieved 21. 4. 2023].
- 17 Jiří KNAPÍK (ed.), *Děti, mládež a socialismus v Československu v 50. a 60. letech* [Children, Youth and Socialism in Czechoslovakia in the 1950s and 1960s], Opava 2014; Jiří KNAPÍK — Martin FRANCO (edd.), *Mezi pionýrským šátkem a mopedem. Děti, mládež a socialismus v českých zemích 1948–1970* [Between the Pioneer Scarf and the Moped. Children, Youth and Socialism in the Czech Lands 1948–1970], Praha 2018.
- 18 Martina WINKLER, *Windeln wechseln für den Sozialismus? Elternratgeber in der Tschechoslowakei (1948–1989)*, *Zeithistorische Forschungen* 17, 2020, No. 3, pp. 445–476, here p. 448.
- 19 Jakub STŘELEČEK, *Genealogie socialistické subjektivity? Přístup k dějinám psy-disciplín v Evropě po roce 1945 v soudobé historiografii a sociologii* [A Genealogy of Socialist Subjectivity? Approaches to the History of Psy-Disciplines in Post-1945 Europe in Contemporary Historiography and Sociology], *Dějiny — Teorie — Kritika* [History — Theory — Criticism] 17, 2020, No. 2, pp. 222–244; Adéla GJURIČOVÁ, *Proměna socialistického člověka v liberální individuum? Psychotherapie v Československu po roce 1969* [The Transformation of Socialist Man into a Liberal Individual? Psychotherapy in Czechoslovakia after 1969], in: Michal Kopeček (ed.), *Architekti dlouhé změny. Expertní kořeny postsocialismu v Československu* [Architects of the Long Change. Expert Roots of Post-Socialism in Czechoslovakia], Praha 2019, pp. 185–216; Mat SAVELLI — Sarah MARKS (edd.), *Psychiatry in Communist Europe*, Basingstoke, Hampshire — New York 2015.
- 20 Kateřina LIŠKOVÁ, *Sexual Liberation, Socialist Style. Communist Czechoslovakia and the Science of Desire 1945–1989*, Cambridge 2018, pp. 163–174; Steven SAXONBERG — Hana HAŠKOVÁ — Jiří MUDRÁK, *The Development of Czech Childcare Policies*, Praha 2012, pp. 45–59.

My analysis here therefore focuses on the adaptation and further development of attachment theory in socialist Czechoslovakia as an example of the reciprocal transfer and transformation of psychological knowledge in the European post-war period.²¹ I would like to show, firstly, that the reception of attachment theory in socialist Czechoslovakia took place within a context of challenging the quality of care in residential care institutions, especially children's homes; that, secondly, the theory became an argument in the discussion about the reform of the children's home system and family legislation; and that, thirdly, it further developed into research on deprivation conceived more broadly, which in turn provided impulses for transnational discourse.

The basic assumption of Bowlby's attachment theory, namely that children "need a warm continuous relationship with a mother or a mother substitute, and they need to be dependably loved. [Otherwise they] may develop all sorts of behavioural and mental problems,"²² had not been new. Its development transcended the West-East dichotomy, demonstrating the relevance and interconnectedness of the (Central) European knowledge space in the first half of the 20th century. This space was destroyed by the Nazis and then rebuilt and reconfigured by different political and economic systems.²³ In his work, John Bowlby took up the research conducted by the "Viennese School" around Charlotte and Karl Bühler in the 1920s and 1930s as well as the psychological pedagogy of the Austrian August Aichhorn, the psychoanalysis of the Hungarian Sándor Ferenczis and, last but not least, the hospitalism theory of the Viennese psychologist René Spitz, who, like Bühler and many other scientists, had been forced into exile after 1933.²⁴ What Bowlby succeeded at was integrating the above simple and neat axiom into a theory and popularising it greatly after he had been commissioned by the WHO in 1950 to travel to many Western European countries and the US to visit research institutes and care institutions for orphaned and neglected children.²⁵ His report was also printed in

21 Important suggestions for the analysis and representation of knowledge transfers can be found in Anna N. HAMMAR — David L. HEIDENBLAD — Kari NORDBERG — Johan ÖSTING — Erling SANDMO, *The History of Knowledge and the Circulation of Knowledge. An Introduction*, in: Anna N. Hammar et al. (edd.), *Circulation of Knowledge. Explorations into the History of Knowledge*, Lund 2018, pp. 9–35.

22 Frank VAN DER HORST — Renée VAN DER VEER, *The Ontogeny of an Idea. John Bowlby and Contemporaries on Mother–Child Separation*, *History of Psychology* 13, 2010, No. 1, pp. 25–45, here p. 26.

23 Alfons SÖLLNER — Mitchell G. ASH (edd.), *Forced Migration and Scientific Change. Emigré German-Speaking Scientists and Scholars after 1933*, Cambridge 1996.

24 Katharina ROWOLD, *What Do Babies Need to Thrive? Changing Interpretations of "Hospitalism" in an International Context, 1900–1945*, *Social History of Medicine* 32, 2019, No. 4, pp. 799–818.

