

RIJKSUNIVERSITEIT GRONINGEN

**Transforming German Universities during the Cold War:
The Failure of American and Soviet Cultural Imperialism**

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van het doctoraat in de
Gedrags- en Maatschappijwetenschappen
aan de Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
op gezag van de
Rector Magnificus, dr. E. Sterken,
in het openbaar te verdedigen op
donderdag 19 mei 2011
om 14.45 uur

door

Natalia Tsvetkova

geboren op 3 april 1973
te Smolensk, USSR

Promotor: Prof. dr. J.J.H. Dekker

Copromotor: Dr. W.A.J. Meijer

Beoordelingscommissie: Prof.dr. W.Th. M. Frijhoff
Prof.dr. M.C. Timmerman
Prof.dr. K.K. Khudoley

Contents

	List of Abbreviations.....	7
	...	
Chapter I	Introduction.....	9
	
	I. Theoretical framework of the research	
	1. Cultural transfer	
	2. Americanization/Sovietization	
	<i>Americanization</i>	
	<i>Sovietization</i>	
	3. Cultural imperialism	
	<i>Revisionism, Neomarxism, and the dependency theory</i>	
	<i>Reinterpretations of cultural imperialism</i>	
	Conclusion	
	II. Previous Literature	
	1. The stage from 1945 through the mid-1950s	
	2. The stage from the 1960s through the 1970s	
	3. The stage of the 1980s	
	4. The stage from early 1990s through the 2000s	
	Conclusion	
	III. Research Question	
	IV. Documentary Sources	
	1. Sources on American policy in West German universities, 1945-1990	
	<i>Archival records relative to American policy in German universities, 1945-1990</i>	
	<i>Published documents on American foreign policy towards East Germany and West Germany</i>	
	<i>Published reports of the Department of State as to international educational programs</i>	
	<i>Recollections of American officials who participated in reforming German universities</i>	
	2. Sources on Soviet policy in East German universities, 1945-1990	
	<i>Archival records relative to Soviet policy in German universities, 1945-1990</i>	
	<i>Published documents on Soviet foreign policy towards East Germany and West Germany</i>	

Recollections of Soviet officials who participated in reforming German universities

Conclusion

V. The structure of the dissertation

Chapter II	Americans and Soviets in the defeated Germany: the division of the country, Occupation administrations, and their transformation strategies for German universities.....	63
	Introduction	
	I. From friendly to hostile division	
	II. The American military administrations in Germany and their transformation strategies for German universities	
	1. The American military administrations in Germany	
	2. Initial strategies for transforming the German university system	
	III. The Soviet military administrations and their transformation strategies for German universities	
	1. The Soviet military administrations in Germany	
	2. Initial strategies for transforming the German university system	
	Conclusion	
Chapter III	American and Soviet structural transformations in German universities, 1945 through the early 1960s.....	78
	Introduction	
	I. American transformations in German universities	
	1. Reopening the German universities and replacing the rectors	
	<i>Preliminary stage in the reopening of the universities and the resumption of university life</i>	
	<i>Modification of university statutes and replacement of rectors</i>	
	2. Revision of university curricula	
	<i>Elaboration of revision plans</i>	
	<i>Introduction of new disciplines</i>	
	Political Science	
	Social Science	
	Courses on General Education	

American Studies

3. Establishment of new institutions, departments, and chairs in German universities, and the founding of the Free University

Political Science institutes

American Studies institutes and chairs

Research institutes in Education and Pedagogy

Establishment of the Free University in Berlin

4. New holdings in university libraries

II. Soviet transformations in German universities

1. Reopening the German universities and replacing the rectors

Preliminary stage in the reopening of the universities and the resumption of university life

Modification of university statutes and replacement of rectors

2. Revision of university curricula

Introduction of central study plans

Introduction of new disciplines

Course on Political and Social Problems of the Contemporary World

Courses on Marxism theory

New Historical Studies

Soviet Studies

3. Establishment of new institutes, faculties, and chairs in German universities, and the division of University of Berlin

Pedagogical faculties in German universities

Marxism-Leninism institutes and chairs

Slavic Studies chairs

The division of University of Berlin

4. New holdings in university libraries

Conclusion

Chapter	American and Soviet policy towards the university	
IV	professoriate, 1945 through the early	15
	1960s.....	0
	Introduction	
	I. American policy towards the German university	
	professoriate	

1. Denazification and reemployment of the professoriate
2. American interpretation of the way of thinking of the German professoriate
3. The Making of a *New Professor*
American and European visiting professors in German universities
The junior university teaching staff in the United States
4. Opposition from conservative professors and the American response.....

II. Soviet policy towards the German university professoriate

1. Soviet evaluations of the philosophical views, methods of teaching, and political positions of the German professoriate
2. Purge of the professoriate
3. The Making of a *New Professor*
Ideological campaigns
The junior university teaching staff in "Aspirantura" and at pedagogical faculties
4. Opposition from conservative professors and the Soviet response

Conclusion

Chapter V	German students in American and Soviet policy, 1945 through the early 1960s.....	19 4
------------------	---	-----------------------

Introduction

I. German university students in American policy

1. Purge of students and modification of admissions rules in the universities
The German student body: state of affairs in the American Zone
Purges
New admissions rules
Special admissions to universities: refugees from the Soviet Zone
Preparatory courses in American admissions policy
2. Instilling German students with new ideological values
Summer schools
Short-term training of German students in the United

States

3. Creating apolitical student organizations in the universities

Creating student councils and united student organizations

Introduction of the campus system

Establishment of student organizations of mutual aid

4. Student opposition and the American response

5. Changes in student daily life under the influence of American reforms

II. German university students in Soviet policy

1. Purge of students and modification of admissions rules in the universities

The German student body: state of affairs in the Soviet Zone

Purges and new admissions rules

Preparatory courses in Soviet admissions policy

2. Instilling German students with new ideological values

Inter-zonal summer schools

Inter-zonal student conferences

Long-term training of German students in the Soviet Union

3. Creating party student organizations in the universities

The first student council elections in February 1947

The second student council elections in December 1947

The final student council elections in February 1948: establishment of a communist dictatorship in the universities

4. Student opposition and Soviet response

Student resistance to both new admissions rules and the expansion of communist ideology in the universities

The resistance to the admission of the lower strata

The resistance to communist ideology and the influence of the SED in the universities

The Soviet offensive against the students

Defining the opposition

Banning student travel to West Germany

Arresting of students

5. Changes in student daily life under the influence of Soviet reforms

Conclusion

Chapter VI	American and Soviet policy in German universities, mid-1960s to 1990: German university conservatism, and the failure of American and Soviet cultural imperialism.....	26
	Introduction	5
	I. American policy in West German universities	
	1. Student radicalism and the American response, 1965-1970	
	<i>The situation in West German universities</i>	
	<i>University reforms</i>	
	2. The victory of German conservatism and the rollback of reforms, 1971-1975	
	3. Decline of American-West German university cooperation, 1975-1990	
	II. Soviet Policy in East German universities	
	1. Preventive reforms against student radicalism in the universities, 1965-1972	
	<i>The situation in East German universities</i>	
	<i>University reforms</i>	
	2. The conservatism of the German professoriate and the failed Soviet response, 1973-1986	
	3. German students in the USSR and the failure of Marxification	
	III. East German universities: silent opposition towards the Soviet Union and restraint of the German professoriate towards the American cultural offensive	
	1. Internal and external sources of university opposition, 1965-1971	
	<i>Specifics of East German university opposition</i>	
	<i>Internal sources of university opposition: professors of Marxism-Leninism and students in the theological faculties</i>	
	<i>External sources of university opposition: the American cultural offensive against East Berlin</i>	
	2. America's approach to East Germany, 1971-1977	
	<i>Initial contacts between the United States and East Germany</i>	
	<i>Students under the influence of the dissident movement</i>	

3. Rapprochement of American-East German relations in education, 1977-1990

Conclusion

Conclusion	32
.....	8
Annexes	33
.....	4
References	35
.....	1

List of Abbreviations

ADS – Action Group for Democrats and Socialists, West Germany
AStA – the German abbreviation for *Allgemeiner Studenten Ausschuß*, the Central Student Committee in the universities, West Germany
BDR – German abbreviation for *Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, Federal Republic of Germany
BDM – German abbreviation for *Bund Deutscher Mädel*, Union of German Girls, Nazi Germany
CDU – German abbreviation for *Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands*, Christian Democratic Union, Soviet Zone in Germany
CIC – Counter Intelligence Corps, United States
DBD – German abbreviation for *Demokratische Bauernpartei Deutschlands*, the Democratic Peasant Party, East Germany
DDR – German abbreviation for *Deutsche Demokratische Republik*, German Democratic Republic
DM – German abbreviation for *Deutsche Mark*, Germany
FDJ – German abbreviation for *Frei Deutsche Jugend*, Union of Free German Youth affiliated to the SED, East Germany
FPA RF – Foreign Policy Archive of the Russian Federation, Moscow
FRG – Federal Republic of Germany
FU – Free University, Berlin
GDR – German Democratic Republic
HICOG –Office of the US High Commissioner for Germany
HJ – German abbreviation for *Hitlerjugend*, Hitler Youth, Nazi Germany's youth organization
IREX –The International Research and Exchange Board, United States
KSV – German abbreviation for *Kommunistischer Studentenverband*, Communist Student Association, West Germany
LDP – German abbreviation for *Liberal-Demokratische Partei Deutschlands*, Liberal Democratic Party, Soviet Zone in Germany
NARA – National Archives and Records Administration, the name for the federal archives of the United States government. Materials of Archive I and Archive II applied in this research are located in Washington, DC, and in Maryland
NATO – North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NDP – German abbreviation for *Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands*, the National Democratic Party of Germany, a party of former Nazis, East Germany
NSC – National Security Council, United States

NSDAP – the German abbreviation for *Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei*, the official name of the Nazi Party, Nazi Germany
OMGUS – Office of the US Military Government in Germany
POW – prisoner of war
RSAMH – Russian State Archive of Modern History, Moscow
RSASPH – Russian State Archive of Social and Political History, Moscow
SA – the “Brown Shirts” (*Sturmabteilung*), the paramilitary organization of the Nazi Party
SA RF – State Archive of the Russian Federation, Moscow
SBZ – German abbreviation for *Sowjetische Besatzungszone*, Soviet Zone of Occupation established in East Germany
SCC – Soviet Control Commission established in East Germany
SDP – German abbreviation for *Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschland*, Social Democratic Party, Soviet Zone in Germany
SDS – German abbreviation for *Sozialistischen Deutscher Studentenbund*, Socialist German Student Union, West Germany
SED – German abbreviation for *Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands*, Socialist Unity Party of East Germany
SEW – German abbreviation for *Sozialistische Einpartei West Berlin*, a wing of the Communist Party of East Germany
SMAD – German abbreviation for *Sowjetische Militäradministration in Deutschland*, Soviet Military Administration in Germany
SS – the “Protective Squadron” (*Schutzstaffel*), a major Nazi military organization
USA – United States of America
USIA – United States Information Agency
USSR – Union of Soviet Socialist Republic

Chapter I

Introduction

In 1945, the Second World War ended. It brought American and Soviet troops and their divergent values and cultures into the countries of Europe and into a defeated Germany. Another important consequence of the victory of the Allies (United States, Soviet Union, Great Britain, and France) over Germany was its division into four zones and later two states, Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany) called officially the *BRD*¹ and Democratic Republic of Germany (East Germany) called officially the *DDR*.² However, unresolved problems centered on Germany such as reparations, borders, and the political future of Germany, known as the German question in historiography, led to gradual political suspicion and tension between the former allies. The unresolved German question contributed to the rise of political confrontation in Europe and in the world, and the new nuclear superpowers – the United States and the Soviet Union – steadily put together western and eastern blocks of countries which supported one of the superpowers.

In order to maintain the ideological allegiance of their partners and in order to win over new ones, the rival powers conducted an unprecedented policy aimed at expanding their divergent values and political culture rooted either in liberal democracy or in Marxist socialism. This ideological confrontation became a significant factor in active cultural expansion, initially in Europe, and later in Asia, Latin America, and Africa. For the superpowers, this cultural expansion brought about an allegiance of receiving societies and their integration into one of the rival political cultures. Consequently, the political and military confrontation known as the Cold War rapidly turned into a Cultural Cold War. In this Cultural Cold War, the educational system, and the universities in particular, played a key role in implanting the liberal democracy promoted by the United States or the Marxist socialism promoted by the Soviet Union in foreign countries and in fostering a new generation with a new system of thinking and a new culture.

¹ BRD is the German abbreviation of *Bundesrepublik Deutschland*.

² DDR is the German abbreviation of *Deutsche Demokratische Republik*.

Germany, located at the epicenter of the political and cultural confrontation between the two rival divergent ideologies, occupied a primary place in the superpower policy directed at expanding the divergent cultures. Economic and technological potential of Germany, its geopolitical position in Europe, and its possible alliance either with the Western or Eastern Blocks after lifting the Occupation regime could ensure a strategic preponderance of one ideological camp over the other in the confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States. West and East Germany, respectively supported by the United States and the Soviet Union, became an important geostrategic piece of Europe that could allow one of the opposing sides to win this politico-cultural confrontation. The superpowers of the Cold War therefore exploited every possibility in order to maintain the allegiance of either the West or East German societies through a range of special cultural programs. German universities became one of the powerful vehicles through which both superpowers implanted their political culture, and the universities became a major part of their strategy for winning men's minds and men's allegiance as noted by US Secretary of State Dean Acheson in 1950.

Both superpowers elaborated a special governmental educational policy aimed at transforming the old, traditional German universities in order to make them more suitable for instilling the American or Soviet political culture in a divided German society. Despite the differences in the political systems and culture of the two superpowers, they pursued similar political goals in a divided Germany in order to maintain the orientation of Germans towards one or the other defined value system. Hence, the superpowers' policy of transformation in German universities is the research question of this dissertation.

However, this research question includes a great many dimensions and angles that need to be evaluated. This chapter will serve as an introduction to the research. It consists of sections that deal with a discussion of the theoretical framework, previous research, documentary sources, and an explanation of the structure of the research offered.

I. Theoretical framework of the research

A discussion of the question of the governmental policies of the United States and the Soviet Union in the two German States during this period of ideological confrontation could be centered around such concepts as "cultural transfer," "Americanization" or "Sovietization," and

“cultural imperialism.” These concepts shed light on interaction between the system of education and political power with an emphasis on the international character of this relationship. The concepts are applied by scholars in order to explain how a political power, state, government or non-governmental actor is able to make their influence felt in a foreign system of education, such as universities, in order to achieve cultural or political aims.

These concepts may be used in order to frame the empirical results that we obtained more carefully. To bring the reader closer to our point of view, we propose the following structure for the section on theoretical frameworks: the first section will analyze the concept of cultural transfer; the second part will discuss the concepts of Americanization and Sovietization, and the third will discuss cultural imperialism. The theoretical frameworks appropriated for this research will be proposed at the conclusion of the chapter.

1. Cultural transfer

Cultural transfer is a process of transmission of cultural practices between countries and nations. The concept is accepted by historians of diplomacy and international relations as well as by specialists in American studies who deal with emigration/immigration, assimilation, and acculturation theses or who deal with studies on American cultural policy around the world. This is viewed nowadays from two perspectives: from the position of a transmitter of values, that is, the United States, and from the position of the receiving ends, that is, the receivers of American culture in various countries. Some scholars apply the term “cultural transmission” to explain the transfer of culture of a definite nation across political borders.

The cultural transfer concept challenges the imperial and hegemonic constituents of intercultural relations and implies a dialogue, a cross-cultural and mutual interconnection between two cultures, for example, between the United States and West Germany.³ The concept has become very popular in scholarly circles since the end of the Cold War. By then a new wave of scholars was arguing that previous “hard” concepts like cultural imperialism should be replaced with theses on modernity or on the cross-cultural process of mutual fertilization reinforced by cultural

³ See, for example: J. Gienow-Hecht, *Transmission Impossible: American Journalism as Cultural Diplomacy in Post-War Germany, 1945-55* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1999).

exchange. This assumption can be found in the works of a group of critics who did research into American cultural influence around the world. They portrayed American influence as the imposition of modernity, investigating how the United States transmitted the culture of capitalism to non-Western cultures.⁴ Also, this group of scholars argued in the 1990s that it was time to dismiss the expansionist ideology charges against the United States and to determine the spreading of American standards of culture and education by means of the fact of globalization.⁵ Other researchers of this new wave interpreted the dissemination of American political culture, mass culture, ideas of the consumer society, etc., as objectively spreading the symbols of the civilized world in the context of a loss of traditional and local cultural values but not as a cultural hegemony by America. The American scholar John Tomlinson, for example, argues that global technological and economic progress has diminished the significance of traditional cultures, and that the term “the global change of culture” should be used instead of “expansion.”⁶ The American historian Richard Pells argues that American cultural transfer is globalization, and the process of transmission or transferring the life style, consumption, music, etc., is beyond governmental control.⁷ Moreover, recent studies on such themes as the dissemination of the Western educational style in developing countries, which was discussed before the end of the Cold War as cultural imperialism, has been centered today on the explicit thesis that the process of transferring unified curricula and examination modes is a cultural transfer based on a dialogue.⁸ Richard Kuisel, a French historian, has explained why it is

⁴ R. Kroes, *The Cultural Transmission and Receptions: American Mass Culture in Europe* (Amsterdam: Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, 1993); R. Pells, *Not Like Us: How Europeans Have Loved, Hated, and Transformed American Culture since World War II* (New York: Basic Books, 1997).

⁵ Pells, *Not Like Us*; U. Poiger, “Beyond “Modernization” and “Colonization,”” *Diplomatic History* 23, no. 1 (1999): 45-55; Kroes, *The Cultural*.

⁶ J. Tomlinson, *Cultural Imperialism: A Critical Introduction* (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1991); E. Rosenberg, “Consuming Women: Images of Americanization in the “American Century,”” *Diplomatic History* 23, no. 3 (1999): 499-524; L. May, *Recasting America: Culture and Politics in the Age of the Cold War* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).

⁷ R. Pells, “Who’s Afraid of Steven Spielberg?”” *Diplomatic History* 24, no. 3 (2000): 495-502.

⁸ A. Rogers, “Cultural Transfer in Adult Education: The Case of the Folk Development Colleges in Tanzania,” *International Review of Education / Internationale Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft / Revue Internationale de l’Education* 46, no. 1/2 (2000): P. 67-92.

time to acknowledge that this is cultural transfer and not cultural domination. He argues that the concept of cultural imperialism demands the agreement of a researcher with the assumption that a society may passively acknowledge external culture and dominance, and yet a society that is under the cultural pressure has never been passive and has always resisted this influence.⁹

However, most of these and other scholars think of the problem of the dissemination of American mass culture *without focusing on a government* as an actor in this cultural interaction. This is absolutely correct, because a government participates only partially in the process of spreading mass culture. Nevertheless, as soon as a scholar focuses on the question of the role of a government in the expansion of native culture, values, and ideologies in order to gain some political aim, the cultural transfer concept is stretched into the concept of cultural imperialism. For example, Masahiro Tanaka, a Japanese researcher, argues that cultural transfer could be similar to cultural imperialism. He proposes that there is such a discourse as cultural transfer in terms of authoritarian exporting and liberal exporting.¹⁰ In conducting research on the American impact on Japanese universities after the end of the Second World War, he argued that Americans were insistent on involving Japanese educators in the implementation of deep reforms in universities, and that this was an example of authoritarian exporting as such. His other case study about the American impact on German Universities after the end of the Second World War showed that, in contrast to their policies in Japan, Americans granted much more autonomy to German educators to implement reforms in ways that best matched cultural patterns and educational traditions. The researcher sees this as an example of liberal exporting as a pattern of cultural transfer. In particular, while the American reformers introduced a model of general education, German educators either ignored or resisted adoption of this model. The result was a German system of higher education that certainly was transformed, but not along the specific lines proposed by the American exporters.¹¹

⁹ R. Kuisel, "Americanization for Historians," *Diplomatic History* 24, no. 3 (2000): 509-515.

¹⁰ T. Masahiro, *The Cross-Cultural Transfer of Educational Concepts and Practices: A Comparative Study* (Oxford: Symposium Books, 2005).

¹¹ Cit. on: D. Bills, "Book Reviews: Masahiro Tanaka. *The Cross-Cultural Transfer of Educational Concepts and Practices: A Comparative Study*. Oxford: Symposium Books, 2005," *International Sociology* 21 (2006): 899-902.

2. Americanization/Sovietization

When debating American and Soviet educational policy, we cannot ignore these two popular and very often committed concepts of Americanization and Sovietization.

Americanization

The Americanization thesis is utilized in research on the historical or current relations between the United States and Western European countries. The concept of the Americanization of Western Europe has aroused hot discussions among commentators and historians since the early 1900s, when British journalist Thomas Stead published his famous book, *The Americanization of the World*, and argued that Americanization would be inevitable and a global process. Since that time, the literature has elaborated a general definition of the term: Americanization is a process of cultural and socio-cultural adaptation to the standards set by the society of the United States.¹² Since the end of the Cold War, the concept has again become very popular among researchers who discuss these questions based on Globalization/Localization, Americanization/Anti-Americanism, and Cultural Transfer/Cultural Imperialism theses.

However, scholars are still debating questions such as how to investigate and measure the complex process of the Americanization of Europe.¹³ This question relates to the methodological problems of the research: how to separate the Americanization process from modernization or globalization, how to avoid the stereotypical image of Americanization substituted often by the discourse of cultural imperialism of the United States, how to measure the empirical facts in order to provide strong evidence that Americanization has happened or not happened, and how to evaluate the degree of Americanization in Western Europe. As to the latter, we can define two groups of discussion centered on the Americanization concept. One group of researchers defends the thesis that Western Europe has been entirely Americanized,¹⁴

¹² See, details: A. Schmidt, "Americanization," *United States and Germany in the Era of the Cold War, 1945-90: A Handbook*, ed. D. Junker (West Nyack, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 635-642.

¹³ See the discussion in *Diplomacy History*, 23, no. 1 (1999) and 24, no. 3 (2000).

¹⁴ S.W. Lucas, "Beyond the Freedom, Beyond Control: Approaches to Culture and the State-Private Network in the Cold War," in *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe, 1945-1967*, ed. G. Scott-Smith (London: Frank Cass, 2003), 53-72; A. Sywottek, "The Americanization of Everyday Life? Trends in Consumer and Leisure-Time Behavior," in

while another group argues that the Americanization of Europe has been only partial and thus that it is necessary to raise the question of the Europeanization of American ideas, culture, and values.¹⁵

The supporters of the full Americanization of Europe state that it was a one-way process generated by the American government after the end of the Second World War that aimed at establishing a political and cultural consensus among American and European political, business, and academic elites.¹⁶ The supporters of partial and Europeanized Americanization incline to the opinion that Europeans have never been passive receivers¹⁷ and that Americanization has never been a one-way process. They state that American values and culture were perceived distinctly by various social groups: youth eagerly consumed American products, music, customs, but older generations and the more educated groups rejected the American presence in culture.¹⁸ Moreover, the positive features of American life such as technologies applied in mass production and business administration were welcomed by Europeans, while the symbols of American mass culture were rejected.¹⁹ For example, Richard Kuisel in his book argued that France was not entirely Americanized, because the process of Frenchification needed be taken into consideration.²⁰ His evaluations coincided with Swedish scholars who stated that European countries and Sweden, as a case in point, had incorporated certain elements of American political culture in their

America and Shaping of German Society, 1945-55, ed. M. Ermarth (Oxford: Berg, 1993), 132-152; G. Scott-Smith, *Politics of Apolitical Culture: Congress for Cultural Freedom, and the CIA and Post-War American Hegemony* (London: Routledge, 2002).

¹⁵ R. Kuisel, "Americanization for Historians"; R. Lunden, *Networks of Americanization: Aspects of American Influence in Sweden* (Uppsala, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1992).

¹⁶ Lucas, "Beyond the Freedom"; Sywottek, "The Americanization"; Scott-Smith, *Politics of Apolitical*; F. Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War* (London: Granta, 1999); R. Wagnleitner, *Coca-Colonization and the Cold War: Cultural Transmission of the United States in Austria after the Second World War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994).

¹⁷ See in details: R. Kroes, "American Empire and Cultural Imperialism: A View from Receiving End," *Diplomatic History* 23, no. 3 (1999): 463-477; R. Boehling, "The Role of Culture in American Relations with Europe: The Case of the United State's Occupation of Germany," *Diplomatic History* 23, no. 1 (1999): 57-69.

¹⁸ See, for an example: U. Poiger, *Jazz, Rock, and Rebels: Cold War Politics and American Culture in Divided Germany* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

¹⁹ See, for an example: B. Boel, *European Productivity Agency and Transatlantic Relations, 1953-1961*. (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 2003).

²⁰ R. Kuisel, *Seducing the French: The Dilemma of Americanization* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 233.

national one rather than having been Americanized.²¹ German researchers also argue that the American policy of reeducation, which implanted American mass culture in occupied Germany, did not touch the German elite since divergence existed between American mass culture and German high culture. Both the Germans and the French are reported to have been conscious of the superiority of their eminently national cultures over American mass culture, and hence Germany and France have not become entirely Americanized. To utilize some American products and practices is not to be under the influence of American values; this thesis articulated by the German researcher Jessica Gienow-Hecht could be attributed to the contemporary understanding of the Americanization concept.²² However, both groups of researchers are unified around the thesis that the Americanization of Western European countries, whether entirely or partially, did occur after the end of the Second World War, and that American government played a role in it.

In order to discuss the Americanization concept, scholars have applied the following empirical facts. Americans formed favorable new ruling elites in all European countries through the effective selection of young leaders and further intensive training in the US. The American government was able to establish and maintain new and close economic relations between American and European businessmen through introducing the style of American management at all the old traditional European factories and companies. A new European generation of businessmen was fostered through their training at American universities and through establishing absolutely new departments of business administration and management at European universities. The introduction of American studies chairs, departments or institutes at European universities, along with the creation and support of new academic magazines, exhibitions, and clubs contributed to the making of a loyal segment of intellectuals. Special programs for students such as the transformation of the curriculum, the building of student villages (campuses), the introduction of student self-governments along democratic lines have contributed to the production of generations ready to live under the democratic political regime. The dissemination of American culture sponsored by the US Government (jazz festivals, exhibitions of abstract art, and so on), the governmental encouragement of tourism between the United States and Europe, and other projects have

²¹ Lunden, *Networks of Americanization*.

²² Gienow-Hecht, *Transmission Impossible*.

been considered as strong evidence of the Americanization of Europe, but with a strong mutual dialogue existing between Americans and Europeans.

Sovietization

While Americanization is treated as a process of a more or less two-way, mutual cultural exchange, Sovietization is evaluated unconditionally by the most scholars as Soviet expansion, imperialism, and hegemony in subjugated nations. Following from previous research, we could draw a sign of equality between such phenomena as Soviet cultural imperialism and Sovietization.

Previous research on the question mainly concerns Soviet transformations in the countries of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. The general definition of the Sovietization concept implies a transformation of national economies, politics, culture, and education based on the Soviet model. However, there are various interpretations of this concept in the literature. Some researchers argue that Sovietization was the implantation of communist ideas in a political culture, educational institutions, and in life as a whole. For example, the imposition of the communist ideas implied enhancing the power of Communists in societal life and, more narrowly in terms of education, the indoctrination of students through reading communist literature and studying Russian, a language of socialism. The society of the satellite countries in Eastern Europe needed to be patterned on the Soviet model, while being called a model for the "Mother Country."²³ Those researchers who investigate the Sovietization of the former Soviet republics give the harshest version of the process, implying the imperialist intentions of Moscow. They state that Sovietization was not a consequence of the internal political and social situation but was a result of an external intervention, of a military victory by Soviet Russia.²⁴

Some of these researchers represent Sovietization as the imitation of the Soviet way of life and, more narrowly, as education in the captive countries. This idea was strongly articulated by the American researcher Richard Starr. Analyzing the integration of Poland into the Soviet sphere of influence, he states that Sovietization was a product of what is seen as

²³ B. Raditsa, "The Sovietization of the Satellites," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 271 (1950): 122-134.

²⁴ B. Jurij, *The Russian Communist Party and the Sovietization of Ukraine* (Stockholm: Kungl. Boktryckeriet P. A. Norstedt & Sonel, 1960).

being a replica of the Soviet system.²⁵ Exploring the process of Sovietization in Albanian education during the 1940s and 1950s, other research has defined Sovietization as the establishment of the Soviet educational system and has argued that the pro-Soviet educational system was set up in Albania in 1946. The Sovietization of education implied the imitation of the following inherent features of Soviet education: the educational system became uniform; all schools were controlled by the state; education was begun in nursery school; the children of peasants and workers were given an advantage in terms of admission; new, more highly specialized institutions (pedagogical and in medicine) were established; and Marxism-Leninism became the main foundation of education.²⁶ John Connelly, studying the Soviet reforms in higher education in Eastern European countries in terms of Sovietization, reiterates the same theses. The higher educational systems in Czechoslovakia, East Germany, and Poland appeared to be faithful reproductions of the Soviet model: “in each case the communist party supervised university operation through a Soviet-style Ministry of Higher Education; at universities Soviet-style ‘protectors’ were implanted to coordinate ‘schooling’ in Marxism-Leninism; students were subjected to planned curricula and obligatory classroom attendance. They prepared for batteries of Soviet-style compulsory examinations from textbooks translated from the Russian. In order to create a socialist intelligentsia, student admissions favored ‘worker-peasant’ students and courses were established to help prepare workers for higher education.”²⁷ However, according to John Connelly, the outcomes of Sovietization were different in these three countries. Sovietization was successful in East Germany and it nearly failed in Poland.

Finally, Russification as a discourse of Sovietization is represented in the literature. The Sovietization of the Baltic States (Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia) is viewed as the campaign aimed at integrating them into the Soviet Union. The promotion of the Russian language and, through implantation, the idea that Russia and each of the Baltic nations have a common culture became the main feature of Russification. The history of

²⁵ R. Starr, *Poland 1944-1962: The Sovietization of a Captive People* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1962).

²⁶ J. Roucek, “The Sovietization of Albanian Education,” *The Slavic and East European Journal* 2, no. 1 (1958): 55-60.

²⁷ J. Connelly, *Captive University: the Sovietization of East German, Czech, and Polish Higher Education, 1945-1956* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 3.

the Baltic peoples has therefore undergone extensive rewriting. There can be no question of a conflict at any point in history between the national interests of the Baltic peoples and those of the Russians.²⁸

Hence, we can observe that the Americanization thesis makes reference to the cultural transfer concept and is defined as one of discourses of the concept, while the Sovietization thesis is integrated with the cultural imperialism concept.

3. Cultural imperialism

The term cultural imperialism was born somewhere in the nineteenth century as a response to British colonial policy around the world. However, the term had a positive tone at that point.²⁹ After the end of the First World War and with the growing criticism of imperialism generated by such politicians as Woodrow Wilson and Vladimir Lenin, the term took on a strongly negative tone. This negative meaning for the cultural imperialism consequently became the traditional definition of the term.³⁰ The general definition of the concept of cultural imperialism is “the use of political and economic power to exalt and spread the values and habits of a foreign culture at the expense of a native culture.”³¹

In as much as the concept has attracted the permanent attention of scholars, it has accumulated numerous and various interpretations, and the most popular discourses are focused on media imperialism, national domination, the global dominance of capitalism, the spread of modernity, language domination, liberal imperialism, cultural imperialism of transnational corporations, and others. This diversity of interpretations can be grouped into two main groups of researchers who have recently applied the concept of cultural imperialism in their research. The first group consists of the famous revisionists, Marxists, and the followers of the dependency thesis. They defend the traditional interpretation of the

²⁸ A. Senn, “The Sovietization of the Baltic States,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 317 (1958): 123-129.

²⁹ Returning to the discussion on British cultural imperialism, some of the current researchers have defined it as *liberal imperialism*. It especially comes up as the British imperial policy in India aimed at integrating and educating the Indian elite social class. See: M. Konkle, “Indigenous Ownership and Emergence of US Liberal Imperialism,” *American Indian Quarterly* 32, no. 3 (2008): 298-299.

³⁰ B. Kuklick, “The Future of Cultural Imperialism,” *Diplomatic History* 24, no. 3 (2000): 503-508.

³¹ Cit. on: J. Gienow-Hecht, “Art is Democracy and Democracy is Art: Culture, Propaganda, and The Neue Zeitung in Germany, 1944-1947,” *Diplomatic History* 23, no. 1 (1999): 21-44.

term, and they measure the relationship between education and political power in terms of hard and coercive policy. The second group consists of scholars of a new wave in communication, globalization, media, and culture studies. They utilize the concept of cultural imperialism but raise the question of a more complicated interpretation of this concept in terms of resistance and response studies.

Revisionism, Neomarxism, and the dependency theory

In the 1960s, due to a series of sensational articles published in leftist American newspapers about the role of the Central Intelligence Agency in forming loyal European intellectuals,³² as well as due to growing criticism of American foreign policy, leftist scholars in the United States incorporated the concept of cultural imperialism into the literature. The concept was exploited in order to blame the United States for the beginning of the Cold War and the Vietnam War, for imperial policy in Latin American and Africa, as well as for exploiting the culture as a tool of imperialism. Christopher Lasch is probably the most striking representative of the revisionist wave; he stated that American expansion was determined not by the necessity to defend the interests of democracy but that defense of democracy was a mask for American imperial ambitions.³³

The followers of this interpretation became the Marxists, Neomarxists, and those who were specialized in political economics and dependency studies. Cultural imperialism as a domination of one country over another country prevails in the debate over American and Soviet cultural policy around the world. Such researchers as F. Ninkovich, R.

³² See, for an example: "How the CIA Turns Students into Traitors," *Ramparts* (April 1967): 38-40.

³³ Ch. Lasch, *The Agony of the American Left* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969); Ch. Lasch, "The Cultural Cold War," *The Nation* (11 September, 1967): 198. The contemporary vision of revisionism or postrevisionism can be found in the works of N. Chomsky and E. Said. These authors promote the idea that the system of education is a channel for suppression and realization of American imperial ambitions: N. Chomsky, *The Cold War and University* (New York: New Press, cop., 1997); D. Barsamian, *Propaganda and the Public Mind: Conversations with Noam Chomsky* (London: Pluto, 2001); E. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (London: Vintage, 1994); E. Said, *Power, Politics, and Culture: Interviews with Edward W. Said* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2001); N. Chomsky, *On Power and Ideology* (Boston: South End Press, 1987); N. Chomsky, *Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2003); N. Chomsky, *Language and Politics* (New York: Black Rose Books, 1988); D. Macedo, *Chomsky on Miseducation* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Pub. Inc., 2000).

Arnové, E. Berman, M. Carnoy, F. Barghoorn, J. Triska, K. King, A. Mazrui, Ph. Altbach, and others interpreted cultural imperialism as a tool for social control. They claim that the educational programs of the American government and philanthropic foundations as well as the educational programs of the Soviet government were concerned with building an elite professional stratum to carry out cultural and technological transformation. All of them argued that cultural imperialism denoted the efforts of one country to undercut another country's culture by imposing its own.³⁴

Moreover, according to scholars, dominant groups of one country have sought to shape the education system of another country. For instance, various scholars have examined how former colonial powers worked to construct dependency or neocolonial relationships with developing societies by spreading the Western educational system or providing technical assistance.³⁵ In this way, the West built loyal elite professional and political strata which carried out cultural and technological transformation and, at the same time, developed social relationships according to the Western pattern.³⁶ In addition, an analogous social transformatory role for education has been noted in connection with Soviet policy in the Third World.³⁷ Among the works

³⁴ F.H. Ninkovich, *The Diplomacy of Ideas: US Foreign Policy and Cultural Relations, 1938-1950* (Chicago: Imprint Publications, 1995); R. Arnove, *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982); E.H. Berman, *The Influence of the Carnegie, Ford and Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy: The Ideology of Philanthropy* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1983); M. Carnoy, *Education and Social Transition in the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990); K. King, "The New Politics of International Cooperation in Education Development," *International Journal of Education Development* 10, no. 1 (1990): 47-58; M. Mazrui, *Cultural Forces in World Politics* (London: Heinemann, 1990); Ph. Altbach, G. Kelly, *Education and the Colonial Experience* (New Brunswick: Transaction, 1984); J. Triska, *Soviet Foreign Policy* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1968); F. Barghoorn, *Soviet Foreign Propaganda* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964).

³⁵ R. Arnove, "Foundations and the Transfer of Knowledge," in *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad*, ed. R. Arnove (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982), 305-331; M. Carnoy, *Education as Cultural Imperialism* (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1974); Berman, *The Influence*; Altbach, & Kelly, *Education and the Colonial*.

³⁶ Carnoy, *Education as*; Berman, *The Influence*.

³⁷ E. Silva, "Maple Leaf, British Bough, American Branch: Canadian Higher Education in Developmental Perspective," in *Universities and the International Distribution of Knowledge*, ed. I. Spitzberg (New York: Praeger, 1980); M. Carnoy, "The Political Economy of Education," *International Social Science Journal* 37 (1985): 157-173; Th.

that refer to this, we can note the research by Martin Carnoy who attempted to understand the spread of Western educational systems into the Third World within the context of political economics. He states that Western education was developed in Asia, Africa, and Latin America as an extension of colonial and neo-colonial relationships between the metropolitan country and the periphery. This development arrived in most countries as a part of imperialist domination. According to this researcher, the function of schooling as an ideological arm of the state, reinforcing and reproducing the social structure and hence its educational system is consistent with the goals of imperialism: the economic and political control of the people in one country by the dominant class in another.³⁸ The same form of imperialism was discussed for Soviet cultural and educational policy. Critics of Soviet Marxism made use of the concept of Soviet cultural imperialism such as Sovietization when describing the primarily political denomination of the Soviet Union's Eastern Block satellites.³⁹

Reinterpretations of cultural imperialism

The traditional and previously dominant interpretation of the concept of cultural imperialism has been questioned, made complicated, and revised in the literature from a variety of angles since the 1990s, by new scholars under such circumstances as the new political development in the world defined in the literature as the period of globalization and under the popularization of new research in the area of communication and international communication studies as well.

Many scholars, especially historians and anthropologists of the new wave who created their work after the end of the Cold War and who supported the cultural transfer thesis, proposed, as we have mentioned above, the idea of rejecting the old thesis of cultural imperialism and substituting some new concepts for it.⁴⁰ In particular, a fundamental shift

Clayton, *Education and the Politics of Language: Hegemony and Pragmatism in Cambodia, 1979-1989* (Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, 2000).

³⁸ Carnoy, *Education as*.

³⁹ Barghoorn, *Soviet Foreign*.

⁴⁰ See, for an example: Scott-Smith, *The Cultural Cold War*; R. Mitter, *Across the Block: Cold War Cultural and Social History* (London, Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2004); R. Willet, *The Americanization of Germany, 1945-1949* (London: Routledge, 1989); Kuisel, *Seducing the French*; M. Hogan, *The Marshall Plan. America, Britain and the Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-1952* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1989); D. Ellwood, *Rebuilding Europe. Western Europe, America and Postwar Reconstruction* (London, New York: Longman, 1992).

from the traditional interpretations of the cultural imperialism concept was begun in the framework of the microhistorical approach to cultural Cold War studies. This approach considered that the Cold War needed to be examined not only as a macrohistory of international relations or high politics, but also as a microhistory of a certain human being molded by a specific political situation.⁴¹ Moreover, scholars have turned away from the examination of government-sponsored cultural policies and shifted their focus to the spread of mass culture across borders in the context of globalization. Terms such as “globalization,” “NGO,” “mass culture,” “local cultures,” “cross-cultural mutual exchange,” etc., substituted for “United States Government,” “Department of State,” “cultural and educational policy,” “Third World,” “hegemony,” etc.

Hence, the thesis that the spread of any cultural values cannot be evaluated as imperialism or expansionism of certain states has challenged the concept of cultural imperialism. Cultural imperialism was supposed to be dead or to have been substituted for globalization and cross-cultural and mutual fertilization theses. Moreover, it was challenged by the ideas of regionalization and localization, which implied that regional and local empires, for example, in Asia, were capable of counter-cultural imperialism against the West. During the 2000s, however, a “revived” concept of cultural imperialism has returned due to the circumstances of the new political situation caused by the American antiterrorism war in Iraq and Afghanistan. Many scholars say that international order, communication between nations, and transferring cultural products remain deeply inegalitarian, and hence that cultural imperialism continues to exist. This heterogeneous group of recent scholars can be divided into two subgroups: the first and the smallest group of scholars argue that the concept of cultural imperialism is dead; the second group, on the contrary, argues that it is alive but in a redefined and reinterpreted form.

Cultural imperialism is dead. This thesis has been sounded loudly in so-called reception studies. Critics of the theory of American cultural imperialism state that foreign consumers do not passively absorb American mass-culture products. In fact, foreign consumers play an active role in the relationship between buyer and seller.⁴² Response theory and reception studies are shifting the theme of cultural expansion

⁴¹ See details: P. Major, R. Mitter, “East is East and West is West? Towards a Comparative Socio-Cultural History of the Cold War,” *Cold War History* 4, no. 1 (2003): 1-22.

⁴² J. Galeota, “Cultural Imperialism: An American Tradition”, *Humanist* 64, no. 3 (2004): 22-46.

to the theme of local resistance to it, and to the theme of the fate of peripheral cultures and indigenous populations who are molded under its influence and domination. Researchers argue that indigenous populations have always resisted the penetration of American culture.⁴³ Scholars, repudiating the concept, have not rejected cultural expansion as such. However, reception studies have challenged the idea of American cultural imperialism that produces a one-way street of hegemonic domination, suggesting instead a project of intentions with no guaranteed outcomes. The investigation by the American researcher Barbara Reeves-Ellington on the establishment of education for girls in Bulgaria by American missionaries in the nineteenth century, for example, concludes that American policy went through a stage of negotiation with the local population, and the American measures in education were accepted selectively and sometimes were resisted at the site of importation.⁴⁴

Some studies consider the concept to be dead or marginal in the current literature on globalization processes. Examining the influence of American music on Chinese youth, one such piece of research rejects the imperial constituent in the spread of American music, because, first, American popular cultural products interact with the local culture and are influenced by it; second, Chinese officials have sanctioned American-made products; and, third, globalization is an imminent reality.⁴⁵ This research states: “Globalization processes disseminate American popular culture far from its origins. Some intellectuals in Europe and the US have equated popular culture with cultural imperialism. In this view American popular culture manipulates the personal tastes of people in other countries. It destroys local, traditional values while promoting global homogenization based on American values like mass consumption and

⁴³ See, for an example: B. Tibi, “Culture and Knowledge: the Politics of Islamization of Knowledge as a Postmodern Project? The Fundamentalist Claim to De-Westernization,” *Theory, Culture & Society* 12 (1995): 1-24; J.R.G. Kieh, “The Roots of Western Influence in Africa: an Analysis of the Conditioning Process,” *Social Science Journal* 29 (1992): 7-19; P. Williams, L. Chrisman, *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory: A Reader* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994); J. Chay, *Culture and International Relations*. New York: Praeger, 1990).

⁴⁴ B.A. Reeves-Ellington, “Vision of Mount Holyoke in the Ottoman Balkans: American Cultural Transfer, Bulgarian Nation-Building and Women’s Educational Reform, 1858-1870,” *Gender & History* 16, no. 1 (2004): 146-171.

⁴⁵ H.N. Rupke, B. Grant, “Country Roads” to Globalization: Sociological Models for Understanding American Popular Music in China,” *Journal of Popular Culture* 42, no. 1 (2009): 126-146.

mass entertainment, which are provided by big corporations and geared to the lowest common denominator.”⁴⁶

Moreover, a new trend in reinterpreting historical events, which previously had been included within the framework of cultural imperialism, challenges the traditional concept. For example, the religious missionary or the philanthropic activities of Western countries, notably of the United States and Great Britain, were usually interpreted from the stance of cultural imperialism, but now some scholars have recently proposed removing this theoretical format from the agenda. Studying the Christian missionary movement in Asian and African countries in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, one segment of such research proposes alternative ways of looking at the role of these missions in modern history. It argues that the missionary movement must be seen as one element in a globalizing modernity that has altered Western societies as well as non-Western ones in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and that a comparative global approach to the missionary movement can help to illuminate the process of modern cultural globalization.⁴⁷

Hence, in repudiating the appropriateness of the concept of cultural imperialism, scholars do not reject that cultural expansion and imperialism as a real phenomenon existed in international relations. The opposite group of investigations aimed at reviving the concept still makes up the overwhelming majority of research found in the literature.

Cultural imperialism is revisited. A scholarly tradition of the 1960s and 1970s presents cultural imperialism as a cultural process dealing with the flow of cultural products from Western countries, in particular the United States, towards the Third World at the expense of local cultures. Since the early 1990s, however, cultural imperialism, as we mentioned above, has come under increasing criticism from diverse perspectives. However, other scholars have tried to convince readers of the necessity of utilizing the cultural imperialism concept for research. According to their logic, in the current global cultural environment, it is no longer possible to sustain the notion of Western domination, because there are several emerging domestic cultural industries in various parts of the world, primarily aimed at markets in the same region or at viewers of the same

⁴⁶ Ibid., 127.

⁴⁷ R. Dunch, “Beyond Cultural Imperialism: Cultural Theory, Christian Missions, and Global Modernity,” *History & Theory* 41, no. 3 (2002): 301-325.

ethnicity, who share similar language and cultural backgrounds.⁴⁸ However, the transfer of cultural products remains undemocratic, because small native cultures are dominated by both old and new empires. Cultural imperialism as a reality continues therefore to exist but as it has become more complicated and ambiguous; the concept needs to be completely redefined.

A variety of new discourses on the concept of cultural imperialism has recently been created in the literature under the influence, we assume, of intercultural communication studies centered primarily on the concept of media imperialism created by H. Schiller in the 1970s.⁴⁹ In a study about the recent development of South Korea's media industry, for example, there is empirical evidence that the South Korean audio-visual industry has begun producing and exporting domestic television programs and films on a large scale, while reducing imports from the US. This was labelled counter-cultural imperialism and the Korean case might well symbolize the arrival of cultural pluralism. However, the cultural imperialism of Western transnational corporations has not yet been phased out in Korea, and has in fact intensified. While South Korea plays a key role in the regional cultural market, the dominance of the US has increased even more rapidly, because Korean popular culture has not penetrated Western countries.⁵⁰ The concept of *counter-imperialism* is proposed as one of the influential discourses of cultural imperialism and as a product of regionalization in the world. Other researchers such as Jean Chalaby propose replacing the concept of cultural imperialism with that of *cultural primacy*;⁵¹ other scholars suggest replacing it with that of so-called *transculturalism*.⁵² Some historians use the *liberal imperialism* thesis to revise once again the relationship between the United States and Native Americans⁵³ or they have applied the *language domination* thesis to demonstrate how language can be exploited for the imperial ambitions

⁴⁸ D.Y. Jin, "Reinterpretation of Cultural Imperialism: Emerging Domestic Market vs. Continuing US Dominance," *Media, Culture & Society* 29, no. 5 (2007): 753-771.

⁴⁹ H. Schiller, *Communication and Cultural Dominance* (New York: International Arts and Sciences Press, 1976).

⁵⁰ D. Y. Jin, "Reinterpretation of Cultural Imperialism", 301-325.

⁵¹ J. Chalaby, "American Cultural Primacy in a New Media Order: A European Perspective," *International Communication Gazette* 68, no. 1 (2006): 33-51.

⁵² M. Kraidy, "Critical Transculturalism," *Conference Papers - International Communication Association* 26 (2005): 1-34.

⁵³ Konkle, "Indigenous Owership," 298-299.

of a government.⁵⁴ Yet other writers use the term *media imperialism* to describe the role of the American government in promoting democratic media abroad, for example, in occupied Afghanistan and Iraq.⁵⁵

However, all of these researchers have rejected the traditional understanding of cultural imperialism by introducing the factors of regionalization and localization and especially the factor of resistance to external cultural influence. These factors, according to the new wave of scholars, undermine the unconditional one-way domination of one country over the other as the previous generation of scholars had argued, and the cultural imperialism concept can only be acknowledged with *proviso*.

Consequently, we could make two observations as to the current position of this concept in the literature: first, since scholars have focused on phenomena such as the spread of American mass culture or living standards that take place without the visible participation of the American government or political forces, the cultural imperialism concept is fading, and thus scholars are exploiting concepts of a non-imperial character; however, as soon as scholars touch the question of American governmental cultural policy around the world, cultural imperialism springs back to life, newly defined. Second, it is clear that the ideas of scholars are directly bound up with the political climate in the world. The phenomenon of interdependency between the interpretation of cultural imperialism in the literature and political developments in the world has been precisely noted by German researcher Jessica Gienow-Hecht. She argues that the discussions on the concept of cultural imperialism were shifted due to structural modifications in the system of international relations: the American policy in Vietnam contributed to the development of the traditional definition of cultural imperialism; the end of ideological competition determined the development of the Americanization thesis that substituted for the cultural imperialism concept *ad interim*. The integration processes, having embraced the world in the 1990s, have made an impact on the development of the cultural transfer concept that again became a surrogate for the cultural imperialism concept. Following

⁵⁴ The language policy of the Russian and Soviet empires, aimed at simplifying official Russian in order to exploit the Russian language as a medium to unite a multilingual population is perfectly reconstructed in: J. Cadiot, "Russia Learns to Write: Slavistics, Politics, and the Struggle to Redefine Empire in the Early 20th Century," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian & Eurasian History* 9, no. 1 (2008): 135-167.

⁵⁵ M.J. Barker, "Democracy or Polyarchy? US-Funded Media Developments in Afghanistan and Iraq post 9/11," *Media, Culture & Society* 30, no. 1 (2008): 109-130.

from this line of argument, we can assume that the new antiterrorist war conducted by the United States in the Near and Middle East is what has contributed to the revival of the cultural imperialism concept, though in new, redefined terms.

Conclusion

History, political science, American/Soviet studies and other fields of knowledge have dealt a number of concepts which might be applied to our research. The available concepts and ideas are intertwined, and sometimes the different designations (e.g., Soviet cultural imperialism and Sovietization; or cultural transfer and Americanization) do not define a difference in essence. In order to define what kinds of concepts are most appropriate for this research, we have unified them into two groups as a criterion of how they characterize the cultural interaction between givers or transmitters (those who are transmitting concepts and practices from one culture to another) and recipients or receivers (those who are at the other end of the process). The first group might consist of concepts such as Americanization and cultural transfer. They are centered on the thesis that even if a transmitter (social groups in a society or the political power of a state) imposes its cultural, ideological, political, economic, and social standards on a society or on other states, this implantation occurs without any political pressure, and on the contrary, mutual dialogue occurs. These concepts therefore tell the story about the soft interrelationships between power and education. The concepts of cultural influence, unified in the second group as cultural imperialism and Sovietization, state that the transmitter implants values, cultural codes, ideologies, etc., on a society or other state at the expense of local culture in order to attain some political and economic goal. Roughly speaking, the available theses are either soft or hard as far as interpreting the intercultural action between givers and receivers concerned.

Having examined the empirical data on the policies of both the United States and the Soviet Union in German universities and having measured the concepts mentioned throughout our research, we might well state that both the American and Soviet policies in Germany were a combination of hard and soft actions. Different aspects and periods of their policies can be viewed from different theoretical angles. Both attempted to exert American and Soviet models of university education in West and East Germany, correspondently, by pressuring the university community, and they exploited the universities as a method for transforming German society and disseminating their rival political

cultures at the same time. Generally speaking, the educational policies of both superpowers look like cultural imperialism; however, a strong open and silent resistance by the German university system has undermined their cultural pressure and, according to our analysis, returned some traditional, local features peculiar to German universities. Consequently, both superpowers admitted the failure of their educational policies in Germany before the end of the Cold War.

II. Previous Literature

This section provides an overview of the main literature on American and Soviet Union university policy vis-à-vis West and East Germany during the years 1945-1990, as published in the last sixty years. We will attempt to fit diverse strands of thought into a single story, because historians, who have written and are writing books and articles on this theme, have not attempted to make a historiographical analysis of previous research. The writing on American and Soviet educational policy in West and East Germany has become popular in the fields of political science and cultural studies since 1945. However, both American and Soviet policies in German universities have only been traced superficially in the diverse and massive scholarship surrounding these two states. Historians have studied American or Soviet educational policy as a part of a comprehensive analysis of American or Soviet cultural policy during the period of Occupation, 1945-1955. Researchers have still made no attempt to describe the American and Soviet educational policies in the two German states beyond the Occupation period, and more importantly, they have not compared American and Soviet activities in the universities of West and East Germany during the entire period of the Cold War, 1945-1990. Nevertheless, as much as the policy of the United States or the Soviet Union in German higher education has been touched upon by American, European and Soviet-Russian historians, it is essential to evaluate their results, so that it becomes clear on which literature this study should be built.

According to us, the literature concerning American and Soviet policy in German universities has passed through four chronological stages: the first stage was from 1945 through the mid-1950s; the second stage was from the 1960s through the 1970s; the third was from the early 1980s until the end of the 1980s; and the fourth stage was from the early 1990s through the 2000s.

The first stage was the period of the Occupation of Germany by the Allies, 1945-1955. Members of the various military administrations, reformers, specialists in the area of education, and German university professors initiated a process of scholarly and public discussion in regard to the reforms conducted by the Occupation authorities. Their writings originated from personal observations, recollections and everyday experience. The authors accounted for what they did or saw in Germany, proposing, to some degree, an analysis and interpretation. These first semi-scientific eyewitnesses evolved into more scholarly studies by the late 1950s. These first writings were descriptive, first-hand accounts. The scholars were witnesses to and participants in the educational policies, and their books and articles were a narration of concurrent occurrences and events.

The second stage was the period from the 1960s through the 1970s. The educational policy of both superpowers was neglected, but the focus of the new studies was organized around three themes: students, crises and reforms happening in West and East German universities at the end 1960s through the mid-1970s. Some historians seemed to forget about the impact of Occupation policies on the further development of the universities in the two German states. Other scholars reexamined the theme of past Occupation reforms in terms of German influence (such as that influence from the German public, academic elite and politicians on the reforms of the Allies), proposing critical interpretations of the reforms in occupied Germany and advocating the idea of reforms as being German-origin.

The third stage was marked by a new series of investigations devoted to Occupation educational policy and mainly to that of the United States. This occurred in the 1980s when scholars gained access to newly declassified archival documents in Washington. New sources produced a strong impetus for revival of the theme of Occupation policies, and a new context for international relations, called for because the second edition of the Cold War in the early 1980s had influenced the interpretations of the topic. Scholars resumed their research on the educational reforms accomplished by the superpowers between 1945 and the 1950s.

And lastly, the fourth stage was the 1990s-2000s, when new documents became available for historians from the former East German and Soviet archives. Historians primarily reexamined different aspects of Soviet educational policy in the period 1945–1949, emphasizing research into micro case studies and the fate of concrete German personalities found at the center of the Cold War conflict.

1. The stage from 1945 through the mid-1950s

Reform of German education after the defeat of the Third Reich became a subject of discussion for politicians and professionals involved in the process of the Occupation of Germany. First-hand actors in the events wrote, on the basis of personal observations and experiences, the first chronicles about the reforms in German education. These stories mainly revealed American policy in German universities and were published in European and American journals during the entire period of the Occupation, 1945 through the mid-1950s. Unfortunately, the Soviet participants in Occupation policy prepared only one investigation of Soviet educational policy. Moreover, all the available publications told the story about reforms in German schools, but the problems in German universities were poorly explored. Still, the legacy of these first historians has become invaluable.

One group of investigations came from European and American specialists and educationalists invited by the United States government to implement a series of reforms in German universities. These first American and European reformers wrote a number of articles on American educational policy in occupied Germany. The authors mainly discussed the question of the possibility or impossibility of making changes in German education. Some of them favored the idea that the German educational system could be reconstructed and modified, while others maintained the theory that re-education of a country was beyond the realm of possibility. Almost all of them stressed that unique attributes of the German university system such as autonomy and isolation from political life should be modified. The group of American professors under the management of the famous American reformer in Germany, G. Zook, published a series of articles in 1946, giving a direct critique of the traditions in German higher education and proposed ideas for their transformation.⁵⁶

A more informative and analytical study about the educational policy of all the Occupation administrations in Germany was prepared by the English researcher Helen Liddell in 1947, especially for the conference dedicated to the German problem and convened by the Netherlands Institute of International Affairs. On the basis of her eyewitness accounts, Liddell characterized the traditions of German education as the premise for the rise of the Führer. We have paid close attention to this article

⁵⁶ G.F. Zook, *Japan and Germany: Problems in Re-education*, 427 (New York: Carnegie Endowment, Division of Intercourse and Education, 1947).

because of its visible contribution to the development of scientific thought about this theme; for the first time, the scholars proposed the idea of confronting the educational policy of the Soviet Union with that of the Western occupying powers in Germany. Evaluating, for example, American policy in the area of education, Liddell mentioned that “in the field of formal education, the American authorities maintain the democratic traditions they are striving to inculcate in the Germans.”⁵⁷ But while assessing Soviet policy, the author stated that: “Russian ‘re-education’ policy is the direct supplement to the indirect attack on the German class system, designed to place power in other hands.”⁵⁸

The first researchers established the orthodox pedigree of the positive and democratic effect of the West, and the negative and totalitarian effect of the Soviet Union on German universities; this thesis occupied a crucial position in mainstream historiography until the end of the Cold War. We should note, however, that some historians challenged this orthodox thesis. At the end of the Occupation, one of the American scholars who worked in German universities at the invitation of the US government published his *Experiment in Education: What We Can Learn from Teaching Germany*, which contained a critique of the American policy aimed at introducing the social sciences in German universities. He argued that German universities had much older scientific traditions in the field of the social sciences, and that German professors should not be led by Americans.⁵⁹ However, this book was forgotten in mainstream research.

The works of German professors who proved to be at the center of American and Soviet activities in German universities constitute a second group of investigations. The number of these works is considerably less than the number of investigations made by the first group of researchers. However, the spectrum of evaluations as to the educational activity of the Occupation authorities varies from an extremely positive pole to an extremely negative one. Werner Richter, the former undersecretary of a Prussian Minister of Education during the Weimar Republic, who had immigrated to the United States in the 1930s, published a book in 1945, which defended the radical changes in the German university system based on the American model. This book became a singular depiction of

⁵⁷ H. Liddell, “Education in Occupied Germany: A Field Study,” *International Affairs* (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-) 24, no. 1. (1948): 30-62, here 46.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 38

⁵⁹ W.E. Hocking, *Experiment in Education: What We Can Learn from Teaching Germany* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1954).

the superiority of the American educational system over the German one, and certainly some political premises such as the desire of Richter to cooperate with the Americans stood behind its evaluations.⁶⁰ In contrast to this, a rector of the University of Frankfurt, in his contribution to the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, noted the similar negative aspects of both American and Soviet policy in German universities such as the establishment of the position of university curator, elimination of autonomy, and other matters. However, the author proposed his original view of these aspects, indicating that the German universities had always been dependent on state appropriations; the minister or the cabinet had nominated professors; and university curators had existed in some universities before the 1930s and 1940s. Thus, the American and Soviet reforms were not something new for German universities. The Americans and Soviets returned to the Prussian system of management in the universities.⁶¹ Moreover, the author became the researcher who offered a constructive view of the Soviet policy in regard to expanding access to universities, claiming that: “in the Russian Occupation zone, one is struck by the fact that the proportion of recent graduates from secondary schools seems to be greater than in the West.”⁶²

A third group of studies consists of books and articles written by members of the Occupation military administrations in Germany. In 1952 and 1953, the Historical Division of the American Military Administration issued two monographs about American involvement in German education. The first book concerned the American reforms in German schools and, in part, in the universities; the other concerned the educational exchange programs between the US and the western part of Germany.⁶³ The books prepared by the American historian and professor Henry P. Pilgert, who worked at the special Historical Division of the American Military Administration, formulated an official assessment of the educational policy implemented by the US Government in German

⁶⁰ W. Richter, *Re-educating Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945).

⁶¹ W. Hallstein, “The Universities,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 260 (1948): 155-167.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 159.

⁶³ H.P. Pilgert, *The Exchange of Persons Program in Western Germany* (Bonn, Germany: Office of the US High Commissioner for Germany Historical Division, 1951); H.P. Pilgert, *The West German Educational System with Special Reference to the Policies and Programs of the Office of the US High Commissioner for Germany* (Bonn, Germany: Office of the US High Commissioner for Germany Historical Division, 1953).

universities. The official appreciation reinforced the previous argument of the divergent educational policies of the US and the Soviet Union. The only unpublished investigation prepared by the Soviet Chief of the Education Division of the Soviet Military Administration in Thüringen, Nikita Bogatyrev, can be attributed to this group of investigations. He defended a dissertation in 1951 whose subject was the democratization of German education in the period of 1945-1949. Using documents from the German Ministry of Education in Thüringen, the author pictured a process of reform of German education at the hands of German Communists and claimed that the Soviet Military Administration was not an active reformer. More importantly, Bogatyrev praised the democracy-oriented Soviet reforms while attacking the educational policies of the former Allies. His main thesis about the truly democratic character of the Soviet reforms was centered on the new admission rules introduced by the Occupation authorities in the East, which gave priority to the children of workers and peasants for entrance into the university and widened access to education, while the Western allies kept the elite admission policy.⁶⁴

Harold Zink's *The U.S. in Germany, 1944-1955* and two articles by Mason J. with a select bibliography of the economic, educational, cultural policies of the Occupation armies in Germany published in the late 1950s, became highly evolved products of this first stage. The authors, for the first time, described the educational policy of the United States or the Soviet Union in terms of the past, and from this point onwards the policy of both military administrations became the subject of history. Harold Zink, an American political scientist, an employee of the American Military Administration in Germany and an active reformer of German educational institutions, made important contributions to the development of further research on this theme. First, Zink divided the Occupation educational policy of the US into several periods and lengthened its timeline to 1955, although we know that the official military Occupation period ended in 1949 with the establishment of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Democratic Republic of Germany. The lengthening of the Occupation timeline proposed by Zink, which

⁶⁴ N.M. Bogatyrev, *Demokratisatsia Nemetskih Shkol Posle Osbvobozhdeniya Germanii: po Materialam Ministerstva Obrazovania Turingii, 1945-1949 (Democratization of German Schools after the Liberation of Germany: Materials of the Ministry of Education in Thüringen, 1945-1949)*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Moscow, 1951. The dissertation could be found in the special but open division of the Russian State Library in Moscow.

later would become a tradition in the literature, was due to the fact that, after the end of the official Occupation, the United States and the Soviet Union both created civic Occupation administrations which continued reforms. Second, Zink, as a former reformer of German universities acknowledged that all the American reforms were directed towards setting up an American educational system. Third, he introduced facts about the failings of the American reformers in Germany. He stressed, for example, that the establishment of political science in German universities was poorly implemented: “The American program looking to a larger place in the curriculum for the social studies may have had some practical influence, particularly at the University level, but the achievements have been far less than expected. Political science, sociology, and related fields still occupy a very small place in the German universities, despite the establishment of the Free University, social science research institutes under American sponsorship, and the provision for chairs of political science in several institutes.”⁶⁵ He also stressed that the exchange programs aimed at training the new elite achieved modest results: “The most significant American contribution to German education was in the field of making it possible for a fairly large number of German education staff members to establish contact with the outside world; however, the visits to American universities were frequently poorly planned, and the German educators derived less profit than might have been possible.”⁶⁶ Fourth, Zink became the first American who perceived the cause of the failure as being the low qualification of the personnel of the American Military Administration, who knew little about German education.

Two bibliographic articles dissecting all aspects of Occupation policy in West and East Germany, published in the United States, demonstrated that American educational policy was represented by more articles and books than the Soviet policy.⁶⁷ Soviet scholars were forbidden for a long time to publish their investigations into the Soviet reforms in German universities openly, and Western scholars were cut off

⁶⁵ H. Zink, *The United States in Germany, 1944-1955* (Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1957), 211.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 212.

⁶⁷ J.B. Mason, “Review: Government, Administration, and Politics in West Germany: A Selected Bibliography,” *The American Political Science Review* 52, no. 2 (1958): 513-530; J.B. Mason, “Review: Government, Administration, and Politics in East Germany: A Selected Bibliography,” *The American Political Science Review* 53, no. 2 (1959): 507-523.

from any access to the Soviet Zone and East Germany that might have provided a reliable evaluation of Soviet policy.

Summing up the first stage in the development of studies on the educational policy of the United States and the Soviet Union in German universities, we have made the following observations. First, the theme of the Occupation policy in universities was not popular among these first chronicles because this primary research tried to provide a general analysis of all aspects of the reeducation policy. Second, personal experience and the status of a participant imposed certain political and ideological limitations upon this primary research. Third, these primary studies did, however, formulate the themes that would appear in future investigations such as German traditions in education, educational Occupation policy, establishment of political and social sciences, etc., to which researchers would turn in 30 to 35 years time, and shaped an orthodox pedigree for the historiography evaluating American and Soviet policies in terms of democracy and totalitarianism that became the mainstream in that historiography until the end of the Cold War.

2. The stage from the 1960s through the 1970s

In the 1960s and 1970s, while the divergent ideological models of society were strengthening in both parts of Germany, and political events around the German question (Berlin crisis of 1958–1961, Berlin Transit Agreement of 1971) were attracting the attention of the public and politicians, scholars turned their research interests to actual events that were occurring in the universities of West and East Germany.

Numerous crises and reforms shaking up the universities in the 1960s-1970s became a new focus for scholarship. The educational policy of the United States and the Soviet Union towards German universities and the German educational system as a whole became a forgotten and secondary subject, while German students and the policy of the German governments towards German universities came to the fore in political, sociological and historical studies.

During the 1960s and 1970s, scholars in the United States, the Soviet Union, and West and East Germanies made visible efforts to “purify” their research from the legacy of the Occupation past, putting the emphasis upon the first local German authorities established by the Allies as the primary actors of university reforms, and, thus, as a new focus for an investigation. In this new revised literature we have defined two groups of thinkers.

One group of historians and sociologists in the United States and West Germany focused on an actual situation that occurred in the West German universities after the Occupation period. The political radicalism of students excited the imagination of researchers. In the late 1960s, a number of scholarly journals devoted especially to the problem of student radicalism in West Germany were issued in the United States. They discussed and established the main reasons for the student demonstrations, and, found, surprisingly, that the need to change university statutes, to increase the quality of teaching and to extend access to higher education had become the primary motivation of student antigovernment demonstrations. Moreover, researchers viewed the students and their demonstrations in West Germany as positive motors of reform, while radicals and members of leftist parties were evaluated by scholars as exploiters of the positive movement of students in order to implant anti-American sentiments in German universities. To them, the previous American reforms in German universities, the general political situation in Germany and in the world, and the rise of the New Left were not the causes of student radicalism.⁶⁸

Other groups of American, West German and Soviet researchers focused upon the reforms being carried out in East German universities. Researchers of this group, although distinguishable ideologically by their interpretations, can be brought together around their similar approach to the examination of the role and place of students in the reforms in East German universities. Students as a prospective social group of intelligentsia and East German universities as a forge of a new socialist intelligentsia became a subject for studies in political science and sociology. The most prominent of these would seem to have been *Sozialistische Universität: die Hochschulpolitik der SED*,⁶⁹ published by the famous West German political scientist Ernst Richter in 1967. Omitting the discussion of the effects of the Soviet Occupation educational policy on East German universities, Richter emphasized the

⁶⁸ See, for example: R.L. Merritt, E.P. Flerlage, A.J. Merritt, "Democratizing West German Education," *Comparative Education* 7, no. 3 (1971): 121-136; W.K. Geck, "Student Power in West Germany: The Authority of the Student Body and Student Participation in Decision-Making in the Universities of the Federal Republic of Germany," *The American Journal of Comparative Law* 17, no. 3 (1969): 337-358.

⁶⁹ SED is a German abbreviation of *Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands*, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. It was the ruling communist party in East Germany. The SED was established in 1946 after the merging of the Social-Democratic Party and the Communist Party of Germany. After reunification of Germany the SED was able to continue its political life, and now it is known as the party of the leftists, *Die Linkspartei*.

influence of German Communists on the university reforms from the 1940s through the 1960s and concluded that the German regime had succeeded in building a new “socialist” university which produced a new loyal intelligentsia. However, as Richter wrote, the socialist university did not win over a certain segment of youth who remained apolitical and indifferent.⁷⁰

His thought was extended by the American sociologist and historian Thomas Baylis in *The Technical Intelligentsia and Eastern European German Elite*. In the framework of concepts about education as a channel for the reproduction of loyal social groups, Baylis pictured the introduction of Marxism-Leninism courses as a method of social and cultural reproduction in East German universities. Similarly to Ernst Richter, he assumed that German Communists were not able to impose this ideology on all students and that there were a lot of dissidents among them.⁷¹

Among this group of researchers, there were historians who asserted that reforms in East German universities, aimed at establishing a new social group, were favorable to the Communist party and achieved positive results. The American historian of education, Geoffrey Giles, claimed in 1978 that the reforms provided “the country with prestigious intelligentsia. They are presenting the nation with just what its leaders have asked for: highly trained specialists, who in their multifarious jobs have hoisted the GDR⁷² economy into its present position, and given the East Germans the highest standard of living in the whole of the Communist block.”⁷³

Soviet historians, who began writing extensively about East German education in the 1970s, also considered the university reforms of the 1940s through the 1960s as the basis for producing a new socialist intelligentsia. Obviously, Soviet historians challenged the interpretations of their Western colleagues on different grounds. Acknowledging the role of German Communists in forming a new loyal social elite and

⁷⁰ E. Richter, *Sozialistische Universität: die Hochschulpolitik der SED* (Berlin: Colloquium Verlag, 1967).

⁷¹ Th.A. Baylis, *The Technical Intelligentsia and Eastern European German Elite* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1974).

⁷² GDR is German Democratic Republic, the official title of the socialist state established in East of Germany by the Soviet Occupation authorities and German communists in 1949.

⁷³ G.J. Giles, “The Structure of Higher Education in the German Democratic Republic,” *Higher Education* 7, no. 2 (1978): 131-156.

intelligentsia since 1945, some of them explained the success of reforms by such factors as the elimination of the autonomy of German universities, the establishment of a new teaching corps and the introduction of social studies departments.⁷⁴ Others asserted that the new intelligentsia was formed due to the modification of the old German university admissions system and the establishment of pedagogical departments at universities.⁷⁵ Contrary to the mainstream Western discourse, all Soviet researchers claimed that the reforms of East German universities had resulted in the building of 38 new higher educational institutions by the end of the 1960s, an increase in the number of students, the development of higher education in lower social groups, and thus had formed this new communist intelligentsia.⁷⁶ Finally, all of them emphasized that the influence of the Soviet government was minimal and that Germans themselves had accomplished these reforms.

Thus, during the 1960s and 1970s, researchers turned to the urgent events that occurred in divided German higher education. The main focus of their writings became those students who were viewed as movers of reforms in West German universities, and, on the other hand, those students who were the object of reforms in East German universities. Historians revised the argument of their predecessors as to the great role played by the Occupation powers in German universities with an argument in favor of an influence from the German authorities on the university reforms that occurred from 1945 till the end of 1960s.

⁷⁴ N.E. Vorobjev, *Vysshie Obrazovanie Germanskoy Demokraticeskoy Respubliki (Higher Education in the Democratic Republic of Germany)* (Rostov: University of Rostov Press, 1972).

⁷⁵ A.N. Gaydarbekov, *Rol' Socialisticheskoy Edinoi Partii Germanii v Sozdanii Socialisticheskoy Sistemy Obrazovaniya, 1945-1962 (The Role of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany in the Establishment of the Socialistic System of Education, 1945-1962)*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation (Moscow, 1974); V. Fomenko, *Realizatsiya Leninskih Printsipov Proletarskogo Inrenatsionalisma i Ispolzovanie Opyta KPSS v Ideologicheskoy Rabote Socialisticheskoy Edinoi Partii Germani, 1945-1949 (Implementation of Lenin's Principles of Proletarian Internationalism and the Application of the Experience of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the Ideological Work of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, 1945-1949)*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation (Moscow, 1973).

⁷⁶ V. Choppe, *Bor'ba za Vovlechenie Intelligentsii v Postroenie Socialisma v Demokraticeskoy Respublike Germanii: Rol' Reform v Vyssem Obrazovanii (The Struggle for the Involvement of the Intelligentsia in the Building of Socialism in the Democratic Republic of Germany: the Role of Reforms in Higher Education)*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation (Moscow, 1960).

3. The stage of the 1980s

In the 1980s, the interest of historians in the educational policy of the United States and the Soviet Union in the Occupation period, 1945-1955, became an attractive object of study and was revived by scholars. This was a rebirth of a topic that had been forgotten and subjected to criticism in the 1960s and 1970s, but it was also a rebirth that was enriched with new documentary base, new approaches, and a new political environment. In our opinion, this renaissance was determined by several main factors. First, the American government declassified some archival documents about its foreign policy in the 1980s. This event stimulated American historians to study the beginnings of the Cold War, the German question, and the Occupation period in particular. The second factor was to be the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the Free University in 1988 that stimulated the publication of archival records devoted to the history of the University in the late 1970s, which spiked the curiosity of researchers in the events of the Occupation period long before the official celebration of the anniversary. The third factor dealt with the research projects of Soviet researchers. A limited access to some select archival documents about Soviet Occupation policy allowed a few Soviet researchers to write dissertations on this theme. The fourth factor concerned the new political situation in the Soviet-American relationship. A new Cold War emerged during the Reagan Administration, and the President Ronald Reagan demonstrated certain interest in Western Europe, West Germany and West Berlin. The introduction of Soviet, and later American nuclear missiles in Europe intensified the number of publications of scholarly books and articles about the struggle of democracy against communism. In this political context, such themes as the "German question" or the struggle for University of Berlin became highly useful in supporting the foreign policy strategy of the American administration, which was aimed at diminishing Soviet influence in Europe.

Here we have defined three groups of investigations. A first group consists of researchers who devoted their works to American policy in German universities in the period 1945-1955; a second group to Soviet educational policy, and a third, solely to the Free University.

New documents declassified by the US Government in the 1970s and 1980s contained not only new information, but sometimes narrated a comforting tale of American educational policy, while also creating new American heroes of reform in German universities. In 1982, American scholars published a special issue of the *History of Education Quarterly*

under the general theme: *Educational Policy and Reform in Modern Germany*. The influence of this issue on the development of thought and discourse about this theme was enormous. Contributions of the issue demonstrated new subjects for further research and set up frameworks for “proper” interpretations in the new political world context. Among the articles, the most influential became the works by Charles D. Biebel and James F. Tent. They implanted two ideas as to American educational policy which remain the central themes for discussion today. The first idea concerned the interpretation of the re-education policy. While the researchers in the 1940s through the 1950s viewed the American re-education policy from the perspective of the possibilities and impossibilities of changing the German mind, political culture and the German university system – with the scholars of 1950s inclined to view the transformation of Germany as an impossibility – the researchers of the 1980s characterized the re-education mainly as an effective tool for the democratization of Germany.⁷⁷ This interpretation reinforced the orthodox tradition of establishing a much stronger, nearly incontestable and very comforting discourse about American educational policy in historical research. Now, American educational policy in occupied Germany was pictured mainly as being prudent, harmonious and a charitable activity. This interpretation was most likely compatible with the new political reality of the Cold War in the 1980s. The second idea dealt with studies of the personalities of the American political establishment and academic world, who made an important contribution to a modification of the German education system. Dr. James Conant, the president of Harvard University, who became the US High Commissioner and first American Ambassador to West Germany in 1953-1957, and who also imposed many reforms in German schools and universities, turned out to be the first reformer highlighted by the American researcher Charles D. Biebel in *History of Education Quarterly*. This first case established a biographic field of study on the most influential personalities and their role in reforming German universities.⁷⁸

⁷⁷ J. Tent, “Mission on the Rhine: American Educational Policy in Postwar Germany, 1945-1949,” *History of Education Quarterly* 22, no. 3, Special Issue: Educational Policy and Reform in Modern Germany (1982): 255-276.

⁷⁸ Ch.D. Biebel, “American Efforts for Educational Reform in Occupied Germany, 1945-1955. A Reassessment,” *History of Education Quarterly* 22, no. 3, Special Issue: Educational Policy and Reform in Modern Germany (1982): 277-287. Later, in 1998, James Tent published a book about Edward Hartshorne, who was responsible for the American policy in some German universities. See: J. Tent, *Academic Proconsul:*

Following upon the journal came the first comprehensive historical book about American policy in German education during the period of the Occupation. The American historian James Tent, mentioned earlier, published his *Mission on the Rhine: Reeducation and Denazification in American-Occupied Germany*, which partially analyzed American activities in universities. He extended the timeline of American educational policy, arguing about the decision-making process in Washington in 1942-1945. The author pictured in detail what happened inside of the American political establishment in terms of planning the educational policy in Germany. He introduced many of the officials who participated in the decision-making process, emphasizing inter-agency and personal conflicts over the policy. Analyzing American policy in universities, J. Tent examined such important problems as denazification, the activities of American specialists, and the crisis at University of Berlin. First, he changed the parameters of the debate about denazification in universities, proposing a newer and wider interpretation of the denazification concept. While the first researchers saw this as the process of the elimination of Nazi ideology in universities, James Tent pictured the denazification concept as the re-opening of universities, the purge of professors and students, and the prohibition of Nazi student organizations. Hence, Tent and other historians discussed methods for the elimination of Nazi ideology in the curriculum. Moreover, he was the first to emphasize the cooperative work between the American Military Administration and German professors in the process of denazification. He wrote that loyal professors, mostly anti-fascists, were granted a chance to purge their colleagues. Second, he continued the critique of the activities of American specialists in German universities offered earlier by H. Zink. James Tent wrote that the American specialists “transplanted the whole American scheme of education; some of them behaved like observers, a few of them had never seen Germany and did not speak German.”⁷⁹ Third, tracing the story of the founding of the Free University, he highlighted first the role of the American journalist Foss in the establishment of the University. To him, this journalist became the figure who was able to transfer the anti-Soviet attitudes of the Berlin University students to Washington politicians.⁸⁰

Harvard Sociologist Edward Y. Hartshorne and the Reopening of German Universities, 1945-1946 (Trier: WVT Verlag, 1998).

⁷⁹ J. Tent, *Mission on the Rhine: Reeducation and Denazification in American-Occupied Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 262.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 288-291.

James Tent, using solely American documents, reconstructed an unbalanced story of events that occurred in Germany. He did not mention, for example, any cases of the resistance of the German professoriate to American reforms. Nevertheless, dissecting the evolution of the decision-making process and some of the operations of the US Government in Germany, the author told impressive stories about the personalities (American politicians, educationalists, journalists, and German professors and students as well), who took part in reforms, and thus, went down in history and in American archival documents.

Simultaneously, the published works of West German historians appeared to be more critical of American educational policy in Germany. Examining the policy of re-education, Jutta Lange-Quassowski, in contrast to the American researchers, claimed that this policy had failed, because the German education had formed a small elite, and the German political socialization had been directed towards generating such attitudes of the people as the acceptance of the political decisions of the government. Stressing American failings in German universities, she wrote that the incompatibility of the American and German educational systems and the strong resistance of German professors to such American initiatives as the training of teachers at universities and the introduction of civic education became the main causes of this unsuccessful re-education policy.⁸¹

The second group consists of researchers who wrote about Soviet educational policy in Germany during the Occupation. In the late 1970s and mid-1980s, a few archival documents about Soviet Occupation policy were declassified in Moscow, and three unpublished dissertations were written about this. The unpublished work of Andrey Nikitin, the son of the former Soviet chief of the Higher Education Division at the Soviet Military Administration in Germany, constituted a landmark in the historiography. His *Activity of the Soviet Military Administration in the Area of Democratization of German Higher Education, 1945-1949* became the first research devoted entirely to Soviet policy in the universities.⁸² The work has a lot of intriguing features when compared with the work of James Tent.

⁸¹ J.-B. Lange-Quassowski, *Neuordnung oder Restauration? Das Demokratiekonzept der amerikanischen Besatzungsmacht und die politische Sozialisation der Westdeutschen: Wirtschaftsordnung-Schulstruktur-Politische Bildung* (Leske Verlag, Opladen, 1979).

⁸² A. Nikitin, *Deyatel'nost' Sovetskoy Voennoy Administratsii v Demokratisatsii Nemetskogo Vysshego Obrazovaniya, 1945-1949* (*The Activity of the Soviet Military*

Like James Tent, A. Nikitin wrote about the democratization and re-education of the Germans through the universities. Writing about Soviet activities in German universities, Nikitin interpreted them in terms of democracy and success, terms which American scholars like James Tent applied in characterizing the American policy of re-education. Nikitin also dealt with the denazification; however, he considered that denazification was not just the elimination of Nazi racial disciplines and the purge of professors, but that mostly it was a process of renewal of the student body. To him, the Soviet policy towards German students was the core of denazification. Using a few documents and the recollections of his father, which presented a positive image of the Soviet Occupation administration, A. Nikitin defended the thesis that the Soviet Union extended access to higher education for the children of workers and peasants. He described in detail the Soviet mechanism for the establishment of mass higher education; this entailed so-called preparatory courses, after graduating from which the poor and uneducated population could enter universities. While James Tent put the emphasis upon American policy towards the University of Heidelberg, where the first academic programs in the area of political science were introduced, Nikitin focused on the University of Jena, where the first Institute of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy was established by the Soviets. However, while the American historian put great emphasis on the founding of the Free University, the Soviet researcher avoided the discussion of this problem. Contrary to James Tent, Nikitin wrote about the resistance of German professors to the Soviet reforms in terms of the conflict between the old reactionary and new democratic academic elites. The final thesis by Nikitin deals with the introduction of Marxist philosophy in all university academic programs. Contrary to the set point of view that existed in American and German historiography, Andrey Nikitin rejected the fact that the introduction was a rude Soviet imposition, claiming that: "The Soviets avoided imposing Marxist philosophy in higher education by means of administrative orders and did not deprive German academics of the right to discuss alternative philosophical theories."⁸³ We now know that Andrey Nikitin's thesis was correct as to the period of 1945-1949; however, later in the 1950s, the

Administration in the Democratization of German Higher Education, 1945-1949. Unpublished PhD Dissertation (Moscow, 1986).

⁸³ Ibid., 103.

Soviet authorities made each professor give courses in the field of Marxist ideology.

Two other Soviet works deal with the Soviet imposition of Soviet literature, language and culture, as well as with the establishment of the famous scientific Society for Soviet Studies in German universities.⁸⁴ The political tone of these dissertations was much more orthodox than that of Nikitin's work, yet they give some ideas for drawing parallels between the establishment of American Studies, on the one side, and Soviet Studies, on the other, in German universities and between the establishment of the *Deutschen Gesellschaft für Amerikastudien* and the *German Society for Soviet Studies* as well.

The third group of researchers organized their work around the history of the Free University founded in 1948. The interest in this topic was generated by the new tense relations between the superpowers in the 1980s, provoked by stationing American and Soviet nuclear warheads in Western and Eastern Europe, and by the forthcoming fortieth anniversary of the founding of that University. We make no claim that before the 1980s there were no investigations devoted to the Free University. They did exist, but they told the apolitical stories about the University as the history of the establishment of new departments, institutes and so on.⁸⁵ It was the period of the 1980s that created a political story of the founding and development of the academic institution in Dahlem-Dorf. The most prominent investigations belonged to such German historians as Siegwald Lönnendonker, Ulrich Schneider, Bernd Rabehl, Uwe Prell and the American historian James Tent.⁸⁶ The book written by the latter was

⁸⁴ V. Yastrebtsov, *Sotrudnichesto Sovetskoy Voenny Administratsii i Nemetskih Demokraticeskikh Sil in Poslevoennoy Rekonstruktsii Germanii, 1945-1949* (Cooperation between the Soviet Military Administration and the German Democratic Forces in the Reconstruction of Germany, 1945-1949). Unpublished PhD Dissertation (Kiev, 1977); Veber D. *Ustanovlenie Druzhy Mezhdru Narodami SSSR i Demokraticeskoy Respublikoy Germanii: Bor'ba Sotsialisticheskoy Edinoi Partii Germanii i Sovetskoy Voenny Administratsii za Novue Otnosheniya Nemtsev k Sovetskomu Soyuzu, 1945-1946* (The Establishment of Friendship between the Peoples of the USSR and the Democratic Republic of Germany: the Struggle of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Soviet Military Administration for the New Attitudes of Germans towards the Soviet Union, 1945-1946). Unpublished PhD Dissertation (Moscow, 1983).

⁸⁵ See, for example: A. Axmann, *Aufbau, Reform, Krise: die Entwicklung des Otto-Suhr-Instituts an der Freien Universität Berlin von 1959 bis 1979* (Berlin: Spiegel der Presse, 1973);

⁸⁶ S. Lönnendonker, *Freie Universität Berlin: Gründung einer Politischen Universität* (Berlin: Duncker und Humboldt GmbH, 1988); U. Schneider, "Berlin, der Kalte Krieg, und die Gründung der Freien Universität 1945-1949," *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte des Mittel-*

translated into German, published literally in the year of the anniversary, and presented to President Ronald Reagan. It received a wide promotion and publicity, and thus gained its central place in the historiography.

All the authors mentioned created a new history of the Free University, a history of the successful political enterprise of German students, professors, and American philanthropic foundations and military administration. The German authors, some of whom participated in a project for publishing the Free University's documents, reconstructed the political history from 1945 until the end of the 1950s, using solely German documents. The unique feature of Tent's new work was a reconstruction of political and academic events that surrounded the university from 1945 until the 1960s on the basis of American and German archival records. As a whole, Tent represented the political situation in Berlin in 1948, a baseline for the conflict between the Soviet and American administrations for the influence in University of Berlin. Analyzing American and German documents, James Tent reconstructed in detail the logic behind the thinking of the American authorities as to Berlin University's crisis. However, without having a chance to read Soviet records, Tent simply omitted the Soviet position in the conflict as well as the Soviet actions toward the University of Berlin.⁸⁷ He assumed, for example, that the expulsion of three students from University of Berlin for their anti-Soviet behavior had accounted for the crisis at University of Berlin and its division.⁸⁸ Yet, this thesis contradicts the newly declassified Soviet records⁸⁹ which gave an account of the transporting of the university's laboratory equipment by the Americans from the Soviet Zone as being the cause of the crisis. Thus, the political story of the Free University remained unbalanced. However, the author, understanding this imbalance, tried to find the cause for the division of the University of Berlin in the ideological Cold War. He wrote that the Free University became a product of the Cold War and "no SED applicants were to be found in the Free University, nor would they have

und Ostdeutschlands 4 (1985): 37-101; B. Rabehl, *Am Ende der Utopie: Die Politische Geschichte der Freien Universität* (Berlin: Argon Verlag, 1988); U. Prell, W. Lothar, *Die Freie Universität Berlin: 1948-1968-1988* (Berlin: Ansichten und Einsichten, 1989); J. Tent, *The Free University. A Political History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988).

⁸⁷ Tent, *The Free University*, 112.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 112.

⁸⁹ See: State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317 "The Files of the Soviet Military Administration in Germany." Inventory 54. File 1: 141.

been accepted had they tried. From the outset a strident anticommunism stamped the entire enterprise...This militant spirit was to persist until an entirely new generation emerged twenty years later. The Free University, despite its title, was fated never to be free of the tug of countervailing forces.”⁹⁰

A final note about the renaissance stage: New documents and the new political context in the world as to the deterioration of the relationship between the Soviet Union and United States in the early 1980s created new interpretations of American educational policy of Germany. Educational policy became a mechanism for democratization and, more importantly, the negative attitudes found in German universities were omitted. Soviet researchers also created their own orthodox tale about the democratization of German universities with a story about the “spiritual renewal” of students and professors.⁹¹

4. The stage from early 1990s through the 2000s

In the 1990s and 2000s, the majority of historians who studied the educational policy of the United States or the Soviet Union in Germany during the Occupation moved from the writing of general, descriptive works to doing research that dissected how high politics intervened in the life of a specific German university, professor or student. Evidently, this shift was generated by new, numerous records which became available in the former Soviet and East German archives in the 1990s. These new records shifted the focus of research from American educational policy to Soviet educational policy. This new direction was observed initially in Germany, where researchers were enormously interested in the reconstruction of the totalitarian past. In the United States and Russia, only a few researchers continued working in the tradition of writing multi-aspect monographs analyzing all facets of Soviet policy in German education.

As a result, this section will review, first, the latest general works published in the United States and Russia. Next, we will analyze those factors that determined the popularity of this new area of study, which we will call a microhistorical area of study on Soviet or American educational policy during the Occupation. And, finally, the third part will offer a grouping of prominent microhistorical investigations.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 141.

⁹¹ Nikitin, *Deyatel'nost' Sovetskoy Voennoy Administratsii (The Activity of the Soviet Military Administration)*.

Two books about Soviet educational policy in Germany, with a traditional analysis of all its possible aspects, were published almost simultaneously in Russia and the United States. One of the chapters, *German Intelligentsia and the Policy of Reforms: The System of Education in East Germany*, written by the Russian researcher N. Timofeeva, was devoted to Soviet policy in German universities. Analyzing Soviet and German records, the author argued, in conjunction with her Soviet predecessor A. Nikitin, that the Soviet Military Administration did not impose its Soviet-modeled reforms, but, on the contrary, that it cooperated successfully with German professors. The academic intelligentsia had many opportunities to assert their views concerning the reforms, because the Communists and the Soviets had no ascendancy over the universities until the 1950s.⁹² In general, she pictured the Soviet reformers as friendly, educated and intelligent men. Contrary to this, the American historian N. Naimark, using similar Soviet and German records, pictured the Soviets in Germany as being brutal, uneducated, authoritarian men. In his *The Russians in Germany: a History of Soviet Zone of Occupation, 1945-49*, N. Naimark devoted one of the chapters to Soviet policy in education and culture, where he claimed that the Soviets successfully imposed their culture on German universities but lost the struggle for the minds of the German intelligentsia due to the strong resistance of the latter. However, contradicting this thesis, the American historian finally concluded that Soviet Union established a socialist university and a socialist East German intelligentsia.⁹³

At the same time, in Germany, a marked change occurred in scholarship, as historians and commentators began to reexamine different aspects of Soviet policy in German universities, and more importantly to modify the methods of the research. One German researcher, Hannover historian Manfred Heinemann,⁹⁴ arranged a conference on Soviet

⁹² N.P. Timofeeva, *Nemetskaya Intellegentsia i Politika Reform: Sistema Obrazovaniya v Vostochnoy Germanii, 1945-1949 (The German Intelligentsia and the Politics of the Reform: The System of Education in East Germany, 1945-49)* (Voronezh: Voronezh State University Press, 1996).

⁹³ N. Naimark, *The Russians in Germany: a History of Soviet Zone of Occupation, 1945-1949* (Cambridge, MA, London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1995).

⁹⁴ In the 1990s and 2000s, Manfred Heinemann published some outstanding works devoted to Soviet and American Occupation policies. He analyzed such questions as the reforms in Jena University and the educational institutions, in Saxony, the American reforms in Bavaria and others. See, for example: M. Heinemann, "Auf dem Weg Zur Volks-Universität. Die Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena 1948," in *Politischer*

Occupation policy in Gosen near Berlin in 1992, to which Russian and German scholars were invited. The papers of the participants were published twice; the first proceedings appeared in a special issue of *Bildung und Erziehung* in 1992,⁹⁵ and the second edition of proceedings with additional papers and interviews of eyewitnesses was published as a book in 2000.⁹⁶ This conference and the proceedings edited by Heinemann proved to be the turning point in the fresh appraisal of Soviet educational policy. The collapse of the communist regime in East Germany allowed German professors who lived during the Occupation period to give witness openly to their experiences in the 1940s and 1950s. In addition, the opening of East German and Soviet archives offered new facts to be balanced with the previously opened documents in American archives. Finally, the studies of the political scientists who wrote their books and articles in the 1990s were more or less free of the ideological interpretations and political tone that resounded in the Cold War context. Consequently, Heinemann and other German historians organized a new center around which other investigations were revolving and proposed such methods of research such as microhistory and microanalysis. A microanalysis of Soviet policy in German universities – that is, the analysis, for example, of the policy of Soviet officers towards one of the German universities, and a microhistory, that is, the influence of Soviet

Systemumbruch als Irreversibler Faktor von Modernisierung in der Wissenschaft?, ed. L. Mertens (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2001), 201-231; M. Heinemann, "Wiederaufbau: Re-education von 1945-1949. Gesamtdarstellung. 1. Wiederaufbau aus amerikanischer Sicht," in *Handbuch der Geschichte des bayerischen Bildungswesens*, ed. M. Liedtke (Bad Heilbrunn, Obb.: Klinkhardt, 1997), 474-548; M. Heinemann, "Hochschulerneruerung in Ostdeutschland. Das Beispiel Sachsen; Erfahrungen und Überlegungen zur Weiterführung," in *Wissen und Wandel. Universitäten als Brennpunkte der Europäischen Transformation*, eds. W. Pfeiffer, B. Seliger (Poznan: Wydawn. Naukowe Uniw. im. Adama Mickiewicza, 1997): 81-96; M. Heinemann, "Hochschulerneruerung und Sowjetische Besatzungsmacht. Oder: Es Muss Alles Neu Geschrieben Werden" in *Die deutsche Universität im 20. Jahrhundert. Die Entwicklung einer Institution zwischen Tradition, Autonomie, historischen und sozialen Rahmenbedingungen*, ed. K. Strobel (Vierow bei Greifswald: SH-Verl., 1994): 164-169; M. Heinemann, *Hochschuloffiziere und Wiederaufbau des Hochschulwesens in Westdeutschland 1945-1952. Die US-Zone* (Hildesheim: Lax, 1990); M. Heinemann, "Der Wiederaufbau der Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft und die Neugründungen der Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, 1945- 1949," in *Forschung im Spannungsfeld von Politik und Gesellschaft. Geschichte und Struktur der Kaiser-Wilhelm-/Max-Planck-Gesellschaft*, eds. R. Vierhaus, B. vom Brocke (Stuttgart: DVA, 1990): 407-470.

⁹⁵ *Bildung und Erziehung* 45, no. 4 (1992).

⁹⁶ Heinemann, M. *Hochschuloffiziere und Wiederaufbau des Hochschulwesens in Deutschland 1945-1949. Die sowjetische Besatzungszone* (Berlin: Akad.-Verlag, 2000).

policy on one of the German professors – became the unique feature of the first proceedings edited by Heinemann in 1992.

The organizer of the conference, Heinemann, articulated several ideas that became popular among the next generation of researchers. First, he proposed applying the concepts of Sovietization and Americanization for the analysis of the reforms of the superpowers in German education. Second, this scholar argued that Soviet and American policies were similar, as both sought to eliminate the traditions of German education. Third, he noted that scholars should not be negatively evaluating Soviet university policy as had been done earlier and, in order to understand it correctly, scholars should analyze the activity of every Soviet officer responsible for university policy in the Soviet administration of every German Land. Here, Heinemann emphasized that it was Soviet army officers who had a free hand in changing Moscow-based educational policy to suit real German conditions. For example, the orders in regard to the harsh purge of professors were not implemented by these Soviet officers because they understood that such denazification would result in the termination of university life. On the other hand, this freedom of action often resulted in negative consequences for Germans; for example, a rector of University of Jena was expelled at the wish of a Soviet chief in the German-state Higher Education Division, although he had no authority to do so. Fourth, Heinemann diminished the role of the crisis in University of Berlin in terms of understanding it as a product of Soviet and American Occupation policy, claiming that there was nothing original because the division of the university happened in the period of the division of the world, Europe, Germany and Berlin.⁹⁷ Hence, a new generation of historians began rewriting Soviet Occupation policy.

A Russian version of the events was represented at the aforementioned conference by Andrey Nikitin and his father Pjotr Nikitin, who was responsible for the Soviet reforms in German universities in 1945-1948. Andrey Nikitin continued the thought of Heinemann about the independent policy of each Soviet officer in each German state and emphasized that the Soviet Military Administration just received general orders from Moscow and, therefore, reforms in German universities depended entirely on the personal characteristics of the Soviet officers involved. Many of them tried to save the humanistic

⁹⁷ M. Heinemann, "Umrisse der Kultur- und Hochschulpolitik der Sowjetischen Militäradministration (SMAD) in der SBZ," *Bildung und Erziehung* 45, no. 4 (1992): 379-391.

traditions of the German university system. However, the model of the Soviet university system was imposed on Germany by the end of the Occupation. Also, Nikitin argued that the Soviet reforms consisted of the following areas: the introduction of Marxism-Leninism, the training of teachers at universities, the elimination of autonomy, and control over the social origins of students. Finally, he, like other Russian political scientists, objected to the thesis about the totalitarian nature of the Soviet reforms.⁹⁸

The third paper was prepared by German professor Günter Zehm. This paper was an eyewitness account of the resistance to Soviet repression at University of Jena, of the expulsion of teachers and students, and of arrests and sentencing for political reasons. He covered the famous Soviet campaign in University of Jena to expel the German philosopher Hans Leisegang, who rejected an offer to deliver lectures about Marxism-Leninism in 1948 and the fate of the student scientific societies such as “Eisenberger Krisen” and “Blochkrisen,” destroyed by the Stasi. Being a member of these societies, G. Zehm wrote how some students were able to leave East Germany, and how the students who remained in East Germany were expelled from the university. Finally, he claimed that escape to West Germany was the only way to resist.⁹⁹

In 2000, Heinemann published the papers from the conference as a book. He included in the edition new papers by German and Russian political scientists as well as his interview with Pjotr Nikitin about Soviet educational policy and the recollection of the latter about the division of University of Berlin.¹⁰⁰ We will discuss the interview and the recollections in the next section which is devoted to the analysis of documents and resources. In the book, there were a number of fresh facts and arguments as to Soviet policy. For example, the Russian researcher D. Fillipovich suddenly changed the traditional point of view about the soft Soviet denazification in German universities. Using new documents, he concluded that the purge of the professoriate in the East Zone was massive: 75% of the professors and 80% of the Dozenten were expelled

⁹⁸ A. Nikitin, “Die sowjetische Militäradministration und die Sowjetisierung des Bildungssystems in Ostdeutschland 1945-49,” *Bildung und Erziehung* 45, no. 4 (1992): 405-416.

⁹⁹ G. Zehm, “Repression and Widertand an der Universität Jena 1949-1989,” *Bildung und Erziehung* 45, no. 4 (1992): 453-466.

¹⁰⁰ Heinemann, *Hochschuloffiziere*.

from universities; however, they were later returned.¹⁰¹ Andrey Nikitin also contributed to this edition with his paper about the establishment of pedagogical departments in German universities. Contrary to Western political scientists, he proposed an argument similar to the opinion articulated by his father: Soviet reforms were not imposed, but, on the contrary, the reforms were discussed and accepted by German academia.¹⁰²

The research activity of Heinemann and other German historians had a profound influence on other investigations published in the late 1990s and 2000s. There are now a number of books and articles devoted to American and Soviet educational policies during 1945-1949, which have used methods of microhistory and oral history. We have classified the more prominent works into three groups: the first group of researchers focused upon American or Soviet policy towards a definite German university; the second focused upon solely Soviet or American policy towards German students; the third group analyzed Soviet policy towards German professors, while American policy towards the professoriate was neglected. Moreover, these researchers did not seek to compare the competitive policies as well as trace them, beyond the Occupation period to the 1950s through to 1990.

There are two universities in Germany whose fate during the period of Occupation still impresses scholars today. They are: the University of Jena, where the Soviet Military Administration accomplished the deepest reforms and where the first ideological chairs and institutes were established, and the University of Heidelberg, where the American Military Administration established the first chairs and institutes in the area of political science and American Studies. Conducting research within the framework of the new approaches to the theme, historians have focused upon the problems of receptivity and the attitudes of the German professors at universities of Jena and Heidelberg towards the imposed American or Soviet reforms. The academic and political fate of the German professors who maintained close contact with the Occupation

¹⁰¹ D.N. Filippovich, "Die Entnazifizierung der Universitäten in der sowjetischen Besatzungszone Deutschlands," in *Hochschuloffiziere und Wiederaufbau des Hochschulwesens in Deutschland 1945-1949. Die Sowjetische Besatzungszone*, ed. M. Heinemann (Berlin: Akad.-Verl., 2000): 35-52.

¹⁰² A. Nikitin, "Die Politik der Sowjetischen Militäradministration in Deutschland zur Bildung des Lehrkörpers der Hochschulen," in *Hochschuloffiziere und Wiederaufbau des Hochschulwesens in Deutschland 1945-1949. Die sowjetische Besatzungszone*, ed. M. Heinemann (Berlin: Akad.-Verl., 2000): 53-74.

authorities such as H. Leisegang in Jena or K. Jaspers, A. Weber and Radbruch in Heidelberg, is pictured in detail.¹⁰³ In addition, describing the American and Soviet reforms, this group of researchers proposed two divergent interpretations of the main consequences of the reforms. While German historians asserted that the reforms of both superpowers eliminated the old traditions of the German university system, American historians again interpreted the American reforms in terms of democracy, while the Soviet ones in terms of totalitarianism.¹⁰⁴

The events around the Free University are pictured by the American political scientist J. Suri. In his article, Suri went beyond the time of the founding of the University and analyzed the radical student movements in the 1960s. Suri describes the life of a leader of the leftist student movement, Rudolf Dutschke. In contrast to the previous researchers who witnessed and wrote about the student demonstrations in the 1960s and 1970s, calling the main causes of student protests the limited access to universities and the quality of teaching, the new generation of researchers in the 2000s started discussing the political reasons behind the student protests of the Cold and Vietnam Wars, the division of Berlin and the pliable position of the US as to the “German question.”¹⁰⁵

Moreover, in the 2000s, a new tendency in studies of the Berlin University crisis can be observed: the focus on the history of the University of Berlin and Humboldt University shifted from the previous theme about the Free University to a secondary position in the literature. Just as German academics between 1990 and the 2000s endured a new period of transformation in former East German universities after the reunification of Germany so German historians began arguing over the transformations of the Occupation period. The German researcher Lönnendonker, who had studied before the founding days of the Free University, now wrote about the political history of the University of Berlin and its split-off Humboldt University. In addition, among the most

¹⁰³ See, for example: S. Schlegel, “Die Sowjetische Militäradministration in Deutschland (SMAD) und die Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena,” in *Hochschule im Sozialismus. Studien zur Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena, 1945-1990*, ed. U. Hoßfeld (Köln u.a.: Böhlau, 2007): 96-118; J. Heß, *Heidelberg 1945* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1996); M. Heinemann, “Die Wiedereröffnung der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena im Jahre 1945,” in *DDR-Wissenschaft im Zwiespalt zwischen Forschung und Staatssicherheit*, eds. D. Voigt, L. Mertens (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1995): 11-44.

¹⁰⁴ See, for example: Heß, *Heidelberg 1945*; G.J. Giles, “Reeducation at Heidelberg University,” *Pädagogik Historica*, 33, no. 1 (1997): 201-219.

¹⁰⁵ J. Suri, “The Cultural Contractions of Cold War Education: The Case of West Berlin,” *Cold War History* 4, no. 3, (2004): 1-20.

prominent works were a series of articles by Ulla Ruschhaupt, who related the history of the reforms at Humboldt University in 1945-1948, 1951 and in 1968,¹⁰⁶ the article by Peter Walther about the founding of Humboldt University,¹⁰⁷ and the article by Ilko-Sascha Kowalczyk about student life at this University.¹⁰⁸

Finally, a slightly different focus for the research on the theme was proposed by the Russian scholar A. Haritonow, who published his *Sowjetische Hochschulpolitik in Sachsen 1945-1949* in 1995. He highlighted Soviet educational policy in three higher educational institutions located in occupied Saxony, the Dresden Technical University, the University of Dresden and the Freiberg Berg Akademie. There are no new facts or concepts as to Soviet policy towards the educational establishments in this German state; however, Soviet policy towards the Berg Akademie, which attracted the Soviets because of its scientific research in the area of the uranium enrichment was reconstructed for the first time.¹⁰⁹

The second group of researchers explored the German student body and the Soviet policy relative to it. The central place among these investigations would seem to be occupied by the works of the American historian John Connelly. Describing the educational policy of the SED towards German students during 1945-1948, he seems to narrow the framework of this policy, claiming that “higher education policy of the

¹⁰⁶ U. Ruschhaupt, “Die Ersten Jahre nach der Wiedereröffnung der Universität 1946-1951,” in *Von Ausnahme zur Alltäglichkeit. Frauen an der Berliner Universität Unter den Linden*, ed. Ausstellungsgruppe an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin und Zentrum für interdisziplinäre Frauenforschung (Berlin: Trafo-Verl., 2003): 151-172. U. Ruschhaupt, “Die Universität nach der II. Hochschulreform 1951,” in *Von Ausnahme zur Alltäglichkeit. Frauen an der Berliner Universität Unter den Linden*, ed. Ausstellungsgruppe an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin und Zentrum für interdisziplinäre Frauenforschung (Berlin: Trafo-Verl., 2003): 173-196; U. Ruschhaupt, “Die Universität nach der III. Hochschulreform 1968,” in *Von Ausnahme zur Alltäglichkeit. Frauen an der Berliner Universität Unter den Linden* ed. Ausstellungsgruppe an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin und Zentrum für interdisziplinäre Frauenforschung (Berlin: Trafo-Verl., 2003): 203-214.

¹⁰⁷ P.Th. Walther, “Von 1945 bis zur Gründung der Freien Universität Berlin,” in *Von Ausnahme zur Alltäglichkeit. Frauen an der Berliner Universität Unter den Linden*, ed. Ausstellungsgruppe an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin und Zentrum für interdisziplinäre Frauenforschung (Berlin: Trafo-Verl., 2003): 143-150.

¹⁰⁸ I.-S. Kowalczyk, “Die Studenten Selbstverwaltung an der Berliner Universität nach 1945,” *Deutschland-Archiv* 26, no. 8 (1993): 915-926 .

¹⁰⁹ A. Haritonow, *Sowjetische Hochschulpolitik in Sachsen 1945- 1949* (Weimar: Böhlau, 1995).

early postwar years can be broken down into two components: the introduction of “workers and peasants” into the student body and the supplementation of “bourgeois” approaches to scholarship with the “scientific worldview” of the working class: M-L (*Marxism-Leninism – Natalia Tsvetkova*).¹¹⁰ However, this thesis is not a key to the research. The resistance of German students to Soviet reforms is pictured in depth in his *East German Higher Educational Policies and Student Resistance, 1945-48*. Connelly revealed such causes of resistance as the similar nature between the Nazi and Communist ideologies, the compulsory attendance at Marxism-Leninism lectures, the compulsory membership in a communist youth organization and the inclusion of low social groups in the university student body. The author reveals such details of student resistance as the critique articulated by students at meetings of the university student council and in letters sent to the Berlin office of the Soviet Military Administration. Referring to the book published by students who escaped from the Soviet Zone of Occupation in 1953,¹¹¹ Connelly argues that the Soviets arrested and subjected 423 German students to repressive measures.¹¹² However, the declassified documents of East German, Soviet and American archives still have not proved this. In his more fundamental research, *Captive University: the Sovietization of East German, Czech, and Polish Higher Education, 1945-1956*, devoted to a comparative analysis of Soviet educational policy in Eastern European countries, Connelly mentions the specifics of the Soviet policy towards East German students. He writes that East Germany became the country where the highest percentage of students rooted in families of workers and peasants entered universities.¹¹³ Finally, he concludes that the Communists gave those Germans who were deprived of education a chance to go to university.¹¹⁴

Other researchers in this group continued the traditions of the American and German social historians of the 1960s and 1970s who viewed the Soviet policy relative to students as a tool for the social engineering of a new intelligentsia. The American researcher John Torpey concludes that the widening of access to universities resulted in

¹¹⁰ J. Connelly, “East German Higher Educational Policies and Student Resistance, 1945-48,” *Central European History* 28, no. 3 (1996): 259-298, here 263.

¹¹¹ M. Müller, E. Müller, „...stürmt die Festung Wissenschaft!“ *Die Sowjetisierung der mitteldeutschen Universitäten seit 1945* (Berlin-Dahlem, 1953).

¹¹² Connelly, *East German*, 259-298.

¹¹³ Connelly, *Captive University*, 4, 274.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 281.

establishing powerful and loyal German intelligentsia. He writes that “during the years before 1960, the SED did much to advantage the previously disadvantaged in gaining access to higher education. At the war’s end the children of workers had constituted a mere three percent of the undergraduate population in German universities. During the academic year coinciding with the first year of the GDR’s existence (1949-50), this figure had already risen more than tenfold. At the end of the 1950s, the underprivileged population of students reached 58%, and by 1965 it was 91.2%.”¹¹⁵ Taking a contrasting stance, Ilko-Sascha Kowalczyk, who also raises the question of social engineering in his *Geist im Dienste der Macht: Hochschulpolitik in der SBZ/DDR 1945 bis 1961*, states that the Communists were not able to win the favor of some sectors of the German intelligentsia who remained deeply opposed.¹¹⁷

The third group of researchers studied Soviet policy towards the German professoriate. Again, we would place the work of Connelly in a central place in these studies. Discussing the German Communists’ policy relative to German professors, Connelly introduced the sociological term “milieu,” which “is understood as a self-reproducing social unit with its own values, habits and demands for loyalty.”¹¹⁸ He argues that it was a milieu that was destroyed by Soviet reforms in the universities. He traces the process of destruction and emphasizes that the Communists initially got rid of “bourgeois” professors who taught philosophy and sociology; then, a fierce denazification cut the number of professors, and, finally, mass escape to the West led to practically all the philosophers active at East German universities leaving them by 1950.¹¹⁹ However, the author rightly noted that the Soviets conducted a dual policy towards professors because they “faced a dilemma: on the one hand they could not rely upon old scholars to inculcate young people with the values of socialism, yet on the other they needed their expertise to establish the material foundations of socialism. A full purge of the

¹¹⁵ J.C. Torpey, *Intellectuals, Socialism, and Dissent: the East German Opposition and its Legacy* (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1995), 16-17.

¹¹⁶ SBZ/DDR is German abbreviation of *Sowjetische Besatzungszone* that is the Soviet Zone of Occupation established in East of Germany.

¹¹⁷ I.-S. Kowalczyk, *Geist im Dienste der Macht: Hochschulpolitik in der SBZ/DDR 1945 bis 1961* (Berlin: Links, 2003).

¹¹⁸ Connelly, *Captive University*, 6.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 3-4, 98, 133.

professoriate would make impossible the training of students.”¹²⁰ That’s why, “from 1948 the SED proved willing to readmit former NSDAP¹²¹ members to the teaching faculties, but strictly differentiated between natural, technical, and medical sciences on the one hand, and humanities and social sciences on the other. In 1954 only 11 percent of the professors in philosophical faculties, compared with 42 percent in the technical disciplines had belonged to the NSDAP.”¹²²

The German historian Ralph Jessen continued John Connelly’s thought that professors in the arts were subjected to fiercer purging than professors of fundamental science. He writes that the professoriate in the departments of the arts was more closely monitored than that of the departments of physics or mathematics. The ideological essence of such disciplines as history and philosophy was the main concern of the Soviet Occupation authorities. Here, Ralph Jessen poses the question as to how old professors were reeducated by the Soviet power. He answers that it happened through the party; that is, the professoriate was compelled to join the Communist Party, and thus, began to believe in communist ideas through delivering lectures in the area of Marxism-Leninism, and thus these professors reevaluated their positions.¹²³ Finally, both John Connelly and Ralph Jessen conclude that the policy towards German professors won out on the whole, because the Communists succeeded in breaking up the university elite. This thesis was articulated more soundly in *Hochschule und Wissenschaft in Zwei Deutschen Diktaturen. Elitenaustausch an Sächsischen Hochschulen 1933-1952*. The German researcher M. Parak compares the reforms of both Nazis and Communists in some German universities, emphasizing the questions of autonomy, professoriate and political power. He argues that university autonomy gradually disappeared because as a result of both totalitarian regimes, the German professoriate had not survived under pressures from both, and consequently, the academic elite was radically changed twice, once in the 1930s and again in the 1940s.¹²⁴

¹²⁰ Ibid., 71.

¹²¹ NSDAP is the German abbreviation of *Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei*, the party of the Nazis.

¹²² Connelly, *Captive University*, 134.

¹²³ R. Jessen, *Akademische Elite und kommunistische Diktatur. Die ostdeutsche Hochschullehrerschaft in der Ulbricht-Ära* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht Verlag, 1999).

¹²⁴ M. Parak, *Hochschule und Wissenschaft in zwei deutschen Diktaturen. Elitenaustausch an sächsischen Hochschulen 1933-1952* (Köln, Weimar, Wien: Böhlau, 2004).

Hence, a variety of the books and articles mentioned have contributed to enriching our knowledge of Soviet policy towards students and professors at the German universities. However, among these groups of researchers, there is no one researcher who has analyzed American policy towards German students and teaching staff alone.

Conclusion

Our analysis of the studies carried out on Soviet and American policies in German universities during 1945-1990 has demonstrated that the theme attracted the attention of scholars who created not polar and mutually exclusive, but rather, partially overlapping and complementary interpretations of Soviet or American educational policy in two German states.

These scholarly interpretations were always limited by the political state of affairs and specific, selected sets of documents which became available for researchers step by step, with the greater portion of them coming from the United States alone; later German and Russian archives brought new facts to light and shifted the interpretations of the events. In the 1940s and 1950s, eye-witnesses to the Allies' policy established a new area of studies in political science, history and comparative education, devoted to the educational policy of the Occupation authorities; in so doing, they proposed the argument of the opposing nature of Western and Soviet educational policies. In the 1960s and 1970s, the topic of the Occupation policy of the US and the Soviet Union "dropped out" of mainstream scholarship, giving way to the theme of the actual life of the German universities on both sides of the dividing line in Germany. These researchers emphasized the policy towards the student body in West and East German universities without citing the previous Occupation policy and the reforms imposed then as the main cause of the student radicalism of the 1960s. In the 1980s, there was a revival of interest in the events of the Occupation period, particularly in American educational policy, because of new documents available in the United States. In the 1990s and 2000s, the focus shifted to Soviet Occupation educational policy because of new documents available in Germany and Russia. New and massive amount of documents have now provided us with new facts and have deconstructed the traditional comprehensive and generalized histories about American and Soviet activities in German education. Researchers are creating new microhistorical histories, narrowing the focus of exploration but widening the number of facts.

Obviously, this last stage has enriched our knowledge of what happened in Germany.

Nevertheless, after all the various books and articles, we should cite several important conclusions to demonstrate our contribution to the present literature. First, researchers seem to have set aside conceptual considerations as to the pile of facts and events. No researcher introduced a concept to frame the activities of both the US and the Soviet Union in German universities. This situation can be explained by the fact that the previous research, describing American or Soviet policy there, exploited the empirical data of the short historical period, the Occupation of Germany from 1945 to 1955, that is insufficient to make a general theoretical conclusion. Second, researchers have not moved beyond the Occupation period in order to analyze American and Soviet policies in German universities up until the end of the Cold War. American and Soviet policy towards German universities in the 1960s, in the 1970s, and in the 1980s remained beyond the sight of the literature. Third, researchers have not made a comparative analysis of American and Soviet policies. The previous research emphasized either American transformation or Soviet transformation of one of German universities. Fourth, scholars missed the opportunity to investigate in depth such important questions as American policy towards the German professoriate and the German students during the Occupation period. There is no book or article in regard to these questions in the literature. Finally, scholars have introduced new data without putting these into the broad political context and without finding any explanations for the motives that lay beneath either the Soviet or American policy.

Our main research objective is therefore to fill up these gaps by raising such questions as: what kind of theoretical concepts can be applied to frame American and Soviet activities in the German universities during the entire period of the Cold War? If they imposed their reforms, making some pressure on the German university community, can we state that both the US and the Soviet Union implemented the policy of cultural imperialism? Hence, we need to raise the questions as to what extent the superpowers were able to transform the German university system, and to what extent the opposition in the German universities which undermined the final results of the reform.

III. Research Question

In order to answer these questions, this research, first, will *compare* American and Soviet policies in German universities, that of West and East Germany, respectively, and, second, will move beyond the Occupation period in order to reconstruct a complete story about the university policies of both superpowers *during the entire period of the Cold War, 1945-1990*.

Hence, the **research question** – the American and Soviet policies of transformation in West German and East German universities from 1945 to 1990 – will focus on the following:

1. Comparison of their policies towards the university administration, institutions, and curriculum.
2. Comparison of their policies towards the German university teaching staff.
3. Comparison of their policies towards German students, and
4. Resistance of the German community to imposed reforms.

Moreover, the American and Soviet policies in West German and East German universities will be reconstructed for two periods determined by events of the Cold War and by shifts in their policies:

The first period is from 1945 to the early 1960s, when the United States and the Soviet Union initiated the unprecedented reforms in German universities in the West and in the East, respectively.

The second period is from the mid 1960s until 1990, when the United States and the Soviet Union attempted to continue to impose their divergent cultural values on West and East Germany, respectively, while, the resistance of the German university community continued to undermine the influence of both superpowers in the West and in the East. In addition, the American cultural offensive towards the East became visible in this period and thus is subjected to analysis.

Finally, the research will test our primary assumption that both American and Soviet educational policy in German universities was the policy of cultural imperialism, and thus the concept of cultural imperialism is the more appropriate frame in order to describe their activities.

IV. Documentary Sources

In order to answer the research question, we will rely on new sources declassified since the end of the Cold War in both American and Soviet archives. The paramount resources for this study of American and Soviet policies in German universities from 1945 to 1990 can be divided into two groups. The first group comprises primary sources of American origin relative to American policy in the universities of West Germany, and the second group is made up of primary sources of Russian origin relative to Soviet policy in the universities of East Germany. These sources have been partially published; however, the bulk of them is archived and deposited in the United States and Russia. The American archival resources are housed in the US archives in Washington, D.C., in Maryland, and in Arkansas; the Soviet ones in Russian archives in Moscow. We have not utilized the records deposited today in such German archives as the Bundesarchiv in Koblenz and Berlin, because, first, the subject of the research primarily concerns American and Soviet policies towards Germany that require original American and Soviet documents, and, second, the documents deposited in Germany relative to the research subject have turned out to be in majority German copies of American and Soviet documents. In order to give a brief analysis of the pertinent material, this chapter is divided into two parts. The first part deals with American archival and published documents, and the second part reviews Soviet archival and published records applicable to this study.

1. Sources on American policy in West German universities, 1945-1990

Documents of American origin utilized for this study are divided into the following groups: i) archival documents; ii) published documents on American foreign policy towards the two Germanies; iii) published reports of the Department of State as to international educational programs; and iv) recollections of American officials who participated in reforming German universities.

Archival records relative to American policy in German universities, 1945-1990

The documents on American educational policy in West Germany and East Germany are housed in such archives in the United States as the Arkansas University Library in Fayetteville that keeps some

federal holdings in the frameworks of its manuscript collection and the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), the primary federal archive, which records, appropriated for our research, are located in Washington, D.C., and College Park, Maryland. These branches keep the documents of the American government.

The main feature of American archival documents is that these documents are put in boxes, and that the pages of documents have no numeration. Hence, the documents are put without chronological order, they are mixed, thus producing obstacles and difficulties for researchers. In addition, the American federal records have a puzzled classification and a lack of coherence that demand some time for preparation before making a research.

The manuscript collection of the Arkansas University Library (Record Group #468) has turned out to be a unique source, because the files of this collection have never been used previously in similar research. This collection consists of unpublished governmental papers of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State and the Information Agency of the United States, the main agencies responsible for the elaboration and implementation of American educational and cultural policy around the world and in Germany, in particular. This collection contains some previously unknown information about American policy in German universities; for example, there are invaluable records on the missions of those American experts who conducted reforms in Occupied Germany, including the reports, plans, correspondence, and evaluations of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State concerning American policy in Germany from 1945 through the early 1970s.¹²⁵ The reason why a plenty of the governmental documents on American foreign cultural and educational policy were removed from Washington to comprise the manuscript collection of the Arkansas University is that William Fulbright, well-known American Senator and sponsor of the academic exchange program, had graduated from the Arkansas University and was

¹²⁵ Arkansas University Library. Manuscript Collection 468. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (CU). Group I. CU Organization and Administration; Group II. Cultural Presentation Program; Group III. Fulbright Program; Group IV. Special Program; Group VI. US Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs; Group VII. International Book and Library Programs; Group IX. Country Files; Group XV. Education and Culture; Group XVI. Post Reports. Group XVII. Reports, Survey, and Correspondence; State Department Programs, 1945-1975.

its President for a short period of time. He was likely to establish this collection transferring the governmental documents from Washington.

The National Archives and Records Administration's divisions in Washington, D.C., and College Park, Maryland, have five record groups containing files on the educational policy of the US Government towards the Federal Republic of Germany during the period 1945-1990 and towards the German Democratic Republic, from the 1970s until 1990. Record Group #59 contains the files of the Department of State, which have become our primary source in studying American policy in German universities. This record group consists of numerous textual files and microfilms such as country plans, diplomatic reports, correspondence between the American Occupation authorities, diplomatic missions in Germany and Washington, files on the Free University and other materials. The documents of the archival group are the most invaluable source for reconstructing the process of elaboration and implementation of American policy in Germany.¹²⁶ Records group #260 and #466 are the documents of the American Occupation authorities in Germany, 1945-1955. The documents on American educational policy in the German states are also deposited in these record groups. Every German state in the American zone of Occupation had a local American Branch on Education that implemented the university policy of the US Government in every German university. The documents of these record groups have contributed to an understanding of how the American reforms were actually implemented in German universities.¹²⁷ To reconstruct American policy in West German universities during the 1960s through the 1980s, we have utilized the records of the Information Agency of the United States (Record Group #306). This agency, established in 1953, was authorized to elaborate and implement the educational policy of the government in the universities of the Federal Republic of Germany. Annual country plans found among the documents measured the effectiveness of the American educational, cultural and information programs. They turned out to be useful in accessing the political aims behind the educational policy in Germany during the 1960s through the 1980s.¹²⁸ The scholars, who study the American activities in German universities, very seldom make use of the materials of the Office of

¹²⁶ National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). Record Group #59. General Records of the Department of State.

¹²⁷ NARA. Record Group #260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters, World War II; Record Group #466. Records of the US High Commissioner for Germany.

¹²⁸ NARA. Record Group #306. Records of the United States Information Agency

Education (Records Group #12), yet this group of archival documents pertains to the American policy towards German students and German teachers. The files describe in details the training of German students and teachers in the United States, their reports, observations, and attitudes as well as the final results of their trips to America.¹²⁹

Published documents on American foreign policy towards East Germany and West Germany

The Department of State and the US Congress have published a great many documents on the American foreign policy relative to both West Germany and East Germany. These collections of books could be divided into collections of documents on the general foreign policy of the United States from 1945 until 1990, which trace the American-German relations, and the collections of books devoted specifically to the relationship between the United States and the Federal Republic.

Volumes of foreign policy and diplomatic documents, entitled *Foreign Policy of the United States*, are the official publications of the United States Government. Today, these published documents cover the period from 1945 until 1976. They have turned out to be a useful tool in understanding how decisions were made and by whom in terms of international educational policy in Washington. Memoranda, policy papers, and reports from various agencies involved in foreign policy, such as the National Security Council, Information Agency, Central Intelligence Agency, Agency of International Development, and the regional bureaus of the Department of State, can clarify the development of international educational policy of the United States around the world and specifically Germany. These collections contain material on the negotiations between the United States and West Germany in the area of education.¹³⁰ There are some volumes among this group of historical materials devoted specifically to Germany. They have contributed to a reconstruction of the general political context of German-American relations from 1945 to the early 1970s.¹³¹ The American government has

¹²⁹ NARA. Record Group #12. Records of Office of Education. Records of International Education. Records relating to cultural exchange programs.

¹³⁰ *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1943-1968* (Washington, DC: GPO, 1955-2000).

¹³¹ *Foreign Relations of the United States*, vol. 3, 1945; vol. 5, 1946; vol. 2, 3, 1947; vol. 2, 3, 1948; vol. 1, 3, 4, 1949; vol. 1, 2, 4, 1950; vol. 3, 4, 1951; vol. 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 1952-1954; vol. 4, 5, 1955-57; vol. 14, 1961-1962; vol. 15, 1962-1963; vol. 15, 1964-1968; vol. 40, 1969-1972; vol. E-15, 1973-1976.

put the electronic versions of the Foreign Relations of the United States in web-page on the Department of State.¹³²

The collections of governmental documents about American-German relations, which also emphasize political relations, include some documents on the educational policy of the United States in Germany: for example, the set of documents on the Truman policy in Germany has revealed some unique reports on the attitudes of the American political establishment towards Germans.¹³³ The documents on the Occupation period are found in books published both by the American government and independent researchers. Such collections consist of primary documents on the educational policy of the United States in the early stages of the Cold War.¹³⁴ The political and educational relations between the United States and West Germany in the later period of the Cold War have been reconstructed by using some of the documents published in the 1970s and 1980s.¹³⁵

It is evident that the selection of documents published was under the influence of the government and the Cold War itself. They reflect the official position of the American government, omitting some problems and failures of American policy; however, they can be used to reconstruct the main stages of German-American relations during the period 1945-1990.

Published reports of the Department of State as to international educational programs

Annual reports on the educational policy of the Department of State, conducted in various regions and countries of the world, present German-American educational relations in detail. These reports were aimed at evaluating the final outcome and effectiveness of American

¹³² "Historical Documents: Foreign Relations of the United States", in US *Department of State. Office of the Historian*, <http://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/>.

¹³³ *Documentary History of the Truman Presidency*, ed. D. Merrill (Bethesda, MD: University Publications of America, 1995), in 34 vols; vol. 3. "U.S. Policy in Occupied Germany after World War II: Denazification, Decartelization, Demilitarization and Democratization".

¹³⁴ *Documents on Germany under Occupation, 1945-1954*, ed. Beate Ruhm von Oppen (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1955); *Germany 1947-1949. The Story in Documents* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1950); *Politics and Government in Germany. Basic Documents, 1944-1949*, ed. Carl-Christoph Schweitzer (Providence, Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1995).

¹³⁵ *Documents on Germany, 1944-1985* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1985).

educational exchange programs and reforms in every country in the world. The reports were publishing starting in 1949. This historical source is useful in defining the position of Germany, among other recipients of American educational programs, in terms of finding both the weak and strong features of American policy, and in identifying those social and professional groups selected by the American government for training programs.¹³⁶

Recollections of American officials who participated in reforming German universities

Recollections allow us to understand much better the political context and action of American officers in German universities. The recollections of L. Clay, the head of the American Military Administration in Germany during the period 1945-1949 and the recollections of H. Kellermann, the head of German Affairs Division in the Department of State, have related various facts on American policy in the universities and have explained why some reforms could not be carried out in Germany.¹³⁷

2. Sources on Soviet policy in East German universities, 1945-1990

Materials on the educational policy of the Soviet Union in East Germany during the period 1945-1990 are divided into the following

¹³⁶ The reports were published under different titles in different years: *The International Information Educational Exchange Program. The 5th-25th Semiannual Reports to Congress by the Secretary of the Department of State. 1953-1960.* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1951-1961); *Educational and Cultural Diplomacy, 1962, 1964* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1963, 1965); *Educational and Cultural Exchange Program. July 01, 1960 - June 30, 1961. Annual Report of the Secretary of State to Congress* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1962); *International Exchange, 1967-1970. A Report of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1968-1971); *International Educational and Cultural Exchange: a Human Contribution to the Structure of Peace* (Washington, DC: Department of State. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, 1974); *International Educational, Cultural and Related Activities for African Countries South of the Sahara* (Washington, DC: Department of State, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, 1975); *The Program of Emergency Fund to Chinese Students, 1949-1955* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1956), etc.

¹³⁷ L. Clay, *Decision in Germany* (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1950); *The Papers of General L.D. Clay*, ed. J. Smith (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1974), in 2 vols; vol. 1, 2; H.J. Kellermann, *Cultural Relations as an Instrument of US Foreign Policy: the Educational Exchange Program between the United States and Germany, 1945-1954* (Washington, DC: Department of State Publications, 1978).

groups: i) archival records; ii) published documents on Soviet foreign policy towards East Germany and West Germany; iii) published recollections of Soviet officials participating in reform of German universities.

Archival records relative to Soviet policy in German universities, 1945-1990

Four state archives in Moscow house records relative to the research. They are *the Russian State Archive of Modern History, the Russian State Archive of Social and Political History, the Foreign Policy Archive of the Russian Federation, and the State Archive of the Russian Federation*. These archives contain the files of the Kremlin, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Ministry of Education, the primary agencies responsible for the decision-making process in regard to educational policy towards Germany, as well as the files of the Soviet Occupation authorities and the Soviet diplomatic missions, the primary agencies responsible for conducting educational policy in German universities in the early and late periods of the Cold War.

Soviet archival documents with comparison to American ones are put in a file, and every page of a document has a numeration. The classification of the records is more logical than that of American records.

The Russian State Archive of Modern History (formerly the Archive of the Central Committee of the Communist Party) houses Record Group #5, called in Russian *Fond #5*,¹³⁸ that comprises documents on Soviet educational policy in Germany as elaborated in the Central Committee of the Communist Party and Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Education and Science Commission of the Central Committee was the center of the decision-making process in the area of Soviet educational policy around the world and in Germany as well. Hence, the files of this group have become the main source for evaluating the position of the Soviet government as to German universities and for understanding those political and ideological aims that stood behind the educational reforms implemented by the Soviets in East Germany during the 1950s through the 1980s. The most interesting and invaluable insights can especially be found among those documents devoted to the problematic and difficult relationship between the Soviet power and the German university intelligentsia in the late period of the Cold War, at the

¹³⁸ We will use *Record Group* as the English translation of the Russian word *Fond*.

end of the 1970s through the 1980s. These documents recount how university professors rejected the Soviet proposals to prepare new textbooks reflecting Marxist ideology, how they enjoyed the cultural exchange programs coming from West Germany, how they encouraged alternative thinking among German students, and other things. These attitudes and the oppositional behavior of the German professoriate were assessed by the Soviet government as a threat to the stability of the German regime.¹³⁹

In addition, the highest governmental documents relative to our research can be found in the *Russian State Archive of Social and Political History* (Record Group #17). The documents of the political situation in Germany and Berlin as well as the evaluation reports of German Communists' policy in German universities in the 1950s are deposited in this group. This group has become the main source for study of such questions as the introduction of new disciplines in German universities, the establishment of new institutions, the modification of library holdings at the universities, and the transformation of German history studies in the 1950s.¹⁴⁰

The files of Record Group #082 in the *Foreign Policy Archive of the Russian Federation* have provided new and important information about the general foreign policy of the Soviet Union towards Germany and the so-called German question in the initial period of the Cold War. These files also contain some papers that directly relate to the educational policy of the Soviet Union in Germany: for example, the minutes of a meeting between J. Stalin and the leaders of the German Communists, W. Peak and O. Grotewohl, about the introduction of new disciplines in German universities, evaluations of the state of public opinion, attitudes among the student body and the professoriate in the period from 1945 through the 1950s.¹⁴¹

The great bulk of files, documents, and various materials relevant to our research have been taken from the *State Archive of the Russian Federation, SA RF*. There are six record groups containing documentation on how Soviet educational policy in Germany was conducted during the period 1945-1990. The story of early Soviet

¹³⁹ Russian State Archive of Modern History. Record Group #5. Central Committee of Communist Party. Records of the Education and Science Commission.

¹⁴⁰ Russian State Archive of Social-Political History. Record Group #17. Central Committee of Communist Party.

¹⁴¹ Foreign Policy Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group #082. German Materials.

activities in German universities was reconstructed mainly using Record Group #P-7317. This group is a collection of the files for the period of 1945 through the 1950s of the Education Division that was established at the Soviet Military Administration in Occupied Germany. The available documents have become an invaluable source for understanding the views, ideas, and policy of the first Soviet officers vis-à-vis German university education. This record group was the only source that analyzed Soviet policy towards the German student body and the division of University of Berlin. There are a lot of documents translated into German that are devoted to the relationship between the Soviet military administration and the first German administration in the realm of education as established by the Occupation authorities. This group includes Soviet evaluations of the attitudes of professors and the Soviet plans to promote Communists in the universities. The group also contains numerous questionnaires, personnel references and other useful documents about every professor working at East German universities from 1945 through the early 1950s.¹⁴²

The events following the Occupation, the mid-1950s, were reconstructed through documents produced by the Soviet Ministry of Education. Since the mid-1950s the entire body of information on the Soviet and German reforms implemented in the universities has been handed over to the Ministry of Education by the Soviet diplomatic, educational, cultural, and intelligent missions. The Record Group #P-9396 contains the unique files devoted to Soviet reforms in the German universities' curricula and academic programs. Also, there are many intriguing reports by Soviet professors and lecturers sent to German universities to implement reforms and make observations at the end of the 1950s.¹⁴³ Record Group #P-9518 keeps files collected under the title "Plans for cultural cooperation between the USSR and GDR." The documentation covers relations between Soviet and German universities during the 1960s. The other files are also relevant to reports from the Ministry of Education devoted to implementation of the plans. Moreover, the notes of conversations and minutes of meetings between Soviet diplomats and German university people are found here. Such detailed notes and minutes have become new and invaluable resources for

¹⁴² State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group #P-7317. The Soviet Military Administration in Germany documents. People Education Division, 1945-1953.

¹⁴³ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group #P-9396. The Ministry of Higher Education of the USSR, 1946-1959.

reconstructing the state of affairs of German university education in the 1960s, and for reconstructing the spirit of the German university under pressure. As usual, these documents reveal the oppositional attitudes of the German professoriate and student body in the 1960s and the reforms conducted by German Communists in the universities at that time.¹⁴⁴

Soviet policy in the late period of the Cold War, notably from the mid-1960s until 1990, has been reconstructed on the basis of three record groups housed in the archive (#P-9606, 9563, 9661). They contain the documents of the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that concern such questions as the reforms of German history studies and pedagogies, the training of German students in the USSR (problems and statistics), exchanges between German and Soviet professors, cooperation between the Soviet and West German universities, the lines of cooperation between the Soviet and German pedagogical departments and institutes, the development of Russian studies, and so on. All these documents have given us a chance to reconstruct in detail the educational policy of the Soviet Union during the 1970s and until 1990, that has never been done in previous research. Numerous reports by the Ministry of Education sent to the Central Committee of the Communist Party contained panicky language about the serious and sudden influence of West Germany on East German students and university professors in the 1980s. Such information has allowed us to come some important conclusions in our research.¹⁴⁵

Published documents on Soviet foreign policy towards East Germany and West Germany

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs published series on Soviet foreign policy and on Soviet-German relations. These books were published both during the period 1945-1990 and during the 1990s and 2000s. Such series contain all the primary agreements and treaties in the area of politics, economics, and education that were signed between the Soviet Union and East Germany, and the Soviet Union and West Germany as well. The period covered by the official documents is 1945-

¹⁴⁴ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group #P-9518. The Committee on Cultural Ties with Foreign Countries at the Council of Ministers, 1957-1967.

¹⁴⁵ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group #P-9606. The Ministry of Higher and Vocational Education of the USSR, 1959-1988; Record Group #P-9563. The Ministry of Education of the USSR, 1966-1988; Record Group #P-9661. State Committee on People Education, 1988-1991.

1986.¹⁴⁶ Moreover, some important documents on Soviet policy towards the two German states have been found in the series devoted to the general foreign policy of the USSR during the Cold War. These dry and official treaties have contributed to establishing the correct and logical periods in Soviet policy towards East Germany.¹⁴⁷ Recent series published in the 2000s have contributed to filling in some blank spots

¹⁴⁶ *Za Antifashistskuyu Demokraticeskuyu Germaniyu. Sbornik Dokumentov, 1945-1949* (In Favor of Anti-Fascist Democratic Germany. Documents. 1945-1949) (Moscow: Press House of Political Literature, 1969); *Otnosheniya SSSR-GDR, 1949-1955. Dokumenty i Materialy* (The Relationship between the USSR and GDR, 1949-1955. Documents and Materials) (Moscow: Press House of Political Literature, 1974); *SSSR i GDR. 30 Let Otnosheniy, 1949-1979. Dokumenty i Materialy* (The USSR and GDR. 30 Years of the Relationship, 1949-1979. Documents and Materials) (Moscow: Press House of Political Literature, 1981); *Sovetskiy Soyuz i Berlinskiy Vopros. Dokumenty* (The Soviet Union and the Berlin Question. Documents) (Moscow: The Press House of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1948); *Sovetskiy Soyuz i Unifikatsia Germanii i Mirny Dogovor s Germaniyey* (The Soviet Union and the Unification of Germany and Peace Treaty with Germany) (Moscow: The Press House of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1952); *Dvadsat' Let SEPG. Dokumenty SEPG* (Twenty Years of the SED. Documents of the SED) (Moscow: Press House of Political Literature, 1966); *Chetyrehstoronnee Soglashenie po Zapadnomu Berlinu i ego Vupolnenie, 1971-1977* (The Quadripartite Agreement on West Berlin and its Implementation. Documents, 1971-1977) (Moscow: Press House of Political Literature, 1977); *Dokumenty po Vneshney Politike Germanskoy Demokraticeskoy Respublike, 1949-1954, 1954-1955, 1955-56* (Documents on the Foreign Policy of German Democratic Republic, 1949-1954, 1954-1955, 1955-56). Trans. from German (Moscow: Press House of Foreign Literature, 1955-1958); *Sobranie Osnovnykh Dokumentov po Otnosheniyam s GDR, FRG i Zapadnom Berlinom (1980-1986)* (The Collection of Basic Documents on the Relationships with GDR, FRG, and West Berlin (1980-1986)) (Moscow: Press House of Political Literature, 1988); *SSSR-GDR: Sotrudnichestvo i Sblizhenie* (The USSR-GDR: the Cooperation and Approachment) (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya, Berlin: Staats Verlag, 1979); *SSSR i GDR: Druzhiba i Sotrudnichestvo. Dokumenty i Materialy* (The USSR and GDR: the Friendship and Cooperation. Documents and Materials) (Moscow: Press House of Political Literature, 1986).

¹⁴⁷ *Vneshnyaya Politika Sovetskogo Soyuza. 1945-1950* (The Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union. 1945-1950) (Moscow: The State Press House of the Political Literature, 1949-1953); *Vneshnyaya Politika i Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya. Dokumenty, 1961-1985* (The Foreign Policy and International Relations. Documents, 1961-1985) (Moscow: The State Press House of Political Literature, 1962-1985); *Vo Imya Mira i Besopasnosti Ludey. Dokumenty Sovetskoy Vneshney Politiki, 1966-1971, 1985-1988* (For the Sake of Peace and the Security of Peoples. The Documents of Soviet Foreign Policy, 1966-1971, 1985-1988) (Moscow: International Relations, 1983-1990). *Sobranie Dogovorov, Podpisannykh Sovetskim Soyuzom i Zarubezhnymi Stranami, 1945-1990* (The Collection of the Treaties Signed by the Soviet Union and Foreign Countries, 1945-1990) (Moscow, 1946-1991).

remaining after work in the archives and have thus obviously been highly useful.¹⁴⁸

Recollections of Soviet officials who participated in reforming German universities

A few books and articles have been published by former Soviet officers who made the first reforms in Occupied Germany in the period 1945 through the 1950s. They published their recollections in various political contexts, notably during the Cold War and afterwards, contexts which influenced their evaluations of Soviet policy. We have utilized such historical resources with caution; however, these recollections have been used to provide us with some details missing in governmental documents. The most valuable autobiographical books have been written by Pjotr Nikitin, a former chief of the Education Division at the Soviet Military Administration. He was responsible for university policy from 1945 until 1949, and thus he has turned out to be a witness and an actor in some of the events occurred in German universities. His recollections have become an additional source of information about the division of University of Berlin.¹⁴⁹ The recollections of other Soviet officers who

¹⁴⁸ *SSSR i Germanskiy Vopros. 1941-1949. Dokumenty iz Arhiva Vneshney Politiki Rossiyskoy Federatsii (The USSR and the German Question. 1941-1949. Documents from the Archive of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation)*, 3 vols; vol. 2, 3 (Moscow: International Relations, 1996-2003); *Sovetskiy Faktor v Vostochnoy Evrope, 1944-1953. Dokumenty (The Soviet Factor in Eastern Europe, 1944-1953. Documents)*, 2 vols; vol. 1, 2 (Moscow: ROSSPAN, 1999); *Politika SVAG in Oblasti Kultury, Nauki i Obrazovaniya: Tseli, Metody i Rezultaty, 1945-1949. Dokumenty (The Policy of the SMAD in the Area of Culture, Science, and Education: The Aims, Methods, and Results, 1945-1949. Documents)* (Moscow: ROSSPAN, 2006); *SVAG: Otdel Propagandy (informatsii) i S. Tulpanov, 1945-1949. Dokumenty (The SMAD. The Propaganda (Information) Branch and S. Tulpanov, 1945-1949. Documents)* (Moscow: AIRO-XXI, 1994); *Ustanovlenie Diplomaticheskikh Otnosheniy mezhdu Sovetskim Soyuzom i Federativnoy Respublikoy Germanii. Sbornik Dokumentov i Materialov (The Establishment of Diplomatic Relations between the Soviet Union and Federal Republic of Germany. Collection of Documents and Materials)* (Moscow: MGIMO, 2005); *Mikhail Gorbachev i Germanskiy Vopros. Dokumenty. 1986-1991 (Michael Gorbachev and the German Question. Documents. 1986-1991)* (Moscow: All the World, 2006).

¹⁴⁹ P.I. Nikitin, *Zwischen Dogma und gesundem Menschenverstand: wie ich die Universitäten der deutschen Besatzungszone "sowjetisierte". Erinnerungen des Sektorleiters Hochschulen und Wissenschaft der Sowjetischen Militäradministration in Deutschland* (Berlin: Akad.-Verl., 1997); M. Heinemann, "Interview mit Pjotr I. Nikitin", in *Hochschuloffiziere und Wiederaufbau des Hochschulwesens in Deutschland 1945-1949. Die sowjetische Besatzungszone*, ed. M. Heinemann (Berlin: Akad.-Verl., 2000), 75-146.

touched on educational policy are a useful source in understanding the situation in Occupied Germany, Berlin, and some other German universities.¹⁵⁰

As a result, we can state that the records found have provided this study with new and original documentation, especially with documents on the later period of the Cold War, the 1960s through to 1990, which have never been used in the literature.

Conclusion

Concluding this section on the primary sources used in our research, we should note that, on the one hand, all the documents mentioned have provided us with invaluable insight into Soviet and American educational policy in Germany; however, on other hand, we should take into consideration some limitations for the study due to these records.

First, we should take into consideration that almost all the materials are *governmental* documents prepared mostly as reports, evaluations, and observations by agencies and officials inferior in rank to the higher governmental structures. This defines the content and language of the documents: they disguise failures, mistakes, and the problems of educational policy by using ambiguous and obscure language, and by exaggerating the success and achievements of the educational policy. For example, some governmental Soviet documents overstate the numbers of lower social groups admitted to German universities, and some American governmental documents overstate the achievements of the American Occupation authorities in terms of establishing political science in German universities. The comparative analysis of the documents taken from different archival record groups has helped to resolve this problem. Second, archival documents deposited in different record groups are mixed and scattered that can impede a reconstruction of events in a consecutive and logical order. Third, the factor of the close interdependence between the foreign policy and international educational policy during the Cold War period has made it essential to find the documentary remains of the educational policy among the countless documents on foreign policy of the United States and the Soviet Union towards two German states. However, the novelty of the records has

¹⁵⁰ M. Semiryga, *Kak Mu Upravlyali Germaniyey: Politika i Zhizn'* (*How We Governed Germany: Politics and Life*) (Moscow: ROSSPAN, 1995); I. Kolesnichenko, *Bitva Posle Voeny* (*The Struggle after the War*) (Moscow: Voenizdat, 1987).

turned out to be more valuable than the limitations of the sources mentioned in our research.

Analyzing the available records, we can conclude that the period in American and Soviet educational policy from 1945 to the end of the 1960s is better served by these documents than the period of the early 1970s through to 1990. However, archival documents of the last period of the Cold War, recently declassified, give us a chance to reconstruct American activities in the universities of West Germany as well as the Soviet ones in East Germany during this period of some relaxation of ideological competition between the United States and Soviet Union during the 1970s, known in the literature as *détente*, and during the period of last tension and final days of the Cold War during the period the early 1980s as well. This reconstruction of American and Soviet policy conducted in the early 1970s through to 1990, in turn, suggests new empirical evidence to support or reject our assumption about failed policy of cultural imperialism.

V. The structure of the dissertation

The following chapters of the research will begin with the empirical part of the comparative study of American policy in West German universities and Soviet policy in East German universities during the period 1945-1990.

Chapter II will explain the Cold War context and the political aims of the superpowers in Germany beyond their educational policies there. In addition, this chapter will provide an analysis of the main mechanisms (agencies, reformers, and experts) established by them both in order to implement a set of reforms in German universities after the end of the Second World War and until early in the 1960s.

Chapters III, IV, and V will investigate and compare the transformations made by the superpowers in the German universities and their policy towards both professors and students during the initial period of the Cold War, 1945 until the early 1960s. Chapter III will investigate important transformations made by the superpowers in the German universities' management, faculty structures, curriculum, and library holdings. In addition, this Chapter will discuss their policy towards establishing new universities and departments, and the Free/Humboldt University case as well. Chapters IV and V will compare the specific policies of the United States and the Soviet Union towards the main

realms of the university community – teaching staff and students. These chapters emphasize the partial character of the imposed reforms and the resistance of the German community that undermined the external cultural pressure coming from both the USA and the USSR.

Chapter VI will compare the achievements and shortcomings of American and Soviet policies in German universities in the new and changing context of the Cold War in the period of the mid-1960s up until 1990. This chapter will put its emphasis on American policy towards radical West German students and on new Soviet reforms in the area of curriculum in East German universities. Moreover, the resistance of the German professoriate, known as conservative professors by both superpowers, will be analyzed as well, and the American cultural offensive towards East German Universities will also be subjected to analysis in this chapter.

The research will end with a conclusion about the main gains and failures of the policy conducted by the United States and the Soviet Union in German universities.

Chapter II

Americans and Soviets in the defeated Germany: the division of the country, Occupation administrations, and their transformation strategies for German universities

Introduction

The primary aim of this chapter is to explain and discuss the policy of the United States and the Soviet Union towards Germany which formed the basis for their activities in German universities during the entire period of the Cold War. The political division of Germany implemented by the victorious powers, and the subsequent impossibility of reunifying Germany due to the political shortcomings of American-Soviet bilateral relations and their policies in Europe after the end of the Second World War, defined the development of universities in Germany. The second aim of this chapter is to give a description of the Occupation military administrations that transformed German universities. Finally, in order to understand American and Soviet reforms in the universities of Germany, the chapter will discuss how the superpowers perceived the German university system and what strategies they proposed in order to modify it.

I. From friendly to hostile division

What happened in German universities during the Cold War period, 1945-1990, was determined by that major event in recent world history known as the division of Germany. The partition of the defeated Germany after the end of the Second World War, planned and executed by the victorious powers in World War II – the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and France – is a much debated question in the literature. One or another interpretation of the events anchored in this division can influence the point of view of a scholar who seeks to study the educational policy of the United States and the Soviet Union in Germany. Understanding the positions of these main Cold War rivals in regard to the division and fate of the defeated Germany is crucial for an accurate comprehension of their policy within Germany and in German universities.

Before the opening of the archives in Russia and the former East Germany in the 1990s, the most wide-spread and traditional view of the division of Germany stated that the partition of the country was an unavoidable consequence of American resistance to Soviet expansionist intentions in Europe.¹⁵¹ This point of view dominated in American and Western European literature. Soviet scholars exclusively blamed the government of the United States for the division of the country.¹⁵² Recent historians, however, both in Russia and in the United States have found no strong, documented evidence that the Soviet Union intended to dominate Western Europe;¹⁵³ on the contrary, new documents claim that the Soviet Union followed a consistent policy of preserving German unity and its neutral position vis-à-vis any military alliances in Europe during the period of 1949 through the mid-1950s. By applying the newly available documents, contemporary scholars now argue that the short-term policy decisions made by both the United States and the Soviet Union, in addition to their mutual suspicion, and the clash of interests in other regions, was what led to the division of Germany and to the long-term impossibility of reunifying the country.

During the final stages of the Second World War, the European countries, the United States, and the Soviet Union strongly believed that German economic and military potential would be a permanent threat to peace in the future. If this potential was not curtailed, Germany would raise once again as the most powerful state in Europe and start a new war. France, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, which had all suffered enormously during the past two world wars, shared this common perception. In the period 1943-1945, they sincerely believed that

¹⁵¹ W. McNeill, *America, Britain and Russia: Their Co-operation and Conflict, 1941-1946* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953); H. Feis, *Churchill-Roosevelt-Stalin: The War They Waged and the Peace They Sought* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1957); A. Schlesinger Jr., "Origins of the Cold War," *Foreign Affairs* 46 (1967): 22-52; J. Combs, *American Diplomatic History: Two Centuries of Changing Interpretations* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).

¹⁵² N.N. Inozemtsev, *Vneshnyaya Politika SSHA v Epohu Imperializma (The Foreign Policy of the US. in the Era of Imperialism)* (M.: Gospolitizdat, 1960); N.V. Zagladin, *Antisovetizm v Globalnoy Strategii Imperializma SSHA (Anti-Sovietism in the Global Strategy of the US)* (M.: Mysl, 1981).

¹⁵³ R. Levering, V. Pechtnov, et al., *Debating the Origins of the Cold War: American and Russian Perspectives* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002). See, new documents and research in regard to the positions and the policy of the superpowers during the period of the Cold War in the *Cold War International History Bulletins*, nos. 1-16, published on the web page of the Woodrow Wilson International Institute for Scholars, Washington, DC <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index/>

Germany should be economically weakened through a partition into smaller states so as to be unable to move its military forces throughout Europe. The American government joined in this solution. At the 1943 Tehran Conference, the Allies (Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin) agreed to divide Germany into several parts, turning Germany into an agrarian country without industry or an army, and thereby diminishing any German potential for war. At the 1945 Yalta Conference, they confirmed this decision by introducing the provision for the establishment of four Occupation Zones. Finally, at the 1945 Potsdam Conference, the Allies agreed to denazify and demilitarize Germany and to demand huge reparations from the defeated nation. In discussing the fate of Germany and making these decisions, the Allies constructed a very important political discourse that determined the perspective of their disputes on the German question: they contemplated the fate of Germany in terms of its division and of the establishment of Zones without taking into consideration the question of any reunification of the country. Not one of them seriously raised the question of the establishment of a central government in Germany after the end of the Occupation period. Literally speaking, together they elaborated the mechanism of the division and management of the Zones during these conferences, but they did not create any mechanism for the unification of these Zones and the city of Berlin after the end of the Occupation period.

After arriving in Berlin, divided also into four sectors but governed jointly, the Allies established their Occupation authorities, they diminished the local economic potential through reparations, and they purged Nazis. However, their alliance, built on the basis of the common enemy – Nazi Germany – soon came apart as a consequence of a clash of American and Soviet political goals and strategies, and as a consequence of a gradual growth of misperceptions, mutual suspicions, and personal aversion between the two governments. The new American president, Harry Truman, as compared with the previous president, Franklin Roosevelt, would not tolerate the policy of Sovietization of Eastern Europe, and this conflicted with Stalin's main foreign policy aim of building a new buffer zone in Europe, and thereby securing the Soviet Union from any possible new attack. The secret building of an atom bomb in the United States frightened and convinced the Soviet government that America would exploit it to conduct coercive diplomacy. Moreover, the perspectives of communist victories in such countries as Italy, Greece, and Turkey, and the actual victory of the communists China in 1949 convinced the American government of the real existence

of communist expansionism. Finally, mutual diplomatic attacks on each other regarding the Iranian and Korean problems impeded the bilateral partnership established during the War. All told, this new situation compelled the former Allies to elaborate new grand strategies for their European policy. They repudiated their previous agreements to jointly build a new, weak, and agrarian Germany, and reevaluated the place of Germany and its Occupation Zones in their new grand strategies.

The United States was the first to propose the unilateral decision to rebuild a piece of Germany as a powerful democratic country with a strong military force. This decision became a constituent part of a new policy towards Europe aimed at developing a common defense system in Western Europe against any possible military offensive by the Soviet Union. The western part of Germany was considered to be an integral element of this system that consisted of the democratic countries. In addition, the bitter memory of the policy conducted by the United States in the interwar period, when the isolationist approach had prevailed over an active position in European politics, encouraged the American establishment to undertake decisive steps on the European continent. Since 1947, the part of Germany controlled by the US, Great Britain, and France was democratized, and developed economically and militarily in order to be integrated in the economic and military block of Western European countries. This decision clashed with the Soviet policy aimed at establishing a unified, neutral, and weak Germany. According to new documents and research,¹⁵⁴ Stalin personally believed that a unified and neutral Germany would be the best way to diminish all possible threats from the West. A Germany, neutral in terms of any military alliances and without an army, coupled with the occupation of the Eastern European countries, was considered the manner to create the strong buffer zone needed between West and East.

According to the new American strategy, the Soviet Union was cut off from access to the western Occupied Zones for the purpose of collecting reparations. The Soviet appetite for huge reparations came into conflict with the American desire to rebuild German industry. After merging the three western zones into the Trizone in 1948 and after introducing a new currency reform there that stimulated the flooding of the Eastern Zone with old Reich marks, the Soviets initiated a coercive

¹⁵⁴ *Cold War International History Bulletins*, 1-16, ed. Ch. Ostermann (Washington, DC.: Woodrow Wilson International Institute for Scholars, 1995-2009) <<http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index>>

policy to compel their former Allies to stop integrating the western parts of Germany into the European economic and defense community, viewed by Stalin as the most dangerous situation possible for the Soviet Union. The Soviets reacted firmly: they blockaded the land routes between Berlin and the western parts of Germany in 1948. This step in Soviet foreign policy severely undermined any hopes for improvement in relations between the two superpowers. Moreover, this political attack worsened the Soviet image in Europe: many European citizens and social democratic parties as well turned away from the Soviet Union and its ideology, perceiving the blockade as the intention of the Soviet Union to expand its power further into Western Europe. After the blockade, the United States quickly elaborated the Bonn constitution for a new German state, the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), created soon after the lifting of the Berlin blockade in May 1949. In response to the founding of the FRG, the German Democratic Republic (GDR) was proclaimed in the Soviet Zone in October of 1949.

During the period 1949-1951, the clash between the United States and the Soviet Union as centered on Germany became obvious. The concept of containment, integrated into the American foreign policy, and the Marshall plan, aimed at reconstructing the Western European economy, along with the building of a European defense system, were of course measures directed against the Soviet threat, but that threat was exaggerated to some extent by the American political establishment as is today admitted in the literature.¹⁵⁵ However, misguided conceptions, perceptions, and unjustified measures contributed to the final and long-term division of Germany. The United States, by making a political choice between a reunification of Germany that could lead to a possible Sovietization of the country and the protection of that part of the country under their influence, decided in favor of the latter. Washington believed that if Germany should come under the influence of the Soviet Union, the strength of the West would be seriously undermined, since a fully integrated Communist block including all of Germany would constitute a dangerous threat to the balance of world power.¹⁵⁶ The creation in 1949 of the Western security system known as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization became a more essential priority for American policy in Europe than proposals concerning the reunification of Germany.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ NARA. Record Group 59. Records of the Department of State. Office of Educational, Cultural Affairs. Lot 98D 252. Box 169-172, 205-206.

The eastern part of Germany was therefore viewed by Moscow as a small but loyal military point and as the buffer zone between West and East. The logic of the Soviet approach was likely the following: if there was no chance to create a unified and neutral Germany, then the establishment of a loyal part of Germany would be also constitute a good outcome for this affairs. The creation of NATO and the steady rearmament of West Germany contributed to the Sovietization of East Germany and to the establishment of military blocks in Europe. The truth of this Soviet approach is proven by the new documents: before the early 1950s, Stalin was reported to reject any ideas of building a socialist Germany. It was likely that he did not to believe that the German nation, the German economy, and German traditions and culture could be remodeled after the Soviet pattern. However, developments such as the American intention to create a new Europe, along with the reluctance of the Allies to discuss the reunification of Germany, together with pressure from German communists, changed his approach profoundly.¹⁵⁷

In March 1952, Stalin personally sent his own diplomatic letter to the governments of the former Allies. In this diplomatic note he suggested withdrawing the armies of the Allies from Germany, unifying Germany, and making the country free from any military alliance. This proposal was viewed by the Allies as a bluff and as a propagandistic step by the Soviet Union. They believed that such a reunification of Germany would lead to its Sovietization. The diplomatic note therefore remained without positive answer: the United States and the Western European allies did not want a new “red” country as had already happened in Eastern Europe and Asia. In addition, the concept of containment of Soviet communism and of Soviet expansionism in any part of the world restrained any experiments with the creation of a neutral and unified Germany in the heart of Europe. Having received no agreement with his proposal from the West, Stalin invited the leaders of the German communist party to Moscow in April of 1952. He spoke to them as follows: “In reality there is an independent state being formed in West Germany. And *you must organize your own state*. The line of demarcation between East and West Germany must be seen as a frontier. One must strengthen the protection of this frontier.”¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁷ *Cold War International History Bulletins*, 1-16.

¹⁵⁸ “Conversation between Joseph V. Stalin and the SED leadership. April 7, 1952,” in *Cold War International History Bulletin*, 4, ed. Ch. Ostermann (Washington, DC.: Woodrow Wilson International Institute for Scholars, 1995): 48.

In 1954, the Soviet Union signed a treaty with the German Democratic Republic and recognized it formally as a sovereign state. The occupation of the Soviet Zone was officially lifted. However, the treaty contained a provision for the permanent location of the Soviet army and for the establishment of a special control commission to communicate with the former Allies. The United States, Great Britain, and France officially lifted their own Occupation regime in 1952, while stipulating in the treaty their right to implement their military commitment to West Berlin and West Germany. The United States integrated the German Federal Republic into the European community and into NATO, declaring in 1955 that West Berlin would be under the NATO nuclear umbrella. In reaction, the Soviet Union incorporated the military power of the GDR into the Warsaw Pact, created in 1955.

Only one problem remained unresolved: the joint control of a Berlin divided into four sectors. Located on the territory of the GDR, Berlin was perceived by the Soviet government as a sort of state within the state. In 1948, the Quadripartite Allied Control Commission for Berlin broke down, and every Occupation authority established its own city administration. The unregulated situation in terms of the four-power responsibilities for Berlin had produced a permanent and dangerous crisis situation between the United States and the Soviet Union. The intention of the Soviet Union to seize control of all parts of Berlin clashed with the American commitment to preserve West Berlin from Soviet hands. This situation resulted in one of the severest crises of the Cold War period, known as the Berlin crisis of 1958-61, when the Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev demanded that the status of West Berlin as the city controlled by the Western Block be transformed into a demilitarized "free city." He wanted the former Allies to withdraw their military forces. Moreover, Khrushchev threatened the American president, John F. Kennedy, with the signing of a separate treaty with East Germany which would give the GDR control over the Western access routes to West Berlin. Following this logic, the two parts of the city could then be merged into a Berlin controlled by the Soviets. In addition, the political regime in East Germany pressured the Soviet Union to close off free access for East Germans to West Berlin because of the high level of emigration from East Berlin and East Germany to the FRG. When the United States repudiated the ultimatum about the "free city," the Soviet Union agreed to let the German communists close all the routes around East Berlin, erect the Berlin Wall in August 1961, and thereby draw a bold line under the first chapter in the division of Germany.

A new and cardinal shift in the policies of the former Allies towards Germany began in the late 1960s, and extended through the 1970s. The political relaxation between the superpowers and the Ostpolitik conducted by the West German Chancellor Willy Brandt contributed to the reunification of Germany in 1990. The political events of that period are reviewed in Chapter VI. Before this period, however, the Germanies and German universities endured radical transformations implemented by both the United States and the Soviet Union in the period of 1945 through the early 1960s. These reforms are reviewed in Chapters III, IV, and V.

II. The American military administrations and their transformation strategies for German universities

1. The American military administrations in Germany

After arriving in defeated Germany, the United States established the *Office of the Military Government, United States*, abbreviated officially as the OMGUS. The main authority over Occupation policy belonged to the Chief of the OMGUS, appointed by the War Department after consultation with the Department of State and after approval by the President.¹⁵⁹ The first head of the American occupational authority was General Lucius Clay who governed the American Zone of Occupation until 1949.¹⁶⁰

The OMGUS had its *Education and Religious Affairs Office* located in West Berlin, which formulated and implemented American policy in the German universities. Each of the following German Länder (called *states* by the American government) of the US Zone of Occupation – Bavaria, Hessen, Baden-Württemberg, and Bremen city – had an educational office which reported directly to the Education and Religious

¹⁵⁹ “Principles Regarding Policy-making and Administration in Occupied Areas. Memorandum for the President by Assistant Secretary D. Acheson, May 11, 1946,” in *Documentary History of the Truman Presidency*, 276.

¹⁶⁰ In 1949, General Clay submitted his resignation. It was not the first time. His previous requests had been rejected by the government because of political crises such as the Soviet blockade of Berlin, and the process of forming the German government. When the political situation became more stable, he sent a letter to President Truman requesting permission to retire. The president allowed him to leave Germany. The general left, but in 1953 he asked the US Government to send him back to run various cultural programs between West Berlin and United States such as the Berlin Viability Program. Due to his efforts, the American government permanently supported the Free University, Technical University, and other educational establishments in West Berlin.

Affairs Office in West Berlin. The Offices of the Military Government were located in the capital of each state: in Munich, Stuttgart, Wiesbaden, and Bremen.¹⁶¹ The branches in these states supervised the German universities located in Munich, Erlangen, Würzburg Frankfurt, Heidelberg, Marburg, and, from 1948 onward, also in Berlin. Every university accommodated an American military officer who supervised university life.

The work of the Education and Religious Affairs Office was supervised by Colonel John Taylor, PhD. He had a doctorate in education from Columbia Teachers College at Columbia University. Taylor had been selected by the Army for implementation of various educational reforms in occupied Italy. Being a specialist in German higher education, he was transferred to Germany. His deputy was Dr. Richard Alexander, an expert in German education, and a former mentor of John Taylor. Late in 1947, their educational adviser became the President of Indiana University, Dr. Herman Wells.¹⁶² These three men elaborated the strategies and plans for American reforms. They were assisted by a corps of American visiting professors invited by Washington to work and observe the situation in German universities. These numerous professors, whose names remain unknown to historians to a larger extent, actually provided Taylor, Alexander, and Wells with ideas on how to reform the German university system according to the American model.

Upon the establishment of the West German Federal Republic in 1949, the functions of the OMGUS were absorbed into the *Office of the U.S. Higher Commissioner for Germany* (HICOG) led by General John McCloy. University policy was relegated to the Office of Public Affairs and to its primary division of *Education and Culture and Exchanges*. Their branches in the German states served as the channel of communications and liaison with the German Land Ministries of Education reestablished in 1949-1950.

After the official lifting of the Occupation in 1952, the functions of control over the German universities located in West Germany were transferred to American diplomats accredited in Bonn, to the American mission located in West Berlin, and to all the American consulates established in every state of West Germany.

¹⁶¹ "Governmental Structure in the US Zone," in *Documentary History of the Truman Presidency*, 372.

¹⁶² Clay, *Decision*, 298-305.

2. Initial strategies for transforming the German university system

The American strategies for the transformation of German universities proposed by American experts such as John Taylor and his numerous assistants mainly proceeded from the general perception of the German university system as being different from the American university system. Americans and Germans approached university education from two deeply divergent perspectives. The German university system was well known for producing students of high scientific potential and educating an elite by selecting students from aristocratic families. German universities were viewed mostly as a system for imparting knowledge and as a system where studies were combined with pure research, with the universities being far from public and political life. The American tradition strove to impart common values to a heterogeneous population, and Americans viewed education as proceeding not simply from school and university but from the family, the community, the church, and social groups as well.¹⁶³ Moreover, Americans placed their main emphasis upon educating students but not upon doing pure research. Another incompatible feature between the German and American university systems, articulated by American experts soon after the arrival in Berlin in 1945, was the elitism of German universities and their distance from public life. This characteristic was criticized by those American officers and professors who came to Germany in order to modify its universities. These initial perceptions of German universities spread widely in American academic circles and the political establishment contributed to developing the idea that the United States should modify them according to the American model.

Initially, the US based its educational policy in the Zone on the famous directive issued by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the summer of 1945. The directive set forth severe policies relating to all educational institutions. They should first be closed, and a system of control over German education and a program of reeducation were to be established in order to eliminate Nazi doctrines.¹⁶⁴ This first directive, elaborated by the Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau, Jr., contained the Roosevelt approach to the future of occupied Germany as a small and agrarian country free from any participation in European military and economic alliances. However, the deterioration in relations with the Soviet Union

¹⁶³ Tent, *Mission*, 3.

¹⁶⁴ *Documents on Germany under occupation*, 13-21; *Documentary History of the Truman Presidency*, 3-8.

and the introduction of the new American goal of bringing the Western part of Germany into a united European economic and defense system enormously changed the general approach of the government to reforms in Germany.

The Directive was superseded by the new one known by its number, 1779, of 11 July 1947.¹⁶⁵ It stated that persuasion, demonstration, and example should be the only means of influence in making West Germany a European state. According to the directive, American educational policy was aimed at establishing a society based on the democratic ideal. It stated that the true orientation of the German people would depend on what was taught, how it was taught, and by whom it was taught in universities and schools. The training of a corps of democratically minded teaching staff, and the development of university education as education for responsible citizenship – which implied a knowledge of how to act intelligently and independently in solving contemporary problems and how to protect freedom – therefore became a primary necessity, therefore.¹⁶⁶

These ideas were developed in more detail by the Education Office. The intention of the head of the Education Office, John Taylor, was to make German universities less aristocratic, to change the structure of the universities by instituting new sub-divisions such as departments, to insert a special representative board made up of persons from outside the universities, to expand the power and duties of the rectors, to introduce more professional knowledge into the universities by appointing more specialists from the outside, to establish a general assembly of teaching staff and thus to reduce the power of the senior professoriate, to expand freedom of teaching, to introduce student body representation into university administrative bodies, to expand the social basis of the student body by introducing entrance examinations, to make admission irrespective of political party affiliations and social roots, to make academic programs and university curricula more suitable for real life and more social sciences-oriented, to introduce general education and political science in every university, to introduce “classes” and seminars instead of lectures, to encourage the individual work of students through the introduction of term papers and examinations, along with tutorship,

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration Programs 1949-1952. Box 7, 12, 25.

and, finally, to establish a system of extra-curricula activities for students.¹⁶⁷

American experts believed that these intentions could not only permit the US government to model German universities on the American pattern but also contribute to achieving American political goals, most notably, the promotion of German solidarity with the West, the strengthening of political and social democracy in Germany, the enforcement of a military alliance with West Germany, the promotion of mutual understanding between the two nations, and an increase in knowledge about the United States and awareness of its common institutions, traditions, and interests, thus also increasing respect for Americans, their life, and moral values, and for American cultural traditions as such.¹⁶⁸

Hence, the scope of these proposed reforms was huge. However, the actual state of affairs in German universities affected these plans of the American government.

III. The Soviet military administrations and their transformation strategies for German universities

1. The Soviet military administrations in Germany

The Occupation authorities in the Soviet Zone were established in June 1945. They were called the Soviet Military Administration in Germany abbreviated officially in the German version of its title as the SMAD (*Sowjetische Militäradministration in Deutschland*). The SMAD functioned officially until October 1949, when it was replaced by a new structure called the *Soviet Control Commission* (SCC). In 1953, the SCC was itself replaced with the apparatus of *Higher Commissioner in Germany* located in the building of the Soviet Embassy at Unter den Linden in Berlin. In 1955, the functions of supervision of life in the universities were transferred to the Soviet ambassador in Berlin and to the Soviet consulates and the Soviet Houses of Culture located throughout East Germany.

¹⁶⁷ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

¹⁶⁸ NARA. Record Group 59. Bureau of Public Affairs. International Exchange Service 1950-58. Box 1, 3.

The Soviet Zone of Occupation was divided into five *Länder* called the “Lands” by the Soviets: Brandenburg, Saxony-Anhalt, Saxony, Thuringia, and Mecklenburg-Vorpommern. Every Land had its own regional office of the SMAD. Their function was to transmit orders from the SMAD to the Lands’ governments and to supervise their execution.

The *Educational Division* of the SMAD was located in Berlin-Karhost. The first head was Professor Pjotr Zolotukhin, a former rector of Leningrad University and a future rector of the Moscow Pedagogical Institute. His staff consisted of fifty-five Soviet officers. The *Sector of Higher Education* was led by *Pjotr Nikitin*, an associate professor at the Leningrad Mechanical Institute. The Sector of Higher Education consisted of eight military officers who implemented a range of Soviet transformations in six German universities located in Berlin, Halle, Leipzig, Greifswald, Jena, and Rostock.

According to Soviet documents, all the Soviet military officers of the Educational Division had university diplomas and several of them had a doctoral degree and had previously been associate professors at Soviet universities.¹⁶⁹ However, not all of them spoke German, and thus they were subjected to permanent language studies in special courses arranged by the Soviet Government in Berlin.¹⁷⁰ In contrast, the American military officers neglected language training, because they were surrounded by numerous former German émigrés who had fled Germany and who had then been invited by Washington to assist the Occupation Administration.

The functions of the Educational Division at the SMAD were very purposefully defined. The Division had control over the policy and activity of the German Administration for People’s Education established by the Soviets in 1945; it confirmed and admitted the governing staff and teaching staff of the universities, and examined and approved university curricula, programs, and textbooks.¹⁷¹ Faced with rising opposition to Soviet reforms, and after Berlin University was splitting up in 1948, the Educational Division was assigned such additional functions as regulating student admissions, introducing Marxism-Leninism studies, and elaborating new standard syllabi.¹⁷²

¹⁶⁹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 11:13-33, 37-38.

¹⁷⁰ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File. 1: 2-14.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁷² State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 9: 10-18.

In contrast to the American authorities, the Soviet Educational Division transformed the universities by using the German governing structures in the area of education. *The German Administration for People's Education* established in July 1945 and the *Land Ministries of Education*, reestablished in 1946, implemented various reforms in the universities.

The German Administration for People's Education, officially called *Deutsche Verwaltung für Volksbildung*, was the primary link between Soviet military officers, on the one hand, and the Land Ministries of Education and German universities, on the other. This agency was new for the German educational system, and it later became the Central Ministry of Education in the German Democratic Republic. The German Administration for People's Education consisted of 204 Germans, with 118 of them communists, and the rest unaffiliated with any party. As to the social roots of the first staff, 100 employees out of 204 were members of the intelligentsia.¹⁷³ The leader of the German Administration for People's Education, Paul Wandel, became the first Minister of Education in the GDR.¹⁷⁴ He was a communist and former editor of the German communist newspaper in Berlin. Coming from a working-class family, he had only been able to obtain an eight-year school diploma (*Volksschule*); however, he received a thorough political education in the Soviet Union, to where he had emigrated in 1931. Soviet documents describe him "as a politically educated man without any ideas about education."¹⁷⁵

The German Administration for People's Education was viewed by the Soviet Occupation authorities as the primary mechanism for the transformation of German universities. The functions of Wandel's Administration were to purge former Nazis from the universities, to select the teaching staff and confirm these lists with Soviet officers, to form new university curricula, and to inspect how the university

¹⁷³ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 8: 233-234.

¹⁷⁴ Paul Wandel (1905-1995) became a member of the Communist Party of Germany in 1926. In 1931, he emigrated to the Soviet Union and remained there till the end of the war. On his return, he became the editor of the *Deutsche Volkszeitung*, the main newspaper issued by the Communist Party of Germany. From 1945 until 1949, he was the president of the German Administration for People's Education. From 1949 till 1952, he was the Minister of the Education in the GDR. Later, he became a member of the Central Committee of the SED.

¹⁷⁵ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 1: 2-14.

administrations had implemented Soviet orders.¹⁷⁶ The Educational Division of the SMAD oversaw Wandel's activity and that of his staff. Broadly speaking, the SMAD elaborated the reforms, and Wandel's Administration carried them out.¹⁷⁷ Initially, Soviet officers trusted Wandel completely; however, his soft policy in the face of opposition in the universities in 1948 and his support of those German historians who repudiated the idea of introducing Marxism-Leninism in historical studies was of concern to the SMAD.¹⁷⁸ The Soviets purged Wandel's staff and warned him about possible negative consequences due to his loyalty to the "Old German Professoriate."¹⁷⁹ As a consequence, Wandel changed his approach, promising to carry out Soviet reforms. In 1949, the German Administration for People's Education was given more freedom to govern German universities. Wandel selected and approved the new Rectors for the universities, the deans of faculties, the directors of institutes, and the heads of chairs, as well as all professors, ordinary and extraordinary. Moreover, the Soviets later allowed the Administration to approve the junior teaching staff and the lists of students admitted to the universities. However, the Educational Division of the SMAD expanded its controlling functions over the Administration and internal life in universities.¹⁸⁰ The SMAD inspected how Wandel was implementing the prescribed transformations by means of party organizations and the special Soviet curators located in every university.

In addition to Wandel's administration, the Soviet Occupation authorities reestablished the Ministries of Education in the German states. The Soviets, in contrast to the Americans, had fewer problems with the local German Ministries of Education, because German communists returning from their Soviet exile were placed in positions as heads.¹⁸¹ Most of the employees were communists with a pedagogical education: 58% of the Ministries' staffs were German educationalists and members of the German Communist Party. The remaining positions were

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 7, 41.

¹⁷⁷ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 8: 229-230.

¹⁷⁸ Russian State Archive of Social-Political History. Record Group 17. Inventory 137. File 891: 170.

¹⁷⁹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 9: 10-18.

¹⁸⁰ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 1. P. 106; Inventory 55. File 11: 32.

¹⁸¹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 8: 229-230.

distributed among the non-partisans (38%) and members of the liberal parties (9%).¹⁸²

2. Initial strategies for transforming the German university system

In contrast to the American Occupation authorities who had elaborated plans beforehand, Soviet officers did not themselves obtain or elaborate any preliminary agenda for German universities before 1945. They deliberated and conducted reforms in Germany on site and on the run, guided by personal and ideological considerations, and the local situation. Observations about the German university system made by Soviet officers were turned into initial guidance and used as a starting point for Soviet reforms.

In contrast to the American reforms, the Soviet reforms, proposed and implemented in German universities, proceeded from a general perception of the German university system as similar to the Soviet university system.

The Russian and German university educational systems shared some similarities, particularly in the period before the radical reforms in Russia after 1917 and in Germany after 1933. First, a combination of research and teaching existed in the universities of both countries. This combination was not fundamentally broken up after the coups d'état in 1917 and 1933. The universities of both Germany and Russia did not consider themselves as institutions of higher learning but rather as places where scholarship should mix with student studies. However, in German universities scholarship could be pursued more for its own sake than was allowed in Russia, and after 1917 in the Soviet Union. Second, academic freedom was the main feature of German and Russian university life. Professors of both countries enjoyed lifetime tenure, and they determined what and how to teach. Third, the academic curriculum was defined by the professoriate without any strict state control. These similarities were determined by the fact that the Russian university system was entirely patterned on the German one, and these Humboldtian ideas had come in Russia and had become profoundly rooted in Russian universities in the nineteenth century.

The Soviets in Russia and the Nazis in Germany implemented radical changes in the universities, imposing their doctrines on the university curriculum, making the professoriate join their parties, and

¹⁸² State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 11: 13-33, 37-38.

eliminating academic freedom. However, in contrast to the American university system, Germany and the Soviet Union strongly maintained a combination of education and scholarship, with both the student body and the teaching staff being deeply involved in research activities. This approach as well as the pliability of universities faced with ideological pressure created more affinity between German and Soviet universities than between German and American universities. Therefore the Soviet Occupation authorities viewed these features of the German university system as the premise for its successful transformation.

Hence, the Soviets came to German universities without any grand strategies for their transformation. This Soviet approach differed from the American approach.

Conclusion

Since the question about the unification of Germany was not resolved by the Allies, the Military Occupation Administrations, which received their own Zone of Occupation in Germany according to mutual agreements, endeavored to create their *own* German states based either on the American or on the Soviet systems of social and political development. German universities were considered a primary tool in the creation of a new and loyal Germany.

Both United States and the Soviet Union established and constantly perfected a special division (generally called an Educational Division) within their Occupation establishments in order to supervise German universities and carry out transformations in those German universities located in their Zones of Occupation. The Soviets additionally established such German educational agencies as Wandel's Administration and the Land Ministries of Education in 1945. These establishments became the mechanism for implementing Soviet reforms. The Americans reestablished the State Ministries of Education only in 1949. American officers relied upon themselves to bring about reforms in the universities.

The American Occupation authorities had elaborated a general line of transformation for German universities before the end of the Second World War. Contrary to this, the Soviets only planned their transformations after arriving in Berlin. Moreover, the strategies of the superpowers were maintained by the different perceptions of the German university system. The American government considered German universities as too elitist, as too closed, and as too scholarly oriented. The Soviets initially suggested no strong critical perceptions of German

universities, identifying themselves more with the shared values between the Russian-Soviet and German higher education systems.

The American and Soviet transformations of German universities were determined by the political interests of both governments within the Cold War context and by the divergent ideological and cultural values of both societies. However, their educational policies in Germany had more similarities than different trends. Both powers reopened the universities, purged the professoriate and student body, revised academic programs and curricula, purged library holdings, etc. However, their rival ideologies (liberal democracy and Marxism), implanted into courses, into textbooks, into student organizations, as well as their reaction to opposition attitudes as articulated by German academic people, were evidently their points of difference.

Chapter III

American and Soviet structural transformations in German universities, 1945 through the early 1960s

Introduction

When the victorious powers occupied Germany, there were 23 universities within its prewar borders. Three of these universities, located in Königsberg, Breslau, and Danzig, were lost for Germany, because Königsberg became the Russian city of Kaliningrad, and Breslau and Danzig the Polish cities known as Wrocław and Gdańsk. Just like the territory of Occupied Germany, the remaining universities were divided among the Allies. The American Occupation Military Administration initially controlled six universities, and after 1948 they controlled seven German universities because of the University of Berlin being split up. The Soviet Occupation authorities supervised six German universities during that period.

To implement their planned strategies and transformations, the Occupation Administrations of the United States and the Soviet Union divided German university life into three dimensions in need of revision: the first dimension was the infrastructure of the university comprising the administrative body, departments (faculties), research institutes, and libraries, and their “filling” or substance, which constituted defined values, traditions, and the ideology of the university rectors, the statutes, academic programs, curricula, courses of lectures, and the holdings of the libraries; the second dimension was the professoriate; and the third dimension was the student body. The initial reforms implemented by the United States and the Soviet Union concerned the first dimension of the German universities. The Occupation authorities transformed the administrative body of the German universities replacing *rectors* and rewriting *statutes*. Both powers attempted to change a *curriculum* of every department by introducing *new disciplines*. Moreover, *new academic establishments* were created at the universities and *the holdings of the university libraries* were thoroughly modified.

Before beginning our analysis of these transformations, two observations should be made. First, neither of the powers had developed their plan for reforms before 1945; at the end of the Second World War,

the Allies elaborated the sole basis for implementing reforms, namely, the Potsdam Agreement that provided for the famous denazification of academic programs, curricula, etc. Second, not all of the intended reforms were carried out by the United States and the Soviet Union in the German universities. The Soviet Occupation authorities, however, managed to carry out more of their planned reforms than the American authorities did. All of the subsequent reforms were suggested, discussed, and implemented by the Allies under pressure from conditions of social and political disorder, from the context of permanent resistance by the universities to the proposed reforms, in the context of a weak understanding of the traditions of German university education on the part of by both American and Soviet military officers, and, finally, in the context of the bad physical state of the university buildings.

The available records allow us to distinguish the following reforms carried out by the American and Soviet Occupation authorities in German universities during the period 1945 through the early 1960s: 1) reopening the German universities and replacing the rectors; 2) revising the curricula of the faculties; 3) establishing new divisions (institutes, departments, and chairs) at the universities; and 4) transforming the holdings of the university libraries.

Hence, the structure of this chapter will proceed from these areas of reform. First to be reviewed will be the American activities in German universities. The second part will discuss Soviet policy, and a brief conclusion will compare the approaches and policies of these rivals.

I. American transformations in German universities

1. Reopening German universities and replacing the rectors

The American model for reopening the universities could be summed up by the following specific features: detailed regulation and supervision of the procedure for reopening and a great deal of attention for the personality of the university rectors.

Preliminary stage in the reopening of the universities and the resumption of university life

In October of 1945, the directive pertaining to the reopening of the German universities was issued. The directive stated that the reopening, supervision, and control over the German universities was the responsibility of the head of OMGUS, along with an American Education

Officer to be appointed at every university. To prepare for the opening of every university, this Educational Officer was to name a loyal and screened faculty member as chairman of the *University Planning Committee*. The chairman would submit five to ten names of professors to act as members of the Committee. The University Planning Committee would discuss the problems involved in reopening the university and submit the minutes of proceedings and all papers to the Education Officer. An official request for the reopening of a department would then be submitted by the university committees to the central office of the American Military Administration in Berlin. This request was to include: 1) nominations for an acting rector and acting deans; 2) a list stating the names and qualifications of the teaching and administrative staff, along with a list of the university personnel who needed to be excluded for political reasons; 3) a detailed operational plan; 4) curricula; 5) standards for the selection and admission of students, and their supervision; and 6) a draft of a new statute and other items.

On approval of this application by the American authorities the departments or universities could start operating.¹⁸³ At that point, the nominated and approved acting rectors submitted to the American Education Officer a list of courses to be offered during a given semester at the university, together with a brief description of their content and the names of instructors. Only after the American authorities had given their final approval, could the proposed courses or lectures be announced. In addition, at the end of each semester, rectors were required to submit a report on research or scholarly activity in the humanities to the Education Officer.¹⁸⁴ The directives emphasized that *even* after approval of the university's statute, life at the university would be subjected to the continued control and supervision of the Military Administration.

The reopening of the universities in the American Zone took much more time than that of the universities in the Soviet Zone. The German universities resumed activity over a period from 1945 until the end of 1948.¹⁸⁵ Preference was given to the universities and the faculties which had high scientific prestige or had closely cooperated with the Occupation authorities. American military officers considered that the most significant universities, for reason of their level of research

¹⁸³ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁵ Tent, *Mission*, xv-xvii.

activities and therefore those to be allowed to open first, were the University of Heidelberg and then the Universities of Marburg, Erlangen, and Frankfurt.¹⁸⁶ Moreover, the medical and theological faculties were given the first preference: the medical faculties provided the authorities with essential expertise and help, and the theological faculties were the first ones which had expressed their intention of cooperating with the United States.¹⁸⁷

The first of the reopened universities was the University of Heidelberg, located in Baden-Württemberg. When the American troops arrived there in April 1945, the University of Heidelberg was closed by General Eisenhower. Most of the university buildings were at once requisitioned. As early as a few days after arriving, a “Committee of the Thirteen” was established with the permission of the American security agents under the leadership of Professor Karl Jaspers. Initially, the Military Administration planned to reopen the university no sooner than fall 1946; however, the need for medical expertise compelled the Military Administration to open the medical faculty in August 1945.¹⁸⁸ By January 1946, all faculties were functioning. The first rector was Karl Bauer, professor of medicine. The University of Heidelberg was followed by the Universities of Frankfurt and Marburg. The procedure was the same: Committees of the Ten or Committees of the Thirteen were established to work on the documents necessary for the reopening procedure. The Universities of Frankfurt and of Marburg were finally reopened in winter 1946. The reopening of the universities in Hessen and Baden-Württemberg states presented almost no difficulties for the American Occupation authorities. However, the reopening of the universities in Bavaria became the first challenge for the United States. The universities in Würzburg, in Munich, and in Erlangen had gone over completely to the National Socialists during the rise of Hitler and were therefore considered the most nationalistic and conservative. Thus, the process of

¹⁸⁶ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁸ NARA Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

denazification turned out to be a prolonged one. Because of their the unsatisfactory political background, they were only reopened in 1948.¹⁸⁹

As a result, during the first two to three years of the Occupation the universities restarted the academic process; however, their initial work was continually damaged and interrupted by American intervention in the management of the universities and in the everyday work of the rectors and the senate. The rectors became the primary target for this American intervention, because they were considered to be the individuals who could influence the adoption of new American-modeled statutes. According to the theory of the Occupation authorities, these new statutes were to contribute to the successful implementation of subsequent American reforms.

Modification of university statutes and replacement of rectors

We have noted that modification of the university *constitutions* – the American officers used this term – evoked strong resistance on the part of the university administration, the rectors, and the senate. In particular, the resistance of the rectors to the American proposal to rewrite the statutes forced the American authorities to replace the first rectors with new ones more favorably inclined to American ideas. Although the archives contain only a few documents relative to the replacements of rectors, it is clear that these replacements were frequent and that they were mainly due to the rectors' standpoints in regard to the American drafting of new constitutions as well as in regard to the denazification of the teaching staff.

After the arrival of American troops, all rectors lost their jobs. The first acting rectors and their successors were selected and nominated by the Occupation authorities. The first acting rectors together with the selected members of the University Planning Committees were offered the chance to rewrite the university statutes of the Weimar period. However, the rectors and the University Planning Committees were reluctant to do it and often even ignored the American call to establish the new statutes reflecting American higher-educational practices.¹⁹⁰ The American higher-educational practices included articles for a representative board comprised of members of the community, representatives of the province or state, and possibly also representatives

¹⁸⁹ NARA. Record Group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. Germany. Internal and Foreign Affairs 1945-1949. Microfilm. Reel 7.

¹⁹⁰ Tent, *Mission*, 275.

from of labor unions, industry, science, and the arts. The main function of this board was to direct university activities in the public interest. The article concerning the authority of the rector implied that the functions of the rector should be increased in order to make him or her more than a mere figurehead. The rector should be elected for four years. The rector should be appointed by the board on the basis of three suggestions for nominees made by the general assembly of the professors. And he or she should have a decisive influence on all university matters. The other article of the proposed statute instituted new departments to replace the former faculties. Finally, the Americans proposed including a third administrative body. This would be a general assembly of all teachers, not just the senior professors in the highest positions who for all practical purposes defined the policy of the university along with making appointments.¹⁹¹ All these new articles were unacceptable to the German rectors and their universities as a whole, because they damaged the aristocratic and elite position of the universities and made them more dependent on society.

The American Occupation authorities summoned a conference of the rectors and senior professors in autumn 1946 in order to convince them of the necessity to modify the old statutes of the universities. The senior professors, deans, and rectors, however, refused to modernize the constitutions and to accept the other elements proposed to produce “more democratic climate in the universities, to incorporate the board of trustees, and to dilute the considerable powers of the senior faculty through establishing a teaching assembly, and to allow the existence of an independent administration on the American model.”¹⁹² These American proposals were vigorously and emotionally rejected. The bellwether of the reaction became Professor Karl Jaspers, who had closely cooperated with the Americans, but who now rejected the interference of the Military Government in the structure of German universities.¹⁹³ The United States then decided to negotiate with the rectors alone, and the final standpoint of the rectors concerning the American proposal to incorporate the new

¹⁹¹ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A; NARA Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

¹⁹² Tent, *Mission*, 275-276.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*

constitutions ended up influencing the future and personal fate of every rector. Some were replaced; others agreed to cooperate.

As in the Soviet Zone of Occupation, the American authorities sought rectors favorable to the American policies, because their allegiance was seen as being the primary basis for a successful outcome for American reforms. New rectors were selected from among former émigrés and from among those university people who had articulated some opposition during the Nazi regime. Applying this approach, the United States, for example, nominated Walter Hallstein as the first rector of the University of Frankfurt. He had emigrated to the United States and been active in organizing the legal faculty for the German prisoners of war in *Fort Getty*¹⁹⁴ in the United States. Returning from America, he became the dean of the law faculty and, in the spring 1946, rector of the University of Frankfurt. Walter Hallstein admired the American educational system and truly believed that German universities should be reconstructed according to the American model: the rector should be renamed as the president; every university should have a board of trustees, campuses for students, a tutorial system, and so on. He called upon his university to follow these changes,¹⁹⁵ and most of the American reforms were realized in the University of Frankfurt.