25 Frank VAN DER HORST — Karin ZETTERQVIST NELSON — Lenny ROSMALEN — Renée VAN DER VEER, *A Tale of Four Countries. How Bowlby Used His Trip through Europe to Write the WHO Report and Spread His Ideas*, *Journal of the History of the Behavioural Sciences* 56, 2020, No. 3, pp. 169–185.

a slightly abridged version in a book in 1953 and quickly became a popular best-seller.²⁶ The book was translated into French, Italian, Spanish and, later, into German. By the 1980s Bowlby had produced many other relevant works,²⁷ none of which were translated into Russian or Czech before 1989.

Interestingly, Bowlby also had the chance to travel to Czechoslovakia in 1950. This was prevented at short notice by travel restrictions, but Bowlby expressed no disappointment at all about this in a letter to his wife,²⁸ although the visit would have enabled him to directly study the forms and consequences of expanded state residential care. The expansion of crèches, kindergartens, after-school care centres and children's homes was the Czechoslovak response to the challenges of the transformation after the Nazi occupation, the war and the expulsion of the German minority, the full integration of women into the labour market and the demand for modern, efficient and comprehensive childcare.²⁹ The belief that residential care institutions were equivalent to the family was not purely a product of the new communist ideology: it also grew out of structures of collective upbringing that had been organically evolving since the late 19th century and had a scientific foundation.³⁰ It was shaped by the dominance of a specific paediatric and pedagogical view³¹ centred on the body and the collective and reinforced by knowledge transfers from the Soviet Union.³² Many strands of psychology, especially individualising psychoanalytical approaches, had been repudiated since the height of Stalinism.³³ Mainstream post-war Czechoslovak psychology, represented for example

-
- 26 John BOWLBY, *Maternal Care and Mental Health*, Geneva 1952; IDEM, *Child Care and the Growth of Love. Based [...] on the Author's Report: Maternal Care and Mental Health*, Melbourne [and elsewhere] 1953.
- 27 Especially noteworthy in this context is Bowlby's three-volume opus magnum, published between 1969 and 1980: IDEM, *Attachment and Loss*, 3 Volumes, New York 1969–1980.
- 28 Archives and Manuscripts Welcome Library, London Personal Papers Bowlby, B.1/11, File: Jan–Feb 1950. Geneva, Stockholm, Paris, The Netherlands, John Bowlby's letters to his wife Ursula, 9 and 11 January 1950. I would like to thank my dear colleague Frank van der Horst for sharing his materials.
- 29 See references in footnotes 2 and 3.
- 30 Tara ZAHRA, "Each Nation Only Cares for its Own". *Empire, Nation, and Child Welfare Activism in the Bohemian Lands, 1900–1918*, *American Historical Review* 111, 2006, No. 5, pp. 1378–1402.
- 31 Martina WINKLER, *Kdo má děti vychovávat a jak? Pedagogika jako klíčový diskurz socialistické společnosti* [Who Should Raise the Children and How? Pedagogy as a Key Discourse of Socialist Society], *Historie — Otázky — Problémy* [History — Questions — Problems] 10, 2018, No. 2, pp. 60–71; Maria Cristina GALMARINI-KABALA, *Psychiatry, Violence, and the Soviet Project of Transformation. A Micro-History of the Perm' Psycho-Neurological School-Sanatorium*, *Slavic Review* 77, 2018, No. 2, pp. 307–332.
- 32 Andy BYFORD, *Science of the Child in Late Imperial and Early Soviet Russia*, Oxford 2020.
- 33 Sarah MARKS, *Suggestion, Persuasion and Work. Psychotherapies in Communist Europe*, *European Journal of Psychotherapy & Counselling* 20, 2018, No. 1, pp. 10–24; Martin A. MILLER, *Freud and the Bolsheviks. Psychoanalysis in Imperial Russia and the Soviet Union*, New Haven, Conn. — London 1998, pp. 69–92.

by Vladimír Tardy, chair of the discipline's department at Prague University, was hardly concerned with childhood in the 1940s and 1950s and adhered to the Pavlovian behaviourist school, according to which upbringing and conditioning held the most sway over a person's development.³⁴ In addition, the regime and science were at that time still focusing on combating infant and child mortality, which had reached staggering levels in the first half of the century, including especially in residential care institutions. Until the 1950s, the reduction of mortality had been considered a major task of the health and care sector.³⁵ Czechoslovak paediatricians looked with admiration at the Soviet Union, where crèches and infant homes were considered efficient "health care institutions".³⁶

Paediatric, pedagogical and behaviourist approaches, which tended to de-emphasise the cognitive and emotional needs of infants and young children, were also dominant in the US and in Western Europe until the middle of the 20th century.³⁷ In Czechoslovakia, however, the prioritisation of health and nutrition, provisioning and employment, upbringing and education of children had an impact, and not only in institutions of residential care, such as children's homes. Practical guides for parents and families published in this period, including the extremely popular book *Péče o dítě* by the paediatrician Josef Švejcar,³⁸ also contain very little about the need for parental love and primarily discuss food sufficiency, physical and cognitive development and discipline through upbringing.³⁹