Disloyal rectors were replaced, however. This happened with the famous physician, a specialist in oncology and rector of the University of Heidelberg, Karl Bauer. He was the first postwar rector and, together with his friend Karl Jaspers, did the preparations for the reopening of the university. However, the American authorities were alerted to the negative position that Karl Bauer had taken concerning denazification and to his resistance to purging university professors. Bauer actually kept many professors and students who were former members of the Nazi party. Besides these “sins,” the rector was for some reason disliked by the

¹⁹⁴ The United States established schools for German captives in 1942. They called these schools the “Idea Factory.” In contrast to the Soviet Union, who encouraged their “students” to join the communist party, the United States did not make liberals of the German soldiers. However, some of the German prisoners of war decided to cooperate with the United States and help them in building a new Germany // N.A. Tsvetkova, “*Cultural Imperialism*”: *Mezhdunarodnaya Obrazovatel'naya Politika SSHA v Period Holodnoy Voyny* (“*Cultural Imperialism*”: *International Educational Policy of the United States during the Cold War*) (St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg State University Press, 2007), 87-89.

¹⁹⁵ See, for example, one of his articles: Hallstein, “The Universities,” 155-167.

famous American reformer Edward Hartshorne,¹⁹⁶ a specialist on German education from Harvard University, and by an officer of the Counter Intelligence Corps, Daniel Penham, a German-Jewish émigré, born Siegfried Oppenheimer. It was a personal animosity. Both men sought out documents discrediting the rector. It was found that the rector had been able to hide certain information about his life during the Nazi regime. This information concerned his scholarly works on racial hygiene, which Penham duly revealed. As a result, the Americans began a persecution of the rector in the hope that Bauer would resign his position. However, the rector began his own campaign against these American experts, declaring publicly that there were no scientists without close associations with the Nazi Party during the period of the Third Reich. American documents show that on November, 15, 1946, Rector Bauer was removed for having been an active member of the Nazi party.¹⁹⁷ The agent involved in the inspection of University of Heidelberg recommended dismissal of the rector, and even suggested hanging the rector for his collaboration with the Nazis.¹⁹⁸ As of yet, now there is no precise date known as to when the rector of the University of Heidelberg was forced to leave his post. We do know that he was recalled as vice-rector of the University on November 22. His place was occupied by another professor who also lost his position soon after.¹⁹⁹

Bavarian universities suffered persecution more than the other universities because of their strong resistance to American reforms and because of the conservatism of their rectors. Three to four replacements happened at every Bavarian university during the 1945-1947 period. A case similar to the Bauer case occurred at the University of Munich. The American authorities appointed the philosopher and dean of the

¹⁹⁶ James Tent, in his books and article has evaluated the activity of this American expert in the area of the German educational system. See, for example: J. Tent, "American Influences on German Education System," in *United States and Germany*, 394-400.

¹⁹⁷ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹⁹ See some interpretations of the Bauer case: E. Wolgast, "Karl Heinrich Bauer—der erster Heidelberger Nachkriegsrector. Weltbild and Handeln 1945-1946," in *Heidelberg 1945. Papers from a Conference sponsored by the German Historical Institute of Washington, DC and Historisches Seminar der Universität Heidelberg, held May 5-8, 1993 in Heidelberg* (Germany: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1996): 107-129; M.W. Clark, "A Prophet without Humor: Karl Jaspers in Germany 1945-1948," *Journal of Contemporary History* 37, no. 2 (2002): 197-222.

philosophy faculty, Albert Rehm, as the new rector. The professor had not been an active supporter of the Nazi party, which influenced his selection from among other figures. However, it later became clear that the rector did not feel any sympathy towards the United States either, since he was deeply conservative. He publicly questioned whether the German university system could really learn anything from the American educational system. Consequently, the American authorities stated that the rector was frustrating the American democratization process, and they ordered the Bavarian Educational Ministry to remove Rehm from his post and replace him with another professor who was, in turn, also replaced thereafter.

It is not feasible to reconstruct in detail the process of replacement of the rectors. Did it always happen through the decision-making process within the Occupation Administration as it happened with the Munich rector, or by means of elections in the university senate or in the University Planning Committee? The available documents and previous research yield nothing about the actual procedure.

The problem of resentful rectors was resolved by other means after 1949. The Department of State proposed the idea of sending German rectors to the United States “to enable the rectors to bring back first-hand knowledge of university administration in the US and learn by observation of the relationship of the American universities to the public and to the state.”²⁰⁰ The evaluations in regard to the effectiveness of the program stated later that this observation by German rectors helped to convince them that American universities had something useful for Germany to simulate or adopt, a much better way of convincing them to learn from them than being told to do so by Americans located in Germany.

2. Revision of university curricula

The American revision of German university curricula could be summed up as a chain of failed and successful attempts aimed at introducing certain disciplines into the academic programs of the humanities faculties, and, consequently, at establishing new structural units featuring American academic programs, curricula, and courses. The policy of this revision can be divided into two stages: 1) the elaboration

²⁰⁰ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

of revision plans; and 2) the implementation of the proposed plans and reforms.

Elaboration of revision plans

Some traditions of the German university system relevant to the content of courses or to the organization of the curriculum, in particular at the philosophy, theology, law, and history faculties, provoked a steady desire in American officers and experts for revision. The American staff at the Educational Division constantly articulated the following characteristics of the German academic process as being ripe for transformation. First, the curricula of faculties such as those of philosophy and theology were assessed as being remote from public life and from the problems of the contemporary world (*Annex 1*). Second, the place of the social sciences in the German curriculum was considered too minor, and, along with this, anthropology, psychology, sociology, and political science were often seen as lacking in the curriculum of the humanities faculties. Where these disciplines were noted, they were seen as founded on a very strong philosophical basis that itself needed revision. Third, the priority of research over teaching in the academic programs was evaluated as the specific feature that needed to be thoroughly altered. Finally, the aristocratic or ivory-tower status of German universities along with their nationalistic intellectualism was deemed an essential detail in need of reform.

However, from the moment when these observations were made to the moment when the reforms were begun, four years passed. During the period 1945 through 1949, American experts had only managed to elaborate plans for a revision of curricula, while at the same time making a few tentative though often unsuccessful attempts at introducing some modifications to German universities. Therefore, one might ask: What disciplines were being taught in German universities after their reopening but before the arrival of American reforms in 1949? We can assume that during the first years of Occupation all the usual courses were allowed to be taught as long as they did not contain nationalist theories. The American officers asked the rectors to provide them with a list of courses together with a brief description of their content and the names of the instructors. If racist, militaristic, and nationalistic ideas were not discovered in the descriptions submitted, the lectures were allowed to be given to students despite all the traditional features inherent in the German university educational system and disliked by the Military Administration.

Concurrently, the first American educationalists were invited by the Occupation authorities to elaborate a plan of revision and the means for introducing new disciplines. The proposals of several of these experts were approved by the American Military Administration and some of the proposed reforms were carried out by the officers.

In 1946, a team of American specialists in German higher education, led by George F. Zook, President of the American Council on Education, arrived in the American Zone of Occupation. They went to several major states in the American Zone, namely Greater Hessen, Baden-Württemberg, and Bavaria. There, they visited and evaluated the institutions of higher education and proposed a set of reforms for General Clay. One of their proposals concerned a method for changing the curriculum in the universities without any American intervention: The team proposed introducing *advisory bodies* to the universities that would be broadly representative of social groups other than educators, and which would advise the faculty of each university on ways in which the curriculum should be modified in order to adapt it more closely and more immediately to changing social conditions.²⁰¹ In the opinion of these Americans, the result of such cooperation would be that the traditional curriculum would be modernized according to the needs of the market and would become more professionally than philosophically oriented. During the first years of Occupation this idea worked; however, in the early 1950s, the German universities rejected these rulings, and the local community – businessmen, trade unions, etc. – were no longer able to impose their influence upon university academic programs.

In 1948, the Dean of the Teachers College of Columbia University in New York, and a friend of President Harry Truman, William Russell, visited Germany and informed the President of his observations concerning the situation in German universities. Russell found the attitudes of the rectors, deans and professors of the universities particularly discouraging. He indicated that their educational ideals were limited by a desire to foster erudite learning and pure research with little attention to the needs of the people. Russell noted that the Germans had not the vaguest idea of American democracy and indicated that the way to get at this problem was to teach *political science* at the university level

²⁰¹ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation. High Commissioner for Germany. Office of OMGUS, Hessen. Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1947-48. Box 702.

and to stimulate self-government.²⁰² The idea of introducing political science to the curriculum had already been circulating among those American officers who saw the political science as a tool of political education.

The American expert Franz Neumann, a former German émigré and a professor of Political Science at Columbia University in New York, had a much more dramatic impact on reforms in this field. In 1949, he submitted his report to the Military Administration concerning the status of the social sciences in German universities. His recommendation for the immediate introduction of the *social sciences* in German universities in the same way as this field was represented in American universities – encompassing economics, anthropology, social psychology, history, government, sociology – became the foundation for all subsequent activities by American reformers at German universities. In addition, he insisted on the introduction of *political science*, while eliminating the “philosophical” approach to the social sciences and the German emphasis on a nationalistic and parochial view of the world.²⁰³

Another expert also seriously influenced the reform of German universities. The president of Harvard University, Dr. James Conant, who had studied German methods of scientific research in the 1920s, became an expert in the American Military Administration in the 1940s, and subsequently the US High Commissioner and the first American Ambassador to West Germany during the period 1953-1957. He first introduced the idea of *general education* as a set of compulsory introductory courses for German students. Conant had three premises for promoting this idea. The first concerned the growing political tensions in Europe. He was the first to declare as early as 1948 that university disciplines had to promote liberal ideology in order to curb expansion of the Soviet one. The second foundation for his proposal was based on his research: He had elaborated the concept that a university curriculum should be divided into general and specialized courses. General courses or general education was not considered by him to be universal education, but was viewed as so-called citizen education that would encourage every student to be a responsible citizen living in a democratic country.²⁰⁴ This thesis convinced the military officers that the

²⁰² *Documentary Story of Truman Presidency*, 539-546.

²⁰³ NARA. Record Group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449.

²⁰⁴ “The Harvard Report on General Education, 1945,” in *American Higher Education Transformed 1940-2005. Documenting the National Discourse*, eds. W. Smith, Th. Bender (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008), 14-20.

introduction of general education, along with studies in comparative politics and government, would contribute to altering young people's political culture and to containing the expansion of Soviet ideology. Finally, the third foundation for his ideas was the widely held thesis that German universities should be involved in public life. Conant and the other experts stated that the job of universities was to teach future politicians, officials, businessmen, and public figures, and not just scholars.²⁰⁵

Finally, in the early 1950s, the idea of intensively promoting American studies as part of the German curriculum was born. According to documents, this suggestion was first made in 1952. The Military Administration had, however, already carried out a few projects aimed at introducing new American studies course at German universities before that date.

Following the proposals made by these American specialists, the Military Administration, together with the Department of State and the Pentagon, decided to introduce disciplines from following fields into German universities: 1) political science; 2) the social sciences, 3) general education; and 4) American studies. The process of introduction was launched during the period 1947-1958; this involved not only a revision of curricula but also the establishment of new divisions in the universities.

Introduction of new disciplines

The US Military Administration hoped up until the early 1950s that the question of the introduction of new disciplines would be resolved through negotiations with the rectors, the university senates and the university planning committees, and this process of introduction would be easy. To begin negotiations, the Americans set up several conferences for the rectors and deans where proposals about the necessity of including political science and the social sciences in the curriculum of all the humanities faculties were advanced. American experts, scientists, military authorities, and politicians believed that the introduction of new academic disciplines would lead to an essential change in the ideology of German education, which was that the value, the weight, and the role of

²⁰⁵ University of Arkansas Libraries. Special Collections. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection. Manuscript Collection 468. Box 239. Germany. Folder 18. [Articles on German Exchange, 1949-1962, n.d.]; NARA Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

abstract and philosophical subjects would be decreased, while the weight of practical knowledge would become central to the formal curriculum.

Political Science. The law faculties were chosen as the first target for American revision, because these faculties, in the opinion of the American specialists, had been the most nationalistic and conservative. The law faculties taught constitutional law, which was actually the clandestine study of politics. However, these constitutional law studies were dominated by conservative professors who focused on nationalistic views and disseminated the idea that the policy of the American Occupation authorities was illegal. The American experts believed, therefore, that the introduction of political science in every law faculty would be able to change the environment there and that a new generation of specialists would be fostered as a result.²⁰⁶

To realize these aspirations, in 1947 the US Military Administration summoned all the deans of the law faculties along with the rectors of the universities and suggested that they should initially introduce the case-study approach in the teaching process as well as courses in political theory, government, and comparative law. The representatives of the universities replied that this innovation would destroy the traditional academic programs of the law faculties and they thus were obliged to completely reject this proposal. During the ensuing two years, American officers, visiting American professors, and experts, tried to convince the university administrations to introduce these new disciplines. In 1949, the rectors of the universities, the deans of the law faculties, and the ministers of education in the occupied German *Länder* finally yielded to American pressure during a newly organized conference, however. The Americans insisted that courses on politics and government had to be given a prominent place in every university.²⁰⁷ More than ninety German university administrators, along with representatives from each of the ministries of education, signed the final resolution requiring them to introduce political science.²⁰⁸ However, no reforms were actually begun by the universities, a fact which was noted by American university

²⁰⁶ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

²⁰⁷ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

²⁰⁸ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7

curators in the early 1950s.²⁰⁹ This resistance forced the American authorities to amend their policy on the revision of the curriculum by proposing the idea of establishing new academic units, where new and American disciplines would be imposed, in the universities.

Why did the universities refuse to introduce political science? The documents lead us to assume that the old professoriate considered political science to be a quasi-science because of its multidisciplinary approach. These professors stated that the subjects studied in political science were related to the curriculum of both the history and law faculties, and that this made this discipline not an independent one; in addition, it was felt that there was no over-riding necessity to introduce additional disciplines that combined law and history.

Social Science. The social sciences curriculum was meant to bring German higher education institutes closer to public life. The Americans believed that the social science disciplines were able to promote a better understanding of the traditions and practical workings of democracy and to produce an understanding of foreign social and cultural points of view as well as educating new democratically minded leaders for the new kind of Germany that American politicians envisaged. German universities needed to adopt a social role in order to form outstanding builders of a new and wholesome German way of life, and social studies was meant to prepare students to cope with perplexing problems, educate them about domestic and international affairs, and instill in them the habits and techniques of democratic living. The establishment or re-establishment of social studies implied the introduction of academic disciplines such as economics, rationalization and business, sociology, sinology, comparative and American education, American theology, history of art, etc., with a strong emphasis on interpretations of distinctive American developments and models of Western culture.²¹⁰

In 1948, the American officers arranged for a conference to begin negotiations with the rectors and deans for the introduction of social science courses in the curriculum of the philosophy faculties. The curriculum of these faculties was regarded as the appropriate field for seeding disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, psychology, etc., which would transmit American postulates in the field of the methodology of

²⁰⁹ Ibid.

²¹⁰ NARA. Record Group 59. Bureau of Public Affairs. International Exchange Service 1950-58. Annual Program Proposal. US Educational Commission in the Federal Republic of Germany. Program year 1957. Box 1, 3.

social research. At this conference on the social sciences, convened in Bavaria in 1948, the American experts stressed the necessity of widening the scope of the social sciences in the universities by placing them at the center of the curriculum which until then had been occupied by the philosophy faculties.²¹¹ There is no accurate and truthful data on how the professoriate reacted to these American proposals. However, the American side remarked that the results so far were not very satisfactory.²¹² The senior professors did not reject the proposals outright as the professors of the law departments had previously done; however, introduction of these disciplines proceeded very slowly. The American university curators noted in the early 1950s that “there has been little progress in the developing of the social sciences in German universities since the war. The Germans have failed to realize that the teaching of the humanities, which they did emphasize and perhaps overemphasize, failed to save them from an endemic Germanic nationalistic intellectualism or to foster properly a critical insight into contemporary problems.”²¹³ Nevertheless, the new disciplines would finally find their place in German universities from the mid-1950s through the early 1960s, when a new generation of scholars arrived on the scene who had been trained by means of American exchange programs.

Courses on General Education. The introduction of the courses in the field of general education, which were courses about the contemporary political situation, began to be implemented in all the universities starting in 1948. General education diluted the tradition of the German humanities as philosophical sciences by means of a range of courses that dealt with the facts of public life, real politics, and the real world. This was meant to increase an appreciation of foreign social and cultural developments, and to create responsible citizenship and an understanding of the contemporary world. Due to the efforts of James Conant, the US Military Administration engaged separately with each university. The Americans were buoyed by the fact that general education would be introduced in the philosophy faculties and that every professor would propose at least one course in the field of general education.²¹⁴ Attempts were made almost everywhere to broaden general education by means of

²¹¹ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

²¹² Ibid.

²¹³ Ibid.

²¹⁴ Ibid.

courses given during the whole semester to all students. Attendance initially was voluntary and thus low.²¹⁵ Revision of the curriculum in this domain took several years, and it was only in 1953 that the first General Studies Program was included in the curriculum at University of Heidelberg. University of Heidelberg thus became the first and only university to carry out the proposed reform.²¹⁶ All the other universities introduced their courses only in 1956 and 1957. These courses became compulsory for all students and lasted one semester. The goals and objectives of general education only became clear by the end of the 1950s rather earlier on. Compulsory courses implied the notion of political education designed to give students the correct orientation in terms of political concepts and to inculcate in a critical comprehension of problems on a worldwide basis. Obviously, the introduction of such courses was provoked by the Cold War context, and it was the political situation in Europe that compelled the universities to agree to such propagandistic education. These courses were similar to the Soviet courses introduced in East Germany, namely “The Political and Social Problems of Contemporary World.” Much as the Soviet Union did, the United States attached great importance to political education within the universities in the 1950s and 1960s. The Academy for Political Education in Bavaria, the *Land* most resistant to American reforms, was opened in 1954 in order to formulate unified standards for teaching and to conduct research in this field.

American Studies. American studies as a series of disciplines concerning American civilization had not been developed in German universities before the Occupation. English seminars had existed in some universities, and the University of Hamburg had given a few courses about the United States.

We can state that the introduction of American studies did not produce the strong negative reaction among professors that political science did. The more or less positive reaction to this revision of the curriculum was, in our opinion, paved by a proper policy on the part of the Military Administration. First, Washington had begun by inviting German *Amerikanisten* and specialists in English to the United States during the first years of the Occupation. These Germans subsequently established numerous institutions for American studies. Second, a certain academic basis for the development of the American studies already

²¹⁵ Ibid.

²¹⁶ NARA. Record Group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449.

existed in Germany: English-language seminars served as a foundation for their development.

Nevertheless, misunderstandings between Americans and Germans as to the American studies created obstacles to the expansion of the field in German universities. The most important of these misunderstandings revolved around the interpretation of what the essence of the American studies was. While Americans considered the American studies to be the study of American civilization with a compulsory combination of subjects such as American history, American literature, American education, American government, American architecture and arts, and political and social sciences dealing primarily with the development of institutions in the United States, the Germans, however, considered American studies primarily as part of the English-language studies, English and American literature, and history. German universities therefore applied more traditional approaches to these studies without integrating them by means of interdisciplinary methods. This discouraged American specialists who stressed that German professors had not differentiated this discipline concerning the United States from the disciplines of language and literature, and that of the courses offered by the various departments, the bulk of them were English-language seminars.²¹⁷ Moreover, the universities, while formally cooperating with American experts in this field, sabotaged American studies to some extent and stated that they could not be inserted into the curriculum because of a lack of specialists, knowledge, and interest. To cope with this attitude was much too difficult, and so American experts suggested the idea of establishing independent institutions, departments, and chairs at German universities where a new curriculum for American studies could be offered.

The Military Administration subsequently acknowledged by the early 1950s that revision of the curriculum through negotiations with rectors, senates, and deans had not worked. The social sciences continued to occupy a very small podium, and political science was not taught in German universities. The resistance of the professoriate and a lack of qualified personnel, of lack of interest, and lack of understanding stood in the American reformers' way. James Conant, in his role as US Commissioner in Germany, remarked that direct American intervention in the decentralized educational system of Germany had achieved only

²¹⁷ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

mixed results. Attempts to impose American practices had been deeply resented.²¹⁸ The resistance of universities forced the United States to modify the means of revision: Instead of attempting to place political science, social sciences, and American studies in the existing traditional curricula, the experts decided to create establishments – institutes, departments, and chairs named after the disciplines introduced – in order to form a new curriculum based on the American model. At the same time young German lecturers were sent to American universities to observe developments in these fields there. Any further American revision policy in German universities would therefore proceed along the following new directions: establishment of new institutes in the fields of the social sciences, political science, and American studies, and close cooperation with the junior German teaching staff.

3. Establishment of new institutions, departments, and chairs in German universities, and the founding of the Free University

The University Education Sector of the American Military Administration officially declared the following main reasons for setting up new academic units: “The older German universities looked too traditional and conservative and the founding of new ones could be more effective for the democratization of the German university system: new institutions and universities might be the theater in which American and other visiting professors could make the most useful contributions, since it will be probable that such new institutions will be less bound to tradition than the older ones and that their teaching staff will be more receptive to changes and improvements. It may be much easier in them to develop programs of general education, the social sciences, and better training of secondary school teachers than in the old universities. Above all, new higher institutions may provide a special avenue for American policy in Germany to realize in a shorter term of years some of its basic conceptions of the social responsibility and social functions of the universities.”²¹⁹

It was actually easier for American politicians to create new faculties or institutes than to alter a German university’s curriculum and academic programs. With the intention of introducing the disciplines of the social

²¹⁸ University of Arkansas Libraries. Special Collections. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection. Manuscript Collection 468. Box 239. Germany. Folder 18. [Articles on German Exchange, 1949-1962, n.d.]

²¹⁹ NARA. Record Group 59. Central Files 1950-54. Box 2450, 2451, 2456.

sciences, political science, and American studies, the United States now sought to create new institutions of: 1) political science; 2) American studies; and 3) pedagogy during the period under analysis here.

Every one of these institutions was established as part of the universities but was granted independence. Moreover, most of the establishments were set up initially in the two German cities where problems regularly arose. These were Berlin and Munich. Berlin was the city where the influence of the Soviets and German communists turned out to be extensive and so created grounds for a possible ideological defeat for the United States, and with the city's cultural centers and educational institutions falling under the control of the Soviet Union. The United States and the Soviet Union therefore intensified their ideological struggle by opening institutions such as Soviet Culture Houses and American Information Centers, Marxism-Leninism Institutes and Political Science Institutes. Munich, in its location far from the influence of communists, was the *Land* of nationalists and conservatives. Munich and Bavaria as a whole maintained a highly oppositional standpoint in regard to American reforms, undermining American efforts aimed at revising Bavarian schools and universities. In the capital of Bavaria, American military officers therefore set up new institutions to disseminate alternative values in this *Land*.

Political Science institutes

The establishment of political science turned into a very important project that implied not just the introduction of such new disciplines such as international law, comparative politics, and American political systems, but also the establishment of new independent institutes and departments within the universities such as the Institute for European History in Mainz, the Max Planck Institutes for Public and International Law in Heidelberg, the Institute of Political Science at the Free University in Berlin and others.

The policy aimed at setting up new academic units in the universities was initiated by the American expert F. Neumann, as mentioned earlier. He suggested to Washington that they create institutes of political science. Being a former German scholar, he reported to Washington that it would be difficult to establish political science faculties within German universities: hence, he recommended establishing *new* and independent institutes for political science. Moreover, this expert pinpointed Bavaria as the specific state where political education should become central to

university education in order to undermine the conservative traditions there.²²⁰

The American government reacted at once. The *Hochschule für Politik* existed during the Weimer Republic, where Neumann had worked before emigrating to the USA, was re-established in Berlin in 1948. The full German name was the *Deutsche Hochschule für Politik, Berlin*.²²¹ The reconstituted *Hochschule* had as its first director Otto Suhr, the famous leader of the Social Democratic Party in Berlin and chairman of the Berlin City Assembly. The aim of the School was the study of politics through the eyes of a practicing political party, a trade union, as well as through the eyes of academicians. A series of lectures devoted to the specific aspects of the on-going reorganization of German statecraft were given by prominent members of the Parliamentary Council in Bonn. The School closely cooperated with the Free University, established in 1948.²²² In 1952, at a joint session of the senates of the Free University and the *Deutsche Hochschule für Politik*, a draft of affiliation was approved.²²³ The *Deutsche Hochschule für Politik* was renamed the Otto Suhr Institute at the end of the 1950s. There were 300 regular students and 400 adults from the government who studied history, geography, law, economics, sociology, internal politics, foreign policy, international politics, and political theory. However, by the end of the 1950s, the American government and specialists had to admit the fact that political science had still not become a recognized discipline and that this institute had not gained any influence within the German university system. Vacant chairs were mentioned as the main problem for development of the Otto Suhr Institute. Nevertheless, this political science institute became the first channel for instilling an understanding democratic processes in prospective government officials, politicians, teachers, lawyers, and judges.²²⁴

In Munich, the Institute for Political Science was set up in 1950. The full German name was *Hochschule für Politische Wissenschaften*,

²²⁰ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

²²¹ Ibid.

²²² NARA. Record Group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. Germany. Internal and Foreign Affairs 1945-1949. Microfilm. Reel 7.

²²³ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration Programs 1949-1952. Box 7, 12, 25.

²²⁴ NARA. Record Group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. FRG. Internal Affairs 1955-1959. Microfilm. Reel 30.

München. The opening of this institution was accompanied by problems. The rector of University of Munich, Alois Hundhammer,²²⁵ who at the time was also the Bavarian Minister for Education, known for his opposition to school reform and for his persistent attempts to retain a mixture of church and state influence in education, frowned on the independent initiatives of the American officers. He appealed to the public and to university people to stop the American initiatives. As a result, in 1951 he was replaced by a new minister, who was much more favorably disposed towards the *Hochschule*. Nevertheless, antipathy and tension continued to exist between the Bavarian educational authorities and the *Hochschule* for a long time because of the independent status of the school. The German authorities stated that, to the extent that there were no academic entrance requirements, the school would never attain a high standard. University of Munich was also fearful that precious financial aid might possibly be diverted to the *Hochschule*, and that the school would encroach upon the realm of higher learning.

Actually, the main activity of both schools was the provision of two-year courses in politics. These courses were centered on the study of political theory, political institutions, and international relations, but also included lectures on economics and sociology. In the 1960s, the Americans observed that the diploma offered by the schools had not proved entirely satisfactory, and did not carry the same prestige as

²²⁵ Alois Hundhammer (1900-1974) was an economist and politician. He was a minister of culture and education in Bavaria during the period 1946-1950. The Soviets described him as a reactionary minister who was eager to establish a system of education with a strong religious component. Americans considered him as a leader of the Bavarian opposition to American reforms, which obliged them replace him in his position as minister in 1951. Hundhammer attempted to establish a new university in the theological seminary: In 1949 he began advocating a change of the status of the theological seminary in Bamberg-Regensburg to that of a university. His argument was based solely on the fact of overcrowding in the existing Bavarian universities. The American Administration was against his proposal, and thus followed a continuing series of disagreements between the Ministry and American authorities. Under Title 8 of Military Government regulations, the final decision in this matter rested with the American authorities. Hundhammer did not send any application for the opening of a new university and the matter was referred to the cultural committee of the *Landtag*, where it was discussed. American diplomats saw no signs of increasing enrollment at the universities; on the contrary, enrollment in Bavarian universities was decreasing. However, an order to Hundhammer sent by the American authorities concerning the impossibility of opening a new university resulted in complaints about of the American Administration being "undemocratic" // NARA. Record Group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. Germany. Internal and Foreign Affairs 1945-1949. Microfilm. Reel 7.

German university diplomas and degrees. This status of the diplomas influenced good students so that they often hesitated to spend two years at the schools.²²⁶

Subsequent years witnessed the creation of two other institutes of political science at universities in Saxony and Hessen. They taught and carried out research in this field. Moreover, up until the early 1960s the universities in Frankfurt, Marburg, Heidelberg, and Berlin (the Free University) established chairs and institutes of political science. In addition, these institutes carried out actual research projects such as on the formation of public opinion in the Eastern Zone of Germany, an analysis of the contemporary party system in Germany, concerning Germany's future role in international organizations, about totalitarian education in the Soviet Zone, on total dictatorship, and other projects as well.²²⁷ Yet, the position of political studies at the universities was far from satisfactory, because universities regularly had vacant chairs in political science.²²⁸ The American government sent American professors to occupy these chairs in order to accelerate development of the prestige of political science; however, this policy did not change the situation, and political science did not attain much of a strong position vis-à-vis the traditional German disciplines such as history or philosophy, for example.

American Studies institutes and chairs

As we mentioned earlier, the American officers were dissatisfied with the place in German universities occupied by disciplines about the United States. The American experts were concerned about the approach that German professors took by teaching American studies as part and parcel of disciplines such as history, literature, or English rather than teaching American civilization as an independent discipline within the framework of interdisciplinary methodology. By the early 1950s, the Military Administration had still not managed to change this situation, in observing that, first, the German senior professoriate had rejected the idea of integrated or independent American institutes; second, literature on the discipline was not to be found in the university libraries; third, the young teaching staff was the only segment of the community interested in studies of American civilization; and, fourth, the positions of director and

²²⁶ R. Hiscocks, *Democracy in Western Germany* (London: Oxford University Press, 1957), P. 251-259.

²²⁷ NARA. Record Group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449.

²²⁸ Zink, *The United States in Germany*, 211; Hiscocks, *Democracy*, 251-259.

full professor in the newly established institutes on American studies were permanently vacant.²²⁹ To improve the situation, the experts proposed opening institutes of American studies at every university despite resistance from the professoriate to this, and thereby putting these disciplines on the examination list, filling the university libraries with literature on the United States, training the junior teaching staff in the United States in order to involve them in conducting research in the field, and, finally, developing a center of German-American studies at one of the universities. These proposals were articulated in the early 1950s, and by the mid-1950s the first results were achieved.

The American government managed to open American institutes at four out six universities by the mid-1950s, and later by the mid-1960s at every university throughout West Germany. The establishment of American Institutes began in 1947. University of Munich became the first to establish a chair of American literature and culture. Previous to this, American studies did not figure at all in the Munich curriculum, although there was a professor who used to offer courses on American literature from time to time. Yet, when establishing the chair, the military officers observed “the lack of interest in the life of the United States and European arrogance towards America.”²³⁰ After the chair was established, the teaching process was still weak because of the lack of literature and teaching staff. This moved the American Administration to send American scholars to Munich. They ran the Institute, cooperated with Germans, and encouraged the government of the United States to award the Munich American Institute the status of a European center for American studies. This came about. An American professor, H. Peters, from a college in Oregon, who had lobbied for the idea through the Department of State, became the first director of the American Institute at University of Munich.²³¹ He invited to teach at the Institute such prominent historians as Merle Curti from Wisconsin and Quincy Wright from Chicago. The Rockefeller Foundation made permanent grants to the Institute to cover salaries of visiting professors from the United States for a three-year period, and also to purchase essential library materials, and to expand the library. By 1955 and 1956 documents on the Munich American Institute mention this establishment as the most important

²²⁹ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

²³⁰ NARA. Record Group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. Germany. Internal and Foreign Affairs 1945-1949. Microfilm. Reel 7.

²³¹ *Ibid.*

center for American studies in Europe. The extensive program of the Institute included both general courses on American civilization available to all students at the University and more advanced courses leading to a doctoral degree as well.²³² However, the Munich Institute later lost its significance in terms of the development of American studies in Europe because of permanently vacant positions and the strong resistance of the Bavarian professoriate to studying about the United States, and so Berlin, the John F. Kennedy Institute of the American Studies at the Free University to be exact, replaced Munich as the European center for American studies.

American specialists observed several problems that decreased the effectiveness of what had been done in Munich and elsewhere as far as promoting American studies in the traditional German curriculum was concerned. First, American scholars were unable to overcome the traditional German approach to studies: most of the courses in the field of political science and governmental studies remained untouched and were devoted to either language, and literature or the history of the United States. American scholars instead had hoped that German professors would deliver lectures and conduct research on the US government, US politics, religion in the US, and similar subjects. The interdisciplinary approach that American visiting professors had hoped to implant in German universities did not take root. Young German scholars, when answering the question of why studies about American government and the American party system had not taken root in the universities, argued that political science and aspects of the political life in the US were the most difficult to be introduced in Germany because of rigid German traditions, lack of open-mindedness in Germany, differences in educational system, and different presuppositions in the field of study and different mentality of Germans.²³³ Second, the number of German professors who delivered lectures in the field had not been increased. The institutes were only half-filled by American lecturers and the position of director was often vacant.²³⁴ The theories and methods brought by the Americans therefore were not taught by German professors, but were instead taught by Americans themselves in German universities. Third,

²³² NARA. Record Group 59. Records of the Plans and Development Staff, Evaluation Branch, 1955-1960. Box 44.

²³³ NARA. Record Group 306. Records of USIA. Office of Research Country Project Files, 1951-1964. West Germany. Box 117.

²³⁴ NARA. Record Group 59. Records of the Plans and Development Staff, Evaluation Branch, 1955-1960. Box 44.

the disciplines involved in American studies were not recognized as being on an equal footing with other fields in the humanities. They were not included in the examination list and did not constitute either a major or a minor specialization for which a student could present himself for examination for a degree. At universities where American studies were offered, a student had to choose English history as a major in order to devote most of his or her time to American subjects. Or, if he or she was studying to be a specialist in American law, such a student was formally known as simply a student of law. In this fashion, the universities did teach students about America but as part of classes in philosophy, law, and economics, and, when American departments existed, they were usually anchored in English-language seminars. There were, however, three universities in Germany which did allow students to major in American studies and earn a PhD in this subject. These were the universities in Berlin, Munich, and Mainz.

Therefore, the American government recognized that the initial approach of taking American studies out of control of the old professoriate had not brought about “a large return,” and so a new plan, elaborated in 1955 and 1956, suggested consolidating American studies into one integrated university department (a *chair*) as the Soviets had done with regard to studies of Marxism-Leninism.

According to the new plan, every university and all teachers colleges in West Germany were to develop American studies chairs. The plan was supposed to include all eighteen universities that existed at the end of the 1950s in West Germany. These chairs were meant to implant these disciplines in the various German academic programs being established as interdepartmental units. The teaching staff of these chairs would give lectures at different faculties, conduct research, and foster young lecturers. Washington clearly defined the necessity of changing the “American Institutes” paradigm for an “American Chairs” one: “the American government encouraged actively the German Universities to establish Chairs in American Studies, because Chairs could contribute to increasing the prestige of the American Studies. As to the German traditions, if there is no Chair and no professor for a given subject, that subject is somehow not quite respectable intellectually and not quite worth serious consideration by other professors, students and by general public. It is thus necessary for American Studies chairs to be established in the universities for the subject itself to gain the prestige both that it inherently deserves and that is necessary for a dissemination of

knowledge about the United States.”²³⁵ In 1957, the United States stated its intention of establishing at least fifteen American studies chairs at eighteen universities by 1962. After this, the next goal was to establish American studies chairs at forty-six teachers colleges, because the graduates of these institutions would have the most direct effect upon the nearly eighty percent of Germans who did not attend universities. Finally, the next phase was the establishment of American studies chairs at eight German technical universities and colleges.²³⁶

In order to implement this plan, American university staff was once again mobilized. In 1959, just over a hundred American professors were written to and informed about the situation in Germany. Of these, twenty-six replied that they were interested and appeared, on paper, to be qualified. The result was the selection of eight of these twenty-six professors as fully qualified. They would become presidents of the chairs in American studies in German universities but for no more than five years.²³⁷ Some American professors, however, were dissatisfied with a new and too unusual a demand from the Department of State with regard to the manner in which they should conduct their lectures at German universities. The Department of State pointed out that “the American lecturers had to realize that a soft and mumbling lecture before German students may not be easily understood and lead to low attendance. Further the artistic approach of many representatives of this category and ‘applied Thoreauism’²³⁸ may be the cause if very casual dress and manners of some lecturers. In view of the high social standing of university teachers in Germany and their rather reserved manners and customs, conservative habits of American lecturers will be of great importance in establishing good relations.”²³⁹

The final results of the plan aimed at establishing new chairs at German universities were controversial. On the positive side, the United States managed to create thirteen chairs at eighteen universities by 1962, and American universities opened thirty-one research centers in

²³⁵ NARA. Record Group 59. Bureau of Cultural Affairs, 1957-1962. Box 50.

²³⁶ Ibid.

²³⁷ Ibid.

²³⁸ Thoreauism is an idea named after American writer and philosopher Henry Thoreau (1817-1862). Thoreau wrote in his book, *Walden*, about simple living in natural surroundings, and in his essay, *Civil Disobedience*, about an argument for individual resistance to civil government in moral opposition to an unjust state.

²³⁹ NARA. Record Group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural Affairs. Lot 98D 252. Box 169-172, 205-206.

American studies in Germany. By 1965, there were twenty-three chairs in American Studies at these eighteen universities, and only three chairs of the were held by Americans.²⁴⁰ Another outstanding achievement could be considered to be the opening of the John F. Kennedy Institute of American Studies at the Free University which became a new center for *Amerikanistik* in Germany and in Europe.

However, failures regarding this American policy could be also observed. First, fifteen out of the twenty-three new chairs concentrated on studies of American literature, but not on political science and American civilization as Americans had intended. Two chairs studied American history; two, social and economic sciences; two, American civilization; one, political science (government); and one, geography. Political science was studied at the John F. Kennedy Institute and at University of Heidelberg, and, hence, only 1000 students out of 18,000 were studying political science within the framework of American studies. Literature as a concentration field was prominently featured, and that bore witness to the fact that the traditional approach of German scholars had not altered. Second, the disciplines of American studies were not listed for compulsory examinations. American reformers had hoped that the German Society for American Studies, established in 1953, would become one of the influential tools in the Standing Conference of Cultural Ministers in terms of formulating standards for examining university students in American studies.²⁴¹ The Society, however, did not promote this objective of the American government, and diplomats indicated that the absence of the disciplines on an examination list undermined the vitality of American studies in Germany.²⁴² Third, library holdings with regard to the American studies remained weak and undiversified, because the universities continued emphasizing literature as the main subject for the holdings. A diversity of holdings was therefore absent with the exception of the holdings at the John F. Kennedy Institute.²⁴³ Fourth, the positive achievements of the Occupation Administration were strongly challenged by some misunderstandings concerning contemporary life in the United States and negative attitudes towards America among professors and, to a greater extent, among

²⁴⁰ Ibid.

²⁴¹ NARA. Record Group 59. Records of the Plans and Development Staff, Evaluation Branch, 1955-1960. Box 44.

²⁴² NARA. Record Group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural Affairs. Lot 98D 252. Box 169-172, 205-206.

²⁴³ Ibid.

students. This was noted for the first time by American diplomats and American professors in 1963. Some German Anglicists suddenly declared that they were no longer in favor of the specialized study of American literature and American linguistics. Students neglected lectures and later demonstrated against American international politics. Consequently, the American government was compelled to modify its policy in the field of exchange programs in order to head off the anti-American movement within the student body. Instead of inviting the German teaching staff to do research in the United States, German students, who had long been neglected by the American government, became the primary target. Of one hundred German participants in the American governmental exchange programs, ninety-eight were German university teaching staff and two were students during the period 1945 through the early 1960s; starting in 1964, out of one hundred German participants, ninety-eight were students and two were professors.²⁴⁴

The American embassies and consulates supervised the content of the academic programs and maintained contacts with the directors of all the programs that sponsored lectures by American specialists for Germans and with the former grantees who had been invited to the US to do research in the field. The latter were provided with additional grants to arrange seminars and lectures, and to purchase books about the United States.²⁴⁵ According to the annual reports of American diplomats, the academic activity of each lecturer who taught the disciplines included in American studies was recorded and evaluated.²⁴⁶ Here, for example, is a description of the development of the American Studies department at University of Bonn in 1965: "There has been progress in American Studies since the chair was established in 1962. A somewhat negative attitude had prevailed up to that time. During the past several years, however, the attitudes have changed gradually. There are now four full professors. Professors <...> interested in American literature have succeeded in building the American section of the library, the other professors are the most active academicians. <...> They invited American professors and used their experience as a part of the curriculum and gave them all academic rights to advise doctoral candidates and conduct oral examinations."²⁴⁷

²⁴⁴ Ibid.

²⁴⁵ NARA. Record Group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural Affairs. Lot 98D 252. Box 169-172, 205-206.

²⁴⁶ Ibid.

²⁴⁷ Ibid.

We have excluded a detailed account of all the courses taught by the professors. These reports illustrate, however, that the intensified expansion of American studies became the primary and more or less successful tool for maintaining a liaison with the German university professoriate, which by the early 1960s had begun articulating strongly unfavorable attitudes.

Despite all the challenges, controversies, and uncertainties surrounding American reforms, the government of the United States believed that American studies would become the cornerstone of the US cultural diplomacy in Western Europe. Actually, it became the only means of promoting a favorable image of the United States in the changing political context of the mid-1960s through the early 1970s and the only means of altering the leftist attitudes of German students.

Research institutes in Education and Pedagogy

The American Occupation authorities, like their counterparts in the East, sought to re-establish pedagogy as a branch of science and as a means for reforming teachers' education in Germany. A corps of German teachers was trained either at the philosophy faculties in the universities or at the special Teachers Institutes.²⁴⁸ American experts, invited for the purpose of coming up with proposals for future reforms in German teachers' education in 1946, suggested establishing independent faculties of pedagogy at German universities to prepare a new corps of teachers for secondary schools. In addition, these experts suggested opening new research institutes in the fields of education and pedagogy.²⁴⁹ However, the first proposals were rejected by American military officers as inappropriate. Instead, they opened sixteen Education Centers to provide teachers and professors with new literature and magazines in the field of

²⁴⁸ Ever since the two-track school educational system in Germany consisted of people's schools for children 6-14 years of age and of the more elite gymnasiums for children of 9-18, teachers for these divergent school worlds were trained in the special teachers' institutes, where studies lasted for three years, as well as in the philosophy faculties of the universities. After the end of the First World War, all teachers were trained in pedagogical academies, and the graduates of the philosophy faculties became teachers in the gymnasiums. The Nazis transformed the pedagogical academies into pedagogical schools, which enrolled the graduates of the people's schools with studies lasting five years, similar to Soviet pedagogical education.

²⁴⁹ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation. High Commissioner for Germany. Office of OMGUS, Hessen. Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1947-48. Box 702.

education.²⁵⁰ The Military Administration financially sponsored thirty-six pedagogical establishments (*Lehrerbildungsanstalten*, *Pädagogische Instituten*, and *Pädagogische Hochschulen*) where future teachers could be trained; yet, the kind of reforms conducted there by the American authorities remains unknown.²⁵¹

During the first years of Occupation, the United States was worried about Soviet activities in some German pedagogical schools. The Soviets, as will be shown later, introduced Soviet pedagogical approaches²⁵² to education in Germany. The American officers were concerned about Berlin, where the system of pedagogical schools and academies had been developed according to earlier reforms by Wilhelm Humboldt and by famous German pedagogues who worked in Berlin. The Soviet authorities successfully established contacts with several famous scholars, appointing them to high positions in schools, local governments, etc. The famous German pedagogue Wilhelm Blume became *Bezirksbürgermeister* in Berlin and director of the most prestigious of the pedagogical schools, the *Pädagogische Hochschule* in Berlin. The school was reopened by decision of the *Magistrat* of Berlin and Allied *Kommandatura* in 1946.²⁵³ In as much as the school was located in the Russian Sector of Berlin, the Soviet officers increased their interest in and control over the *Pädagogische Hochschule*. They sat in on lectures, sitting among the students; they searched the student card index and made notes on the addresses of many of the students as well as other information. In December 1948, the director of the *Pädagogische Hochschule*, W. Blume, received a letter from the Berlin *Magistrat*, which cooperated closely with the Americans, stating that the present political situation at that time, which was the conflict between the Soviet and American Occupation Administrations over University of Berlin, made it necessary to transfer the *Pädagogische Hochschule* to the western part of Berlin. For this reason the *Pädagogische Hochschule*, the letter continued, would be transferred to the building of the secondary

²⁵⁰ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

²⁵¹ NARA. Record Group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449.

²⁵² The main ideas of Soviet pedagogics were narrowly evaluated as being the ideology of labor and polytechnic education.

²⁵³ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

school for girls, Berlin-Lanwitz, Barbarastrasse.²⁵⁴ In December 1948, the *Hochschule* was moved by the American Military Administration. The Department of State sent American specialists in the field of the philosophy of education in order to teach the prospective teachers new methods for their future profession.²⁵⁵

The 1950s witnessed a new stage in American intervention in German pedagogy. New institutes at the universities were opened to do research in the field of education. In February 1951, the *Deutschen Institut für Internationale Pädagogische Forschung* was established in Frankfurt as a special project of the Military Administration.²⁵⁶ The German pedagogue and émigré, and a consultant to the American Occupation authorities, Erich Hylla,²⁵⁷ promoted reforms in German pedagogical research and teaching. He applied to the Department of State for permission to introduce psychological methods to Germany. He, together with some American specialists, established this Institute and he became its first director. Hylla called for university status for the Institute and received it. The Institute was incorporated into University of Frankfurt. In 1952, the first thirty students were admitted to study questions of educational psychology and measurement, along with school administration and curriculum. Among the Institute's main concerns was the development of psychological and achievement tests for controlled experimentation – a field almost untouched by German educational research – and the subsequent training of German school administrators and teachers in the use and interpretation of such tests.²⁵⁸ This institution became the first school for educational research and advanced studies in education in Germany, and influenced the development of other research institutes in West Germany. American and European specialists, recruited by the Department of State, contributed to the development of educational research tools and techniques and helped in the training of specialists for key positions in German education.²⁵⁹ In the course of the following three years, the United States established three institutes for

²⁵⁴ Ibid.

²⁵⁵ Ibid.

²⁵⁶ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

²⁵⁷ Erich Hylla was evaluated as a German who contributed enormously to the development of a new pedagogy and to the establishment of American studies in the Federal Republic of Germany. See, NARA. Record Group 59. Records of the Plans and Development Staff, Evaluation Branch, 1955-1960. Box 44.

²⁵⁸ NARA. Record Group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449.

²⁵⁹ NARA. Record Group 59. Central Files 1950-54. Box 2450, 2451, 2456.

pedagogical investigations: The Munich Testing Institute, The Pedagogical-Psychological Institute in Berlin, and The Pedagogical Institute in Wiesbaden in Hessen.²⁶⁰ Pedagogy and psychology were the primary topics of investigation.

A brief comparison with Soviet policy in this field would lead us to conclude at this point that the Americans were more interested in creating a basis for doing research than in reforming the existing teachers institutes (*Pedagogical Institutes*) where the first reforms were begun only at the end of the 1960s.

Establishment of the Free University in Berlin

Another project attributable to American policy in the domain of setting up new educational institutions in Germany was the opening of a new university in Berlin named the Free University in 1948. This event has attracted the attention of scholars and politicians right up until the present day, and, of course, has been the subject of numerous conventional facts and judgments about why and how the United States created this university in their zone of Occupation. Every scholar dealing with the subject knows from the many books and articles that after increased Soviet pressure on academic freedom in University of Berlin, which was opposed by three students (Otto Stolz, Joachim Schwarz, and Otto Hess) who were in turn expelled from the University in April 1948, the American Military Administration supported the request of German students, professors, and the Berlin *Magistrat* to set up a new university in Dahlem-Dorf. The Free University began functioning in December 1948.

This story would seem on the whole to be true, if we go by the American documents prepared in the period of the 1950s and 1960s. These documents related the events of 1948 within the new political context of worsening Soviet-American relations, which reshaped the story. However, the documents prepared by the American Military Administration in the days surrounding the establishment of the university, which was the period of 1945-1948, tell us a different story. Our task here is therefore to trace how official American documentary versions of the events were changed over the time and how the actual American participants perceived the events. We will use all available documents that deal with the reaction of the American Occupation

²⁶⁰ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

authorities and of Washington to the events that happened at University of Berlin.

Before this analysis, we should note that, on having examined the documents of the American Military authorities and of the Department of State, we came to the conclusion that only a few of these documents could be attributed to the immediate reaction of the authorities to the current events which surrounded the founding of the Free University. Most of the documents are official representations of the events which had happened several weeks or months earlier, or even years previously. Hence, the available documents can be divided into two groups: 1) those documents pertaining to the immediate reaction and engagement of the American authorities in the case, where the issuing date of the document comes close to the date of the event; and 2) those documents depicting past events, where the issuing date of the document is not near the date of the event. To differentiate between these two types of documents, we will call the documents of the first type the *concurrent* documents and the documents of the second type the official *post-event* descriptions of the founding of the Free University.

Before that day, April 16, 1948, when the Soviet authorities expelled the three German students from University of Berlin, which, as we know, became the main reason for founding the Free University, the American authorities had had intensive discussions about the idea of establishing *a new University in Berlin*. The discourse of the debates centered on a new university but not on a free or democratic university or, indeed, on the reestablishment of the old University of Berlin, nor did it have anything to do with Soviet oppression. As long ago as 1946, a team of American educationalists under the direction of George Zook recommended to the American Occupation authorities and General Lucius Clay that all the institutes for advanced study and research be unified in one organization to be made available in the American Sector in Berlin: "The problem of higher education in Berlin is complicated by the fact that one occupying power is in sole control of University of Berlin. There are in the American Sector of Berlin a number of institutes for advanced study and research. These institutions, many of which are the most distinguished of their kind in the world, could be joined in a cooperative organization and be given them such assistance, material and otherwise, [sic] as they may

need to resume their work.”²⁶¹ There is no document about the reaction of the American authorities to this proposal. However, in 1948, before the three students’ case, an outline for a new university was prepared in the Education Branch. The outline covered the faculty divisions for this new university, its ideology, the system of management, etc. The document contained an extremely significant phrase that could be used as evidence of early deliberations by the American authorities about establishing a new university in Berlin: “For more than two years there have been announcements and rumors that the Americans would help establish a new university in Berlin. It is time to move ahead and actually establish such a university.”²⁶² Some Soviet documents also bore witness to the fact that, before the Berlin University division, the United States had intended to establish a new university, but – according to the Soviet version – by exploiting the academic institutes of University of Berlin, that were located in the American Sector of the city. In documents issued after April 1948, the idea of establishing *a democratic university in the Western Sectors of Berlin*, which would be a prestigious victory for the democracies over Russian activities in the universities and would change the German model of teaching, can be found in the American documents.²⁶³ In addition to its democratic essence, this university was meant to reflect American approaches to university education. American experts believed that political education, general education, and sociology should be compulsory courses, and they should destroy the German selfish individualism of the isolated specialists; the philosophy courses ought to be culture-historical sketches, setting the students free from the adoration of so-called ‘German Idealism’ and abstract philosophical facets which, according to Americans, enable the Germans to adore great mystical ideologies. Moreover, mass lectures should be changed radically and a system of classes (seminars) should be introduced, and the free attendance should be restricted.²⁶⁴

In May 1948, the first post-event description of how *a Free University – not a New University* – was established was issued by the

²⁶¹ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation. High Commissioner for Germany. Office of OMGUS, Hessen. Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1947-48. Box 702.

²⁶² NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

²⁶³ Ibid.

²⁶⁴ Ibid.

American Occupation authorities. In May 1948, the first mention of the new university as the Free University occurs. The document is the dispatch of the United States Political Adviser for Germany, Richard Sterling, to the Secretary of State about the Berlin University crisis and the movement to establish the Free University. Sterling participated in the events and he centered the beginnings of the founding of the University not on the problems involving the three students, as now is conveyed, but on problems involving the Berlin *Magistrat*. These events occurred within the governing structures of the city and were the ones which instigated all subsequent actions. He writes that the Berlin City Council authorized the Berlin *Magistrat* to immediately take all steps necessary to establish a free and independent university in Berlin. The SED members of the Council were against this decision and thus the final resolution turned out to be controversial. This resolution *did not call for a new university in Berlin but demanded the establishment of a free university*. This can be interpreted to mean that the *Magistrat* was empowered to explore the ways and means of restoring academic freedom to the University of Berlin. Only if the *Magistrat* was unable to reestablish the University of Berlin as a free institution it would propose and support the founding of a new university.²⁶⁵ The idea of the reestablishment of the University of Berlin as a new university was born. In addition, the author of the document mentions a fact which never turned up later in other documents. According to the author, the Soviet authorities attempted to readmit the expelled students to the University in order to stop the movement towards founding a new university. Moreover, he indicates the specific standpoint of the rector of the University of Munich concerning events: “Meanwhile the SED-controlled central administration for education attempted, in conjunction with Berlin University authorities, to appear more reasonable in the handling of the expulsion of the three students <...> The Soviets tried to avoid the establishment of a new university in the Western Sectors. Using the professors of University of Berlin, they invited two of the expelled students, Schwartz and Stolz, and declared that Wandel²⁶⁶ was prepared to readmit the three expellees to the University, if they admitted their attacks on the University. They refused and, moreover, Otto Stolz went to Munich and addressed a protest

²⁶⁵ NARA. Record Group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. Germany. Internal and Foreign Affairs 1945-1949. Microfilm. Reel 7.

²⁶⁶ Wandel is Paul Wandel, the president of the German Administration for People's Education in the Soviet Zone.

meeting of two hundred students. The Rector of the University of Munich refused to take part in the demonstration as did the Student Council on the grounds that all the facts pertaining to the expulsion were not available."²⁶⁷ Finally, the author specifies at the end of the report that General Clay established a special committee to estimate the possible assets on hand in Berlin's Western Sectors for the establishment of a new university.²⁶⁸

Hence, according to the early official version of the founding of the Free University, the Berlin *Magistrat* intended to restore the University of Berlin through establishing a new university called a free university. The Soviets tried to stop this, proposing instead that the three students should return to the University of Berlin, while the American authorities went about estimating the financial possibilities available for creating a new university in the American Sector of Berlin.

In July 1948, the Major of Berlin, Ernst Reuter,²⁶⁹ sent a letter to the British, French, and US Military Governments to ask for their support for the project to establish a new university in Berlin. The author tells us that on June 19, 1948, a large group of professors, students, and other Berliners met and resolved to establish a new university in Berlin, which would be free from Russian influence. This group of Berliners created a preparatory committee to carry out this project and appealed to the Allied authorities. Reuter admitted the fact that the project could not be realized without the support of the Western Occupation authorities. The letter was read by the Office of Military Administration in August, and the United States stated that it would fund the activity of *the preparatory commission for the Free University*.²⁷⁰ From other concurrent documents we know that this preparatory committee consisted of one of the expelled students, Otto Hess, as well as Ernst Reuter and other Germans, and was set up at 4 Boltzmannstrasse in Dahlem, and that it did most of the work necessary for the enrollment of about 1500 students in November. The

²⁶⁷ Ibid.

²⁶⁸ Ibid.

²⁶⁹ Reuter was a unique individual. He had been a communist after the First World War, and he was a close associate of Lenin; he knew Stalin personally. He had returned from the Soviet Union in 1918 to form the Communist Party of Germany, but then he defected from the party and became a Social Democrat and a member of the Reichstag. During the Nazi regime he had to flee Germany and worked in Turkey. After the Second War he returned to Berlin and became the major of this city.

²⁷⁰ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

head of the secretariat was Dr. von Bergmann. The secretariat made direct contact with over 100 prospective professors and *Dozenten*.²⁷¹ About 1100 students indicated their desire to attend the university. The preparatory committee found that the institute buildings in Dahlem were considered highly favorable for a new university. They were the Biology Building, Anthropology Building and a large *Völkerkundemuseum*. To begin the projects, the committee asked for DM 2 million from the Western Allied governments. However, the question was that of creating a legal status for the university. To make the university independent from the state, the *Magistrat* gave it the status of a public corporation and the American Military Administration approved this act. However, the French and British representatives rejected participation in the project. The British representative stated that the times and conditions were not favorable for launching a project of this size and that the British government had to finance and handle the Technical University which cost them DM 7 million per year.²⁷² Kendal Foss,²⁷³ the American editor of the *Neue Zeitung*, was mentioned as the person who should be the main mediator between the Germans and the American Military Administration.²⁷⁴ Furthermore, the preparatory committee together with the Higher Education Branch at the American Military Administration, was involved in the establishment of the Free University.

In November 1948, the second post-event description of the founding of the Free University was recorded by Kendal Foss, as mentioned above. It was a report prepared specially for the Department of State. Foss was an American journalist and a staunch anti-communist, as well as being an active mediator between German students and the American authorities in Berlin, and, in the opinion of James Tent, he was just in Berlin to cover the breaking story.²⁷⁵ The personal characteristics and mission of Foss influenced the content of the document. The tone of the entire text is pompous. Foss starts off by saying that, while the official opening ceremonies of the new school will not be held until early

²⁷¹ Ibid.

²⁷² Ibid.

²⁷³ Kendall Foss was a journalist, who wrote for the *Neue Zeitung*, and he became a new editor of the newspaper in the 1940s. He was American-born, Harvard-educated, fiercely anti-communist and a great admirer of German culture.

²⁷⁴ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134

²⁷⁵ Tent, *The Free University*, 94.

December, the moment seems appropriate to review the growth of this dynamic concept from its inception on April 23, to its implementation six months later. Consequently, according to Foss, the roots of the founding of the university stemmed from the date of April 23. On this day, he continues, some 2000 students of the old university met in protest against the expulsion of three of their fellows by the authorities of the Soviet Zone. The issue, in the opinion of Foss, was not whether the three had deserved their dismissals, but whether the university still enjoyed its traditional autonomy and the privileges of academic freedom. After this protest meeting, the Military Governor authorized the establishment of a committee to examine the feasibility of this desire on the part of the Germans. In May, the committee declared that a free university could be created. Meanwhile the City Assembly (with the SED alone opposing) had voted to instruct the *Magistrat* to attempt once more to bring the old university back under city control and, failing that, to take steps to found a new free university. Like the previous author, Foss also mentioned that a group of Berliners decided to take the initiative and take up the job of establishing a new university in the Western Sectors of Berlin; and they named this job initiative the preparatory committee. The chairman was Ernst Reuter. The Military Government decided to invest DM 2 million to start up a new university. The secretariat was created and led by Fritz von Bergmann, son of two of Germany's well-known doctors. By mid-September, the organizers were ready to seek a legal foundation. The *Magistrat* officially recognized the Free University as an institution under public law with the right to engage in the business of higher education. The problem had been to find a way to confer the city's approval on an administrative act (which would not require four-power approval) and to avoid a legislative act which would have had to have had a four-power blessing. It was decided to confine the first semester's activities to three faculties – the Philosophy Faculty, the Medical Faculty, and the Law Faculty.²⁷⁶ So, according to Foss, Soviet oppression in University of Berlin, the protest of students, the aspiration of Germans in Berlin to establish a university free from Soviet control, all contributed to the decision made by the United States.

Finally, on November 20, 1948, after the official opening of the Free University, a political adviser for Germany sent a report to the Secretary

²⁷⁶ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

of State about the founding of the Free University. It was the third post-event description and the most impressive of the stories about the expulsions of the three students, about the activities of the *Magistrat*, and about how the United States created a free and democratic university. The story then became more turgid and centered on the struggle between democratic Berliners and the Soviet Union. The blockade of Berlin was first mentioned here as being critical to the situation in Berlin, in the framework of which the new university would come to symbolize for many Berliners their opposition to communist and such acts in its name. The Free University was hailed as the most democratic university in Europe, and one which would guide other universities in Germany. The author indicated that “the university’s official opening on November 8 for 1948-1949 academic year, just six months from its original conception, is one of the outstanding achievements to date by democratic elements in Berlin and a heartening example of the strong core of resistance in the city to political and intellectual domination by the Communists. Successful establishment of the Free University was the result of a series of measures adopted by the Soviet Military Administration aimed at denying the basic rights of free expression and academic independence to University of Berlin...” Finally, the report indicated that “a significant factor in enlisting support was the eminent historian Friedrich Meinecke’s official break with the University of Berlin and his subsequent selection as Rector of the new University.”²⁷⁷ The first rector of the Free University was indeed the professor of history from the University of Berlin, Friedrich Meinecke.²⁷⁸

In the subsequent years of the Cold War period, the stories about the founding of the Free University and its development during its first years necessarily assumed a political tone similar to the third version. The American documents in 1951, for example, related that the Free University was founded in the face of strong Soviet opposition and in spite of the blockade, for the purpose of achieving academic freedom. Documents from 1953 correlated the movement of the day to make Berlin a free city with the founding the Free University²⁷⁹ and an official history

²⁷⁷ NARA. Record Group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. Germany. Internal and Foreign Affairs 1945-1949. Microfilm. Reel 7.

²⁷⁸ Friedrich Meinecke was a prominent historian. His tenure as Rector was short due to his age, 86. Later the Historical Institute at the Free University was named after Meinecke, *Geschichte Friedrich Meinecke Institut*.

²⁷⁹ NARA. Record Group 466. Records of US High Commission for Germany. Berlin Element. Public Affairs Division, 1943-1953. Box 1, 2, 4, 5, 9.

of the founding of the Free University was written by a young assistant in the history department. The founding period was depicted in darker tones in 1958: "The Free University was created by a group of students, professors and politicians because Communist penetration of the old University of Berlin (unfortunately located in the East Sector), coupled with growing coercion and oppression, as well the arrest and ouster of students, had reached such proportions that the establishment of a new university in the Western Sector appeared to be the only solution."²⁸⁰

There is no need to set out a detailed conclusion about the interpretation of the facts with regard to the establishment of the Free University. We can only emphasize that before the events of 1948, the American authorities in Berlin had discussed the idea of establishing a new university and after the oppressive Soviet activities in the old University of Berlin, this idea was transformed into the suggestion of establishing a free and democratic university. It is evident that, by having set up the Free University, the United States had acquired a strong ideological weapon against the Soviet Union which found itself thoroughly defeated in this matter. However, it also led to serious difficulties such as the need for permanent funding for the university, strong student opposition, and other problems.

4. New holdings in university libraries

Analyzing American and Soviet policy towards German universities, we cannot pass over that aspect of their policy which is connected to the libraries, because this aspect was directly related to the reforms of curricula and academic programs. The policy towards the university libraries implied the following activities for the United States: supervision of the content of textbooks and monographs available in German libraries, establishment of new libraries for the university teaching staff and students, publication of new textbooks and books, and the dissemination of literature throughout the university libraries.

Air bombardments caused irretrievable damage to German university libraries: half of all holdings were incinerated. However, some holdings, for example, those of the Marburg University library had been evacuated in time and hence were entirely preserved.²⁸¹ The American authorities

²⁸⁰ NARA. Record Group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. FRG. Internal Affairs 1955-1959. Microfilm. Reel 30.

²⁸¹ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation. High Commissioner for Germany. Office of OMGUS, Hessen. Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1947-48. Box 702.

started reopening the libraries in 1946 with the condition that Nazi books would be eliminated from circulation according to the directives. To open a library, the rectors of the universities needed to obtain special permission from the Military Administration.²⁸² On the whole, Nazi literature was eliminated; however, in the early 1950s, libraries were checked again in order to eliminate communist literature. The US High Commissioner James Conant in 1953 issued the order which provided for this new inspection of each university library as well as of reading rooms of *Amerika Häuser* to remove books which had communist passages.²⁸³ At the same time American authorities encouraged cooperation between German and American libraries. The Military Administration informed universities in 1948 of the possibility of ordering books from the United States at American expense; however, for a long period of time, the United States continued to examine lists of books requested by German universities.²⁸⁴

Besides supervising university libraries, the American officers built and opened quite a few libraries in their zone and later throughout West Germany. Sixteen of the Education Service Centers mentioned above had libraries with reference books, along with source books for research in writing textbooks and in planning course of study. Special collections were developed to provide professors and students with books in the field of social studies. There were collections of American textbooks for students, and the centers became places where German teaching staff met American university people and learned about the best educational practices, read curriculum reports, along with professional books and magazines. The centers provided universities with additional materials (both audio-visual and printed) and facilities.²⁸⁵ American information centers, opened everywhere, also had libraries aimed at students and

²⁸² NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

²⁸³ The order mentioned two authors whose books had to be removed: Howard Fast and Anna L. Strong. They were American leftist writers and their novels dealt with political themes. Both were Marxists and members of the Communist Party. Fast wrote about American life, and Strong appraised Soviet life, although she had been arrested by Soviet agents in 1949 // NARA. Record Group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449.

²⁸⁴ Ibid.

²⁸⁵ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

professors.²⁸⁶ Twelve American-controlled branch libraries were opened in Bavaria alone, and the university public made up the majority of all registered borrowers.²⁸⁷ American libraries, opened at German universities where American Institutes or Chairs had been established, seemed to have the strongest influence on the modification of holdings in the university libraries. They were a direct channel for books and magazines coming from the United States. These libraries were headed by Germans who had the full confidence of the American Occupation Administration: for example, the American library at the American Institute at the University of Frankfurt was headed by Fritz Meinecke, who had also been the organizer of the orientation course for the German prisoners of war at Fort Getty, located in the United States.²⁸⁸ Finally, new libraries were opened by the Americans for the new university establishments as well. Although the names of these libraries did not have the word “American” in them, they were American in essence. This was manifest in the content of the library holdings which mostly consisted of American books and – more important to German perception at the time – was arranged in a system of open shelves. The Germans were impressed by the system of the open-shelf system, and local newspapers mentioned this novelty to German universities several times: “The ‘open shelf’ library plays an important role in the American library system. Nearly all university libraries give their students open access to the books which they need for their studies. With some exceptions, scientific libraries in Germany still adhere to the controlled book lending system, but some of our popular libraries have begun to introduce the open shelf system with which the *Amerika Häuser* have made us acquainted.”²⁸⁹

What kinds of new books were sent to those existing and newly opened libraries? First of all, the United States initiated an expensive but effective *textbook program* in 1950 in order to write manuscripts and publish books and then to provide the libraries at universities and those at American Centers with new literature. Favorably inclined German

²⁸⁶ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

²⁸⁷ NARA. Record Group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449.

²⁸⁸ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation. High Commissioner for Germany. Office of OMGUS, Hessen. Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1947-48. Box 702.

²⁸⁹ NARA. Record Group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449. Fritz Meinecke was an associate director of the Institute of American studies at Frankfurt University and became a participant in an American exchange program for the German elite in the 1950s.

emigrants and American scholars were asked to participate in this project. They wrote books in the newly introduced disciplines such as American studies, political science, or general education. Before publication, a manuscript was screened by the American authorities with the participation of respectable German and American scholars.²⁹⁰ The books prepared by F. Neumann, who developed political science and law at the Free University in Berlin, had a particular significance. His books laid the foundation for a new curriculum and teaching process in the *Deutsche Hochschule für Politik*, integrated into the University. His textbooks dealing with civil rights in the United State were very popular in Germany.²⁹¹ Another book entitled *Picture History of Western Man* was published as the primary textbook for junior university students in the framework of the textbook project in 1951. The book was evaluated as the most important due to its special ideological message and fairly good statements about American ideas.²⁹² It tells the history about “Western man who was the architect of the modern world, the chief contributor to its patterns of thought and action; he was a most interesting, instructive and colorful individual whose manifold activities through the centuries elevated the human spirit and ennobled the human heart; he was a Christian and his faith served as a mighty engine of civilization which not only produced works of art that remain the wonder and the admiration of posterity, but also evolved a set of moral standards which are the very bedrock of his heirs’ society today. Western Man, by any definition, is a product of Western Europe.”²⁹³ Moreover, the textbook project published books criticizing the dogmas of communism. For example, in 1951, as a response to the distribution of Stalin’s “Short History of the Soviet Communist Party” in millions of copies throughout the Soviet Zone of Germany, the United States published its own version of the history of the Communist Party. In the opinion of the American Military Administration, “it would be a true and factual short history of the Bolshevik Party, explaining all errors, lies, distortions and myths, and hence the book would be the most effective means of anti-communist

²⁹⁰ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

²⁹¹ Ibid.

²⁹² NARA. Record Group 466. Records of US High Commission for Germany. Berlin Element. Public Affairs Division, 1943-1953. Box 1, 2, 4, 5, 9.

²⁹³ *Picture History of Western Man*, ed. H. Luce (New York: Time Inc., 1951), 1.

propaganda. The scholars of a German journal, *Der Monat*, established by the former German émigré community, contributed to this book.”²⁹⁴

However, in conducting the textbook program, the American government was not safeguarded from oversights. Books that included pro-communist passages were sometimes missed by the American experts and were published. The *World History Textbook*, containing definite communist and anti-Catholic biases only discerned after publication in November 1952, is a case in point in illustrating to what extent improper ideological passages could be a challenge for the American government. The manuscript was prepared by the German socialists, Arno Peters²⁹⁵ and his wife. The book was a timeline study of world history. The project was fully supported by the American Administration within the framework of the textbook program. Before publication, the manuscript was screened by American experts and German scholars who did not find any objectionable information.²⁹⁶ The authors established their own publishing company and published 14,000 copies of the book, as agreed with the Americans. Only when about 10,000 had been distributed among the various universities and American libraries, did journalists in the United States and Germany discover some strong communist passages in the textbook, and more interestingly, later, when an investigation was begun, these journalists ironically stated that the Red-authored book was an embarrassment to the US, thus implying that the American government could not allow a communist book to be published under its auspices. The investigation carried out by a special security division in the Department of State found that communist bias was shown in the selection, phrasing, arrangement, or omission of historical data; in the application of modern communist terminology to social conditions in ancient times; in considering all historical movements in terms of social changes in favor of or against “workers and peasants”; and in applying Stalinist historical concepts to pre-Soviet and Soviet history, and to recent history elsewhere. An anti-religious bias was revealed in stressing the abuses and weaknesses in the medieval church,

²⁹⁴ NARA. Record Group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449.

²⁹⁵ Arno Peters (1916-2002) was a historian who focused on giving all people of the world equal voice by making a timeline with each year receiving equal space on a page. This project culminated in the development of the Peters World Map in 1974, which depicted a new size for lands and states. Giving a voice to the people of the Third World on the map, America was shown as smaller than Africa.

²⁹⁶ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

playing up cruelties when chargeable to Catholic Church leaders and overlooking them when committed by reform movements, and in depicting Christian teaching as primarily social revolutionary in character while disregarding its emphasis on human salvation.²⁹⁷ Consequently, the book was eliminated from all libraries.

In addition to conducting the textbook program, the United States filled German university libraries with books and journals that had come directly from America. Some of the literature was translated into German, but the most it was sent to the libraries in the original. Since the 1950s the American government annually spent US\$403,000 to provide the German university libraries with American books and journals. This was more than the total funds spent on medical equipment and library facilities.²⁹⁸ The American literature received by the German universities could be divided into three groups. The first group was made up of books about the United States such as the following: *The U.S.A., its Lands, its People, its Industries*; *Amerika und die europäische Geist*; *Seeing the U.S.A. through Maps*; *The U.S.A.*; *The Spirit of '76* (an explanation of the significance of the Fourth of July in American history); *The Negro in American Life* (about the life of the American Negro and social changes affecting his life); *U.S.A. – Permanent Revolution* and its German variant, *USA. Die permanente Revolution*, (a description of various aspects of the American way of life, with an emphasis on the philosophy of the American form of government); *United Action in Korea* (a pictorial story of the member nations of the UN in action in the Korean War); and others.²⁹⁹ The second group of literature comprised American periodicals such as the following: *Time*, *Department of State Bulletin*, *Fortune*, and *The New York Times*. The third group consisted of books about the American educational system. As a whole, the United States managed to provide German libraries with new literature through establishing new libraries, conducting the textbook program, and by sending new literature from the United States. All these projects were helpful for revision of the German traditional curricula and academic programs in the universities.

To conclude the first part of the chapter devoted to American structural transformations in German universities, we can state that projects such as the establishment of new institutes, chairs, and libraries

²⁹⁷ NARA. Record Group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449.

²⁹⁸ NARA. Record Group 466. Records of US High Commissioner for Germany Bremen Land Commissioner. Records relating to Special Projects. Box 133.

²⁹⁹ NARA. Record Group 466. Records of US High Commission for Germany. Berlin Element. Public Affairs Division, 1943-1953. Box 1, 2, 4, 5, 9.

at the universities turned out to be more successful than those projects related to the introduction of new disciplines such as general education, political science, the social sciences, and American studies into the traditional curriculum of the humanities faculties of German universities.

II. Soviet transformations in German universities

1. Reopening German universities and replacing the rectors

Soviet views on how to reopen the German universities, on the one hand, differed slightly from the American approach. The Soviet Military Administration did not deliberate thoroughly as Americans all the necessary formal papers, orders, and directives for regulating the reopening procedure, and the Soviets did promote a new university statute more persistently than Americans did. On the other hand, there were quite a few similarities between the Soviet and American approaches: The rector of every German university was evaluated by the Soviets as the primary figure who could impede or facilitate the promotion of the new statutes and initial reforms. As in American policy, the Soviets therefore took the personality of the rector into consideration. Based on Soviet documents, we can define two main stages for the reopening of the universities: 1) the preliminary stage of opening; and 2) modification of the statutes and the policy towards the rectors of the universities.

Preliminary stage in the reopening of the universities and the resumption of university life

The Soviets occupied the six German universities in Berlin, Halle, Leipzig, Greifswald, Jena, and Rostock. The universities in Leipzig, Halle, and Jena had been occupied for some time by American troops and, in June 1945, were handed over to the Soviet Military Administration in Germany. According to Soviet observations, most of the universities were in bad condition. The universities in Berlin and Leipzig had suffered the most – the majority of Berlin University buildings and the main administrative unit were destroyed. The same conditions were observed in Leipzig where out of 98 university buildings only 20 had survived the fire, and the main administrative unit with its library was completely lost. The buildings of the other universities remained untouched. According to Soviet reports, however, massive damage was done by American troops who removed “the equipment and

university scholars of the Universities of Leipzig, Halle, and Jena and transformed the buildings of the universities into American hospitals.”³⁰⁰

In September 1945, the Soviet Marshal and Commander in Chief of the Soviet troops in Germany, George Zhukov, issued an order which determined the procedure for a renewal of academic life in German universities and established forms of control over the universities. A new German education administration established by the Soviet authorities had to eliminate Nazi ideology and renew the instruction process in the universities, and the Education Division of the Soviet Military Administration in Germany had to modify admissions rules and curricula.³⁰¹ The university in Jena was the first to be reopened due to the help of a leader of the German communists, Walter Ulbricht, in October 1945. Jena was followed by the University of Berlin, reopened in January 1946. Later, in February 1946 the universities in Halle, Greifswald, Leipzig and Rostock were reopened too.

Soviet officers, like their American counterparts, had not previously elaborated any plan for reforms, and their first acts centered on denazification of the curriculum, libraries, and administration, as specified in the Potsdam Agreement.³⁰² During the summer of 1945, the Soviet Military Administration began elaborating a procedure for reopening universities, and, in September 1945, a directive concerning the universities was issued. It made provisions for conditions which would bring about the resumption of academic life in the universities. The German Administration for People’s Education, led by the communist Paul Wandel, along with the presidents of the states, and the mayors of the cities, had to report to the Occupation authorities on the state of affairs in the universities and to eliminate Nazi doctrines in the curriculum. The Education Division of the Soviet Military Administration and its chief, Professor P. Zolotukhin, had to examine candidates and to approve the rectors of the universities, deans of faculties, and heads of chairs as well as check curricula and syllabi. The Division had to take total control of the universities.³⁰³ In short, this directive indicated that

³⁰⁰ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 1: 1-14; Semiryga, *Kak Mu Upravlyali (How We Governed)*, 228.

³⁰¹ “The Order #50. The Opening of the German Universities. September 4, 1945,” in *Za Antifashistskuyu Demokraticeskuyu Germaniyu. Sbornik Dokumentov (In Favor of an Anti-Fascist Democratic Germany. Documents)*, 143-144.

³⁰² Heinemann, “Interview mit Pjotr I. Nikitin,” 127.

³⁰³ *Za Antifashistskuyu Demokraticeskuyu Germaniyu. Sbornik Dokumentov (In Favor of Anti-Fascist Democratic Germany. Documents)*, 143-144.

the preliminary activities for reopening the universities meant the denazification of the universities by German communists under the control of the Russians.

The chief of the Soviet Military Administration, Marshal G. Zhukov,³⁰⁴ personally was not eager to resume the activities of the universities in 1945 and in 1946. He considered it best to continue the denazification of professors, students, libraries, and courses for several years, and then to reopen the universities. Yet, Moscow insisted on a fast-track policy for reopening and convinced the Marshal of the political gains from this in the context of rising competition among the former Allies for German educational and research institutions.³⁰⁵ Consequently, Zhukov prepared the directive mentioned above, and, in order to be first among the Allies, the preliminary stage for reopening was conducted quickly and without a thorough denazification of the teaching staff and curriculum. In November 1945, denazification was formally ended. However, every officer of the Soviet authorities in Germany and every politician in the government in Moscow recognized that there were too many professors and administrators, who had formerly been active members of the party, both in the universities and libraries, and that their courses had not been checked in depth.³⁰⁶ In as much as the Soviet Union was keen to be the first of the Allies to reopen Germany universities, on the December 19, 1945, Zhukov officially gave the order for University of Berlin to reopen and on January 4, 1946, to reopen the remainder of the universities.³⁰⁷

However, it became clear in February 1946 that even before Zhukov's orders, the University of Jena had been allowed to resume by the local staff of the Soviet Military Administration in October 1945. This happened due to an internal conflict between the Soviet officers of Berlin and those of Jena with regard to control over the reopening procedure. The former insisted on their primary responsibility over the procedure, while the latter claimed that the local Soviet authorities should

³⁰⁴ George Zhukov (1896-1974) was the Commander-in-Chief of Soviet troops during the World War II and Chief of the Soviet Military Administration in Germany until 1946.

³⁰⁵ Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation. Record Group 059. Inventory 4. Box 5. File 26: 93.

³⁰⁶ Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation. Record Group 082. Inventory 27. Box 123. File 36: 30-31.

³⁰⁷ Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation. Record Group 082. Inventory 30, Box 134, File. 68: 1.

be in control of it.³⁰⁸ As a result, the University of Jena was reopened without any preliminary denazification of courses, professors, libraries, or members of the administration, which later became a real headache for the Soviets who were compelled to purge both former Nazis and anti-communists from the university. The university was reopened with a formal ceremony at which the head of the Soviet Military Administration in Thüringen, General V. Chuykov, in his speech illustrated the essence of Soviet policy in the universities from 1945 to 1947. He said: “When I fought against the Germans near Stalingrad, I never thought that I along with other Soviet comrades would be reopening the University of Jena. I must confess that I hated all German people then. However, after the victory my hatred disappeared, and my Russian heart said to me that we must never hit a man when he is down. Stalin said once that Hitler has come and gone, but that the German people should remain. So, I would like to raise my glass to the prosperity of the German people and to the revival of Germany as a democratic country. And I appeal to all the professors of the University of Jena to contribute to the reeducation of the German people in the spirit of democracy.”³⁰⁹ Chuykov brought out here a very important detail of Soviet policy in Germany: the shift from the profound hatred towards the Germans to friendship with them. For most Soviet officers, in particular for those who had lost their families, it was very difficult to make this shift. This general and others encouraged the Soviet officers who dealt with German education to conduct a soft policy in the universities in order to win the hearts and minds of the Germans and to establish friendly relations with them for the sake of future relations between the USSR and Germany. However, this soft policy lasted only two to three years. As soon as resistance within the universities became strong, Soviet policy took a hard-line course.³¹⁰

The reopening of the University of Jena was followed by the reopenings of the universities of Berlin, Halle, Leipzig, Rostock, and Greifswald. They were reopened from December 1945 through February 1946. However, the reopening of the universities and the conducting of solemn ceremonies did not imply that academic life had revived. As a rule, within two months of reopening, the teaching process had resumed. The resumption of academic life contributed to an actual acquaintance of

³⁰⁸ Heinemann, “Interview mit Pjotr I. Nikitin,” 127.

³⁰⁹ *Za Antifashistskuyu Demokraticeskuyu Germaniyu. Sbornik Dokumentov (In Favor of Anti-Fascist Democratic Germany. Documents)*, 169-170.

³¹⁰ Heinemann, “Interview mit Pjotr I. Nikitin,” 132.

Soviet officers with the traditions of German academic programs, and courses, as well as with the behavior and attitudes of the administration of the universities.

Modification of university statutes and replacement of rectors

Having reopened the universities, the Soviet Military Administration had two main two concerns: modifying university statutes and the personalities of the rectors in terms of their positions concerning the new statutes and reforms being proposed. These two questions – the statutes and the rectors – were closely interconnected: The policy aimed at revising statutes according to the Soviet model would entail the replacement of those rectors who were primarily against this initial Soviet reform.

The Nazi model of the university statute, which had abolished university autonomy, had given full powers to the rectors, and had required that all lectures comply with Nazi ideology, was eradicated by the Soviets. In its place the university statutes of the Weimar period were reinstated. However, the Soviets were dissatisfied with the Weimar statutes, and they summoned the rectors in 1947 in order to propose the acceptance of a new statute elaborated by the Soviet officers and German communists. This model specified an increase in the power of the rectors, the establishment of new departments, and the enrollment of lower social groups in the university community. The rectors and professors refused to approve this proposed model and stated that the statutes of the Weimar Republic were well formulated and that there was no need to replace them. Dissatisfied with the results of these negotiations, the Soviet Military Administration then issued a directive which obliged every university to work according to the new model of the statute. All the universities and their administrations openly protested against this. However, the universities were annoyed not with the content of the statute but with the Soviet policy of imposing the statute from above. The rectors stated that the Soviet Military Administration should discuss the new statute with each university and its teaching staff. Open resistance was very strong at the University of Halle, led by its rector, Otto Eisfeld,³¹¹ who officially declared that the Soviet model of the university constitution would never be approved.

³¹¹ Otto Eisfeld (1877-1973) was a theologian and a professor at Halle University. He was rector of the University from 1945-1948.

The indignation of the universities made the Soviet officers discontinue promoting the statute.³¹² However, the Occupation authorities had no intention of giving up, considering instead that private negotiations with the rectors would bring about the desired results. They proposed a different policy in 1948 aimed at “convincing” the rectors to cease their resistance to this initial Soviet reform. This policy was called “strengthening management in the universities” and implied the replacement of every disloyal rector if negotiations failed and if the rectors continued resisting. The rectors and the deans would be replaced by new ones who demonstrated a favorable position vis-à-vis Soviet reforms.³¹³ This policy was articulated at the end of March 1948, and by the end of October 1948 the rectors of Jena, Halle, Greifswald, and Leipzig Universities were replaced through official elections by the university senates. This marks a very important difference from the American policy towards rectors. Although the American Military Administration conducted a softer policy towards them, the US Occupation authorities themselves nominated and replaced the rectors during the initial years of Occupation. The Soviets ventured to implement this replacement policy through the university senates and were successful. Their success was determined by the fact that some influential professors (such as Valter Markov,³¹⁴ Eduard Winter,³¹⁵ and many other scholars and professors) in every university actually supported Soviet policy, and some of the apolitical professors were convinced by the Soviets to elect a predefined kind of rector.³¹⁶

The most difficult situation emerged at the University of Jena where the rector, Fredrich Hund, one of the most famous specialists in quantum theory,³¹⁷ adhered to a firm standpoint against Soviet reforms. Due to his

³¹² State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 8: 88-94.

³¹³ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 6: 143.

³¹⁴ Walter Markov (1909-1993) was a historian and a member of the SED. He taught at Leipzig and Halle Universities after the end of the Second World War. He was expelled from the SED because of his support for the Titoist movement. Markov was famous for Slavic studies and for his studies on the French revolution.

³¹⁵ Eduard Winter (1896-1982) was a historian and professor at Halle University. From 1948-1951 he was rector of Halle University and in 1951 became director of the Eastern European History Institute at Humboldt University.

³¹⁶ Semiryga, *Kak Mu Upravlyali (How We Governed)*, 228.

³¹⁷ Friedrich Hund (1896-1997) was a physician and a professor of theoretical physics. He was rector of Jena University in 1948. After his replacement by the Soviet authorities, he

position, the new statute was not accepted, new students from lower social groups were not enrolled, and new courses were not introduced. One of the Soviet officers, the chief of the Education Division of the Soviet Military Administration in Thüringen, N. Bogatyrev, who later would defend a dissertation about Soviet reforms in Thüringen, decided to replace Hund without coming to any agreement with the Soviet central agencies in Berlin. He suddenly burst in on a meeting of the senate of University of Jena, which shocked the senior professoriate, and declared that the senate had to replace the rector and, if not, then the senate would be dissolved. The reasons for the replacement, as N. Bogatyrev stated, were “mistakes” purposely made by Hund when enrolling new students. Finally, the senate agreed under duress and the rector was replaced by a new one, the communist Otto Schwarz.³¹⁸ However, the professors of the University of Jena sent a letter to the central office of the Soviet Military Administration in Berlin concerning the attack by this Soviet officer, and N. Bogatyrev was disciplined and sent back to Moscow. Otto Schwarz kept his position, but Hund was compelled to flee to the Western Occupation Zone. Later, the Soviets realized the loss of this famous physicist and presented Hund with the National Prize of East Germany for his outstanding findings in quantum physics.³¹⁹

Today, it is very difficult to reconstruct how the Soviet officer actually behaved at the University of Jena, what he actually said to the professors, and to what extent the events in the University were typical. However, Hund’s case and Bauer’s case which occurred in the American Zone were often discussed in documents, articles and recollections that bear witness to the serious challenges to American and Soviet educational policy. Here are some extracts from the recollections of one of the Soviet officers working with Bogatyrev in Jena. This officer offers some additional details to the picture of Hund’s replacement: “Since his first days of activity as rector of the University, Professor Hund proved himself an ardent opponent of democratization. He openly sabotaged our demand to improve the social composition of the student body. So, eventually we were obliged to say goodbye to Professor Hund. The local staff of the SED nominated Otto Schwarz, a member of the SED, to the

became a professor at Frankfurt University in the American Zone in 1951. He was very famous for his contributions to quantum physics.

³¹⁸ Otto Schwarz (1900-1983) was a botanist. He had emigrated during the Nazi regime to Turkey. After the war he became a member of the SED and a professor at Jena University. From 1948-1951 and from 1958-1962, he was rector of Jena University.

³¹⁹ Heinemann, “Interview mit Pjotr I. Nikitin,” 97-99, 134.

position of rector. When it became known within the University, his candidacy provoked heated discussions among members of the senate and professors. These heated discussions alarmed us, because we did not want to get 'a second Hund' instead of Schwartz as rector of the University. We therefore decided to take control of the election by giving the professors guidance. Hoping that my participation in the election would not be perceived by the professors as interference in senate affairs but would be perceived as my desire to help the university deal with the rector crisis, I went to the university and gave a talk to the senate and professors. During the talk I convincingly explained why the Soviet officers considered the candidacy of Schwartz to be the most appropriate. At the same time the chief of the Education Division, N. Bogatyrev, had a talk with professors of every faculty of the university. Our work turned out to be effective and Professor Schwartz was elected as rector of University of Jena. He became the first rector who was a member of the SED and his election opened new perspectives for further democratization and creation of a healthier political environment in the University: some professors were removed and replaced by members of the SED."³²⁰

This quote demonstrates how the Soviets conducted their coercive policy of transformation within German universities. The Soviet officers simply pressured the professoriate to make them elect the person desired.

By conducting such a policy, the Soviets produced results: by early 1949, out of 62 rectors and deans working at ten higher education establishments, 20 were members of the SED, 33 were unaffiliated, and the rest were members of liberal parties. In addition, the Soviets managed to appoint members of the SED as vice-rectors and vice-deans.³²¹ This success with the policy of appointing politically loyal figures to key positions in the universities influenced the approval of the new statutes by the senates. Finally in May 1949, they were accepted by all the universities. According to the statutes, the universities were declared state higher educational institutions. The rectors, deans, teaching staff, and lists of students were subject to approval by the state ministries of education. The rector had undivided authority. Every discipline had to be backed by an approved syllabus. The new statute contained not one word about university autonomy, however. On the contrary, it introduced a position

³²⁰ Kolesnichenko, *Bitva Posle Voynu (Battle After the War)*, 188-190.

³²¹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 14: 64.

of curator, a member of the SED, who would take control over personnel and budget policy.³²² Finally, the statute had two important provisions that reflected the essence of Soviet reforms: the first provision stipulated the very important status of new preparatory departments as full-fledged departments in the universities; the second provision gave priority to lower social groups in terms of admission to the universities.

However, the story of Soviet policy towards the rectors did not end in 1949. Later, the German Administration for People's Education was authorized by the Soviet Occupation authorities to be the primary supervisor of German universities. German communists could approve and replace rectors, deans, and ordinary teaching staff were entitled to amend the statutes as well. Consequently, they included all the previous Soviet reforms in the new official education law issued in 1951. According to this new law, universities were subordinate to the Minister of Education. A new organization of universities was established: the rector had four vice-rectors responsible for teaching Marxism-Leninism, for Russian and German language and literature, for research and extended education, and for postgraduate studies and professional practice outside the university. The rector was subject to *appointment* by the Minister of Education, and the senate could elect only the vice-rectors. In addition, the law defined a new length for the academic year, vacations, examination sessions, and the terms of professional practice for students outside the university. This law and the new rules were modeled entirely on the Soviet university system.

Finally, during 1957 and 1958, the cardinal reforms of the universities were implemented. After the well-documented protests in 1956 of students and some professors who called for revisionism, which meant decreasing Marxist-Leninist disciplines in the university curricula, and after the rector of University of Jena, Josef Hämel,³²³ fled East Germany at the same time, both the German communists and Moscow were left in a state of shock. The regime summoned all the rectors and deans of the German universities in 1957 and declared for the first time officially that East Germany would build a socialist system of university education. Some of the rectors and deans opposed this declaration and

³²² State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 10: 69-71.

³²³ Josef Hämel (1906-1969) was a professor of dermatology. He became rector of Jena University in 1951. As rector he supported the demand of students to decrease the influence of Marxism-Leninism and the communists on the academic life. He fled in 1957 and later worked in Würzburg University.

stated that the SED was a non-academic and hence alien element in German universities. In answer to this opposition, the communists warned the universities that scholars who publicly opposed the state and its leading party, and who influenced the students in this regard would be removed from the universities. This campaign for “socialist universities” was rounded off with the partial exercise of a self-criticism session and some rectors, for example, the rector of University of Greifswald, advanced a slogan that Marxism-Leninism should be the foundation of university education. University life, statutes and the behavior of the rectors were entirely modified from that moment on.

2. Revision of university curricula

Soviet revisions of German university curricula and academic programs could be divided into two of the following consistent parts: the initial part was the introduction of a unified curriculum, called central study plans, and the second was the introduction of new disciplines in German universities.

Introduction of central study plans

The Soviet Military Administration began its intervention in academic programs and the curricula of German universities with the denazification of the content of all available courses. Courses such as “Theory of Lebensraum,” “Military Philosophy,” “Bolshevism,” and “The German People and Lebensraum” were eliminated. Moreover, the institutes which conducted research on racial questions and colonial countries were closed.³²⁴ This was followed by the second intervention when the Soviets attempted to introduce new disciplines and new rules for teaching.

The Soviet reforms like the American ones challenged the German traditions of university education. The Soviet Occupation authorities and Soviet officers considered some features of German university education and its inherent parts such as academic programs and curriculum as obstacles to reform and thus they were subject to revision based on the Soviet model. While the American experts considered that the content of German academic programs was far too removed from public life, too philosophical and aristocratic, the Soviet specialists noted two other features of the German academic process that were subject to revision: a

³²⁴ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 1: 116-119.

lack of detailed study plans, known as a curriculum, and a lack of detailed plans for every course, known as a syllabus.

German universities actually had never elaborated any detailed curricula and syllabi. Where such documents did exist such as in the medical, law, and theological faculties, they offered only a brief list of the main courses. The Soviets were astonished at such a state of affairs and in particular, with the list that gave information on courses offered at the universities, but gave no information as to the sequence of courses delivered from one semester to another and from year to year.³²⁵ On the contrary, the Soviet standard for a curriculum was a written formal document including information on a strict schedule of courses delivered every semester, the precise duration of a course as measured in academic hours, the lecture-seminar ratio, and methods for monitoring student knowledge. The Soviet standard for a syllabus made provisions for a description of every lecture with a detailed list of reading and other assignments for students.

The Soviets sought to introduce this Soviet model in German universities. The intention to bring some order to these formal educational documents, modeled on documents from the Soviet university system, became the primary premise behind introducing a single curriculum model in every department of the university. The other reason for unification proceeded from the requirements of the German Administration for People's Education and from Wandel personally, who was obliged by the Soviet Occupation authorities to check every syllabus of lecture courses available, which came to 2,000 to 3,000 syllabi annually.³²⁶ Hence, establishment of a unified syllabus model for every course and of a unified curriculum for every faculty could make it easy to exercise control over academic life and the content of lectures.

The establishment of a unified curriculum implied, for example, that the curriculum and academic programs of the philosophy department at the University of Jena would be absolutely no different from those of the University of Berlin, and establishment of unified syllabi implied that the content, the duration, the assignments for students, etc., for similar courses, for example, on the history of philosophy as delivered at the University of Jena, would be similar to the course delivered at the

³²⁵ Nikitin, *Deyatel'nost' Sovetskoy Voennykh Administratsii (The Activity of the Soviet Military Administration)*, 69.

³²⁶ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 1: 147.

University of Berlin. The views and personality of a professor were not taken into consideration; moreover, the Soviet specialists truly believed that the new model for the curriculum and syllabus, introduced in every department and for every course of lectures, correspondingly, would be an easy task. However, such reforms required several years of coercive diplomacy and thus went on until the end of the 1950s.

In July 1946, the Education Division articulated the idea of the unification of all curricula and academic programs. Consequently, all 150 academic programs existing at German universities were grouped by Soviet experts. The first group constituted the academic programs in such fields of study as medicine, philology, physics, and mathematics, which had more or less identical curricula and syllabi. The second group constituted the academic programs in such fields of study as history, philosophy, pedagogics, and psychology, which needed, according to the Soviet understanding, new and equal syllabi to be elaborated.³²⁷ After composing this list, the Soviets urged Wandel's governing body to start elaborating new unified curricula for philosophy, history, theology, law, economics, and other social sciences-oriented departments as well as a model for new syllabi for every course. The Education Division of the Soviet Occupation authorities was, in turn, authorized to encourage the administration of the universities to accept new standards of academic life and teaching processes.

However, the Soviet plans were unexpectedly challenged by the professoriate, if not by the administrations of the universities themselves. The professors stated that these new curricula and syllabi were simply impractical and were poorly composed. They declared also that no specialist from Wandel's body had consulted with German professors on the layout of curricula and syllabi, and thus they could not be applied in the teaching process. The professors forced the Education Division of the Soviet Occupation authorities to back down. The Soviet experts reformulated their demands and declared that the proposed curricula and syllabi should be considered as a blueprint, and that the professors could revise them at their discretion.³²⁸

By 1948, it became clear to the Soviet authorities that the policy aimed at unification of curricula and syllabi had failed. The Soviets urged the German professoriate to reconsider the policy by proposing the

³²⁷ Ibid., 116-119.

³²⁸ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 8: 88-94.

following idea: traditional courses, which had no Nazi concepts, could be offered, but courses introduced or reintroduced by communists such as pedagogy, Soviet history, Soviet literature, Soviet pedagogics, German literature, German history, world literature, and others, had to be provided with new unified and approved syllabi.³²⁹ The universities appeared to agree to this; however, after one year, it became evident that rectors were permitting professors to give lectures which were not specified in any curricula and that Wandel's Administration had not taken absolute control over the situation at all.³³⁰ This situation aroused feelings of dissatisfaction among the Soviet officers, who were afraid of and angry with the growing opposition among the university people that this implied. In 1949, Moscow interfered in the university situation and sent a directive. It specified that each course of lectures must be provided with a standard syllabus.³³¹ The Soviet officers inserted this provision in the university statutes that were approved by the universities in May 1949.³³²

The introduction of a new statute with new provisions about the syllabus and the curriculum did not change the situation any. The universities sabotaged the provision regulating the introduction of identical curricula and syllabi. On inspecting the activity of the universities at the end of 1949, the Soviet officers remarked that "the academic work has not been changed and is entirely based on the old German traditions <...>; the universities have no curriculum and nobody supervises how lecture hours are used. Many universities announce useless and harmful courses such as "Human Races," "The History of German Political Parties since 1848," "Philosophy of Pedagogy," and others."³³³ Understanding that the professoriate and faculties of the universities would never accept the Soviet model of a unified curriculum and syllabi, the Soviet Occupation Administration decided to change this policy. Instead of waiting until the professoriate started elaborating

³²⁹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7133. Inventory 1. File 254: 15-18.

³³⁰ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7133. Inventory 1. File 254: 15-18; State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 10. File 37: 196-209.

³³¹ Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation. Record Group 082. Inventory 35. Box 174. File 91: 49-51.

³³² Timofeeva, *Nemetskaya Intellegentsia i Politika (The German Intelligentsia and the Politics)*, 142.

³³³ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 10: 75, 133; State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 14: 75.

syllabi for their courses, the Soviet experts proposed introducing *new* courses, provided with Soviet syllabi and delivered by new and loyal lecturers. The Education Division requested a number of Soviet universities and institutes to send examples of standard syllabi for humanities disciplines in 1951. The syllabi of the Moscow higher educational establishments in the fields of pedagogy, history, economics, and law were used as models for similar academic programs in German universities.³³⁴ The German professors had to make a choice: either leave the university, because their courses were cancelled, or accept the Soviet model for the content of a lecture course.

Introduction of new disciplines

Similar to what went on in the American Zone, the Soviet Occupation authorities introduced new disciplines into the traditional German curriculum. The courses proposed in the American and Soviet Zones had different titles, but the political aims pursued by both powers were similar. While the United States introduced general education courses in order to educate students in the ideals of democracy, the Soviet Union introduced a specific course called “Political and Social Problems of the Contemporary World” in order to convince students of the ideals of socialism. Where the United States introduced political science, the Soviet Union introduced Marxism-Leninism. Both these disciplines brought with them the ideological impact and values of their rival political cultures. While the American studies were introduced everywhere, some disciplines that could be included in Soviet studies were introduced in German universities. While the American experts were reforming the disciplines of the social sciences, the Soviet specialists modified fields such as pedagogy and history.

Course on Political and Social Problems of the Contemporary World.

This was an introductory and general course for new students. The course taught about the international situation, the history of Germany, new political and philosophical concepts, and sought to clarify the political situation in Occupied Germany. The introduction of this course proceeded faster than the introduction of the general education courses in the American Zone. The Soviet Military Administration already arranged a meeting with the university authorities concerning the introduction of the course in October 1946. The universities approved the introduction of

³³⁴ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 11: 80.

this course and its syllabus without any protest except that of the Leipzig rector, Gadamer, who resented the new course.³³⁵ However, due to lack of staff, only Greifswald, Berlin, and Halle were holding lectures in it by mid-1947.³³⁶ Initially, the course was not taught from the perspective of Marxism-Leninism. However, due to the unfavorable atmosphere in the universities at the end of 1948 and due to pressure from Moscow, the course was reworked within the framework of this ideology and introduced everywhere.³³⁷

Courses on Marxism theory. The most well-known courses in the field were “Fundamentals of Scientific Socialism,” “Historical Materialism,” and “Dialectical Materialism.” These courses were designed to have an impact not only on the value system of the students, but also to change research methodology and perceptions in branches such as philosophy, history, sociology, pedagogy, literature, and music. The main idea behind the courses was that common welfare could be achieved through the establishment of a socialist economic system (characterized by production for use rather than profit, by the equality of individual wealth, by the absence of competitive economic activity, and also usually by governmental determination of investment, prices, and production levels, etc.). In addition, this course transferred the basic foundation for any research, particularly in the social sciences and historical studies, in such a way that, for example, world history and the history of every people would be studied in terms of the movement of the proletariat.

Until 1949, Soviet educationalists who worked at in Germany had not even thought to introduce these disciplines, in the belief that they could never take root in Germany. It was German communists, however, who insisted these courses be introduced. On March 22, 1948, the SED approved the “Fundamentals of Scientific Socialism” as a compulsory course to be taught in all universities. However, on April 23, 1948, this decision was cancelled after the return of the SED leaders Wilhelm Pieck³³⁸ and Otto Grotewohl³³⁹ from Moscow. They had gone there to tell

³³⁵ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 2: 152.

³³⁶ Connelly, *Captive University*, 211.

³³⁷ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 9: 10-19.

³³⁸ Wilhelm Pieck (1876-1960) was the main founder of the German Communist party and the President of the German Democratic Republic or DDR.

³³⁹ Otto Grotewohl (1894-1964) was head of the Social Democratic Party in the Soviet Zone of Occupation. He led his party into a merger with the Communist Party led by Wilhelm Pieck in April 1946, thus forming the new Socialist Unity Party (SED).

Stalin about their achievements in Germany and said that they were going to introduce this compulsory examination course. Stalin asked whether other parties and students would agree. Peak answered that they would have to agree. From the available minutes of the meeting it is clear that Stalin did not believe in 1948 that it would be possible to change the curriculum in such a major way in Germany, and he did not give his approval for this initiative by the communists.³⁴⁰ The German communists corrected their previous decision and declared that courses ordained from above could not be introduced in German universities. Nevertheless, they would be introduced step by step from below by means of decisions by the faculty, when trained lecturers who could deliver lectures in the field of Marxism-Leninism became available.

Growing opposition in the universities to Soviet policy accelerated the introduction of new courses. 1949 became the year when conflicts between the Soviet Occupation authorities, on the one hand, and students and professors, on the other, reached their peak. Exclusions, arrests of students, and the division of the University of Berlin compelled the Education Division to shift its policy from a soft to a harder line. The students who remained after the purge at the universities were fed new courses which became compulsory for them. The Soviets were careful, however, not to spread new courses to all the universities. The courses were imposed at a limited number of universities and departments such as the newly established departments of the social sciences and pedagogy, and the philosophy departments of the two universities in Leipzig and Halle. The lecturers were only the teaching staff who had graduated from the Higher Party School in Berlin. Consequently, these limitations on Soviet policy in this field resulted in courses in Marxism-Leninism not being taught in German universities until the early 1950s. One of the Soviet professors sent to Germany to deliver courses at the universities reported that “the universities have still not introduced courses on Marxism-Leninism because of the lack of appropriate lecturers, and lectures on Marxism were attended by students much less frequently than lectures on Idealism.”³⁴¹ Another Soviet observer mentioned in 1952 that “there is disorder on the ideological front in Germany: the curriculum and

Grotewohl became the first Prime Minister of the *Ministerrat* (Council of Ministers) of the German Democratic Republic and held this position from 1949 until his death.

³⁴⁰SSSR i *Germanskiy Vopros. 1941-1949. Dokumenty (The USSR and the German Question. 1941-1949. Documents)*, vol. 3, 624-625.

³⁴¹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 14: 10, 12.

disciplines in the field of Marxism-Leninism are wrongly compiled; the course on Marxism-Leninism is just entitled 'Philosophy.' Part of the course on Marxism has been substituted by a theme devoted to dialectics. The syllabus is absent, the works by Stalin are ignored, and Hegel and Kautsky are, on the contrary, admired. The Universities of Jena and Berlin are the most oppositional. The courses on dialectical materialism and historical materialism are not taught due to a lack of experienced lecturers."³⁴² Hence, the disciplines of Marxism-Leninism were not separated from the disciplines of philosophy and, although Marxist disciplines were offered, they were taught within the framework of a general course in philosophy.³⁴³

This situation was deemed unsuitable by the German communists who governed East Germany on an almost equal footing with the Occupation forces starting in the early 1950s. The 1951 education law specified a provision that promoted the study of Marxism-Leninism in the universities. It stated that in as much as ideological formation and academic work were unified in the German universities, the study of Marxism-Leninism was compulsory for all departments in the universities. These compulsory studies were declared to be the main foundation for the fostering of a socialist intelligentsia. By the beginning of the mid-1950s, chairs of Marxism-Leninism had been established in all the universities. They had three unified divisions: fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, political economy, and historical materialism. According to the curriculum introduced, students were to study the courses in these fields for three academic hours per week.

New Historical Studies. No other discipline attracted as much attention from the Soviet Occupation authorities as history. Historical science was placed entirely at the service of the German political regime. Narrowly conceived, comprehensive revision of the traditions of interpretation, along with the traditional research subjects in German history, characterized the initial steps taken by the Soviet Occupation authorities.

After the arrival of Soviet troops, the teaching of history was terminated. In order to get an idea about the extent to which professors of history were ready to shift their views along the lines of Marxism, the Soviets arranged a conference for rectors, and for all scholars specializing in history, in May 1946. The plenary speech was given by Anton

³⁴² Russian State Archive of Social-Political History. Record Group 17. Inventory 137. File 90: 22.

³⁴³ *Ibid.*, 92.

Ackermann.³⁴⁴ His paper was entitled “The current situation in Germany and its meaning for historical science.” He stated that German historians could contribute to building a new Germany if they reexamined priorities in their research and investigated themes such as: 1) the socio-economic structure of society and the everyday life of the lower social classes; 2) revolutionary movements in the course of German history; and 3) the interrelations of the German people with other nations. Continuing on in his speech, Ackermann claimed that the proposed reexamination of German history did not run contrary to the true development of historical events, but that only the emphasis had shifted. During the heated discussions that followed, some participants completely rejected Ackermann’s ideas and stated that historical science should be independent and should be depicted from various standpoints, not from Marxist ones alone. Another faction of historians, led by W. Markov, supported Ackermann’s proposals and believed that history should be studied and taught from the standpoint of Marxism. During the course of the conference the two groups of historians, whose positions seemed to be irreconcilable, were finally actually able to reconcile their standpoints, and the opponents of Marxism agreed that the materialistic view of history had to be represented on an equal footing with the other approaches that were applied in historical science in the universities. University professors finally promised to revise their lectures on German and world history so as to insert Marxist ideas. However, after the end of

³⁴⁴Anton Ackermann (1905-1973) became a member of the Communist Party of Germany in 1926. He fled Germany in the 1930s and lived in the USSR. In 1946 he became a member of the SED and made a party career as a prominent propagandist of communist ideas among Germans. From 1949 until 1953 he was the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the DDR. Anton Ackermann had some unique ideas about the building of socialism in Germany: in his book, *Der deutsche Weg zum Sozialismus*, he considered, for example, that the Soviet model should not be used in Germany; however, he was not able to convince other communists of this. As a result, in 1953-1954 Ackermann was expelled from the Central Committee of the SED and fired as its Secretary because of “party-hostile activity.” In 1956 he was rehabilitated and worked for the State Planning Bureau. In 1973 he committed suicide. Anton Ackerman was likely to be the only East German politician evaluated very highly by the American Occupation authorities. They claimed that he was a really influential figure and also well-known as a publicist and journalist; he was a party theorist; he spoke Russian; he was an intelligent, objective and responsible person; he formulated the doctrine that ‘there would be no formalistic transfer of Soviet conditions to Germany.’ // NARA. Record Group 466. Records of U. S. High Commission for Germany. Berlin Element. Public Affairs Division, 1943-1953. Box 1, 2, 4, 5, 9.

the conference, the representatives of the universities proved in no hurry to do so.

In the early 1950s, a new round of Soviet interference in German historical science was initiated. The German communists, who had received a stiff reprimand from Moscow for their failed projects with regard to the revision of historical studies in the universities and the publication of new textbooks on German history and the history of the German Communist Party,³⁴⁵ formulated a thoroughly new plan for reforming the study of and research in German history. The plan specified establishing new research institutes, writing new textbooks, and promoting new research subjects among scholars. The leader of the German communists, Walter Ulbricht,³⁴⁶ focused special attention on the promotion of new research subjects such as “the history of workers’ movements in the period of imperialism,” “the struggle of German workers during the first Russian revolution of 1905,” “the struggle of the working class under the leadership of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg,” “the formation of the first Red Army in the Ruhr,” “reparations for the armed insurrection of 1923,” “the struggle against Hitler’s fascism and the leading role of Thalmann.” Ulbricht was able to implement many of his intended reforms, but some remained unrealized.

The German communists succeeded in establishing new research institutes for German history at the Universities of Leipzig and Berlin as well as in the opening of a museum of German history, presenting it in terms of the history of revolutionary movements. A new Marxist textbook for university students was finally published. However, the communists failed in their efforts to make German scholars carry out research in the proposed subjects and to write monographs and university books. The scholars, in the opinion of the Soviet experts, did not do research on urgent historical problems, but on problems irrelevant to the history of

³⁴⁵ Moscow was very dissatisfied with the writing of the new textbook on German history. Ulbricht was ordered to speed up the work. Following instructions from Moscow, he officially designated new themes for research in the field of German history // Russian State Archive of Social-Political History. Record Group 17. Inventory 137. File 891: 1-4.

³⁴⁶ Walter Ulbricht (1893-1973) was the preeminent politician of the DDR. He had become a member of the German Communist Party before the Nazi regime. The Nazis had allowed him to emigrate to the Soviet Union. Upon his return to Germany in 1945, he became involved in establishing the Socialist United Party of Germany (*die Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands, SED*). Up until the 1970s he was the leader of the SED and the face of the DDR. In 1971 he was removed from his leading position by his old friend Erich Honecker, supported by the Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev. After that, Ulbricht occupied the politically meaningless post of honorable chief of the SED.

the German people.³⁴⁷ The situation was such that German professors published only one book based on Marxist ideas during the period 1945-1955. This book was called "The History of German Foreign Policy," and the author here exposed the so-called policy of "German imperialism" before the arrival of the Soviets. As the German regime had no other books, this monograph was awarded the National Prize. Historians who were members of the SED published a few newspaper articles on the history of the so-called German liberation movement, for example, an article against Napoleon (!). These publications were scrutinized by Soviet experts who worked in Germany as members of the Soviet Control Commission, the new name given to the Occupation authorities beginning in 1952. The Soviets were disappointed with the interpretations of the events that happened in the nineteenth century. They severely criticized German historians, arguing that they "insufficiently explained German-Russian friendship, belittled the great deeds of the Russian people who liberated Europe from the yoke of Napoleon, and were keen on lists of facts at the expense of broad conclusions and generalizations."³⁴⁸

The lack of Marxist books and research influenced the teaching of history in German universities, which was judged by the Soviets as unfavorable: "The professors of history have never been provided with a new syllabus and have delivered lectures applying their own plan. Hence, they have made an uncontrolled choice of historical themes for lectures. The elaboration of a new standard syllabus for the discipline of German History, initiated by the Minister of Education in 1952, has not yet been finished, and there is no hope that the universities will get this syllabus during the coming years. There is also no hope that the historical subjects proposed by Ulbricht for research will be worked on by historians and new books published."³⁴⁹

Moreover, the dissertations elaborated by doctoral students, who were expected to form a new generation of Marxist historians, became a new source of nightmares for Soviet experts. The students did not investigate the themes proposed by the SED. According to the Soviet documents, out of 87 doctoral student historians, 46 students were specializing in the field of German history, and the themes of their

³⁴⁷ Russian State Archive of Social-Political History. Record Group 17. Inventory 137.

File 891: 175.

³⁴⁸ Ibid., 176.

³⁴⁹ Ibid., 177.

doctoral dissertations “were fallacious and were far removed from current problems. For example, one doctoral dissertation at the University of Jena was ‘The medieval man and his critics in contemporary historiography.’ Another of the Leipzig University doctoral students wrote a dissertation on ‘England in the period before the French revolution as described by German travelers.’ Other doctoral students are reported to be keen on research of the history of the Church.”³⁵⁰ The Soviet experts were inclined to blame the university professoriate for such a state of affairs. In order to “improve” the situation, the Soviets proposed that the German regime make a strict plan for scientific work in the universities and research institutes. This meant giving the old professoriate definite and approved themes for investigation that would deprive them of the possibility of carrying out research on optional and free themes. Another means for taking control of historical science was the suggestion of career promotions for historian-members of the SED and scholarly cooperation with the old professoriate that could influence the views of the latter. Finally, Moscow demanded that every lecturer of history be provided with a syllabus based on Marxist interpretations of past events.³⁵¹ All these problems were articulated by the Russians in the mid-1950s, and twenty years later most historical questions worked on by German historians were being interpreted from Marxist standpoints.

Soviet Studies. The branch of science called “Soviet Studies” never existed in the Soviet Union and East Germany, and the Soviet government, as compared to the Americans which introduced “American studies” into German universities, never made the decision to impose a series of disciplines called, in general terms, “Soviet studies.” The Soviets tried to promote the study of the Russian language in Germany, particularly “the language of Old Russian,” “Soviet literature,” and “History of the USSR.” However, a special and comprehensive policy of promotion never existed. During the period under examination here, the process of introduction of these new disciplines moved so slowly that the Soviets seemed in no hurry to introduce these disciplines and had no plans to do so any time soon. The documents mention that in 1949 the Occupation authorities discussed the idea of introducing a course in Old Russian and Soviet literature. However, the profound disagreements about the content of the course that arose among Soviet experts terminated the process of introduction. The experts could not reach

³⁵⁰ Ibid., 178.

³⁵¹ Ibid., 173-179.

agreement with regard to the question of how so-called bourgeois literature, which comprised those works of Russian poets and writers who had lived in the early twentieth century, could be presented to students. Not mentioning Anna Akhmatova, Boris Pasternak, and Marina Tsvetaeva, among others, when delivering a course on Soviet literature, would be to lose a great part of Russian culture, but covering the legacy of these poets and writers would lead students far from the ideas of Marxism and socialist realist literature.³⁵² Finally, the course was introduced only at the end of the 1950s, when the process of de-Stalinization and the ensuing political thaw allowed one to speak more openly about the non-Marxist legacy in Russian culture. The same situation occurred with the course on Soviet History. Its introduction was begun only in the mid-1950s because of the lack of appropriate specialists and literature. The introduction of Russian language studies was more promising for the Soviets. In 1951, the German regime announced that the study of the Russian language was compulsory for students during their first four years and for two hours per week. These studies developed very slowly due to a lack of teachers of Russian.

Concluding the part of our analysis devoted to the Soviet revisions of German university curricula and syllabi, we should make three observations here that might be useful for understanding Soviet policy and its results.

First, the Soviets unlike the Americans had a very strong partner and ally in occupied Germany, the German communists. The first and second generations of these men and women truly believed in the ideals of socialism and the Soviet political system, and thus they often initiated reforms in university academic programs themselves. Soviet archives kept many telegrams sent by German politicians to the Soviet government which requested models of Soviet university curricula, models of syllabi on specific humanities disciplines and literature in order to introduce new courses in the universities. The Americans had no such partners who would request the Department of State to send models of curricula or syllabi. The German communists seemed to be the first to propose the idea of compulsory attendance for Marxist lectures and Russian language classes without any intervention on the part of the Soviets. And it was German politicians who stated in 1950 that German

³⁵² State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 7317. Inventory 55. File 11: 20-22.

universities should be reformed on the Soviet model.³⁵³ The first delegation from the Ministry of Education under the leadership of the Minister of Education, Harig, soon arrived in the Soviet Union in order to bring back samples of curricula from all the departments at Moscow University and other higher educational establishments.³⁵⁴ Hence, some reforms were initiated by the German regime itself.

A second observation touches on the question of when the revisions ended. The answer could be given by the analysis of a university curriculum. By way of example, we have analyzed two curricula from the University of Berlin, one from 1950 and one from 1958, accordingly. In the 1950 curriculum, there are two new and compulsory disciplines based on Marxist doctrine, *Political Economics*, given for 108 hours per semester, and *Political and Social Problems of the Contemporary World*, 54 hours per semester. These disciplines were studied for one semester. Disciplines such as Dialectical Materialism and Historical Materialism were not mentioned as separate courses; however, they were often taught within the framework of the course on philosophy.³⁵⁵ In the 1958 curriculum, there are already separate and compulsory courses such as *Historical and Dialectical Materialism*, which was taught for 98 hours per semester, *The Fundamentals of Socialist Political System*, for 64 hours per semester, and *Scientific Socialism*, for 48 hours per semester. These disciplines were to be studied for one or three years by students. The Russian language was mentioned as an elective course, but it was required to pass an exam in it in order to qualify for other final examinations.³⁵⁶ According to later documents, during the 1960s the academic hours were increased for lectures and seminars in these courses. Hence, somewhere in the mid-1950s or at the end of the 1950s the initial transformations of the German university curriculum were completed.

Third, to sum up our analysis of the revisions of the German university curriculum conducted by both American and Soviet political powers, we should note that the United States, having recognized the fact that it would be very difficult to revise the German university curriculum

³⁵³ Russian State Archive of Social and Political History. Record Group 17. Inventory 137. File 637: 5-6.

³⁵⁴ Russian State Archive of Social and Political History. Record Group 17. Inventory 137. File 889: 92-96.

³⁵⁵ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

³⁵⁶ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9396. Inventory 19. File 30: 30-42.

profoundly by means of inserting new disciplines, shifted their policy of curriculum revision to a policy of establishing new independent academic institutions in the universities, where the American curriculum model was imposed. The Soviet Union, on the contrary, concentrated on a profound revision of the curriculum at the universities and, to a lesser degree, on the establishment of new pro-Soviet institutions.

3. Establishment of new institutes, faculties, and chairs in German universities, and the division of University of Berlin

Soviet policy in the domain of establishing new structures at the German universities looks less comprehensive than the American one. This could be explained by two factors: first, the Soviets initially aimed at integrating Soviet and communist ideas with German traditions in education and, second, the Soviet government did not possess the financial resources the American government had to set up new academic establishments. The United States, on the contrary, built and set up new academic units with an independent status, with a new curriculum, and with new professors. While the United States created chairs and institutes in the fields of the American studies, political science, and, to a lesser degree, created research institutes in the field of pedagogy, the Soviet Union planned to establish: 1) pedagogical departments at every university; 2) chairs and institutes of Marxism-Leninism at every university; and 3) chairs of Slavic Studies at several universities. The establishment of the pedagogical departments can be evaluated as a purely Russian project. Other projects (such as instituting chairs of Marxism-Leninism and the development of Slavic Studies) were promoted and conducted by German communists. Finally, the division of the University of Berlin and the establishment of the new university called Humboldt University can be related to this aspect of Soviet policy.

Pedagogical faculties in German universities

The Education Division of the Soviet Military Administration decided in July 1946 to set up pedagogical departments at every university. They were considered to be the main element in the training of new German teachers. The Division justified this for the following reasons: "German teachers for the higher schools, called by Soviet experts the 9-12 *Klassen*, were formerly trained in the philosophy departments of the universities. German teachers for the middle school, called the 5-8 *Klassen*, were trained at pedagogical institutes established during the Weimar period and later transformed by Hitler into the Higher

Schools of Pedagogical Education. It makes no sense to reform these Nazi schools with their deeply distorted ideology. Hence, we should train teachers in the separate departments of the universities.”³⁵⁷ In addition, the experts articulated reasons for the training of teachers at the universities such as the high academic standards of the university, its teaching staff and resources, and, in particular, that these elements could be applied to the training of highly qualified teachers and for developing applied pedagogy as a new field of science.³⁵⁸ Consequently, the order concerning the establishment of six pedagogical departments aimed at “training qualified pedagogical personnel, selected from *democratic elements*³⁵⁹ of German society, who would be able to continue the democratic reform of German schools and education,” was issued.³⁶⁰

The reopening of these pedagogical departments aroused protest on the part of liberal parties and the university professoriate. The opposition claimed that the setting up of these departments would lead to the politicization of education and proposed preparing future teachers in the philosophy departments in order not to break with the traditional structural division of German universities.³⁶¹ This protest compelled the Soviet experts to correct their policy, and teachers for German schools were trained both in philosophy and pedagogical departments.

The first classes were held in autumn 1946 and the enrollment of students exceeded three times over the enrollments in the other departments. The students in the pedagogical departments attended the university for three years and did not pay for their education.³⁶² However, the first students were unable to complete their studies, because most of them were taken from lower social groups and were often poorly educated.³⁶³ The graduates of the pedagogical departments could therefore not compete with the graduates from the philosophy departments, who were also able to teach at German schools and gymnasiums. Because of the low level of knowledge of the graduates of the pedagogical departments, the universities were able to convince the

³⁵⁷ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 7317. Inventory 55. File 2: 98.

³⁵⁸ Ibid.

³⁵⁹ The notion of “democratic elements” implied the lower social groups.

³⁶⁰ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 7317. Inventory 55. File 2: 98.

³⁶¹ Timofeeva, *Nemetskaya Intellegentsia i Politika (The German Intelligentsia and Policy)*, 35, 40, 105.

³⁶² State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 8. File 6: 149-150.

³⁶³ Nikitin, *Deyatel'nost' Sovetskoy Voennoy Administratsii (The Activity of the Soviet Military Administration)*, 125.

Soviet Occupation authorities to impose a ban on the employment of these graduates in gymnasiums.

In addition to establishing pedagogical departments, the Soviet Union sought to disseminate information about the methods of Soviet pedagogy throughout Germany. The Soviets arranged various conferences for teachers, students, and university professors in order to acquaint them with the ideas of Soviet pedagogy. The Soviet specialists here mainly promoted the idea that teachers should be trained in the universities and that the German pedagogical idea of the separation of children by talent was incorrect. They stated: "Contemporary German pedagogy was born during the Weimar period and it followed the idea of 'dynamic education,' which was the idea of cooperative education. However, this idea rejects the role of heredity and racial theory in words only, while in fact dividing children into gifted and ungifted groups and composing the classes on the principle of capable and backward children. This idea is antiscientific."³⁶⁴ The Soviet approach of mass and democratic schools convinced many German professionals, who had strongly believed in the efficiency of the two-track (elite and egalitarian tracks) German school, to eliminate the traditional German school system.

The Soviet Union, like the United States, was able to modify these bi-level schools and to create egalitarian school education in East Germany. However, in comparison to the United States, the Soviet Union, in disseminating its approaches to pedagogy, did not establish new independent research institutes to form a community of new researchers in this field. Only during the 1970s would the Soviet Union deal with the promotion of Soviet pedagogy in East Germany.

Marxism-Leninism institutes and chairs

The Soviet Occupation authorities considered that the establishment of separate institutes and chairs for Marxism-Leninism at the universities would be very harmful for the promotion of socialist ideas, because it would be perceived by professors and students as clearly coercive. However, the introduction of the courses on Marxism-Leninism within every department's academic programs was considered to be a more effective tool for the expansion of this ideology in university education. The only institute which was established by the Military Administration

³⁶⁴ Russian State Archive of Social and Political History. Record Group 17. Inventory 132. File 63: 67-80.

was the Institute of Dialectical Materialism at the University of Jena.³⁶⁵ This institute subsequently became the center for writing and publishing textbooks on Marxist-Leninist subjects and for doing research in this field. However, the Institute did not acquire any influence over university education during the period being examined.

The other project concerned the establishment of profoundly ideological departments at the Universities of Rostock, Jena, and Leipzig for training the bureaucratic elite for the new German state. Such departments were called the social science departments. To be admitted, prospective students had to have a year of previous employment and a recommendation from the SED. The students were provided with the highest scholarship (DM 300 per month). However, protests by rectors at these and other universities obliged the Soviets to close down these social science departments in 1951.³⁶⁶ They were subsequently transformed into new higher educational establishments, which awarded a university diploma (!) after two years of study, such as the Institute of Social Science and the Higher Party School of the Central Committee of the SED.³⁶⁷

Slavic Studies chairs

Contrary to American studies, doggedly developed by the United States, Soviet studies were not purposely promoted by the Soviet government, although German universities had the grounds for fostering Soviet studies within the framework of *German Slavic Studies*. Since the nineteenth century, there had been an academic tradition in German universities to study the history and language of the eastern and southern Slavs who were those peoples that first settled in the territories of Eastern Europe and Russia. In the 1920s, Slavic Institutes were established at the Universities of Berlin and Leipzig, as well as a special scholarly commission at the Academy of Science in Berlin. German Slavic Studies were centered more deeply on Slavic languages than on Slavic history, and these studies had a nationalistic touch that was to be intensified by Hitler. Many German specialists in the field remained in the Eastern Zone of Occupation, who, while not being members of the SED, cooperated

³⁶⁵ Nikitin, *Deyatel'nost' Sovetskoy Voennoy Administratsii (The Activity of the Soviet Military Administration)*, 109

³⁶⁶ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 8. File 8: 72-74.

³⁶⁷ Russian State Archive of Social and Political History. Record Group 17. Inventory 137. File 888: 156-157.

with the Soviets and initiated the reestablishment of Slavic studies. The rector of the University of Halle, Edward Winter, became the first scholar in this field to propose that the Occupation authorities create a new Institute of Eastern European History at the University of Berlin in 1951. This was supported by the Occupation authorities. However, the Soviets did not go any further; they did not impose Slavic studies everywhere, even though the development of a separate branch of Slavic studies such as Soviet studies would have seemed to be a very effective tool for the Sovietization of East Germany. Only two chairs of Slavic studies were established at the Universities of Leipzig and Greifswald on the initiative of German scholars. Moreover, the German *Slawisten* in their postwar research tended to emphasize Eastern European countries rather than the Soviet Union.

In concluding the section of the chapter on the Soviet approach to establishing new structures at the universities, we cannot avoid the question of the splitting up of University of Berlin.

The division of University of Berlin

The founding of the Free University in the American Sector of Berlin was perceived by the Soviet authorities as the division of University of Berlin, whose main building was located in the Soviet Sector. The Soviet documents contain the Soviet version of those events, which differs somewhat from the American one. As we mentioned in the part of the chapter devoted to the founding of the Free University, the documents that depicted these events can be divided into two groups: the first group is made up of the documents which are concurrent with the events, and the second group comprises the documents which represent the events that occurred around the Free University and the University of Berlin as being in the past. This typology is also suitable for the examination of the Soviet versions of the Berlin University division. Similar to the previous section, we will trace how the Soviet descriptions of the event changed year by year.

We know from Soviet documents that starting in the autumn of 1945 the question of the the University of Berlin was raised in the meetings of the Allied *Kommandantur* of the city, in which representatives of all the Occupation authorities participated. This question was raised both by Soviet and American officers in as much as they were interested in partitioning university property found in both the Soviet and American Sectors. One of the Soviet documents says that the question of reopening the University “turned out to be the most complex, because the building

located in the Russian Sector was destroyed, while the remaining untouched buildings were located in the American and British Sectors. The Americans and British therefore insisted that reopening and controlling the university should be done by all the Allies. The Education Division of the Soviet Military Administration could not give a positive answer to such a suggestion.”³⁶⁸ When the Soviets understood that the Allies would continue their pressure, they quickly reopened the University themselves and placed the University under the authority of Paul Wandel. Otherwise, their Western colleagues could have opened the University in the American Zone, where several buildings were located, without any Soviet participation, and the center of decision-making of the University of Berlin could have been transferred to the Western Sector. Hence, the University of Berlin was reopened and placed under the authority of the German Administration for People’s Education from December 1945 through January 1946.

However, the initial Soviet success in taking control of the University was overshadowed by the strong opposition arising inside the University of Berlin. The professoriate and students ignored the Soviet proposals to admit lower social groups, to introduce new courses, and to establish new institutions at the University. This had not been anticipated by Soviet authorities. When the chief of the Education Division, Professor Zolotukhin, came to the University in 1947 in order to inspect how the University of Berlin was functioning, he found what seemed total sabotage of Soviet directives by staff and students. He wrote in a report: “The Admission Commission works strangely. The rector who led the Commission was in fact barred from participation in its work. The Commission was divided into two sub-commissions: the first reviewed the political background of perspective students and the second, the academic possibilities of the students, and coordination between them was absent. The Commission has lost hundreds of student questionnaires, has enrolled more students than were planned in the medicine and law departments, with many students having been members of the Nazi party, and, as a result, has refused admission to lower classes for lack of any positions open. Students rooted in the lower classes have not been admitted, therefore. The courses of lectures have by no means been changed: the professors of history, philosophy, pedagogy, and psychology are not working on modifications to the content of the course

³⁶⁸State Archive of Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 1: 12-14.

of lectures, and nobody has elaborated a course to be called ‘The Political and Social Problems of the Contemporary World.’ Finally, the preparatory courses have not been established. In other words, the University of Berlin has turned out to be the most oppositional.”³⁶⁹ The same state of affairs was observed in 1948: Only a few lower social groups were being admitted to the University, too many students held profoundly anti-Soviet attitudes, the teaching staff had not revised the courses of lectures, and the rector had not contributed to the conducting of reforms.³⁷⁰ Hence, the Soviet Occupation authorities were unable to manage this university, and with the University of Berlin lacking balance, its location in the center of the ideological clash necessarily resulted in conflict.

In July 1948, the **first post-event description** of the Berlin University division was prepared by the Information Division of the Soviet Military Administration. The experts looked at the events through the lens of a political struggle between supporters and opponents of the SED, and of Soviet policy as well, a struggle which had expanded throughout all the universities. The experts wrote: “The sharpest political struggle has developed in the University of Berlin. The political life and the attitudes of the student body are under the influence of the tense political environment and the mass media of the Western Sectors of Berlin. <...> In April 1948, three students – Stolz, Hess, and Schwartz – were expelled from University of Berlin by the German Central Administration for People’s Education for their leadership of the reactionary (*oppositional – N.T.*) segment of the student body and for their oral and published attacks against the SED and the progressive (*loyal – N.T.*) professoriate. In connection with this expulsion, the Western press commenced a furious campaign against the policy of the Soviet Military Administration. The reactionary elements distributed leaflets in the University that called on students to strike. A political rally was organized at the Technical University located in the British Sector. Most members of the student council of the University of Berlin supported the reactionary students. These three expelled students were supported by the Berlin *Magistrat*, who started the campaign to establish a new, ‘free’ university in the Western Sectors.”³⁷¹ However, this

³⁶⁹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 2:57-58.

³⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 122-123.

³⁷¹ *Ibid.*

document noted that the Soviet position was supported by a portion of the student body, of the professoriate, and of the Senate, which cast doubt on the Western campaign, and that they approved of the expulsion of these students, whose activity had harmed the University.

In August 1948, when the preparatory committee for the Free University began to work in Dahlem-Dorf, the Education Division observed: "University of Berlin has been splitting for 4 to 5 months. The process has resulted in a vote of the city parliament (*Berlin City Council – N.T.*), and it has voted for it, because the majority of votes belong to liberal parties; the signboard saying 'Free University – Secretariat' has appeared on a building in Dahlem. The student Stolz has become a member of the Secretariat. The Secretariat has obtained assistance from the United States. All facilities are provided by the American Military Administration. Teaching staff and students are being recruited: 2,250 students have submitted their applications, while 10,500 students have submitted their applications to Humboldt University."³⁷² According to these documents, after receiving this information, the Soviet Military Administration tried to stop the division of the University through a campaign that presented a positive image of the SED among students of the old University of Berlin. However, the Soviet experts recognized that this was too late, because there were strong sentiments of support for the "free" university.³⁷³ And "the state of affairs resulting after the opening of the 'free university' by the Americans remains alarming, because the Deans of the Economics and Forestry Departments and their group of students have fled <...> The Free University is turning into a real factor in the struggle of reaction [conservators] against the process of democratization in higher educational institutions. There are four departments, philosophy, law, economics, and medicine, in the university. <...> As before, the University of Berlin remains littered with a bourgeois student body and a conservative teaching staff <...> The teaching of new, young university faculty is unsatisfactory in substance, and the reeducation of the old (*conservative and traditional – N.T.*) members of the faculty is in the developmental stage."³⁷⁴

³⁷² State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 6: 125-127.

³⁷³ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File no # "Reports on the Inspection of Higher Educational Institutions", 86.

³⁷⁴ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 14: 47.

After the founding of the Free University in December 1948, the Education Division sent Moscow a detailed report entitled “The Functioning of the University of Berlin under Special Conditions.” This was a **second post-event description** of the division. The document gives a new perspective on the division, blaming the United States for it: “The University of Berlin has a special place among other universities located in the Soviet Zone, not only because of its size, but also because of the role that it plays as the capital’s university. <...> The Western powers sought to bring the University under the control of the Berlin *Magistrat* and the four Allies. The Soviet representatives could not concede it to the Allies, because their intervention in the University would undermine the democratization of the latter. The Soviet side placed the University under control of the German Administration for People’s Education. <...> The American power then illegally decided to transfer some of the University’s property to the Berlin *Magistrat*: the Botanical Garden was placed under the control of the Berlin *Magistrat*. When the University started functioning under the control of the Soviet Military Administration, the Americans started preparing a division of the University. Initially, they tried to do it through propagating the idea of a ‘World University.’ They sent a project paper for establishing the ‘World University’ to every foreign mission in Germany. When this idea failed, in early 1947 the assistant head of the Education Branch at the American Military Administration, Dr. Karsen,³⁷⁵ suggested creating a ‘super university in Berlin’³⁷⁶ under the control of the Americans. This idea was not supported by the German professoriate, because it ran counter to the German tradition of the unity of research and study. However, the idea was supported by Schumacher’s agents³⁷⁷ at University of Berlin such as

³⁷⁵ Fritz Karsen (1885-1951) was a professor of pedagogy. In 1933, he emigrated to the United States. There he met John Taylor, the future Chief of the Education Branch of the American Military Administration in Germany. Taylor invited Karsen to return to Germany and reform education there. In the opinion of the researcher Manfred Heinemann, Karsen had earlier promoted the idea of the division of Berlin University and the idea of establishing a postgraduate studies institute as well as the idea of establishing the World University in Berlin on the basis of the available institutes of Berlin University located in the American Sector. See, Heinemann, *Hochschuloffiziere und Wiederaufbau des Hochschulwesens in Deutschland 1945-1949*, 118.

³⁷⁶ It is difficult to understand what “super university in Berlin” means. Probably an author of the document implied the American idea of establishing a new university in Berlin.

³⁷⁷ With the words *Schumacher’s agents*, an author of the document implied those students who were members of Schumacher’s party. This was the Social Democratic

Stolz, Schwartz, Hess, and others. This has happened, because too many students, originating in the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie, were enrolled after reopening of the University. Consequently, they followed the bourgeois parties and protested against the admission of lower social groups and the introduction of the new *Political and Social Problems of the Contemporary World* course. For their active resistance, supported by external forces, the German Administration for People's Education has expelled the leaders of the opposition.³⁷⁸ In answer to this action, the Berlin *Magistrat* made the decision to set up a 'free' university in the Western Sectors of Berlin in spring 1948. An American commandant sympathized with the decision and provided the 'free' university with a building. The 'Free' University started classes in the departments of philosophy, law, and medicine on November 15, 1948. According to the admission rules, individuals who cannot enter the universities of the Eastern Zone for political reasons may be enrolled in the 'Free' University. The Senate of University of Berlin in turn passed a resolution on December 2, 1948, whereby every student of University of Berlin who studies at the 'free' university excludes himself from a list of Berlin University students. The student council of Berlin University, made up of the expelled students, has been dissolved.³⁷⁹

Hence, we can argue that the Soviet authorities placed responsibility for the division of Berlin University squarely on the American Military Administration. Soviet documents constantly transmitted the thesis that the Americans had established a new university in order to get their hands on the Berlin University buildings located in their sector, and the expulsion of the three students provided an excuse to carry out this plan.

Party (*Die Sozialdemokratische Partei, SDP*). The leader of the party was Kurt Schumacher (1895-1952). His party existed only in the Western Zone, because he had rejected the proposal of his former partner, Otto Grotewohl, to merge with the German communists. The SDP merged into the Communist Party, and as a result the United Social Party of Germany (SED) was established. Schumacher therefore left for the West and established the new SDP.

³⁷⁸ Both the Soviet and the American Occupation authorities issued a directive in 1946 that provided for the dismissals of those professors and students who put up any resistance to the "democratization of the universities and contributed to the dissemination of the Nazi ideologies." Each Occupation authority interpreted differently the expression "resistance against democratization of the universities" pursuant to their rival ideologies and political culture.

³⁷⁹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 1: page no #.

Finally, a **third description** of the Berlin University division appeared fifty years after the fact in the memoirs of the main participant in those events, the Soviet officer and head of the University Sector at the Soviet Military Administration, Pjotr Nikitin. His version does not contradict the previous Soviet documents; yet, he provides more details for further deliberations on the topic. Nikitin begins his story with his first visit to the University of Berlin in the summer of 1945. The Rector of the University was Eduard Spranger, a professor of education, who, in Nikitin's opinion, was not elected by the Senate, but took control of the University on his own.³⁸⁰ When Nikitin entered the building of the University, he did not encounter the rector; the professors who were working that day at the University said that Spranger was busy *removing some documents to the area of Dahlem-Dorf to reopen the University where those buildings of the University untouched by bombs were located* and where *some of the teaching staff and Spranger himself* were living. The professors also said that the rector had been in talks with the Americans to put the University under their power and care. Nikitin decided to remove the rector, and Johannes Stroux was elected as the new rector in August 1945. At the same time, the British and Americans started promoting the idea of the subordination of the University to the Berlin *Magistrat* and the Allied *Kommandantur*. Their proposal ran counter to German university tradition: the University of Berlin had been directly subordinate to the German Ministry of Education before the Occupation. In addition, discussions about control of the University division the professoriate of University of Berlin into two irreconcilable groups: those professors who aspired to subordinate the University to the *Magistrat* and lived in Dahlem supported the former rector and the idea of reopening the University of Berlin in Dahlem, while those professors who did not want to open the University in Dahlem were inclined towards the Soviet policy aimed at keeping the University in the Soviet Sector.

Observing this situation, the Soviet officers, Nikitin and Zolotukhin, prepared a document for discussion at a meeting of the Allied *Kommandantur* that specified the subordination of the University of Berlin to the Soviet Military Administration in as much as the University was located in the Soviet Sector. The disagreements between the Allies as

³⁸⁰ During the Nazi period the rector of Berlin University was Prof. Lothar Kreuz, M.D. (1888-1968), a member of the Nazi party. He was captured by American troops in 1945. He was released in 1948 and continued his academic career at Tübingen University.

to this paper resulted in approval of *the decision in February 1946 that German universities would be subordinated to the Administration of the zone where they were located*. This decision was likely seen as suiting the Soviets. But the American Occupation authorities interpreted it as a provision for taking control of the Berlin University buildings located in their zone. In July 1946, the Soviet members of the Allied *Kommandantur* asked the Americans not to take the equipment and facilities and to share the buildings of University of Berlin as well. John Taylor, the head of the Education Branch at the American Military Administration, said that the Americans would cease their activities if the Russians agreed to accede to the joint running of the University and to its subordination to the Berlin *Magistrat*. Nikitin and the other officers rejected this blackmail.

In early 1947, John Taylor invited Nikitin and his wife for dinner. Near Taylor's house the Soviet officer saw a poster about a lecture entitled "The World University," to be delivered by an American officer. Nikitin asked about it, and Taylor answered that some people from the United States wanted to establish an international university in Berlin, but it was, in his opinion, too expensive and unreasonable. Later, Fritz Karsen, a German adviser at the American Administration, told Nikitin that the United States would establish the World University using the buildings of University of Berlin. At the end of 1947 and in early 1948, the Western press, however, discussed not the idea of the World University, but the idea of the Free University as analogous to the World University.

This imbroglio obliged Nikitin to try to counter opposition in the University of Berlin and turn it into a more favorable educational institution by strongly promoting the SED and by imposing lectures on Marxism there. However, this had just the opposite effect: students protested, and some of them were expelled on April 16. On May 11, the *Magistrat* decided to set up the Free University. Twelve professors from University of Berlin, who later left for West Germany, sent an open letter to the *Magistrat* opposing this decision. They demanded that the *Magistrat* cancel the decision in order to safeguard the unity of the biggest and one of the most famous universities in Europe. According to Nikitin, the Soviet Military Administration was not opposed to the founding of the Free University, but against the American approach to establish this university in the buildings of the University of Berlin, which, in the opinion of the Soviet experts, belonged to them, although they were located in the American Zone. To prevent this, the Soviet staff

of the Education Division intended to transport equipment of the University from the American into Russian Zone; however, the cost of doing so was too high (DM 4.7 million), and the Soviets repudiated this plan. So in November 1948, the Free University opened on the property of the University of Berlin. In April 1949, the Soviet authorities received American documents from the hands of the new rector of the University of Berlin, Walter Friedrich, whereby the new University of Berlin was informed of the loss of its buildings in the American Zone. The rector sent a letter to the rector of the Free University asking that this split-up be stopped. The rector of the Free University answered that he had no authority to cancel the decision made by the United States.³⁸¹

Hence, the Soviet versions emphasized the problem of the property of the University of Berlin. The Soviet documents transmit the thesis that the United States had no right to seize the buildings of the University and that American attention focused on the fate of the expelled students was determined by a strong desire to possess the resources of the University. American versions, on the contrary, emphasize the ideological grounds for founding the Free University as being due to the growing coercion and oppression of the Soviets, thus bypassing the question of property.

4. New holdings in university libraries

The Soviet policy towards German university libraries differed from the American approach: The Soviet Occupation authorities did not set up new libraries as the American Military Administration did. However, the number of new textbooks and books translated into German and published in Germany exceeded similar American projects. Soviet policy can be divided into the following elements: supervision of the content of those holdings which remained after the war, and denazification of the university libraries; and the translation of Soviet textbooks for the universities and publication of new ones.

The Soviet authorities, like their Western colleagues, began their library policy with the elimination of Nazi literature. The directive concerning this was issued in September 1945. The directive said that all the books and textbooks comprising the ideology of fascism and anti-Sovietism had to be removed together with their index cards.³⁸² Every university organized a special commission to remove books and cards,

³⁸¹ Heinemann, "Interview mit Pjotr I. Nikitin," 411-420.

³⁸² *Za Antifashistskuyu Demokraticeskuyu Germaniyu. Sbornik Dokumentov (In Favor of Anti-Fascist Democratic Germany. Documents)*, 147-148.

and transported them to special depositories. Some of the books removed were recycled and some books were sent to the Soviet Union. In the end, the holdings of the university libraries were reduced by half.³⁸³ In as much as the universities had already reopened, the Soviet authorities allowed the universities to use those textbooks published before 1933, but they were also checked.³⁸⁴

While American officers removed pro-communist literature during the 1950s, the Soviet Occupation authorities removed anti-communist literature. In 1947, the Soviets began removing books coming from the Western Zones.³⁸⁵ *The History of Western Man*, mentioned above, was removed by Soviet experts. In 1948, the Soviet authorities began a new wave of removals called “the quest for harmful anti-Soviet literature.” The “anti-Soviet literature” notion implied those books written by Soviet opponents of the Stalinist regime such as Trotsky, Bukharin, and many others. The literature of philosophy and the social, economic, and political branches of science as well as German fiction were especially thoroughly checked.³⁸⁶

On the other hand, the Soviet government attached great importance to the restocking of library holdings through translating Soviet university textbooks from Russian into German. Soviet military officers indicated in 1947 that “we urgently need to implant as many Soviet books as possible into German libraries in order to educate professors and students. If there is no literature from us, then English, French, and American books will fill the gap and that would be undesirable for us.”³⁸⁷ According to the documents, the Soviet government began translating Soviet university textbooks in 1944. The German communists who had emigrated to the Soviet Union translated Soviet textbooks on world history, Soviet history, pedagogy, and geography. This helped the Occupation authorities to flood the libraries with qualified translations of Soviet textbooks, published in Germany. In September 1948, the Education Division elaborated a plan to supply every university with Soviet books translated

³⁸³ Semiryg, *Kak Mu Upravlyali (How We Governed)*, 218.

³⁸⁴ Nikitin, *Deyatel'nost' Sovetskoy Voennoy Administratsii (The Activity of the Soviet Military Administration)*, 49.

³⁸⁵ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 3: 126.

³⁸⁶ Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation. Record Group 0457-b. Inventory 4. Box 31. File 34: 54.

³⁸⁷ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 81: 88-94.

into German. Priority was given to books on pedagogy, dialectical materialism, and the Russian language. The rectors soon obtained a directive indicating that they had to ensure student access to this new literature,³⁸⁸ which meant making students read these books.

The Soviet government was able to manage this plan. The newly created publishing company “People and Knowledge” disseminated books on pedagogy throughout the pedagogical departments. Soviet books such as “Pedagogy,” “Moral Education in the Soviet Union,” and others became the primary textbooks for students. All the universities were provided with German versions of the works of Lenin and Stalin; works by the latter were removed from the libraries in the early 1960s with de-Stalinization.³⁸⁹ During the period 1945 to 1949, around 7.5 million volumes by Lenin were published to replace the 15 million volumes of Nazi literature removed as part of the process of denazification.³⁹⁰ If the German population constituted 19 million citizens, then every 2.3 Germans were provided with one volume. The language courses were provided with 2.5 million textbooks on the Russian language. However, textbooks on Soviet history were published slowly. Until the mid-1950s, German university libraries had obtained only a few copies of the only textbook on the history of the Soviet Union translated into German.

Still, the Soviet Union was able to supply the German libraries with the new books necessary for the revised curricula. Unlike the way in which the United States sent literature about the American political system to Germany, the Soviet Union flooded the libraries with books on Marxism and pedagogy that became the primary tools for the Sovietization of the universities.

Conclusion

A comparative analysis of the first American and Soviet reforms in German universities during the period of 1945 through the early 1960s allows us to define common and different features:

1) Reopening the universities, the modification of statutes, and the replacement of rectors.

³⁸⁸ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 4: 118-119.

³⁸⁹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9606. Inventory 1. File 606: 155.

³⁹⁰ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 11: 78-87.

Both powers sought to reopen the occupied universities as soon as possible in order to resume normal academic life, to decrease the tense social situation and political confusion, to purify the universities of the influence of Nazi values, and finally to exploit the universities for their political agenda. Moreover, the temptation to be first among the Allies caused activities dealing with the policy of the resumption of university life in Germany to be rushed.

Both powers implemented preliminary preparations for the universities to reopen. These preliminary preparations meant denazification of courses, of teaching staff and the student body, and of library holdings. The United States conducted the preliminary stage more thoroughly by creating a solid legal basis for regulating the reopenings and for the ensuing functioning of the universities. In addition, the Americans purged university people more severely than the Soviets did. The universities in the American Zone therefore reopened later than those of the Soviet Zone. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, did not elaborate any legal basis in detail, confining itself to issuing just two or three directives, and they did not profoundly purge the professoriate. This was primarily determined by the goal of the government to be the first of the Allies to restore normal life in Occupied Germany.

Once university studies had been resumed, both powers began reforming the university statutes so that they would contribute to their reforms and mirror the American or Soviet university systems. The American government proposed the insertion of provisions expanding the influence of society on university curricula through trustee boards, as well as provisions expanding the influence of young lecturers in the decision-making process in the Senate, and other provisions containing new democratic and American norms. The Soviet government proposed increasing the authority of the rectors and elimination of their elective status, and arranged for the establishment of new departments and the admission of lower social groups to the universities. The German universities resisted these new models both in the American and Soviet Zones. The imposition of new statutes from above was the main factor that caused indignation. Consequently, the United States gradually acquiesced to the demands of the opposition and most American proposals were not introduced into the university statutes during the period under examination here. The Soviet Union was able to promote a new model of statute by exploiting the power of German communists and by pressuring the rectors and professors.

Both powers sought to appoint or promote loyal rectors through the election process in the Senate. The Occupation authorities of the US replaced and appointed new rectors themselves, while the Soviet Administration campaigned for new communist rectors in the Senate. Consequently, by applying different approaches, the United States and the Soviet Union were able to ensure their success in reforming the universities.

2) The revision of the German university curricula.

Both powers introduced new courses to the existing curricula of German universities. The courses introduced obviously reflected the political culture of the rivals. The United States intended to impose courses in fields of study such as general education, political science, social studies, and American studies. The Soviet Union introduced the introductory course “Political and Social Problems of the Contemporary World” and they added disciplines such as Marxism-Leninism, pedagogy, and, to a certain extent, Soviet studies as well. The selection of these fields and courses were determined by the political aims of implanting a definite ideology (liberalism or socialism) in occupied Germany.

The implementation of the revisions took a very long time, and only by the end of the 1950s were the new courses of lectures being more or less taught in German universities. The resistance of the universities did have an impact in terms of slowing down the introduction of these reforms. The Soviet Union, however, turned out to be more persistent than the United States in pushing for reforms and, as a result, Soviet disciplines found a formal place in the traditional German curricula of the humanities departments. The United States recognized the fact that even when the German universities formally acquiesced to the American revision of the curricula, they refused to develop the new disciplines proposed by the Americans. The United States resigned itself to the fact that German university curricula would not be fully reformed and, therefore, shifted to a policy of establishing new structures in order to introduce new disciplines.

3) The establishment of institutes, departments, and chairs at German universities.

The establishment of new structures was viewed by the United States as a means of undermining the curriculum and academic programs which existed in German universities. Setting up independent institutes of political science, of American studies, and of education research at universities actually turned out to be more effective than inserting certain courses from these fields into the German curricula. The United States

emphasized the establishment of chairs of American studies in every Germany university; this became an effective tool for promoting a favorable US image and for popularizing American fields and methods of research in German universities. The Soviet Union, on the contrary, did not apply this means to deal with German universities; they mainly established departments of pedagogy in the period we have examined.

4) The founding the Free University and the division of University of Berlin.

Both powers had a hand in the fall of the great and famous University of Berlin in order to take full control over its resources, brains, scientific potential, and property, scattered all over the three sectors of occupation in Berlin. Moreover, the activities of the two states, determined by their ideological goals, contributed to the division the university. The Soviet Union strongly promoted communists and Marxism in the university in order to ensure its allegiance. The United States, on the other hand, by discrediting their opponent for this policy and denouncing it as oppressive, was able to find the ideological basis and persuasive justification for opening a new University of Berlin, to be called the Free University, in the buildings of the old Berlin University. The decline of the University of Berlin is a study in miniature of the attitude of the Allies towards German universities and towards each other.

5) Transformation of the university libraries' holdings.

The United States and Soviet Union were both able to effectively organize permanent replacements of holdings in the libraries. The United States supplied the universities with literature about the political system of the United States and most of the literature was in English. The Soviet Union translated the Soviet literature on Marxism-Leninism and pedagogy into German and flooded the libraries.

Finally, the initial reforms of both Occupation authorities, as examined in this chapter, were instrumental in attaining political goals such as the implantation of a new ideological constituent in German university education and the fostering of a new political culture in German society by means of the universities. The revision of statutes, curricula, libraries, as well as the establishment of new institutes, departments, and chairs were more or less effective means of achieving the political goals of those who occupied Germany. All the reforms we have examined were imposed on German universities and, hence, aroused indignation and resistance to them among university people.

Chapter IV

American and Soviet policy towards the university professoriate, 1945 through the early 1960s

Introduction

It must be admitted that up until the present American and Soviet policy towards those Germans who delivered lectures and carried out research, who occupied positions such as professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and lecturers in German universities after the end of the Second World War, has not been analyzed in any depth in the literature due to the lack of documents solely devoted to this question. This is because reconstruction and analysis of the history of the relationship between the Occupation authorities and German university faculty requires a meticulous selection of materials from among a mass of documents which describe all the various reforms but only touch on this question. American policy in regard to German professors, in particular, remained largely beyond the parameters of previous research. We began from a perspective which assumed that all the transformations proposed either by the Americans or by the Soviets seriously touched on the personal life and academic careers of those professors who worked at universities. These professors would therefore have been left with the choice of either reacting positively or negatively to the reforms and this, in turn, would have enormously influenced the final effects of these transformations. Hence, we defined our research task in terms of reconstructing both American and Soviet policy towards the German university corporation of professors. As a result, our analysis suddenly revealed a special and an exceptional role played by professors in the fate of both the American and Soviet transformations of German universities.

This chapter consists of three parts. The first part will analyze American policy towards the German teaching staff from 1945 through the early 1960s, and the second part will investigate Soviet policy in this area and over the same period. The chapter will end with our conclusions.

I. American policy towards the German university professoriate

As we have mentioned previously, the American Zone of Occupation included Bavaria, Württemberg-Baden,³⁹¹ Hessen, the city of Bremen in the British Zone in Lower Saxony, and the sector of Berlin located in the Soviet Zone in the State of Brandenburg. There were seventeen institutions of higher education in the Zone, seven of which were universities. The history of the universities in Berlin, Heidelberg, Munich, Erlangen, Frankfurt, Marburg, and Würzburg stretched back to the late fourteenth century,³⁹² and their international recognition as centers of science and philosophy had long been established by the community of the professoriate of these universities. This community of the professoriate, being a constituent part of university life, was subjected to revision in order to create a new and pliable corporation of professors whose work would contribute to the implementation of all the reforms proposed by the American government.

American policy towards the German professoriate can be reconstructed in terms of the following constituent parts: i) the program of denazification of the professoriate; ii) the interpretations of the way of thinking of the German professoriate; iii) the making of a *New Professor*; and iv) opposition from the old conservative professoriate and the American response to this.

1. Denazification and reemployment of the professoriate

The American Occupation authorities, in contrast to the Soviet ones, arrived in Berlin with a preconceived apparatus for managing the German teaching staff, and more importantly, with selected and trained experts in the field of university education. The training of military officers – men who had achieved distinction in American university education or who had studied the German university system – began in the School of Military Government at Charlottesville, Virginia, in May 1942. These initial experts formulated certain basic ideas about how to remove all the active Nazis and Nazi sympathizers from positions of authority in German universities. After arriving in Germany, these experts worked out

³⁹¹ This state was called Baden-Württemberg in 1952 after unification of three German states.

³⁹² The oldest universities were Heidelberg and Würzburg, established in 1386 and 1402 respectively. Other universities were created from the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries.

of a central secretariat and had field affiliations in the University Education Branch of the OMGUS located in each German state.³⁹³ In addition, every German university accommodated an American University Officer and agents who communicated with the professoriate and kept a check on their activities.³⁹⁴

The purge of former Nazis proclaimed by the Potsdam Agreement became the initial main and surprisingly prolonged part of American policy towards the German professoriate. The Americans, in contrast to their colleagues in the Soviet Zone, very thoroughly purged Nazis found among the university personnel. The American version of denazification implied three types of action regarding the German teaching staff. Collaborators with the Nazis were dismissed at once. Later some of them were reemployed, while some of them never returned to the universities. The academic life of those who were allowed to return to the universities was entirely under the control of the American Military Administration.

Immediately after the end of the war, all universities were closed and taken over by the Military Administration. Reopening of the universities was arranged after screening the faculty members and after the approval of petitions for reopening sent by the universities themselves to the Education Division of the American Military Administration. These petitions contained a detailed curriculum and a list stating the names and qualifications of the teaching staff.³⁹⁵ An American Education Officer, special agents, and professors who cooperated with the Occupation Administration, were responsible for purging the universities of Nazis. American University Officers organized a special University Committee involved in the process of denazification of the professoriate. These committees were comprised of professors and scientists who had either become antifascists in the period of Adolf Hitler's power or who had demonstrated an active pro-American position during the period of the

³⁹³ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration Programs 1949-1952. Box 7, 12, 25

³⁹⁴ Documents indicate the main responsibility of an American University Officer was as follows: "a surveillance to prevent a repetition of what happened in the thirties, the infiltration and capture of the universities by undemocratic and military political power." The position of the University Officer existed until the early 1960s. // NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

³⁹⁵ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

Occupation. For example, the two leading scientists at the University of Heidelberg, Karl Jaspers and Gustav Radbruch,³⁹⁶ played a significant role in purging the university staff. The American Military Administration supported such people by providing them with certain benefits. For example, the members of the University Committee at the University of Heidelberg were released from the duty to lodge American soldiers in their own homes.³⁹⁷ For submission to the American Education Officer, the committee formulated plans covering the nominations of those lecturers whom they considered academically and politically acceptable, along with a list of the university personnel who had already been excluded or should be excluded for political reasons.³⁹⁸ Hence, those German professors who participated in committees such as these contributed to the American program of denazification. Their activity, however, created a platform for conflict and tense situations among the professors in the universities themselves.

The first purge began in 1945. Initially, the Americans supposed that denazification could be carried out through recommendations made by these committees as well as through investigations based on the *Fragebogen*, a questionnaire filled out by the university people, along with additional investigations made by secret and anonymous agents of the *Counter Intelligence Corps* or the CIC, a special intelligence agency for hunting down members of the Nazi Party. Archival records mention that there was no time to conduct personal interviews or to do any thorough investigations. All the initial *Fragebogen* were quickly examined by these special agents, and those professors who fell into the automatic arrest category, as having been active members of the Nazi Party since 1933, were interned; all other people initially remained in the universities. As a result, after the reopening of the universities, classes began with many professors who had been involved with the Nazis and who believed in National Socialism.

In 1946, a new investigation or purge began, because agents of the CIC had received information that there were still professors who continued to give lectures from the standpoint of nationalism and racism.

³⁹⁶ Gustav Radbruch was a famous professor of law and of Kantian philosophy, and a member of the Social Democratic Party as well. He had held a seat in the Reichstag in the 1920s.

³⁹⁷ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

³⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

In one of the reports, an American agent indicated that “a tremendous mistake was made in opening the University of Heidelberg in 1945 without consideration for the fact that University of Heidelberg, as well as all of the German Universities had been, over a period of twelve years, Nazified to the core. It will require at least another six months of careful, methodical investigation before it can be said that the elements of potential threat to the security of the American Occupation have been removed.”³⁹⁹ Another reason for this second purge was determined by resistance on the part of the administration of the universities to dismissing these professors. At the University of Würzburg, the military officers of the OMGUS and CIC learned that many lecturers still remained in the university, contrary to the instructions for denazification previously issued by the Education Branch of the OMGUS. An officer of the University Education Branch pointed out this violation to the Vice Rector Josef Martin and advised him to dismiss those professors without any further delay. The Vice Rector suddenly opposed this order and was therefore himself replaced by the American Military Administration “because of his failure to carry out denazification directives.”⁴⁰⁰

During this extensive second purge, the American authorities and the agents of the CIC first conducted personal interviews pertaining to the subjects taught by the professors and to all the books which the professors had published. In addition, the agents of the CIC tried to persuade professors to provide information about those colleagues who had actively participated in the Nazi Party. Those professors who had voiced nationalist ideas in their previous books or voiced them during the interview were dismissed. A fresh group of professors now was forced out of the universities, resulting in a wave of grievances among the faculty members. Rectors of German universities appealed to the American authorities requesting a stop be made to this denazification “which was inimical to the best interest of the universities.”⁴⁰¹ Professors who personally sent letters to the American authorities complained in

³⁹⁹ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁴⁰⁰ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Bavaria. Office of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-49. Box 57-63.

⁴⁰¹ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

them about the uncertainty of their futures. This uncertainty produced, as one of the German professors wrote in his letter to the American Military Administration in Berlin, “a reluctance to cooperate on the part of those who had not yet been screened, due to the fact that none of the professors knew how he stood, and all of them had not yet been screened, due to the fact that none of the professors knew how he stood, and all of them had the fear of falling out with a rector in the case that they are too helpful to the CIC [sic].”⁴⁰² Moreover, the professoriate, both senior and junior staff, found themselves between the frying pan and the fire, between the university and the American Administration. Collaboration with the Americans implied betraying those colleagues who had been active members of the Nazi Party and thus created conflicts within a university. However, denial of any such collaboration implied hiding information about former Nazis and thus provoked a dangerous living situation for a professor and his family: He could lose his position at the university and thus the essential daily allowances of food and wood provided by the universities.

The most extreme purge happened in the universities of Bavaria. The Würzburg, Erlangen, and Munich universities were considered the most *reactionary* universities by the Military Administration. The notion of “reactionary universities” implied their nationalistic and anti-American positions. These universities were the last to be reopened, because they were the first to completely give themselves over to the National Socialists during the rise of Hitler. Hence, screening was conducted there several times. The philosophy and law faculties of these universities were the hardest hit by denazification of any other department. The percentage of dismissals was the highest, with half of the standing faculty discharged.⁴⁰³ The University of Erlangen suffered the most: out of the total teaching staff then employed, seventy percent were dismissed.⁴⁰⁴

On the contrary, other German states such as Baden-Württemberg, and in particular the University of Heidelberg located there, became the first to “have felt the might of the American denazification on its

⁴⁰² Ibid.

⁴⁰³ NARA. Record Group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. Germany. Internal and Foreign Affairs 1945-1949. Microfilm. Reel 7; NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

⁴⁰⁴ NARA. Record Group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. Germany. Internal and Foreign Affairs 1945-1949. Microfilm. Reel 7.

back.”⁴⁰⁵ This oldest of the universities, and the one with a strong international reputation, was opened in September 1945, after a purge of 184 professors out of 376.⁴⁰⁶ However, the dismissal of almost half of the teaching staff compelled the rector of University of Heidelberg and the famous European medical doctor Karl H. Bauer to complain to the American authorities about the state of affairs in the university in order to impede denazification. Addressing his letter to the American administration, he wrote: “By denazification the staff has been reduced to about half its size. The remaining half consists, to almost two thirds, of old, partly too old professors [sic]. Some of them were undernourished for a considerable time; many are weakened or even sickly. Many bear the signs and the consequences of the mental suffering of the Nazi time [sic]. The problem is made especially difficult by the fact that precisely the middle generations are affected with particular severity by denazification. In these very generations the means of bait and pressure of the Party were immense, so that the individual could hardly escape them sometimes [sic]. German science has suffered a great number of bleeding [sic] one after the other. Denazification may be compared with a great operation performed on an organism already weakened considerably. One will understand that precisely the German anti-Nazis, who, at the same time the preservation of science is nearest to their hearts, plead that the operation should not be more dangerous than the illness for which is performed. Precisely those who hate the real Nazis ardently ask all the more for grace those who merely lost their way and for those who, in our opinion, taken a false step [sic].”⁴⁰⁷ Rector Bauer made an effort to protect scientists and professors from denazification. However, after the second purge in his university in 1946, the rector, as a former member of the Nazi Party and the administrator “who tried in every way to soften and, if possible, to nullify the denazification,” was discharged by the Occupation Administration.⁴⁰⁸

⁴⁰⁵ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁴⁰⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁰⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁰⁸ The agents of the CIC even suggested hanging the rector. // NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

There is no doubt that this program of denazification devastated the universities and contributed to the interruption of normal academic activity. It may well be that the American officers understood the level of severity of their program, although we have no direct record of this in the documents. However, a new policy that followed the program of purges may be evidence that the American authorities decided to shift away from this policy of purges when they began to allow former Nazis to return to the universities in 1947 and 1948.

After the wave of dismissals, a process of reemployment, called *reinstatement* in the documents, was elaborated and began in 1947 and 1948. This policy was aimed at returning *nominal* members of the Nazi Party to academic institutions. All the members of the Party that had been dismissed were given the opportunity to submit a petition for reinstatement in the universities. The universities, in turn, were permitted to elaborate on the criteria for the reinstatement of these dismissed professors. The university committees first examined whether a dismissed colleague was capable of usefully serving a university in terms of his work and his personality. If a dismissed colleague turned out to have been a convinced and active adherent of Nazism, he forfeited all suitability for his position. If, however, he could provide evidence that he had joined the Party under the pressure of circumstance or for fear of losing his family's and his own means of existence and of being forced to renounce his scientific calling or if, being weak-willed, he had succumbed to a lesser pressure and become a member of the Party, these reasons were henceforth not be taken as indications of Nazi-mindedness and so such persons could be reemployed. If a professor had refrained from any National-Socialist activity or if, after a brief adherence to the Party born of misplaced idealism, he at the least now showed some genuine remorse and a reversal of feeling, then such a man would tend not to be rejected by this committee. This was especially the case when a professor had done much for science and for a university, and where his academic and research activities were seen as practically indispensable for scientific instruction there.⁴⁰⁹ In other words, professors had to produce evidence that they had been forced to join the Party in order to be reinstated in the universities.

⁴⁰⁹ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Bavaria. Office of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-49. Box 57-63.

In addition, the Military Administration now elaborated on its policy towards those who wished to be reevaluated in terms of whether they had been active members of the Party and whose previous petitions for reemployment had been rejected for this reason. The sanctions were now given gradations. For lecturers who had contributed to the spread of National Socialism but who had not been National Socialists in their *mental attitudes*, these lecturers were not permitted to deliver lectures for an appropriate but unspecified length of time and were blocked for future promotion. Those professors who had been active members of the Party and had exploited their Party membership to their own advantage were dismissed with recognition of their claim to a pension.⁴¹⁰ These rules regulated in detail the fate of the senior staff, those professors whose age ranged between 60 and 80 years old, but said nothing about the junior staff. In short, the Americans assumed responsibility for deciding on the extent to which the views and so-called mental attitudes of university staff had been Nazified. Such a policy of evaluation was not dissimilar to that of the Soviet authorities who defined the philosophical credo of every professor.

In order to be newly reinstated, the dismissed members of the faculty had to fill out a detailed questionnaire (*Personalfragebogen für Hochschulbeamten*), and every department at every university sent a petition, together with a letter from an American University Officer, stating its agreement that the former professor should be reemployed. These documents were passed on to CIC agents who made the final decision. The questionnaire included questions about the dismissed person's past life, that of his or her family, and about his or her political views. In the petition, it was necessary to give evidence for the "scientific value of a re-employee," stating certain facts about the person's academic career and proving that he or she had been forced to join the Nazi Party. The following excerpt from a petition prepared on behalf of the theological department at University of Heidelberg demonstrates the style of the petition used in order to reemploy one member of the professoriate: "We are sorry to see him (*Professor Günter Moldaenke – N. T.*) rejected by the Military Government. The Faculty ask [sic] to plead for this young scholar, who has attended the chair of Ecclesiastical History. <...> he was forced in 1936 <...> to enter the Nazi party. But, wherever he was, he became feeling the prejudice and neglect [sic] generally shown in

⁴¹⁰ Ibid.

the party against theology.”⁴¹¹ However, despite this petition and a letter sent by an American officer at the University of Heidelberg, who indicated that the subject of ecclesiastical history demanded two instructors and that this professor had a good reputation as a scientist, the CIC agents stated that inasmuch as Günter Moldaenke had been an active member of the Nazi Party and had been sent to Estonia in 1936, where he helped the Party which was outlawed there and confined to underground activities, he could not be re-admitted to the University.⁴¹²

The program of reemployment lasted during the entire period of Occupation. On the whole about 30-40% of dismissed faculty members had returned to academic life by 1955. It is possible that some of the rejected persons were later able to be reinstated in the universities during the period of the 1960s through the 1970s; archival records do mention such cases but without providing any detail.

In addition, this program was accompanied by supervision of the academic and teaching activities of every reinstated professor, which implied checking the content of courses, as well as a policy of isolating deviant or disagreeable professors, along with the promotion of pliable members of the faculty. Every reemployed professor was put under the control of the American University Officer, who supervised the content of courses delivered by these professors. The procedure for this supervision of courses was as follows: the rectors of German universities submitted to the American University Officer a list of courses together with a brief description of their content and the names of the instructors; only after the officer gave his approval, were the proposed courses or lectures announced by the lecturers. The research and scholarly activities of the reinstated community of professors were placed under the control of the American officers. At the end of each semester, the universities reported on these activities to the officer.⁴¹³ Finally, right up until the end of 1955, the University Education Branch of the OMGUS kept a complete file on professors and officials, which dealt with their political

⁴¹¹ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁴¹² Ibid.

⁴¹³ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

activity under the Nazi regime and under the American Occupation.⁴¹⁴ This system was highly developed by the Military Administration in the most nationalistic Bavarian universities in Würzburg, Erlangen, and Munich, and was later used by the United States everywhere else.

As was the case in the Soviet Zone of Occupation, the American authorities tried to get rid of unreliable and disloyal professors who articulated anti-American views. Professor W. Wengler, a dean of the law faculty at the Free University, was dismissed “because of his hostile attitude at the time of the founding of the Free University, his derogatory remarks about the Free University to foreigners and press representatives, and his various alleged actions during the Nazi regime.”⁴¹⁵ In addition, the American authorities pointed out the professor’s association with Humboldt University, located in the Soviet Zone, and denounced it as a threat to the stability of the Free University. However, in the early 1970s, he was allowed to return to the Free University and became the head of the Free University’s Institute of International and Comparative Law.

The program of denazification implemented by the American Military Administration during the entire period of Occupation can be described in terms of the dismissal and reemployment of the university professoriate. The military authorities of the United States dismissed a high percentage of faculty members, which varied from forty to seventy percent of the teaching staff. Hence, the question arises as to how German universities were able to operate during the initial years of Occupation, if half or two-thirds of the teaching staff was discharged. The answer proves to be rather simple: these vacant positions were filled by professors who had been dismissed by the Nazis and by a limited number of academic personnel from the US and European countries invited by the Military Administration.⁴¹⁶ This replacement, called *the reconstruction of the teaching staff*, is illustrated by the following figures for University of Erlangen: “there were 112 teachers previous to the second denazification investigation in fall 1946; 29 of those were dismissed; 13 were later reinstated; 55 *new people* were added, and the total number as of today

⁴¹⁴ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Bavaria. Office of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-49. Box 57-63.

⁴¹⁵ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

⁴¹⁶ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

[1948] is 151,” that is, the number of the university academic staff was increased after denazification.⁴¹⁷ The “new people,” mentioned in this document, came from universities in the United States and Europe.

Drawing conclusions at this point, we can state that the American program of denazification proved to be much harsher than the Soviet one in terms of figures and formal procedure: the United States dismissed a higher percentage of the faculty members than the Soviet authorities did. In addition, the American authorities elaborated a more complex system for the reemployment of those dismissed than the Soviets did.

2. American interpretation of the way of thinking of the German professoriate

One of the most serious obstacles that American authorities encountered in the process of purging and in their initial transformation of German higher education was the fact that the philosophy of German university education and the way of thinking of the professoriate differed completely from the philosophy of American university education and the way of thinking of American professors.

American universities primarily regarded themselves as teaching sites where the democratic principles of teaching and cooperative work between a professor and students resulted in the formation of a citizen capable of involvement in public and political life. The situation in Germany was entirely different. In brief, in German universities the principle of the unity of research and teaching, along with a strong philosophical approach, resulted in forming scholarly oriented persons who positioned themselves far from public and political life. For the American experts, German universities, as compared to American universities, seemed to be institutions which were too removed from public life to be able to play, let alone implement, any social role.⁴¹⁸

More importantly, American experts perceived this stance on the part of the German professoriate as the primary reason behind the social apathy found in German universities. On the one hand, American experts evaluated the academic excellence of the German professoriate as being on a high level in terms of training of scientific personnel and agreed that German universities obtained outstanding results in terms of the

⁴¹⁷ Ibid.

⁴¹⁸ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

production of scholars. On the other hand, when assessing German universities in terms of American educational ideology, the experts indicated that German professors were less successful in preparing students for the responsibilities of informed and intelligent citizenship and in making instruction relevant to current political and social problems. The staff of the University Education Branch disliked the fact that German university people, with their traditional concept of “absolute truth,” considered the social responsibilities of higher education to be secondary. The American military authorities concluded that the professoriate assigned too important a role to philosophy and theoretical scholarship in their concept of university education. As a result, the courses delivered by German professors neglected those problems of significance to the society as a whole.

Evaluating the German professoriate in light of their own educational ideology, the American experts were intent on changing this mode of thinking of the university teaching staff. The program of general reform in universities should be accompanied, in the opinion of the experts, by a modification of worldview that included the teaching and research methods of the aristocratic German professoriate. This implied fostering a so-called new professor who would modify his university according to the American model.

3. The Making of a *New Professor*

A new type of professor implied that such a professor would esteem the American model of higher education and the American approach to research and teaching and, more importantly, would be ready to deliver lectures for newly introduced courses in the field of political science, American studies, general education, and other subjects. The government believed that professors engaged in giving lectures in these disciplines would have their value system transformed, which would in turn make them more loyal to the United States. But the most important question raised by the OMGUS was how to achieve these goals and how to encourage the German professoriate to deliver lectures in these new disciplines. The recommendations of two American scientists employed as temporary consultants by the University Education Branch, Sigmund Neumann and Franz Neumann, both of whom had fled the Nazis and had become leading specialists in the field of political science in the United States, served as the basis for the governmental policy of the United States vis-à-vis the German professoriate.

Sigmund Neumann was professor of political science at Wesleyan University in Connecticut. His book entitled "Permanent revolution: totalitarianism in the age of international civil war" had attracted the attention of Washington because of its propagandistic value stemming from its analysis of the ideology of totalitarian regimes such as that of the German Nazis and Soviet Communists. Franz Neumann, same surname but no relation, was a political scientist at Columbia University in New York. He was a member of the Frankfurt School, an émigré community in the United States, and he was best known for his analysis of fascism. During the war, Franz Neumann was recruited by the US Army, and he became a prominent political expert in the Office of Strategic Services responsible for elaborating on covert and overt American policies abroad. Both these prominent men were known to the American political establishment. Both were invited by the Department of State to propose reforms for the German universities in the American Zone during the period 1948 through 1950. Their ideas and the plans they proposed were carried out by the Occupation authorities, and today these two men are considered to be the founding fathers of political science in West Germany.

Sigmund Neumann, who came to Germany in 1948, proposed an entirely new way to have an affect on the German university teaching staff. He stated that, in as much as the German professoriate could not learn American methods of cognition by themselves, a designated number of American and European visiting professors should teach these methods within the framework of the new universities and institutes established by the US government in Germany. Moreover, in these new universities and institutes, American and European scientists should regulate the training process and foster a new generation of young German scientists. Neumann ironically noted that, since German university teachers held reactionary attitudes, they would not be able to follow the new influences coming from sociological interpretation which were prevalent among American political scientists. Close observation of the work of and personal contacts with German professors convinced this former German scientist that a change in basic attitudes could not realistically be expected in the near future. He claimed that "for this reason, a much needed reform of the teaching and training in political science will not derive from this traditional center of exclusively statistic

[sic] thinking.”⁴¹⁹ Professor Neumann emphasized that German universities placed an emphasis on a nationalistic and parochial view of the world at large.

Accordingly, the only thing to do was to establish new higher education institutions in the area of political science in cities such as Heidelberg, Munich, and West Berlin, and provide them with a group of American specialists and educators who would establish a new curriculum and develop new topics for further research activities in order to prepare new generations of German scholars.

Neumann positively evaluated only one university that, in his opinion, could become the center of the development of political science in Germany. This was the University of Heidelberg, which actually was an exception among the others because of its interest in the development of this area of study. Hence, Neumann suggested developing a department of political science within this university, with permanent staffing by American visiting professors as heads of such a department. Later, as Neumann recommended, a systematic exchange program for “progressive” German professors would assure the development of these new institutes.⁴²⁰

After two years, Franz Neumann, Sigmund Neumann’s colleague, went to Germany to evaluate how political science was developing. He proposed the development of this field of study within all existing German universities, emphasizing the Free University created in 1948 as a model institution for such an introduction: “Political science must be introduced as an overt subject in German universities and taught by reliable university professors. The best place is the Free University of Berlin. Once political science is established there, other universities will unquestionably follow. Until political science is a recognized subject in German universities, the teaching of political science by American visiting professors will be of little use.”⁴²¹

Although the evaluations and recommendations of American experts differed to some extent, they converged in one thought that was to become a unique motto for American policy towards the German university professoriate: “New Subjects, New Methods, and New

⁴¹⁹ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134 and NARA. Record Group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449.

⁴²⁰ Ibid.

⁴²¹ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

Blood.”⁴²² This slogan implied filling the universities with new scholars and lecturers who could bring new disciplines, new methods of teaching and research, and thereby would change the so-called old conservative professoriate who opposed American modifications.

Washington carefully considered the opinion of these American experts. Having analyzed their recommendations, the officials of the Department of State authorized the following plan to address the German professoriate: i) send brilliant American and European specialists on an assignment to establish and give an impetus to developing a partnership with German teaching staff, and ii) train in the United States those young German university instructors who had completed their PhD theses or demonstrated definite interest in a lifetime career as lecturers and professors of political science.⁴²³

However, as far as these recommendations and plans were concerned, no judgments and opinions stemming from German professors themselves which might be taken into consideration by American politicians were included. Reasoning from the documents we have analyzed, we are inclined to believe that the American experts and the Occupation authorities did not consult with the teaching staff before compiling this and other programs of transformation for German universities. There are no notes of conversations or any documents about any such dialogue between German university people and the American Occupation authorities. American experts and military officers, in contrast to the Soviet ones, did not arrange private conversations with members of the teaching staff to discuss future transformations. On the contrary, American experts believed that the old professoriate would follow the new ideology, methods, theories, and knowledge, if they were “surrounded” by new professors from the United States and Europe, who would bring about new ways of study and scholarship. The Soviet experts, as we will see later, would act differently: They urged German university professors to revise the content of their lectures by means of private conversations and through persuasion accompanied by serious material support and indoctrination, but without introducing Soviet specialists into German institutions.

⁴²² NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁴²³ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7; NARA. Record Group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449.

American and European visiting professors in German universities

One of the most underestimated and untouched questions in the literature is the question of those American professors who came to occupied Germany in order to implement reforms and establish mutual understanding between two academic worlds – the American and the German professoriate. Documents found in the manuscript collection at the University of Arkansas give us an opportunity to shed light on this question and to show the role these visiting professors, often called the “consultants” in American documents, played. These professors transformed German universities on a day-by-day basis, and it was they who are depicted in these documents as constituting the primary mechanism for the implementation of reforms and for the establishment of grass-roots contacts with German colleagues. Yet, information on their activities, problems, and achievements, as well as information on their biographies, is quite scarce in the archives.

In contrast to the Soviet administration in Germany which raised a generation of “new professors” through short-term training as part of post-graduate studies, American experts acted differently: They flooded German universities with European and American lecturers and scientists. American experts supposed that direct contact between German university instructors and highly qualified American personnel would bring about all the necessary reforms.

In 1948, after the purge, a first contingent of ninety visiting professors from the United States, Switzerland, and the Netherlands filled these vacant positions. Later, 100-175 specialists from American and European universities were sent annually to German higher education establishments by Washington. The official purpose of this program was the implementation of the foreign policy objectives of the Department of State and of the American Military Administration in Germany by bringing highly ranked American professors into direct contact with the German people.⁴²⁴ The more detailed intentions of this program are fairly well described in the following: “Visiting professors, as it has long been demonstrated by the large number that the United States has sent to Latin America, can be very helpful. The best contribution of such persons is by their example, and they can be helpful by bringing fresh point of view

⁴²⁴ University of Arkansas Libraries. Special Collections. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection. Manuscript Collection 468. Box 240. Folder 25. EDX 19-2 Review of US Professors Program in Germany, 1953-1954; Box 239. Germany. Folder 10. EDX 2 Reports. Exchanges with Germany, 1949-1955.

[sic], new subject-matter, new methods, and expert advice. Visiting professors should be brought to facilitate the development of new fields and new methods. Their effectiveness will in large part depend upon how long they stay over here; one-semester assignments may not accomplish much. A few examples of fields in which American visiting professors might be valuable are: social science, general science, education and educational research, political science, American history, international relations, and cultural history.”⁴²⁵

The Department of State was responsible for finding an appropriate professor from an American or European university.⁴²⁶ American professors with specialized knowledge in various fields of activity such as law, labor, religious affairs, education, community activities, governmental institutions, public welfare, and information services had a priority in the selection procedure.⁴²⁷ They had to know German, and hence most of them were selected from the immigrant community.⁴²⁸ All the American professors came to Washington for ten days for consultation and briefing prior to their departure for Germany and immediately upon their return from Germany. They had an orientation course called “Introduction to Germany” which interpreted American foreign policy objectives in Germany. After recruitment, these specialists obtained the status of a visiting specialist, a consultant, and a temporary employee of the military government. They were also provided with a special mission at a German university and a salary. After completion of a project, they submitted a final report about their activities in Germany to the Department of State and spent one to two days in Washington being debriefed.⁴²⁹

⁴²⁵ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁴²⁶ University of Arkansas Libraries. Special Collections. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection. Manuscript Collection 468. Box 240. Folder 25. EDX 19-2 Review of US Professors Program in Germany, 1953-1954.

⁴²⁷ Ibid.

⁴²⁸ University of Arkansas Libraries. Special Collections. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection. Manuscript Collection 468. Box 239. Germany. Folder 10. EDX 2 Reports. Exchanges with Germany, 1949-1955.

⁴²⁹ University of Arkansas Libraries. Special Collections. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection. Manuscript Collection 468. Box 240. Folder 25. EDX 19-2 Review of US Professors Program in Germany, 1953-1954; Box 239. Germany. Folder 10. EDX 2 Reports. Exchanges with Germany, 1949-1955; NARA. Record Group 260. OMGUS. Records of the Educational and Cultural Relations Division. Visiting Consultants Program. Box 211.

If we look through the available biographies and academic achievements of those specialists who arrived in Germany from the United States as visiting specialists or professors, it is notable that the majority of them belonged to the community of German scientists who had moved to the United States during the 1930s. Almost all of them were specialists in the fields of political science, pedagogy, and social studies. At the desire of the Department of State, they remained in Germany for several months. However, many of them remained there for longer periods of time, for instance, one political scientist, Dietrich Gerhard, who was sent by the US Government to the Münster and Köln Universities to set up a department of political science, and who then remained in Germany to assume the position of president of the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Amerika Studien* established by the United States. He later became the director of the Modern History Department at the *Max-Planck-Institut für Geschichte* in Göttingen, which was also established by the American government.⁴³⁰ To provide an impetus among German professors for the development of new branches of science such as political science or American studies, the American government found outstanding political scientists in the United States whose efforts brought about a birth of political science throughout Germany. Arnold Brecht, a political scientist of the highest standard of scholarly inquiry who taught at the famous New School for Social Research in New York, Quincy Wright, a professor of International Law at the University of Chicago, Charles Aikin, dean of the Department of Political Science at the University of California, Berkeley, and at one point an assistant to Dean Acheson, the former Secretary of State,⁴³¹ along with many other famous scientists, were invited by the Department of State to implant new ideas into the German professoriate.⁴³² They were responsible for the

⁴³⁰ University of Arkansas Libraries. Special Collections. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection. Manuscript Collection 468. Box 141. Folder 7. EDX 22-2. US Specialists in Germany, 1950.

⁴³¹ Ibid.

⁴³² The list of prominent American professors who contributed to American policy in Germany is extremely long. However, we cannot fail to mention such persons as Dr. Gunnar Dybwad, a lecturer in the Sociology Department at the University of Michigan who was sent to develop studies on children in newly established research institutes at the universities; Dr. Elizabeth Fackl from the University of Denver who developed women's studies; Dr. Dorr, the chairman of the Department of Political Science, University of Michigan, who consulted with American authorities concerning the field of administration; Dr. Dietrich Gerhard, a German émigré and a professor in the Department of History at Washington University in Missouri, who developed American Studies in

preparation of outlines for courses of study, for compiling subject book lists, and for demonstrating to German professors American methods of teaching in small groups. Moreover, they were responsible for reorganizing academic programs; imposing social studies, political science, general education, and American studies in the curriculum; and establishing new structures in the universities such as departments, department chairs, and institutes. They also wrote new textbooks, shaped the holdings of libraries, transformed German methods of teaching in universities, and communicated with professors on a day-by-day basis over several years.⁴³³

In contrast to the Soviet Union whose initial reforms were implemented at the hands of military officers alone without sending professors from the universities, the reforms carried out by the United States were in the hands of academic circles. In implementing the reforms, these visiting professors were likely to be far from the higher realms of politics, but they turned out to have successfully implemented the political tasks assigned by politicians.

Moreover, to help the American specialists, representatives of European academic circles were sent to Germany through the channels of the Department of State. The American government considered that the use of European specialists would be an advantage in deeply transforming the German university education, because these Europeans were well acquainted with Germany's history and traditions, and they had a practical knowledge of German political, economic, social, and cultural life. In addition, their employment was more economical because of savings in travel and time.⁴³⁴ European specialists such as these were also selected by the Department of State. The Europeans, just as their American colleagues, became temporary employees of the American Occupation authorities and received their orders as well as their salaries

several German universities; Dr. James O. Murdock, professor of International and Comparative Law at George Washington Law School, Washington, DC, who was responsible for a revision of the curriculum in the area of law studies; Dr. Charles Robson, head of the Department of Political Science at the University of North Carolina, who was sent to participate in projects concerning university administration and so on. See: University of Arkansas Libraries. Special Collections. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection. Manuscript Collection 468. Box 141. Folder 7. EDX 22-2. US Specialists in Germany, 1950.

⁴³³ NARA. Record Group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449.

⁴³⁴ NARA. Record Group 260. OMGUS. Records of the Educational and Cultural Relations Division. Visiting Consultants Program. Box 211.

(\$35 per day⁴³⁵) from the American authorities in Berlin.⁴³⁶ About fifty European visiting professors were sent every six months to six German universities located in Württemberg-Baden, Hessen, and Bavaria.⁴³⁷

Among the European specialists, professors from Switzerland, England, France, and Sweden were welcomed by the American government.⁴³⁸ The Department of State and the Military Administration in Berlin primarily selected the candidates for work in Germany. However, many European scholars volunteered to work in German universities, to give lectures, and to revise curricula by sending their requests directly to the Department of State. Dutch university professors especially stood out against the background of other European specialists. In 1948, nine professors from various Dutch universities asked the American government to include them among the teaching staff in German universities for six months. G. Van der Leeuw was the first Dutch lecturer to cross the border. He was a professor at Groningen University, a specialist in church history, and a former Minister of Education. His activity in Germany was reported to have influenced the development of phenomenology at the University of Heidelberg.⁴³⁹

According to the documents, Switzerland also proved to contribute greatly to American reforms in German universities. This country was the main participant in the European consultant program, and its emphasis was on the development of governmental studies and teacher education at

⁴³⁵ This sum of money was less than that paid to American specialists. American visiting specialists received \$50 per day. However, the final amount for daily allowances depended on the service to be performed, the qualification of a consultant, and the salary scale for this type of service in the consultant's country. As usual, the average monthly salary was \$600-700. See: Special Collections, University of Arkansas Libraries. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection. Manuscript Collection 468. Box 240. Folder 25. EDX 19-2 Review of US Professors Program in Germany, 1953-1954; NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁴³⁶ NARA. Record Group 260. OMGUS. Records of the Educational and Cultural Relations Division. Visiting Consultants Program. Box 211.

⁴³⁷ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁴³⁸ University of Arkansas Libraries. Special Collections. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection. Manuscript Collection 468. Box 239. Germany. Folder 18. [1949-1962].

⁴³⁹ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

higher educational institutions. The Swiss specialists preferred to give lectures concerning governmental decentralization and to participate in instilling new ideas and techniques of research in German professors. A new German pedagogy developed by Americans was also introduced under the aegis of Swiss scholars. The Swiss professor Heinrich Jakobi assisted German experts in teacher education in liberalizing teacher training and in-service training. The Swiss professor Karl Guenther brought information concerning the most modern practices in teacher education in Switzerland to the pedagogical departments of universities in Hessen and Bavaria, and evaluated teacher training programs in German universities on assignment from the American authorities. The history professor Karl Schib, who had extensive experience in working with teacher education groups, introduced university summer courses for Germans in order to discuss certain trends in European teacher education.⁴⁴⁰

The most urgent and at the same time the most difficult task for the US government was to convince the university authorities and German professors to modify their topics of research and the philosophical basis of their lectures, along with revising curriculum. For three to nine months, the visiting specialists mainly worked with the university authorities and committees who managed the curriculum and staff. Through everyday contacts with rectors, with members of the Senate and university committees, these visiting professors proposed their recommendations for improvement of the curriculum in the fields of social studies and political science.⁴⁴¹ The documents cover several cases of how American visiting professors convinced the Germans to introduce something new at their universities. To convince the Germans to introduce, for example, general education courses, visiting professors during the period of the 1950s through the early 1960s arranged a number of conferences relevant to this problem. The American authorities and visiting professors insisted that every German university professor should deliver at least one course in which “the social pertinence of its field was taught during the whole semester.”⁴⁴² This meant that every professor had

⁴⁴⁰ NARA Record Group 260. OMGUS. Records of the Educational and Cultural Relations Division. Visiting Consultants Program. Box 211.

⁴⁴¹ University of Arkansas Libraries. Special Collections. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection. Manuscript Collection 468. Box 239. Germany. Folder 18. [1949-1962].