In the mid-1950s, however, the first doubts about these paradigms began to appear in Czechoslovakia. Concerns were raised by psychology and psychiatry experts who, as practitioners in the wide network of care, diagnostic and therapeutic institutions (by now residential infant and children's homes had a capacity of about 15,000) were directly involved with children separated from their parents on an everyday basis. They observed developmental disorders and behavioural problems in the children and these could no longer be explained or addressed by physiological or pedagogical means, but required other instruments. There was also a pan-European context to this. As Tara Zahra has shown in her impressive book on the reconfiguration of the concept of childhood during and after World War II, collective institutions such as displaced person camps, foster homes and rehabilitation facilities revealed the vulnerabilities and needs of children beyond material provisioning and became labo-

34 Vladimír TARDY, *Psychologie dítěte a dospívající mládeže* [Child and Adolescent Psychology], Praha 1955; on Tardy see: Alena PLHÁKOVÁ — Olga PECHOVÁ, *Život a dílo Vladimíra Tardyho* [The Life and Work of Vladimír Tardy], Praha 2012.

35 Jiří BLECHA, *Návrh na ochranu vývoje kojence* [Proposal for the Protection of Infant Development], *Pediatrické listy* [Pediatric Letters] 6, 1951, pp. 51–56.

36 Kamil KUBÁT — Ferdinand DÉMANT, *Péče o dítě v SSSR* [Child Care in the USSR], *Pediatrické listy* 6, 1951, pp. 327–330, here p. 328.

37 K. ROWOLD, *What Do Babies Need*.

38 Josef ŠVEJCAR, *Péče o dítě* [Child Care], Praha 1951; for a detailed analysis of parenting guides, see M. WINKLER, *Windeln wechseln*.

39 Július BREZA, *Vývoj a výchova dieťaťa* [Child Development and Upbringing], Bratislava 1952.

ratories of a different knowledge of childhood that found expression in Bowlby's attachment theory, among others.⁴⁰

In this sense Vladimír Vojtík's article quoted at the beginning of this paper was the first to address the problems and dangers posed by institutional upbringing for the psychological and emotional development of children in socialist Czechoslovakia. Vojtík describes in drastic terms the behavioural and developmental problems he observed: the children were withdrawn, listless, lethargic or aggressive, would throw tantrums; lack a functional emotional control and know no boundaries, could not adapt to their environment; their cognitive abilities were limited and their sense of orientation and memory damaged. He sums up the situation as follows: "There is hospitalism there already today."⁴¹ Vojtík thus adopts, without giving any direct reference, as noted above, the classification introduced by the Austrian-American psychologist René A. Spitz in his papers in 1945 and 1946.⁴² At the same time, Vojtík located the cause of these disorders in the absence of mother, highlighting an aspect with which Spitz was less concerned but which Bowlby focused on in his WHO report. While Vojtík does not call for a radical change of the system, he does provide a warning that is also a forward-looking crisis diagnosis: "It is necessary to improve upbringing in collective institutions for children. If we succeed at this, we will achieve a drop in mental disorders, not only in children but also in adults."⁴³

Subsequently, he argued in other essays that psychiatrists, paediatricians and educators should work more closely together to prevent the development of these disorders.⁴⁴ Vojtík's article already points out two central aspects of the Czechoslovak discussion: the role of residential care institutions as laboratories of knowledge production and the crisis diagnosis directed both at the present and the future of society. Both paved the way for a productive appropriation of the knowledge offered by developmental psychology and attachment theory.

The parallels between Vojtík's diagnoses and Anglo-American hospitalism and attachment theories were not coincidental: he and other Czechoslovak physicians and psychologists had access to the publications of Spitz, Bowlby, Goldfarb and others, as evidenced by further discussion of the topic. Only a short time after Vojtík, Marie Damborská, physician and head of the infant home in Luhačovice, east of Brno, discussed in detail Western research on hospitalism and maternal deprivation, giving

40 Tara ZAHRA, *The Lost Children. Reconstructing Europe's Families after World War II*, Cambridge, Mass 2011; summary: EADEM, *Lost Children. Displacement, Family, and Nation in Postwar Europe*, *The Journal of Modern History* 81, 2009, No. 1, pp. 45–86.

41 V. VOJTÍK, *K otázce hospitalismu*, p. 309.

42 René A. SPITZ, *Hospitalism. An Inquiry into the Genesis of Psychiatric Conditions in Early Childhood*, *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* 1, 1945, No. 1, pp. 53–74; IDEM, *Hospitalism. A Follow-up Report*, *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* 2, 1946, No. 1, pp. 113–117.