⁴⁴² NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-

to deliver a course applicable to the building of a new Germany. The courses in the field of general education were the most appropriate ones.

To help German professors understand what general education was, the American experts established Education Service Centers at all the universities; these offered training courses, books, and other materials necessary for the faculty members.⁴⁴³ Franz Neumann, mentioned above, left some notes about the introduction of general education at the Free University: "Quite surprisingly we succeeded in convincing the Curriculum Committee that a general education course is indispensable in order to raise the intellectual level of students. The course will be given as a cooperative course of all faculties. It will be prepared after the American model, its teaching material will mimeographed and the members of the various faculties will jointly give the course. The major American universities (Columbia, Harvard, Yale, Chicago) sent to the Free University the text and source books on such courses as contemporary civilization, humanities, etc."⁴⁴⁴ From these quoted notes, we can state that the American reforms were carried out through grass-roots contacts between American and German universities, and not between the military and professors as was the Soviet case. This day-by-day and year-in-year-out communication allowed the United States to counter the strong sense of indignation on the part of the German university professoriate who had been so provoked by denazification and by the policy of reemployment.

The American government believed that the introduction of American teaching methods and the imposition of American textbooks in the universities would convert a segment of the German professoriate to the American model of university education along with American methods of research. American visiting professors were therefore asked to present new methods of teaching and to fill the libraries with new monographs, textbooks, and other literature. The documents mention that visiting professors disseminated the idea of the introduction of smaller classes instead of lectures as a new method for teaching in German universities, but that this approach only took root in the Free University during this period.

134; NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁴⁴³ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

⁴⁴⁴ NARA. Record Group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449.

The holdings of German university libraries were also under the special control of visiting professors. The German professoriate had no right to order books, journals, and other literature for themselves and for the libraries until the early 1950s. The visiting professors were assigned the task of assembling new holdings in every university library by compiling lists of books in the fields of political science, social science, and American studies, to be ordered in the United States. In addition, they had to withdraw books from circulation that positively treated such opposing ideologies as Marxism and communism.⁴⁴⁵ Moreover, all new textbooks in the area of political science, considered inherent to American values, were prepared by American scholars.⁴⁴⁶

The establishment of new chairs and institutes at German universities also involved the work of American visiting specialists. The Department of State invited American specialists to take up positions as heads of chairs at universities or independent research institutes for a period of from three to five years. The main responsibility of these specialists was to develop new chairs and institutes, introduce new fields of research, and establish a new community of German scholars. They tried to root the new areas of research and study such as American politics, government, history, and civilization as a whole by attracting younger German teaching staff and former students to become involved in these new fields of academic work. The life of these research establishments was maintained for an extended period of time by the Americans themselves and, where the number of American scholars was sizeable and higher than that of German professors, these institutes and chairs succeeded in being developed according to American governmental expectations. For example, at the Free University, only 30 professors out of 350 were German due to the employment of American and European specialists in the mid-1950s.⁴⁴⁷ These American professors were free to develop and maintain academic life in the new research institutions such as the East European Institute, the Otto Suhr Institute, and other new institutes at the University, according to American expectations.

In a report by the American military authorities for 1948, there is a list of the projects accomplished by American visiting professors. The

⁴⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁴⁶ Franz Neumann wrote a four-volume work on civil liberties and published these books at the Free University. // NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

⁴⁴⁷ NARA. Record Group 59. Records of the Plans and Development Staff, Evaluation Branch, 1955-1960. Box 44.

report says that American professors 1) established the Institute of American Studies at the University of Munich; 2) developed and improved the training of school teachers at the Pedagogical Institutes in Hessen and Bavaria through the introduction of social science, educational psychology, and the system of workshops; 3) delivered lectures in the field of philosophy at University of Marburg and delivered lectures in the field of sociology at University of Frankfurt and at universities located in Bremen and Württemberg-Baden, and delivered lectures on social ethics at the Free University; and 4) conducted seminars in intergroup relations in several German universities, etc.⁴⁴⁸ So the work accomplished by American and European visiting professors would appear to have been quite comprehensive.

However, these reports provide no information as to how the German professoriate reacted to this activity on the part of the Occupation authorities nor information about any contacts between American and German professors. The one question which cannot be answered therefore is the question of how American and European visiting specialists arranged and maintained contacts with the German professoriate who survived the Hitler purges, wartime bombings, and American denazification. The governmental reports only mention that the American and European visiting professors prepared their own independent reports about such contacts and sent them directly to Washington. Undoubtedly such reports would reveal a reaction and a response by the German professoriate and could therefore contribute to a more balanced evaluation of the final results of American policy. In as much as we have not located these reports, we have to operate on the basis of the statements about the success of the Visiting Professors Program prepared by the American authorities for Washington consumption.

The junior university teaching staff in the United States

The policy aimed at training the German faculty in American universities and political establishments became an alternative way to foster more loyal professors who would go on to teach and conduct research in the fields of political science and American studies. As with the projects of visiting specialists, the training of these German university

⁴⁴⁸ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

personnel was mainly aimed at reforming the university academic programs. While visiting specialists removed traditional courses in philosophy, theology, classics, etc., from university academic programs and replaced them with the new disciplines of American studies, political science, and general education, the program of training German teaching staff fostered new lecturers capable of teaching these new disciplines and enriching the universities with new knowledge obtained in the United States.

The transformation of the curriculum and the introduction of new disciplines were undertaken by the American authorities in an original American manner: The United States did not coerce the teaching staff to deliver new courses as the Soviets did, but created a *new intellectual leadership* that consisted of pliable lecturers who demonstrated their desire to develop new branches of the sciences, to set up new courses, to guide other academicians and, generally speaking, to give impetus to their careers in this new political situation.⁴⁴⁹ This is a very important difference from the policy of Soviet politicians, who assumed that what was needed was to oblige every German professor to deliver courses in the field of, for example, “Scientific Communism.”

In so far as a segment of the older professors demonstrated their apathy in this regard, the main target of this policy became the younger generation of German teaching staff. The emphasis on the younger generation was also determined by the theory that “there is a difference between the attitudes of the older and young university teachers, the latter being much more ready to recognize the need for changes. The latter need to be assisted by outside resources, or it will inevitably imitate their elders. The prestige, seniority, and fellowship of the older men is bound in time to influence the younger to the same points of view. The most hopeful solution is for as many as possible of the younger teachers to be sent abroad in the environments of universities such as ours. This is furthermore the best hope for providing successful programs of Social Sciences and of General Education in the German university curricula.”⁴⁵⁰

⁴⁴⁹ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁴⁵⁰ Ibid.

In 1949, “The General Project for the Interchange [sic] of University Instructors”⁴⁵¹ was officially initiated by the Department of State. This program provided for short-term visits by the junior faculty staff of German universities to American universities and to institutions of the American government. The program was clearly designed to achieve tasks such as conveying to German university instructors information concerning the results of recent developments in the social sciences, political sciences, and American studies, as well as in American teaching methods in higher educational establishments, along with encouraging German university instructors to investigate and teach a range of disciplines in these three areas back in Germany.

During their visits to American universities, young German lecturers observed the teaching methods and became generally familiar with course work, with a special emphasis placed on political science. Each German participant spent the first six to eight weeks at a leading American university. The participants then traveled to various points in the United States where they could observe American life first-hand and meet their professional colleagues, both within and outside the university.⁴⁵² Furthermore, they were able to observe certain practical ways in which the disciplines of political science and public administration affected local, state, and federal government policy.⁴⁵³

Hundreds of young assistant professors, lecturers, associate professors, and PhD students passed through this program annually. The scope and intensity of the program positioned West Germany in first place among other European states as to the number of young university teaching staff who had participated in similar American programs. The effectiveness of the program was high. As a rule, upon their return, most participants introduced new courses in political science, with the number of these new courses varying from one to seven.⁴⁵⁴ The young German lecturers’ stay at American universities influenced their methods of

⁴⁵¹ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁴⁵² NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134. NARA. Record Group 12. Records of Office of Education. Records of Special Projects and Programs. Case Files of the Foreign Leader Program, 1950-1954. Box 2.

⁴⁵³ NARA. Record Group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

⁴⁵⁴ NARA. Record Group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural Affairs. Lot 98D 252. Box 169-172, 205-206.

teaching. According to the documents, most of the participants introduced the system of small group discussions instead of lectures, developed closer student-professor relationships, and a tutorial system.⁴⁵⁵ In addition, the US government contributed to the promotion of the careers of these former participants. Some of the former grantees became deans of new departments and presidents of new institutes during the period of the 1960s through the 1970s.

4. Opposition from conservative professors and the American response

In their analysis of the situation in German universities, American military officers and visiting professors often informed Washington that a segment of the professoriate would never agree to the imposed reforms. This segment was not made up of former Nazis or communists; they were simply traditional German professors who believed that the coming reforms would undermine the elite status of German university education.

This segment of the professoriate was called the *Old Professors* and was viewed by the Military Administration as a reactionary or conservative force. The experts at the University Education Branch, when describing university professors, noted the following conservative characteristics: "They are generally quite old and quite tradition-minded. The professoriate is overweighed with persons devoted to humanistic studies and not very sensitive to modern problems. They realize little how far back the German higher institutions [sic] have slipped and know little about higher education in America. The older professors are in general those most resistant to change, most wedded to the old curricula, most attached to traditional methods of teaching, least cognizant of training students for effective citizenship, least aware of the social responsibilities of higher education, and least democratic in general."⁴⁵⁶ Another document states: "German universities are now composed largely of men and women of advanced age who [sic] by the very nature of things lack the initiative and energy to rebuild the universities and adapt them more

⁴⁵⁵ NARA. Record Group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. Germany. Internal and Foreign Affairs 1950-1954. Microfilm. Reel 24.

⁴⁵⁶ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

closely to the needs of present day life [sic] in Germany.”⁴⁵⁷ Their close work and personal contacts with German professors convinced American visiting professors that a change in basic attitudes could not realistically be expected in the near future.⁴⁵⁸ While formally proclaiming their acquiescence to the American reforms to the curriculum, the professoriate in actuality neglected to offer lectures in political science and American studies. The American experts were therefore compelled to develop these new disciplines outside of the traditional German faculties by establishing independent institutes. The setting up of independent institutes at the universities, where new disciplines were imposed by the visiting professors and delivered by the junior staff, was a more or less effective means of countering the opposition. The old professoriate remained in its position within the traditional departments of the universities but was surrounded by numerous visiting professors.

The available documents, however, do bear witness to the fact that the work accomplished by American and European specialists was certainly positive, albeit controversial. On the one hand, they were more or less able to implement the reforms planned by the American government, even while, on the other hand, some difficulties in communication between the visiting professors and the German old professoriate concerning the proposed reforms, such as the revision of curriculum and the introduction of new disciplines, were noted in the documents. First of all, most of the American visiting professors were German émigrés and they therefore encountered a certain disregard on the part of those Germans who had lived and survived first under the Nazi regime and then under American denazification. This situation created an obstacle to the introduction of the reforms. The old professoriate rejected the proposals made by these former Germans; for example, the project concerning the introduction of political science that was elaborated and proposed by Professor Neumann, a former German scholar, was disliked and thus was only developed slowly. A visible reluctance on the part of the conservative German professoriate to modify the traditional German university system and to change their topics of research and lectures contributed to mixed results for the reforms instigated by the US

⁴⁵⁷ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation. High Commissioner for Germany. Office of OMGUS, Hessen. Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1947-48. Box 702.

⁴⁵⁸ NARA. Record Group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134 and NARA. Record Group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449.

Government, even after five years of the Visiting Professor Program had ensued. Second, the documents mention the fact that not all the visiting professors selected by the government turned out to be ready to implement political tasks and military orders. Some visiting professors seemed more interested in doing their own research and gathering materials about Germany than in carrying out the reforms in the universities.

Hence, in so far as the reforms were actually carried out, the modification of the universities according to the American model proceeded slowly. This was a major problem in the eyes of Washington. The opposition of the German old professoriate persuaded Washington to pay more attention instead to the junior teaching staff and to develop an effective program to create a new professor out of this younger generation.

II. Soviet policy towards the German university professoriate

As we mentioned earlier, the military authorities of the Soviet Zone took control of eighteen higher educational establishments, six of which were universities. These six universities numbered in 1945 more than 2,000 full professors, along with associate professors called Dozenten, and lecturers. The documentary sources for Soviet policy towards these German members of the faculty are more extensive than those for American policy in this area. To the extent that Soviet experts, educationalists, military officers, and diplomats who stayed on in Germany sent numerous and detailed reports to Moscow concerning the behavior of German professors, and their interrelations with the Soviet authorities and German communists, these archives hold a generous number of documents dealing with the relationship between the Soviet Military Administration and German professors and are quite sufficient for our purposes. These archival documents will allow us to represent and discuss the following components of Soviet policy towards the German university faculty: i) Soviet interpretations of the philosophical views, methods of teaching, and political positions articulated by the German professoriate; ii) the purge of the university teaching staff; iii) the making of a *New Professor*, and iv) opposition from the professoriate and the Soviet response to it.

1. Soviet evaluations of the philosophical views, methods of teaching, and political positions of the German professoriate

While the American authorities purged the German professoriate at once, right at the beginning of the Occupation, the Soviet Military Administration was in no hurry to dismiss and reemploy professors from the universities. Once they had occupied the German universities, the Soviet authorities began instead to establish initial contacts with the professoriate by focusing attention on the personality of every professor who remained, on his or her political and even philosophical views, and on these professors' attitudes towards the new political regime as well.

The Education Division of the SMAD believed that understanding the three pillars of the life and academic activity of the professoriate, that is, their methods of teaching, philosophical views, and political position, was the key to their policy of creating new and pliable professors and thus to the final success of Soviet reforms. Establishing contacts with the professoriate and winning over their minds were considered the primary ways of carrying out reforms without bloodshed. In their initial communication with this academic corporation, the Soviets embarked on their policy by learning about the German professoriate *per se*. Monitoring the positions, views, and mood of the German university professoriate was the means the Soviets would use to understand them and to establish friendly and cooperative relations with them. The Soviet interpretation of the professors' philosophical positions, values, and thoughts about the communist regime therefore constituted a very important part of Soviet policy. In contrast to the Americans, who considered the opinions, views, and mood of the professoriate as not that paramount, the Soviet reformers based their initial reforms upon private conversations with the German intelligentsia aimed at persuasion.

In as much as the Soviet military officers who conducted these initial evaluations had been members of faculty in Soviet universities before the Second World War, they were primarily interested in the academic activities of the German professoriate rather in German methods of teaching and the philosophy of the German academic system. When they did take stock of the methods of teaching, the Soviets were astonished by the absence of syllabi and by the rules of free attendance which existed in German universities. In one of the Education Division's documents the following observation was made: "A specific feature of German higher education was the absence of a list of disciplines essential for students to obtain knowledge within a specialty; there was no indication of the number of lecture hours devoted to a definite course, and there was no

system of a sequence of disciplines [*in a curriculum – N. T.*]. Students were free as to their attendance at the universities, and the first examination was arranged only after two years of studies. Students did not possess sufficient knowledge for practical activity.”⁴⁵⁹ Hence, Soviet experts, just as American ones, also emphasized the lack of professional and practical knowledge. However, in contrast to the Americans, the Soviets were more surprised by the absence of a formal academic plan, which meant a university curriculum, and by the absence of a formal plan of lecture courses, which meant a syllabus: “As to our traditional [Soviet] understanding, there have never been curricula and syllabi in German institutions of higher education. Professors and lecturers frequently announced the courses that would attract the greatest number of students in order to earn higher honoraria. Curricula were compiled exclusively at the professors’ discretion.”⁴⁶⁰ Such an approach to teaching – the German teaching methods entailing the absence of a curriculum and syllabus, and the lack of professional knowledge – was considered in need of revision.

However, it was the views of the professoriate which bothered the propagandists of the Soviet military administration far more. The Soviets were interested in understanding the philosophical and political basis of the disciplines taught by the professoriate. To clarify what their philosophical and political views were, the Soviets disseminated a special questionnaire among the professors. All professors who delivered lectures in the departments of philosophy, theology, classics, and other departments of the arts received the order from the Soviet authorities to complete and return this detailed questionnaire and, moreover, to write a report entitled “My worldview.” The questionnaire was elaborated by those Soviet military officers who had specialized in philosophy before the Second World War. By encouraging the professoriate to prepare this report, the Soviet officers were trying to clarify what the philosophical credo and political thinking of every professor in the Zone was. However, most of the professors were opposed to this, and the results of the “poll” of those professors who did agree to fill in the questionnaire demonstrated to the Soviets that almost all the professors stood for the position known as *idealism*. This was the term used to designate any philosophical currents considered as un-Marxist thought by Soviet

⁴⁵⁹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 1: 110.

⁴⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 112.

officers.⁴⁶¹ The Soviets were dissatisfied with the results, because to shift professors away from the stance of idealism and to the stance of Marxism was considered to be more difficult than shifting them from National Socialism to communism.

Along with this came the monitoring of attitudes towards the new political regime and the Soviet Occupation itself among university professors. The results of this assessment were also deplorable as far as the Soviets were concerned. Strongly suspicious attitudes on the part of the German intelligentsia towards the Soviet regime became a sad fact of life for the Soviets: “The typical mood of a substantial part of the German intelligentsia appears to be aloof, suspicious, expectant and skeptical with respect to everything new as well as negative in relation to the Occupation authority. For professors, it is difficult to free themselves from the well-known prejudices with respect to the cultural and political values of Russia. Even leftists share visceral prejudices against Russians, particularly Russian soldiers.”⁴⁶² Elsewhere one reads: “The collapse of Nazism, the actual division of Germany, and obviously the prolonged period of Occupation are causes for a state of deep depression among substantial segments of the intelligentsia.”⁴⁶³ This suspicious and negative attitude towards the Soviet regime would remain the main feature of the political position of German university faculty, as noted by Soviet diplomats and educators who lived and worked in East Germany, during the entire period of the Cold War.

Once they had equipped themselves with a certain knowledge of the political and philosophical views of German professors, along with their teaching methods and their attitudes towards the new regime, the Education Division began a policy of denazification of the university teaching staff, called “the purge” in Soviet documents.

2. Purge of the professoriate

With the monitoring phase behind them, the next step to be undertaken by Soviet officers in dealing with German professors was denazification as the Potsdam Agreement demanded. The purge in the universities had specific Soviet features in keeping with the different

⁴⁶¹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 3: 121.

⁴⁶² State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7133. Inventory 1. File 273: 305.

⁴⁶³ Archive of Foreign Policy of Russian Federation. Record Group 0457 b. Inventory 6. File 25: 83.

name used. Screening of the university teaching staff was begun in May 1945, and ended in September 1946. Soviet denazification was of a superficial nature in comparison to the American policy of cleansing that lasted several years. We assume that this unique Soviet approach to denazification was determined by the fact that far too many professors had left the Soviet Zone during the first year of the Occupation: out of more than 2,000 members of the university faculty that comprised the universities in 1945, only about 800 members remained in 1946 (*Table 1*). In order to preserve the remaining part of the professoriate, the Soviets softened the terms of denazification.

Table 1
*Number of Teaching Staff in the Universities of the Soviet Zone, 1945/1946*⁴⁶⁴

University	Professors				Associate Professors and Lecturers			
	1945	fled the Zone		1946	1945	fled the Zone		1946
		Nazi	non-Nazi			Nazi	non-Nazi	
Berlin	583	150	325	108	404	90	252	62
Leipzig	224	58	107	54	103	38	50	15
Jena	133	34	58	41	86	13	40	33
Halle	144	78	14	52	85	60	10	15
Greifswald	80	17	29	34	34	9	1	24
Rostock	96	19	42	35	69	20	39	10
Total	1,260	359	575	324	781	230	392	159

According to the table 324 professors out of 1,260 remained in six universities by the winter of 1946, and 159 members out of the junior staff of 781 remained in the Soviet Zone. As follows from this table, the Soviet Occupation authorities accredited the remainder of the German professoriate.

The Soviets, in contrast to the Americans, did not elaborate a complex and detailed system for denazification and selection of non-

⁴⁶⁴ Nikitin, *Deyatel'nost' Sovetskoy Voennoy Administratsii (The Activity of the Soviet Military Administration)*, 214.

Nazis. Individual interviews were the means used for cleansing. As a result, the Soviet authorities preserved the number of staff necessary for renewal of an interrupted academic life. Nominal members of the Nazi Party continued working in universities. A rigid policy was adopted only in respect to German professors and lecturers of history. Almost all of them were discharged. On the whole, however, the percentage of former members of the Nazi Party, who were allowed to remain in the universities by the Soviets, varied from 36% to 47.9%.⁴⁶⁵ Pjotr Nikitin, the Chief of the Higher Education Division, mentions in his memoirs that all the professors purged earlier were reinstated in their previous positions during the period of 1946 through 1949.⁴⁶⁶

According to the Soviet final evaluation of the implementation of denazification, “611 representatives of German higher educational institutions were purged under the terms of denazification. However, 650 new teachers for the universities were trained by the Soviet authorities up to and including 1948, so that the average number of lecturers in eighteen institutions varied from 1,303 to 1,380 persons, which was 57% of the number of lecturers in 1940.”⁴⁶⁷

3. The Making of a New Professor

After carrying out the in-depth evaluation of the professoriate and the superficial purge, the next step was the policy of the making of a new professor. This policy was called the molding of a new worldview (perceptions and attitudes) among the “shilly-shally” German university teaching staff implied the fostering and the reproduction of political allegiance on the part of the professoriate. Moreover, this policy was aimed at making the professoriate not only formally acknowledge Soviet ideology, but believe deeply and sincerely in it and, hence, deliver lectures from a Soviet materialist point of view.

This new type of faculty member implied a lecturer, *Dozent*, or professor who was consistent with the unified syllabi when delivering lectures, who knew the principles of Soviet pedagogy, who esteemed communists, and who would build a new Germany. The Soviet authorities were aware of the significance of the German university teaching staff in legitimizing the Soviet regime and ideology in German

⁴⁶⁵ Archive of the Foreign Policy of Russian Federation. Record Group 082. Inventory 27. Box 123. File 36: 31.

⁴⁶⁶ Heinemann, “Interview mit Pjotr I. Nikitin,” 140.

⁴⁶⁷ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 10. File 37: 197.

society. Creating a favorable community among the professoriate was at the center of Soviet educational policy in Germany. In documents of the Education Division, it was repeatedly emphasized that the “German intelligentsia and professors of universities in particular, were the real force whose use would considerably facilitate the implementation of serious objectives relative to reforms in German society.”⁴⁶⁸ The use of this force assumed the creation of a loyal German university professor who would support and disseminate the virtues of socialist ideology, culture, and politics. This policy of creating a loyal German university professor, in contrast to the American policy, centered on the idea that individual contact between the Soviet political authorities and every German professor could alter the academic life and attitudes of the professoriate.

Moreover, the Soviet approach to creating a new professor who would be pro-Soviet contrasted with the American approach of creating a pro-American one. While the American Military Administration used a two-prong approach of sending hundreds of visiting professors to win over the German professoriate by means of grass-root contacts and of fostering new pro-American professors through the training of hundreds of young lecturers in American universities, the Soviets created a new professor through i) involving him or her in special scholarly mass campaigns to discuss the philosophy of Marxism and communism and through ii) the training of young lecturers within the newly established pedagogical departments and within a new system of postgraduate studies. The Soviets did not send Soviet visiting specialists to German universities and did not train German professors in the Soviet Union in the great numbers the Americans were able to do.

Ideological campaigns

The fastest way to create this new type of lecturer, it was decided, was to involve the professoriate in public campaigns, conferences, and debates where problems such as the new role of and autonomy for the universities as well as the role of Marxism in German universities were proposed for discussion. In the opinion of the Soviet authorities, these discussion campaigns, aimed at demonstrating the power of the new ideology, would change the worldview of those professors who had formerly been nominal or active members of the Nazi Party or who were

⁴⁶⁸ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 4. File 107: 118-119.

proponents of idealism; the result of these campaigns would be to attract the university teaching staff to the side of the communists.

These Soviet campaigns actually did attract at least the attention of the professoriate, who saw in them an opportunity to discuss the problems of the university. The renewal of academic life in the universities in the fall of 1945 had contributed to a rash of heated discussions among the German intelligentsia about both the role of universities in German life and the autonomy of universities especially in terms of political influence. The Soviets, on their end, arranged meetings and conversations with German university professors in order to convince them to follow the lead of the communists and to build a new socialist Germany. As a result, these discussions divided the German professoriate into two groups: One group of professors began supporting the activity of the new regime in the universities, while another segment, mainly consisting of the senior university teaching staff, spoke in favor of total autonomy for the universities from the Soviet Occupation authorities.

Discussion of these two points of view was joined by the German philosopher Karl Jaspers who ended up taking the lead in these public debates. This philosopher proclaimed that every German university should be cleansed of the old German aristocrats who had discredited themselves by their connections with the Nazis. He condemned the caste nature of German universities and called for equal access to higher education for all social strata. These ideas coincided with the Soviet perception of democratization of the German university system. The Soviets at once established close contact with this academic in order to encourage him to convince German professors to follow the democratization of the universities proposed by the communists. The Soviet experts recognized that the personality and the oeuvre of Jaspers would be supported and followed by the great majority of university professors. Two articles by Jaspers, *Science in the Hitler State* and *People and University* were purposely disseminated and were skillfully used by the Soviet authorities. He was therefore allowed to express all the views, deemed sympathetic by the Soviet authorities, that he held, and at first this philosopher did nothing to sully the partnership. However, the idea of university autonomy and academic freedom, as also defended by this scholar, clashed with the Soviet intention of promoting Marxism and communists in the universities and, more importantly, of supervising academic life. When Jaspers officially stated to the Education Division that "after the purge, German universities should delegate famous German scientists known for their work and democratic viewpoint to the

establishment of self-government,” the Soviets decided to curtail their campaign of participation with the scholar.⁴⁶⁹ Moreover, when Jaspers began discussing his famous existentialist ideas, regarded as non-Marxist philosophy, the Soviets curtailed this particular activity of Jaspers in the Zone. Jaspers quickly came to the conclusion that there was no chance of obtaining academic freedom in the Soviet Zone; as a result, both he and his friend and fellow philosopher Hans-Georg Gadamer left the Zone.

The departure of these philosophers was used by the regime as a chance to expose the weakness of the positions of idealistic philosophy. The initial strong offensive against non-Marxist philosophy, and existentialism in particular, began in the universities. This first offensive entailed the expansion of scholarly discussion about the role of Marxism in European philosophy in all periodicals. Soviet officers and German communists began a campaign to discredit any philosophical school other than Marxism. This campaign lasted until 1948 and influenced some professors to redefine their positions regarding the German Communist Party. Soviet documents indicate that many philosophers openly acknowledged the primacy of Marxist theory at this point.⁴⁷⁰

In addition to these public discussion campaigns, special seminars and lecture courses designed to reeducate the university faculty were established in all universities. The lectures, given by Soviet officers, covered such topics as Soviet society, dialectical materialism, Marxist dialectical materialism, materialistic understanding of history, and Soviet democracy and individual freedom. The lectures attracted a significant number of listeners among the professoriate. Initially, the discussion of such topics produced positive feedback that allowed Soviet officers to claim that the “questions of professors demonstrated their actual interest in understanding the essence of the Soviet system.”⁴⁷¹ Success for the seminars was also depicted by the Education Division: “The university faculty showed an interest in lectures on Marxist philosophy delivered by Major Patent, a lecturer of the Information Division. His lectures attract the attention of professors and are accompanied by pointed discussions

⁴⁶⁹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File no # “Results of the Examination of Higher Educational Institutions”: page no #.

⁴⁷⁰ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 10: 69.

⁴⁷¹ Russian State Archive of Social and Political History. Record Group 17. Inventory 125. File 526: 36, 38.

between the followers of idealistic trends in philosophy and the followers of Marxism.”⁴⁷²

Establishing scientific journals was also considered by Soviet officers to be an effective way of attracting the university teaching staff to discussions about Marxism and of defining views of every scholar. The establishment of the scholarly journal, *Scientific Notes of the University of Jena*, was described in the documents as “a project aimed at defining a philosophical position of each German scientist according to his work, because we [*the Soviets – N. T.*] scarcely know anything about it [*the worldview of German intellectuals – N. T.*].”⁴⁷³

Finally, another method which was exploited to involve German professors in discussion campaigns concerned the arrangement of various and numerous conferences on the problems of teaching social studies, and history in particular, in the universities. In May 1946, the Soviet authorities held a conference of historians in Berlin in order to ascertain whether the conditions were ripe to teach history from a Marxist point of view in German universities. All the historians who remained in the Soviet Zone participated in the conference hoping to debate scientific questions. However, before the scholarly presentations began, German communists took the floor and delivered a paper that blamed German intellectuals for Hitler’s rise to power. Continuing their presentation, the communists suggested to historians that the way to overcome their “reactionary” heritage and mistakes was to return civil duty, so-called, to the German people through a revision of historical studies. This revision should entail pursuing all the investigations needed to reveal the life led by the lower social groups and to highlight the proletarian movements at all stages of Germany’s historical development. In other words, the communists demanded that the Soviet approach to historical studies that emphasized the history of the revolutionary movement be applied.

After heated discussion, the German historians found themselves divided into two fractions: The more numerous group adhered to non-Marxist positions and spoke in favor of the autonomy of science and academic freedom in historical studies; the other group supported the German communists with some scholars genuinely asserting that “nobody will accuse us of infringement of academic freedom, if we give

⁴⁷² State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 12: 57-58.

⁴⁷³ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 8: 94.

equal rights to scientific socialism and Marxism within the framework of the disciplines so as to enable non-Marxist professors to become acquainted directly with the views of their ideological opponents.”⁴⁷⁴ Finally, after two weeks of polemics, the opposing fractions arrived at a compromise that historical studies, the teaching of history at the universities, and all the syllabi in this discipline should combine both materialist theory and various theories belonging to the idealistic point of view.

Although the communists consented to this compromise, this pluralism lasted for only two years. As early as 1948, the Education Division had already arrived at a decision about asserting the supremacy of Marxist theory in history. Historians who delivered lectures in the history or philosophy departments were asked not to give “ideologically harmful lectures,” which meant lectures employing non-Marxist points of view. They were required to deliver compulsory courses on historical and dialectical materialism and political economy. Moreover, historians as well as other university teaching staff were forced to conform to the formal requirements regarding the inclusion of the tenets of Marxism in their syllabi, requirements established by the Soviet authorities for such disciplines as history, didactics, pedagogy, and literature.⁴⁷⁵

This and other campaigns had a sobering effect on a segment of the professoriate who discussed the position of Marxist and non-Marxist ideas in German universities in terms of scholarship rather than in terms of politics. When the communists proclaimed to German professors that “socialism will come about with the assistance of today’s intelligentsia or without it, and if the German intelligentsia does not enter into an alliance with the working class, then it will be driven into a corner by the new intelligentsia,”⁴⁷⁶ most professors understood that these campaigns were employed not to provide a forum for a sincere discussion of the future of the German university system but to win over their allegiance and convince them to cooperate with the Soviets. Some professors quickly left the Zone; however, other professors were undoubtedly swayed by these influences and became partners with the regime.

⁴⁷⁴ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 14: 10-11.

⁴⁷⁵ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 11: 76.

⁴⁷⁶ Russian State Archive of Social and Political History. Record Group 17. Inventory 128. File 338: 123.

The junior university teaching staff in “Aspirantura” studies and at pedagogical faculties

The successive steps which would lead to the making of a new university professor were codified into a planned and consistent process for producing new personnel for German universities from among the junior staff. To create a new professor who would introduce Marxist philosophy into all corners of academic life, the Soviet experts, first of all, decided to insert post-graduate studies called *Aspirantura* into the system of German higher education and to reeducate young lecturers at this level. The second project was to foster future university professors from within the framework of the pedagogical departments in the universities. And the third project was to promote the academic careers of the younger teaching staff at the expense of the oldest professors.

In 1947, a program of two-year postgraduate study of the Soviet type was established in all the higher educational institutions and universities of the Zone in order to foster a new favorable faculty. Selection of potential postgraduate students and future lecturers was strict. German citizens originating in the lower social classes and loyal to the Soviet regime were to be admitted. Out of the first sixty-six students accepted in 1947, forty-nine were already members of the German Communist Party. Instruction was established according to a system of complete control: Postgraduate students were compelled to participate in monthly conferences devoted to questions of socialism and Marxism, to prepare plans for their future lectures, and to play a part in the political life of their university.⁴⁷⁷ However, after the first round of students, subsequent recruitment of fresh postgraduate students went very slowly. By the end of 1948, out of 200 positions available, only 89 were filled. German professors viewed these new methods for preparing new assistant professors for the universities with suspicion and tried to curtail them. For example, the president of the Academy of Sciences in Saxony, and a well-known scholar of German studies, Professor Frings, wrote to the Soviet authorities that the current method [*of postgraduate studies – N. T.*] hampered progress in the training of new and capable scientists more than it helped and that it damaged the traditional German system for fostering scientists. However, he as well as other professors finally yielded to the Soviets and took positions as supervisors in *Aspirantura* studies.

⁴⁷⁷ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 8. File 10: 8.

The establishment of pedagogical faculties in the six universities in the Zone, which we discussed in a previous chapter, had a profound effect on the production of new loyal university faculty. Each department annually accepted from 150 to 300 students who mainly originated in the lower social groups, thereby demonstrating the egalitarian approach of the Soviets to higher education.⁴⁷⁸ Never before had there been pedagogical education at the university level in Germany; previously all school teachers had been taught in special Higher Schools of Education established outside the university system. Now, the Soviet authorities were seen as undermining this tradition of German teacher education: Universities now had to educate prospective teachers by giving practical professional education. To bring this new kind of pedagogical education even closer to the Soviet model, certain measures were undertaken to implant and popularize the Soviet pedagogical system in German universities. Soviet scholars translated a number of Soviet books into German; among these were *Lenin and Stalin's ideas of schooling and upbringing*, *Overcoming formalism in the process of schooling and upbringing*, and *The basic principles of Soviet didactics*. All six pedagogical departments established in German universities were given the Soviet textbook entitled *Pedagogy*, which was the one used at that time in the USSR.⁴⁷⁹

We should note here that Soviet pedagogy did attract genuine interest on the part of German specialists in the field, and they enthusiastically participated in the numerous conferences devoted to pedagogy arranged by the Soviet officers. There is no doubt that dissemination of all these books contributed to the implantation of the Soviet pedagogical system. This system, built on the principles of Marxism with its ideas about the primacy of collective interests over individual ones, and the primacy of fostering an active citizen during his/her attendance in the public schools, along with exercising control over the leisure time of each student when not in school, when coupled with the establishment of the system of pedagogical departments in the universities, turned into one of the successful projects of Soviet educational policy in Germany. It also succeeded in contributing to the production of new loyal university teachers.

⁴⁷⁸ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 2: 98.

⁴⁷⁹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 3: 23.

The promotion of a young loyal faculty on the career ladder turned out to be a difficult matter for the Soviet authorities. The old professoriate tried all sorts of ways of keeping young Soviet protégés out of high academic positions in the universities: “The reactionary professoriate undertakes all means to discredit and depreciate the knowledge of young docents in order to not allow them to gain professorial status. For example, the rector of the University of Berlin said to one docent that: ‘If you had not been a member of the German Communist Party, you would have been awarded with the rank of a professor long ago.’”⁴⁸⁰ Similar cases irritated the Soviet authorities sufficiently to result in the issuing of an order for regional military administrations to investigate cases and dismiss from the universities any senior professors found restricting these young docents.

4. Opposition from conservative professors and the Soviet response

The Soviet staff of the Education Division recognized the fact in 1948 that most of the old professors were predisposed against Soviet reforms and the ideology of Marxism. Moreover, in as much as many of these professors were of advanced age, over 70 years old, Soviet experts admitted that it would be difficult to change the minds and views of this segment of the German professoriate.⁴⁸¹ Despite this understanding, the Soviet Military Administration decided to try to influence the old professoriate in terms of their Marxification. In contrast to the American authorities, who decided to avoid direct confrontation with this old and conservative segment of the professoriate by establishing new institutes independent of the influence of the old professoriate, the Soviets decided to take up the struggle against this segment of the university teaching staff and make Marxists of them.

To try to convert this segment of the university community, the Soviet officers set up four-month courses for training and reeducating old German professors. These four-month reeducation courses were aimed at attracting the old professors to Marxist concepts, at convincing them to treat Marxism with respect, and, finally, at winning the professoriate over to the side of the communists. The seminars included “the study of selected works from the classics of Marxism-Leninism and had themes

⁴⁸⁰ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 10. File 37: 199.

⁴⁸¹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 3: 95.

such as *Lenin and the end of bourgeois philosophy*, *The Marxist doctrine of statecraft*, *Science and Marxism*, *Lenin and Stalin's ideas of German predatory imperialism*, *Critiques of the philosophical systems of the German philosophers Spengler and Hartmann*, among others.⁴⁸²

However, as one of the records noted, this policy of reeducation within the framework of four-month courses was not efficient: "Established in a number of universities, Marxist seminars (the four-month courses) still have no serious effect on the ideological substance of the teaching process in higher educational institutions. The German Communist Party organized several theoretical seminars for professors, and some of the members of the university faculty attended the course of lectures devoted to Marxist philosophy at the Central Party School. However, the introduction of Marxism into higher education as a whole is not advancing properly."⁴⁸³

A more important measure taken by the Soviet authorities towards the old German university faculty entailed obliging the professoriate to deliver both traditional and newly introduced disciplines from the standpoint of Marxism. This policy of imposing Marxism was accelerated in 1948 as a result of the division of the University of Berlin. This division, as well as the political problems with the Americans over the control of the city of Berlin, puzzled and frightened the Soviet authorities, and, more importantly, caused Moscow to interfere directly in the policy implemented by the Soviet Occupation authorities. In our opinion, it was Moscow that forced the Soviet officers to accelerate the introduction of Marxism in the universities and to implement the following policy in 1949: "Reinforce control over the teaching process in higher educational institutes by revising the curricula and syllabi so as to ensure proper teaching in institutions of higher education; provide for the preparation and publication of new textbooks in the field of the humanities during the current year; organize the translation and publication in German of a number of staple Soviet textbooks for universities; get the best theorists of Berlin and the Zone to take part in giving lectures in the field of philosophy, and impose more decisively the teaching of dialectical materialism so as to enhance the activity of Marxist professors in the ideological struggle against anti-Marxist theories; expedite the training of

⁴⁸² State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 11: 75.

⁴⁸³ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 12: 60.

new teaching staff for the universities; cleanse the university teaching staff of active reactionary elements.”⁴⁸⁴

However, the Soviet experts in Germany clearly understood that this proposed policy could not be applied with regard to the old German professoriate whose intention was to revive and maintain liberal and autonomous processes in the higher schools. In order to implement Moscow’s order and not to undermine the fragile liaison established with the universities, the Soviet Military Administration elaborated a system of formal consultations on the problems of new curricula, disciplines, textbooks, etc., with the German university faculty. Without Moscow’s approval, Soviet officers decided that “the syllabi should not be offered to German universities from above, but that they should be discussed, elaborated and finally approved at meetings held by the university teaching staff.”⁴⁸⁵ This approach, in the opinion of the Soviet officers, would contribute to winning the confidence of German professors that was necessary.

Soon, the Soviet authorities reaped the fruits of their soft policy. During the year 1949, the new system of making up and approving curricula, schedules, and all syllabi, as well as the introduction of new disciplines, was accepted by German rectors and professors. The result was as follows: “1) the dialectical history of materialism course has been introduced in all universities of the Zone; 2) the principles of planning in the Soviet national economy, in the economic departments of Universities of Berlin and Leipzig; 3) the tenets of the state and law, in the departments of law of Universities of Berlin and Leipzig; 4) a brief history of the USSR, in the Slavic departments of Universities of Berlin and Leipzig; 5) a course of general psychology, in the philosophy and pedagogy departments of Universities of Berlin and Jena; 6) the principles of Soviet pedagogy, in all the pedagogy departments of all the universities in the Zone; 7) the principles of Soviet linguistics, in the philosophy departments of all universities in the Zone; 8) a course of lectures on Soviet literature, in the Slavic departments of the Universities of Berlin, Leipzig, and Jena, along with a course of lectures on the theoretical grammar of the Russian Language.”⁴⁸⁶ Hence, the old German

⁴⁸⁴ Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation. Record Group 082. Inventory 35. Box 174. File 91: 50.

⁴⁸⁵ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 11: 22.

⁴⁸⁶ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 11: 86-87.

professoriate, which must have participated in these meetings, had agreed to introduce these new disciplines in their universities. No doubt it was a passive approval on their part but, according to the documents, the Soviets did gain the support of a segment of the professoriate who voiced their intention to cooperate with the communist regime.

However, after this approval of Soviet policy by the professors, the Occupation authorities ran up against an unexpected and significant difficulty involving the actual insertion of these new courses into the university academic programs and curricula. It turned out that the professors did not in fact introduce the new disciplines and did not deliver any of the lectures on the imposed disciplines. The disciplines existed on paper but were never delivered in fact. This situation was similar to the situation the United States faced when introducing the discipline of political science: the professoriate approved the American decision but the disciplines were never actually offered. In the Soviet Zone, the professoriate agreed to the imposed reforms, but only a few of them ever delivered lectures in accordance with the Soviet plans. The staff of the Education Division of the SMAD was shocked by such behavior on the part of the professoriate and indicated that “most disciplines are still being taught from the standpoint of a bourgeois world outlook. The history of philosophy is taught by old professors – followers of various idealistic schools – such as Professor Leisegang⁴⁸⁷ in Jena and Professor Jakobi⁴⁸⁸ in Greifswald. Among the faction of reactionary professors, there is a tendency to limit and isolate Marxist disciplines, to not allow the penetration of Marxism into the teaching of any of the scientific disciplines, and into history, biology, the history of law, and philosophy in particular. A number of professors excoriate Marxism. For example, Professor Leisegang sharply opposes dialectical materialism not only in the lectures he delivers, but also in a number of papers published in the Western Zones. Leisegang states that ‘Marx’s dialectics is a step backwards with respect to Hegel’s dialectics’ in his article ‘Hegel, Marx and Kierkegaard’s ideas of dialectical materialism and dialectical theology.’ The views of this professor are typical to some extent of the majority of the professors who give lectures in the field of the history of

⁴⁸⁷ Leisegang, a philosopher and professor at the University of Jena, fled East Berlin in 1948 and became a professor at the Free University.

⁴⁸⁸ Jakobi, a philosopher and professor at Greifswald University, remained in the Soviet Zone.

philosophy in German universities.”⁴⁸⁹ Elsewhere one reads: “The distinctive frame of mind of the reactionary professoriate is demonstrated by the statement quoted below from the dean of the philosophy department at University of Halle. The offer of a curator [a Soviet supervising officer at universities] to distribute two vacant positions of heads of chairs among two rival representatives of idealistic and materialistic philosophies was objected to by the dean as follows: ‘I do not understand what you want with your materialism and Marxism. This, in fact, was a concern [in science] until some time in the 60s of the last century. It became a relic long ago. Nowadays, Marxism is a superstition or something like a scarecrow for children.’”⁴⁹⁰

These fragments demonstrate that the professoriate opposed the introduction of Marxism by stating that its tenets could not constitute a new theoretical foundation for philosophical, historical, and other studies. This opposition on the part of the old professoriate served to limit the expansion of Marxism in German universities. As we should remember, American visiting scholars who attempted to introduce political science in German universities also mentioned that the old professoriate disregarded the disciplines of political science due to the absence of any scientific and philosophical character about them.

The Soviet experts who worked at the Education Division of the SMAD understood that it would be impossible to influence the old professoriate. However, in explaining this situation to Moscow, the Education Division produced reasons for the failure to make the professoriate deliver lectures such as the absence of an outline for every lecture supervised by a Soviet curator at the university and the lack new teaching staff and the opposition of students: “in as much as the syllabi are not regulated, they created a loophole for the reactionary professoriate to build a course of lectures any way they like and to deliver lectures whichever way they prefer.”⁴⁹¹ And elsewhere one reads: “The introduction of Marxist disciplines in higher education schools proceeds extremely slowly and encounters great difficulties. The main difficulty in this regard is the absence of qualified personnel. None of the leading figures of the German Communist Party possesses the theoretical

⁴⁸⁹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 12: 60.

⁴⁹⁰ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7133. Inventory 1. File 273: 311.

⁴⁹¹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 10. File 27: 205.

knowledge necessary to give lectures in universities. The compulsory course for all students, 'Contemporary political and social problems,' called upon to play a significant role in the political education of students, was not provided with qualified manuals in sufficient quantity. Moreover, the lectures of professors supporting Marxism are attended by students to a lesser degree than those that state the facts from the position of idealism."⁴⁹²

In contrast to the American approach of creating a new professor from among those who wanted to cooperate, the Soviets tried to coerce every professor into changing his or her philosophical foundation. This pressure was therefore met with stronger and more persistent resistance from these professors than it was in the American Zone.

Another and equally complex thing that the Soviet experts were faced with was a deep unwillingness on the part of the faculty to join the German Communist Party. The Soviets believed that affiliation of professors with communists would revise their views and would pave the way for the expansion of Marxist disciplines. The Education Division tracked this problem very carefully, reporting monthly on the numbers of new communists which appeared among the professoriate: "In 1948, out of 1,595 professors, senior lecturers and others, 265 were members of the German Communist Party, 895 were non-Party members, 292 were former nominal Nazis, and the others were members of bourgeois parties."⁴⁹³ The same state of affairs existed within the administrative staff (rectors and deans) of the universities: "Out of 62 executives, only 20 of them were members of the German Communist Party, 33 were non-Party members, and the others were members of bourgeois parties."⁴⁹⁴ The loyal members of the faculty, which numbered nearly 300 people by the end of the Occupation, were the oldest members of the German Communist Party,⁴⁹⁵ while "the majority of the German professoriate has taken conservative positions in the field of science and has politically adhered, at best, to the positions of bourgeois liberalism."⁴⁹⁶ As a result,

⁴⁹² State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 12: 62-63. State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 14: 10-11.

⁴⁹³ *Ibid.*, 51.

⁴⁹⁴ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 11: 75.

⁴⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹⁶ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File no # "Results of the Examination of Higher Educational Institutions": 53.

the problem of converting these independent professors into loyal members of the Party would remain unsolvable for the Soviet government not only during that period but also during the entire history of the Cold War.

The final challenge for the Soviet Occupation authorities and consequently for the political regime of the German Democratic Republic became the so-called “escape of professors,” the term used in the Soviet political vocabulary, “to the West.”⁴⁹⁷ Before the Red Army arrived in Berlin, about 75% of the German teaching staff of higher educational establishments had already left the future Soviet Zone. According to the documents, this “escape of professors” deeply irritated the Occupation regime because of the affect it had in terms of weakening the Zone’s scientific potential. According to the documents, ideological motives were the primary reason for leaving the Zone. These motives were perfectly stated in a letter of resignation from Professor Wanstrat of University of Jena addressed its rector. It was entitled “the letter of resignation for ideological reasons”, and is worth citing:

“His Excellency, the Rector of University of Jena, Prof. Dr. Schwarz,

I must inform you that I have decided to leave the teaching staff effective 1 May of this year. I have received an associate professorship in the field of sociology at the Free Berlin University. The reasons which have forced me to resettle concern the events of last year. The Soviet delegates as well as the German communists emphasized at the pedagogical congress in Leipzig in July 1949 that all lecturers who do not wish or cannot be advocates of the Marxist-Leninist outlook should be “removed” little by little. After the announcement of class struggle – which I essentially reject – it has become clear to me in recent months that it is impossible to remain neutral. My serious and objective work with Marxism and Leninism has shown me that this was a speech not about science,

⁴⁹⁷ Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation. Record Group 0547 b. Inventory 35. File 25: 352.

but about having a class-coherent outlook. According to my specialty – sociology – I cannot become a supporter of this outlook in a German university because I consider this outlook, on the basis of my scientific conscience, to be wrong. Moreover, as to my political conviction, it is necessary to struggle against any dogmatic totalitarianism both on the left and the right in order to maintain peace for mankind; therefore, I cannot remain in the Eastern Zone, as my work appears to be impossible there. I hope that my point of view will be understandable at the University of Jena. I do not wish to be a hypocrite. The idealist cannot be influenced by financial privileges; otherwise he deceives himself and betrays his views...⁴⁹⁸

Thus, the aversion to the philosophy of Marxism forced the professoriate, historians, and philosophers in particular, to leave the Soviet Zone. Their departure was sometimes done openly to demonstrate their opposition to the implantation of Marxism in the universities.

Up until the end of the 1950s, Soviet experts became accustomed to such turns of events and, moreover, the departure of obstinate professors was welcomed by the new regime, because members of the young teaching staff either educated within the pedagogical departments or in the system of postgraduate studies were there to fill these vacant positions in the universities. In one of the reports it is specified that “the strengthening of the position of progressive forces [Marxists] in institutions of higher education has forced some representatives of the reactionary forces to flee to the Western Zones. Thus, in terms of the offensive on the philosophical front, the professor of philosophy at the university in Jena, Benze, has fled to the West. Similar cases will continue to happen; the necessity for further democratization in institutions of higher education must bring about the elimination or self-

⁴⁹⁸ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 11: 139.

elimination of some representatives of the old reactionary professoriate from all work in institutions of higher education in the Soviet Zone.”⁴⁹⁹

Moreover, each notable case of a crossing of the border by a professor resulted in a new improvement in the financial position of those professors and their families who remained.⁵⁰⁰ Resistance from the German university faculty and the shortage of staff forced the Soviet authorities to initiate a new program of financial support and a new pension system for the German professoriate. The improvement of the financial position and welfare standards of the university teaching staff became a key step in implementing Soviet policy in the Zone. From January 1947 onwards, the basic and hourly wages for all categories of teaching staff, along with payments to rectors and deans in particular, increased tenfold, with the income tax being lowered. Special pensions for scientists and national prizes in the field of pedagogy were introduced. All members of the university faculty were provided with extra food and extra firewood during the initial years of the Occupation. In addition, health centers and rest houses were reconstructed or rebuilt just for German professors beginning in 1951. The German professoriate was granted leaves for rest and relaxation in Soviet sanatoriums in the south but with compulsory participation in seminars on Marxism. They were also provided with special credits for building their own homes. All these measures undoubtedly promoted a growth in trust in the Soviet regime among those members of the German university staff who had remained in the Zone. At one time or another, the financial position of university professors improved so much that for a short while those who had previously left the Soviet Zone began to return. However, these newly arrived professors were placed under tight surveillance by the Soviet police, which forced many of them to return to the Western Zone again.

Summing up Soviet policy in regard to German professors, it is possible to state that improvement of the financial positions and welfare standards of the German university teaching staff, and the establishment of pedagogical departments along with the system of postgraduate studies contributed to the fostering of a loyal segment of the professoriate. When evaluating their own policy towards the corporation of professors, Soviet

⁴⁹⁹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 11: 77.

⁵⁰⁰ Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation. Record Group 0547 b. Inventory 35. File 25:353.

officers mentioned that they had “created the necessary prerequisites for a transformation of the higher schools into strong features of German democracy.”⁵⁰¹ This implied that some form of loyalty on the part of the professoriate had been established. However, the allegiance of the professoriate was more formal than real. The persistent resistance on the part of the old German professors created difficulties that hindered any profound transformation of German universities.

Conclusion

The policy of the United States towards the German teaching staff differed from that of the Soviet Union. At the same time, their policies had similar features. Although both powers shared the aim of creating a new, pliable professor (either a pro-American or a pro-Soviet one), their methods for bringing this about differed. In particular, a line of difference can be drawn in such areas as their approaches to purging the professoriate, modes of communication with the professors, and methods of promoting reforms by means of the university corporation of the professoriate.

First of all, denazification and reinstatement were carried out in a much more rigorous manner in the American Zone than in the Soviet Zone. The American authorities elaborated a more complex and strict system of denazification and consequent reemployment of the teaching staff: *Fragebogen*, University Committees, and the work of special agents were the main elements in purging former Nazis. In contrast, the Soviets followed less formal criteria for denazification: individual contact, verbal persuasion, and intimidation were the Soviet mechanisms for convincing the professoriate to cooperate with the new regime.

Second, the American military authorities conducted a more formal process of communication vis-à-vis the German university professoriate. They did not establish intimate contacts with the German teaching staff in order to understand their views and to collaborate with them, and in this way to persuade them in the end – as the Soviets did – to modify the content of courses, research interests, etc. The American approach was determined by the American view of the place and role of the German professoriate in the general transformation of the universities. The American Occupation Administration did not define the German university teaching staff as a separate albeit main target for

⁵⁰¹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group P-7317. Inventory 54. File no # “Results of the Examination of Higher Educational Institutions”: 53.

transformation. The German university corporation, termed German university instructors by the American officers, served only as only one of a number of tools for imposing American reforms. For the Americans, the German professoriate, and its conservative segment in particular, did not play a great role either in establishing new academic programs in the new independent institutes or in the Americanization of German universities. This was done by means of both the young, pliable university staff and the American professors. Among the documents, there is no one completely given over to discussing the German professoriate. Their attitudes and academic life were only touched on in the documents devoted to other transformations taking place in German universities. Quite to the contrary, for the Soviets, the German professoriate was the force whose behavior would contribute either to the failure or to the success of the Marxification of German universities. The Soviet Union worked individually with every professor, convincing him or her to teach new disciplines and to cooperate with the communists.

Third, both powers applied different methods for promoting their reforms through the university corporation of the professoriate. The United States elaborated the system of visiting professors recruited by the Department of State and the system of training the junior staff in the United States. The American and European experts promoted the model of American education, established new structures in the universities, introduced new themes and methods of research, wrote textbooks, and filled libraries with new books. Their activity contributed to the implantation of American scientific inquiry in German universities. Young and promising members of the faculty, trained in American universities, went on to revise the university curriculum, modify existing disciplines, and they were able to guide the activity of other pliable members of the faculty in German universities in accordance with the general line of the reforms. On the contrary, the Soviet military authorities transformed the work of the German teaching staff without any intensive and massive training in the USSR and without sending specialists to German universities. The Soviets tried to persuade and at the same time to pressure professors through special semi-scholarly campaigns. Seminars and conferences were held in order to encourage them to revise the conceptual foundations of their academic disciplines, along with their own philosophical views and political positions. Moreover, they trained a new loyal and pro-Marxist teaching staff within the framework of newly established postgraduate studies called

Aspirantura as well as in the new pedagogical departments established in the universities.

However, both policies were similar in terms of the goals assigned: Both the Americans and the Soviets intended to create a new professor. Influencing a professor by means of political science or American studies was the American way of creating a new professor in the German university system. Convincing a professor to deliver lectures from the standpoint of Marxist philosophy was the Soviet way of creating a new professor of the German university system.

In creating a new professor, both powers encountered resistance from the old German professoriate. While formally accepting the reforms proposed, these professors stated that these imposed reforms undermined the traditional German university system and they opposed some of the transformations. They refused to deliver lectures and seminars in the fields of political science and general education in the American Zone and in the field of Marxism in the Soviet Zone. This opposition on the part of the professoriate was milder in the American Zone than it was in the Soviet Zone and, anticipating the following chapter, the opposition of the professoriate soon begins to appear much weaker when compared to that of the students, as will be seen when events begin to unfold later in the period under study.

Chapter V

German students in American and Soviet policy, 1945 through the early 1960s

Introduction

Archival records provide us with an opportunity to make a comparative analysis of American and Soviet student policies in Germany from 1945 until the early 1960s. It turns out that their policies regarding students moved in very similar directions, much more similar than in regard to the professorship, and this, despite divergent political systems, values, and state ideology. It was a range of available archival records which unexpectedly exposed certain similarities and comparable features that defined the criteria for both policies and thus provided a narrative for our analysis. Relying on archival records, we have defined the following elements of American and Soviet policy towards the German student body that will be discussed in this chapter: 1) purging students and modification of admissions rules in the universities; 2) instilling German students with new ideological values; 3) creating student organizations in universities; 4) student opposition and the response of the American or Soviet governments; and 5) new changes in German student daily life under the influence of reforms.

This chapter will have the same structure as former one: The first part will examine American policy towards German university students. The second part will investigate Soviet policy towards German university students. The third part will be a brief comparison relative to both policies.

I. German university students in American policy

1. Purge of students and modification of admissions rules in the universities

Denazification of the student body and the policy aimed at revising German traditions in terms of admission of fresh students to the universities are very interrelated. After purging the Nazis three times within the student body, the American authorities widened access to

universities to a small degree for both the less aristocratic social groups and for refugees from the Soviet Zone. They established special preparatory courses for those who had insufficient knowledge to study at the university level, and blocked access to universities for those who supported procommunist ideas.

The German student body: state of affairs in the American Zone

American reforms in German universities eventually affected students who were considered to be the main force that would lead Germany along the road to democracy. These university students were under pressure in terms of all the transformations coming from the United States. As a result, students, as compared to the professoriate, turned out to be the focus of American attention and American commentary.

The OMGUS left more eyewitness accounts about the conditions of life of German students than its Soviet counterpart did. In observing the student body, the American authorities emphasized their poor physical condition. According to American documents, German students were very sick, undernourished, disabled and poor, most were paupers, and they often suffered from tuberculosis. A yet more detailed and dramatic picture of the life of German students was left by Bauer, Rector of the University of Heidelberg, who appealed to the OMGUS. He wrote that “the general picture of the student body of today is somewhat different than it was before. The students, whose studies were interrupted by the war, are now coming back to complete their education. They believe that the university will give them a position compatible with their former exalted status as officers. Practically none of the students have an independent income, most of them are relying on their parents’ savings which, in many cases, are dwindling away rapidly. They were deceived by lies and cheated out of their youth. Their personal life and the German future are still uncertain for them. They are still supersensitive against any form of a sudden outward stimulus. They need time, indulgence and much love. They do not yet dare firmly to believe in the idea of humanity. They have seen and witnessed too many inhuman acts. When they venture to speak of it, they are moved in their very depths by the German fate in the East. Many have come from there, and they have seen there still too much inhuman cruelty in a time when the war is at an end and when the realization of humanity alone can preach in a persuading

way the idea of humanity.”⁵⁰² The rector made this appeal to save those German students who had been members of the Nazi Party and were now being subjected to the purge, and his observation was thus highly sympathetic.

Other information which was of interest to the American authorities concerned the age of the student body and the number of students coming to the universities. The Education Division of the OMGUS tracked statistical data such as this in detail. Most students were older than those who had attended universities before the war. On average, they were 25 to 30 years old, and they might well have been members of the Nazi Party and soldiers of the *Wehrmacht*. Moreover, in contrast to the Soviet authorities, the OMGUS regularly fixed the number of students who entered universities. Comparing available statistics relative to student enrollment, we can conclude that the initial number of students in six⁵⁰³ of the reopened universities in the American Zone in 1947 exceeded that of students in the six reopened universities in the Soviet Zone by almost twice as many (*Table 2*).

Table 2
*Number of German Students in the Universities of the American Zone, 1938/1939, 1947.*⁵⁰⁴

University	1938/1939	March 1947
University of Erlangen	831	5,283
University of Frankfurt am Main	1,597	4,731
University of Heidelberg	1,684	3,969
University of Marburg	1,209	3,290
University of München	4,802	9,997
University of Würzburg	1,253	3,199
Total	11,376	30,469

⁵⁰² NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁵⁰³ There were 7 universities in the American Zone after the division of the University of Berlin in 1949.

⁵⁰⁴ *Handbook of Education Statistics. US Occupied Area of Germany. Education and Cultural Division* Berlin: Office of Military Government for Germany, 1949), 54.

As follows from this table, the student population increased from 11,376 in the 1938/39 academic year to 30,469 in 1947, despite the war and the denazification.

However, the only thing which was not tracked by American experts concerned the attitudes and views of those students who had survived the Nazi times, the war, and the Occupation.

Purges

By December 1945, most universities had begun functioning again and denazification in terms of expulsion of members of Nazi organizations from the student body was immediately initiated. In contrast to the Soviet authorities, American experts of the Education Office at the OMGUS elaborated very precise criteria for the purge of students. In addition to the general principles about dismissing active Nazis, the American model of denazification implied two characteristic rules which were absent in the Soviet model of denazification: the first rule allowed for the enrollment of former Party members at up to ten percent of the total student body,⁵⁰⁵ and the second rule was the compulsory admission of student refugees from the Soviet Zone.

Emphasizing these two specific limitations, the Military Administration of the United States established the following criteria for the purge in 1945. Excluded from admission to universities were: 1) those applicants who were officials in the National Socialist student movement, actively participated as leaders in that student movement or as leaders of students of the former *Ordensburgen*;⁵⁰⁶ 2) all members of the NSDAP who joined the Party prior to May 1, 1937, or those who had been more than nominal Party members; 3) all members of the NSDAP who, after four years of service in the *Hitlerjugend*, *HJ*,⁵⁰⁷ and, once past their eighteenth birthday, had been taken in by the Party; 4) all leaders of the *Hitlerjugend* and of the *Bund Deutscher Mädel*, *BDM*;⁵⁰⁸ 5) all other applicants such as public officials; 6) all the officers of the SA,⁵⁰⁹ SS,⁵¹⁰

⁵⁰⁵ Requirements of the 10 percent quota in the Directive from OMGUS, AG 350 (IA) dated 2 March 1946: *Non-admittance of Persons with former Nazi Affiliations as Students to Institutions of Higher learning*. See, Hallstein, "The Universities," 159-161.

⁵⁰⁶ *Ordensburgen* were schools for the training of the elite Nazi military.

⁵⁰⁷ HJ is the German abbreviation for *Hitlerjugend*. It was the youth organization of the Nazi party.

⁵⁰⁸ BDM is the German abbreviation of *Bund Deutscher Mädel*, the female youth organization in Nazi Germany.

⁵⁰⁹ SA is the "Brown Shirts" (*Sturmabteilung*), the paramilitary organization of the Nazi Party.

and *Waffen-SS*;⁵¹¹ 7) all who were members of the SA prior to April 1, 1933; 8) all professional officers; 9) all recipients of certain medals and decorations; and 10) all applicants against whose admissions objections were made by the Military Government.⁵¹² In other words, “no active Nazi could be admitted to the University”⁵¹³ and, according to the tenth criterion, those students who did not gain the confidence of the Occupation authorities, considered communists and leftists, could be subject to dismissal. Hence, the OMGUS elaborated tough criteria for the selection of students. Moreover, the American Military Administration, like the Soviet authorities, introduced another criterion to purge students: those students who spread Nazi or anti-democratic doctrines,⁵¹⁴ implying by the term “anti-democratic doctrines” those values incompatible with American ideology, were expelled.

Purge, denazification, or screening – these three notions, used by the American curators to define the process of expulsion of German students – went through several stages. Originally, the entire responsibility for the purge was assigned to the rectors of universities. All rectors were required to form a selection committee composed of reliable students together with approved faculty members. They made a preliminary examination of the biographies of students and submitted recommendations for exclusion to the rector. A rector was responsible for excluding all students who fell into a mandatory removal and exclusion category. Initially, rectors were authorized by the Americans to take final action on each student.⁵¹⁵ Screening was based on the analysis of written questionnaires filled out by the students. Each student was required to submit a *Fragebogen* at the time of registration, screened by the selection committee. The *Fragebogen* consisted of 131 questions about their previous lives as students. It was a physical, family, biographical, and religious profile. The most important part of the *Fragebogen*, of course,

⁵¹⁰ SS is the “Protective Squadron” (*Schutzstaffel*), the major Nazi military organization.

⁵¹¹ *Waffen-SS* is the “Armed SS,” the combat arm of the SS.

⁵¹² NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁵¹³ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation. High Commissioner for Germany. Office of OMGUS, Hessen. Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1947-48. Box 702.

⁵¹⁴ *Documents on Germany*, 142.

⁵¹⁵ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

related to membership of a respondent in various Nazi organizations. We have taken one *Fragebogen* to illustrate the American approach to the purge (*Annex 2*). The respondent had studied at both the Universities of München and Heidelberg before the war. During the war, he had been a colonel in the *Wehrmacht* and then a pilot in the *Luftwaffe*. He had participated in the military operations in Russia and had received medals and decorations. Then finally, when 25 years old, he was held in American captivity. In addition, he had been a member of several Nazi organizations.⁵¹⁶ Despite the formal criteria for the purge, which rejected the admission of such a category of German citizen, this young man was admitted to the University of Heidelberg. Such cases were reported to have been repeated over and over. Numerous questionnaires bear witness to the fact that student selection committees did not follow the criteria elaborated by the OMGUS for the purge. There are a number of reasons to explain this disobedience.

First of all, the efficiency of screening depended on the sincerity of respondents in clarifying their past lives and the honor of the student selection committees, primarily consisting of German university professors, trusting them not to cover up former Nazis. However, it turned out that rectors and these committees did try to save students who had formerly been members of Nazi organizations. Moreover, according to the documents, the initial members of these committees turned out to be those professors who had cooperated with the Nazi Party. Rector Bauer at the University of Heidelberg, for example, appointed as chief of a student selection committee a professor who had been a member of the SA since 1933. Similar situations were observed in other universities, which led, according to American accounts, to the admission of students who “were mild with the National Socialists.”

Second, the efficiency of the purge was undermined by the huge amount of *Fragebögen* to be read and eventually judged. The committees had to evaluate daily about 500 to 600 questionnaires, and personal interviews were non-existent. American experts noticed that the purge was simply non-existent or masked by rectors. Investigating the University of Heidelberg, an American expert noted that the committee of the University processed 3,000 *Fragebögen* in four days, with all students

⁵¹⁶ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

being admitted.⁵¹⁷ The American Occupation authorities were shocked by this finding and by the statement made by Rector Bauer that no student was removed for political reasons. Further investigation revealed that this university had actually made no attempts to even begin the purge of the student body.⁵¹⁸ In addition, members of the committees accepted bribes in the form of sugar and bread from parents of students, and thus members of Nazi organizations were easily readmitted.

Evidently, this state of affairs ensured the admission of active and nominal Nazi members, and the percentage of Nazis within the student body was high. After the enrollments at universities in 1946 and 1947, the OMGUS recognized the fact that the number of students, who were former members of the NSDAP, enrolled at the universities was in excess of the quota permitted by the OMGUS, which was no more than ten percent. The American governor in Germany, Lucius Clay, mentioned in a report that “Nazi influence is said to be considerable in universities, where students, often too young to have held responsible positions which would require their removal, band together in associations under leadership of former *Wehrmacht* officers and others who proved their ‘leadership worth.’”⁵¹⁹ And he added: “Many former officers are the senior students. They are seen walking about the campus in almost complete uniform with shining boots and medals, lacking in some cases only the insignia of rank. Their studies were supported by the *Wehrmacht* and they were trained to be leaders of propaganda. No attempts have been made to have these dangerous elements removed.”⁵²⁰

However, university administrations tried to convince the Military Administration that “all students have proved worthy of the confidence to [sic] put in them. No sign whatever could be observed of an underground movement or ‘Fascist spirit’ in student [sic] body.”⁵²¹ After that the OMGUS decided to deprive rectors of the right to admit students to

⁵¹⁷ Ibid.

⁵¹⁸ Ibid.

⁵¹⁹ “Intelligence and Confidential Annexes. Monthly Report of Military Governor, #7. US Zone. February 20, 1946,” in *Documentary History of the Truman Presidency*, vol. 3: 198.

⁵²⁰ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁵²¹ Ibid.

university, and rectors instead had to submit the *Fragebögen* of students for further screening by American authorities.⁵²²

Having discovered that about 26 percent of the students at universities were former Nazis, 16 percent more than admissible, the Occupation authorities made a decision on the second screening to find those who had written down false data in the *Fragebögen* and those who had admitted former Nazis to the universities. The previously elaborated criteria for selection were curtailed, and there was only one criterion applied in order to lower the percentage of Nazis within the student body: "All those who had joined the Party prior to 1941 had to be immediately dismissed and referred to a public prosecutor, and others should be given an opportunity to prove before the selection committees that their falsification was not intentional."⁵²³ The fate of those who were expelled during this second purge and who awaited a court decision during the period of Occupation is not known. In addition, we do not know the precise numbers of students expelled during the second purge. We do know that the screening became more thorough, because the OMGUS itself approved or disapproved each student by means of an interview.⁵²⁴

However, in implementing the first and second purges, the American authorities were faced with a problem which concerned those students expelled, who turned out to be out on the street without families and money. While in the Soviet Zone this category of students fled to the Western Zones, these dismissed students in the American Zone had nowhere to go or to flee to. The Military Administration noted that in Hessen alone, where Marburg and Frankfurt universities were located, approximately 9,000 students⁵²⁵ were admitted to institutions at the university level, but some 20,000, at best estimate, who applied for

⁵²² NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134; NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁵²³ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

⁵²⁴ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁵²⁵ Later, about 1000 students would be dismissed.

admission, had been rejected.⁵²⁶ These men and women remained without higher education and work. This problem was of course socially dangerous, because nobody could guarantee the proper behavior of these rejected students under the circumstances of the recently ended war, the Occupation, and political chaos. To resolve this problem, the experts of the Education and Cultural Division proposed the establishment of work camps for expelled students. These camps were considered by the American authorities as the best way to avoid any consequences from the purge. In 1946 and 1947, the first work camps were established combining real labor with education in the form of lectures, reading, and discussions. To impose certain values on these students, the United States invited German prisoners of war, who had been captured and trained in camps located in the United States,⁵²⁷ to become instructors in these work camps for students.⁵²⁸ In the American Zone there were 27 camps containing 120,000 political internees. According to the documents, the great majority were educable German youth of the same average age as university students, that is, 25 to 30 years old. The question of providing opportunities for these interned young men was discussed in the Education Division and some of these men, whose folly or whose fate had led them to join SS organizations, were freed and were allowed to enter the universities, others were provided with some ideological training at the principal camp of this sort located near Darmstadt in Hessen.⁵²⁹ According to the researcher James Tent, courses for these student-veterans included compulsory lectures about world thought and history within the past ten years in order to reorient them.⁵³⁰

However, after implementation of these two purges the percentage of students, former members of the NSDAP, was in excess of ten percent of

⁵²⁶ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation. High Commissioner for Germany. Office of OMGUS, Hessen. Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1947-48. Box 702.

⁵²⁷ The United States established schools for their German captives in 1942. They called these schools the "Idea Factory." In contrast to the Soviet Union, which encouraged these "students" to join the German Communist Party, the United States did not make liberals of these German soldiers. However, some German prisoners of war cooperated with the United States and helped them in building a new Germany // Tsvetkova, "*Cultural Imperialism*", 87-89.

⁵²⁸ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation. High Commissioner for Germany. Office of OMGUS, Hessen. Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1947-48. Box 702.

⁵²⁹ Ibid.

⁵³⁰ Tent, *Mission*, 57-69.

the total student body. Lucius Clay, the first American governor in Occupied Germany, in a third attempt decided to find and exclude members of the Nazi Party from universities so as to be at a level of ten percent of former Nazis admitted to the universities. The third version of the criteria for selection emphasized the following: no new former Nazis could be admitted to universities, and all the students who were already admitted had to fill out new *Fragebögen* indicating whether or not they had been members of the NSDAP.⁵³¹ This third purge caused indignation on the part of students and professors, who appealed through letters and visits to the American Occupation authorities to stop the purge. The Americans, familiar with the student opposition that had occurred in the Soviet Zone and comprehending that additional tensions should not be allowed, smoothed over these negative attitudes by declaring that regular officers of the *Wehrmacht* might be admitted, except those officers who had entered this career in peace time (before October 1938).⁵³² This was a well-timed proposal and proved a correct decision: while the number of former Nazis did not fall in the universities, the opposition that had been emerging from the student body grew silent.

New admissions rules

These purges were followed by new admissions rules elaborated by American experts. They proposed rules different from the admissions rules in the Soviet Zone. While the SMAD strongly emphasized social status as a main criterion for admission or rejection, the OMGUS did not demolish the German elitist approach to admission, but they did, at the same time, propose to rectors that they enroll students from lower strata, whose skills and knowledge were sufficient to study at the university level. However, the American authorities, like their Soviet counterparts, introduced certain political preferences in the admission system for German universities. The following groups received preferential treatment: 1) persons who had suffered for political reasons; 2) war veterans (!); 3) war widows with children; 4) students and refugees from the East; 5) students who only required two or three terms at most for completion of their studies; and 6) students who were politically clean.

⁵³¹ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁵³² NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation. High Commissioner for Germany. Office of OMGUS, Hessen. Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1947-48. Box 702.

Members of the Nazi Party could only be admitted if vacancies existed for them and their number did not exceed ten percent of all students admitted. Only after evaluating the suitability of every student according to these criteria was the Military Administration interested in his or her scholastic skills.⁵³³ Students did pass entrance examinations. However, during the Occupation period, German universities were compelled to pay more attention to these politically oriented preferential criteria than to the scholastic aptitude examination.⁵³⁴

Jumping ahead, we should note that, in contrast to the Soviet purge model, the Nazi past of students played a more significant role in the American version of purging the student body. At the same time, the American authorities had no intention of crucially modifying the privileges of the traditional social groups of the aristocratic and middle classes as far as their admission to the new universities was concerned. However, the United States actually did face a higher percentage of former Nazis in the universities than the Soviet Union did.

Special admissions to universities: refugees from the Soviet Zone

Another challenge that influenced the admissions policy of the United States concerned those students who had fled from the East Zone. This stream of students from the East was caused by the modification of admissions rules carried out by the Soviet Military Administration. According to American records, all the students from the Soviet Zone who had sought but were denied admission to universities stemmed from “bourgeois” families. There were none from the lower social groups. All of them claimed that their applications for admission to East German universities were turned down either because they had failed to meet communist ideological requirements or because of the middle-class status of their families. In the list of criteria for the selection of students, the American Administration included these categories of student-refugees from the East. This category was granted privileges over other citizens when being admitted. As a whole, during the period analyzed, these

⁵³³ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

⁵³⁴ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation. High Commissioner for Germany. Office of OMGUS, Hessen. Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1947-48. Box 702.

refugees comprised from two to six percent⁵³⁵ of the total student body in every university of the American Zone. At the Free University they comprised from 40% to 45% of the total student body.⁵³⁶

This stream of students from the Soviet Zone influenced the traditional German admissions rule known as the *numerus clausus*, the limitation on enrollment of students in universities. When the first 400 students at the University of Jena, located in the Soviet Zone, were replaced by working-class students and fled to Heidelberg in 1946, the American authorities asked the University of Heidelberg to raise the number of students that could be enrolled, thereby changing this old German *numerus clausus* rule.⁵³⁷ The University of Heidelberg agreed to this, and this change was followed by the rest of the universities. In the 1950s and 1960s, the quota for student enrollment was permanently increased in West German universities.

Consequently, the number of refugees became too large by the mid-1950s,⁵³⁸ particularly in West Berlin and in its Free University. The Free University alone, which had been established for 6,000 students at most, now accommodated more than 9,500 due to 3,500 refugees who had obtained scholarships to be admitted to the University.⁵³⁹ The Berlin authorities introduced a bill to limit the enrollment of students coming to the Free University from the Soviet Zone and Eastern sector of Berlin in 1956. The government of the United States blocked this initiative by

⁵³⁵ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

⁵³⁶ NARA. Record group 466. Records of US High Commission for Germany. Berlin Element. Public Affairs Division, 1943-1953. Box 1, 2, 4, 5, 9.

⁵³⁷ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁵³⁸ Until the mid-1950s, students from the East were accepted without question by West German universities, since their educational achievements were considered adequate to meet the required standard. In the succeeding years, however, it became increasingly evident that, whereas their knowledge of natural science and mathematics remained good, and Latin and English language accomplishments were fair, they showed an almost complete lack of background in ancient and medieval history and only a one-sided familiarity with modern history and German literature. But they were skilled in discussion techniques and surpassed the average student from the West in this respect. In the words of documents, "the DDR educational scheme was beginning to show its effect." See, NARA. Record group 59. Bureau of Public Affairs. International Exchange Service 1950-58. Box 1, 3.

⁵³⁹ NARA. Record group 59. Confidential US Department of State. Central files. FRG. Internal Affairs 1955-1959. Microfilm. Reel 30.

raising additional funds for scholarships. However, the infrastructure of this university was developing more slowly than the increase in number of students, and that became one of the factors for student dissatisfaction in the 1960s.

Moreover, the government of the United States saw political potential in these student refugees in the context of the ideological confrontation with the Soviet Union. While in 1953 the National Security Council, the NSC,⁵⁴⁰ articulated in its policy papers the aim of American educational policy in Berlin as the “penetration of the ideals associated with the United States in the surrounding area of Communist domination,” students were considered as “one of the single most dynamic and potentially powerful of the elements of Berlin’s resistance and the center of carrier [sic] contacts with the Eastern Zone.”⁵⁴¹ The NSC elaborated a special policy towards the East German student body called *the policy of defecting students from the Eastern Zone*. It took up the active encouragement of German youth to leave East Germany in order to undermine the potential of the communists. This covert defection plan was conducted through contacts and radio programs that persuaded students to flee from the Eastern Zone; the government of West Germany was provided with additional funds to accommodate these refugees.⁵⁴² In 1955, the new American Occupation authorities, the Office of United States High Commissioner for Germany, built a special camp in Berlin called *Eichkamp International Student Work Camp*. This camp was the “student collector” where students from the East were interviewed and sent to West German universities.⁵⁴³ In one document there is mention that this camp was built for the benefit of the youth of the Eastern Zone of Germany: food, visits, education, and recreation.⁵⁴⁴ After the construction of the Wall, 200 students from East Germany and East Berlin arrived in the camp in 1963, obtained a scholarship from the

⁵⁴⁰ The National Security Council, the NSC, is the main foreign policy decision-making agency. It was created in 1947 to advise the President on international and security problems. The NSC elaborated the strategies for international educational policy.

⁵⁴¹ NARA. Record group 466. Records of US High Commissioner for Germany. Berlin Element. Public Affairs Division, 1943-1953. Box 1, 2, 4, 5, 9.

⁵⁴² NARA. Record group 59. Records relating to the Department of State Participation in the Operations Coordinating Board and National Security Council, 1953-1960. Entry 1586. Box 18.

⁵⁴³ NARA. Record group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

⁵⁴⁴ NARA. Record group 59. Bureau of Public Affairs. International Exchange Service 1950-58. Box 1, 3.

special student organization, *Das Sozialamt*,⁵⁴⁵ and continued their education at universities.⁵⁴⁶

Winning students to their side, the United States must have been faced with the problem of espionage emanating from the side of the Soviet Occupation authorities who monitored this permanent flow of students. In the mid-1950s, as a result of investigation by Berlin's *Kampfgruppe gegen Unmenschlichkeit* (the Fighting Group against Inhumanity), headed by Rainer Hildebrand,⁵⁴⁷ seven University of Marburg students were accused of being Eastern Zone government agents. One of these accused students was a member of the student council at the University of Marburg. HICOG sent Marburg students to Berlin to confer with a committee which screened Eastern Zone applicants for universities in the Western Zones in order to develop a more rigid screening process as a precaution against a recurrence of this situation.⁵⁴⁸ When this committee found certain connections between these students and Soviet security agencies, the American Occupation authorities elaborated one more criterion for the admission of students to Western Zone universities – that student members of the SED and its affiliated organizations should not be admitted to the universities.⁵⁴⁹

Consequently, a point system for admission was introduced. It awarded scientific, social, and political points towards admission. The political points took priority and implied non-membership of prospective students in communist organizations.⁵⁵⁰ The communists were rejected for admission to universities in the American Zone just as members of liberal parties were expelled from universities in the Soviet Zone.

⁵⁴⁵ *Das Sozialamt* is *die Sozialfürsorge*, the social service agency.

⁵⁴⁶ NARA. Record group 59. Central Files 1963. Box 3559.

⁵⁴⁷ Rainer Hildebrandt (1914-2004) founded this anti-communist group in West Germany. He was a historian and after the end of the Cold War he founded the Checkpoint Charlie Museum in Berlin. During the Occupation period, he fought Soviet terror by disseminating information about it. According to his files, during the Soviet Occupation in East Germany 12,000 citizens disappeared into Soviet prisons. See, *Time*, 1949, August 01.

⁵⁴⁸ NARA. Record group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449.

⁵⁴⁹ Tent, *The Free University*, 141.

⁵⁵⁰ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

Preparatory courses in American admissions policy

The United States officially declared that all social groups should have access to university education. The Military Government tried to encourage German universities to broaden its student social base by facilitating admission to university studies by students from all classes of the population. The American promotion of an egalitarian system of higher education in Germany was not as radical as that of the Soviet Union and the German Communist Party. The United States only attempted to create an egalitarian university system; opposition and the power of tradition that existed in German universities, however, sought to block this United States policy.

To implement its policy aimed at democratizing German elitist education, the American military administration was able to establish so-called preparatory courses for those German students who could not meet academic criteria for admission. Previous research says little about this element of American policy and these preparatory courses are barely touched on in books and papers. This situation in the literature is determined by the fact that documents relative to the American establishment of preparatory courses are very scattered: there are no confidential data about the duration of studies (they must have lasted one year); there are also no statistics on how many students were educated in these preparatory courses and how many achieved the status of full-fledged students. However, these courses did exist at German universities in the American Zone and, later on, in West Germany, and we can point out the following features of American policy in this field in comparison to the Soviet one.

Hessen became the first *Land* where a plan for enabling lower social groups to gain student status was approved by the *Landtag*. According to this plan, students from the working class who did not have the necessary graduation certificate (*Das Abitur*) could, nevertheless, after being interviewed by university officials, be admitted provisionally to university study, and, after passing special examinations at the end of the second semester, be granted full university status.⁵⁵¹ The similar experience was noted in other states in Germany. However, resistance from the universities, from Bavarian universities (such as Würzburg and Munich) in particular, to this American proposal was strong. When the

⁵⁵¹ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation. High Commissioner for Germany. Office of OMGUS, Hessen. Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1947-48. Box 702.

rector of the University of Erlangen, upon recommendation by the American military administration, proposed that the advantages of university training should be extended to all social classes, the Bavarian Ministry of Education and the rectors of the Universities of Munich and Würzburg stated, for example, that they were opposed and would never agree to this. The American authorities attempted to discuss this problem with both the opposing Minister and the rectors, but their position remained unchanged. The OMGUS consequently decided to admit lower strata on a limited scale and only at the University of Erlangen and without the approval of the *Landtag*. According to this reform, all young people aged 18 to 30 who had the “abilities and inner aspiration for higher education were permitted to attend universities.”⁵⁵² However, final acceptance of these students only occurred after two probationary terms at the university and after passing academic examinations at the end of that period.⁵⁵³ Consequently, the rectors from all German universities agreed in a conference arranged by the OMGUS to accept some gifted students coming from working-class social groups.⁵⁵⁴ Later, even oppositional universities such as Würzburg and Munich were reported to be offering remedial courses to students whose standard of knowledge was not considered high enough to begin university studies. These future students were given the chance to improve their knowledge in the following studies: 'classical languages, mathematics, a compulsory reorientation course and philosophy.⁵⁵⁵

By establishing these preparatory courses, the United States was able to insert into the study plan such disciplines as “*Weltanschauung*” aimed at the democratization of students while participating in these special classes. This course included some information about the United States, and students were furnished with publications and films on American history and on the life and institutions of the United States.⁵⁵⁶ In addition, a reorientation course was introduced, which gave factual presentations of world thought and history during the past decade, which put special

⁵⁵² NARA. Record group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. Germany. Internal and Foreign Affairs 1945-1949. Microfilm. Reel 7.

⁵⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁵⁴ NARA. Record group 59. International Information Administration Programs 1949-1952. Box 7, 12, 25.

⁵⁵⁵ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Bavaria. Office of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-49. Box 57-63.

⁵⁵⁶ NARA. Record group 59. Bureau of Public Affairs. International Exchange Service 1950-58. Box 1, 3.

emphasis on Germany's relations with the world, politically and economically.⁵⁵⁷ Finally, the students in these preparatory courses were awarded a scholarship. The amount in 1956 was DM 80 per month (vs. DM 150-180 in East Germany) for room and board, awarded by the government of West Germany. American experts noted that this was not enough to do much in West Germany, such as going to the theater once a while.⁵⁵⁸

Still, an egalitarian university educational system was not really thoroughly developed due to the permanent resistance of the administration of the universities and, more importantly, due to the fact that creating such an educational system was, in fact, not the main goal of American reforms. Recognizing the fact that the plan for democratizing the German university system was not able to be successfully implemented, the American authorities simply stopped proposing any additional ideas for modifying the rules of admission somewhere around the mid-1950s. In one of the reports relative to those German universities located in Baden-Württemberg, an American curator noted "the admission of students has been made much more democratic than it formerly was in Germany: a larger percentage of students now came [sic] from classes not economically favored, although the large majority still earn [sic] from families of business, professional, and official classes. As yet, a very small number of persons in Germany are enrolled in higher institutions, compared with the numbers enrolled in the United States and in other democratic countries."⁵⁵⁹ In 1964, American diplomats remarked that out of 100 students who attended the universities of West Germany, only one student originated from a farming family, four came from families of the self-employed, four were children of white collar and civil service employees, and 0.4 from the working class. Those diplomats who prepared this report were reminded of a popular German cartoon from that time showing a worker scolding his boy, saying, "If you don't behave, I'll send you to university." So, the diplomats concluded that the

⁵⁵⁷ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

⁵⁵⁸ NARA. Record group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. FRG. Internal Affairs 1955-1959. Microfilm. Reel 30.

⁵⁵⁹ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

lower classes did have a chance to enter universities but that they did not want to take advantage of this chance.⁵⁶⁰

Concluding our discussion about the primary element of American policy towards students, we can argue that the United States elaborated very detailed and strict criteria for the purging of Nazis. Selecting students through a complex system of denazification, the American authorities were faced with two problems: the first problem concerned the high percentage of former Nazis admitted to universities and the second was that the number admitted exceeded the number of students that the universities had admitted before the Occupation period. Evidently, student migration from the East, provoked by Soviet oppression and American policy encouraging defection, also contributed to the growth of the student body. Consequently, the government of West Germany reaped the fruits of this American policy when the infrastructure of West German universities lagged behind the increasing numbers of the student population, which, in turn, caused dissatisfaction and student opposition in the early and mid-1960s. The United States, like the Soviet Union, established preparatory courses to educate less favored students and to rebuild the traditional admissions system of German universities. However, this project was blocked for the most part by the universities, and hence the idea of creating an egalitarian system in Germany was not so strongly promoted by the United States as it was in the Soviet Zone.

2. Instilling German students with new ideological values

The introduction of political science in order to impose the ideology inherent in the American political system on German universities was considered to be the main tool for fostering a new generation of Germans. However, the American authorities understood that the introduction of new disciplines alone would not be sufficient to produce a new student who would have a deep belief in the values of liberal ideology under such adverse circumstances as the economic crisis, monetary reform, deterioration of living conditions among the population, and ideological propaganda from the Soviet Union. Quite the contrary, all these circumstances were bound to produce a student with a belief in the values of socialism. The United States therefore developed additional programs to familiarize German students with American life and its political system, and to convince them that liberal economics and ethics were

⁵⁶⁰ NARA. Record group 59. Central Files 1964-1966. Educational and Cultural Exchange. Box 385.

more advantageous than communist ones. The American government educated students on a mass scale during the holidays (summer schools), and invited student leaders to visit America and participate in special training programs (exchanges).

Summer schools

Summer schools became the most popular method of American public diplomacy to influence students. The first summer school was simultaneously arranged in the Universities of Heidelberg, Erlangen, Marburg, and Frankfurt in 1947. The OMGUS came to an agreement with the German universities on the main course programs. Courses lasted three weeks, delivered in both German and English, and covered such themes as *Grundlagen des amerikanischen Verfassungsrecht* (American public law), *der Schweizer Verfassung* (the Constitution of Switzerland), *Die Krise des modernen Menschen des Geisteswissenschaftlers und Medizin* (the crisis of individuals from the perspectives of psychology and medicine), *Gemeinschaft und Gruppenbildung an den Deutschen Universitäten* (political associations in German Universities), which were delivered in German by those German professors who had emigrated to the United States and had now returned. Additional courses covered topics such as political theology, the Catholic Church, and ideology and social structure in Russia. They were delivered in English by American professors. Moreover, there were courses on music and ancient history. In Marburg, university authorities agreed to add courses which primarily touched on the United States. Students attended five lectures on the history of the American constitution, one lecture on American government, and two lectures on American literature in America. In Heidelberg, there were courses such as *Dialectical Idealism, Materialism, and Idealism as leitmotif for explanations of history and for political education*, which were similar to the program of the first Soviet summer school. The Military Administration of the United States invited about fifty professors from England, Sweden, Denmark, Italy, Switzerland, Greece, Czechoslovakia, America, and Hungary. About one hundred and fifty students from each university participated.

The American authorities invited students from the Soviet Zone; however, Russian representatives stated that the invitation had come too late to find and send students. Despite this rejection, forty students from the East came to Marburg without any official invitation. The arrival of these students raised problems for the American authorities. Initially, the

Americans asked them to leave the university and the American Zone because they did not have proper interzonal passes to travel between zones. However, the other participants in the summer school held a secret meeting and suggested going home in protest. After debate, the American authorities allowed these forty students to remain, providing them with hotel rooms and ration cards for meals.⁵⁶¹

Moreover, American visiting professors and politicians were urged to give vacation-period lectures for German students devoted mainly to American history or political science. In 1952, for example, lectures at the University of Heidelberg about the American political system were delivered by an American politician and congressmen. More than 160 students participated.⁵⁶² The *Amerika Haus* at the University of Heidelberg presented a series of lectures concerning the history of the United States (*Annex 3*).⁵⁶³ According to the documents, the first and subsequent summer schools were very popular among German students.⁵⁶⁴

Short-term training of German students in the United States

The system of education, and those who worked and studied within it, had first priority among all the target areas for educational exchange programs (*Table 3*). German students, who demonstrated leadership potential for future careers as politicians, state officials, heads of student organizations, and researchers were involved by the American authorities in so-called exchange of persons programs.⁵⁶⁵ This program of exchanges, aimed at creating a new elite in German society, was implemented with highest intensity during the period from 1947 through 1953. It was during this period that future politicians and Chancellors of West Germany were trained in the United States. In the years that followed, up until the early 1970s, German students were offered a range of other exchange programs from the American government, and, as

⁵⁶¹ Ibid.

⁵⁶² NARA. Record group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449.

⁵⁶³ Ibid.

⁵⁶⁴ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁵⁶⁵ University of Arkansas Libraries. Special Collections. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection. Manuscript Collection 468. Box 239. Germany. Folder 18. [Articles on German Exchange, 1949-1962, n.d.].

earlier, they were given priority over all other students from West European countries.⁵⁶⁶

Table 3
Exchange of Persons Program
*German leaders to the U.S., 1947-1953*⁵⁶⁷

Program Areas	Cumulative number	%
Education	887	18.1
Political & Governmental Leadership	705	14.4
Labor	673	13.7
Youth Activity	611	12.5
Information Service	461	9.4
Cooperative Action	318	6.5
Religious Affairs	276	5.6
Women's Affairs	262	5.4
Agriculture	254	5.4
Public Health & Social Services	185	3.8
Libraries and Museums	108	2.2
Miscellaneous	9	0.2

Initially, exchange programs aimed at students were elaborated and developed with a certain amount of trouble. A segment of the Washington establishment cast doubt on the necessity of bringing German students to the United States. It is known that the main arguments of opponents of the Truman Administration asserted, first, that students could bring leftist ideas and infect the American student body⁵⁶⁸

⁵⁶⁶ *A Statistical Profile of the US Exchange Program, FY 1971* (Washington, DC: Department of State, 1973).

⁵⁶⁷ NARA. Record group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

⁵⁶⁸ The negative position of some congressmen and American academics could be illustrated by the process of the passing of two significant public laws relative to American educational policy around the world. The first was the Fulbright Act of 1946 introduced by Senator Fulbright, and the second was the US Information and Educational Act of 1948 sponsored by his friend, Senator Mundt. These two acts opened up a new era in American educational policy, because for the first time they authorized budget funds for educational programs to be expanded by the United States *globally*; also, these laws

and, second, that students were young people who had not yet demonstrated their potential for maintaining the values of American society in West Germany. Therefore, they, in the opinion of opponents, should not be a main target of influence. These circumstances resulted in a slow-down in the elaboration of exchange programs for general students until the mid-1950s.

However, the sharpening of the situation centered on Berlin, and the popularity of the communists among Germans and Europeans as a whole influenced Washington to shut its eyes to these possible problems relative to exchanges and, instead, to focus on enhancing the training of German youth. In 1947, the State Department began training leading German students at American universities in order to create a new, favorable elite in Germany. Initially, the State Department, knowing the high quality of work of the American officers in the Zone, assigned the American Governor in Germany, Lucius Clay, to elaborate the criteria for the selection of such students. General Clay, as an official who was keen on saving those budget funds allocated to the first exchange program, decided that only students from theology departments, as well as those students who could pay for their travel to the United States, should be selected. His choice of the theological departments as the primary participants in the exchanges was determined by the very close cooperation between these departments and the American military Administration. Theology departments became the first educational establishments who declared their intention to cooperate with the new Occupation regime. General Clay appraised the warm relations with the professoriate and student body of these departments and decided to promote exchange programs for them. However, this choice on the part of Clay aroused indignation in Washington, because the students who came to American universities turned out to have no aspirations to study or to build a new democratic pro-American Germany. They came to visit relatives and friends in the United States.⁵⁶⁹

tied education to foreign policy and the government, and, more importantly, they designated ideological preferences as to the selection of countries and persons for participation in American educational programs. However, the passing of these laws through Congress awakened the isolationists, who argued that the global educational exchange program would bring communism to American universities. See, in detail: Tsvetkova, *Cultural Imperialism*, 58-61; 65-67; *HR. 3342. US Information and Educational Exchanges Act 1947. Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. US Senate, 80th Cong., 1st sess.* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1947).

⁵⁶⁹ Clay, *Decision in Germany*, 282-305; Kellermann, *Cultural Relations*, 25-30.