43 V. VOJTÍK, *K otázce hospitalismu*, p. 311.

44 IDEM, *Organisace a metodika práce v dětské psychiatrii* [Organization and Methodology of Work in Child Psychiatry], *Československá pediatrie* 12, 1957, No. 10, pp. 868–873; IDEM, *Prevence v dětské psychiatrii* [Prevention in Child Psychiatry], *Československá pediatrie* 12, 1957, No. 10, pp. 874–880.

an explicit citation.⁴⁵ Moreover, she used the cited findings and her own observations as arguments against the existing system of children's and infant homes. In her article in *Československá pediatrie*, Damborská, like Vojtík, emphasised the efficiency of the institutions run according to "Soviet principles", but also called attention to the increased incidence of cognitive and emotional disorders in them. Damborská used Western research as a mirror for her own diagnosis of the situation in socialist Czechoslovakia: on the one hand, she argued that these impairments occurred much less frequently there and were in any case reversible; in addition, many children, she said, came to the homes, where the children were first "properly" cared for, with prior conditions, caused by "moronic" and "callous" mothers.⁴⁶ On the other hand, she argued that structural changes were needed to prevent and treat these impairments, but that those could not consist simply in leaving the child with his/her mother. Damborská did not reject residential care institutions, quite the contrary. However, she called, interestingly with reference to Scandinavian institutions, for more and better qualified staff and the merging of infant and toddler homes in order to minimise disruptive changes in the care environment at an early age.⁴⁷ Early childhood was labelled a particularly vulnerable phase of life in which the prevailing paradigms of care and provisioning without sufficient emotional attention no longer applied.

Damborská thus not only took up the central findings of Anglo-American hospitalism research and attachment theory and combined them with her own observations, but also translated them into specific care policy demands. Like Vojtík, however, she did not call for a radical change of course and question the system as a whole. In her view, socialism always offered "better" conditions for child-friendly care, whose structure, however, needed to be improved. While Damborská praised the health and care system of socialist Czechoslovakia in richly illustrated brochures addressed to Western countries,⁴⁸ in her other work on infants and toddlers in her institution, again following Spitz, Goldfarb and Bowlby, she brought to light serious developmental deficits that were increasingly regarded as permanent and repeated her demands for better equipment in the homes.⁴⁹ In 1963, Damborská also participated in the documentary film *Děti bez lásky* [Children Without Love], which exposed the conditions in Czechoslovakian children's homes, crèches and similar institutions and was withdrawn by the Ministry of Health after a few screenings.⁵⁰

45 Marie DAMBORSKÁ, *Některé aktuální otázky výchovy ústavních dětí* [Some Current Issues in the Education of Institutionalised Children], *Československá pediatrie* 12, 1957, No. 10, pp. 893–898.

46 Ibid., p. 896.

47 Ibid., p. 895.

48 EADEM, *ČSSR pečuje o děti* [Czechoslovakia Cares for Children], Praha 1962. Her book was simultaneously published in German, English, French, Spanish, Italian and Russian.

49 EADEM, *Rozdíly mezi dítětem vychovávaným v rodině a v ústavu během 1. roku* [Differences between a Child Brought up in a Family and in an Institution During the First Year], *Československá pediatrie* 12, 1957, No. 7, pp. 980–990.

50 Zdeněk MATĚJČEK — Jan JANDOUREK — Markéta ELBLOVÁ, *Zdeněk Matějček. Naděje není v kouzlech* [Zdeněk Matějček. Hope Does Not Lie in Magic], Praha 1999, p. 128.

This meant that, in the early 1960s, the discussion about the pedagogical and, above all, psychological risks of institutional care had reached not only professionals but was also increasingly taking place in the wider public. De-Stalinisation to a large degree eroded the belief in a rapid and irreversible progress towards socialism and led to a broad reform discussion in Czechoslovakia, centred on the economy and cultural policy.⁵¹ However, children and their “normal” development, and thus the future of society, were also a topic.⁵²

In this climate, which has hitherto not been researched much, attachment theory became a central and pragmatically used concept for challenging care policy structures. Along with Damborská, especially two Prague psychologists seem to have played a pivotal role in this trend, both of whom also contributed to the *Děti bez lásky* movie. Zdeněk Matějček and Josef Langmeier had come together in the mid-1950s at the Sociodiagnostický ústav [Sociodiagnostic Institute] in Prague, where children considered to have behavioural problems or to be delinquent were examined and therapeutically treated. In their 1959 publication *Člověk známý neznámý*, specifically its chapter *Šťastné dětství* [Happy Childhood], Langmeier and Matějček had already explicitly taken up approaches used in psychoanalysis and developmental psychology and emphasised the necessity of loving, emotional and secure interpersonal bonds for child development, thus challenging the behaviourist mainstream of Czechoslovak psychology. “[Modern] psychology is constantly providing new evidence that the basic structure of human character is formed long before puberty is reached, even before the child goes to school and, in the majority of cases, before the parents are aware that it is time to start parenting. And if the development of this character is to be healthy, meaningful and positive in the social sense, it needs to take place in an atmosphere of healthy, meaningful and thoroughly positive social relations, in an atmosphere of security and cheerfulness.”⁵³ The book argued there had been a crisis-like transformation of the family and upbringing in the post-war period and discussed the resulting challenges and risks for the psychological and emotional development of children. Placement in children’s homes was no longer ideologized as a best practice or a genuine element of socialist care policy but merely recognised as a temporary necessity whose practical design was in need of reform.⁵⁴

A clear expression of this paradigm shift was the focus on deprivation, its causes and consequences, its forms and diagnosis, its prevention and therapy. The term had

51 Pavel KOLÁŘ, *Der Poststalinismus. Ideologie und Utopie einer Epoche*, Köln — Weimar — Wien 2016; Martin SCHULZE WESSEL (ed.), *The Prague Spring as a Laboratory*, Göttingen 2019; IDEM, *Der Prager Frühling. Aufbruch in eine neue Welt*, Ditzingen 2018, Czech translation: IDEM, *Pražské jaro. Průlom do nového světa* [Prague Spring. Breakthrough into a New World], Praha 2018.

52 Květa JECHOVÁ, *Matky a děti, chtěné i nechtěné* [Mothers and Children, Wanted and Unwanted], in: Oldřich Tůma — Tomáš Vilímek (edd.), *Opozice a společnost po roce 1948* [Opposition and Society after 1948], Praha 2009, pp. 10–72.

53 Josef LANGMEIER — Zdeněk MATĚJČEK, *Člověk známý neznámý* [Man, Known and Unknown], Praha 1959, p. 209.

54 *Ibid.*, pp. 220–243.

already been introduced by Goldfarb and used by Bowlby, but it was comprehensively and systematically elaborated on in Prague. For Langmeier and Matějček, deprivation replaced Spitz's concept of hospitalism, which was considered too narrow, since the psychological and emotional neglect of children was not only found in institutional contexts but also in the families themselves. The concept of deprivation, however, also emphasised an aspect of the problem which was different from the concept of attachment coined by Bowlby. The concept of attachment was also seen as too narrow, as it focused on the mother-child dyad and the tendency to individualise responsibility meant that the structural context of undesirable development was disregarded.

The term deprivation was introduced into the Czechoslovak discussion by Langmeier's 1962 paper mentioned at the beginning. It also reveals the common roots and the paths along which knowledge related to developmental psychology was transferred to socialist Czechoslovakia. In *Československá pediatrie*, Langmeier combined Central European and Anglo-American hospitalism and attachment theory research, conducted since the 1920s, with Soviet paedology and current Czechoslovak deprivation research. He resolutely criticised the behaviourism of educational psychology, which was still mainstream: "The [sort of] upbringing of a child recommended by paediatricians and educators in the previous phase is entirely irrational in the family."⁵⁵ Now, however, science had entered a new phase, he argued, demonstrating that institutions like children's homes in their current form are not an alternative to families but need to be rethought: "It is only logical, then, that these trends need to become thoroughly established, in family care as well as in care for children without families. The belief must prevail among parents that the development of the child takes place above all through their relationship with the child [...]. [...] Children need their love [...]. The institution is not an equivalent alternative [...]. Crèches are therefore not a good solution. [...] Crèches and kindergartens are a valuable addition for pre-school children, as they offer extended social contacts and experiences."⁵⁶

One year later, Langmeier and Matějček detailed the concept in their main work *Psychická deprivace v dětství*. They were still building on Anglo-American research, but substantiated their explanations with their own studies and many studies conducted by their Czechoslovak colleagues in the early 1960s.⁵⁷ "Psychological depriva-

⁵⁵ J. LANGMEIER, *Otázka psychické deprivace*, p. 650.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 651.

⁵⁷ Antonín MORES, *Rozbor problémů dlouhodobého a trvalého pobytu dětí v kojeneckém ústavě, týdenních jeslích a mateřské školce a ve všech dětských domovech olomouckého okresu* [An Analysis of the Problems Related to Long-Term and Permanent Residence of Children in Infant Homes, Nurseries and Kindergartens and in All Children's Homes in the Olomouc District], *Československá pediatrie* 18, 1963, No. 1, pp. 74–80; Marie DAMBORSKÁ — Pavla ŠTĚPÁNOVÁ, *Problémy adaptability ústavních dětí* [Adaptability Problems in Institutionalized Children], *Československá pediatrie* 17, 1962, No. 7–8, pp. 600–606; Jaroslav KOCH, *Pokus o analýzu vlivu prostředí kojeneckých ústavů na neuropsychický vývoj 4měsíčních až 12měsíčních dětí* [An Attempt to Analyse the Impact of the Environment in Infant Institutions on the Neuropsychological Development of 4-Month-Old to 12-Month-Old Children], *Československá pediatrie* 16, 1961, No. 4, pp. 322–330.

tion is a state of the organism that arises as a result of life situations in which the subject is unable to satisfy his basic (vital) psychological needs to a sufficient extent over a prolonged period of time.”⁵⁸ Langmeier and Matějček used this broad concept of “deprivation” to examine various forms of care for children. They used children’s homes as laboratories for research into early childhood and as points of reference for critical stocktaking and alarming projections regarding the causes and consequences of emotional neglect by caregivers. In their view, the children’s home system in its current configuration — large, age-homogeneous groups, staff turnover, unstimulating environment with everything subject to a timetable and schedule — was inevitably promoting deprivation. Langmeier and Matějček developed a differentiated typology of the forms, causes and consequences of deprivation.⁵⁹ Moreover, they identified problems not only in residential care institutions, such as children’s homes and crèches, but also in the family as the child’s primary social environment.⁶⁰ They analysed the socio-cultural and economic foundations of deprivation and included factors operating at the level of society as a whole into their theory.⁶¹