After this initial failure, the State Department sent its own envoy to the OMGUS, the president of Indiana University, Herman Wells, who set about elaborating new criteria and procedures of selection, notably, that those young and loyal students with leadership potential should be selected, checked by the Ministry of Defense, interviewed, and then sent to Washington.⁵⁷⁰ After several years of selection, training begun in 1951 and would include famous future politicians of West Germany such as the Chancellors Kurt Kiesinger, Ludwig Erhard, and Gerhard Schröder.⁵⁷¹

According to their applications, students with anti-communist views were primarily selected. The Nazi past of students was already no longer a hindrance for participation in American exchange programs sponsored by the government. Now former members of the Nazi Party and its youth organizations were selected in meritorious cases. However, students who were members of any organization affiliated with or controlled by the German Communist Party were not selected. The process of screening and selection remained long and intense. Students were first screened by special Education Exchange Staff in the *Ländern*, then in the OMGUS, and then in Washington.⁵⁷² Finally, no rigid standards were applied as to scholastic ability and the achievements of the students; criteria for leadership and political affiliation, however, were taken into consideration.

We have selected several applications to illustrate the American approach to this selection. Charlotte Homann, a German student and a scientific assistant at the Free University, applied for the program called "Study and observation of political life and governmental administration in the United States" (*Annex 4*). During the Nazi regime she had been a member of the BDM. Since 1945 she had studied at Humboldt University and worked at the same time at the famous Osram Company.⁵⁷³ Yet, she left Humboldt University in the summer of 1948, and took part in the

⁵⁷⁰ Kellermann, *Cultural Relations*, 3-39.

⁵⁷¹ *International Exchange, 1968. A Report of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1968), 3.

⁵⁷² NARA. Record group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

⁵⁷³ The Osram Company enriched uranium. There are now many speculations in Russia that the availability of uranium and of facilities for its enrichment built by the Nazis in the eastern part of Germany contributed to the decision made by Moscow on the division of Germany.

foundation of the Free University.⁵⁷⁴ Siegfried Duebel,⁵⁷⁵ a student of psychology, philosophy, and journalism at the Free University, had seen war experience on the Russian front. He then studied at the University of Halle in the Soviet Zone, but he decided to leave the Russian Zone.⁵⁷⁶ The third student, Gisela Conrad, was a student at the University of Tübingen in the East, but later she, like the previous applicants, transferred to the Free University because she was expelled by the SMAD as an American spy.⁵⁷⁷ These and other students explicitly indicated their anti-Soviet positions so that it is obvious that their anti-Soviet positions worked in favor of these applicants.

At the same time, the Military Administration of the United States did not forget about those students who demonstrated apathy towards the new political life, and could thus fall prey to the Soviet Union. This group, designated as “senior students and unemployed graduates,” constituted 15% of the total student body.⁵⁷⁸ Public opinion polls of this segment of students conducted by American experts in 1949 showed that these students continued to articulate the ideas of National Socialism. Such expressions as “a strong nation could not be built without a dictator,” “an Aryan has no right to marry a non-Aryan woman,” “books criticizing the government should not be published,” “Jews do not have the same rights as Aryans,” “Danzig,⁵⁷⁹ the Sudetenland,⁵⁸⁰ and Austria should belong to Germany,” and “National Socialism is a good idea but it was realized wrongly” showed that democracy still had not reached this

⁵⁷⁴ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-1949. Box 148-151.

⁵⁷⁵ He published a book: S. Duebel, *Dokumente zur Jugendpolitik der SED* (München: Juventa Verl., 1964).

⁵⁷⁶ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-1949. Box 148-151.

⁵⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷⁸ Kellermann, *Cultural Relations*, 75-93; A.J. Merritt, R.L. Merritt, *Public Opinion in Occupied Germany: The OMGUS Surveys, 1945-1949* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1970), 3.

⁵⁷⁹ Danzig is the German name for Gdansk, the principal Polish city on the sea. This German town was governed by the League of Nations and Poland after the end of the WWI. It was annexed by Germany in 1939 and returned to Poland in 1945.

⁵⁸⁰ Sudetenland was the German name used in English for the western regions of Czechoslovakia inhabited mostly by ethnic Germans. The latter was the main excuse for annexation in 1938. After WWII, the Sudeten became part of Czechoslovakia and most of the Germans migrated to West Germany.

segment of the student body.⁵⁸¹ This state of affairs shocked the American government which had purged students three times, but, nevertheless, the universities were filled with such opinions. The decision was therefore made to multiply the number of students coming to American universities with an emphasis upon selection of this category of students to give them a chance to study the foundations of democracy.

Training this passive segment of the student body, the American government attempted to safeguard them against the influence of communism, as well as to shift them away from their position of passivity and National Socialist stance, by encouraging them to participate in building a new democratic Germany. The “foundations of democracy” subjects definitely included applicable knowledge that could be used by German students in Germany on their return. What did German students actually study in the United States? The most important subject was the functioning of American student organizations. Students with leadership potential were assigned to visit American student meetings and activities in order to be able to implant American models of various student organizations in German universities. Consequently, it was these German students who became the founders of the German Student Union.⁵⁸² Those students designated as unemployed mainly studied law. They were groomed to undertake careers as officials in a German bureaucratic apparatus which would be based on democratic principles of governance. Designated as the “apolitical and passive,” these students studied the principles of civil society and political party building.⁵⁸³

The results of these training programs were controversial. On the one hand, after their return these students changed the student way of life by establishing student organizations and implanting democracy as they understood its principles. On the other, American experts noted that the student body (in comparison with other groups of exchangees such as teenagers and the ruling elite) was found to have made fewer changes in their attitudes.⁵⁸⁴ According to the documents, the government suggested

⁵⁸¹ Merritt & Merritt, *Public Opinion in Occupied Germany*, 6.

⁵⁸² “SWNCC 269/9. US Policy on German Youth Activities: Policy Statement. February 3, 1947,” in *Germany 1947-1949. The Story in Documents*, 578-583; R.J. Aldrich, “The Struggle for the Mind of European Youth: the CIA and European Movement Propaganda, 1948-60,” in *Cold-War Propaganda in the 1950s*, ed. G.D. Rawnsley (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999), 183-203.

⁵⁸³ Merritt & Merritt, *Public Opinion in Occupied Germany*, 3-65.

⁵⁸⁴ NARA. Record group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

that the social group made up of German students had a dim memory of pre-Nazi Germany, and was consequently poorer “raw material” for the educational program to work with than were other groups.⁵⁸⁵ American experts concluded that university students showed less promise of profiting from the exchange experience than other groups because they seemed to have acquired something of an attitude of snobbery towards American life.⁵⁸⁶ Nevertheless, they returned to Germany, started careers, and some of them contributed to the democratic orientation of West Germany.

Finally, similar to the Soviet government which concluded the first state agreement about training German students in the USSR, the American government also decided to establish such a legal foundation for their exchange programs. The government concluded two important agreements with West Germany in 1952 and 1953: the first agreement, signed by the US High Commissioner in Germany, John McCloy, and the first German Chancellor, Konrad Adenauer, opened up the Fulbright program to German universities,⁵⁸⁷ and the second agreement, signed by Adenauer and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, concerned all the educational programs.⁵⁸⁸ On average, the American government annually invited more students than the Soviet government: about 250 versus 200; however, the United States emphasized short-term education (from three to twelve months), whereas the Soviet Union focused on long-term education (from five to seven years).

3. Creating apolitical student organizations in the universities

A new German university would be considered to have been established if a new, pliable student government had been established there. Well-controlled student government, termed student councils, was a primary goal of student policy of both the United States and the Soviet Union. However, their approach to the establishment of new student organizations was radically different. While the Soviet authorities

⁵⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁸⁶ NARA. Record group 59. Central Files 1950-54. Box 2450, 2451, 2456.

⁵⁸⁷ Full text of the agreement: *Agreement between US and FRG* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1952).

⁵⁸⁸ The White House was unable to sign the treaty or the agreement about cultural relations with Germany because of the American Senate’s intention not to ratify the agreement. See, NARA. Record group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural and Public Affairs. Subject Files 1945-1997. Educational and Cultural Agreements, Germany, 1948-1968. Box 123, 124.

stimulated political turmoil in the universities in order to promote their interests and to eliminate ardent opponents to the communist regime, the United States authorities rejected the politicization of German universities. By establishing an apolitical student government and numerous minor student organizations, the American Occupation authorities tried to erode the political ambitions of students and smooth over negative attitudes of students towards the new regime by directing them towards the arena of discussions between the administration of the universities and the student body, but not between the American authorities and the students.

American policy in this sphere can be divided into three facets: the first was the creation of apolitical student councils and a united student organization to serve as defenders of student interests in the university senate; the second was the introduction of the campus system governed by students; and the third was the establishment of student organizations for mutual aid.

Creating student councils and united student organizations

Similar to their Eastern counterpart, the American authorities were faced with two main problems in establishing student councils in the universities: the passivity of students in terms of their unwillingness to participate in American projects, and the strong influence and popularity of the old German student unions. In general, students did not seem very eager to form new student councils, stating that they had a desire to finish their studies as quickly as possible in order to be able to earn a living and settle down after six years of military service in the war.⁵⁸⁹ In addition, investigations by the American security authorities showed that certain former elite student unions, forbidden by the Occupation authorities, continued their existence under innocent names. A struggle against these tendencies lasted for several years during the American Occupation.

The Occupation authorities assumed that these negative tendencies would disappear if a new position – the Dean of Students – was introduced into German universities. The Dean of Students was considered to be the means for enabling student self-government to develop gradually without forcing it. The job of the dean, a junior member of the teaching staff, was to supervise the students and advise the

⁵⁸⁹ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

rector about student affairs. German universities had had no such equivalent previously. The new official was instructed to serve as the channel for communication between students and the rector just as the rector was already the designated intermediary between the faculty staff and the university officer of the Military Government.⁵⁹⁰ The dean selected some advisors from among the older students. These were charismatic personalities who would exercise the pedagogical and psychological empathy necessary to become advisors to students. All these students were to be selected on the merits of having distinguished themselves by their activities promoting the new university concept. The experts from the Military Administration placed great hope in this position. They wrote that “the introduction of the ‘advisor system’ would not only accomplish the mentioned goals. The students grown up in the advisor system will keep on cherishing the social idea in their sphere of activity even after cessation of their student days.”⁵⁹¹ However, the underlying goal behind the introduction of the Office of Dean was to control any possible politicization of the student body by directing those students who favored direct action and who rejected compromise towards the arena of rector-student discussions.

After introduction of this important position, students were allowed to form a Provisional Student Committee themselves, with the assignment of preparing the elections for student councils.⁵⁹² The student council elections encompassed only candidates proposed by deans of departments. In 1946, for example, Rector Bauer of the University of Heidelberg reported to the OMGUS: “the Deans selected three students representing each department as students of trust. In January 1946 they began discussions over student organization with the administration of the University. They reached an agreement to keep the [sic] party politics aloof from the University.”⁵⁹³ However, the American authorities

⁵⁹⁰ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation. High Commissioner for Germany. Office of OMGUS, Hessen. Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1947-48. Box 702.

⁵⁹¹ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

⁵⁹² NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation. High Commissioner for Germany. Office of OMGUS, Hessen. Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1947-48. Box 702.

⁵⁹³ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

encountered students who hungered to establish party organizations and elections, and to engage in political struggle. The new rector of the University of Frankfurt, Walter Hallstein, who had been a prisoner of war (POW) in the US for three years and had been active in teaching at Fort Getty⁵⁹⁴ wrote: “one might say that the students are a deeply disillusioned generation, filled with soberness, skepticism, and a strong aversion to any enthusiastic surrender to a new ideology; prepared to discuss political questions critically, perhaps, as an aftermath of the past, with a tendency toward a realistic viewpoint in politics. It is therefore certainly not true that they have no political interests.”⁵⁹⁵ The pressure coming from these students was very strong: they visited the office of the American Administration requesting that they be allowed to create such organizations on the basis of the principles of American democracy. The Occupation authorities hesitated briefly. The authority of the German philosophers Karl Jaspers and Gustav Radbruch,⁵⁹⁶ who publicly rejected politicization of the universities and who closely cooperated with the Americans in the area of university reforms, cooled the American Military Administration towards this idea.⁵⁹⁷ However, bearing in mind the American experience of university life of that day, the OMGUS decided to encourage the establishment of religious organizations. Three officially approved student organizations were established in 1946: the *Freie Deutsche Studentengemeinde*, the *Protestantische Studentengemeinde*, and the *Katholische Studentengemeinde*. As was explained in the directives, the aim of these establishments was to encourage a democratic and progressive spirit in German university life in order to help develop a student’s personality on a free and democratic basis, and to promote self-education and self-control in the student community.⁵⁹⁸

⁵⁹⁴ NARA 260. Records of US Occupation. High Commissioner for Germany. Office of OMGUS, Hessen. Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1947-48. Box 702.

⁵⁹⁵ Hallstein, “The Universities,” 159-161.

⁵⁹⁶ Gustav Radbruch was a famous professor of law and Kantian philosophy and a member of the Social Democratic Party as well. He had held a seat in the Reichstag in the 1920s.

⁵⁹⁷ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁵⁹⁸ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

The next step was the formation of a united student organization to represent student interests within the administration of each university called the *Central Student Committee, AStA*.⁵⁹⁹ This was a representative body of students which sat in the senate of a university.⁶⁰⁰ The United States decided that the president of AStA should have the right to attend senate meetings when student affairs were discussed, and to speak but not to vote. The members of AStA chose a president, who, with the help of other students, organized various student activities and services: scholarships, welfare matters, accommodation, employment, travel, international exchanges, and different forms of cultural activity. The founders of AStA truly believed that this activity would keep the students away from political struggle and from the influence of leftist ideologies. Actually, nobody in the American Military Administration could have foreseen that this offspring of the OMGUS would exercise strong opposition to American activities in German universities by the end of the 1960s and throughout the early 1970s.

However, signs of oppositional behavior by this organization became visible soon after its establishment in 1948. AStA became a center of the first student opposition against the German educational authorities. The American authorities were, on their end, satisfied with this, because the students were involved in a conflict with local authorities, which was very far from high-echelon politics. University of Munich students protested in 1948 against the order of a Bavarian Minister of Education concerning the control of funds received by AStA. The Ministry was insisting on controlling them, but AStA protested against this order. Students of the University of Munich successfully campaigned against this minister, however, finding help in the form of the local American consulate. The American consul invited the minister to the consulate, and after the meeting the order was annulled.⁶⁰¹

Defending the interests of students, the American authorities in Germany prepared the soil for future fierce attacks, which would go unpunished, by students and which were aimed at the German administration of the universities, the professors, and the Americans

⁵⁹⁹ AStA is the German abbreviation of Allgemeiner Studenten Ausschuß, the Central Student Committee.

⁶⁰⁰ NARA Record group 260. Records of US Occupation. High Commissioner for Germany. Office of OMGUS, Hessen. Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1947-48. Box 702.

⁶⁰¹ NARA. Record group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. Germany. Internal and Foreign Affairs 1945-1949. Microfilm. Reel 7.

themselves. West German students obtained the right to express their disaffection, to attack officials criticizing them publicly, all while being defended by the American authorities in Germany. This right was implanted in German universities by the American Occupation Administration in order to shift students away from their stand of neutrality, political apathy, and sympathy for communism in the ideological conflict with the Soviet Union. By allowing students to be involved in a democratic and public struggle with the university authorities, American officers demonstrated to students the advantages of the liberal approach in comparison to the communist terror in the East. In the 1950s, the Military Administration was fully satisfied with its student policy, noting that the battle against student passivity was won and the influence of the old student unions was diminishing: "Continued cooperation with university student leaders has revealed a trend toward the acceptance of greater responsibility for students [sic] affairs and an interest in promoting student government." The establishment of student forum centers where university students could gather for discussion was proving to be a counterbalance to the attempted comeback of the nationalistic *Korporationen*, such as the Nazi student league (*Nationalsozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund*) or, even older, the dueling fraternities and *Burschenschaften*.⁶⁰² Student leaders actually wanted to cooperate with the Occupation authorities in establishing self-government and the campus system.

Introduction of the campus system

The introduction of the American model of the university campus system became one more step in the American policy towards the German student body. The American authorities believed that the establishment of the campus or the *Collegium Academicum*, where students could live together, would be "an enterprise that could transfer worth-while experience of American college life, enhance yearning among the student generation for similar social experience and intensify contact between students and faculty."⁶⁰³ American experts also assumed that German students would build the campus system themselves after obtaining the knowledge and experience in American universities and after obtaining financial support from the government as well.

⁶⁰² NARA. Record group 59. International Information Administration. Field Program for Germany 1945-1953. Box 1-7.

⁶⁰³ NARA. Record group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449.

In as much as the German university system had no campus program and little was known about the function of student participation in extra-curricular activities in terms of the American approach, the Department of State in 1950 initiated a special observation program in the United States for student leaders coming from German universities. This project was expected to contribute to the following objectives: 1) to help German youth to understand the effectiveness of student government activities; 2) to orient student leaders in terms of aspects of the community concept of university life; 3) to permit German youth leaders to discover the place of extra-curricular activities in a broad educational program; 4) to enable German university youth leaders to study the design and function of, and student participation in, management and administration; and 5) to come up with ideas concerning the development and administration of scholarship and student welfare programs.

These student leaders visited selected American universities whose programs in student government, extra-curricular activities, student-union community centers, and student welfare fund programs were outstanding; each German student spent his entire tour at one university studying aspects outlined in the objectives and then prepared a detailed report on his findings; upon return to Germany a conference with these students was held to exchange information and determine the best methods for conveying this information to West German universities.⁶⁰⁴

In addition, this observational tour consisted of special courses on such problems as leadership technique and group dynamics. German students participated in the activities of American student government councils in order to understand questions such as the organization of student activities, their constitutions, elections and financing, and methods of control. They studied how sports, dances, and other university-related activities were organized.⁶⁰⁵ After returning, these German students and their universities were provided with American donations to build campuses or student villages.

However, the results of this policy turned out to be modest. An American-modeled campus was established at the University of Heidelberg only in the early 1950s. Then, the Free University obtained a

⁶⁰⁴ University of Arkansas Libraries. Special Collections. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection. Manuscript Collection 468. Box 240. Folder 4. HICOG-Special Projects, 1953.

⁶⁰⁵ NARA. Record group 59. Decimal Files. Box 2436-2449.

grant to build its student village in 1957.⁶⁰⁶ After this, no document mentions the continuation of this project.

Establishment of student organizations of mutual aid

In addition to these important projects, the United States encouraged German students to re-establish organizations aimed at helping less favored students that had existed before the period of the Nazi regime. Initially, American officers themselves established such organizations of mutual student aid without any initiative and support on the part of German students. The first organization, *Studentenwerk* was re-established by the Military Government in every university, in 1946. It helped organize the following activities: a housing agency, a sick fund which paid for doctors' bills up to 100 percent, a social welfare branch (scholarships and free meals), an agency which gave advice on courses of study, a student mess where 1,000 students could eat, and a spacious Student House, containing a kitchen, dining, and living quarters. *Studentenwerk* renovated the Student Houses, which served as excellent places for all student social meetings and recreational activities.⁶⁰⁷

After these projects, the American authorities seemed to forget about this part of their activity; however, the currency reform of 1948 caused many hardships among students and forced the authorities to revive projects for student mutual aid. Prices for food and clothing rose considerably. A group of Heidelberg University students came to *Amerika Haus* to inquire about ways and means of meeting these financial difficulties which many of the students were experiencing with the change of currency. When students approached other affiliations of the OMGUS, the Occupation authorities decided to establish a united student employment association that would help put students in touch with American families needing baby-sitters, window washers, language teachers, etc. The pay was one Deutsch Mark per hour. Ten percent of the money earned by the students would be returned to the student employment service to defray the expenses of telephone and clerical help. Two hundred and twenty students out of 1100 who filled out job

⁶⁰⁶ NARA. Record group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. FRG. Internal Affairs 1955-1959. Microfilm. Reel 30.

⁶⁰⁷ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

applications were placed in odd jobs; most of them worked as unskilled labor.⁶⁰⁸

Summing up American policy in the area of the establishment of student organizations, we can say that the Military Government was able to lessen to some extent the influence of those political parties which existed in the Zone in terms of the atmosphere surrounding reforming the universities. Among the established student organizations, AStA alone must have demonstrated some political potential. Evidently, having observed the events that had occurred in the universities occupied by the Soviets, the American experts deliberately created apolitical organizations in order, first, not to let communists and other leftists influence students, which could come about through the activity of party-affiliated student organizations and, second, so as not to give German students a forum to criticize and undermine American reforms. The result was that the American government was able to exercise control of the students during the period of Occupation; however, the United States would lose this control after the end of the Occupation.

4. Student opposition and the American response

Students in the American Zone in contrast to those of the Soviet Zone did not demonstrate any tough resistance to the activities of the Occupation authorities in the universities. However, over time, they publicly began to articulate some negative judgments about the Occupation. Most students regarded the American values and ideology, introduced by the new disciplines such as political science and American history, with skepticism. Distrust on the part of the students towards American ideology sometimes resulted in a negative reaction to the introduction of a course and new lectures: "In the course of a lecture delivered by Professor Jaspers, the students started laughing and scraping their feet on the floor at the mention of democracy, in connection to the spiritual situation of Germany. As soon as this began, Professor Jaspers interrupted the lecture and declared that he would not tolerate such a demonstration."⁶⁰⁹ However, apathy and unwillingness to participate in public life was more often described as the reaction of students to American initiatives: "Among students it was found that many of them

⁶⁰⁸ NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS. Württemberg-Baden. Records of Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949. Box 913-917A.

⁶⁰⁹ Ibid.

had a do-it-without-me attitude, others want to have back the good-old-days, and again others demonstrate [sic] interest in the direction of communist or fascist movements. All this constitutes a serious danger for the participation of Germany in the democratic family of nations.”⁶¹⁰

According to the documents and previous research, students arranged only two public protests in the streets up until the early 1960s. The first happened in June 1948: students at all the Bavarian universities protested their meager rations that did not exceed 1550 calories per day. James Tent mentions in his book that students, carrying posters reading “Even a Dog Needs 1,700 Calories per Day,” marched to the office of the American Administration to protest their exclusion from food programs. Consequently, the Occupation authorities raised the daily rations to 1,980 calories.⁶¹¹ The second protest occurred after the monetary reform: in 1949, which was one year after introducing new Deutsch Marks in the Western Zones along with a limited exchange of Reichmarks into the new DM banknotes that caused a temporary fall in the standard of living, 3000 students went into the streets of Berlin to voice their discontent with the economic policy of the Occupation authorities. The demonstration was peaceful and ended quickly; however, during the demonstration the covert work of leftist students was noted. They agitated for the others to engage in radical action against the United States. American soldiers were able to neutralize this behavior on the part of a leftist group of students. At that time, the experts did not pay attention to the power of leftist students in the city where adherents of rival ideologies confronted each other.⁶¹²

Later, by the end of the 1950s, the influence and role of leftist students would become more visible to the United States. The first reports about this kind of oppositional mood as well as about trends and changes in the attitudes of West Berlin students were written up by American diplomats in 1958. One of the reports remarked that the political attitudes of the students are quite different from what they were 9-10 years ago. They are much younger and less mature today. In contrast to the students of 10 years ago, they have grown up in an atmosphere of security, and the majority of them have not had experience of living

⁶¹⁰ NARA. Record group 59. Central Files 1950-54. Box 2450, 2451, 2456.

⁶¹¹ Tent, *Mission*, 279.

⁶¹² NARA. Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters. World War II. Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural Relations Branch, 1945-49. Box 128-134.

under a communist regime. There are very few students who are Communists [sic] sympathizers. However, it is very difficult to say how many of them are or would be susceptible to the influences of Communist propaganda and the students of the Humanistic Faculty are the most susceptible to Communist influences.”⁶¹³

This report was followed by urgent diplomatic telegrams from Berlin to Washington about the first radical protest of students against the American position on the German question: the students organized the *Student Congress against Atomic Armament* and passed a resolution in favor of a communist confederation thesis in the context of the 1958 Berlin crisis provoked by Nikita Khrushchev. This surprised American diplomats and Washington, who actually were not ready to respond to such pro-communist positions on the part of the students. Moreover, when the Central Intelligence Agency found that this radicalism stemmed from the East through a group of students who had joined together around the leftist journal, *Konkret*,⁶¹⁴ the American political establishment requested the NSC to elaborate new measures against the power of the leftists. The decision was to estimate the percentage of leftists in the universities, to define the reasons behind the anti-American position of the students, and to find leaders for an opposition to this.

An estimate implemented by the NSC showed that only 5% of students had outright pro-communist sympathies, 20% of the total student body – although basically non-communists – were inclined to play with neutralist, pacifist, and Marxist ideas, and a full 50% of students were described as politically apathetic; the remaining 25% were actively opposed to the communists.⁶¹⁵ And more importantly, the radical minority was not made up of student refugees from East Germany. The latter, on the contrary, appeared “to be immune to radicalism and to be better able to judge and avoid pro-communist activities and some of them tended to revive student conservative corporations.”⁶¹⁶

The main factor of the anti-American position of students proved to be a loss by students of the understanding of what it meant to have grown

⁶¹³ NARA. Record group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. FRG. Internal Affairs 1955-1959. Microfilm. Reel 30.

⁶¹⁴ *Konkret* was a leftist German magazine “for politics and culture” (according to its subtitle) that had existed since 1957. Until 1964, it had clandestine ideological and financial relations with the East German government.

⁶¹⁵ NARA. Record group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. FRG. Internal Affairs 1955-1959. Microfilm. Reel 30.

⁶¹⁶ *Ibid.*

up in a democratic country: “The spirit of defiance toward Communist oppression and desire for democratic freedom which characterized the students who established the Free University has been largely buried under layers of indifference, naiveté, and taken for granted attitude toward freedom, a somewhat nihilistic ‘non-conformism,’ a dilettantist toying with Marxism and pacifist and neutralist ideas, and, in the case of a very small minority, definitely anti-Western views and activities.”⁶¹⁷ Many students were reported to have developed a certain skepticism toward their elders’ steadfast determination to keep their freedom, their undiminished distrust of communists, and their faith in the Western Powers and in the United States in particular. In addition, American experts noted at the end of the 1950s that a segment of the university student body had become very vulnerable to extremist ideas because of the hard conditions of student life provoked by high rents for housing and the low studentship, with the understanding that the Soviets paid a much higher studentship to East German students.⁶¹⁸

Other factors that caused the first signs of radicalism were reported to be the following: a lack of political training in the universities that implied that political science, introduced by both American and European professors, did not succeed in implementing its primary aim of raising a new generation of students loyal to the ideas of liberalism; changes in the composition of the student body, which had in ten years been completely replaced; an increasing fragmentation of the student body that meant an increase of a segment of students who lacked companionship and led a lonely existence; and finally, the 1950s generation of students had too dim a memory of the Nazi regime, the Soviet invasion and Occupation, the 1948 blockade, and even the 1953 uprising in the Soviet Zone. American experts who observed the students concluded that the students had lost the *esprit de corps*, devotion to freedom, and defiance of communism, which could be very dangerous in the context of the Cold War.

Finally, American diplomats named the first leaders of the student opposition as causes: Hans Stern and Reinhardt Opitz. Both students were editors of the *Konkret* journal and members of the Socialist German Student Union (*Der Sozialistische Deutsche Studentenbund*). They were disseminating the idea of reunification of Germany through negotiations with the East and the Soviet Union. This idea was known to have been

⁶¹⁷ Ibid.

⁶¹⁸ Ibid.

rejected by the Washington and German political establishment in the 1950s, but it became the essence of German Chancellor Willy Brandt's *Ostpolitik* in the 1970s.

Consequently, foreign policy decision-makers elaborated a new series of reforms both to deal with such students and with the leftist opposition. These reforms were implemented at the end of the 1960s, and we will discuss them in Chapter VI.

5. Changes in student daily life under the influence of American reforms

According to the available records, both superpowers observed and evaluated the policy towards German students conducted in the rival ideological camp. Among the documents of both Russian and American archives there were more evaluations and reports about student life across the border than those about students who lived in the sphere of influence of either the United States or the Soviet Union. In other words, American archives stored reports filed by American diplomats about student life in the Soviet Zone and East Germany, while Russian archives stored reports filed by Soviet diplomats about student life in the American Zone and West Germany. Evidently, such reports emphasized the weakest points of either version of student life so that they could be further exploited by means of the educational policy of either the Soviet Union or the United States. Thus, the available documents determined the configuration of the following analysis: how the Americans evaluated the life of students in East Germany and how the Soviets evaluated the life of students in West Germany. Therefore, *Soviet representations of student life in West Germany will be depicted* in this final section about American policy towards German students.

The financial conditions of student life in West German universities were the main theme for discussion and observation. According to the German students interviewed, studies at West German universities had to be subordinated to students' earning their livelihoods, because those students whose parents earned over DM 350 per month did not qualify for scholarships; such students comprised the majority of the student body. Students were compelled to work in order to earn enough to cover tuition expenses that amounted to DM 160 each quarter.⁶¹⁹ In addition,

⁶¹⁹ According to the American point of view, tuition, including all the fees, was about DM 130 per semester. See, NARA. Record group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. FRG. Internal Affairs 1955-1959. Microfilm. Reel 30.

they paid DM 35-50 a month rent for a room in a boarding house. Students were reported to be able to afford spending at most DM 50 per month for food. Some students had to work in their free time during the day and could only study at night. A respondent, a 22-year-old student, often considered giving up his studies, but after looking around he realized that he was getting along about as well as thousands of his colleagues and so he continued. Like hundreds of students he sat around almost every afternoon at a student employment center waiting for a call offering a few hours of work. Sometimes it was a job as a transportation worker, sometimes there was a call for someone “from a good family” to tutor a high school student, and sometimes even for a Santa Claus. The girls were hired as nursemaids. They went to take care of American babies and often had to let themselves be imposed on much further.⁶²⁰

Moreover, with great attention the Soviets observed student life at the Free University, especially the financial problems connected with this life. They claimed that the West Berlin budget for 1957 showed that out of 8,303 students at the Free University only 807 received an average scholarship of DM 110 per month.⁶²¹ Out of this sum a student had to pay for room, board, laundry, and personal expenses. The average price for a room was DM 40. A monthly bus ticket cost DM 7. Towards the end of the month, when various bills fell due, many students went without food for several days.⁶²² Actually, the scholarship of East German students (DM 280) was higher to some extent than that of West German students. East German students did not pay tuition and did not suffer from employment problems after graduation. However, they paid a high price – a restriction of speech and movement – in return for more or less comfortable conditions at university.

⁶²⁰ *Neues Deutschland*, July 23, 1957.

⁶²¹ According to the American point of view, slightly less than 50% of students received scholarships averaging DM 110.

⁶²² *Neues Deutschland*, July 23, 1957.

II. German university students in Soviet policy

1. Purge of students and modification of admissions rules in the universities

The German student body: the state of affairs in the Soviet Zone

In contrast to the German professoriate, whose attitudes, behavior, and mood were tracked and taken into consideration by the Soviet Occupation authorities, German students did not receive such careful attention from the Soviet officers. However, German university students experienced much more strongly and deeply what Soviet reforms felt like than did German professors, because students proved to be the ultimate target of all the reforms. Soviet officers did not seek to convince students (as they did in regard to the old German professoriate) of the need to learn new Marxism-based disciplines at the universities; on the contrary, the new regime literally made students attend classes and lectures on these new disciplines. Unlike German professors, students therefore demonstrated disobedience to Soviet reforms that led to mass expulsions from universities, to escapes to West Germany, to arrests, to exiles, and to executions of students. One of the former professors of the University of Berlin, and then a dean at the Free University, wrote about Soviet policy towards students: "On the whole, teachers in any of the accepted subjects were well treated; they received sufficient salary and the so-called 'Pajoks' – monthly packages of meat, sugar, butter, potatoes, some coffee, and Russian cigarettes – in those days items valued higher than money. Teachers were also granted admission to certain cultural clubs where journalists, politicians, artists, actors, and professors could receive meals without surrendering ration tickets. This attitude was impressive. For a while it looked as if we in certain professions might hope for recovery from our fourteen years of degradation. However, we were soon to experience pressure directed against another part of our University, the *student body*."⁶²³

We do not know the precise number of German students who came to study in the reopened universities in 1946 and 1947, since the Soviet purge of former Nazis and a radical transformation of admissions regulations permanently amended the Soviet statistics, and thus figures are very different in various documents. However, we can state that in the spring of 1947 there were about 17,000 students in six universities, which

⁶²³ W. Heubner, "Education in the Shadow of the Iron Curtain," *Science, New Series* 118, o. 3057 (July 31, 1953), 121-124.

exceeded the number of students in the same universities for the academic year of 1938-1939 (*Table 4*). Moreover, the number of German students in the universities of the Soviet Zone was considerably less than that of German students in the universities of the American Zone because of a stable outflow of students from the East to the West; for example, in 1948, there were 24,500 students in all eleven higher educational institutions in the Soviet Zone, while there were 31,700 students in seven universities alone in the American Zone.⁶²⁴

Table 4

*Number of German Students in the Universities of the Soviet Zone, 1938-1939, 1947.*⁶²⁵

University	1938-1939	March 1947
Berlin	6,260	5,684
Halle	942	2,801
Greifswald	742	1,483
Jena	1,218	2,964
Leipzig	2,154	2,487
Rostock	1,024	1,516
Total	12,321	16,935

Being 24 to 26 years old, the overwhelming majority of these students were former soldiers of the *Wehrmacht*, the German armed forces, and members of the Nazi Party, the NSDAP. Some students were POWs, and, having been in Soviet captivity, they had become members of the Communist Party or communist-led movements established by the Soviet government, namely, *The National Committee of Free Germany* and *The Union of German Officers*.⁶²⁶

As soon as Soviet officers stepped over the threshold of every German university, they noted two main traits in the attitudes of the

⁶²⁴ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 1: 120-121.

⁶²⁵ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 6. Page 2-14; Inventory 54. File 12: 1-9.

⁶²⁶ The organizations aimed at re-educating German soldiers who were held in Soviet captivity during the war. The Soviet Union successfully created a new vanguard that consisted of former Nazis who returned from the Soviet Union to Germany and helped the German Communists to build a new Germany.

students. First of all, fear when faced with the Soviet army and uncertainty were the main feelings felt by the students. Many students who had previously been members of the Hitler youth organizations such as the HJ felt themselves to be social outcasts. They complained to the Soviet authorities that “Hitler was elected by our parents and not by us. Earlier we could not be admitted to universities, if we were not members of the HJ. We are now being ejected from universities, because we were members of the HJ.”⁶²⁷ Second, despite all the fears which engulfed the students, a spirit of protest against the new political power was constantly demonstrated by German students. Soviet experts observed that students were less favorably disposed towards the Soviet regime than the older generation. They, in contrast to the old professors, openly showed their negative feelings towards Soviet policy from the very first months of the Occupation. In December 1945, students, for example, refused to welcome a Soviet university curator at the University of Jena. Being against the final decisions of the Potsdam Conference, the students publicly neglected a German *Dozent* who tried to deliver a lecture about this conference at the University of Jena. Evaluating the behavior of the University of Jena students, the SMAD noted that older generations of Germans were also against the Soviet Union and the decisions made at the Potsdam Conference; however, they preferred not to show it.⁶²⁸

Purges and new admissions rules

It was essential for the Soviet authorities as it was for the Americans to eliminate the influence of Nazi ideology within the student body. The Potsdam Agreement about denazification seemed to lead to similar purges in every zone of Occupation. However, in spite of mutual documents signed by the Soviet Union, the United States, and the other Allies, denazification of the student body was processed differently in each Zone.

The Soviet model of denazification had several characteristic features which emanated both from the nature of the Soviet political system, which combined an advancement of communist ideas with severe suppression of those who opposed them, and from the local situation which Soviet officers faced in German universities. On the one hand, the

⁶²⁷ The Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation (Archive of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation). Record group 0457-b. Inventory 4. File 8: 45.

⁶²⁸ Timofeeva, *Nemetskaya Intellegentsia i Politika (The German Intelligentsia and the Politics)*, 91.

Soviet Union, like the United States, expelled active Nazis from the student body and modified admissions rules in order to protect universities from reenrollment of former Nazis. On the other, however, the Soviet authorities turned out to be more tolerant and even more compassionate towards students who had been members of the Nazi Party or its affiliated youth organizations. The purge of Nazis in the Soviet Zone was quickly transformed into the pursuit of political opponents among the students. While the purge of Nazis in the American Zone extended over several years, denazification in the Soviet Zone was accomplished rapidly. Moreover, while the Allies, and the United States in particular, were able to preserve the privileges of the elites and the middle social groups in terms of admission to universities and, at the same time, were able to encourage German educational ministries to enroll talented students from lower social groups, the Soviet Occupation authorities built a persistent system of selection of prospective students according to their family roots, namely, children of workers and peasants. For the first time in German history these categories of citizens had priority over children who originated in the upper and middle social groups in terms of admission to university. Finally, the Soviet purges of former Nazis in the student body were mixed with the introduction of new admissions rules. This juncture of purges with new admissions rules created difficulties for historians in terms of pointing out a line of demarcation between the policy of purges and the policy of introduction of new admissions rules.

The purge began in September 1945, when the Higher Education Division of the SMAD disseminated its order about new admissions rules. It was emphasized in the order that, in as much as the old German intelligentsia had been unable to struggle against the rise of Hitler and fascism, German universities should now educate new intelligentsia. The insolvency of the German intelligentsia was interpreted as the main premises for revoking “bourgeois” privileges for education. Yet, this first order did not contain any definite action aimed at eliminating these privileges. According to the document, all young people who had been students before May 1945 could continue their studies in universities; however, active members of the Nazi Party and its affiliated organizations could not enter the universities. In addition, this order did not define any criteria for what an “active Nazi” was. Among the records we have not found any other details about the requirements and criteria for the purge and admissions. The documents talk about the purge of active Nazis from the student body, and about the purge of students who

disseminated Nazi or anti-democratic doctrines at the universities as well.⁶²⁹ John Connelly, in his research based on some of the German documents, specified additional Soviet rules for admitting new students to universities from 1946 through 1948: 1) applicants from worker and peasant circles, so long as they had not belonged to the NSDAP; 2) graduates of preparatory courses; and 3) only those *persons who had been members of youth organizations such as the HJ or BDM*.⁶³⁰ This third criterion was highlighted on this list. It demonstrates the divergent approaches of the Soviet and American authorities to the admission of students: while the Soviet Military Administration enrolled all members of the HJ and BDM, the American authorities did not admit leaders and active members of these two youth organizations to universities.

The Soviet purge and new admissions criteria were both administered through personal contact between a student and the Occupation authorities. In contrast to the American Military Administration which purged students using formal and numerous criteria and mostly without personal interviews, the Soviets tried to interrogate every student. One of the Soviet officers writes about this Soviet approach to the purge and admission of students at the University of Jena in 1947: “Denazification and readmission was accompanied with an interview of every student by an admissions commission. The commission planned to expel 250 students from the University. The possible expulsion of such a big number created uncertainty among students and impeded the normal process of learning. I summoned 10 students subjected to expulsion and asked them who they were and why they expected to be purged. I found that the motives for their exception were completely insufficient. I ordered that these interviewed students be readmitted and that the fate of every student be handled with care.”⁶³¹

We cannot give precise statistics on the number of students expelled by reason of their connection to the Nazis because Soviet documents do not provide these. However, we do know that 4.1% of university students were former Nazis at the end of the purge. This percentage of readmitted Nazis seems to be insignificant compared to the percentage of readmitted Nazis in the universities in the American Zone, where the authorities officially recognized that former Nazis constituted from 10% to 26% of

⁶²⁹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 8. File 6: 160-161.

⁶³⁰ Connelly, “East German Higher Educational Policies”, 268.

⁶³¹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 6: 88-94.

the total university student body, even with the purge having been conducted much more strictly. How can we explain the fact that the number of former Nazis remaining at universities in the Soviet Zone was definitely small, while the purge there was less severe than the purge in the American Zone? There are three possible explanations: the first is that most of the students in universities of the Soviet Zone quickly became members of communist organizations such as the *Socialist United Party, SED*, and the *Union of the Free German Youth, FDJ*,⁶³² and thus their previous activity within the framework of the Nazi Party was not taken into consideration by the Soviet powers; the second is that most of the Nazis fled to Western Zones and applied there for university studies, and thus that the United States, and not the Soviet Union, was compelled to resolve the problems of their Nazi past; and the third is that the Soviet Military Administration must have neglected to calculate the number of former Nazis among the students, because social roots and not the Nazi past of students became the main attribute to be tracked, calculated, and applied in politics.

It was the *social roots of students* that became the essence of the Soviet model of the purge and the essence of the Soviet modifications of the admissions rules in German universities. Initially espousing in general terms the necessity of eliminating the privileges of certain social groups with regard to education, from 1947 onwards the Soviet authorities began putting these words into practice. In order to make the universities revise their approach to admissions policy, the German Communists with the help of the Soviet Military Administration arranged a conference in 1947, to which rectors and deans of the German universities were summoned. Anton Ackermann,⁶³³ the main ideologist of the SED, asserted that just

⁶³² FDJ is the German abbreviation of *Die Freie Deutsche Jugend*. It was the youth party organization affiliated to the SED.

⁶³³ Anton Ackermann (1905-1973) became a member of the Communist Party of Germany in 1926. He fled Germany in the 1930s and lived in the USSR. In 1946, he became a member of the SED and pursued a party career as a prominent propagandist of communist ideas among Germans. From 1949 until 1953, he was the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the DDR. Anton Ackermann had certain unique ideas about building socialism in Germany: in his book, *Der deutsche Weg zum Sozialismus*, he considered, for example, that the Soviet model should not be used in Germany. However, he was not able to convince other communists of this. The result was that in 1954 Ackermann was expelled from the Central Committee of the SED and fired as the Secretary because of "party-hostile activity." In 1956, he was rehabilitated and worked for the State Planning Bureau. In 1973, he suddenly committed suicide. Anton Ackerman was the only East German politician very highly evaluated by the American Occupation authorities: "He is a really

2% of the German student body in the 1920s through the 1930s consisted of children of workers and peasants. Thus, the main task of democratization would be a transformation of the student body through eradicating reactionary privilege in education and through admitting workers and peasants to universities.⁶³⁴ There is no doubt that the rectors and deans were summoned in order to be informed of the new admissions policy by the new German authorities but not to discuss it.

To enhance the admission of lower social groups, the Soviet Military Administration formulated new rules giving a description in detail of the new privileged categories of students. The first priority was to be given to students of worker-peasant roots, graduates of special preparatory courses, and those who had been persecuted during the period of the Nazi regime. Those who could prove their distinguished qualifications for study in the universities and those who were participating in building a new Germany were related to the second advantaged group. The remainder of prospective German students, which constituted the third group, was described in documents as “all other candidates.” Universities could select candidates of the second or third group only after the enrollment of aspirants from the preceding group. After issuing this order, the Soviet Military Administration set its Education Division the task of “organizing a new admissions policy to universities in 1948 and 1949 in order that the number of students from the lower classes would constitute no less than 50% of the total student body.”⁶³⁵

To accomplish this task, Soviet educationalists established special admissions commissions in every *Land*, town, and village. These commissions consisted of loyal members of the Communist Party who selected prospective students from among factory workers and peasants literally working in the fields. Most likely these German workers and peasants were not expecting that their future was to become students. In addition, those candidates representative of the politically loyal intelligentsia were interviewed and selected for admission. As a result of

influential figure and also well-known as a publicist and journalist; he is a party theorist; he speaks Russian; he is intelligent, objective, and a responsible person; he formulated the doctrine that ‘there would be no formalistic transfer of Soviet conditions to Germany.’” // NARA. Record group 466. Records of US High Commission for Germany. Berlin Element. Public Affairs Division, 1943-1953. Box 1, 2, 4, 5, 9.

⁶³⁴ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 8: 163-172.

⁶³⁵ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 6: 163-166.

such recruitment, the admissions commissions selected 2,389 students from the lower classes for study in the universities and reported to both Moscow and Berlin that this number constituted 49.3% of the total enrollment for the 1948/1949 academic year.⁶³⁶ However, according to other SMAD documents and official East German statistical data, the first students from the lower social groups actually constituted from 26% to 28% of the total student body in the 1948/1949 academic year.⁶³⁷

In conducting this policy, however, the Soviet Military Administration was faced with disobedience to these new admissions rules on the part of students originating from the upper and middle social groups. Those senior students who had been able to keep their places in universities did not want to share the universities with new students coming from the lower strata. They appealed to the Occupation authorities, protested in the streets, and walked out of classrooms. The University of Berlin's students demonstrated the strongest noncompliance with the newly introduced admissions rules. By participating in the university admissions commissions, students blocked access to the University of Berlin for the lower social groups. While all other universities admitted a significant percentage of workers and peasants, the University of Berlin, according to Soviet documents, admitted an "insufficient number of the working people: only 197 out of 903 newly enrolled students were children of workers and peasants."⁶³⁸ This explicit unwillingness of the students of the University of Berlin to share their classrooms with these new students resulted in the massive flight of the University of Berlin's senior students to the western sectors of Berlin. For example, only 30 students out of 246 at the Law Department stated their desire to pass final examinations at the Berlin High Court (*Das Kammergericht*⁶³⁹) located in the Soviet sector. The rest decided to leave East Berlin. This position of the students irritated the Soviets who noted that "there were a large number of descendants of bourgeois families among students of the Law Department at the University of Berlin that

⁶³⁶ Ibid., 166.

⁶³⁷ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 9: 81; *Hochschulführer der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik* (Berlin: Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1968), 102.

⁶³⁸ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 6: 163-166.

⁶³⁹ *Das Kammergericht* was the High Court of Berlin located in the eastern part of the city. In addition to its direct functions, the Court arranged the final examinations for the students of the University of Berlin until 1949.

produced professionals for the western sectors of Berlin and the Western Zones. It is necessary to take some radical measures in order to convert the University of Berlin into the forge, where a new democratic intelligentsia would be produced from the working class.”⁶⁴⁰

In addition, Soviet officers who controlled the universities sometimes carried this new admissions policy to extreme lengths, thereby inflaming the situation: for example, in Saxony, Soviet officers decided to admit solely those students who had graduated from preparatory departments at the University of Leipzig in 1948. This caused a negative reaction in German academia; a direct appeal was made to the Soviet headquarters in Berlin to resolve the situation.⁶⁴¹ This unauthorized regulation was cancelled; however, no one in the Soviet Military Administration was able to withdraw a new tradition, that of formulating special secret lists of students who would be admitted before the date of the official entrance examinations. Although such activity was a secret, the students knew about it, and that caused a burst of indignation among those who were accustomed to the academic merit system of selection.⁶⁴²

However, the rise in disobedience to the admissions rules on the part of the students obliged the Soviet Military Administration to revise its approach to purges concurrently. The SMAD had already been struggling since 1948, not necessarily with Nazis, but with students who originated in families of the upper classes, and who began to declare their opposition to the new admissions rules.⁶⁴³ Soviet officers then began to manifest a certain tolerance in respect to those students who were former members of Nazi organizations and who now demonstrated loyalty to the Soviets, while those students who preferred not to share classrooms with the lower classes and publicly expressed their disagreement were gradually expelled from the universities. The Soviet Military Administration informed Moscow in 1948 that disagreements with students over the privileges given to descendants of worker-peasant families had assumed the form of open demonstrations that could explode as a political situation in the universities. The experts proposed a list of measures to

⁶⁴⁰ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 11: 123-124.

⁶⁴¹ Timofeeva, *Nemetskaya Intellegentsia i Politika (The German Intelligentsia and the Politics)*, 124.

⁶⁴² State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 6: 148-150.

⁶⁴³ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 1: 124.

deal with this situation. The list specified expulsion for those students who resisted the new policy, and the establishment of new departments where new admissions rules could be imposed without opposition.⁶⁴⁴

Actually, the first 30 students who protested against their new classmates were expelled in 1948 and 1949, along with an official statement that depicted them as enemies of democratization of the universities.⁶⁴⁵ However, the more radical measure was to establish entirely new departments which had never existed within the German university system before, and to fill them only with lower social groups and loyal members of the SED. Pedagogical departments and departments of social sciences came about in this way. Pedagogical departments were created in all the universities. Free education was established, and students obtained allowances from DM 100 to 140 per month. The enrollment quota varied from 300 students at the University of Berlin to 100 at all other universities, which exceeded quotas for admission in other departments twice or three times over.⁶⁴⁶ The pedagogical departments became the “laboratories” for the introduction of Marxist-based academic programs. It was the pedagogical department of the University of Jena where the first Institute of Dialectical Materialism was established. Yet, the Soviet authorities were faced with problems in this area. From 1948, and until the end of the Cold War, the pedagogical departments had a major student shortage. The first years in particular were the most difficult: many students from lower-strata backgrounds were unable to complete their studies. Documents tell a long story about the pedagogical department at the University of Jena where only 20 out of 140 enrolled students were able to graduate. One of the main reasons that “the student outflow proved to be [so low were] the bourgeois attitudes of professors and the low academic abilities of the working class.”⁶⁴⁷ To resolve this problem, the Soviets decided to establish special preparatory courses for worker-peasant students (i.e. students with a worker-peasant background) a discussion of which will be given below. In addition to the pedagogical departments, departments

⁶⁴⁴ Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation. Record group 082. Inventory 35. Box 174. File 91: 73-75; Russian State Archive of Social-Political History. Record group 17. Inventory 132. File 165: 68-69.

⁶⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁴⁶ State Archive of Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 8. File 6: 149-150.

⁶⁴⁷ Nikitin, *Deyatel'nost' Sovetskoy Voennoy Administratsii (The Activity of the Soviet Military Administration)*, 124-125.

of social sciences were created at the Universities of Leipzig, Rostock, and Jena for the admission of lower social groups only. The duration of studies there lasted two years. The Soviet authorities declared that the departments of social sciences were to train the new professional elite for the government. Students from the social science departments obtained higher scholarships (DM 250-300 per month) than those of the pedagogical departments.⁶⁴⁸

The large-scale enrollment in these departments undoubtedly provided a more rapid diffusion of the “bourgeois” segment of students in every university as a whole. These departments produced ideologically loyal personnel for German schools, universities, and for the Party during the entire period of the Cold War. Due to the Soviet reforms, “the number of worker-peasant students increased considerably from between 10-14.5% in 1946, to between 26-28% of the total number of students in 1948. Lower social groups obtained access to the universities, free education, and scholarships.”⁶⁴⁹ Contrary to this, access to universities for the upper and middle social groups was in turn restricted. However, another effective method for transforming the admissions system and the social composition of the student body was the preparatory courses called *Arbeiter- und Bauernfakultäten* which trained those German citizens who could not pass the entrance examinations.

Preparatory courses in the Soviet admissions policy

As early as 1946, the experts of the Education Division at the Soviet Military Administration recognized the fact that German *Abiturienten* – higher school graduates – who were going to be entering the universities in the coming years, would not stand for Marxism, thus creating additional impetus for instability among the students. On discussing this problem, Soviet educationalists proposed the idea of setting up preparatory courses for future students in order to educate them ideologically and to help those who worked in factories to obtain additional knowledge for study in the universities.⁶⁵⁰ The first preparatory courses were established at the University of Halle, and in 1946 all other universities began offering them. Those who desired to study in the

⁶⁴⁸ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 8. File 8: 72-74 .

⁶⁴⁹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File no #. “Papers Relative to the Inspection of the Universities”: 52.

⁶⁵⁰ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 1: page no #.

preparatory courses submitted their documents to the universities or to the local affiliated offices of the Education Division. Initially, these studies lasted several months; later they lasted one year. The “learners” – the official name of students in the preparatory courses – studied German, German literature, math, physics, chemistry, and foreign languages – mainly Russian, English or French – as well as Soviet history.⁶⁵¹ These “learners” passed a final exam and its successful outcome guaranteed the right to be admitted to universities without entrance examinations. The latter still existed at the universities, and the examination commissions were composed of the rector, deans, professors, and senior students, who all influenced the final decision about admission of new students. Establishment of the preparatory courses contributed to increasing the level of knowledge of students from the lower strata.

However, establishment of the preparatory courses caused a sharp reaction on the part of the democratic parties that existed in the Soviet Zone and their active members, that is, students from the universities. The most active and the most unappeasable position on this question was taken by the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP).⁶⁵² The LDP considered that the impending deterioration of the scholarly level of the German university system, caused by admission of a new, uneducated generation of young workers and peasants coming from the preparatory courses, would destroy the cultural unity and legacy of the German nation. They openly asserted “that a shortsighted class interest was brought to the foreground. The power of one class turned out to be more preferable than the interests of the nation. The class interest impedes the liberal, magnanimous and unprejudiced education of capable people.”⁶⁵³

Such statements irritated the Soviet officers, who themselves understood that graduates of the preparatory courses could not compete against students from the upper and middle strata in every respect. In

⁶⁵¹ Nikitin, *Deyatel'nost' Sovetskoy Voennoy Administratsii (The Activity of the Soviet Military Administration)*, 88.

⁶⁵² LDP is the German abbreviation of *Liberal-Demokratische Partei Deutschlands*. The Party was established after the end of the World War II in the Soviet Zone like the other liberal parties – the Social Democratic Party (*Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschland, SDP*) and the Christian Democratic Union (*Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands, CDU*) – according to the order issued in 1945. The LDP was founded by the German politician Wilhelm Külz, who died in 1948. After the establishment of the socialist republic in East Germany with the one-party dictatorship of the SED, the LDP became a party without real power in East Germany.

⁶⁵³ Cit. on: Timofeeva, *Nemetskaya Intellegentsia i Politika (The German Intelligentsia and the Politics)*, 98-99.

order to increase the cultural and educational level of the “learners,” the Soviets incorporated these preparatory courses into a structure within the universities that had the status of new, separate departments with their own deans, chairs, and students. Soviet military officers assumed that this formal incorporation would bring the spirit of a German university to the courses and would enlighten the students. In 1949, all the preparatory courses were officially included in the structure of the universities and were renamed *Preparatory Departments*. The Soviets planned to enroll 3,000 new students there. The duration of training was increased from one year to two years, which actually raised the general level of knowledge of the “learners.” A new curriculum was developed: eight hours per week were allocated for German and German literature; six hours for Russian and Russian literature, and the same for mathematics; four hours for world history; two hours for geography, or in any case for the discipline the Soviets called “The Political and Social Problems of the Contemporary World,” and the same for physics and biology.⁶⁵⁴ Lectures lasted more than seven hours per day for six days per week.

On implementing this policy, the Soviet Military Administration again faced admissions problems. German workers and peasants who applied for the preparatory courses studied very reluctantly. The Soviets spent some time trying to understand the reasons for this unwillingness to study. It turned out that the new student life compelled these former workers and peasants to leave their families and work places, and move to other cities. In addition, their income was tacitly cut, and, generally speaking, most of them had no aspirations to enter university. The Soviets successfully responded to one of these problems. The scholarship was increased, and from 1949 on it was equated with the salaries of workers. Moreover, the officers of the Education Division conducted an aggressive advertising campaign in all areas of the Zone to increase the number of applications. In Saxony alone, thirty thousand leaflets were distributed among lower social groups, a special booklet was published, a short film about the preparatory departments was made, and students from these departments were exploited as the main propagandists able to talk with factory workers. All these things contributed to an increase in subsequent enrollments.

Consequently, in 1949, the universities received 7,195 applications from lower social groups. Most of the candidates were recommended by

⁶⁵⁴ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 11: 130.

communist organizations in factories and plants. Soviet experts selected 3,098 students from these applicants using interviews. The student composition in the preparatory departments was therefore as follows: as to gender grouping, 2,638 students were men and 460 were women; as to social-professional grouping, 2,158 were workers, 200 were peasants, and 740 came from the so-called “remaining social categories”; as to party membership, the majority (3,037) of them were members of the SED and FDJ.⁶⁵⁵ Thus, membership in one of the communist organizations, notably the SED or FDJ, along with the social roots of the candidates had become the inherent criteria for a student’s selection.

The Soviets organized a more or less comfortable environment and good conditions for students to be successful in their studies: “The overwhelming majority of students were provided with rooms in dormitories, which had a dining room, separate rooms to do homework, libraries, and rooms for “political-instructive work.” All the students obtained a scholarship of DM 150-200.”⁶⁵⁶ Students who graduated successfully from the courses were admitted to German universities without entrance examinations. However, neither the comfortable conditions for study nor the prolonged duration of education in the preparatory courses could ensure that these lower social groups would attain a high level of quality, competitively speaking, when compared with those German students entering the universities from other social strata. On average, 12% of the students from the preparatory departments were unable to continue their education as full-fledged students due to academic and economic difficulties, and as a result of resistance from admissions commissions. Again, the University of Berlin demonstrated the fiercest opposition, admitting only a minor number of students from its preparatory department. It was known that the SED of the University of Berlin had failed to attract Berliners originating from the lower social strata to study at the university and had failed to break the opposition to admission of workers to the university.⁶⁵⁷ The University of Berlin accommodated 4.2% of its preparatory department’s students, while the University of Leipzig admitted 23.8% (*Table 5*).

⁶⁵⁵Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation. Record group 082. Inventory 31. File 65: 19-20.

⁶⁵⁶Ibid.

⁶⁵⁷State Archive of Russian Federation. Record group 7317. Inventory 55. File 11: 130.

Table 5
*Graduates of Preparatory Courses in the Student Body of East German Universities, 1949, in %*⁶⁵⁸

University	1948/49
Leipzig	23.8
Jena	22.8
Halle	15.1
Rostock	10.7
Greifswald	8.3
Berlin	4.2

However, year by year the percentage of those who graduated from the preparatory departments and entered university grew. In 1966, the East German regime recognized that the departments had accomplished the task of social modification within the student body, and the preparatory departments ceased to exist as a result.⁶⁵⁹ During the 1960s, most East German university students had backgrounds in the lower social strata. This can be seen from *Table 6* which shows the social composition of students admitted to East German universities from 1946 through 1960.

Table 6
*Social Composition of Students in East German Universities, in %*⁶⁶⁰

Years	Workers and Peasants	Technicians	Intelligentsia	Others
1946	10	n/a	n/a	n/a
1949	28	n/a	n/a	n/a
1951	45.5	n/a	n/a	n/a
1954	53.2	23.8	12	11
1956	56	21	13.6	9.4
1958	58.2	19.2	13.8	8.8
1960	56.6	19	14.9	9.2

⁶⁵⁸ Connelly, "East German Higher Educational Policies," 265.

⁶⁵⁹ Connelly, *Captive University*, 273, 275.

⁶⁶⁰ *Hochschulführer*, 102.

Later, the number of students who originated from families of workers and peasants reached almost 100%. The documents from the 1960s emphasized this inherent feature of the admissions policy of East German universities: first priority was given to children of workers and peasants and second priority to those of technicians and the intelligentsia. The sixties saw a similar admissions procedure as established by the Soviet Occupation powers in the 1950s. The main criteria for selection were the political views of a student, the result of an interview, and the level of knowledge attained. Like the 1950s, the admissions commission consisted of representatives of loyal Party organizations. Yet, a negative consequence of this social transformation in universities became visible in the 1960s and 1970s: students dropped out of university due to poor progress. From 5% to 7% of students were unable to finish their university studies. According to Soviet documents, the main reasons for this poor progress were weak ideological education and lack of interest in their studies among these students.

Concluding this section, we must admit that in transforming the student body, the Soviet authorities succeeded in implementing one of their political goals in Germany, notably, the production of loyal social groups through university education. The purge and the establishment of the new selection system for students based on their family backgrounds and party affiliation contributed to the formation of a new social and professional elite in East Germany favorable to the ruling German Communists. The new admissions rules proved to be persistent and stable throughout the first decades of the Cold War.

2. Instilling German students with new ideological values

The main instrument of ideological influence exerted upon German students was the introduction of new disciplines in the area of Marxism and Soviet studies in every department of all universities, as has been reviewed in Chapter III. In addition to these modifications in the university curriculum, the Soviet Union, like the United States, organized mass academic programs for German students in order to demonstrate the advantages of its political system. The main reason for elaborating on specific academic programs such as exchanges, summer schools, and conferences was the disorder of the value system that had embraced most of the youth after the downfall of the Third Reich. The collapse of the old way of life, the economic devastation, the ideological Cold War centered in Europe, the information wars closely associated with it, along with

permanent pressure from the Occupation authorities, contributed to the moral and spiritual fluctuations of students who found themselves unable to evaluate whose ideas, whether Marxist, Nazi, or Liberal, were the better choice for a new pivotal point in their lives. However, as far as the rival Occupation authorities were concerned, such a state of affairs certainly was crucial, and it was fair to do whatever it would take to win over the students. Both superpowers therefore created various educational programs for students in order to engage them in a new system of values. The Soviet authorities emphasized means of propaganda for Soviet ideas such as: 1) so-called inter-zonal summer schools; 2) inter-zonal conferences; and 3) long-term training of German students in the Soviet Union.

Inter-zonal summer schools

While the United States disseminated new knowledge about the United States and democratic governance in its summer schools, Soviet experts established summer schools in order to convince students of only one thing, the supremacy of Marxist philosophy over philosophical movements such as idealism and existentialism, both of which were very popular among students at that time. In 1948, the Soviet Military Administration arranged the first summer school (called a “holiday school”) for university students. Lectures were devoted to both existentialism and Marxism as the main opposing philosophical movements. It was an intrepid step for Soviet experts, because the concepts of existentialism were deeply rooted in the student body due to lectures by the German philosopher Karl Jaspers, who delivered them both in the Soviet and the American Zones,⁶⁶¹ as well as due to lectures by the French philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre, who visited the University of Berlin during the period of the Occupation. Yet, Russian Marxists, who truly believed in the Soviet ideology and the ideas of socialism, were not daunted by the popularity of other philosophical concepts and the possibility of ideological defeat. They bravely invited lecturers from the Western Zones, who delivered lectures about existentialism, as well as German Communists, who enlightened students with their opposing ideas.⁶⁶²

⁶⁶¹ K. Jaspers consequently left the University of Berlin for Heidelberg and became Rector.

⁶⁶² State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File no #. “Papers Relative to the Inspection of the Universities”: 70.

In order to alter the views that students had about the nature of communism, the Marxists put up for discussion the most stirring question for German academia, to be discussed within the framework of both Marxism and existentialism, that of the question of freedom. Marxists were able to convince the majority of students that Marxism, not existentialism, could give freedom to a human being. Transferring this philosophical discussion to the real world, Marxists convinced students that the SED alone could implement democratic reforms in Germany. This thesis about democratization and the chance for real participation in the liberation of the universities from the Nazi legacy attracted students, and as whole they agreed with the German Communists that reforms based on Marxism were needed in the universities. Soviet experts wrote that “the establishment of a holiday school for students proved its value, because students became more familiar with Marxism. The school helped to establish close ties with students from the Western Zones, who were not members of political parties, and to invite them to participate in SED life. The school helped the students to re-evaluate the policy of the East German Communists and contributed to finding certain convergent ideas between the students and the SED.”⁶⁶³

Inter-zonal student conferences

Student conferences became the second way to win the allegiance of German students. From 1948 until the building of the Berlin Wall, the Soviet authorities arranged annual conferences known as “the all-German student congress” for students from all the Zones. A pattern demonstrative of the Soviet approach towards winning over the student body was the Congress of 1949 devoted to the 200th anniversary of Goethe’s birth. The Soviet authorities pursued goals such as this in order to show and promote the positive developments in the Soviet Zone and, more importantly, to create a united all-German student organization under the control of the communists. This was a highly suitable moment for mobilization of the students because public and political discussions about the future reunification of Germany had convinced young people to join any organization which would be able to promote a positive solution to the German question. This mood and these aspirations were successfully exploited by the Russians. Understandably, the former Allies of the Soviet Union – the United States, Great Britain, and France – could

⁶⁶³ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 12: 75.

not allow the Soviet authorities to mobilize students from the Western Zones.

The Soviet authorities invited student leaders from all the universities of the former Germany. One hundred and eighteen students came from twenty-five universities in the Western Zone of Occupation. Since the conference was about the personality and work of the German famous poet, students initially discussed this question, but soon scholarly debates turned to questions about materialistic and idealistic approaches in literary criticism, philology, and history. As soon as the discussion touched on questions about materialism and idealism, Soviet experts divided the students into small groups which had one or two capable students with communist views, and, in these groups, promoted the ideas of materialism among students of the Western Zone. The Soviets wrote how scholarly debates were exploited to attain political goals: "A scholarly discussion in the conference covered two approaches as to how we should understand the personality of Goethe. Students from the Eastern Zone were trying to study scholarly questions within the framework of the materialistic point of view, and students from the Western Zone articulated their idealistic views. The materialist connotations and interpretation of art as a reflection of the real world was opposed by an idealistic view that the work of Goethe should be evaluated within the framework of his subjective genius which was not determined by the real world. Step by step these discussions transformed into political debates. In order to involve the Western students in debates about the future of Germany, the students were divided into small groups and were seated around the table with communists, who convinced them that the Soviet authorities would like to cooperate with Western students in creating a united student organization. Moreover, our students proved that there was no terror in the Soviet Zone, which was what West German and American newspapers were shouting, and that students had freedom of speech and had no fear of being repressed. The students of the West were assured that the Soviet authorities would give them a chance to know the conditions of life here. The conference ended with the announcement of a competition of student papers devoted to Goethe's legacy. The Soviet Military administration allocated DM 15,000 to organize an inter-zonal jury, award winners, and expand activity in regard

to the establishment of this united student organization about Germany.”⁶⁶⁴

To destroy these plans of the Soviet authorities for building a new student organization and in order to damage the image of the Soviet Union, the American Military Administration elaborated its plan of sending several capable and loyal students to this conference in order to disseminate information about the arrests of students in the Soviet Zone. However, the Americans failed in this, because spies informed the Soviet authorities about it. The Soviet experts reported to Moscow: “Before the conference, we obtained information that a group of students, who were former Nazis, officers, and members of Schumacher’s party [members of the SDP – N. T.], were coming to the conference from the University of Heidelberg. They had been assigned by the American Occupation Administration to wreck the conference and to raise a question about the former chief of the student council at the University of Leipzig, W. Natonek, arrested by us as an American spy. This group was not allowed to pass through the border of the Zone by finding some problems with their passports and documents.”⁶⁶⁵ It can be seen here that the American Occupation authorities also tried to use the conference to attain their own political goals. Later, the Soviets gave up this idea of the establishment of an all-German united student organization under the control of the communists because of the complete division of Germany; however, the Soviets kept strong ties with Western leftists among the students, who later participated in the student movement of the 1960s.

Long-term training of German students in the Soviet Union

The Soviet Union signed the first agreements about training German students in the Soviet Union in 1951 and 1952, after Otto Grotewohl sent a letter asking Moscow to admit the first 200 German university students and graduates of the preparatory departments to Soviet higher educational establishments. The Soviet government at first responded to Grotewohl by delaying, because the terrible economic and political situation inside the Soviet Union due to matters such as the wartime destruction, the poverty, the emotional depression of the people, and their permanent fear and terror were not considered to be appropriate for demonstrating to

⁶⁶⁴Russian State Archive of Social and Political History. Record group 17. Inventory 132. File 108: 72-75.

⁶⁶⁵Russian State Archive of Social-Political History. Record group 17. Inventory 132. File 108: 72-75.

German students the achievements of socialism. However, the Occupation authorities finally convinced Moscow to start an exchange program, and the Soviet government complied with the Grotewohl's request, sending its letter to him through the Soviet Occupation authorities. Consequently, in the spring of 1952, the official agreement was concluded⁶⁶⁶ and, on average, about 200 German students entered Soviet universities and other higher educational institutions every year in order to study for five to seven years, so that they became full-fledged students. During the 1950s through the early 1960s, most German students were being trained for future utilization in the Foreign Service of the DDR. All exchange students first completed a two-year basic study course. After this two-year period, there was a five-year specialized study program with an eye to future utilization in diplomatic relations. They studied Russian, French, and English extensively, as well as the history of the West. These programs of education developed further in the 1960s and 1970s, and so we will discuss them in Chapter VI.

Hence, summer schools, inter-zonal conferences, and exchange programs to some extent contributed to the dissemination of Marxist ideas among students and to the establishment of a new elite in East Germany. However, a student political struggle in the universities, deliberately initiated by the SMAD, turned out to be the strongest tool for the dissemination of the new regime's ideology.

3. Creating Party student organizations in the universities

The Soviet Occupation authorities permitted the activity of all possible non-Nazi organizations and encouraged students to participate in the political struggle centered on elections to the university student councils. These student councils influenced academic life and student affairs: the councils participated in admissions commissions and senate meetings, organized self-government, and mediated between students and the Occupation authorities. Soviet policy in regard to elections to the student councils and to the establishment of other student organizations sharply differed from the American approach to students affairs. The American authorities declared that a university should be free of politics. Quite the contrary, the Soviet Union encouraged German students to participate in political struggle within and beyond the universities. Why? The answer is simple: in order to reveal loyal political forces in the universities, to

⁶⁶⁶ *Otnosheniya SSSR-GDR, 1949-1955. Dokumenty (The Relationship between the USSR and GDR, 1949-1955. Documents)*, 166, 170, 213-216.

eliminate opposition to the communists, and then to establish a Party monopoly in the universities and in the student councils in particular. Hence, the statement “creating student organizations in the universities” implies the Soviet policy aimed at promoting the SED’s influence in student councils and the establishment of communist-affiliated youth organizations such as the FDJ.

Initiating such projects as the establishment of communist-affiliated student organizations and the renewal of the activity of student councils, the Soviet authorities like the American ones were confronted with deep passivity and apathy on the part of students. The heterogeneity of political and ideological ideas articulated by the students was a marked characteristic of the German student body of the first postwar years. Quite a lot of students anticipated the revival of the old traditional German student unions which had existed before the Nazi regime such as *Die Burschen*, an elitist student union; other students hoped to plunge into pure science, while yet other students decided to participate in a real political struggle in order to gain power for student self-government within the university administration.⁶⁶⁷ Among these groups there were a few students who strongly believed in socialist or communist ideas or who did aspire to share power with the Soviet authorities in the universities. The Soviets understood very well that the opposition from the liberal parties was very strong in German universities in 1945 and 1946, so there were only a handful of members of the SED that rejected the idea of establishing communist-affiliated student organizations in the universities.⁶⁶⁸ As a result of this new SED policy, the situation of liberal party strength was about to change.

In spring 1946, a few communist groups started working in the universities, which gave the Occupation authorities a chance to promote organizations affiliated with the SED. These new organizations were established in all five universities except the University of Berlin, because the SED could not win the confidence of the students there.⁶⁶⁹ In the autumn of 1946, Soviet inspectors noted that out of the total number of students, 8,500 in total, the members of the SED made up 13.6%, while the members of the LDP and members of the *Christian Democratic*

⁶⁶⁷Nikitin, *Deyatel'nost' Sovetskoy Voennoy Administratsii (The Activity of the Soviet Military Administration)*,152-155

⁶⁶⁸ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 1: page no #.

⁶⁶⁹ Ibid.

Union, CDU,⁶⁷⁰ made up 14%. The rest of the students were not members of any political parties. By the end of 1948, the Soviet authorities and the German communists were able to achieve growth in the number of members of the SED in every university, except Berlin, where the number of members of the SED among the students peaked at 9%. The situation was better in the other five universities, where the number of students who joined the SED varied from 22% to 43% of the total student body.⁶⁷¹ Thus, during the first three years of the Occupation, the SMAD was able to increase the number of students who became members of the SED.

Initially, the Soviets did not make students join the SED. Most students applied for membership on their own for the following reasons: first, as we discussed above, the radical modification of the university admissions policy determined the party choice made by the children of workers and peasants; and, second, membership in the SED had advantages in terms of admission to the university or passing exams. A segment of the German intelligentsia and senior students became conscious that societal rules had been extremely transformed, which therefore demanded radical changes in behavior in order to survive. Most students who joined the SED to survive only weakly believed in the ideals of communism. The Soviet authorities understood this, and thus the fate of such students was unenviable: almost all of them were forced out of the universities. One of the young communist leaders at the University of Leipzig wrote: “Young people who had a desire to study in the university came to me to become members of the SED and get a recommendation for admission. One hundred people passed through my hands. I formed a student communist organization, and then I noticed that the students, being members of the SED by chance, wanted least of all to evaluate university reforms along the general line of communist policy. We asked such students to leave the university.”⁶⁷²

⁶⁷⁰CDU is the German abbreviation of *Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands*, the Christian Democratic Union. The Union was established after the end of the World War II in the Soviet Zone, just like other liberal parties, according to the order issued in 1945. The CDU, like other liberal parties, existed in East Germany without political influence and power.

⁶⁷¹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 11: 13-33, 37-38.

⁶⁷² Cit. on: Timofeeva, *Nemetskaya Intellegentsia i Politika (The German Intelligentsia and the Politics)*, 91

After establishing this quite amorphous political base within the student body, the SED made up its mind to participate in student council elections arranged three times in the Soviet Zone, in February and December 1947, and in February 1948. After these elections, opposition liberal parties ceased to exist in the universities, further elections became a formality, and the political monopoly of the SED became a reality.

The first student council elections in February 1947

In the summer of 1946, the Soviets established student councils. Their statute defining the roles of new student councils in the new university life was elaborated by Soviet experts from the Education Division but not by the students themselves. According to the statute, students had to: 1) support the rector in fighting fascist ideology and in promoting democratic thought and action; 2) promote university studies; 3) help improve the material situation of students, and 4) nurture the cultural and social life of students.⁶⁷³ In addition, the SMAD elaborated a procedure for the February elections. Before the elections, students had to nominate their classmates to special election commissions and then to elect members of student councils according to their party preferences.

While establishing these election commissions in the universities in the summer of 1946, the SMAD faced its first obstacles. Nominations to the commissions were widely discussed, and debates demonstrated to what extent students were dissatisfied with Soviet educational policy. Students from the University of Jena, who were members of the Liberal Democratic Party, accused the Soviets of interfering in the academic sphere, which they felt should be free of state politics. Students of the Christian Democratic Union declared that they had deliberately joined the Union to struggle against the influence of communists in the universities. Finally, University of Jena students decided to play a nasty trick on the Soviet authorities. In order to demonstrate certain ideological similarities between Nazism and communism, students elected several former Nazi officers of the *Wehrmacht* and a former leader of a local *Hitlerjugend* to the commission which consisted of ten students. These attacks were so shocking to the Soviet officers that they made a firm decision to fight such challengers. In June 1946, the Soviet Military Administration issued an order concerning disciplinary action against students who propagated

⁶⁷³ Connelly, "East German Higher Educational Policies," 274-275; Nikitin, *Deyatel'nost' Sovetskoy Voennoy Administratsii (The Activity of the Soviet Military Administration)*, 152-155.

“anti-democratic ideas.” The “anti-democratic ideas” formula implied all improper ideas articulated by students against the new power in Germany. Applying this order, Soviet officers organized an explanatory campaign among students in order to convince them to become more loyal and “not ask for trouble.” As soon as the situation became worse, and the students reluctantly cooperated, the Soviet authorities decided to remove leaders of the student opposition from the universities by expelling and arresting them.⁶⁷⁴

However, this order and action could not stop student attacks against the Soviets. The fiercest attacks were observed in the University of Berlin, where Soviet security agents arrested several students. These initial arrests, however, could not help the communists win, and the elections ended with the outright defeat of the SED. The majority of seats were won by students who represented liberal parties such as the Liberal Democratic Party and the Christian Democratic Union. The success of these parties was visible at the Universities of Jena, Rostock, Leipzig, and Berlin. Right after these elections, Soviet agents arrested six members of the student council at the University of Berlin who were leaders of the opposition, and then arranged by-elections, called in the documents “force majeure elections,” nominating twenty-eight students belonging to the SED. However, only three of these were elected by the students.⁶⁷⁵

The election defeat and the situation in the University of Berlin, which could not be hidden from the Allies and the German public, puzzled the Soviet Administration. According to the documents, the staff of the Education Division was at a loss for a moment. Yet a solution was finally found: uncompromising promotion of SED students within the student councils, the expulsion of opposition students, and, as we discussed above, an increase in the number of students rooted in the lower social groups, became the answer for the Soviets in the wake of their first political defeat.⁶⁷⁶

The second student council elections in December 1947

Tensions in the universities were growing: students refused to attend lectures on Marxist philosophy, to share classrooms with the new

⁶⁷⁴Nikitin, *Deyatel'nost' Sovetskoy Voennoy Administratsii (The Activity of the Soviet Military Administration)*,152-155

⁶⁷⁵ Archive of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation. Record group 082. Inventory 35. Box 174. File 91: 4-7.

⁶⁷⁶ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 1: page no #.

students, and, more importantly, to vote for those who came from the lower strata. The Soviet curators of the universities wrote at the end of 1947: “If in 1946 we could speak about the majority of students as apolitical and disappointed young Germans solely interested in how to finish their studies, acquire a profession, and leave the university, now the situation has changed. The struggle between the bourgeois and working segments of the student body has worsened. The bourgeois students, seeing a growth in the lower class component in the student body, are mobilizing forces to keep their power in the student councils and universities.”⁶⁷⁷ Soviet officers were evaluating student opposition in terms of the Marxist concept of a class struggle, and this justified a tough policy towards those who resisted.

The election outcomes again turned out negatively for the Soviet authorities. The communists achieved less growth in number of seats on student councils than the liberal parties such as the Liberal Democratic Party (*Table 7*). The Universities of Berlin and Jena demonstrated their lack of confidence in communist ideas. According to the Soviet documents, the SED had the weakest position in the philosophy departments and had the strongest position in the new pedagogic, social sciences, and preparatory departments established by the Soviets.⁶⁷⁸

⁶⁷⁷ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 12: 1-9.

⁶⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

Table 7
*The Party Affiliations of Students Elected to Student Councils, February and December 1947*⁶⁷⁹

University	Total	of total				
		SED	SDP ⁶⁸⁰	LDP	CDU	Unaffiliated
Berlin	30	3	4	1	3	19
Leipzig	30	8	-	11	9	2
Halle	23	12	-	4	3	4
Greifswald	17	7	-	2	4	4
Rostock	21	11	-	1	3	6
Jena	20	7	-	6	5	2
Total	141	48	4	25	27	37
%	100	34	2.8	17.7	19.1	26.3
The results of the first elections, February 1947 (in %)	100	32.2	3	11.6	15	38

Analyzing the results of these elections, the Soviet Military Administration emphasized a surprising phenomenon: the students, members of the SED, turned out not to vote for their candidates; on the contrary, they voted for candidates from the liberal parties. So, communists were unable to win the confidence of the general student body or even of those students who were members of the SED. The Education Division reported to Moscow: "The elections demonstrate that the SED has no power in the universities. There is no accurate way of finding out who really are, or who are not, members of the SED. It happens very often that members of the SED have a membership card from another party or that a student will declare his nonpartisan status.

⁶⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁸⁰ SDP is the German abbreviation for *die Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschland*. The SDP was reestablished after the end of the World War II in the Soviet Zone, along with the liberal parties. This party merged with the German Communists, and the SED was established in 1946. However, a faction of the members led by Kurt Schumacher rejected the idea of merging; for several years the SDP existed independently in the Soviet Zone. Schumacher and his followers later left the Soviet Zone and established a new SDP in West Germany.

Many members of the SED came to the Party in order to worm themselves into the university. They are not true and eager members of the SED, and that's why they easily yield to the influence of the bourgeois parties. The students who are leaders of the SED do not communicate with students of worker family backgrounds. In as much as students from worker and peasant families have a lower educational level, they are easily exposed to negative influences. The liberal parties (LDP and CDU) and bourgeois professors exploit this vulnerability of the new students, playing on their petty bourgeois aspirations. In addition, the policy aimed at seeking and preparing student leaders who could be loyal to the SED is unsatisfactory. The universities have some capable students who can lead the student body, but these students have been bribed by the liberal parties. For example, a competent student named Schepf is the leader of the CDU at the University of Greifswald. He has read works by Lenin and Stalin and accepted them entirely; however, he spoke against the SED and democracy at meetings, because the LDP has made him do it by paying him DM 500 per semester for his work."⁶⁸¹

While the SED had problems finding students loyal enough to make new leaders of student organizations of them, the liberal parties were actually led by outstanding students whose activities and personalities allowed these liberal parties to win these first and last elections. One of them was the student leader of the LDP at the University of Leipzig, Wolfgang Natonek. During these elections, local newspapers together with the Leipzig office of the SMAD organized a political campaign against Natonek in order to undermine his authority and popularity among students during the elections. The Soviets attempted and failed to turn things around: the popularity of Natonek and his party continued to grow, and the LDP gained more seats in student councils than the SED. The Soviet officers then decided to arrest him and to eliminate the LDP at the university. This ended up having the opposite effect: it escalated the popularity of the party among the students who in turn now sought to join the LDP, thus helping the party keep its leading role in the universities.

The personality of Natonek gave the Soviets the idea of trying to increase the number of influential students in the SED, students who could then lead and convince other students of the appropriateness of communist ideas for Germany. The staff of the Education Division evaluated the personalities of all of the heads of the SED student organizations in the universities and concluded that "in contrast to the

⁶⁸¹ Ibid.

liberal parties, the SED had no students who had real leadership potential. One of them had a high educational level but low political literacy; another SED leader was a former soldier of the *Wehrmacht*, who had become a communist in an antifascist school in Russia, and his loyalty was questionable;⁶⁸² another leader had proper social roots, but he had been held in captivity by American troops, which also raised a question about his allegiance.”⁶⁸³ To find a leader like Natonek or find communist students like the students of the University of Berlin was a complex question for the Soviet authorities. However, the political situation and forthcoming elections prompted the authorities to resolve this problem. The only way was to create a Party school for perspective leaders in order to prepare them for future elections. Two hundred and sixty students were selected for three weeks of intensive education. The best intellects of the SED became teachers at this Party school. Anton Ackermann, Walter Ulbricht, and Paul Wandel delivered lectures about propaganda work. This work partially contributed to the improvement of the skills of students in debating with opponents from the LDP and CDU.⁶⁸⁴ Later, some of them were sent to Moscow for continued studies as was one future leader of East Germany, Erich Honecker.⁶⁸⁵

⁶⁸² The Soviet government opened a special school for German prisoners-of-war in Krasnogorsk, a town near Moscow, in 1942. Some German soldiers were groomed to become leaders of the Communist Party in Germany. The German Communists who had emigrated to the Soviet Union became lecturers in this school. Walter Ulbricht was assigned to be a director of this school. It was his duty to form new members of the Communist Party of Germany out of former soldiers of the *Wehrmacht*. In point of fact, many soldiers returned from the Soviet Zone and took up leading positions in the new state. See: Tsvetkova, *Cultural Imperialism*, 86-87.

⁶⁸³ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 12: 82-89.

⁶⁸⁴ Russian State Archive of Social-Political History. Record group 17. Inventory 132. File 165: 67-69; Inventory 137. File 891: 214.

⁶⁸⁵ Russian State Archive of Social-Political History. Record group 17. Inventory 137. File 90: 80-84. Erich Honecker (1912-1994) was a famous politician in East Germany. He was a member of the Communist Party, and one of the few members of the party who did not emigrate to the Soviet Union during the Nazi regime. Honecker was arrested by the Nazis, but he was not executed. He was successfully freed by Soviet troops. After the war, he was responsible for youth affairs in the Central Committee of the SED. In 1971, Honecker removed his patron Walter Ulbricht from the position of leader of the SED, and became the last leader of the DDR. After the democratic revolution in Germany, he emigrated to the Soviet Union, but he was compelled to leave the Russian Federation for Chile in 1992, where he died in 1994.

The final student council elections in February 1948: establishment of a communist dictatorship in the universities

The struggle between the students and the Soviet Military Administration intensified during the period of the new election in February 1948. The situation worsened on account of the forthcoming incorporation of the preparatory courses into the structure of the universities. Before this incorporation which occurred in 1949, “learners” from these preparatory courses were granted the rights and duties of full-fledged students, notably with the right to vote and to be elected to student councils, which could influence the results of elections. Now the “learners” in the preparatory courses, plus the loyal students in the pedagogy and social science departments, outnumbered the students in the rest of the departments of the universities, something which could also influence election results.

Reading the Soviet documents, we can see that the students began a new offensive against the communists in the 1948 elections: “Although the social composition of the student body has changed, bourgeois elements constitute a considerable majority of the student body. Political immaturity and the influence of conservative professors have prepared the ground for the anti-Soviet views of students. Provocative demonstrations relative to the so-called ‘arrested students’ in the Universities of Berlin and Halle have taken place. The participants, reactionary students, demanded the release of a *group of fascist elements* arrested in the University of Berlin. The instigators of this demand were also arrested.”⁶⁸⁶ So, beginning in 1948, the Soviets were already unafraid to arrest students; this so-called group of fascist elements consisted of students who resisted the politicization of the University of Berlin.

The results of these elections were considered a failure by the Soviet authorities, because a possible united coalition of the liberal parties and non-partisan students could now block any Soviet reform or proposal (*Table 8*).

⁶⁸⁶ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File no #. “Papers relative to the Inspection of the Universities”: page no #.

Table 8
*The Party Affiliations of Students Elected to Student Councils, February 1948*⁶⁸⁷

University	Total	Affiliation				
		SED	SDP	LDP	CDU	Unaffiliated
Berlin	31	4	2	1	3	21
Leipzig	30	8	-	11	9	2
Halle	23	12	-	4	2	5
Greifswald	16	6	-	3	3	4
Rostock	21	11	-	2	1	7
Jena	19	6	-	6	5	2
Total	140	47	2	27	23	41
%	100	35	1	19	16	29
The results of the second elections, December 1947 (%)	100	34	2.8	17.7	19.1	26.3

However, the liberal parties and the nonpartisan movement which both demanded autonomy for academic life were unable to combine their efforts against the Soviet offensive. Most probably the previous dictatorship of the Nazis and the war, along with the permanent psychological pressure of being arrested and killed, resulted in exhaustion and apathy on the part of the students. Only a few were able to resist the Soviets, while the rest of the students did not react to the Soviet offensive.

After this third defeat, the Soviet Military Administration made a decision to eliminate the political influence of the liberal parties in the universities once and for all. These parties were allowed to exist but were compelled to unify under an umbrella organization called the United National Front, while the most resistant of the students were expelled from the universities.⁶⁸⁸ In addition, in order to dilute the influence of the

⁶⁸⁷ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 12: 1-9; Timofeeva, *Nemetskaya Intellegentsia i Politika (The German Intelligentsia and the Politics)*, 124.

⁶⁸⁸ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File no #. "Papers relative to the Inspection of the Universities": page no #; State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 12: 1-9; State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 6: 143.

liberal parties, two new parties were established, the Democratic Peasant Party, the DBD,⁶⁸⁹ for peasants and the National Democratic Party, the NDP,⁶⁹⁰ for former Nazis. Moreover, a new youth organization was established in the universities. It was the famous Union of Free German Youth affiliated to the SED and governed by a young member of the SED, Erich Honecker. These measures predetermined the results of subsequent elections to student councils.

4. Student opposition and the Soviet response

In the opinion of the Soviet Military Administration, the environment in the student sphere was extremely unfavorable. Analyzing the reasons behind student opposition, the Soviet experts wrote: “There is an actual struggle between the reactionary [*that is the opposition students – N.T.*] and progressive [*that is the loyal students – N.T.*] students. Students have strong reactionary attitudes: they are against the privileges granted to children of workers; they are against the students of the pedagogy and social science departments. These reactionary students have grounded their attacks on the argument that the university should sustain a high level of academic knowledge. These students attack the SED, promoted by the German educational authorities and the Soviet Military Administration. Finally, the theories of the reactionary German philosopher and existentialist Karl Jaspers, elaborated by him in the book ‘The Spirit of the University,’ which demanded ‘autonomy’ of the universities from political life and the state, are very popular among a considerable portion of the students. In addition, a negative influence on political life in the universities is exerted by the theology, law, and medicine departments.”⁶⁹¹

⁶⁸⁹DBD is the German abbreviation of the *Demokratische Bauernpartei Deutschlands*, the Democratic Peasant Party. It was one of the parties in East Germany which shared some real political power with the SED. It was established in 1948.

⁶⁹⁰NDP is the German abbreviation for the *Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands*, the National Democratic Party of Germany. It was established in 1948 by a former member of the Communist party of Germany, Lothar Bolz (1903-1986). The establishment was sponsored by the communists in order to involve former Nazis and *Wehrmacht* soldiers in the building of a new political system in East Germany. Bolz assumed various leadership positions in the political structure of East Germany: he was the Minister of Foreign Affairs and a Member of Parliament, among others. After the reunification of Germany, the party became a part of the Free Democrats Party.

⁶⁹¹State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 14: 10-11; State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 12: 50-63.

In this report the Soviet officers enumerated those elements of Soviet policy which provoked resistance from students: the admission of lower social groups, the introduction of new courses, the uncompromised push of the SED within student councils, and the establishment of a new communist organization. Soviet policy caused open and strong resistance on the part of students that lasted until the early 1960s. After that, the resistance would be transferred underground, a silent opposition that lasted until the end of the 1980s.

Student resistance to both new admissions rules and the expansion of communist ideology in the universities

The resistance to the admission of the lower strata. Beginning in 1948-1949, when new admissions rules began operating in every university and the preparatory departments were established, fierce resistance from students became apparent.

Initially, the students and a segment of the professoriate tried to convince the Soviets that with the new admissions rules, the traditions of a high level of academic knowledge would not be able to be maintained, and suggested that the main criterion for selection should be natural aptitude and high academic preparedness of the candidates.⁶⁹² The Soviets were seen to ignore these remarks. When the opposing students and professors understood that their words were not being heard by the Soviet Military Administration, they decided to push for anti-admissions laws through the *Landtags*. Students in Mecklenburg and Saxony-Anhalt were able to raise the question about new admissions rules in meetings of the *Landtags*. The *Landtags* passed anti-admissions laws that nullified these Soviet regulations, and a *Landesminister* of Saxony-Anhalt permitted the University of Halle to cancel all the Soviet rules in light of the new anti-admissions law. However, a new rector of the University of Halle rejected this idea, and later, when the majority of seats in the *Landtags* belonged to the SED, the Soviet authorities were able to rescind these anti-admissions laws.⁶⁹³ Participating in the admissions commissions, those students who were members of the liberal parties tried to block decisions about the enrollment of workers, peasants, and so-called “other democratic elements.”⁶⁹⁴ Soviet curators of the

⁶⁹² State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 6: 163-166.

⁶⁹³ Ibid.

⁶⁹⁴ Ibid.

Universities of Leipzig, Jena, and Berlin reported that “the students and certain professors, members of the LDP, purposely belittled the academic achievements of workers, peasants, and members of the SED during entrance examinations. Children of workers were not admitted to the University of Jena time and time again.”⁶⁹⁵

In such cited reports the Soviet staff of the Education Division emphasized that the LDP and its members represented the main challenge to Soviet initiatives. The Liberal Democratic Party and its student leaders were, in point of fact, the most persistent body, resisting Soviet reforms to the very end. It was the LDP’s students who first opposed new admissions rules in every university stating that universities should admit students capable of studying. Other parties only followed the LDP. In June 1948, a strong wave of student protest rippled through the Universities of Rostock, Halle, and Leipzig. The Soviet authorities dissolved the student councils in these universities as a retaliatory measure.⁶⁹⁶

The University of Berlin acted differently. First of all, its students began leaving the University for the Western Sectors of the city or Western Zones, beginning in 1946. Leaving this university, they openly stated to a Soviet curator that the main reason for their flight was the new admissions rules.⁶⁹⁷ Second, without sound protests and demonstrations, the admissions commissions and the students of the University of Berlin themselves successfully blocked candidates from the lower social groups until the early 1950s, because most of the seats on both the commission and the student council belonged to nonaffiliated students who were against the SED.⁶⁹⁸

The resistance to communist ideology and the influence of the SED in the universities. One of the most popular methods of struggle against communist ideology was to bring discredit to the communists, anonymously but publicly, by comparing their ideology with that of the Nazis. The students scribbled their anonymous comparisons and epigrams about communism on doors and walls of toilets. The most famous epigram was: “O, Lord, grant us the Fifth Reich. The Fourth has turned out like the Third!” (*Herr, schenk uns das fünfte Reich! Das vierte ist*

⁶⁹⁵ Ibid., 198.

⁶⁹⁶ Ibid., 148-150.

⁶⁹⁷ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 2: 139.

⁶⁹⁸ Ibid., 47-48, 162.

dem dritten gleich!).⁶⁹⁹ Or they leafleted every university in the Soviet Zone. Like members of the *White Rose*, the student underground organization that acted against the Nazis during the 1930s and 1940s, students in the now liberated but occupied Germany were compelled to take up the pen again. In the following cited leaflet, translated into Russian by Soviet officers for a Moscow report, students called for resistance to Soviet terror at the University of Halle:

“Students! The Communist terror is becoming more oppressive. East Germany is suffering under the forced domination of a small group of hirelings, who serve a foreign state. Thousands of democrats are languishing again in concentration camps because they clearly expressed their political views.

Students! Do you want see more of your classmates being arrested right in the lecture halls? Do you want to see further how the academic excellence of the universities in the Eastern Zone is descending to the academic level of vocational schools? Do you want to listen to more communist Dozenten and their compulsory classes, waiting until you end up a student in a Marxist Party school? Do you want your interests to be represented by Red student councils, curators and governmental officials?

Students! Remember the movement of 1848. There are always students who resist oppression and injustice in Germany.

⁶⁹⁹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7133. Inventory 1. File 273: 305-311.

Students! You will assume the responsibility for spiritual leadership in Germany in the future. So, you must prove that Germans have learned many things from those 12 years of dictatorship. You must demonstrate to the world that the young German intelligentsia have no desire to escape into an 'inside emigration.' We do not want to become victims of a ferocious Party clique again. Remember the old student traditions and duties. One of them is to be fighters for freedom and progress. Nobody can stand on the sidelines today and nobody has a right to say that he is not interested in politics, because this matter is not about political views and positions but about the survival of Western culture and human civilization as a whole. That's why you must help us in the struggle for freedom and humanity. Resist no matter where. There are many chances to put up resistance. This is your duty towards yourself, Germany, and mankind. Otherwise you will be accomplices and perpetrators in this monstrous crime, the crime of instituting dictatorship and slavery instead of human rights and human dignity."⁷⁰⁰

This emotional leaflet demonstrates the darkest sides of Soviet policy vis-à-vis those German students who did not want to obey the Russians.

⁷⁰⁰ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7133. Inventory 1. File 280: 171-172.