In order to study and describe child development, Langmeier and Matějček thus went beyond discussing an individual child and family and adopted environmental approaches from Marxist-inspired psychology.⁶² While Czechoslovak deprivation research built on Western studies, it amounted to more than a simple adoption of concepts and terms from hospitalism and attachment theories. It shifted the theoretical and methodological boundaries of existing developmental psychology and produced knowledge that could be taken up in other countries and by other disciplines. This was made possible not least thanks to the study of hundreds of institutionalised children. Czechoslovak research thus benefited from specific conditions that could hardly be emulated in the West at that time. Western children’s homes were not centralised and run by the state, but instead managed by churches and charities. They were hardly accessible from the outside, which is why problems and serious abuses in the treatment of children only became public very late, but were followed by a massive deinstitutionalisation that never happened in Czechoslovakia.⁶³

Psychická deprivace quickly became a widely respected standard work and was also positively received by Czechoslovak educators, despite its frequent criticism of socialist

58 Zdeněk MATĚJČEK — Josef LANGMEIER, *Psychická deprivace v dětství* [Psychological Deprivation in Childhood], Praha 2011, p. 26.

59 EOSDEM, *Typy chování dětí* [Types of Child Behaviour], *Časopis lékařů českých* [Journal of Czech Physicians] 106, 1967, pp. 546–550.

60 EOSDEM, *Psychická deprivace*, pp. 73–176.

61 *Ibid.*, pp. 177–203.

62 A. BYFORD, *Science of the Child*, pp. 30–39; Anton YASNITSKY (ed.), *A History of Marxist Psychology*, New York 2020.

63 For a critical discussion of abuse and violence in children’s homes in the Federal Republic of Germany and Austria see Wolfgang BENZ — Barbara DISTEL (edd.), *„Gemeinschaftsfremde“*. *Zwangserziehung im Nationalsozialismus, in der Bundesrepublik und der DDR*, Berlin — Dachau 2016; Reinhard SIEDER — Michaela RALSER (edd.), *Kinder des Staates = Children of the State*, Innsbruck 2014.

care policy's central pillars.⁶⁴ It was the combination of foreign research and the authors' own studies that won recognition and resulted in an impact beyond the professional public: the stirring documentary *Děti bez lásky* might have been withdrawn shortly after its release, but it had already been shown on television and as a supporting film in multiple cinemas. It also attracted attention to the topic from among the Czechoslovak public, which, as noted above,⁶⁵ had already begun to move in the years of liberalisation.⁶⁶

The second half of the 1960s in Czechoslovakia was marked by an intensive and controversial discussion on how to reform care policy. This discussion has not been given much attention in historical research so far, but it revealed the complexity of the expert discourse and revolved primarily around the topic of deprivation risk and prevention in residential care institutions.⁶⁷ After the publication of *Psychická deprivace*, Langmeier and Matějček came forward with demands for a comprehensive reform of the institutional system, which led to an open dispute with educators, although both sides agreed on the crisis diagnosis.⁶⁸ Damborská also argued that children's homes should only be a temporary emergency solution for infants and small children. In her view, what was needed was maternal care and attention, since otherwise children would suffer not only motor and cognitive, but especially psychosocial and emotional damage, the gravity of which she now apparently assessed differently than a few years earlier.⁶⁹ Damborská produced manuals and textbooks for educators and healthcare workers, in which she discussed extensively the psychological and emotional needs of (young) children.⁷⁰ She also redesigned the infant facility

⁶⁴ Juraj ČEČETKA, *Recenze: Psychická deprivace v dětství (Langmeier)* [Review: Psychological Deprivation in Childhood (Langmeier)], *Vychovávateľ* [Educator] 8, 1963–64, No. 6, pp. 188–189; M. DOLEJŠÍ, *Recenze: Psychická deprivace v dětství* [Review: Psychological Deprivation in Childhood], *Pedagogika* [Pedagogy] 14, 1964, No. 2, pp. 236–238; Olga KOLÁŘÍKOVÁ, *Recenze: Psychická deprivace v dětství* [Review: Psychological Deprivation in Childhood], *Psychológia a patopsychológia dieťaťa* [Child Psychology and Pathopsychology] 1, 1966, No. 1, pp. 93–94.

⁶⁵ K. JECHOVÁ, *Matky a děti*, pp. 40–41.

⁶⁶ M. SCHULZE WESSEL (ed.), *The Prague Spring*.

⁶⁷ For a detailed analysis of the discussion see Frank HENSCHER, *A Project of Social Engineering. Scientific Experts and the "Child-Issue" in Socialist Czechoslovakia*, *Acta historica Universitatis Silesianae Opaviensis* 9, 2016, pp. 143–158.