Leaflets with similar texts were disseminated at other universities and, according to the documents, the SMAD was unable to discover the authors of this text.

After dissemination of this leaflet, university students began an open offensive against Soviet policy. They publicly disregarded the Soviet authorities and communist ideology. At the funeral of Marthe Bruin, a student and a member of the SED, one of the University of Halle students openly declared: "These funerals were held with pomp just as the Nazis had done. Try to find flowers and fabrics in Berlin, and you can't normally do it. Yet for this, everything was to be found and in huge amounts. And a great number of people were pressured into participating in these funerals. The Nazis also did this. Why is this woman so valuable? We didn't know her and had never heard about her. She was reportedly killed by fascists. In fact, she was killed by Russian soldiers. The Nazis also used to behave like this."⁷⁰¹

Other students publicly acted against the SED in the universities. In 1946, students of the University of Berlin, under the leadership of the famous student and main sponsor of the Free University, Otto Hess,⁷⁰² declared that red flags should not be hung in the university building and, after that, students tore them down. They sent a letter to Rector Johannes Stroux stating that the University of Berlin "served scholarship and education and it was not a Party institution."⁷⁰³ The Soviet authorities, of course, could not tolerate such behavior, and, consequently, these students were arrested or expelled.⁷⁰⁴

The patience of the Soviet authorities and German Communists was finally exhausted after they received information that a segment of the students from aristocratic backgrounds had decided to establish a new united party to join in the struggle against the promotion of the SED in student councils and universities. In August 1948, students of the University of Leipzig arranged a secret meeting in Dresden to formulate their united position relative to Soviet policy in German universities and

⁷⁰¹ Ibid.

⁷⁰² Otto Hess was elected as the first chairman of the student council at the University of Berlin. In 1948, he was expelled from the University of Berlin for "anti-Soviet propaganda." He, together with two other students, became the primary founders of the Free University. // The State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 1: page no #.

⁷⁰³ Cit. on: Connelly, "East German Higher Education Policies," 273.

⁷⁰⁴ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 1: page no #.

to elaborate a platform for a new party. During this meeting, students emotionally talked about all the political parties that existed in the Zone. They summed up the SED as the party that “disparages our friends who had been killed in action, belittles our virtues and wants to make us content with a Soviet paradise.”⁷⁰⁵ The party of Schumacher, the SDP, also came under criticism by these students because of the loyalty it to some extent had to the SED. Then the LDP was discussed. The students said that “there are some people in this party with good will and honorable intentions. However, they have no courage (!) to say anything against the communist leaders.”⁷⁰⁶ At the end of this meeting students elaborated a plan to establish a party with a conservative inclination, similar to the Tories in Great Britain, because conservatism was considered to be the most suitable for the interests of educated students. However, this plan was not fated to be realized. The Soviet authorities recognized that the establishment of such a new opposition party would take the lead over all the parties and would enhance resistance to reforms. The Soviet Military Administration made a decision to liquidate all the liberal parties in the universities and their leaders, as along with any students with leadership potential who could lead students.

The Soviet offensive against the students

The Soviet Occupation authorities believed that the extremism and openness which they attributed to the feelings and behavior of these young people would disappear if the Soviet staff of the Education Division spoke out and convinced the students to become communists or to be loyal to the new regime. The staff worked hard with the students, arranging lectures and private talks, expounding the history of the Soviet political system to the students, and Soviet experts did find that some students began to change their minds and began to truly believe in the ideals of Marxism and Soviet society.⁷⁰⁷ However, over the course of time, dissatisfaction and resistance on the part of the students only grew on account of the general political and economic situation in Germany, and the behavior of the Occupying powers who were unable to resolve the question of the reunification of the Zones. The Soviet military

⁷⁰⁵ Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation. Record group no #. “Department of the Telegraph Agency of the Soviet Union.” Inventory 9. Box 104. File 124: 1-2.

⁷⁰⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁰⁷ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 8: 88-95; Russian State Archive of Social-Political History. Record group 17. Inventory 137. File 637: page no #.

authorities and security agencies were not prepared for this stubborn behavior on the part of the students, and they were also dissatisfied with the fact that the Education Division had no tough answers to the students' improper behavior.

Ever since 1948 and 1949, Soviet experts had begun elaborating a long-term policy to subjugate the student body. The soft part of this policy included such ideas as finding and isolating student opposition, and limiting the general communication between students in the different Zones. However, the tough part of this policy included such measures against the opposition as expulsion from the universities and arrests.

Defining the opposition. First of all, all the students were divided into four categories in order to define the most dangerous segment of students. The first group of students who supported the communists made up from 10% to 15 % of the total student body in the universities. The second group of students was depicted in documents as nonpartisan students who loved Germany and thus desired to participate in building a new Germany. This group constituted of 50% of the student body. Students in the third group "have grown up deeply rooted in the old German past; they show independence in their behavior, they have a nostalgia for their lost privileges, and they want them returned."⁷⁰⁸ These students, in the opinion of Soviet experts, made up 25% of the total student body and were not dangerous, but they would require a great deal of work to win them over. The fourth group included from 5% to 10% of the total student body. According to Soviet strategists, they "were the deliberate and malicious opposition. They have wriggled into universities despite hurdles being put in their way at the point of admission. These students are stirring up trouble everywhere."⁷⁰⁹

After this analysis of the student body by groups, the staff of the Soviet Military Administration made a decision that the first three groups could remain in the universities, because they were expected to show continuing allegiance. However, they did feel that their travel to the West and communication with the former Allies should be somewhat restricted in order to prevent influence from an alternative ideology. The fourth group must be *found, isolated, and banished* from the universities.⁷¹⁰ To find this group was not difficult for Soviets agents, because the members

⁷⁰⁸ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7133. Inventory 1. File 273.

Page: 305-311.

⁷⁰⁹ Ibid.

⁷¹⁰ Ibid.

of the LDP fell into this category. Those students who were arrested belonged mainly to this party. Moreover, a more tricky policy was used to isolate opposition students from influencing other segments of the student body. The Soviets exploited traditional methods of splitting the students up. Their proposal was that “the students themselves must rise against the leaders of the opposition and make that opposition feel that the ground is slipping from under its feet.”⁷¹¹ Finally, to banish opposition from universities would mean shutting the university’s doors against it, thereby furthering student emigration to the West.

The purge aimed at eliminating the opposition lasted until the early 1960s. In light of this grouping of the students, the Soviet authorities stepped up their policy of banning student travel to the Western Zone in order to “protect” the first three categories from its influence and, furthermore, increased their policy of arrests, exiles, and executions in order to eliminate the fourth group of students.

Banning student travel to West Germany. This became visible when the regime officially proclaimed the building of socialism in East Germany in 1952, which immediately impacted student life. Moreover, the June demonstrations in Berlin in 1953 and later in Hungary in 1956, where young people made up the nucleus of the rebels, contributed to a toughening of their political policy aimed at German students. Travel by students to the West and communications with it were considered to be the main evil that was provoking oppositional attitudes and behavior by East German students. When the first restrictions were launched, they were covert and invisible to most people who visited East Berlin. One of the West German students who visited Soviet Berlin in 1954 left the following notice about it: “There is no actual physical barrier between the eastern and western sectors of Berlin. One can simply board a subway train, the U-Bahn, somewhere in the western sector, ride a few minutes and then get off in East Berlin. If one is lucky, no questions are asked and no official check is made upon visitors; this is entirely up to the whim or suspicion of the individual police.”⁷¹²

Yet, in 1956, American diplomats in West Berlin reported to Washington that “East German students were told that university authorities could no longer support student applications for permission to visit West Germany. The reason given was that in the past too many

⁷¹¹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 4: 1-4.

⁷¹² NARA. Record group 59. Central Files 1963. Box 3559.

students traveling in the Federal Republic were recruited by West German agents either for positions in West German industry or for espionage work against the GDR.”⁷¹³ A new East German Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs, addressing students of the University of Halle said that “under present conditions every trip to West Germany is a political matter, and every student should determine honestly whether his trip serves or injures our Republic and a possible rapprochement between both German states. We are certain that there are students who have close relatives in West Germany whom they want to visit. However, we object to visits to non-existing uncles.”⁷¹⁴ According to a new rule of travel to capitalist countries, students could travel to those countries with which the GDR had diplomatic relations;⁷¹⁵ East and West Germany, however, did not have any diplomatic relations until 1972. In the end, the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961 ultimately barred the way to the West for students and other people in East Germany.

Arresting of students. Until the end of the Cold War, the Soviet Union and East Germany did not recognize the facts of repression, meaning the arrests, exiling, and executions carried out against German students. In the West, as far back as 1953, German students who were able to escape this Soviet terror and who fled to West Germany published a book in which they listed the names of 453 students sentenced to death by the Soviet authorities in Germany.⁷¹⁶ This book was a unique source of speculation for a long time; some researchers believed in the information stated in this book, while other researchers claimed that this book was a project of American propaganda. However, after the opening of archives in Russia and East Germany, some of the facts about the repression discussed in the book have been confirmed; others have not, because a solid portion of the students mentioned in the book, along with other students arrested by the Soviet authorities, were released at the end of 1956 and in the early 1960s as a result of the famous political thaw initiated by the Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev. Nevertheless, we have to admit that German students suffered the most from Soviet pressure and terror.

As we mentioned above, leaders of the liberal parties, and in particular the leaders of the LDP at the universities in Leipzig and Berlin

⁷¹³ NARA. Record group 59. Bureau of Public Affairs. International Exchange Service 1950-58. US Mission, Berlin to the Department of State, June 19, 1956. Box 1, 3.

⁷¹⁴ Ibid.

⁷¹⁵ Ibid.

⁷¹⁶ Müller, Müller, *Stürmt die Festung Wissenschaft*.

who opposed Soviet reforms, were arrested and executed in the 1940s and in the early 1950s. The popularity of the LDP, its victories in student council elections, and its constant challenges to the SED became the main premise for these arrests. The staff of the Education Division in Leipzig reported to Moscow: "In November 1947, our security bodies arrested 14 students implicated in spy activities. They are members of the Liberal Democratic Party."⁷¹⁷ Wolfgang Natonek, a student at the University of Leipzig, the head of the student council and the deputy head of the LDP in Leipzig, is among these students arrested. Natonek, who is famous for his anti-Soviet views and reactionary positions, leads the LDP's student group in the University of Leipzig, which has about 500 members. Taking into consideration our general policy towards the LDP at present – *not to miss any chance and suitable moment to weaken and to forbid the activity of the LDP in the university* [italics added] – the Soviet governor of Leipzig, Nikoly Trufanov, dissolved the LDP student group and its leaders were arrested."⁷¹⁸ So, the reason for Natonek's arrest was to liquidate the LDP, this strong competitor of the SED in the ideological struggle for the minds of students. Wolfgang Natonek was a student in the philosophy department, and after his arrest on November 11, 1947, he and his friends were tried by the Soviet military tribunal and sentenced to 25 years forced labor in Soviet camps. This student was held in an East German prison until the end of 1956, when he was discharged; he was soon able to flee to West Germany, where he lived until his death in 1994. Wolfgang Natonek was rehabilitated by the Russian government in 1995.

Another center of strong student opposition was the University of Berlin. In March 1947, Soviet security bodies arrested several members of the student council for protests against the admissions rules, red flags, and tough policy of the SED in this university. Georg Wrazidlo, Gerda Rösch, and Manfred Klein suffered the most in this crackdown. Georg Wrazidlo was the leader of the student council and the other students were its active members. They were subsequently sentenced to 25 years forced labor for their protests. Other members of the student council visited the chief of the Education Division of the Soviet Military Ad-

⁷¹⁷ The accusation of spy activities against the Soviet Union was the favorite method used by Soviet security agencies. German citizens, for example, talking with representatives of the American Occupation authorities could be evaluated as constituting spy activities on behalf of the United States.

⁷¹⁸ Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation. Record group 082. Inventory 35. Box. 174. File 92: 122.

ministration, Professor Pjotr Zolotukhin, asking for an explanation. They were told that the students had been arrested due to their improper behavior as German citizens but not as members of the university. Zolotukhin advised them to behave in a way that would preclude further arrests.⁷¹⁹ Later, these students were released during the 1950s. George Wrazidlo was discharged in 1956 and fled to the West, where he died in 1959. Gerda Rösch was released in 1957 and worked as a teacher in West Germany. Manfred Klein was released in 1956, lived in Bonn until his death in 1981, and worked as teacher of political education. He wrote a book in 1968 about the resistance to the Soviet Occupation authorities entitled *Jugend zwischen den Diktaturen 1945-1956*.

For some reason or other, the Soviet authorities did not sentence the leaders of the opposition to death. There is no definite answer in the records as to why these students were spared. Possibly, their lives were saved by their popularity both in the East and West as well as the fear of the Soviet authorities faced with united discontent and protests, as a result of information spreading about such executions. Thus, these students mentioned were luckier than the less famous students, who silently resisted and silently died in Soviet prisons. Students such as Axel Schröder, a student of the University of Leipzig and a member of the FDJ, who was executed by firing squad in 1952 for so-called “spy activities” but actually for his communication with the American authorities, and Arno Esch, a student of the University of Rostock, and a member of the LDP, who was executed by firing squad for “establishing the underground counterrevolutionary organization at the university” but actually for the establishment of an opposition student organization, and other students, who were not leaders of the resistance, were less lucky. All of them died in Stalin’s camps in the Soviet Union.⁷²⁰

From the mid-1950s on, resistance grew less strong. Many students tried to flee the Soviet Zone, but many of them became nominal members of the SED, while many students “went into internal emigration” in order to survive. According to the observation of the researcher John Connelly, by the mid-1950s “all open opposition among students had been smothered, yet the Party was becoming obsessed with its inability to ‘know’ students and to recognize enemies in the student body. Students

⁷¹⁹ Connelly, “East German Higher Educational Policies,” 282-83.

⁷²⁰ “The Stalin Terror,” *Memorial Society* <http://www.memo.ru/memory/donskoe/> Accessed August 9, 2009; The State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File no #. “Papers Relative to the Inspection of the Universities”: page no #.

no longer revealed their thoughts in the classrooms or in youth organizations.”⁷²¹

However, the documents say that students began establishing secret academic clubs where they discussed political questions. After the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, the voice of such German student clubs sounded very loudly, and two of them – *George Lucas-Kreis* at the philosophy department and *Jakobiner-Klub* at the history department of Humboldt University in Berlin – publicly articulated the demands of German students. Students demanded freer travel, freer access to all literature, free choice of university, freedom to organize student organizations beyond the official FDJ, participation in control of their institutions, and freedom from compulsory lectures on dialectical materialism and Russian studies. The East German political elite and Walter Ulbricht personally decided to open a public discussion with this segment of the student population, believing that their position was a result of Western propaganda but not a result of communist policy within the universities. Ulbricht published a long “letter to students” in *Neues Deutschland*. His letter was very emotional and menacing: he reminded the students that it was the communists who enabled the intelligentsia to study in the universities. Then, he blackmailed students by indicating that a socialist state could use people prepared to help in socialist construction, and, if that was not clear, the workers themselves would be happy to explain this rule to the students. The letter had no effect on the student body: students boycotted lectures and continued their other anti-regime activities. Their actions were so forceful that they made the SED change its policy: academic hours allocated to Marxist disciplines were decreased in 1957. After numerous discussions, the regime suddenly declared that students specializing in fundamental science might be allowed to learn a fewer number of Marxist disciplines and to learn a second foreign language in addition to Russian. At the same time, the students who had led the opposition were expelled or arrested. The student body of Humboldt University is reported to have suffered the most.⁷²² Moreover, to purge opposition students, Ulbricht proposed the idea of sending loyal students of the FDJ, representatives of trade unions and workers from factories to these opposition clubs in order to demonstrate the fist of the socialist state. After having visited universities in Berlin, Halle, and Dresden, this loyal representative body published a statement that there should be no

⁷²¹ Connelly, *Captive University*, 216.

⁷²² “Ostberliner Studenten Rebellieren,” *Die Zeit*, 20 (May 16, 1957), 4.

reduction in Marxist-Leninist instruction, no student organizations other than the FDJ should be allowed, and no suggestions for changes from either professors or students should be recognized if contrary to the Party line. Ulbricht, “obeying the voice of the public,” declared that no further demands of the opposition students would be met by the SED.⁷²³ After this date, sources are silent about the development of the opposition movement within the student body; however, we are inclined to believe that opposition did exist, but in terms of a silent and underground movement.

5. Changes in student daily life under the influence of Soviet reforms

This chapter about Soviet policy towards German students would be incomplete without a description of student life in the Soviet Zone and later in East Germany, as it was presented by American diplomats. American authorities, like the Soviets, observed the changes in student life that were occurring in the East.

According to the American documents, information about the life of East German students was obtained from unknown East German students interviewed by American diplomats accredited in Berlin. The main themes of interest to the American diplomats related to the selection of students for university studies, indoctrination methods, behavior and attitudes of students, and living conditions at Humboldt University in East Berlin.

The basic observation concerned the admissions rules: children of middle-class families were discriminated against, and educational advantages were given to the children of workers and peasants. According to the American documents, while sons of peasants and workers received a scholarship of DM 180 per month, students with a background from families of upper and middle social groups received only DM 80, which made it very difficult for them to remain at university.

In order to enter university in East Germany, a student, as he told the American diplomats, had to become a worker, then a member of the FDJ in order to obtain a positive recommendation from a place of employment. One of the students from the University of Halle told the

⁷²³ “Background Report. So Geht Das Nicht Weiter – Dissidence in East German Universities. January 29, 1957. Box-folder-report: 23-10-210. Germany,” in *Open Society Archives*
<<http://files.osa.ceu.hu/holdings/300/8/3/text/23-10-210.shtml>> Accessed: 09.07.2009.

Americans how he had gone to work at Wismuth A.G., the East German uranium enterprise, in order to gain status as a workingman, and hence to enhance his chances of entering the university. Then he became a member of the FDJ, because it was practically an obligatory requirement for admittance to every university. Without it, he had no chance of being accepted. Leaders of the FDJ wrote a special report about his doings, behavior, and ideological allegiance, and this report was considered by the admissions commission in the university.

American diplomats also discussed the heavy indoctrination of students. Students who “lived in dormitories without families were more prone to adopt the orientation, which was woven through all their studies, than those who had the stabilizing family influence.”⁷²⁴ Moreover, they observed that even opposition students might eventually accept Marxism due to the long-term learning of communist disciplines.⁷²⁵ Diplomats admitted that the effect of communist ideas imposed upon the students was strong enough to prolong the existence of the political regime in East Germany.

The behavior and attitudes of students were the main topics of the American reports. According to them, most students were against the regime. Some students regarded communism as a game that they had to play in order to complete their education. Simply trying to obtain a professional degree, they were careful about expressing political opinions and were very slow to take anyone into their confidence.

The final and main theme running through the documents was a comparison of the living conditions of students at Humboldt University and at the Free University. In 1965, American diplomats wrote that Humboldt University students received a high monthly scholarship of DM 280 that was adequate for students needs and, more importantly, that this scholarship exceeded that of students at the Free University.⁷²⁶

⁷²⁴ NARA. Record group 59. Bureau of Public Affairs. International Exchange Service 1950-58. Box 1, 3.

⁷²⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷²⁶ The Soviet Military Administration and German Communists provided students with high governmental scholarships and food during the Occupation period in order to win their support. In 1947, students obtained double the ration for bread, sugar, potatoes, and meat, which was much more than the rations allocated to other categories of the German population. See, State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 8. File 12: 112. In addition, according to the documents, some students received flats and high scholarships. See, State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 54. File 14: 10-11. In 1949, the Soviet Military Administration provided only students of the University of Berlin with additional higher scholarships, higher than those

Moreover, rent for students was DM 35 for a privately rented single room, while those who lived in dormitories paid DM 11 monthly. It made American diplomats recognize that East German students had more comfortable living conditions. However, the interior of Humboldt University, its study facilities, and the utilities in the student dormitories were shabby in contrast to the modern buildings of the Free University.⁷²⁷

American diplomats reporting to Washington definitely mentioned both the strong and weak points of East German student life in order to elaborate a plan for a future offensive against the communist influence being imposed upon German youth. In as much as such plans were elaborated at the end 1960s and implemented during the 1970s, we will continue this story about the students in Chapter VI.

Conclusion

In making a comparison between American and Soviet policy towards German students from 1945 through the early 1960s, we can argue that:

American and Soviet styles of purge had certain similarities and differences. Both created special criteria for denazification of the student body, and both declared the necessity of purging Nazis in order to establish a democratic university education. The United States, having elaborated more detailed and stricter criteria for their purge than the Soviet Union, was faced with the problem of the high percentage of Nazis admitted to the universities: despite a tough purge, the percentage of former Nazis ranged from 10% to 26% of the total student body in the universities of the American Zone. The Soviet Union, having elaborated less detailed and less strict criteria for their purge, were not faced with such a problem: former Nazis made up 4.1% of the total student body in the universities of the Soviet Zone. One possible explanation for this gap is that the universities of the Western Zone admitted all refugees and former Nazis arriving from the Soviet Zone, which increased the numbers of both students and former Nazis. The Soviet statistics often omitted the

for the rest of the university students, with those students who lived in the western sectors of Berlin and studied at the University of Berlin being provided with extra allowances calculated in Western deutschmarks. See, State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record group P-7317. Inventory 55. File 11. Page 59. In the 1950s through the 1960s, the student body in East Germany received the highest scholarships in comparison to the student bodies in other East European countries. See, Connelly, *Captive University*, 273.

⁷²⁷ NARA. Record group 59. Central Files 1964-1966. Educational and Cultural Exchange. Box 385.

information about the past affiliation of students with the Nazi Party if they became members of the Communist Party in East Germany, which decreased the officially declared figures with regard to numbers of former Nazis among students.

The subsequent problem for the superpowers concerned admissions rules. The Soviets more radically modified the traditional German approach to the admission of students than the American authorities did. While the Soviet authorities admitted students stemming mainly from the lower social strata, the American authorities admitted students with scholarly potential, student refugees from the East, as well as those students with a *Wehrmacht* past. However, both governments selected politically loyal students in order to groom a new elite to maintain the new political regimes in the two divided parts of Germany. Revising admissions, both Occupation authorities established preparatory courses for prospective students who did not have sufficient knowledge to enter university: the Soviet Union exploited these courses not only to make disadvantaged students more competitive with highly educated students from upper social groups but also to expel students coming in from the upper social groups. As a result, in East Germany the social composition of the student body was cardinally changed up until the early 1960s. The American authorities tried to create an egalitarian system of university education by establishing courses in order to increase the chances for underserved people to enter the universities, but this policy was weak and was not a primary goal of American policy in Germany.

In the field of establishing student organizations, both the Soviet Union and the United States demonstrated radically different approaches. The Soviet Union encouraged political and Party struggle in order to define and eliminate the opposition, and hence to promote the ideological domination of the communists among students. The United States, on the contrary, rejected the idea of establishing party organizations in the universities and instead of this created apolitical and religious organizations. As a result, the Soviet Union, by deepening the political disorder in the universities, expanded its ideology, and eliminated any open and visible opposition by the student body, while the United States, eroding the political ambitions of students, postponed the wave of opposition for several years.

In as much as both intended to create a new loyal student, they often applied similar methods. They established summer schools to demonstrate the advantages of their rival societal systems to students. These summer schools and other mass educational activities contributed

to the dissemination of the rival ideologies. Moreover, both involved the parts of Germany they controlled in the signing of mandatory cultural agreements to train university students. Educating German students, the United States more intensively applied short-term observation tours throughout America to encourage students to build democratic institutions in universities such as the campus system and other communities of student self-government. Some participants actually implanted these American ideas in Germany and contributed to the building of cooperation between the United States and West Germany. The Soviet Union, on the contrary, promoted long-term education to foster a loyal communist elite. These students became the Party leadership in East Germany.

Finally, both authorities had to deal with student opposition. German students articulated their discontent relative to both the Soviet and the American reforms. However, communism incited more oppositional activities on the part of students in the 1940s and 1950s because of the association of communist ideology with the oppressive promotion of new admissions rules, and because of the introduction of communist organizations and of Marxism as a new basis for study in the universities. When encountering this open and strong student opposition, the Soviet Military Administration treated students very severely. Arrests, purges, and executions became the norm in Soviet policy until the early 1960s.

Chapter VI

American and Soviet policy in German universities, mid-1960s to 1990: German university conservatism, and the failure of American and Soviet cultural imperialism

Introduction

A new period in the educational policy of the United States and the Soviet Union towards German universities was bound up with new realities of the Cold War. The building of the Berlin Wall in August of 1961 and the Cuban Missile Crisis in October of 1962 culminated in tense relations between the United States and the Soviet Union that had been escalating since 1945. A gradual normalization and reduction of tension began after these events and grew into the period of political relaxation between the United States and the Soviet Union known as the period of *Détente*. This period lasted from the end of the 1960s until the end of the 1970s and had a significant impact on the educational policy of both superpowers towards German universities.

Normalization of American-Soviet relations made it possible to bring about a specific policy towards the East Block, conceived of by Willy Brandt, who became Chancellor of Germany in 1969, serving until 1974. Brandt proposed to Washington to agree with the position of the USSR that the political borders instituted after the end of World War II between West and East Germany be recognized in exchange for the establishment of closer economic and cultural contacts between West Germany and East Germany. The policy of close economic and cultural ties or *Ostpolitik*, as Brandt claimed, would lead to gradual improvement in the relations between the Soviet Union and West Germany, and to a final reunification of Germany.⁷²⁸ His policy aimed at rapprochement between the Western and Eastern European countries expanded cultural relations between West and East, and the American government was able to begin a cultural offensive in East German universities. The period of *Détente*

⁷²⁸ “Document 191. Memorandum of Conversation. December 14, 1966,” in *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1964-1968*, vol. XV. Department of State. Office of the Historian, <http://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1964-1968v15/d191> (accessed 5 April 2009).

together with Brandt's Ostpolitik contributed to the collapse of Soviet ideology in Germany.⁷²⁹

Such cardinal changes in the political arena in Europe led to a successful signing of the Helsinki Accords in 1975 that established two very important agreements between West and East: The Accords recognized the political borders that had appeared after the end of the Second World War in Europe and thus Western European countries and the United States recognized the German Democratic Republic (GDR) as a sovereign state. It was a real diplomatic victory for the Soviet Union; yet, in exchange for this agreement the countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union were urged to support a political concept of the advancement of human rights in their countries that opened up the era of a semi-legal existence for opposition groups, expansion of travel, and the arrival of some international organizations in the East which would monitor the situation in this sphere. The signing of this agreement partially opened the "Iron Curtain" between West and East and allowed non-governmental organizations from the United States and Western European countries to communicate with the opposition, to expand cultural exchanges, and to take control over implementation of the Accords. It was a great success for American and European diplomacy that paved the way for a channel of influence to a part of the population of the East Block, which, in turn, gave impetus to the development of dissident movements.

The Helsinki Accords, the promotion and popularity of the human rights concept, and the growth of cultural contacts between the United States and Eastern European countries made the breach in the "Iron Curtain" so wide that the events of the early 1980s, such as the cooling of American-Soviet political relations because of the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan, which begun in 1979, and the refusal of the US Congress to ratify the treaty on limitation of strategic ballistic missile launchers, signed by Leonid Brezhnev and Jimmy Carter in 1979, the cooling of relations between Western and Eastern European countries due to the deployment of new ballistic missiles in Europe and repressive measures undertaken by the Soviet and Polish regimes against the dissident movement in Poland could not stop the cultural offensive and

⁷²⁹ New documents and research in regard to the period of Détente can be found in the *Cold War International History Bulletins*, no 1-16 published at the web-page of the Woodrow Wilson International Institute for Scholars, Washington, DC <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index/>

expansion of new values in the East. Ronald Reagan's aggressive cultural policy in the East finally crushed Soviet ideology in the Eastern European countries during the period of economic crisis that developed from the early 1980s onwards.

However, before those events of the end of the Cold War period the universities of West and East Germany were faced with a new attack from American and Soviet educational policies. The attack by both superpowers on the separate halves of Germany had a similar motive: to stop oppositional and negative attitudes expressed by students and professors against the imposition of ideology, whether the American ideology in the West or the Soviet one in the East.

The United States and the Soviet Union in their own way resolved the problem of losing control over academic life in both countries. The American government attempted to influence the student body which had initiated wide protest against the United States in West German universities. To eliminate student opposition, in 1969 Washington compelled the government of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) to introduce a new package of reforms proposed by American experts for the German universities; however, these reforms finally became bogged down due to the strong resistance of the conservative old professoriate. This segment of German professors initiated a successful counter-offensive against the models of university life imposed by the United States in the mid-1970s. The unexpected strength of the German professors and their success in resisting American influence was followed by a return of some of the old characteristics of the traditional German university system that had been eliminated by American reforms in the period of the Occupation and in 1969. The professors were able to return to their powerful influence within the professoriate in terms of the essence of education and training, and their freedom to make decisions over academic programs and curriculum despite the desires and intentions of the student body. They also have instilled again the idea of the isolation of academic life from politics. After this victory by the conservative professoriate, cooperation between the US and Federal Republic of Germany in the area of education has been seriously collapsed until the end of the Cold War.

The Soviet government also conducted a fresh ideological attack on East German universities through its conventional means, which was the expansion of Marxism in the disciplines, curriculum, and even in the behavior, and the life of students and professors. This new attack in the 1970s was brought about by the concern of the Soviets with a specific

position held by East German students and professors. Though demonstrating outward obedience to the indoctrination and ideology of the ruling regime, they had never become loyal and convinced followers of communism and never accepted the imposition of a Marxism foundation for academic life. This was clearly understood by both Moscow and Berlin, and they attempted to make the university people accept these imposed values by all possible means. However, neither was able to achieve this.

Moreover, the East German professoriate and students fell under the influence of incoming American and Western culture. During the period of *Détente* and during in the early 1980s, the United States arranged for a steady influence to be imposed on a segment of East German students and professors, and the intelligentsia as well. American educational exchange programs reached the universities of the GDR starting in the mid-1970s, and many cultural programs, radio, and TV from the FRG became popular among East Germans. However, the German professoriate demonstrated restraint towards the new ideology and values coming from the West. University professors and a segment of the students, in contrast to religious young people and most of the intelligentsia, who became members of the broad dissident movement supported by the West, did not fall into American arms.

Hence, to demonstrate the development of these different components inherent in American and Soviet educational policies – their reforms in German universities, the internal resistance to them, the American offensive towards the East and, finally, the failure of superpowers' cultural imperialism – the segments of this chapter will be arranged in the following order. The first part of the chapter will discuss American policy and the second part will analyze the Soviet policy in German universities from approximately 1965 until the end of the 1980s. The third part will investigate American attempts to influence East German academia as well as the place of East German students and professors in the dissident movement that developed during the period of *Détente*. The conclusion to this chapter will answer the question of why the cultural imperialism of them failed during this period.

I. American policy in West German universities

After the erection of the Wall, the West German university system underwent both huge and well-documented shake-up and reforms

provoked by the student movement and American interference in German universities. As is well known in the historiography, the student movement was rooted, first of all, in the need to expand access to the institutions of higher education and in the need to improve the standard of living and study of students. The reforms implemented coped with the overcrowded educational institutions, and the government of West Germany opened many new universities. The second source of the student movement grew from the leftist and anti-American mood that had developed in Europe and, in particular, in the universities. The leftist student movement laid the foundation for permanent demonstrations by students and radical young lecturers, and not only against the Vietnam War. American government documents, however, now shed new light on the events that occurred in West German universities, revealing information that had previously remained hidden from contemporary historiography. In this segment of the chapter, we will clarify the American interpretation of the student movement. We must begin by noting that, first of all, the American government referred to “student movement” – a scholarly term with a definition – as *student radicalism*.⁷³⁰ The United States did not stand on the sidelines while events were happening in the FRG at the end of 1960s through the early 1970s: Washington tried to eliminate student radicalism and to impose new reforms. However, the final results of this policy were controversial and witnessed the final failure of the American government in its attempt to transform the German university system according to the American model.

American policy in the West German universities in the period of the mid-1960s through to 1990 can be divided into three stages. The first is 1965-1970, when the United States struggled intensively with the student movement or student radicalism and participated in the elaboration and implementation of new reforms. The second is 1971-1975, when that segment of the professoriate known as the conservatives was able to revise or rollback the reforms made in West German universities. The third is 1975-1990, when educational contacts between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany declined to zero.

⁷³⁰ University of Arkansas Libraries. Special Collections. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection. Manuscript Collection 468. Box 317. Folder 17. Germany, Federal Republic of, 1963-1970.

1. Student radicalism and the American response, 1965-1970

The situation in West German universities

On the territory of West Germany before the mid-1960s, eighteen universities operated in Kiel, Hamburg, Göttingen, Cologne, Münster, Bonn, Marburg, Giessen, Frankfurt am Main, Mayence, Saarbrücken, Freiburg, Tübingen, Heidelberg, Munich, Erlangen, Würzburg, and in Berlin with the Frei Universität (Free University). From 1965 until 1975 twenty-five new universities were opened, and the total number of universities encompassed about 300,000 students. This was actually a huge number of students, much more than in other European countries. The American government is reported to observe the development of all these universities. However, according to archival documents, the universities, previously located in the American Zone of Occupation, turned out to be the primary target of the American interest and policy. Seven universities in Berlin, Heidelberg, Frankfurt-am-Main, Munich, Marburg, Erlangen, and in Würzburg were in the focus of American educational policy and we therefore emphasize the American policy in these universities.

Evidently, the great size of the student body created both expected and unexpected problems as observed by those American experts and diplomats who remained in Germany. The first visible problem reported concerned overcrowding in the universities. This problem was especially acute at the Free University, where students could not find places in the dormitories and in lecture halls.⁷³¹ By 1964, the problem of too many students amid an inadequate university infrastructure went national and included every university. American diplomats recounting the opinion of German experts in the area of education reported that the basic problem of the Germany university system was an increase in student population without a commensurate increase in staff and facilities. This had resulted in a low teacher-student ratio and very limited access to professors. While the number of university students had increased during the 1960s, faculty size at universities had remained relatively constant. For example, in the University of Munich only fifteen professors of law were available for a total of 2,626 law students, and only two professors of English for 689 students of that subject.⁷³² The number of students had risen for a wide

⁷³¹ NARA. Record Group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. FRG. Internal Affairs 1955-1959. Microfilm. Reel 30.

⁷³² W. Stahl, *Education for Democracy in West Germany: Achievements, Shortcomings, Prospects* (New York: Frederick & Praeger, 1961), 156.

variety of reasons. Among the most important were the high birth rate and the fact that access to university education had become more widely available, hence more and more families sought to give their children a higher education. However, the number of professors remained extremely small, as American diplomats emphasized as early as 1961-1965.

At the same time American observers noted other problems which took on a national scope by the end of 1960s. One problem concerned the attitude of a segment of students towards the values of democracy imposed by the United States and also towards the international situation at the time. One segment of the students fell easily under the influence of communist ideology and the leftist movement.⁷³³ The other students, on the contrary, demonstrated strong political apathy and discouragement, and often chose to withdraw from the political arena rather than be subjected to intimidation and the “politicization” of leftists.⁷³⁴ Initially, before 1965, the American government had remained silent and did not react to the various attitudes of the students. Yet, as soon as the mood of the students became mixed up with the growing problems in the universities and the students began marching in the streets to demand certain university reforms, the United States decided to interfere.

The first surge of the student resentment which attracted the attention of Washington was a student demonstration at the University of Munich. In early 1965, students demonstrated for better educational opportunities and for the opening of new departments. Nearly 5,000 students gathered in the courtyard of the university to hear speeches by students and professors. The demonstration was organized by the University Student Organization, ASTA. They marched through Munich’s streets. The rector and professors understood that new departments and new universities were necessary in order to improve student life, and they promised to do something about this.⁷³⁵ In 1966, students of the Free University protested against decisions by some departments regarding “mandatory Exmatrikulation.” The students who did not fulfill the requirements for a degree within nine semesters were to be dropped and those remaining were required to notify a dean of a department at the end of every semester whether they wished to take the examinations or apply for an extension. The reason for this was that some students studied up to

⁷³³ NARA. Record Group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. FRG. Internal Affairs 1955-1959. Microfilm. Reel 30.

⁷³⁴ NARA. Record Group 59. Culture and Information, 1970-1973. Box 392.

⁷³⁵ NARA. Record Group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. FRG, 1963-1966. Microfilm. Reel 34.

twenty-eight semesters without ever reporting for exams. The students, however, argued that the academic load and the content of the curriculum were steadily increasing and that, as a result, an average student had no chance at all of getting a degree within the period prescribed by the departments. The students demanded therefore a reduction in the amount of time students spent at the university, a revision of the obsolete curriculum, and, more importantly, admission on an equal footing with professors in the special curriculum commissions set up to make these changes. On top of this, they were dissatisfied with overcrowded seminars, poor student counseling, lack of student-professor contact, and a shortage of study materials.⁷³⁶

The United States completely supported these demands by the students, because they reflected American ideas about student representation in administrative bodies and about the revision of the curriculum, and so student unrest was exploited to pressure the German government into transforming German universities still further along the lines of the American model.

However, the situation soon changed quite quickly, and, instead of moderate demands, the students began calling not only for equal participation of students in the composition of the curriculum commission (three professors and three students from every department) but also for including the study of the philosophy and works of New Left scholars such as Herbert Marcuse in the university curricula and the dismissal of the old, conservative professors. In order to achieve these goals, they began boycotting lectures in the departments of philosophy, political science, and law. Some professors had to hold their lectures in overalls due to the constant pelting with eggs and tomatoes. Some professors suffered sudden heart attacks and numerous lecturers sought for medical assistance due to the physical and psychological stress.⁷³⁷

At the same time, the students were turning severely anti-American and were involved in the protests against the Vietnam War. Students from the universities of Frankfurt, Berlin, and Hamburg were the first to demonstrate against American intervention in a divided Vietnam. Their cry was “*Today Vietnam, Tomorrow us.*” The leaders of these demonstrations were said to be part of the leftist intelligentsia, from leftist organizations such as the *Socialist German Student Federation*, and from the Communist Party which by then existed illegally in West

⁷³⁶ Ibid.

⁷³⁷ Ibid.

Germany. In September of 1965, a leader of the student organization at the Free University, Wolfgang Lelevre, and a son of West Berlin Mayor Willy Brandt disseminated a letter against the war among the students. The American government would never have paid any attention to such an action, if American diplomats had not known that this initiative had come from a communist organization (The Committee for Peace and National and International Understanding) connected to the East Berlin Communist Party. The Committee was led by Erich Engel, a West Berlin resident, who was a movie director in East Germany. American diplomats stated that this organization was directed by an SED bureaucrat who lived in West Berlin. Such behavior on the part of the students, specifically their ties to the East German Communist Party, could not be ignored by the American government and was considered dangerous as opposed to the previous student demonstrations against the poor conditions of study and life in universities.

Hence, *anti-Americanism*, rather than the demands of the students for improvements in and expansion of the universities or for participation in the university decision-making process, was how the Americans now defined the student movements and upheavals in 1966. Initially diplomats on the grounds and back in Washington assumed that any anti-Americanism could be quickly circumvented by the propaganda work of the pro-American, loyal student organizations established by the United States during the Occupation. However, when they counted the number of anti-American and pro-American student groups, the Americans were stunned to see a ratio of 12:1.⁷³⁸ Moreover, establishing new Institutes or a Chair of American Studies at every new university in West Germany, presented the American government with a brand new problem: the low growth in student numbers in these American studies programs during a period when all other departments in the universities were overcrowded. The shortage of students was especially acute in Marburg, Saarbrücken, and Würzburg.⁷³⁹ As a result, American policy of the previous twenty years aimed at establishing loyal, apolitical student groups had failed in fell swoop.

The other term applied by Washington to define all the things happening both in German universities and in the universities of such countries as the United States, France, and Japan, was *student radicalism*. The movement of student radicalism encompassed many universities in

⁷³⁸ NARA. Record Group 59. Confidential US Department of State Central Files. FRG, 1963-1966. Microfilm. Reel 35.

⁷³⁹ NARA. Record Group 59. Central Files, 1967-1969. Box 345.

the countries mentioned; however, in the universities of West Germany, this movement was the most radical and dangerous for the political stability because of the geographic closeness of West Germany to the communist regime of East Germany which influenced the student body in the West. For Americans, the radicalism was not demonstrations and demands of students to revise the curriculum or dismiss professors, but the student radicalism as defined as a pro-Marxist stance by the students. The term was first mentioned in American documents in 1967 and explained as follows: "The radical German university student has emerged as a visible and vocal factor of the German political stage, serving as the prime mover for the New Left – Dissident Mao-Marxist students, intellectuals, and artists."⁷⁴⁰

American diplomats stated that student radicalism was appearing in such universities as Berlin, Frankfurt, Heidelberg, and Marburg. We should emphasize that in these universities mentioned the United States had conducted the bulk of their reforms and had previously imposed American models in management, teaching, and curriculum. The most radical faculties were the humanities and social sciences that had been transformed by the Americans during the period of the Occupation.⁷⁴¹

The Americans were concerned that the students, who flirted with Marxism, Maoism, communism, and Castroism, would establish close and direct contacts with the East German and Soviet communists. Washington, in our opinion, had realistic reasons to think so: first, most of the West German student movement's leaders like Rudy Dutschke⁷⁴² had come from East Germany and its universities and this might have left an imprint on their mode of thinking in terms of communism and behavior. Although the leaders of the students proclaimed their dislike for the Soviet Union and Soviet ideology, they expressed a commitment to Castro or Maoist communism that sounded just as dangerous for the United States in the context of the cultural Cold War. Second, the SED has actually expanded its influence in West Berlin and West Germany by establishing not only a network of pro-communist and radical student

⁷⁴⁰ Special Collections. University of Arkansas Libraries. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection. Manuscript Collection 468. Box 317. Folder 17. Germany, Federal Republic of, 1963-1970.

⁷⁴¹ NARA. Record Group 59. Culture and Information, 1970-1973. Box 392.

⁷⁴² Rudi Dutschke was the most prominent spokesperson of the German student movement of the 1960s. On April 11, 1968, Dutschke was shot in the head. Dutschke reentered the German political scene after protests against the building of nuclear power plants activated a new movement in the mid-1970s. He also began working with dissidents opposing the communist government in East Germany. He died in 1979.

organizations there, but also by opening legal political training schools in West Berlin such as the Reichsbahn Party School for Marxism-Leninism in 1966.⁷⁴³ Third, the government of the USSR maintained very close contacts between student groups in the Soviet Union and West Germany. The Soviet students came to West Germany by official invitation of leftist student groups such as *the Socialist German Student Union* (Sozialistischen Deutschen Studentenbund, (SDS)).⁷⁴⁴ These contacts are mentioned in both American and Soviet documents.⁷⁴⁵

Hence, the American government, while supporting the moderate demands of students relative to reforming the universities, could not ignore the radical slipping of a segment of the student body into Marxism.

University reforms

This radicalism and anti-Americanism impelled the government of the United States to find some common thread to the behavior of students in order to help eliminate the main roots of such dangerous behavior. The American government spent several years painstakingly observing the students and elaborating a new policy towards them. In 1969, American experts sponsored by Washington investigated the causes behind student

⁷⁴³ NARA. Record Group 59. Central Files 1964-1966. Educational and Cultural Exchange. Box 385.

⁷⁴⁴ The *Sozialistischen Deutschen Studentenbund*, SDS, was a radical-left group. It succeeded in developing a massive student protest movement, beginning around 1965 based on the discontent of students, and capitalizing on blunders by the authorities, while carefully developing more general political issues of an inflammatory nature (war, persecution, and injustice). Its philosophical underpinnings were certainly Marxist, but – like its spiritual mentor, Herbert Marcuse – it was anti-authoritarian in principle, and hostile to the bureaucratic communism of the Soviet Block. They studied the tactics of the American civil rights and student protest movements. Membership nationwide never exceeded 2,500, though the right issue would bring out the students en masse to demonstrate: 15,000 after the death of the student Benno Ohnesorg - shot by a plainclothes policeman during an earlier demonstration - in July 1967; 40,000 after Rudi Dutschke was severely wounded – shot by a right-wing student – in May 1968. The SDS dissolved itself in 1969 in the face of external pressures – it was, for example, outlawed at Heidelberg – and in conformity with its own anti-authoritarian determination to avoid bureaucratization. Since that time, work has been concentrated at the grass roots level in “basic groups” and “red cells,” developing Marxist political indoctrination. // NARA. Record Group 59. Culture and Information, 1970-1973. Box 392.

⁷⁴⁵ NARA. Record Group 59. Central Files 1964-1966. Educational and Cultural Exchange. Box 396; Russian State Archive of Modern History. Record Group 5. Inventory 35. File 102: 120.

radicalism in German universities. They pinpointed three reasons that had led to it.

The first concerned *the conservative nature of German universities*, which the American government had attempted to eliminate for the past twenty years. Just as they had twenty years earlier, American experts reported to the government that the German University remained traditional and elitist, reserving an exalted status and power for full professors, and admitting only a small number of students. University life and study were organized around small seminars, with close personal association between professors and students, all of whom came from the aristocracy. The conservative structure has broken down in the twentieth century; as the old social coherence of the university was disturbed by an influx of students from the middle class and – to a lesser extent – from lower social groups, and as the numerical growth of the student body rendered impracticable a close professor-student relationship the old professors could no longer lead their students.⁷⁴⁶ The experts especially pointed out that the leadership in the universities had been assumed by the survivors of the pre-Nazi era and for twenty years they had not comprehended their own obsolescence.⁷⁴⁷ This segment of professors was defined by *German conservatism*, which maintained obsolete norms of teaching methods and behavior on the part of professors. This conservatism was unacceptable to the students and, hence, they were demonstrating primarily against this.

The second cause of student radicalism was defined as *mistakes of educational policy made by the United States during the Occupation period*. The experts and American diplomats emphasized that the German educational system after 1945 was reestablished essentially in the old liberal mold. American policy, aimed at granting the universities full independence from the German federal government, had contributed to the crisis situation of the 1960s “by permitting the central government virtually no competence in the field of education, thus leaving the burden of reforms on the competing state governments and universities themselves.”⁷⁴⁸ In other words, the lack of state control over the

⁷⁴⁶ NARA. Record Group 59. Culture and Information, 1970-1973. Box 392.

⁷⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁴⁸ Actually, Basic Law Article #74 allowed the federal government joint competence only in the “promotion of scientific research” and Article #70 conferred exclusive competence on the state governments in areas not subject to exclusive federal or joint federal-state competence.

universities had created “superfluous freedom for students and professors.”⁷⁴⁹

The third root was the *isolation of the student body from any deep understanding of how democracy works* and of political science as imposed previously by Americans.⁷⁵⁰ The government of the United States admitted that the introduction of new disciplines embracing the American political ideology of the supremacy of the constitution and the law and of the separation of powers had failed. The West German students had not become confirmed liberals.

While the United States had been investigating the causes of student radicalism, German students had won a transformation in their position in university administrative bodies. Their success concerned the diminishing of that very power of the professoriate that had been urged by the United States. The first student victory over the administration of a university was a 1967 decision at University of Tübingen to admit students and teaching assistants to the university’s policy-making councils, where previously only full professors had been admitted.⁷⁵¹ The reduction in the full professor’s power in the German university was a radical departure from the long-standing practice of making all academic groups totally dependent on the professors. The second success was a decision by the municipal government of West Berlin to adopt a so-called “third-party” plan of control for the Free University in 1968. At the center of the new university was the powerful office of the president elected for a seven-year term. At each stage below him governing councils comprised a number of professors, junior instructors and teaching assistants, and students, with no single group commanding a majority of the votes. In practice, the students joined with the instructors and assistants to force the tenured professors, long the sole power within the structure, into a minority position. Versions of the new “Berlin model” were adopted in other universities including Bremen, Hamburg, and Hessen.⁷⁵² The third achievement of the student movement without a doubt was the establishment of the Curriculum Revision Committees, which featured equal membership by students, professors, and junior teaching staff. Hence, the students now had the possibility of influencing the content of academic programs and university curricula, and where there was an

⁷⁴⁹ NARA. Record Group 59. Culture and Information, 1970-1973. Box 392.

⁷⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁷⁵¹ NARA. Record Group 59. Central Files, 1967-1969. Box 345.

⁷⁵² R.L. Merritt, E.P. Flerlage, A.J. Merritt, “Democratizing West German Education,” *Comparative Education* 7, no. 3 (1971), 129-130.

alliance created between the students and the junior teaching staff, which very often occurred, the younger generation had a voting majority and could abolish any proposal made by the professoriate. These changes were welcomed by the United States. Finally, the fourth victory of student radicalism in the eyes of the American government was the election as president of the Free University of a 31-year-old graduate student in sociology named *Rolf Kreibich*, who had no administrative experience but was liked by the students. Rolf Kreibich had been born in Dresden in 1939. He had studied at the Humboldt University in East Berlin from 1958 to 1960, and then had fled to the West before the eve of the building of the Wall. He continued his studies (sociology) at the Free University and graduated in 1964. At the time of his election to the presidency of the Free University in 1969, Kreibich was working on his dissertation in the Economics and Social Sciences Department and delivering lectures as an assistant. While in East Germany, Kreibich had been a member of the communist Free German Youth, but he had left this organization and East Germany because socialism – according to his own words – of the GDR variety did not suit him. After his election, he promised to change the Free University's organizational structure in accordance with modern management principles, to expand the experimental reforms, and to resign from the presidency if massive opposition to this program developed.⁷⁵³

Welcoming these first victories of the student movement and calling them as moderate changes in the conservative German universities, the American government soon worried about the most radical students who were inclined to extremism and communism. It was the most leftist and most radical of the students who wished the universities to be centers of Marxism and communism. Actually, the small number of students supported from the GDR was able in some cases to turn the dissatisfaction of moderate German students with their living and study conditions towards a political struggle against the West German political system. Students of the most radical vein conducted rude attacks against the professoriate, the administration of universities, and against the political and social system of the West during peaceful discussions of internal university problems between professors and students. The American government was sure that these activist students with strong leadership potential would soon influence part of the apolitical student

⁷⁵³ NARA. Record Group 59. Central Files, 1967-1969. Box 345.

body and turn them into militant socialists, which would lead to catastrophe.

The Americans, in support of the moderately radical students and professor-reformers, therefore demanded that the administration of the universities exercise tight control of this two percent of the most radical students. What kinds of measures were proposed to take control of them? First of all, the American diplomats wished to eliminate the communists from the West Berlin universities. They asked the government of West Berlin to curb illegal public demonstrations and to take control of the Free University if the administration was unable to do this by itself. Also, it was proposed to withdraw permission for the SDS to operate at the Free University.⁷⁵⁴ The West Berlin government implemented these proposals: the demonstrations were dispersed by the police, socialist and communist groups of students were forbidden, unauthorized meetings of students were no longer permitted, and the lecture halls could not be used for student political activities such as anti-Vietnam exhibitions.⁷⁵⁵

To advance the decision to take control of students at the Free University, Hans-Joachim Lieber, a rector of the university before the tenure of R. Kreibich, was invited to Washington. After his return in December of 1968, he initiated disciplinary procedures against fourteen leftist students, including ASTA chairman Jürgen Treulieb, for inciting or participating in protests that led to disruption of classes. These students were expelled, and a new wave of expulsion began to affect all the universities in 1969. This provoked a new and strong reaction from the students, and more importantly, from some of the apolitical and moderate students who were becoming the members of leftwing as well as socialist and communist groups, along with junior teaching staff began supporting the students. The policy of student expulsion initiated by the United States reminds us of the Soviet policy towards opposing students in 1949-1955. Strong protest and the pro-communist position of the West German students, which could undermine the political system implanted and fostered in the FRG by the United States, caused a tough response on the part of the American government at the end of the 1960s; resistance by East German students to Soviet indoctrination and their pro-liberal position had caused the same response from the Soviet Union twenty years earlier.

⁷⁵⁴ NARA. Record Group 59. Central Files, 1967-1969. Box 345.

⁷⁵⁵ NARA. Record Group 59. Central Files 1964-1966. Educational and Cultural Exchange. Box 385.

Finally, on April 2, 1969, the United States Vice-President arranged a talk with Chancellor Kurt Kiesinger, a leader of the Grand Coalition, on the question of student radicalism. Kiesinger was invited to the American Embassy in Bonn where he was directly asked about the continuing student unrest in German universities. The Chancellor replied that the situation had become less violent for a while because the universities expelled the militant elements. American diplomats asked a further question about the possibility of an alliance between workers and students that could bring about a revolutionary situation. The Chancellor answered that there was no fear that German workers would ever side with the students as the French workers. The Chancellor also added that "if anything, German workers were spoiling for an opportunity to lay their hands on the students."⁷⁵⁶ He was most likely right, because one year earlier a worker, Josef Bachmann, had shot the leader of the West Berlin leftist students, Rudi Dutschke, three times. Dutschke survived, but he never fully recovered before his death in 1979.⁷⁵⁷

A gentler way of stopping the radicalism was proposed by the United States after the expulsion of most of the radical students from the universities. One of these was quite conventional and concerned the training of selected groups of students in American universities. As I mentioned in previous chapters, students had been involved in special educational programs sponsored by the government since the early 1950s. During the entire period of the 1960s and early 1970s the number of students was the largest among all other categories of West Germany citizens.⁷⁵⁸ Training the students in the United States, the government pursued the goal of implanting the American model in German universities such as student governance, and the campus system and of urging this select segment of the student body to study the principles of youth leadership, youth organizations, group techniques, and so on.⁷⁵⁹ However, the American government was interested in involving students of a pro-democratic and pro-American stance in these programs, while neglecting the remaining mass of students and leftists. This situation continued until 1968; American experts recruited the five to seven percent of the student body that did not belong to the student radical

⁷⁵⁶ NARA. Record Group 59. Central Files, 1967-1969. Box 345.

⁷⁵⁷ J. Suri, "The Cultural Contractions of Cold War Education: The Case of West Berlin," *Cold War History* 4, no. 3 (2004): 1-20, here 11.

⁷⁵⁸ NARA. Record Group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural Affairs. Lot 98D 252. Box 169-172, 205-206.

⁷⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

movement, while the broad majority of students as well as radicals were not included in American educational, information, and cultural programs.⁷⁶⁰

When student radicalism began its national movement in 1965, the government of the United States continued its previous projects and programs aimed at the future leaders of Germany, who studied at the universities. Washington was absolutely sure in 1965 that university students and the Berlin university students, in particular, would become hard-working, intelligent leaders, who would consciously avoid becoming extremist. These students with leadership potential were educated by the Americans to be leaders of political parties or first-rate reporters or editorial writers. In 1968, however, American diplomats insisted to Washington that past programs and priorities were no longer adequate. Germany has become increasingly caught up in political and social problems. However, university students – who constitute only seven percent of total German youth, but almost every future leader will come from this group – have become the center of the ‘New Left’ and this group of students falls into categories. The first is the leadership of moderate young people and student organizations. The second is the hard core membership of radical organizations.⁷⁶¹ American diplomats proposed emphasizing the student leadership, both radical and moderate. But to understand who was who, and to estimate correctly the values, desires, and goals of German students, Washington launched a specific diplomatic project aimed at direct communications between American diplomats accredited in Bonn and German students.

The American Embassy in Bonn established *The Youth Committee*. It accumulated, first of all, some biographical data (Embassy’s Youth Register) on those students with whom the United States needed to speak in order to influence on their behavior. These students were radicals, though not the most leftist and extremist among them, and numbered 300 throughout West Germany. They were selected according to their moderate interest in Marxism and their dislike for the Soviet Union. The goal was to keep them from slipping into more radical forms of thinking and behavior.⁷⁶²

After having created this biographical database, the American diplomats started acting: they established personal contact with the

⁷⁶⁰ NARA. Record Group 59. Central Files 1964-1966. Educational and Cultural Exchange. Box 395.

⁷⁶¹ NARA. Record Group 59. Central Files, 1967-1969. Box 363.

⁷⁶² NARA. Record Group 59. Central Files, 1967-1969. Box 363.

students, invited them to the embassy, initiated discussions about radicalism, the leftist movement, democracy, and so on.⁷⁶³ Actually, for the first time in the history of American educational policy, politicians spoke with the targets of their policy personally. Again, this policy turned out to be similar to Soviet policy aimed at establishing open and individual contacts with students to convince them to be more loyal and more obedient. The newest and most intriguing instrument for influencing students became the junior staff of the American diplomatic corps specially selected in the United States. Washington assumed that younger diplomats called Junior Foreign Service Officers, who had just graduated from American universities, could come to an understanding faster with the German students.⁷⁶⁴ The political job of a Junior Foreign Service Officer was to go to these students and student organizations, visit those key students who participated in discussion groups, and arrange to entertain them privately. Many young American officers actually established close personal contact with German students. These Junior Foreign Service Officers hosted student conversation groups in order to learn how to influence German students. The American officers regularly attended meetings of some of the student organizations.⁷⁶⁵ After establishing personal contact, the diplomats proposed giving talks on the necessity of the German-American partnership and on American foreign policy. In addition, every student received a book explaining Lyndon Johnson's policy.⁷⁶⁶ The universities of Frankfurt, Marburg, Berlin, and Munich became favorite places for American diplomats to deliver these talks.⁷⁶⁷ This contact provided valuable information on student affairs which was then reported to Washington. And German students showed a willingness to discuss their ideas, including even such sensitive matters as their organization's plans, with these young American officers.

American diplomatic documents, however, regularly mentioned that efforts to reach the mass membership of German young people and student organizations were clearly beyond the American Embassy's capabilities, and inconsistent with its priorities.⁷⁶⁸ Student organizations outside the universities, which remained the most radical, were reached

⁷⁶³ NARA. Record Group 59. Central Files 1964-1966. Educational and Cultural Exchange. Box 395.

⁷⁶⁴ NARA. Record Group 59. Central Files, 1967-1969. Box 363.

⁷⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶⁶ NARA. Record Group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural Affairs. Lot 98D 252. Box 169-172, 205-206

⁷⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁶⁸ NARA. Record Group 59. Central Files, 1967-1969. Box 363.

by the United States. Hence, it is difficult to evaluate to what extent these programs countered the pro-Marxist position of students and converted them to the American side. But one thing can be clearly seen: the most radical groups of students, those who called themselves Maoists, Castroites, Trotskyites, and anarchists were not covered by the new youth policy of the United States. The latter addressed their programs to those students who led moderate student organizations. Estimating the final result of its youth project through polling of the political attitudes of German students in 1971, the US government stated that democratic attitudes of young people had diminished: students had not developed positive adherence to the political values of the Bonn Republic, and demonstrated dissatisfaction with the political reality and democratic ideals. Washington did not blame the junior diplomatic corps for the failure of this project but did blame the earlier project of introducing political science into German universities that was carried out from 1949 to 1955 for the weakness of belief of students in democracy and liberalism as revealed in the early 1970s. Political science, in the opinion of American experts in 1971, had not taught German students to be democrats.⁷⁶⁹ We assume that these American experts had not understood the actual desires and intent of moderate German students: most young German university people considered the term “democracy” as meaning a “political ideology” and “party government” that undermined the concept of “academic freedom” in German universities. The younger generation regarded American activities in the universities as a sort of interference in their traditional concept of “academic freedom” and they therefore repudiate the term “democracy.”

Moreover, the United States insistently encouraged the government of the Federal Republic to carry out a program of reforms in 1969 that would end overcrowding, increase the percentage of young people in the universities, re-establish a high degree of personal rapport between students and professors, and adjust study programs to minimize personal student disorientation. Such a package of reforms was considered to be an effective response to legitimate student grievances. In addition, the government of the Federal Republic was asked to retire the pre-war generation of professors and replace them by a younger generation of teachers more in tune with the prevailing democratic ethos and more sophisticated in the complex ways of parliamentary democracy. All these

⁷⁶⁹ NARA. Record Group 59. Culture and Information, 1970-1973. Box 392.

proposals were elaborated by the American government for immediate implementation by the federal government of West Germany.

These proposals were met with disappointment and reluctance by German politicians and professors. The professors were especially displeased with the American initiatives aimed at reducing their power. Nevertheless, the new Chancellor Willy Brandt showed some signs of including the American package of reforms in his own initiatives aimed at putting education and training, and research and science at the top of the reforms to be made. He promised to provide financial assistance to the *Länder*, the individual German states, for construction projects, to remove obsolete hierarchical structures in the universities, and to speed up expansion of the universities. Actually, he was able to revise the system of control over universities: Responsibility was transferred from the Bundesrat and Land Affairs Ministry to the new Education and Science Ministry.⁷⁷⁰ Moreover, his reforms proclaimed such important things as 1) democratization of the decision-making process at all levels, and a sharing of power by three or four groups: professors, middle-level academic staff, students, and in some cases nonacademic employees of the university; 2) replacement of the rector serving a one-year term by a president elected for a term of five to seven years, and 3) the establishment of departments to take the place of the large faculties.⁷⁷¹ These initiatives by Brandt were obviously influenced by the United States, which in turn disrupted the power of the professoriate.

How indeed did the United States make the Brandt government introduce these reforms despite the protest of professors in 1969? Washington counted on those administrators and professors in the universities who had previously participated in American exchange programs and had demonstrated their general allegiance. In 1969, the American government stated that the aim of the educational exchange program should be to contribute to educational reform. The moving forces behind these reforms were the many returnees from the International Visitors and Fulbright Programs who held important positions as minister presidents, cultural ministers or education specialists in the *Länder* governments and in prestigious educational bodies such as the Council for the Promotion of Science and Humanities and the German Educational Council which were established to make recommendations for educational reform. In North Rhine-Westphalia, for example, the

⁷⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷⁷¹ Ibid.

University of Bochum was allowed right from the start to deviate from the old system as a result of the efforts of its young, forward-looking rector Kurt Biedenkopf. The rector, a 1949-1951 student grantee, who was known for his liberal thinking, introduced the departmental system and other facets typical of the American university into his new university. Another good example of how the United States lobbied its package of reforms was Dr Heinz Autenrieth, head of the University Department at the Ministry of Education in Baden-Württemberg. When he visited the United States in 1962, the Ministry was planning to establish new universities in Ulm and Konstanz. Heinz Autenrieth at that time was responsible for the preparatory work and the planning for these universities. He undertook his study trip with the purpose of inspecting a cross-section of American universities and investigating all aspects of their organization and structure in order to determine which of these factors might be applied to the new universities. Both the University of Konstanz and the University of Ulm used the departmental system, both had a president instead of a rector, and both had adopted American university methods.⁷⁷² Moreover, Brandt himself, who assigned education and universities as a top priority of his policy, had participated in the special student leadership program in the early 1950s; the Minister of Education and Science, Prof. Hans Leussink, a 1961 International Visitor Program grantee, and Dr Hildegard Hamm-Brücher, a 1949-1950 student grantee and 1966 International Visitor Program grantee turned out to be the key decision-makers who presented a plan of reforms based largely on American experiences and American educational concepts. As to university education, the plan stipulated the expansion of equality of educational opportunity, a key force in American education that had impressed Dr Hamm-Bücher during her 1966 visit. Hence, the people who admired the American university system became the first reformers and so there was a strong United States influence to promoting more liberal reforms in West Germany. Actually, the governmental documents state that the American government looked at the reforms as a chance to democratize the German university system and promote the curricula reform in the social sciences that it had been attempting to achieve since 1949.⁷⁷³

⁷⁷² University of Arkansas Libraries. Special Collections. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection. Manuscript Collection 468. Box 317. Folder 17. Germany, Federal Republic of, 1963-1970.

⁷⁷³ Ibid.

Hence, proposing these transformations modeled on American university models in 1969, the American government was absolutely sure that the reforms would stop student radicalism and reduce the power of the German professoriate. However, the final results of the reforms that appeared in the early 1970s became controversial and were a disappointment for the American government.

2. The victory of German conservatism and the rollback of reforms, 1971-1975

In 1971-1972 the American government judged the results of the reforms conducted by the Willy Brandt government in German universities as deplorable. The transformation initiated in 1969 was still very much under way, and far from complete, in 1971-1972. Washington observed that, insofar as reforms had led to a direct resolution of specific radical student group demands, the reforms also tended to confirm those in positions of power. Those leftist students sliding into a Marxist and communist stance had unexpectedly taken power in university administrative bodies. This was determined by the fact that leftist students through the system of “three-way parity” in Berlin institutions, which gave them and junior teaching staff substantial representation in the governing councils of the university, had gained a direct voice in the nomination of professors and the development of courses. Moreover, in Berlin, the calculated harassment of the more conservative professors had in many cases succeeded in literally driving them to other more tranquil universities in the Federal Republic, thus leaving the leftist voice stronger among those staying behind. After Berlin, the most radicalized universities were Frankfurt and Marburg, and further down the scale, Heidelberg and Freiburg.⁷⁷⁴ That the most radical students and teaching staff had gained more power than the moderates in the universities was what bothered the American government the most.

Moreover, and contrary to American predications, radicalism had been growing in the early 1970s. The “leftist-radicalism” defined as opposition to the fundamental principles of the system of government in the Federal Republic now became an opposition with Soviet roots. In 1971, students of University of Bonn established a pro-Soviet group called *Spartacus* led by Christoph Strawe.⁷⁷⁵ Thirty-five student groups at

⁷⁷⁴ NARA. Record Group 59. Culture and Information, 1970-1973. Box 392.

⁷⁷⁵ Dr. Christoph Strawy now works in the Institute for Present-Day Social Questions in Stuttgart and continues to be a representative of socialist thinking in Germany. He is engaged in the movement campaigning for fair globalization.

the university level met in Bonn in May of 1971 and chose to unite under the umbrella of this organization. It became the first national organization of communist university-level students in post-war Germany. Spartacus was reported to be the result of more than two years' work by the German Communist party. The leader declared that the organization would be involved in the fight in the universities to make all students "ready Marxists." Such groups played skillfully with the difficulties of student life – dormitory problems, bad study conditions, financial problems, unemployment, and so-called "black lists" on some doctoral candidates allegedly in circulation – and so attracted students to become members of Marxist organizations. Spartacus officially proclaimed its support for the SED in East Germany and for Soviet ideology; it favored the international recognition of East Germany (this happened in 1972), the ratification of the Moscow and Warsaw Treaties concerning the recognition of post-war borders in Europe (this also happened in 1972) and the convocation of a Conference for European Security (this happened in 1975).⁷⁷⁶ In 1973, this communist student organization had several thousand members in Germany out of 400,000 students.⁷⁷⁷ Moreover, it was uncovered that the Marburg University students had become involved in a close financial relationship with the SED in East Germany. Hence, this segment of the student body inclined ideologically to the Soviet Marxism-Leninism, and rejected, for example, Maoism, which had attracted them at the end of 1960s. These groups united in 1973 under the auspices of two of the most radical and near-terrorist organizations, the *Communist Student Group* (KSV)⁷⁷⁸ representing the Maoist ultra-radicals and the *Action Group for Democrats and Socialists* (ADS), a disciplined and goal-oriented tool of the Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin (SEW).⁷⁷⁹

Undoubtedly, the popularity of these groups varied from German state to German state, and from university to university, and thus the universities differed markedly from each other in the degree to which they had been affected by the spirit of reform and the spirit of leftist radicalism. According to an analysis by the Americans, Germany's 43 universities could be grouped in terms of leftist influence as follows: four universities were deeply affected by leftist radicalism and its disruptive

⁷⁷⁶ NARA. Record Group 59. Culture and Information, 1970-1973. Box 392.

⁷⁷⁷ NARA. Record Group 59. Culture and Information, 1970-1973. Box 392.

⁷⁷⁸ KSV or *Kommunistischer Studentenverband* was a pro-communist and Maoist group.

⁷⁷⁹ SEW or *Sozialistische Einpartei West-Berlin* was a wing of the SED, the Communist Party of East Germany.

tactics; five were seriously affected; while thirty-four were comparatively little affected. Seventy percent of Germany's students were enrolled in this last group. The deeply affected universities such as the Free University, the University of Marburg, the University of Bremen and Technical University in Berlin, had already developed a pro-Marxist curriculum in the social science and humanities; however, those pro-Marxist tutors who were in a position to make an impact on the curriculum were neo-Marxist idealists rather than Marxists of the Soviet variety. Political science especially suffered at the hands of these tutors more than the other disciplines.⁷⁸⁰

Hence, reforms proposed by the United States did not diminish the radical mood of this segment of university people. This was the first and most unfavorable result of American efforts to transform universities, according to the American line.

Another enduring result became the problem of the "*Marxification*" of the university academic program and curricula. The social sciences and political science came under pressure from Marxism. "Marxification" of the social science and humanities curricula was a process of bringing the content of teaching, research, and publishing activities under the influence of Marxist (or rather neo-Marxist) ways of thinking. This process turned out to have gone quite far at the Free University, much further than at most of the other German universities. There were a number of departments and institutes (such as the Psychology Department, the Economics Department, the German Department, and the Otto-Suhr Institute, which specialized in political science) where between fifty and ninety percent of all courses taught were Marxist-oriented.⁷⁸¹ Insofar as the Marxification of German universities contributed to the growth of anti-democratic tendencies, weakened the German-American alliance within NATO, and contributed to anti-Americanism, this was of real concern to the American government.⁷⁸² However, the American experts could not come up with anything to counter Marxification, which demonstrated to the federal government the failure of their policy aimed at giving the students more power than the professors.

Another important consequence of the 1969 reform was the resignation of old and traditionally minded professors from the universities. Some of them left for research institutes, preferring the more

⁷⁸⁰ NARA. Record Group 59. Culture and Information, 1970-1973. Box 392.

⁷⁸¹ Ibid.

⁷⁸² Ibid.

quiet life of a scientist than the wild life of a professor at the universities; some of them were offered retirement by the rectors; and some of them left for the United States. The American experts reported to Washington that “teaching and research activities at several universities, such as Berlin, Frankfurt, Heidelberg, Hamburg, and others have been seriously impeded, that an increasing number of scholars have either moved to universities less affected by the unrest or looked for jobs outside the universities, and that to an increasing extent research tasks are being transferred to non-teaching research institutions such as the various institutes of the Max Planck Society.”⁷⁸³

The professors at the Free University were the first to leave the university circle. As a protest against the enactment of the law on reforms, some professors resigned publically from the staff of the university.⁷⁸⁴ Other professors were reported to have left the university in a demonstrative fashion or to have refused to hold their classes.⁷⁸⁵ In 1972, the situation surrounding the retirement of conservative professors became intolerable: the departments of political science, German studies, philosophy and social sciences were left to be governed by leftist teaching staff. Rector R. Kreibich promoted Marxists to these positions, while proposing that the old professoriate resign; the students helped the rector by disrupting the lectures of old conservative professors. Some of these professors were even forced to escape through a window to escape physical injury.⁷⁸⁶ Documents hold a letter from one of the professors forced to resign that reveals the situation. This letter was written by Professor G. Knauer, who taught Classics at the Free University of Berlin for twenty years and was a scholar of international reputation. He explained to the Senate and Mayor of Berlin the main reasons for his resignation from the University in 1974. He wrote:

“<...> I have been a member of
the Free University for 20 years, but
as a result of the university law of
1969, it has become a travesty of a
university. <...> I am leaving Berlin

⁷⁸³ Special Collections. University of Arkansas Libraries. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection. Manuscript Collection 468. Box 317. Folder 17. Germany, Federal Republic of, 1963-1970.

⁷⁸⁴ NARA. Record Group 59. Central Files, 1967-1969. Box 345.

⁷⁸⁵ R.L. Merritt, E.P. Flerlage, A. J. Merritt, “Democratizing West German Education,” 129-130.

⁷⁸⁶ NARA. Record Group 59. Culture and Information, 1970-1973. Box 403.

because the university law has destroyed the basis on which the academic profession can function. The destruction of the University has not been caused by “radical” or more precisely communist students or by that rather negligible figure who for the time being happens to be the president of the Free University (Rolf Kreibich – *N. T.*). The distraction is attributable only to the erroneous and deceptive ideas of “reform” as laid down in the university law. In a university invaded by politics, everyone is forced to take sides. In the long run, this is incompatible with the duties of a university teacher. <...> My colleagues and friends are being treated in the most offensive manner by so-called students and colleagues, as well as by the university authorities. I cannot understand why the major, who by virtue of his office is also chairman of the Kuratorium of the Free University, has failed to protect and support those loyal members of the University <...> After Mr. Kreibich’s election was so hastily confirmed, we came to see it as our civic and academic duty to warn – as best we could – the public, which did not then have the slightest idea of what was going on. <...> “anti-authoritarians,” “the Maoists,” etc. would only be the forerunners of the “law-and-order” communists of the SEW. No wonder that the president of the Free University, who has

repeatedly confessed to collaboration with groups in the University which are dominated by the SEW, denounces the disruptive, ultra-radical KSV and *Notgemeinschaft für eine freie Universität* (this organization was established by professors to stop the influence of radicals in the universities – N. T.) as “the enemies of reform.”

If, however, Chancellor Willy Brandt...says:

There are a number of opponents of the democratic process of reform. These include not only backward-looking holders of privileges, but also criminal fanatics. We shall not have our reforms hampered by yesterday's men, nor will we suffer them to be slain by rioters – either in the universities or anywhere else...

then I am unable to discover any real difference between the attitudes of the President of the Free University and the Federal Chancellor, in so far as their identification of loyal citizens with enemies of the constitution <...>⁷⁸⁷

Professor Knauer left the Free University and accepted a professoriate at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia. This letter is reminiscent of some letters sent by German professors to the Soviet Occupation authorities at the end of the 1940s. By that time the East German professoriate had concluded and declared to the Soviets that it was not possible to teach and work at the universities under ideological pressure. Now, in the 1970s, the West German professoriate also declared the same but this time to West German government, that is, that it was

⁷⁸⁷ “Professor Knauer’s resignation from the Free University of Berlin,” *Minerva* 12, no. 4 (November 12, 1974): 510-514.

not possible to work in the aftermath of the reforms that had been implemented.

However, in contrast to the East German professors, the conservative segment of West German professors united around the idea of revising and rolling these reforms. In his letter, the professor mentioned the organization of university professors known as the *Emergency Committee for a Free University* (*Notgemeinschaft für eine freie Universität*). It successfully lobbied the rollback policy through German government channels. In addition, moderate students and professors in 1973-1974 organized groups to oppose to oppose this leftist radicalism. The two most famous and influential groups were *The Emergency Committee for a Free University* and *The Alliance for Freedom and Science*.⁷⁸⁸ They were able to begin the counter-offensive movement that succeeded in changing the 1969 reforms.

Following that, the Government of West Germany reviewed the amendments to the university reform law instituted in 1969. The amendment bill promoted by the professoriate demanded that the administrative structure be tightened up by reducing the number of elected councils, increasing the power of the senate, and recasting the student tutorial program to reduce the misuse of small classes for political agitation and Marxist indoctrination. However, these amendments provoked the opposition of both the radical and the moderate left, especially the idea of changing the voting parities in various university councils where the professors were often outvoted by the combination of students and teaching assistants.⁷⁸⁹ The professoriate was attempting to return to their previous all-powerful position in the universities. The leader of this segment of the professoriate was Richard Löwenthal, the internationally-renowned political scientist and the director of the Otto Suhr Institute, who had been forced to resign by Rector R. Kreibich. They declared that the 1969 University Law had become the root of the current politicization of university affairs and the source of the institutional power of extremist forces. Therefore, a revision of that law was urgently needed in order to restore authority over academic matters to those faculty members and administrators with experience and qualifications.⁷⁹⁰

The bill was discussed for a long time, up until the spring of 1973. However, a new wave of student demonstrations protesting the bill and

⁷⁸⁸ NARA. Record Group 59. Culture and Information, 1970-1973. Box 392.

⁷⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁹⁰ Ibid.

the rollback of reforms only contributed to the final success of the conservative professors. The federal government had only been barely able to tolerate the leftists: After a boycott of classes by 20,000 students in all the Berlin universities and demonstrations held by younger faculty, Rector Kreibich, under pressure from the German government and professors, took a firm stand against the extremists' use of force and used disciplinary measures against forty activist students, members of the Communist Student Group.⁷⁹¹ The actions of the students and the turnaround in the Rector's stance demonstrated to the German professors that the reforms could be rolled back. In March of 1974, American diplomats finally informed Washington that the prospects for enactment of this bill had become "favorable for professors and unfavorable for us."⁷⁹² The bill was augmented by new amendments such as a provision for full power of the university senate over the disciplinary committees responsible for the enforcement of internal university regulations and for the authority of the senate to make appointments to university positions.⁷⁹³ And in 1975, the Framework Act on Higher Education, enacted by both federal and state governments, was the product of these conservative efforts. New institutions, such as the participation of students in the work of the curriculum committees, senate and other important administrative bodies, were nullified and everything reverted to the traditional university system.

Consequently, those radicals and Marxists who had gained power in university administrative bodies repudiated their previous stance and adopted moderate and even traditionally-minded ways of thinking. An especially surprising conversion was that demonstrated by the rector of the Free University, Rolf Kreibich. As early as 1972, he solicited the American Embassy about the possibility of taking part in one of the government exchange programs in order to visit American universities and become acquainted with their life. In a letter sent to the American embassy, he stated that he held an important office in the most important Berlin educational institution and that he had a keen interest in seeing the United States at first hand and in discussing with his American colleagues their own experiences with problems of curriculum, governance, student dissent, and faculty relations. Washington hesitated about whether to invite or not invite this controversial man, but, having obtained his promise that the Rector would re-establish the work of J.F. Kennedy

⁷⁹¹ Ibid.

⁷⁹² Ibid.

⁷⁹³ Ibid.

American Institute at the Free University, which had been terminated by student radicals, Washington was inclined to let him visit, but only in 1975.⁷⁹⁴ However, his possible visit incited severe protest by both American academia and the conservative segment of the German professoriate. The latter was dissatisfied with his policy towards full professors who had lost much of their traditional power with the university as a consequence of the 1969 university reform law, and of the policy of the young Kreibich, which had promoted a new generation of assistants, often Marxists, to key positions at the Free University, resulting in a number of conservatives withdrawing from participation in university governance. The challenge made by the American and German academics to the visit of the Rector was smoothed over Kreibich's statement that he needed to come to American universities in order to see what might be useful for a solution to his own difficulties and to strengthen the Free University's ties with US institutions. The visit took place in March of 1975, and upon his return Kreibich declared that he was no longer a Marxist anymore and that extreme elements could not really be expected to be part of any kind of meaningful cooperation in university matters. Consequently, moderate elements gained a majority in the university council, and this body subsequently elected moderate candidates to key positions in the administration of the Free University in 1975. Moreover, the Free University's old professoriate again re-established final authority over many of the appointments made by council presidents and the senate was able to eliminate the courses set up young, often Marxist-oriented, tutors.⁷⁹⁵

In short, we can safely state that it was in 1975 that those reforms proposed by the United States in 1968-1969 came to grief in such domains as expansion of the student and junior teaching staff, representation in administrative bodies, and reduction of the power of the old professoriate. This failure of the American-sponsored reforms was, in our opinion, caused by following factors. First, the United States was likely to have discovered that the reforms had only led to the power gained by radicals, Marxists, socialists, and communists in the universities, estimated as dangerous for the political stability of the Federal Republic. Deciding between reforms and stability of the universities and political life, they chose the latter. Second, the German professoriate which had lost its position and power had managed to bring

⁷⁹⁴ NARA. Record Group 59. Culture and Information, 1970-1973. Box 403.

⁷⁹⁵ NARA. Record Group 59. Culture and Information, 1970-1973. Box 392.

about a counter-offensive policy against the reforms. They were able to cooperate with the moderate segment of students in revising the reforms by introducing a new law concerning higher education. Third, the replacement of the Brandt government had also impacted the revision of the 1969 reforms. The new Chancellor of West Germany, Helmut Schmidt, on taking power in 1974, had no intention of flirting with radical elements and supported the conservative professoriate.

3. Decline of American-West German university cooperation, 1975-1990

The cooling of American-West German relations in the domain of education emanated from the raging years of 1965-1975. Both governments reduced financial support for bilateral educational contacts starting in 1976. German politicians, following the opinion of the professoriate, openly stated to the American government that educating German students in the United States was undesirable. Professors were highly skeptical about any real need to cooperate with American universities in the field of social science, in the belief that the reality of the academic scene in two nations (such as the wide qualitative difference between American and German universities, the lack of real equivalencies between the universities of both countries in terms of degrees and credits, and with little guarantees that students returning to Germany would be admitted to German universities) diverged too much to develop cooperative relationships.⁷⁹⁶ This skepticism was the one officially stated, but there were unofficial statements from professors insisting that it were the United States which had infected German young people with radicalism and had exploited this to transform German universities.

In order to eliminate this image, the United States encouraged American universities at the end of the 1970s to develop private partnerships and affiliations with German universities in order to improve their library holdings, strengthen language departments, develop area studies, establish new departments, and conduct exchanges of students and faculty members.⁷⁹⁷ However, such projects developed too slowly to have much bearing on the German university system.

⁷⁹⁶ University of Arkansas Libraries. Special Collections. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Historical Collection. Manuscript Collection 468. Box 317. Folder 17. Germany, Federal Republic of.

⁷⁹⁷ NARA. Record Group 59. Records of the US Board of Foreign Scholarships, 1971-1980. Box 7, 27.

By the early 1980s, the American government concluded that their policy aimed at transforming German universities had failed. This appraisal occurred during the most depressed period in American-West German bilateral relations, when power in Germany was assumed by the “Sixties” generation. These former anti-American radicals, the very ones who had attacked the *Amerika Häuser* (the American Institutes) and disrupted lectures, had become politicians, successful businessmen, professors, and editors. American diplomats found that “the German television coverage of the US continuously negative reflecting the ascendancy of ‘60’s-generation Germans to editorial positions as German TV networks. This creates ‘an ever increasing gap’ between Germany, NATO ally, and the negative American on German TV.”⁷⁹⁸ During this period, there was considerable degree of misconception and misunderstanding about the US in Germany and the FRG in the United States. American experts again stated that this poor state of affairs was due to a deficit of knowledge, resulting from the quality of teaching about each other in both countries.

President Ronald Reagan endeavored to improve this situation by proposing that the federal government enhance American-German educational ties by simulating the development of American studies at German universities and German studies at American universities, and through the exchange of students and professors. By 1988, the Reagan Administration was able to improve the situation as a result of the student exchanges: about 800 German students participated in American governmental programs in 1988 versus just 100 in 1970. The professors, however, continued to boycott the American programs: about twenty German professors participated in the American programs in 1988 versus eighty in 1970.⁷⁹⁹ As a result, West Germany sank to the last place in the statistics relative to West European professors invited by the American government.

There is no doubt that the American government had every intention of correcting this situation, but suddenly the events occurring in East Germany seemed far more important than the problem of the victory of the conservative professoriate over reforms.

⁷⁹⁸ NARA. Record Group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural Affairs. Lot 98D 252. Box 169-172, 205-206.

⁷⁹⁹ *International Exchange and Training Programs of the US Government. Annual Report, 1988, 1989* (Washington, DC: Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, United States Information Agency, 1988 and 1989).

II. Soviet Policy in East German universities

East Germany took a priority place in Soviet international educational policy during the period of mid-1960s through to 1990. No other country in the East Block was involved so intensively in Soviet educational exchanges as the German Democratic Republic. It became the leading country for numbers of students, professors, scientists, and specialists in higher education trained in the USSR. Moreover, German universities had most of the Soviet experts in the field of higher education sent by Moscow to foreign countries.⁸⁰⁰ Evidently, the focus of attention by the Soviet government on Germany was determined by its strategic and specific location on the European Cold War map. The Soviets could not allow East Germany and East Berlin to fall prey to the American and West Germany cultural offensive. Hence, Moscow tried to gather a majority of students and professors through the ideological indoctrination.

Soviet policy towards East German universities can be divided into two phases. The first phase was 1965-1972 when the political regime in East Germany implemented new reforms in universities that increased the ideological pressure on students. The second phase was 1972-1990, when the Soviet government, dissatisfied with the reforms made by the GDR regime, decided to implement its own reforms aimed at German universities, which ultimately failed.

1. Preventive reforms against student radicalism in the universities, 1965-1972

The situation in East German universities

In contrast to West Germany, where new universities and new departments were rapidly expanding in mid-1960s through to the mid-1970s, the number of universities in East Germany increased very little degree: from six in 1945 to seven in 1962, and that due to the renaming of the Higher Technical School in Dresden as the Technical University.⁸⁰¹ The number of East German students was less than that of West German students. However, in contrast to the situation in West Germany, where the number of potential students was much greater than the universities

⁸⁰⁰ The Russian State Archive of Modern History. Record Group 5. Inventory 69. File 578. Page 4; Record Group 5. Inventory 55. File 55: 29.

⁸⁰¹ The total number of higher educational institutions in East Germany was 54 vs. 228 established in West Germany before the end of the Cold War.

could admit, the situation in East Germany was just the opposite. The number of high school graduates could not provide for the needs of universities of numbers of fresh students. East German universities and social sciences, departments, in particular, were permanently short of students, because a great number of students, originated in lower social groups, demonstrated weak knowledge and could not graduate from universities. In order to resolve this problem, the government of East Germany recruited workers and students from vocational schools to become students in universities. However, even this did not resolve the problem of the university student shortage.

The building of the Berlin Wall in August 1961 was the turning point that forced intellectuals and university people to adapt to the political regime in the German Democratic Republic. The majority of East Germans most likely remained anti-communist, albeit with decreasing emotional fervor.⁸⁰² The popular temper among university people was no longer one of potential revolt. Many of the truly dissatisfied professors and students had been able to flee through the open Berlin border before the Wall was built.⁸⁰³ Those who remained in East German universities found themselves under permanent ideological pressure, and the regime fought hard to prevent intelligentsia from challenging the basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism.

In contrast to West German universities, where the student movement boiled up against the United States and against the conditions of student life and teaching, the East German universities led a wretched existence. Students did not march in the streets to demand academic freedom and did not publicly denounce the Soviet Union as an imperialistic country as West German students did. Students in the GDR did not pelt professors with tomatoes. It would appear that students and the professoriate in the East remained largely silent. However, that silence concealed tacit disobedience and protest. This masked and soundless opposition frightened the governments of both the Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union during the period of student demonstrations occurring in the West. The political regime understood that the events going on in West German universities could not help but influence part of the East German student body. Thus, as long as the

⁸⁰² "Document 113. Special Report Prepared in the Central Intelligence Agency, May 28, 1965," in *Foreign Relations of the United States 1964-1968*, vol. XV. Department of State. Office of the Historian, <http://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1964-1968v15/comp1> (accessed 5 April 2009).

⁸⁰³ *Ibid.*

student upheavals that had started in Berlin and Munich in 1965 went on, the Ulbricht government and Moscow discussed the need for new reforms in the universities in order to prevent any possible development of events on the Western model.

University reforms

The idea of reforming the universities was introduced by the SED in 1965. The main goal of reforms was to exert more rigorous control over students in the universities and to prevent them from being influenced by the West through expanding the teaching of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. To achieve this goal, the government of East Germany sought to alter the structure of the universities by establishing larger departments, known as *Sections*, instead of faculties, by reducing the study period from five years to four years, and by revising once the curricula in every university. The revision of curricula was introduced by a mandatory inclusion of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in every academic program, every syllabus, and, of course, lectures, including courses in mathematics, physics, and other applied sciences. Students were therefore compelled to study Marxist-Leninist philosophy as part of every discipline, not just through a separate course on Marxism-Leninism, as had been the case earlier. Moreover, to prevent any possible student opposition, the political regime applied the Soviet pedagogical idea of the unity between academic knowledge and so-called educative work.⁸⁰⁴ This meant that a university student should not only absorb specialized knowledge in various subjects, but he or she had to be fostered by or educated through everyday indoctrination.

This package of reforms was elaborated by the German communists, but the Soviet government did not initially pressure the SED to initiate these reforms as the United States had done it with respect to the West German government in 1969. Soviet diplomats, however, on examining this plan of reforms in detail forecast that open and deep indoctrination in every discipline could arouse the opposition among the German professoriate. In reality, professors simply refused to introduce these additional segments devoted to Marxist-Leninist philosophy in their lectures. Discussing potential opposition to the new reforms, Soviet diplomats encouraged the Germans to negotiate with the professoriate in

⁸⁰⁴ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9518. The Committee on Cultural Ties with Foreign Countries at the Council of Ministers. Inventory 1. File 883: 93.

advance and to convince them of the need to increase the amount of academic hours for the ideological part of their lecture courses.⁸⁰⁵

Discussions about reforms and negotiations with the professors lasted for a long time. However, the events in Czechoslovakia in 1968, notably the student demonstrations and arrests at the University of Prague, became a catalyst for accelerating the reforms. By the end of 1968, all discussions were terminated, a governmental commission was established, and during the following four years the reform plan was formally implemented despite opposition from the universities and part of the professoriate.

The traditional German subdivision of the universities was reorganized into a number of more manageable departments (sections). These departments reduced the number of faculties: for example, instead of 167 faculties and institutes, 23 departments were established at Humboldt University. Every university established general departments of Marxism-Leninism, economics, sports, foreign languages, a pedagogical department, and several departments for specializations. However, two faculties kept their previous structure and formal title: the Faculty of Medicine and the Theological Faculty. Instead of a rector, the position of the director was introduced.

To the extent that the establishment of the departments had been discussed beforehand with the universities, this aspect of the reforms was not rejected by the universities. Yet, following this transformation, the government then introduced a new set of changes in the structure of the universities, which had not been proposed and discussed previously. The senate, a traditional structure of the German university system, was eliminated in 1969. The communists liquidated this organ of possible mobilized opposition and established three different semi-academic and party organizations instead of the senate: Public and Academic Councils and a University Assembly. The SED now completely controlled these broken, disconnected, and weakened segments of academic life. There is no doubt that this came as a strong blow against those voice of professors who wanted to stop reforms and any further Marxification of the curriculum. By breaking up the senate, the communists intended to prepare the universities for the main transformation of curricula that would end up causing new discord with the professoriate.

Following these transformations, the government of the GDR began revising university academic programs and curricula. This was to be a

⁸⁰⁵ Ibid., 23-25.

new stage in the ideological indoctrination of every student. The SED proclaimed that the task of the universities was to give students an all-round education and instruction in order to develop socialist character through political education, socialist military training and Marxist-Leninist studies. The departments of social studies and Marxist-Leninist philosophy became the main instruments for fostering this new generation of loyal intellectuals and intelligentsia. The departments were responsible for requiring all students to study Marxist-Leninist philosophy, and the history and contemporary policy of the SED, so deeply that the philosophy would become a *personal conviction* of everyone. Thus, the idea of making Marxism-Leninism the personal belief and value system of every student became an essential factor of the 1969 reforms in East Germany. The students were compelled to study the Marxist-based social sciences such as the history of the workers' movement in Germany, political economics, and Marxist-Leninist philosophy throughout the full period of their university studies. Before 1969, East German students had studied these subjects only during their first two years. Thorough indoctrination was also achieved through controlled reading, discussions, the writing of numerous papers, and summaries of books, etc. Every student had to participate in student competitions featuring research papers on its Marxist-Leninist philosophy. Moreover, to convince students that the Western philosophy and value system were not appropriate for a student in a socialist society, every student had to write a paper criticizing so-called bourgeois ideology. This approach was centered on a new pedagogical concept from the Soviet Union designated to foster a student who was an active fighter against the West.

More importantly, all professors specializing in Marxist-Leninist philosophy, history and other social disciplines, as well as in mathematics, physics, chemistry and other applied disciplines, had to expand or introduce additional lectures on Marxism-Leninism. Those students who studied applied sciences and carried out research in the field of technical disciplines had to somehow apply their knowledge of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in order to resolve the theoretical and practical problems of their applied fields of studies.

Hence, all university curricula and every syllabus, both in the arts and the applied sciences, were revised in 1969 to contain additional information about Marxist-Leninist philosophy. However, this was a formal revision, and functionaries could not really ensure that this

addition to their lecture courses would actually be articulated by the professors. To control every class was not possible, even for the Stasi.

The final innovation concerned university admission requirements and was introduced in 1971. Like the elimination of the senate, the new reform of admission requirements was begun without any prior negotiations with the universities. These new admission regulations made it more explicit that political orthodoxy was the main prerequisite for admission to universities. While political criteria had been included in previous admissions requirements introduced during the Occupation period, the prevailing emphasis had remained on academic qualifications. The new regulation now clearly manifested the primary consideration for the ideological needs of the state. The preconditions for application and admission were: 1) active participation in socialist society and a readiness to actively defend socialism; 2) a readiness to fulfill all demands of a socialist society and, upon completion of studies, to submit to the established procedures for job placement. Applications contained an evaluation of the applicant's total personality written by a former supervising school, factory, or army official, in consultation with a political functionary. Moreover, strong political control was injected into the admission process by the new provision that the admission panel of each institution should include one representative each from the FDJ and SED. The new regulations eliminated the panel of three educators which previously made the initial recommendation for admission on strictly academic grounds.

By 1972, these reforms were formally being carried out, and there is no evidence of public, open opposition from professors and students. Only the introduction of compulsory military service for university students and university courses on military training, caused open disaffection among students at Leipzig University. A few students marching near the university were arrested and expelled from the university.

The government of East Germany seemed to be satisfied with the outcome of the reforms. The Soviet Government through its diplomats in Berlin, however, showed displeasure with the reforms made. The Soviets, after making their own secret analysis of the reforms, found that the German professoriate did not really implement the mandatory inclusion of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in their courses. The Soviets noted that those professors, who told the students how this philosophy could be applied in mathematics, physics, and other sciences, did so without any personal conviction, and often ironically. The Soviet government was

convinced that East German professors were repudiating the indoctrination of students, contrary to what the reforms required. Still, the Soviet experts considered that the professors were not an oppositional force as they had judged them to be during the Occupation period. They reported that these academics simply did not want change in their lives and professions and preferred to maintain the old German traditions in education such as academic freedom and isolation of university from politics, which ran counter to the Marxification policy. Thus, their position vis-a-vis the proposed innovations was known as the *conservatism of the German professors*.⁸⁰⁶ In response to this, the Soviet Government elaborated its own plan of reforms to overcome this strong conservatism on the part of the German professoriate, and after brief negotiations with the SED, their plan was carried out by means of Soviet visiting experts and professors during the ensuing following years.