⁶⁸ Jaroslav KOCH — Josef LANGMEIER — Zdeněk MATĚJČEK, *Návrh nového systému péče o děti vychovávané mimo vlastní rodinu* [Proposal for a New System of Care for Children Brought up outside Their Own Family], *Pedagogika* 15, 1965, No. 3, pp. 316–326; Antonín ŠULC — Marie BUŠKOVÁ — Josef ČERNÝ — Ján SOJKA — Jiřina TAXOVÁ-ŠOLKOVÁ — Iva VAŇKOVÁ, K „Návrhu nové koncepce péče o děti vychovávané mimo vlastní rodinu“ [On the “Proposal for a New Concept of Care for Children Brought up outside Their Own Family”], *Pedagogika* 16, 1966, No. 2, pp. 186–190.

⁶⁹ Marie DAMBORSKÁ, *Citový život a vývoj řeči kojenců v kolektivních zařízeních* [Infants' Emotional Life and Language Development in Residential Care Institutions], Praha 1963, pp. 83–84.

⁷⁰ Marie DAMBORSKÁ — Jaroslav KOCH, *Psychologie a pedagogika dítěte. Učební text pro střední zdravot. školy, obor dětských sester* [Child Psychology and Pedagogy. Textbook for Secondary

she ran, introducing smaller groups, permanent caregivers and a pedagogical programme aimed at family-like relationships.⁷¹

Czechoslovak deprivation research also entered the international discourse. Matějček and the paediatrician Jiří Dunovský, who also advocated reforms in care policy, published in German and English journals.⁷² *Psychická deprivace* was published in English in 1975, in German in 1977 and in Russian in 1984 and was very well received.⁷³ Interestingly, even though this was a publication from a socialist people's republic, Western colleagues did not look down on the research. Instead, they were probably grateful for the results, which they would not have been able to produce as they lacked access to institutions and the children living in them. Accordingly, the Mainz professor of social paediatrics Johannes Pechstein praised *Psychická deprivace* in his preface to the German edition as a "unique collection of international deprivation research findings" that would "undoubtedly spread rapidly".⁷⁴ The Dutch educator Martinus Langeveld credited the Czechoslovakian deprivation research of the 1960s with reviving the subject, which had quickly become sidelined after Bowlby's first publications in the early 1950s.⁷⁵ Anglo-American studies and handbooks cite the English edition, entitled *Psychological Deprivation in Childhood*, as a foundational work of attachment and deprivation research, on par with Spitz and Bowlby, which was particularly influential in social pedagogical practice.⁷⁶ From the late 1970s until

Medical Schools, Children's Nurse Qualification], Praha 1969; Marie DAMBORSKÁ, *Vývoj a výchova kojence v ústavním prostředí. Příručka pro pracovníky dětských zdravotně výchovných zařízení* [The Development and Upbringing of Infants in Institutional Settings. A Handbook for Staff in Children's Health Care and Educational Institutions], Praha 1967.

- 71 EADEM, *Obtížné cesty hledání* [Difficult Ways of Searching], *Československá pediatrie* 38, 1983, No. 1, pp. 50–54; EADEM, *Problémy socializace ústavních dětí* [Socialization Problems in Institutionalized Children], *Psychológia a patopsychológia dieťaťa* 11, 1976, No. 1, pp. 3–9.
- 72 Zdeněk MATĚJČEK, *Die langfristige Beobachtung der Entwicklung von Kleinkindern in den Heimen der CSSR*, in: Gerd Biermann (ed.), *Jahrbuch der Psychohygiene*, München — Basel 1974, pp. 170–187; Zdeněk MATĚJČEK, *Die Aufklärung von Adoptivkindern über ihre Herkunft*, *Unsere Jugend — Zeitschrift für Jugendhilfe in Wissenschaft und Praxis* 21, 1969, No. 9, pp. 403–409; Jiří DUNOVSKÝ, *Fürsorge für Kinder ohne Familien in der Tschechoslowakei*, *Unsere Jugend — Zeitschrift für Jugendhilfe in Wissenschaft und Praxis* 18, 1966, No. 5, pp. 228–230; IDEM, *Homeless Children Find a Home*, *Czechoslovak Life* 21, 1966, No. 3, pp. 8–9.
- 73 Robert BIELER, *Langmeier, J., Matejcek Z.: Psychische Deprivation im Kindesalter*, *München 1977*, *Heilpädagogik* 21, 1978, No. 4, p. 125; *Book Briefs*, *Child Welfare* 55, 1976, No. 3, pp. 230–232, here pp. 231–232.
- 74 Josef LANGMEIER — Zdeněk MATĚJČEK, *Psychische Deprivation im Kindesalter. Kinder ohne Liebe*, München 1977, p. V.
- 75 Martinus J. LANGEVELD, *Educating a Whole World*, *Paedagogica Europaea* 2, 1966, No. 1, pp. 1–26, here p. 10.
- 76 Monroe M. LEFKOWITZ — Edward P. TESINY, *Rejection and Depression. Prospective and Contemporaneous Analyses*, *Developmental Psychology* 20, 1984, No. 5, pp. 776–785, here pp. 776–777; Maryanne LOUGHRÝ — Carola EYBER, *Psychosocial Concepts in Humanitarian*

his death in 2002, Matějček published follow-up studies on the causes, forms and consequences of deprivation in US journals as well.⁷⁷ The research was thus relevant and would be taken up even after 1989.

Its influence was nevertheless greatest in Czechoslovakia itself. After the Family Act was amended in 1963, many institutions took advantage of the new freedoms and changed the care they provided. Matějček, together with colleagues from other disciplines, among them Jiří Dunovský, founded an association for promoting the establishment of SOS Children's Villages and thus furthered the transfer of knowledge and practices.⁷⁸ Finally, the period 1970 to 1974 saw the adoption of many new laws and regulations. The institutional system was not abolished, but it was put on a new footing. Adoptions and foster care were facilitated and psychological and material support for families and mothers was strengthened.⁷⁹ The justification for the reform, cited at the beginning, explicitly refers to research on the emotional and psychological needs of children, which care policy was supposed to focus on. The fact that these demands for reform met with success during Czechoslovak "normalisation", often described as a period of stagnation and re-Stalinisation, deserves further investigation.⁸⁰

The basis of the care policy reforms in late socialism was thus a comprehensive and reciprocal transfer of knowledge of developmental psychology concepts and terms, which could only be briefly outlined here due to its complexity and multiple effects. However, it is evident that psychology in socialism was neither an ideologized science subservient to the regime and that it also did not take place exclusively in some oppositional and clandestine niches, either. Instead, firstly, the then current approaches in developmental psychology — hospitalism, attachment and deprivation theories — were known in socialist Czechoslovakia; secondly, they were adapted, further developed and (re)transferred and, thirdly, they prompted a critical and interdisciplinary discussion of care and upbringing ideals as well as a reform of care policy. The reception history of attachment theory in socialism thus connects to current paradigms of contemporary historical research: the dissolution of a simple East-West dichotomy, the permeability of the "Iron Curtain", also and especially for knowledge; the relative autonomy of the social and psy-sciences in socialism and, finally, the level of scientification in modern, and also and especially socialist, societies.⁸¹

Work with Children. A Review of the Concepts and Related Literature, Washington, DC 2003, here pp. 5–8.

77 Zdeněk MATĚJČEK — Zdeněk DYTRYCH — Vratislav SCHÜLLER, *The Prague Study of Children Born from Unwanted Pregnancies*, *International Journal of Mental Health* 7, 1978, No. 3–4, pp. 63–77; Henry P. DAVID — Zdeněk DYTRYCH — Zdeněk MATĚJČEK, *Born Unwanted. Observations from the Prague Study*, *American Psychologist* 58, 2003, No. 3, pp. 224–229.

78 F. HENSCHL, *Projektování sociálního rodičovství*.

79 IDEM, *Engineering Families for Children*.

80 Pavel KOLÁŘ — Michal PULLMANN, *Co byla normalizace? Studie o pozdním socialismu* [What Was Normalisation? A Study of Late Socialism], Praha 2016.

81 Important impulses in this regard have recently been provided by M. KOPEČEK (ed.), *Architekti*.

The specific implementation of the reforms in the institutional and administrative structures, the scope and content of the public discussions in the 1960s and the transmission of knowledge related to developmental psychology and attachment theory to care practitioners and parents are some of the many aspects that remain underexplored and still require thorough and comprehensive research. It can be assumed that the “child question” was much more important in the reform processes of the 1960s and the Prague Spring than previously thought. The parallels between the call for a “third way”, a “socialism with a human face”, and Josef Langmeier’s plea for care and upbringing to be geared towards “giving children the opportunity for free self-realisation in a humane and democratic society”⁸² are unmistakable.

RÉSUMÉ:

The paper shows that knowledge about child development and needs fundamentally changed in communist Czechoslovakia between 1950 and 1970 and that this had far-reaching consequences for care policy. This change was stimulated by the transfer and adaptation of knowledge related to developmental psychology, especially Anglo-American hospitalism and attachment theories. The paper therefore analyses the adaptation and further development of this knowledge — especially the attachment theory proposed by the British psychologist John Bowlby — by Czechoslovak psychologists, paediatricians and educators as an example of the transfer of psychological knowledge during the Cold War. It argues, firstly, that the reception of attachment theory took place in the context of challenging the quality of residential care institutions for children, especially children’s homes; that, secondly, the received knowledge became an argument in the discussion about reform of the children’s home system and family legislation; and that, thirdly, it was further developed into a research on deprivation conceived more broadly, which in turn provided impulses for transnational discourse. The article thus sheds new light on the temporal, spatial and discursive dimensions of the psychologization of childhood in the second half of the 20th century, which have so far been largely left unexplored in socialist societies.

Dr. Frank Henschel is a research assistant at the Department of Eastern European History at the Seminar of History, Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel. He holds a Doctor’s degree from the University of Leipzig for a thesis on multiethnicity and nationalism in Kassa/Košice/Kaschau between 1867 and 1918. Subsequently, he conducted research under several third-party funded projects on the history of childhood, care and disability in socialist societies, especially in post-1945 Czechoslovakia (henschel@oeg.uni-kiel.de).

82 Josef LANGMEIER, *Náhradní péče o dítě očima psychologa* [Substitute Child Care through the Eyes of a Psychologist], *Československá pediatrie* 24, 1969, No. 10, pp. 865–872, here p. 871.