2. The conservatism of the German professoriate and the failed Soviet response, 1973-1986.

Soviet visiting experts at every East German university reported to Moscow in the early 1970s that there was no university where the curriculum or syllabus for every discipline had been organized according to the requirements of the reforms of 1969. As we mentioned, the reason for this failure was the conservatism of the German professoriate, most notably their persistent reluctance to change university academic programs and to indoctrinate students. This reluctance was difficult to control, because professors did introduce the required elements in the syllabi and some of them also included remarks about Marxist-Leninist philosophy in their lectures to students, but without any so-called personal conviction, the Soviet experts noted. The professors, in the opinion of the Soviet visiting experts, did not believe in Marxism-Leninism, and this feeling was transmitted to the student body. Moscow concluded that “the German professors did not indoctrinate students, and they did not know how to indoctrinate them; moreover, they themselves needed to be indoctrinated in the spirit of socialism.”⁸⁰⁷ The worst situation emerged in the departments of pedagogy and Russian studies where anti-Soviet feelings ran rampant. This sort of conservatism was the chief obstacle to fostering new socialist generation, and it was subjected to be uprooted.

⁸⁰⁶ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9563. The Ministry of Education of the USSR. Inventory 1. File 4974: 36-37.

⁸⁰⁷ Ibid.

Following on this state of affairs, the Soviet Government made a decision to revise the curriculum of every university once again. Selected Soviet professors were assigned to implement this new project. According to the plan, they were to visit every university and, through collaboration and personal contact, convince every professor to honestly revise the syllabi along the lines of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. In addition, these Soviet experts were to urge their East German colleagues to insert changes into the curriculum at those universities where the professoriate had been to weaken the ideological courses. The Soviets paid special attention to personal contacts between German and Soviet professors as they had done during the Occupation period. The visiting professors attempted to establish contacts based on trust with their partners, to organize a friendly environment, and to convince Germans to become Marxists according to the Soviet model. There is no doubt that this was pure utopian fantasy on their part, but the three actors in this projects – the Soviet government, Soviet professors, and their colleagues at East German universities – played this game from 1973 until 1986. The project was finally terminated in 1986 due to its failure and a lack of financial resources in the Soviet budget.

During the period of 1973-1986, the number of Soviet professors and specialists in the domain of higher education continued to increase from year to year. This changed the parameters of statistics for the academic exchanges between the Soviet Union and East Germany: the professoriate but not the student body took top billing in the statistics. Every year 100 Soviet professors on average were sent to seven universities.⁸⁰⁸ So, every department in an East German university included a number of Soviet experts who worked with the teaching staff. The Soviet professors received the new title of “consultant” in the field of higher education. In addition, German professors were invited by the Soviet government to learn models of curricula and indoctrination. Every year, twenty to thirty professors visited Soviet universities.⁸⁰⁹

The Soviet experts were able to make a lot of revisions. By 1974 they had reformed the curriculum of all academic programs. First, universities increased the academic hours for the Marxist-Leninist studies both in the applied science and humanities departments, however, this

⁸⁰⁸ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9606. The Ministry of Higher and Vocational Education of the USSR. Inventory 1. File 301: 2-28.

⁸⁰⁹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9518. The Committee on Cultural Ties with Foreign Countries at the Council of Ministers. Inventory 1. File 741: 226.

was only on paper. Second, the number of academic hours allocated to both specialized disciplines and ideological ones became almost the same in every departments. For example, future engineers in building and construction studied mathematics and the history of the German labor movement in an almost equal hourly load (*Table 9*).

Table 9
*Distribution of the week's hourly load for first-year students specializing in building and construction studies (an excerpt)*⁸¹⁰

Semester	I		II	
Discipline	Lectures	Seminars	Lectures	Seminars
History of the German labor movement	1	1	2	1
Mathematical analysis	2	1	2	1

The third achievement of the Soviet visiting experts concerned an increase in the general number of hours allocated to Russian language studies in both the humanities and the applied science departments of the universities. Before 1974, students in the Slavic Studies departments alone studied the Russian language. In 1974, Soviet professors were able to insert the discipline in every department of the university. Hence, those departments where the ideological disciplines were not the disciplines of specialization increased their number of classes for students (*Table 10*).

⁸¹⁰ G. Taukach, *Vyssshaya Shkola GDR (The Higher School of the GDR)* (Kiev: Vischa Shkola, 1973), 85.

Table 10
 The hourly load for students specializing in agriculture (an excerpt)⁸¹¹

Discipline	Total hours per 8 semesters	Total hours in %
Marxism-Leninism	296	8
Russian language	128	3.5
.....
Total number of classes of all disciplines	3640	100

As follows from Table 10, ideological disciplines including Russian language studies accounted for more than eleven percent of total academic hours allocated for a student during one semester. Earlier, these disciplines composed three percent of the total component of disciplines of an academic program. If we compare this data with the number of hours allocated for Marxist-Leninist studies in the humanities and, therefore, in the most indoctrinated of the departments, the pedagogical departments, for example, we see that the hourly load was almost equal between the departments of applied science and humanities (cf.: *Table 11 and Table 10*).

Hence, the Soviet idea that Marxism-Leninism should be a deep personal belief for every student was realized through an increase in the number of lectures, seminars, and other classes in both the applied science and the humanities departments of the universities.

⁸¹¹ R. Keler, *Vysshee Obrazovanie v GDR (Higher Education in the GDR)* (Berlin: Nauchno-Issledovatel'skiy Institut Vushego Obrazovaniya, (Research Institute of Higher Education), 1973), 26.

Table 11
 The hourly load for students specializing in pedagogy (an excerpt)⁸¹²

Disciplines	Total hours per eight semesters	Total hours in %
Marxism-Leninism	320	7
.....
Total hours	4720	100

As follows from Table 10 and Table 11, students at universities spent seven to eleven percent of their university time attending such courses as “Dialectical and Historical Materialism,” “Scientific Communism,” and “History of Workers’ Movement” and another four to five disciplines of this sort, and wrote summaries of almost all the works by Marx, Engels, and Lenin within the framework of special seminars.⁸¹³ In order to enforce the ideological education of students, Soviet professors wrote and published a number of new textbooks translated into German in the GDR such as “Dialectical Materialism and its Enemies,” “Critique of Falsifiers of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy,” “History of the Soviet Union for Students of the GDR,” and others.⁸¹⁴

On introducing these additional revisions to the curriculum, the Soviet government and Soviet experts paid special attention to the departments of history and the pedagogical departments in the universities. These departments taught future teachers in schools and carried out important research projects in the field of German history and pedagogy. In addition, these departments attracted the greatest number of students, because diplomas from these ideological departments ensured a good party career in a socialist society.

The departments of history were turned into centers of so-called scientific collaboration between German and Soviet historians in 1974–1975. Scientific collaboration in the field of history meant carrying out cooperative research projects by German and Soviet university teaching staff concerning certain questions, holding conferences and seminars, and also editing monographs. The aim of this cooperation was a conventional one: to take control of the mainstream of historical research carried out by Germans and to convince them at last to apply Marxist-Leninist

⁸¹² Vorobjev, *Vysshee Obrasoovanie (Higher Education)*, 120.

⁸¹³ Keler, *Vysschee Obrasoovanie (Higher Education)*, 25.

⁸¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 48.

philosophy in their investigations. Such control was determined by the fact that the part of the German professoriate known as the conservatives continued doing research on irrelevant themes (in the opinion of Soviet ideologists) such as the “Development of a German National Language from the 16th to 18th Centuries.”⁸¹⁵ Instead of this and other irrelevant topics, the Soviets proposed “Modern Bourgeois Historiography and its Critique,” “The Role of the People at Different Stages of History,” “The Laws of Historical Process,” “The Policy of the USSR on the German Question,” “The History of the International Movement,” etc.⁸¹⁶ Research questions were elaborated and approved by Soviet politicians in Moscow and then recommended to German colleagues. This cooperation helped maintain “an ideological vitality” among German intellectuals, and from year to year themes for joint research projects were repeated. All scholarly developments in history were placed under the control of Soviet scientists. Even if German scientists had positive views concerning Western philosophy or their own treatment of history, they would not have any opportunity to report this to a larger audience. Almost all publications about history were the result of scientific cooperation with the USSR or were reviewed by Soviet scientists. As a result of this scientific collaboration, historians of the Soviet Union and GDR published 400 scholarly papers, 67 books, and prepared 116 new lecture courses for students by 1977.⁸¹⁷ By 1976, all departments of history at German universities and faculties of history at Soviet universities had formed new, standard and similar academic programs with the same number of disciplines.⁸¹⁸

However, in the mid-1980s the Soviet government, evaluating the results of the scientific collaboration with German historians, stated that the historians in German universities were not yet true Marxists, the implantation of the Marxist-Leninist philosophy had not succeeded, and the German professoriate still resisted carrying out collaborative research projects on such topics as revolution, people’s movements and others of a

⁸¹⁵The Russian State Archive of Modern History. Record Group 5. Inventory 35. File 102: 10.

⁸¹⁶Ibid., file 223: 121-149.

⁸¹⁷The Russian State Archive of Modern History. Record Group 5. Inventory 69. File 578: 4.

⁸¹⁸State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9563. Inventory 1. File 2032: 116-122.

similar nature.⁸¹⁹ Hence, some historians were able to escape Soviet indoctrination and maintain their old traditions of studying history.

Pedagogy became the new target for Soviet intervention during the entire period from the 1970s until the mid-1980s. This field of studies became the area of the closest contact between German and Soviet professors. The Soviets viewed pedagogues and pedagogical education as an effective instrument in educating future socialist teachers for schools who, in turn, would be able to foster new generations of socialist schoolchildren. This collaboration was therefore aimed at propagating and implanting German pedagogical education the Soviet idea of rejecting the individuality of a person in a socialist society.

In contrast to German historians, German professors of pedagogy constantly emphasized that they bowed to the leading role of Soviet socialist pedagogues. At the expense of German universities, they sent students to be trained at the Soviet pedagogical institutes.⁸²⁰ In this area, the German professors themselves proposed a lot of projects that bore witness to their true orientation around the Soviet school of pedagogy. They studied such questions as “Communist education in the Soviet Union,” “Youth in the USSR,” “The Problems of Youth in West Germany” and so on. To the Soviet diplomats, Germans themselves proposed establishing collaboration between the pedagogical journals in the GDR and USSR. Two famous journals, the “Herald of Higher Education” in the USSR and “Das Hochschulwesen” in the GDR, began a project of joint writing and publishing of scholarly articles. The project folded in 1986 because of financial problems due to the Soviet budget.⁸²¹

Despite such intensive Soviet interference in German universities, Soviet experts involved in the implementation of joint projects in the field of pedagogy encountered a problem relative to the teaching of students, who were perspective teachers of the Russian language in schools, colleges, and universities. In early 1970s, Soviet experts noted and reported to Moscow that the level of knowledge of Russian of the students was dropping year on year. Students who studied Russian language and culture in the pedagogical departments of the universities and their professors openly articulated unfriendly opinions about the

⁸¹⁹ *SSSR-GDR: Sotrudnichestvo i Sblizhenie (The USSR-GDR: the Cooperation and Rapprochement)*, 140.

⁸²⁰ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9563. Inventory 1. File 2032: page no # and 2033: 1-89.

⁸²¹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9518. Inventory 1. File 883: 138.

Russian language and the Soviet culture imposed on East Germany. One of the Soviet observers reported in 1974: "The old German intelligentsia boasts of German history, the past of Germany, and continues to consider Russians as savage people. The attitude to the Russian language in the families of professors is bad and, therefore, the students do not want to study the language. Teachers of the Russian language have been poorly trained, German schools and universities require too low a level for knowledge of Russian, and propaganda from the West through TV has an enormous influence on German students."⁸²²

After this report, in 1975 the Soviet government sent a group of experts to the pedagogical departments of the German universities to inspect the situation. They reported back about the miserable situation in terms of training of students in the Slavic divisions of the department: "Contemporary and effective textbooks of Russian are absent and no professor is writing one; students study the language only seven to eight hours per week and extra classes outside the university have never been arranged; students and their professors speak Russian very seldom, and their knowledge is very weak; students do not watch movies in Russian, do not organize parties of Russian culture, and do not prepare a student newspaper in Russian; finally, students are admitted to the Slavic division of the pedagogical departments without entrance examinations due to the low popularity of the division and the shortage of students."⁸²³

Moscow was shocked by this state of affairs. Even Slavic studies developed in Nazi Germany were evaluated by the Soviet government as a field of sincere scientific interest for the Germans. The Soviets in comparison to the Americans, who imposed American Studies and maintained the viability of this field in West Germany, had neglected this area. Moscow had established chairs of Russian language and Slavic studies during the Occupation and then let them take their own course. In 1975, the Soviet government decided to correct this mistake by sending a number of Soviet specialists to change the situation by revising the curriculum and writing new textbooks for students.

This group of Soviet specialists in the fields of education, philosophy, pedagogy and the teaching of Russian for foreigners elaborated a detailed plan for cultivating love for Russian in German universities. Initially, they moved from university to university where

⁸²² State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9563. Inventory 1. File. 4974: 36-37.

⁸²³ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9563. Inventory 1. File 4974: 1-60.

they delivered special seminars for professors about the Soviet approach of preparing a teacher of Russian for a socialist school. The Soviet specialists demonstrated curriculum models composed in the Soviet Union, proposing that German colleagues apply them in their universities. According to the documents, the Soviet experts spent one year convincing the German professoriate to revise the academic curriculum of the Slavic divisions. Consequently, they managed to increase the hours allocated for Russian classes. During the next four years, these Soviet experts prepared and published new textbooks for Russian for German students in Slavic studies in the GDR;⁸²⁴ they made students speak Russian outside the universities, involving them in parties, concerts, etc.⁸²⁵ They sent about twenty German teachers, who taught Russian to the Soviet universities annually, and distributed the Soviet teachers who arrived among various universities and schools; this latter universities number reached 100 per year in 1976-79.⁸²⁶

Such intensive projects for the revision of the university curricula should seemingly have been enough to encourage the German professoriate and student body to believe in Marxism-Leninism and therefore to put an end to the influence of old German traditions on the students. However, in 1982 the Soviet government stated that the revision of the curriculum seemed to have been insufficient and, hence, the teaching of the Marxist-Leninist philosophy needed to be further stressed in the pedagogical departments of the universities. This statement was motivated by the events that had occurred in Czechoslovakia and Poland where human rights movements, demonstrations and the popularity of “Charter 77” and “Solidarity” had gained in strength and were destabilizing the regimes. Moscow and Berlin seized upon the danger inherent in these events which could possibly incite the German student body and professoriate as well. In as much as the students and professors of the pedagogical departments had been evaluated as less educated in the field of communism philosophy, the Soviet government was determined to exert its influence on them.⁸²⁷ In 1982-1983, the number of students and professors in the pedagogical departments to be trained in the USSR was doubled. The students were sent into Soviet youth camps where they

⁸²⁴ Ibid., 1-120.

⁸²⁵ Ibid., 1-60.

⁸²⁶ *SSSR i GDR. 30 Let Otnosheniy, 1949-1979. Dokumenty (The USSR and GDR. 30 Years of the Relationship, 1949-1979. Documents)*, 307-308.

⁸²⁷ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9563. Inventory 1. File 4150: 15.

oversaw Russian schoolchildren and studied Soviet approaches to educating the young people. Every student was provided with a special pocket vocabulary containing political terms both in Russian and German and their translation and interpretation.⁸²⁸ The professoriate of the departments was involved in these projects now being initiated by the Soviets; the format of the conferences in the field of pedagogy was selected as being the most effective. German and Soviet colleagues discussed questions as to the ideological education of students, impetuses for boosting the socialist character of students and others, all of which became further annoyances for scholars. Engaging in these conventional measures, the Soviet Union attempted to win the allegiance of the professors; however, it was too late, because, as we will show below, the West's cultural offensive, dissident movements in the East, and the growing economic crisis were destabilizing the strength of the Soviet regime.

Finally, in 1986, the Soviet government recognized once again the fact that the collaborative projects with German specialists in the field of pedagogy, including conferences and other efforts to make them believe in the communist ideology, had failed. The ideology of Marxism never became a personal and deep belief for German students and professors.⁸²⁹ All Soviet projects were seen to be implemented on paper. The curriculum contained the extended hours allocated to ideological disciplines and Russian language, and the German professors published articles devoted to the German revolutionary movement of the working class, and to the ideological education of students, but neither students nor professors truly believed in the imposed ideology. Moscow was inclined to blame the Soviet visiting experts for this failure. Since the early 1980s, Soviet visiting experts and professors were said to have failed to really instill their ideological work in the German professoriate.⁸³⁰ Close to the end of the Cold War, Soviet documents mentioned more and more often the fact that the Soviet Union and Marxism were losing popularity in the GDR, that the professors had become orientated towards the West, and that the United States was effectively imposing its values on the East German intelligentsia through exchange programs, radio, and TV.

⁸²⁸ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9563. Inventory 1. File 4974: 1-120.

⁸²⁹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9563. Inventory 1. File 5186: 1-44.

⁸³⁰ *Ibid.*

3. German students in the USSR and the failure of Marxification

While the United States believed that students in West Germany had become true Marxists by the end of the 1960s, the Soviet Union was permanently dissatisfied with the low level of Marxification of the students in East Germany. To reinforce the ideological allegiance of East German students – the future ruling elite – the government of the Soviet Union took various steps. Long-term training in Soviet universities was always considered to be the most direct way to influence those students who aimed at making a career in GDR society.

As we mentioned above, the Soviets began training the German student body from 1952. And in 1961 the Democratic Republic occupied the first place among other Eastern European countries in numbers of students educated in the Soviet Union.⁸³¹ The same situation was observed in 1972,⁸³² and in 1979 the number of the East German students studying in Soviet universities became the largest in the entire history of GDR-USSR educational exchanges: 4000 students were studying at that time in the Soviet Union.⁸³³ After that the numbers began to fall; however, in 1989, among other socialist countries, the Democratic Republic sent the most students out of the total number of foreign students who studied in the USSR: 2300.⁸³⁴

In contrast to West German students who studied in the United States for six to twelve months, East German students spent a full period of studies of five to seven years. The majority of them tried to enroll in the applied science faculties of the universities, where ideological indoctrination was strongly outweighed by the disciplines involved, and only fifteen percent of the students agreed to study in the social science faculties. Students were selected by the German government through the one-year special institute at University of Halle established for these students and for high school graduates.⁸³⁵ This institute provided a basic knowledge of Russian and offered the students vacant places at Soviet

⁸³¹ The Russian State Archive of Modern History. Record Group 5. Inventory 35. File 180: 82.

⁸³² State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9606. Inventory 1. File 5349: 2.

⁸³³ *SSSR-GDR: Sotrudnichestvo i Sblizhenie (The USSR-GDR: the Cooperation and Rapprochement)*, 137.

⁸³⁴ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9661. Inventory 1. File 589: 12.

⁸³⁵ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9396. Inventory 19. File 30: 1-11.

social science faculties. However, the government of the GDR continued to report to Moscow that students preferred studying engineering, medicine, and music rather than studying history, sociology, and pedagogy in the Soviet Union. Hence, the aim of the Soviet government to reinforce Marxification through education in the Soviet Union was limited by the fact that students rejected offers to study social sciences in the Soviet Union.

The political events of 1968 in Prague had a great influence on the training of German students in the Soviet Union. After the Prague student demonstrations, the political education of the students arriving from the socialist countries of Europe became of primary importance. Soviet universities had to indoctrinate these students by all possible means. Classes on Marxism-Leninism became compulsory for attendance from 1968 onwards.⁸³⁶ Students studied the Russian language intensively, with an emphasis on the Soviet political terminology; they were sent to summer labor camps to work with Soviet students; they lodged with Soviet families, etc. However, during the ensuing years of the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, party observers at the universities reported to Moscow that German students studying the Marxist-Leninist disciplines and passing exams successfully remained the most opposed to Soviet ideology among all the other students arriving from Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, and did not believe in the doctrines of this philosophy.⁸³⁷

In 1985 the Soviet government attempted once again to reinforce ideological indoctrination by proposing the idea of a compulsory final examination on Marxist-Leninist disciplines. After long discussion, the government of the Soviet Union introduced this final examination in 1988, in the belief that it would help the students become eager believers in communism.⁸³⁸ However, it was unable to shift the attitude of the students towards this falling ideology: Not one of them took the classes seriously. Classes were not attended, the exams became a formal procedure, and most of the students continued listening to American radio stations like Voice of America and looked towards the longed-for West,

⁸³⁶ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9606. Inventory 1. File 336: 15.

⁸³⁷ The Russian State Archive of Modern History. Record Group 5. Inventory 35. File 180: 185.

⁸³⁸ G. Philippova, *Obuchenie Inostrannuh Studentov i Stazherov v SSSR I Zarubezhom. (The Training of the Foreign Students and Tranees in the USSR and Abroad)* (Moscow: University of the People Friendship, 1991), 27.

which had become closer during the period of Détente and Gorbachev's rapprochement policy.

Hence, without any open opposition such as occurred in West Germany, the professoriate and students were able to more or less repudiate this new ideological attack from the Soviet Union. Although studying Marxism-Leninism, passing examinations, revising curriculum, publishing articles and books, and doing the other mandatory things to survive, both professors and students still did not believe in this imposed ideology. In short, the Soviet policy of cultural imperialism, aimed at fostering a sincere ideological allegiance in students and professors in particular, did not succeed due to the failure of Marxist ideology to be convincing during a time of cultural influence from the United States and the West European countries on the GDR.

III. East German universities: silent opposition towards the Soviet Union and restraint of the German professoriate towards the American cultural offensive

Beginning in the mid-1970s, two new phenomena became visible in the countries of Eastern Europe. The first was a steady expansion of American programs in culture and education, and, the second was the gradual development of a dissident movement among intellectuals. The emergence of these new tendencies was caused by the important political events that occurred in high-echelon international politics during the 1970s. The détente in bilateral relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, and between Western and Eastern Europe as well, brought about the development of cultural contacts between the West and the East; and the development of the international movement in the domain of the advancement of human rights as stimulated by the Helsinki Accords of 1975 contributed to the growth of opposition groups which began demanding more freedom and more civil rights in the countries of the Socialist Block. The agreements signed by all the European countries and the Soviet Union in Finland required respect for civil rights and an expansion of cultural contacts between Western and Eastern Europe. As we mentioned above, the Soviet Union signed these mandatory agreements because the political borders established in Europe after the Second World War were recognized, which increased the prestige of the Soviet Union. Although, the Soviet government exchanged the diplomatic recognition of borders for diplomatic support of the idea of the

advancement of human rights, assuming that this would not be a crucial question for the high-echelon politics, such new phenomena – the presence of American culture and the emergence of human rights groups in Eastern Europe – made a valuable contribution to the collapse of communist ideology.

These two new phenomena emerged in the German Democratic Republic as well. However, the East German case was very specific and distinct from the other countries of Eastern Europe. The main specific features were lack of consolidated and mobilized opposition among intellectuals and university people as well (in contrast to, for example, the development of opposition movements in Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia) and the too slow (in contrast to other Eastern European countries) improvement in the East German-American contacts in the domain of culture and education. However, the documents allow the evolution of these two phenomena in East Germany to be traced from 1961 until 1990 and to arrive to the conclusion that the American cultural offensive and internal growth of opposition movements contributed to some extent to the fall of the political regime in East Germany. However, we should emphasize that the German professoriate demonstrated unexpected restraint towards American cultural influence starting in the GDR at the end of the 1970s through to the early 1980s.

Our story about the development of university opposition to the advent of American educational and cultural programs into East German universities could be divided into three periods. The first is 1965-1971: During this period a new sort of university opposition was formed and, separately, the United States indirectly affected the development of the opposition mood of East German intellectuals through a special cultural program. The second period is from 1971 until 1977: The United States began a process of approach towards the East German universities through complex negotiations with the government of the Democratic Republic, and the students showed some signs of opposition activity under the influence of the internal dissident movement. The third period is 1977-1990: The presence of American and West German culture increased enormously in East Germany in the context of the fading influence and popularity of Soviet ideology that finally had a partial effect on a few students and professors who joined the dissidents in 1989.

1. Internal and external sources of university opposition, 1965-1971

Specifics of East German university opposition

The opposition of the university people, defined as open demonstrations and the active position of dissidents groups in university as occurred in Poland or Czechoslovakia, was almost absent in East German universities. The majority of the historians in the field of the dissident movement in Eastern Europe are convinced today that it is incorrect to speak of an opposition in the GDR prior to the opening of the Hungarian border in 1989.⁸³⁹ We, however, consider that the opposition did exist in the GDR but it was another sort of opposition, quite different from the opposition movements existing in other countries of the East Block that could be defined here as *silent and nonviolent disobedience* to the political regime and to the imposition of Soviet indoctrination. This sort of opposition touched only a part of the critical students and professors, and it was associated with the Protestant church, activists on issues such as peace, human rights, women's rights, and ecology.

The erection of the Wall in 1961 stopped the development of the opposition in the GDR since contacts between the two parts of Germany and Berlin were cut, and those in academia who had earlier put up opposition left the GDR before the building of the Wall. Actually, resistance was so thoroughly destroyed by the communists that, for example, the students, professors and staff of Humboldt University were reported to have elected the SED member and former Stasi spy, Heinrich Fink, as Director of the University even in 1990. After the purge in the early 1950s, the universities comprised both those who either believed blindly in communism as devoted members of the SED or those who aimed at making any career that demanded the membership in the Party, and those who accepted the political environment reluctantly but were compelled to remain in the Eastern part of Germany. Such a configuration of academia would not very likely form a new resistance movement against the penetration of Soviet ideology. Moreover, the weakness of the university opposition was determined by the effective policy of the SED vis-à-vis the university professors and students. They could be excluded from the higher education system, which would derail any positive future career and life. As a result, those who felt some

⁸³⁹ S. Pfaff, "The Politics of Peace in the GDR: The Independent Peace Movement, the Church, and the Origins of the East German Opposition," *Peace and Change* 26, no. 3 (2001): 280-300, here 280.

opposition attitudes preferred to be more integrated in the elite than to be excluded from the ruling class.

Nevertheless, covert, hostile attitudes on the part of a substantial segment of the university teaching staff towards socialism, the GDR, and the USSR had been growing after the building of the Wall. The Soviet diplomats reported in the mid-1960s that "...the significant part of intelligentsia, which consists of a number of scientists and university teachers, adheres to hostile attitudes. The majority of teachers adhere to bourgeois views and this negatively affects the social order of the GDR and the socialist transformations implemented in it."⁸⁴⁰ Soviet diplomats, on the basis of conversations with German teachers and German propagandists, noted the following mood of the intellectual elite of the GDR: "...the work among the intelligentsia faces still greater challenges. The old scientific and technical intelligentsia is starting to change its attitude when there are strong political earthquakes... Its representatives affected young intellectuals ... Many oppose the social order by keeping silent... The German intelligentsia is partially incited against the USSR and does not recognize the value of the role of our communication with the USSR."⁸⁴¹

The articulation of a hostile mood was the specific stance of East German university people. Gradually, this mood became the foundation for the birth of a new university resistance movement in the mid-1960s, which continued its development during the entire period of the 1970s, and, finally, crystallized in the middle and end of the 1980s.

Internal sources of university opposition: professors of Marxism-Leninism and students in the theological faculties

It was the communist elite and the professors of the Marxist-Leninist philosophy at the universities who became the real danger to communist ideology toward the middle and end of the 1960s. The professoriate of the universities, being in the service of the ruling party, recognized the fact that the GDR was in need of economic reforms of a non-socialist type and that German party ideology needed to reject some tenets of the philosophy imposed by the Soviet Union. The governments of the GDR and the USSR were concerned about these revisionist ideas flowing from a segment of the professoriate which was member of the SED and taught

⁸⁴⁰The Russian State Archive of Modern History. Record Group 5. Inventory 35. File 102. P. 8

⁸⁴¹ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9518. Inventory 1. File 883. P. 109-110

Marxism philosophy. Soviet diplomats noted that the grounds for this revisionism lay in the weak belief of the professoriate in communism. According to Soviet observations, the members of this opposition were the lecturers who articulated various critical comments about Marxism and who were estimated to be *unconvinced lecturers* in Marxism-Leninism.⁸⁴² The representatives of the German government also noted that even the professor-members of the SED resisted indoctrination. They complained to the Soviet diplomats: “We have a rough time working with the professors in the universities. They are constantly dissatisfied with the situation in the GDR and impart to students their negative attitudes about the party and its ideology. The difficulties with our communication with the intelligentsia are defined by the fact that we have become accustomed to pressure the intelligentsia but not to convince them.”⁸⁴³

Special popularity among the professoriate and student body was attained by a professor of physical chemistry at Humboldt University, Robert Havemann, who was expelled from Humboldt University for his criticism of the SED and for publishing his papers in West Germany in 1966. He was reported to have a strong influence on students because his lectures in the early 1960s became a forum for discussion about revisionism in Marxism. However, he, like some other professors, was a true believer in socialism and communist dogma; he collaborated with the Stasi and heralded the building of the Wall. The SED tolerated him until he published an article in *Der Spiegel* in 1964. He was expelled from the party and dismissed from academic establishments. No protests in the universities ensued, and Havemann was kept under virtual house arrest until his death in 1982.⁸⁴⁴ The regime in the GDR struggled successfully against this first round of opposition that arose roused after the building of the Wall. Some of the professors lost their positions. However, these professors influenced the critical part of the student body, and then organized secret circles to discuss the political situation.

Other signs of new opposition during that period rippled through the theological faculties of the universities, theological academies, seminaries, and the church as a whole.⁸⁴⁵ The reason for the serious

⁸⁴² The Russian State Archive of Modern History. Record Group. 5. Inventory 35. File 102. P. no #

⁸⁴³ The Russian State Archive of Modern History. Record Group 5. Inventory 55. File 55: 21.

⁸⁴⁴ J. Rodden, “The Galileo of the GDR: Robert Havemann,” *Debatte* 14, no. 1 (2006): 37-48.

⁸⁴⁵ The Lutheran Church became the primary shelter for opposition groups. The East German Catholic Church did not support the opposition groups as the Protestant Lutheran

dissatisfaction of the theological faculties was the introduction of universal compulsory military service in 1962. Students at universities found themselves under pressure from the this law. Some researchers mentioned that “there were no exceptions for pacifists until the introduction of an unarmed alternative military service in 1964, still under the auspices of the army. Those students doing this alternative service had to suffer considerable social disadvantages, such as being excluded from university and being conscripted at an older age, thereby risking being torn away from their young families.”⁸⁴⁶ Scholars now assume that the introduction of military service contributed to the civil rights movement in the GDR. Students in the theological faculties were the first to protest against the introduction of this law by marching in the streets near the University of Leipzig. They also became the first to protest against the planned deconsecration of the parish church at the University and against the Soviet intervention in Prague in 1968.⁸⁴⁷ Years later, as is well known, they were the ones who organized the first demonstration against the collapsing regime in 1989. The centers for this sort of opposition were three theological establishments of higher education in Leipzig, Naumburg, and Berlin.⁸⁴⁸ Still, the government was successful in suppressing this opposition: Students from the theological faculties were excluded from the universities and sent to factories to join the ranks of the working class. The church did, however, play an important role in the mobilization of protest in the fall of 1989.

External sources of university opposition: the American cultural offensive against East Berlin

Undoubtedly, what weak opposition there was in German university circles was fed by various contacts (letters, parcels, and personal meetings) between Germans of West and East, as well as by the American presence in West Berlin. Since the early 1960s, German propagandists and Soviet diplomats noted the fact that West German

Church did. In 1985 the Lutheran Church had 6.95 million members, whereas there were only 1.2 million Roman Catholics.

⁸⁴⁶ A. Hadjar, “Non-Violent Political Protest in East Germany in the 1980s: Protestant Church, Opposition Groups and the People,” *German Politics* 12, no. 3 (2003): 107-128, here 108, 124.

⁸⁴⁷ See the memoirs of one of the participants in the demonstration at Leipzig University: D. Koch, *Das Verhör. Zerstörung und Widerstand* (Dresden: Verlag Christoph Hille, 2000).

⁸⁴⁸ E. Neubert, *Geschichte der Opposition in der DDR: 1949-1989* (Berlin: Ch. Links, 1997), 467.

propaganda was irresistible and that it was impossible to stop the decline of German intellectuals' and professors' interest in Soviet culture: "The impact of West Germany on university teachers is not limited by two radio stations. The main thing is family relations between teachers from West Germany and the GDR that comprise millions of letters, parcels, and phone calls. Influence through these channels is much stronger than that of radio propaganda."⁸⁴⁹

Some of the cultural programs of the United States in West Berlin, already forgotten in contemporary scholarship, had a definite influence on the intelligentsia of East Berlin and East Germany. One such program was so-called *Viability Program for Berlin* sponsored by the US government. This program stipulated that West Berlin had to be developed culturally to such a high degree in order to demonstrate to the population of East Berlin the advantages and superiority of Western brand of culture and education over the socialist one. The cultural development of West Berlin was centered on the enlargement of the cultural, scientific, and educational establishments in West Berlin, and on transforming the city into an international center of science, cultural institutions, and education. This project was a constant irritation for Moscow which clearly saw the dangerous influence that the culture of West Berlin represented for intelligentsia of East Germany.

Even before the erection of the Wall, those American experts and politicians who stayed in West Germany stated that culture and education had a role of critical importance in demonstrating the capacity of a free society. The American government considered that the development of universities and research centers in West Berlin (the Free University and Technical University, various pedagogical institutions, and state libraries) should be the tool for making West Berlin a developed and integral part of the West. After the Wall went up in August of 1961, the leader of the American Mission in Berlin, Lucius Clay, sent a letter to the Department of State about transforming Berlin into the most important cultural and educational center in the Western World. The Department of State responded to this letter proposing an increase in the number of young American students in the creative arts studying in West Berlin, and the additional grants for the Free University and international educational programs, cultural conferences and additional projects as part of the exchange program. In February of 1962, Secretary of State Dean Rusk

⁸⁴⁹The Russian State Archive of Modern History. Record Group 5. Inventory 55. File 55: 18-19.

reiterated this proposed program for Berlin and the term “Berlin Viability Program” was coined. Additional financial support was given to the Free University and Technical University, to art and music academies, and to theological seminaries and colleges. The program of the recruitment of West German professors and their dispatch to Berlin was begun. And the American proposal to increase the number of foreign students in Berlin was supported by European politicians. Finally, American universities prepared and realized a project to increase the number of international conferences.⁸⁵⁰

During the ensuing years and until the end of the Cold War, the Berlin Viability Program was developed into a long-range undertaking which helped to restore the confidence of West Berliners in their future through promoting Berlin’s cultural significance for West Germany as a whole. The government of the United States encouraged American private investments and halted emigration from West Berlin so that by the end of 1960s there was a net gain of immigration over emigration. In area of education, the Free University, its American Institute, the Technical University, and the Pedagogical Center were expanded substantially to become international centers for research.⁸⁵¹

Until the end of the Cold War, the Soviets officially articulated their disaffection with this program stating that the cultural development of West Berlin had a political and propagandistic influence on the population of East Germany. The Soviets demanded the transfer of international cultural and educational centers to Bonn in order to maintain the calm around West Berlin. As usual, the actual Soviet answer, as with similar projects before, was to harass travelers connected with the newly established cultural and educational centers.⁸⁵²

Hence, the Viability Program fed the mood of pessimism and criticism of the East German intelligentsia and made the political regime of the GDR suppress the negative attitude of the part of the intelligentsia even more. This skeptical and pessimistic mood on the part of the intelligentsia had a profound impact on a segment of the student body,

⁸⁵⁰ NARA. Record Group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural and Public Affairs. Subject Files 1945-1997. Educational and Cultural Agreements, Germany, 1948-1968. Box 123.

⁸⁵¹ NARA. Record Group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural Affairs. Lot 98D 252. Box 169-172, 205-206.

⁸⁵² NARA. Record Group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural and Public Affairs. Subject Files 1945-1997. Box 124.

who listened, analyzed, and established secret circles in the mid-1970s until early in the 1980s.⁸⁵³

2. America's approach to East Germany, 1971-1977

During the first seven years of the 1970s, the GDR as well as Europe underwent political and cultural changes that affected the behavior of university professors and students.

Initial contacts between the United States and East Germany

Erich Honecker, who assumed the position of head of the East German state in 1971, began introducing some liberal reforms. The intelligentsia at that time hoped to gain more freedom, especially in the domain of censorship. But, as a result, some professors and students began to voice critical observations as to the economic situation in the country. Honecker, however, had no intention of being a liberal, and his toying with liberalism was just to demonstrate to the West on the eve of the international festival of youth, planned for East Berlin in 1973, that socialism could be more democratic. Many students and professors did not understand this tricky policy of Honecker's and the result was that those who demanded more freedom or provoked the people into open demonstrations were interned in psychiatric hospitals.⁸⁵⁴

Nevertheless, Honecker's toying with liberalism, initiated in the context of the politics of Détente was exploited by the United States government as a motive for beginning a dialogue with East Germany. Another formal reason for the political rapprochement between East Germany and the United States concerned the diplomatic recognition of the GDR as a sovereign and independent state by the United States. Hence, the general political situation in Europe and the world was affected by the establishing of contacts between them in the early 1970s.

Before these events the United States, as is well known, rejected any possibility of initiating official contacts with the client country of the Soviet Union. The American government, for example, negatively reacted to initiatives by American academic circles that wanted to initiate cultural contacts with East Germany in 1965. The Department of State disseminated a letter to all American universities about the reasons

⁸⁵³ State Archive of the Russian Federation. Record Group 9518. The Committee on Cultural Ties with Foreign Countries at the Council of Ministers. Inventory 1. File 883: 125-130.

⁸⁵⁴ See in detail the opposition among the intelligentsia during the period 1971-1985: R. Woods, *Opposition in the GDR under Honecker, 1971-85* (London: Macmillan, 1986).

behind the impossibility of contact with East Germany, indicating that “the US does not recognize the so-called German Democratic Republic as a sovereign and independent country and, therefore, has no diplomatic relations with that regime. For this reason, we cannot encourage any relationship between an educational institution here in the US and an East German organization or institution. We have found that East German efforts to foster such relationships, however innocent they may appear on the surface, are usually designed to do no more than enhance the prestige of the communist regime of the Soviet Zone.”⁸⁵⁵ Soon afterwards, German universities began encouraging the US Government to elaborate a more dynamic educational policy with respect to East Germany. The rectors of the Free University, as well as Universities of Frankfurt, Hildeburg and Marburg aspired to sign bilateral agreements with universities in East Germany. In 1970, the rector of the Free University, Rolf Kreibich, initiated the establishment of academic contacts with East German universities. Americans stated that this initiative could cause political repercussions related to Bonn’s Ostpolitik, and the representatives of the West German Ministry of Education publicly criticized this initiative for overstepping the limits of their [rectors] mandate, claiming that the Ministry had no intention of supporting this initiative.⁸⁵⁶

Nevertheless, these external pressures and a certain improvement in the relations between the superpowers allowed the Nixon Administration to consider the expansion of contacts with East Germany. The American administration elaborated on its policy aimed at developing cultural relations between the United States and the countries of Eastern Europe to further ultimate goal of their independence from Soviet control, and to help alleviate the fear and distrust of Germany among the people of Eastern Europe.⁸⁵⁷ In 1972 exhaustive talks about the exchange of university teaching staff and students between the governments of the United States and East Germany were initiated by the government of the United States.

IREX (International Research and Exchange Board), the American non-governmental agency and the principal organizer of governmental East-West academic exchanges since 1968, was selected to the talks. Its

⁸⁵⁵ NARA. Record Group 59. Bureau of European Affairs. Records relating to Berlin and Eastern Affairs 1957-1968. Box 2.

⁸⁵⁶ NARA. Record Group 59. Culture and Information, 1970-1973. Box 392.

⁸⁵⁷ NARA. Record Group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural Affairs. Lot 98D 252. Box 169-172, 205-206.

director, Professor Allen Kassoff, went to East Berlin in October of 1972. He was very skeptical about any prospects for early progress. However, upon his return he reported to the American government that GDR officials had evidenced great interest in concluding an agreement in the not-too-distant future. The main negotiators were the East German Ministry of Foreign Affairs and, on other side, IREX, together with the Department of State of the United States. The talks took place both in East Berlin and Washington, and lasted three years, from 1972 until 1975. The main and continual line of the talks was about the number of citizen to be sent and to be admitted in both countries as well as the areas of cooperation. The United States insisted on the number of 75 East German professors and students to be sent to American universities annually. The United States demanded that the participants of the exchange agreement specialize in the social sciences, and, vice-versa, the GDR in science and technology.⁸⁵⁸ Finally, Kassoff was able to convince the government of the Democratic Republic to send 25 professors and students, and to allow a parity of participants between the social sciences and the applied sciences.⁸⁵⁹ Actually the government of East Germany and chief of the Cultural Division of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Wener Bettin, considered that 75 candidates from East German universities could undermine the stability of academic life upon return from the United States. Bettin personally was sure that the signing of the educational exchange agreement with the United States would only bring bitter defeat for East Germany. He understood quite well that the United States would exploit the educational exchanges to demonstrate the weaknesses, deficiencies, and grimness of East German culture, and thus East Germany would lose this cultural competition. He attempted, therefore, to delay the signing of the treaty.

Yet, the Helsinki Accords, signed by all the European States and the Soviet Union in 1975 and stipulating the opening of borders for mutual cultural and educational exchanges, gave a new impetus for concluding the first agreement between the GDR and the USA.⁸⁶⁰ It was an agreement, however, between the government of the GDR and the non-governmental organization of the United States, which was IREX. Politicians in East Berlin, therefore, were dissatisfied with the fact that

⁸⁵⁸ NARA. Record Group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural Affairs. Lot 98D 252. Box 169-172, 205-206.

⁸⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁶⁰ NARA. Record Group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural and Public Affairs. Subject Files 1945-1997. Box 124.

the United States was represented by a private institution instead of the government, even though this private institution obtained funds from the governmental budget.

The number of scholars finally turned out to be smaller than IREX would have hoped. Initially, six to seven scholars participated from each side, and certainly no sensitive topics such as the American political system or the American constitution or the like were allowed to be promoted and discussed. The Americans tried to reserve special quotas for the social sciences and humanities, but, despite this, the German Republic sent scholars specializing mainly in the natural and technical sciences; it was these very scholars, however, who would later join the dissident movement at the end of the 1980s. Americans were more interested in the history of Germany, in music studies, and in philosophy, which ended up becoming the primary areas promoted by the both governments. During the first years, most of the German participants represented the senior staff of the professoriate in East German universities. The Americans, as usual, demonstrated a diversity of formal professional statuses on the part of their participants. They were professors, associate professors, and students.

In the end, the program developed very slowly because of technical problems and mutual suspicion. When the United States proposed to the East German government the idea of the Humboldt University Book Presentation, aimed at presenting 1,000 books to the University, this program was not stymied. American diplomats in Berlin blamed Washington for the initial failure, due to an inability to overcome certain technical difficulties: the Embassy was struck by the fact that this unrealized Book Presentation was due to problems created on the US side. Ambassadors wrote: "If the GDR wanted to subdue our presence, which the embassy does not believe, problems of our own making have made it easier for them to do it..."⁸⁶¹ Moreover, the exchange program did not work efficiently, because the East German government insisted on the conclusion of a formal intergovernmental agreement in the domain of education and culture. This was something that the United States had previously signed before with many countries around the world, but Secretary of State Vance stated that visits of scholars and academicians need not be formalized. In letters addressed to American diplomats in Berlin, he asked them to get the GDR to invite more US lecturers without

⁸⁶¹ NARA. Record Group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural and Public Affairs. Subject Files 1945-1997. Box 124.

setting up a formal program.⁸⁶² In response to this, the government of East Germany declared that there would be no expansion of exchanges without the signing of an intergovernmental agreement.

In the two years following the development of the exchange program, the GDR and the USSR began to articulate their concern about the strong and deep influence the programs were having on minds of the intelligentsia. In 1976, the Soviet Union stated that the impact from the exchange program between the United States and the Democratic Republic was too strong in its rather rapid dissemination of information about the United States among intellectuals. In particular, the Soviets were dissatisfied with the participation of artists, and professors of history and sociology in the exchange program, although this number was small.⁸⁶³ The Soviet response to this was not original: it consisted of a further promotion of Marxist philosophy in all fields of culture and science in the GDR, as discussed in the second part of the chapter. In addition, the political regime began to worry about the presence of American culture in the GDR. Acting Foreign Minister of the GDR, Dr Horst Grunert, published an article on the cultural exchanges. He assured everyone that, despite the growing influence of American culture on the German intelligentsia and universities, socialist ideology had not destabilized, and that the first task of the GDR's foreign cultural policy was still exchanges with the Soviet Union, and only secondarily organizing equal exchanges with capitalist countries. Yet, he recognized that countless artists from Western Europe and the United States had already performed in the GDR, and hundreds of foreign books and films had also appeared in the GDR.⁸⁶⁴ This article bears witness to the fact that the regime tried to convince itself that the socialist state was powerful enough to stop the cultural penetration of the West, even though politicians had already foreseen their future defeat in this cultural contest.

Students under the influence of the dissident movement

In addition to the situation around the exchange program, Moscow was concerned about the negative sentiments articulated by great numbers of the intelligentsia, and especially by artists, poets, and singers. The East German poet and singer, Wolf Biermann, became a new star for East

⁸⁶² Ibid.

⁸⁶³ The Russian State Archive of Modern History. Record Group 5. Inventory 69. File 636: 9.

⁸⁶⁴ NARA. Record Group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural and Public Affairs. Subject Files 1945-1997. Box 124.

German university students. In 1976, he gave a concert at University of Bochum in West Germany, broadcast to the East by West German radio and TV. The concert attracted the attendance of thousands of West German students, while millions of Germans in the East were able to listen or watch this concert. This event had a great impact on the young people the GDR, who never before had been able to listen to open criticism of the regime. After that, the bravest students began a movement to read Biermann's forbidden works, listen to his forbidden songs, and organize groups of fans of forbidden Biermann material.

Another inspiration for the development of opposition among the student body was the German philosopher and Marxist Rudolf Bahro. Thanks to the exchange programs that existed between West and East Germany, he was able to bring to the West and publish there his famous book entitled *Die Alternative: Zur Kritik des real existierenden Sozialismus*. The book criticized the absence of political and civic freedoms in the GDR, and demanded political reforms. Bahro had been born in West Germany but he had decided to leave for East Germany. During the middle and end of the 1950s, he studied philosophy at Humboldt University and became a student leader as the editor of *The Forum*, the communist student newspaper. However, Bahro suddenly revised his communist views under the influence of Professor Robert Havemann at the end of 1968, proposing reforms for the political system. After publication of the book in 1978, he was arrested and sentenced to eight years in prison. The Western European public and President of the United States Jimmy Carter personally organized a campaign against this decision.⁸⁶⁵ The Stasi was compelled to free and deport Bahro to West Germany.

His book and life attracted a part of both the student body and of the professoriate, who then established secret circles for the reading of Bahro's works, called *The Critical Marxists*. The most famous circle was the group of students at University of Jena, called the *Bahro-Lesekreise*, led by the professor of literary studies Manfred Beyer. Similar groups of students were found by the Stasi at the Department of History of University of Leipzig.⁸⁶⁶ This segment of academia called itself the followers of Bahro, and they, like other revisionists, defended the existence of the GDR but proposed certain transformations of the system. This trend is very important to understand, because most of the

⁸⁶⁵ See in details: Neubert, *Geschichte*, 226-227.

⁸⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 244, 320. See for details about R. Bahro: D. Bathrick, "The Politics of Culture: Rudolf Bahro and the Opposition in the GDR," *New German Critique* (1978): 3.

opposition groups located in the universities would later stand for the continuation of the GDR's existence but in some revised form with more freedoms.

In short, there were two visible but slow processes going on in East Germany during the middle and end of the 1970s. The first was the growth of a semi-open opposition among university students, and the second was the growing presence of Western culture and science that became more and more difficult for the regime to control.

3. Rapprochement of American-East German relations in education, 1977-1990

In 1977, two important events occurred in both Berlin and Washington that provided a new impetus of the development of American-East German ties in education and culture.

The first concerned the appointment of a new head of the Cultural Division at the East German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who supported American-East German cultural contacts. In January of 1977, an unknown ambassador, Kurt Merkel, became the chief of the Cultural Division instead of Wener Bettin. He was much more positive about the American cultural presence in the GDR than his former chief. Just after his appointment, he talked with the American diplomat in East Berlin about working out a new plan for cooperation, and he agreed to American proposals for an increase in cultural programs.⁸⁶⁷ Following this, Merkel organized the American film week, and museum exchanges and exhibits at the end of 1977.⁸⁶⁸

The second event concerned a new concept elaborated and promoted by American president Jimmy Carter that enormously influenced the strengthening of the internal dissident movement in the GDR and the promotion of American-East German cultural ties. In 1977, the President officially declared that the main aim of American foreign policy would be the advancement of human rights in Eastern European countries. The Helsinki Accords provided a legal foundation for supporting various opposition and semi-opposition groups such as the Green movements or peace movements that started developing in the East. This concept expanded financial support of coming from the United States for dissident movements and supplied real stimulus for opposition to the

⁸⁶⁷ NARA. Record Group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural and Public Affairs. Subject Files 1945-1997. Box 124.

⁸⁶⁸ Ibid.

communist regimes.⁸⁶⁹ Moreover, the Carter Administration aimed at expanding cultural contacts with the East in order to disseminate this concept in the Socialist Block.

Thus, a new and expanded cultural plan for cooperation between the United States and East Germany was signed in 1977. It was a breakthrough in American policy towards the GDR. The agreement provided a broad umbrella for all exchanges with the United States. Actually, the United States acquired wider access to the East German market in terms of the performing arts, exhibits, books, and films. In one year alone, citizens of the GDR saw exhibitions from US museums, and films, and were able to buy some American books freely. However, the GDR would not permit US scholars to give lectures as the American government did in respect to East German scholars participating in the university exchange program.⁸⁷⁰ The 1977 agreement increased the number of participants in the exchange programs to 40 instead of 25, and, more importantly, American studies became the primary topic for German scholars sent to the United States. However, these studies of the United States were mostly historically oriented and did not imply any engagement in themes concerning the American political system. Moreover, the government of the GDR did not agree to send German scholars for more than two to three months. This can be explained by the great fear of officials had about the strong impact of the West on German intellectuals. Finally, the Germans demanded that an intergovernmental agreement be concluded in the domain of culture between the two sovereign states instead of the existing agreement between one state (East Germany) and a non-governmental agency (IREX). In 1979, the United States agreed to begin discussing a draft of an agreement which would encompass cooperation between universities, study and lecture tours, and textbooks and teaching aids. The primary emphasis was on cooperation in the field of English and American studies⁸⁷¹. The GDR and the US concluded a new cultural agreement. According to the new agreement, American lecturers obtained the right to give lectures in East German universities and to participate in an exchange of textbooks and to provide teaching aids to East German teaching staff. Also, the United States and

⁸⁶⁹ NSC, "Presidential Review Memorandum 28. On Human Rights. July 08, 1977," in *Presidential Directives and Executive Orders*. Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/direct.htm> (accessed February 15, 2006).

⁸⁷⁰ NARA. Record Group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural and Public Affairs. Subject Files 1945-1997. Box 124.

⁸⁷¹ *Ibid.*

GDR cooperated in the realm of radio and television broadcasting and news agencies, and the German book market was open to American scholarly literature.⁸⁷² However, the two sides could not resolve the major point at issue: the distribution of materials. The GDR continued to object to paragraphs in the text of the proposed agreement concerning access to cultural facilities and to public distribution of materials. For the Americans, the question of access and distribution of materials was a fundamental principle of all exchange programs. However, the Germans resisted and, in 1983, American diplomats in Berlin declared that “it would not be appropriate at the present time for the US to continue talks about the distribution of materials, because of the GDR’s unwillingness to include reference to public distribution of cultural, informational, and scientific materials.”⁸⁷³

Despite these difficulties, cooperation in education and culture grew year by year. In 1979-1980, the government of the GDR allowed IREX to invite several rectors of East German universities to observe the work and life of American universities. The rectors of most pro-communist universities such as Dresden and Leipzig came to the United States in 1980. The Americans noted the great success of this program, because it was the first open challenge to communist education. After this visit, the rectors of these universities and universities in Rostock and Greifswald agreed to sign university-to-university agreements between American and East German universities in the domain of American and German studies. In 1981, IREX established The Commission on the Humanities and Social Sciences with the GDR. It was a bilateral organization set up to elaborate collaborative projects in those areas. The commission provided the first opportunity for both sides to explore the political and intellectual life of both countries by using archive records. Obviously, this seemed to be quite an achievement for the United States, that is making the GDR more open. In actuality, the first archival projects were only implemented in 1987-1988.

However, the German professoriate specializing in the humanities began to demonstrate some signs of restraint in regard to participation in such projects. Some of them declared that they did not wish to develop American studies or organize any scientific cooperation with American universities. The government of the United States ignored such declarations in its euphoria over the success of other programs.

⁸⁷² Ibid.

⁸⁷³ Ibid.

A new period in the development of American-East German ties began when the Ronald Reagan Administration entered the White House in 1981. He proposed quite a new approach to liquidate the communist influence in Eastern European countries through information, and educational and cultural programs. Reagan was known as a severe critic of the policy of Détente, convinced that the United States should conduct a more active policy towards Eastern Europe and a much tougher policy towards the Soviet Union in order to liberate the region from Soviet ideology. Reagan was the first president to announce that the United States would apply the cultural and educational contacts that existed between the United States and the GDR in order to promote and strengthen the free press, free union trades, democratic political parties, new universities, and non-governmental organizations openly and without taking into consideration the Soviet position. This new, audacious and shocking concept for the Soviet government was called the "Democracy Project." The President announced it officially in 1982 while on a tour of Western European countries. He encouraged Western European governments, private TV channels, and journalists to help the dissidents in Eastern European countries. And his appeal found a broad response among Europeans. Soon the President established a special semi-governmental philanthropy foundation called the "National Endowment for Democracy" and this organization implemented the ideas of Ronald Reagan to implant democracy in the East until the end of the Cold War. The political regime in the GDR and the Soviet Union could do nothing to counter this pressure, because the United States was acting legally and within the framework of the agreements signed. The Soviet Union tried luring the German intelligentsia and German young people through its usual means of disseminating Soviet culture and expanding the dissemination of their outdated communist ideology, obviously and hopelessly losing cultural contest.

Ronald Reagan understood this quite well, and, moreover, his advisers such as the American historian and economist Richard Pipes convinced the President that the 1980s economic crisis would eventually lead to the development of a strong opposition and to the collapse of the political regimes in the East. In point of fact, early in the 1980s the low price of oil forced the Soviet Union to cut financial support for the European communist regimes, including its educational policy there, beginning in 1981. The opposition grew month by month. When the SED introduced compulsory military education in the universities, this became a factor in a consolidation of the opposition. In order to protest, students

became members of the semi-governmental, semi-independent peace movement. Protesting against war in general and the deployment of nuclear weapons in Europe, in particular, the students demanded more freedom in the GDR and a cancellation of military education and service. By the early 1980s, the 100,000 young people participating in this peace movement suddenly turned into the opposition. The peace movement became the platform for students to demand civil freedoms. The Church and the theological faculties of the universities had become shelters for the opposition after their position became freer in the GDR in 1978.⁸⁷⁴ Consequently, in 1981 as University of Leipzig and Leipzig St. Nicholas Church once again became the center of student demonstrations against NATO, demonstrators suddenly began demanding more freedom in the GDR. Previously, students at the Protestant Leipzig Theological College along with other opposition groups had already initiated a discussion forum about the problems of the GDR and the church system. In 1982, dissidents in the GDR, including some students, signed the Berlin Appeal initiated by Robert Havemann. This demanded the neutralization, disarmament, and reunification of Germany. However, it was the students who suffered the most. They were forced to say goodbye to any prospect of higher education.

At the same time, more and more East German professors were being invited by the West German and American governments to participate in various conferences. These short trips became an effective channel for acquainting them with Western science and culture, even within the existing conditions of the well-documented rigid interdictions and censorship in the GDR. The Federal Republic of Germany, with the assistance of the USA, managed to organize a continuous flow of international conferences held on West German territory and was able to invite their Eastern neighbors to attend. Some of the professors stayed on in West Germany. This was extremely disturbing for both German communists and the Soviet rulers in Moscow. One of the Soviet diplomats reported to Moscow that "...the propaganda [of the West] on aimed at university teachers of the GDR has intensified. Here is a most typical example of the behavior of the German university teaching staff: at the end of September of this year, Professor M. Krauze left for West Germany as the adviser for the documentary film 'Marx is alive' that is being made by East German producers, and he has remained there. He

⁸⁷⁴ J. Ott, "Der Bund der Evangelischen Kirchen, Die Protestanten und Die 'Streitkultur'. Der DDR der 80er Jahre," *Revue d'Allemagne* 24, no. 1 (1992): 143-158.

named the reasons of such a step as ‘disappointment in the public system of the GDR’ and ‘professional dissatisfaction.’ Up until that moment he had had a good reputation.”⁸⁷⁵ The increasing flow of professors to the West frightened the Soviet Union so profoundly that in 1983 Moscow demanded a cut in the number of American exchange programs. However, it could not stop the expansion of new ideas in the GDR.

Due to this new and blatant cultural offensive by Reagan, nearly 90% of the population in the GDR was now able to watch at least one of the three West German state channels which began showing a sharply higher number of American films.⁸⁷⁶ US mass culture infiltrated the GDR through West German television.⁸⁷⁷ Moreover, West German broadcasting companies and television channels began communicating with opposition groups so as to be on the spot when they planned any activity.⁸⁷⁸ United States diplomats and journalists from Great Britain and West Germany played a definite role in financially supporting opposition groups in the GDR and other countries, starting in early 1982.⁸⁷⁹

By 1985, the collaborative research projects between the universities of the US and the GDR were touching on sensitive political themes forbidden earlier by the Stasi. In 1985, a conference on German writers in exile was arranged in East Berlin. Scholars began discussing the problem of the image of the US in the GDR, mutual perceptions, and the role of the Soviet Union in German culture, along with the US Constitution and the political system in the United States. East German professors at all the universities proposed developing American studies at their universities in order to attract financial support from the government of the United States.⁸⁸⁰

Obviously, this policy was now destabilizing the ideological foundations of communism in the GDR. The young people especially fell

⁸⁷⁵ The Russian Archive of Modern History. Record Group 5. Inventory 88. File 208: 4.

⁸⁷⁶ S. Fox, “My Bitter America: The Role of Mass Culture in New Identities for East Germans before and after the Wall,” in *Cultural Transmissions and Receptions. American Culture in Europe*, ed. R. Kroes (Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit, 1993), 198-208.

⁸⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁷⁸ H. Behrend, “The Rise and Fall of the East German Civil Rights Movement,” *New Politics* 6 (1997), <http://www.wpunj.edu/newpol/issue23/behren23.htm>, (accessed 27 May, 2009).

⁸⁷⁹ “Stasi Report on the Size and Structure of the East German Opposition, June 1, 1989,” in *German History in Documents and Images*, <http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/> (accessed May 27, 2009).

⁸⁸⁰ IREX, “Annual Reports, 1975-1992,” in Official Web p. of IREX, www.irex.org/resources/annual/ (accessed May 27, 2009).

under the influence of American mass culture. The regime noted that young people demonstrated their insubordination by brandishing by Western icons such as jeans, Coca Cola and rock music. The latter made so strong an impact, that the SED was compelled to organize a number of concerts for young people. German propagandists stated that “the West German cultural presence will increase considerably in the GDR, while the GDR in cultural and ideological terms most likely lose...”⁸⁸¹ But the most dangerous symbol of Western culture for the socialist system was considered by German communists to be the *Burda* magazine, which nevertheless, began circulate in the GDR beginning in the early 1980s.⁸⁸² This West German magazine disseminated the ideas of fashion for women in the society which was in deep economic crises that provoked additional indignation by the ruling regime.

Finally, a new scope for the American offensive and a new impetus for renewed talks between Americans and East Germans were provided by the Geneva summit between President Ronald Reagan and Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev in 1985. At this summit, Ronald Reagan clearly stated to the Soviet leader the American intention to increase the frequency of educational exchanges between the United States and the Eastern Block. The proposals of the President concerned such programs as the introduction of new methods of teaching English and social sciences in the universities of East Germany, and also the short-term training of students who specialized in the fields of social studies and the humanities.⁸⁸³ The Soviet leader agreed. Subsequently diplomats from East Germany and the United States were able to sign historic agreements concerning the development of American studies in the GDR and Fulbright academic exchanges in 1987. IREX noted that, since the conclusion of this agreement, American scholars were now able to work on topics that five years earlier would have been characterized as

⁸⁸¹ The Russian Archive of Modern History. Record Group 5. Inventory 88. File 208: 18.

⁸⁸² Ibid.

⁸⁸³ NSC, “National Security Directive 194. Meeting with Soviet Leader in Geneva: Themes and Perceptions. October 25, 1985,” “National Security Decision Directive 223. Implementing the Geneva Exchanges Initiative. April 02, 1986,” in *Presidential Directives and Executive Orders*. Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/direct.htm> (accessed February 15, 2006); “Joint Soviet-United States Statement on the Summit Meeting in Geneva. November 21, 1985,” “Statement by the Principal Deputy Press Secretary Speaking on Soviet-United States Cultural and Educational Exchanges. August 05, 1986. in *The Public Papers of President Ronald W. Reagan*. The Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, <http://www.reagan.utex.edu/archives> (accessed 1 March, 2005).

sensitive ones such as the Soviet Occupation period, the role of the Communist Party in East Germany and others subjects.

Gorbachev's reforms in the Soviet Union and the dynamic cultural policy of the United States in the GDR stimulated the establishment of new and open opposition groups. These dissidents began an open offensive against the regime. In 1986, East German dissidents signed a famous Appeal on the anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution which was disseminated in all the countries of Eastern Europe. The letter demanded political democracy, independence, and pluralism based on the principles of self-government for those countries, along with respect for the rights of all minorities there, and for the peaceful reunification of a divided Europe. However, no university professor signed the Appeal. The government of the United States estimated the number of opposition groups to be ten; university professors, however, were not listed as members of these groups.⁸⁸⁴

The same restraint was demonstrated by university students. In the opinion of some American experts, the oppositional mood of the student body was still weak in 1988: "The mood of political activism evident among some segments of the GDR's younger generation has not spread to the country's student body. During the recent wave of political unrest among East German human rights activists and would-be émigrés the student community in the GDR remained quiet. Similarly, only a few students took part in the unofficial peace movement of the early 1980s. Theology students associated with the Evangelical Church have been the one exception to this political apathy. Students have also refrained from open protests criticizing university conditions."⁸⁸⁵ One of the reasons for this apolitical behavior on the part of students was reported to be the strong, professionally oriented position of university students: "In an East German survey, when asked what they considered the most important aspects of their studies, 94% of the students said that 'learning a job' was very important. On the other hand, 'to become politically engaged' was viewed as important by only 36% of those interviewed."⁸⁸⁶ The second

⁸⁸⁴ "An Annotated Survey of Independent Movements in Eastern Europe. Radio Free Europe Research Report, 1989," in *Open Society Archive*, <http://www.osaarchivum.org/files/holdings/300/8/3/text/120-4-279.shtml> (accessed May 27, 2009).

⁸⁸⁵ "Alienation and Protest: Students in Eastern Europe. Radio Free Europe Research Report, 1988," in *Open Society Archive*, <http://www.osa.ceu.hu/files/holdings/300/8/3/text/119-4-7.shtml> (accessed May 27, 2009).

⁸⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

reason for the lack of critical political thinking and activism among students was attributed to the very strict selection procedure. The political allegiance articulated by the university students was the result of their willingness to conform in order to acquire an education. The third factor was “the way in which a student’s studies were organized. Students were given hardly any choice in planning their curricula once a specific focus of study has been chosen. Students of the same department or discipline were put into seminar groups in which they remained for every course during their entire studies. Each group which consists of twenty to twenty-five people, had its own FDJ (the official youth organization) group, which acted as a monitor. As a result, the average student had little possibility of developing and expressing independent or nonconformist thought and behavior. Finally, American experts noted that “for a student the cost of nonconformist behavior was high. Those who took part in unofficial peace or human rights groups or tried to organize political protest within the university were expelled.”⁸⁸⁷ In addition, in the reports, prepared for the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe concerning the implementation of the Helsinki Final Act, the Department of State reported that the GDR maintained the tightest control over access to its institutions, implying American access to the mass media, archives, and universities. In addition, the Department of State reported that the state controlled all cultural offerings and cultural policy. Despite this, the American performing arts obtained access to the local market and had a strong impact on East German intellectuals. The American government opened the US Embassy library, which attracted visitors, though they were monitored by the Stasi. Nevertheless, the number of young East Germans visiting the library in particular increased dramatically the ensuing two 2 years.⁸⁸⁸

Right on the eve of the fall of the Wall, the professoriate and the students were observed as having joined two new nongovernmental organizations, *Democracy Now* and *New Forum*, which led demonstrations in Leipzig in the fall of 1989. The professors and students of the theological faculties and applied science departments of the universities led a list of academic representatives.⁸⁸⁹ However, of the twenty-seven initial organizers of the New Forum, only three were students and five professors. One of the leaders of New Forum was

⁸⁸⁷Ibid.

⁸⁸⁸ NARA. Record Group 59. Office of Educational, Cultural Affairs. Lot 98D 252. Box 169-172, 205-206.

⁸⁸⁹ Behrend, “The Rise,” <http://www.wpunj.edu/newpol/issue23/behren23.htm>.

Professor Jens Reich. Leading this organization, he, like other professors, rejected the idea of the unification of Germany; on the contrary, most of the members of the professoriate who joined the opposition at the end of the 1980s defended the thesis of a gradual reform of the political system in the socialist GDR without uniting with capitalist West Germany. According to the Stasi reports, only three groups out 150 opposition groups that existed in the GDR in 1989 included members who were professors and students.⁸⁹⁰

As a result, university opposition remained passive. Professors preferred to remain silent and not to articulate their negative attitudes towards the regime and its ideology. They also demonstrated coolness, restraint, and arrogance towards the arrival of American culture and values. None of my sources has provided an appropriate answer as to why university people followed this stance. We can assume that the nature of German conservatism – isolation from politics and academic freedom but formal obedience to the imposition of values and silent repudiation of them – defined the behavior of the German professoriate and a segment of the students. They were not loyal to the Soviets, but they perceived the new ideas coming from the West without the enthusiasm that the rest of German adults and young people had. Hence, neither communist values, nor American ones were the foundation of German thinking and this reflected the value system of the German professors. Their normal stance was to simply defend traditional university.

Conclusion

The period of the mid-1960s through to 1990 saw new and dramatic events unfold in the universities of West and East Germany. The universities of both countries endured reforms and external interference, along with the growth of opposition to the imposition of ideologies, as can be readily observed in both West and East Germany.

Two important events happened simultaneously in both the West and East between 1969 and the early 1970s. The university systems of both countries underwent reforms and new interference from their Big Brothers. The internal university reforms and external interference in universities were interdependent. New transformations in West German universities (establishment of the position of president instead of rector and a departmental system instead of faculties; the attempts of the introduction of student representation on a par with the senior

⁸⁹⁰ “Stasi Report,” 3.

professoriate in administrative bodies; enforcement of federal control over the universities through the establishment of a Ministry of Education) were encouraged by the United States in its struggle with student radicalism. New transformations of East German universities (establishment of the position of director instead of rector and departmental (section) system instead of faculties; and a new imposition of Marxist-Leninist studies on the university curricula) were initiated by the government of East Germany to prevent possible student radicalism, but the consequent outcome of these reforms resulted in Soviet interference in the German university system.

Hence, the reforms in both countries had internal causes: the weak development of university infrastructure and difficult student living conditions on campuses with the rise of student population in West Germany resulting in a student movement labeled as student radicalism by the American government. However, this student radicalism had two sides: one was a moderate radicalism that demanded the transformation of the university system, and the other consistent with leftist, radical and extremist movements. The United States supported the moderate demands of the students, because they reflected American intentions regarding the introduction of student representation in administrative bodies and a revision of the curriculum, and so this student unrest was exploited to pressure the German government to transform German universities yet further along the lines of the American model. On the other hand, the United States was totally opposed to the most radical students who demanded the Marxification of university academic programs. Such students were subject to expulsion from the universities in order to prevent their having a destructive impact on the other moderate and apolitical students. Some of these leftist radicals were expelled, some of their leaders were arrested. The reforms proposed to Bonn by the American government were therefore aimed at promoting the demands of the moderates and at taking disciplinary measures against the radicals, communists, and extremists. In East Germany, the reforms initiated by the SED in 1969 were determined by the student upheavals that had occurred in the West. Frightened at this possible influence coming from West, the political regime of the GDR expanded the hours of Marxist-Leninist studies to prevent students from slipping into pro-West sentiments and open opposition. Both superpowers encountered student opposition which differed in the two halves of Germany. While the United States was concerned with the far-reaching Marxification of West German students, the Soviet Union was dissatisfied with the meager

Marxification of students in the universities of East Germany. It would be interesting to know whether, if the West German students were transferred to East German universities and were subjected to Marxification, would they continue promoting this ideology or not. We assume not, because they repudiated all external pressure and cultural interference which they encountered in their universities: West German students resisted the United States; the East German students evaded Soviet indoctrination.

The results of the reforms in both West Germany and East Germany turned out to be contrary to the expectations of the superpowers. We have noted two consequences of the reforms in West Germany. The first was the fact that either the moderate students were unable to gain power in administrative bodies, being pushed out radical students, or they slipped into a Marxist and pro-Soviet position. This, in turn, contributed to the so-called Marxification of university academic programs, which implied a process of bringing the content of teaching, research, and publishing activities under the influence of Marxist ways of thinking. And the second was the fact that the part of the professoriate called the old and conservative professors by the United States lost their power and position at the universities.

Hence, unexpectedly for the United States, which had been neglecting the problems of the senior university staff in favor of the problems created by radical students, a segment of the conservative professoriate which disliked any American interference in German universities managed a counter-offensive against the reforms. They were able to revise the reforms through introducing a new law aimed at higher education in 1975. The traditional power of a professor and senate were re-established, and equal representation of students and professors in administrative bodies, especially in the curriculum commissions, was eliminated. The American government was unable to overcome this strong opposition, which found support late in the day from the new government of West Germany, and admitted that the reforms had failed and that American influence had been undermined. The decline of West German-American cooperation and the reluctance of the professoriate to participate in American university projects during the mid-1970s and 1980s demonstrated this failure.

In East Germany the situation that centered on the consequences of reforms was less transparent due to the covert nature of the opposition of university people. The Soviets were displeased with the reforms made by the government of East Germany as a preventive measure against

possible student radicalism as well as with the disobedience expressed by a segment of the professoriate labeled as the conservative professors by the Soviet Union. In contrast to West Germany, this disobedience was tacit and manifested itself only in a silent opposition to the reforms. The Soviet Union, but not East Germany, initiated a new reform program aimed at eliminating the conservatism of the professoriate through involving them in cooperative historical and pedagogic studies, through expanding contacts between German and Soviet teaching staff, and by encouraging the professors to sincerely believe in Marxist philosophy. This rather utopian program failed in 1986, when Moscow finally admitted that the German professoriate was not and would never become convinced Marxists.

Hence, both superpowers encountered either open or masked forms of opposition from those professors who admired the old traditions of the German universities such as academic freedom, isolation from politics, the repudiation of imposed ideologies, and a powerful position for the senior staff. It was they who withstood external influences either entirely or to a limited extent in both parts of Germany. Both the West German and East German professoriate believed that the rival ideologies – either American democracy or Soviet Marxism – meant a political ideology that undermined the concept of academic freedom and the other traditions of German university life. Both ideologies were repudiated by the professors but with help of different means depending on where a professor lived. This repudiation of external interference became visible during the period of the American cultural offensive begun in East Germany at the end of the 1970s through the early 1980s. While most of the East German population admired the culture coming from the West through television and radio, the professoriate of East Germany, despite the attractiveness of new symbols and despite the intensity of this offensive, showed a cool attitude toward these new values.

Hence, the behavior of both West and East German students and professors demonstrates their ability to diminish the effect produced by indoctrination coming from the United States and the Soviet Union. Resisting external inference in their educational system and life, German students and professors managed to prevent the elimination of the traditions of the German university system.

Conclusion

Both the American and Soviet transformation policies in German universities were intended to build loyal (democratic or socialist) societies in the divided nation. The universities were considered by both powers to be one of the potent vehicles through which either the American or the Soviet governments would be able to implant their political culture in the context of the Cold War. However, in as much as the Cold War was an unstable period in the development of international relations, with bilateral American-Soviet relations knowing periods of both tension and relaxation, their policies of transformation, which followed from this political context, demonstrated different phases, different impacts, and different responses from German university people.

During the initial period of the Cold War, from 1945 through the early 1960s, when the Cold War was proceeding at a steady gait and when the universities in occupied Germany were losing their old traditions under the strong influence of the new values which had arrived together with such politically and culturally divergent victorious powers as the United States and the Soviet Union, the German universities of the divided Germany were more open to deep external reforms. These American and Soviet reforms, despite the divergent ideological and cultural values of both societies, moved more in similar directions than in different ones. Both powers purged the professoriate and the student body, both revised academic programs and curricula, cleansed library holdings, established new institutes, and changed rectors and statutes to make the universities more loyal and favorable to them in the context of the unfolding cultural Cold War. Yet, two things were different in their transformation policies: their ideologies (liberal democracy and Marxism), implanted in courses, textbooks, and in student organizations, and their reactions (soft and/or tough) to the opposition attitudes articulated by German professors and students. During that period, these reforms undermined those traditions of the German university such as its deep philosophical basis, its isolation from public life, voluntary attendance at lectures, the powerful position of its professoriate, and the absence of a strict curriculum.

However, both American and Soviet reforms were shattered by the opposition which developed slowly but steadily in German universities starting in 1945. The imposition of new statutes from above and the replacement of rectors became the first main objects of indignation. The United States gradually acquiesced to the demands of the opposition and

most of the American proposals were not included in the university statutes. The Soviet Union promoted a new and Soviet model of statute by persuading and pressuring rectors and professors. The revision of the university curricula, which implied the introduction of such disciplines as general education, political science, social studies, and American studies in West Germany, and Marxism-Leninism, the Soviet version of pedagogy, and, to some extent, Soviet studies in East Germany, was the second factor that made a segment of the professoriate and the students rise up in opposition. Due to their resistance, revision took a very long time, and only by the end of the 1950s were these disciplines being more or less taught in German universities. In dealing with such an important reform, the Soviet Union turned out to be more persistent than the United States in undermining the opposition and implementing this reform. By expelling those students and professors who opposed the revision of academic programs and promoting loyal lower social groups in the universities, the Soviets were able to insert new Marxist disciplines into the traditional German curricula. The United States, on the contrary, demonstrated a softer reaction to the opposition and tried to introduce their disciplines through establishing close and friendly contacts between the American and German academic communities. Political science, general education courses, and American studies were gradually imposed on the traditional German curricula. However, both powers recognized the fact that German universities had only formally acquiesced to the revision of curricula and that a segment of both the professoriate and the student body did not really go about developing these new disciplines and did not believe in the new ideas brought either by the Soviet or the American powers. The main visible success of the policy of both powers was reported to have been the establishment of new universities, research institutes, and chairs. These new institutions were seen by them as the very means to undermine any opposition and to implant models of either American or Soviet education in Germany. The independent institutes of political science and chairs of American studies set up at universities in West Germany, and the faculties of pedagogy and chairs of Marxism-Leninism set up in universities in East Germany, turned out to be more effective tools for implanting the new disciplines in the universities than attempting to integrate them into the traditional German academic programs.

Due to the existence of opposition, the relationships that both the American and Soviet governments had with the professoriate and the student body were complex and controversial. Both governments

recognized the fact that final success for their reforms depended on a balanced and correct policy with regarding to these two academic segments – professors and students. For both Americans and Soviets, it became evident that the revision of the German curricula, and of the methods and theoretical basis for scholarly research, could be successfully implemented by creating a loyal and friendly professoriate that would implement and maintain either the American or Soviet plans well into the future. In order to create such a loyal professoriate, the American government introduced the system of visiting professors who were from the United States, established contacts with German faculty members, and urged the latter to transform their universities. These visiting professors, who actually shouldered all the reforms, established new institutes and chairs in the universities, introduced new themes and methods of research, wrote textbooks, and filled the libraries with new books. Their activity contributed to the implantation of American scientific inquiry in German universities and to the establishment of mutual understanding between the American and German academic communities. The Soviet authorities created a new professoriate without sending Soviet visiting professors to German universities. They attempted to persuade the German professoriate to revise courses and academic programs according to Soviet ideology; when this method failed, the Soviets turned to a coercive policy towards the German professors. This practice included political pressure and promotion of professors who were members of the Communist Party. The professoriate, while formally demonstrating its loyalty to the reforms, nonetheless remained dissatisfied with the values, disciplines, and ideas that had been imposed.

Students, in contrast to the professors, openly articulated their discontent with regard to both the Soviet and the American reforms. Communism provoked more opposition activities on the part of students than did American liberal democracy during the period 1945 until the early 1960s because of the association of communist ideology with the oppressive promotion of the new admissions rules aimed at expanding the access of lower social groups to the universities. German students ignored these new rules and showed their contempt for the new students who came from families of workers and peasants by blocking access of these students to the universities. This opposition, however, was suppressed by the Soviets by co-opting students in the midst of the political confusion that had unfolded between liberal and pro-communist groups in the universities. This partisan struggle that had been instigated ended up forcing students to choose socialism over liberalism in order to continue

their studies or, by choosing liberalism, to say goodbye to any prospect of a university education. Quite the opposite, however, was true for those students who studied in universities located in West Germany; here they found themselves in a better position. As students acquiesced in setting up apolitical student organizations and organizing student life along the lines of the American model, the United States ended up cooperating more with the students than with the professors. This cooperation between the American authorities and a segment of the student body, however, resulted in tension between the students and the administration of the universities which would give birth to the student movement in the mid-1960s.

The period of the mid-1960s through 1990, when détente was progressing at a steady gait, brought about new and dramatic events in the universities of both West and East Germany. The university systems of both countries underwent reforms and experienced new interference on the part of both the United States and the Soviet Union. The American interference in West German universities was determined by the student radicalism and anti-American attitudes that had developed among the academic community. The new transformations that had occurred in East Germany's universities, along with Soviet interference in the German university system, resulted in a silent opposition to both the communist regime and the domination of Soviet ideology in university academic life.

In West Germany, the American government encountered two sides to student radicalism. On the one side was a moderate radicalism whose proponents demanded improvement in the university system, while on the other was the leftist, radical, and extremist movement. The United States supported the moderate demands of students, because they reflected American intentions regarding further development of student representation in the administrative bodies of, and revision of the curriculum in the universities. These demands were exploited to pressure the German government in 1969 to transform German universities along the lines of American models. These reforms expanded the power of the students and the junior teaching staff in the universities, and, as a result, a segment of the professoriate, labeled conservative professors by the United States, lost its power and position. However, these reforms also gave a voice to radical and pro-Marxist students and the junior teaching staff. Their leading position in administration bodies and in the curriculum commissions, in particular, was considered dangerous for any further movement in German academic life in terms of its Americanization. The United States was totally opposed to these radicals

who demanded the Marxification of university academic programs. Radical students were subjected to expulsion from the universities in order to prevent any destructive impact they might have on moderate and apolitical students.

The old professoriate, which had lost their influence on academic life after the 1969 reform, mobilized themselves around the idea of rolling back the 1969 reforms. This conservative professoriate protested against both the Americanization and Marxification of the universities. They demanded a return to power of the senior professoriate in order to influence the content of the academic programs, of the curricula, and of the disciplines, as well as to dissolve the curriculum commissions and to abolish student representation in the administrative bodies. In the early 1970s, they mounted a counter-offensive against the 1969 reforms. After several years of struggle with both Marxists and those who supported the Americanization of the universities, the conservative professoriate was able to revise the reforms of 1969 through the introduction of a new law in 1975. The traditional power of the professoriate was re-established, and equal representation of students and professors in the administrative bodies, as well as on the curriculum commissions, in particular, was eliminated. The American government was unable to overcome this strong opposition and was forced to admit that the reforms of 1969 had failed and that American influence had been undermined in German universities. The further reluctance of the professoriate to participate in American university projects during the mid-1970s and 1980s demonstrated this failure.

In East Germany, the reforms initiated by the German Communists in 1969 were determined by the student upheavals that had occurred in the West. Frightened by a possible influence from these, the political regime expanded the hours of Marxism-Leninism studies in order to prevent students from slipping into pro-Western sentiments and open opposition. However, the Soviets were dissatisfied with these reforms, because they saw them being blocked by the stubborn disobedience of a segment of the professoriate, whom the Soviet Union also labeled as the conservative professors. All the provisions of these reforms in fact only existed on paper. Moscow therefore initiated its own new reform program in 1973 aimed at eliminating the conservatism of the professors by involving them in cooperative historical and pedagogic studies, by sending Soviet professors to Germany, and by encouraging the professors to believe sincerely in Marxist philosophy. This rather utopian program

failed in 1986, when Moscow finally admitted that the German professoriate was not and never would become true Marxists.

Hence, both superpowers encountered either open or masked forms of opposition from those professors who admired the old traditions of the German universities such as academic freedom, isolation from politics, repudiation of imposed ideologies, and a powerful position for the senior staff. This opposition on the part of the professoriate condemned external influences in both parts of Germany. The West German and East German professoriate believed that both American democracy and Soviet Marxism undermined the concept of academic freedom and the other traditions of German university life. These ideologies were repudiated by different means depending on where a professor lived: a West German professor who opposed the reforms joined a legal lobbyist organization consisting of conservatives and promoted the new law of 1975; an East German professor agreed to the imposed reforms but in reality continued delivering lectures and doing research according to German tradition.

While confrontation between the West German professoriate and the US government was abating and stabilizing, by the end of the 1970s through the 1980s the East German professoriate and students began to fall under the influence of incoming American and Western culture. The new political context that was détente allowed the United States to influence a segment of East German students and professors, along with the intelligentsia. While most intellectuals supported this influence, since it was helping to develop the dissident movement, the German professoriate suddenly demonstrated their restraint towards the new ideology and values coming from the West. University professors, in contrast to religious young people and the intelligentsia, showed a rather cool attitude faced with these new values. The grounds for such a position can be explained in terms of the old traditional behavior of the German university academia – to be isolated from politics and not to yield to the imposition of ideologies so that academic freedom might be preserved – and this prevailed over the temptation to accept the new incoming liberal ideology. This old traditional behavior on the part of German university academia, which both Americans and Soviets were unable to eradicate during the entire period of the Cold War, became visible in the 1980s.

On comparing the American and Soviet transformations in German universities, we can state that both conducted a policy of cultural imperialism: both powers attempted to impose their models of university education either in West or in East Germany by pressuring the university community and by working to attract this community to their divergent

political cultures. It is evident that their policies of cultural imperialism were stimulated by ideological confrontation: both the United States and the Soviet Union exploited German universities in order to transform German society, to disseminate their rival political cultures, and, generally, to win the minds of Germans in the cultural Cold War. However, open or silent resistance on the part of the German university undermined both their cultural influences and thus the policy of cultural imperialism pursued by the United States and the Soviet Union in German universities eventually failed. Both governments acknowledged the failure of their policies in Germany, and the academic community of the two Germanies was able to retain certain traditional features of the German university system throughout the entire period of the Cold War.

Annexes

*Traditional Curriculum of the Philosophical Department of the
University of Würzburg to be transformed by the American Military
Administration in Germany (2 pages)*

Curriculum:

<u>Philosophy</u>		
Meyer	<u>General History of Philosophy</u>	4 hrs
Meyer	<u>Russian Life and Cultural Philosophy</u>	1 hrs
Meyer	Philosophical Seminary	2 hrs
History		
Esselin	History of the Time of the Roman Emperors	3 hrs
Esselin	Ancient History Seminary	
	Exercises for Monumentum Ancyranum	2 hrs
Archaeology and History of Arts		
Möbius	Greek Sculpture	2 hrs
Möbius	Colloquium after Lecture	2 hrs
Hampe	Greek Vase Painting	2 hrs
Hampe	Colloquium after Lecture	2 hrs
Kieser	European Painting from 16th to 18th Century	2 hrs
Kieser	Exercises after Lectures	3 hrs
Indo-germanic Languages		
Krahe	Fundamental questions of the Study of Languages for Students of all Language Branches	2 hrs
Krahe	Ancient Europe in the Light of Language	2 hrs
Krahe	Exercises in History of the Latin Language	2 hrs
Krahe	Language and Cultural Historical Interpretation of Selected Old High German Monuments	2 hrs
Krahe	Sanskrit for Beginners	2 hrs
Classical Philology		
Pfister	Historical Work of Thukydides	3 hrs
Pfister	Exercises after Lecture	2 hrs
Martin	Virgil	3 hrs
Martin	Exercises after Lecture	2 hrs
Kühn	Greek Style Exercises	2 hrs
Kühn	Latin Style Exercises	2 hrs

German Philology		
Schröder	Interpretation of Tacitus Germania	2 hrs
Schröder	Introduction to the Gothic	2 hrs
Schröder	History of German Drama	3 hrs
Schröder	German Proseminary: Hartmann von Aue Ercc	1 hrs
Schröder	German Oberseminar: Exercises in Comparative History of Literature	2 hrs

English Philology		
Schröder	Introduction to Old English	2 hrs
Leidig	(Plan available later)	

Romance Philology		
Krahe	Introduction to Old French	2 hrs
Wolf-Denjon	French Oral Exercises for Beginners	2 hrs
Wolf-Denjon	French Oral and Written Exercises for Advanced Students	2 hrs
Braunsiger	French - German and German - French Translation Exercises	2 hrs

Rooms: Lecture rooms of the Institutes of the Medical Faculty.

Students:

1. Admittance: On account of the shortage of housing accommodation only, students domiciled in Würzburg will be admitted for all terms. Non-domiciled Students only for Pre-term and 5 to 8 terms.
2. Accommodation: a) at home, b) rooms approved by Wohnungsamt c) in adjacent villages, especially the College of Agriculture in Veitshöchheim, d) not yet required Institute rooms of the University.

Budget: Remuneration of personnel, maintenance of rooms and teaching aids is borne by the Bavarian State. Income is derived from enrolment and lecture fees of the students.

Signed: Martin

The Questionnaire for students in the American Zone of Occupation
(8 pages)

MG / PS / G / 9a
(Rev. 15 May 45)

MILITARY GOVERNMENT OF GERMANY

Fragebogen

WARNING: Read the entire Fragebogen carefully before you start to fill it out. The English language will prevail if discrepancies exist between it and the German translation. Answers must be typewritten or printed clearly in block letters. Every question must be answered precisely and conscientiously and no space is to be left blank. If a question is to be answered by either „yes“ or „no“, print the word „yes“ or „no“ in the appropriate space. If the question is inapplicable, so indicate by some appropriate word or phrase such as „none“ or „not applicable“. Add supplementary sheets if there is not enough space in the questionnaire. Omissions or false or incomplete statements are offenses against Military Government and will result in prosecution and punishment.

WARNUNG: Vor Beantwortung ist der gesamte Fragebogen sorgfältig durchzulesen. In Zweifelsfällen ist die englische Fassung maßgebend. Die Antworten müssen mit der Schreibmaschine oder in klaren Blockbuchstaben geschrieben werden. Jede Frage ist genau und gewissenhaft zu beantworten und keine Frage darf unbeantwortet gelassen werden. Das Wort „ja“ oder „nein“ ist an der jeweilig vorgesehenen Stelle unbedingt einzusetzen. Falls die Frage durch „Ja“ oder „Nein“ nicht zu beantworten ist, so ist eine entsprechende Antwort wie z.B. „keine“ oder „nicht betreffend“ zu geben. In Ermangelung von ausreichendem Platz in dem Fragebogen können Bogen angeheftet werden. Anlassungen sowie falsche oder unvollständige Angaben stellen Vergehen gegen die Verordnungen der Militärregierung dar und werden dementsprechend geahndet.

A. PERSONAL / A. Persönliche Angaben

1. List position for which you are under consideration (include agency or firm). — 2. Name (Surname), (Fore Names). — 3. Other names which you have used or by which you have been known. — 4. Date of birth. — 5. Place of birth. — 6. Height. — 7. Weight. — 8. Color of hair. — 9. Color of eyes. — 10. Scars, marks or deformities. — 11. Present address (City, street and house number). — 12. Permanent residence (City, street and house number). — 13. Identity card type and Number. — 14. Wehrpaß No. — 15. Passport No. — 16. Citizenship. — 17. If a naturalized citizen, give date and place of naturalization. — 18. List any titles of nobility ever held by you or your wife or by the parents or grandparents of either of you. — 19. Religion. — 20. With what church are you affiliated? — 21. Have you ever severed your connection with any church, officially or unofficially? — 22. If so, give particulars and reason. — 23. What religious preference did you give in the census of 1939? — 24. List any crimes of which you have been convicted, giving dates, locations and nature of the crimes. —

1. Für Sie in Frage kommende Stellung: stud.iur. an der Universität Heidelberg.

2. Name Wörn Karl 3. Andere von Ihnen benutzte Namen
Zu-(Familien)name Vor-(Tauf-)name

oder solche, unter welchen Sie bekannt sind. keine

4. Geburtsdatum 13.9.1920 5. Geburtsort Schwetzingen, Baden

6. Größe 1.70 7. Gewicht 65 kg 8. Haarfarbe m-blond 9. Farbe der Augen blau-grau

10. Narben, Geburtsmale oder Entstellungen Narben: Unterkiefer rechts-Handrücken links

11. Gegenwärtige Anschrift Schwetzingen, Baden, Moltkestrasse 5
(Stadt, Straße und Hausnummer)

12. Ständiger Wohnsitz Schwetzingen, Baden, Moltkestrasse 5
(Stadt, Straße und Hausnummer)

13. Art der Ausweiskarte Kenn- Nr. 28446 14. Wehrpaß-Nr. 15. Reisepaß-Nr.

16. Staatsangehörigkeit deutsch 17. Falls naturalisierter Bürger, geben Sie Datum und Einbürgerungs-
ort an. nicht betreffend

18. Aufzählung aller Ihrerseits oder seitens Ihrer Ehefrau oder Ihrer beiden Großeltern innegehabten Adelstitel.
keine

19. Religion evang. 20. Welcher Kirche gehören Sie an? ev. 21. Haben Sie je offiziell oder inoffiziell
Ihre Verbindung mit einer Kirche aufgelöst? nein 22. Falls ja, geben Sie Einzelheiten und Gründe an.
nicht betreffend 23. Welche Religionsangehörigkeit
haben Sie bei der Volkszählung 1939 angegeben? evang. 24. Führen Sie alle Vergehen, Uebertretungen oder Ver-
brechen an, für welche Sie je verurteilt worden sind, mit Angaben des Datums, des Orts und der Art
keine

B. SECONDARY AND HIGHER EDUCATION / B. Grundschul- und höhere Bildung

Name & Type of School (If a special Nazi school or military academy, so specify) Name und Art der Schule (im Falle einer besonderen NS oder Militärakademie geben Sie dies an)	Location Ort	Dates of Attendance Wann besucht?	Certificate Diploma or Degree Zeugnis, Diplom oder akademischer Grad	Did Abitur permit University matriculation? Berechtigt Abitur od. Bakkalaureus zur Universitätsimmatrikulation?	Date Datum
<u>Volkschule Schwetzingen</u>	<u>Schwetzingen</u>	<u>1927-1931</u>			
<u>Hebel-Oberschule Schwetzingen</u>	<u>Schwetzingen</u>	<u>1931-1939</u>		<u>Ja, Abitur</u>	<u>27.2.39</u>
<u>Universität</u>	<u>München</u>	<u>Herbst 1939</u>			
<u>Universität</u>	<u>Heidelberg</u>	<u>Frühjhr. 40</u>			

REPRODUCED AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

Authority NND765045
By KUNARA Date 02/05/07

25. List any German Un-
Napola, Adolph Hitler School, Nazi Leaders College or military academy in which you have ever been a teacher. — 27. Have your children ever attended any of such schools? Which ones, where and when? — 28. List (giving location and dates) any school in which you have ever been a Vertrauenslehrer (formerly Jugendwalter).

25. Welchen deutschen Universitäts-Studentenburschenschaften haben Sie je angehört? keinen
26. In welchen Napola, Adolf-Hitler-, NS-Führerschulen oder Militärakademien waren Sie Lehrer? Anzugeben mit genauer Orts- und Zeitbestimmung. keiner
27. Haben Ihre Kinder eine der obengenannten Schulen besucht? nein Welche, wo und wann? _____
28. Führen Sie (mit Orts- und Zeitbestimmung) alle Schulen an, in welchen Sie je Vertrauenslehrer (vormalig Jugendwalter) waren. keiner

C. PROFESSIONAL OR TRADE EXAMINATIONS / C. Berufs- oder Handwerksprüfungen

Name of Examination Name der Prüfung	Place taken Ort	Result Resultat	Date Datum
nicht betreffend			

D. CHRONOLOGICAL RECORD OF FULL TIME EMPLOYMENT AND MILITARY SERVICE

29. Give a chronological history of your employment and military service beginning with 1st of January 1931, accounting for all promotions or demotions, transfers, periods of unemployment, attendance at educational institutions (other than those covered in Section B) or training schools and full-time service with para military organizations. (Part time employment is to be recorded in Section F.) Use a separate line for each change in your position or rank or to indicate periods of unemployment or attendance at training schools or transfers from one military or para military organization to another.

D. Chronologische Aufzählung jeglicher Hauptanstellungen und des Militärdienstes

29. Geben Sie in zeitlicher Folge eine Aufzählung Ihrer Beschäftigung und Ihres Militärdienstes seit dem 1. Januar 1931 an, mit Begründungen für alle Beförderungen oder Degradierungen, Versetzungen, Arbeitslosigkeit, Besuch von Bildungsanstalten (außer solchen, die bereits in B angeführt sind) oder Ausbildungsschulen, und Voldienst in militärähnlichen Organisationen (Nebenbeschäftigungen sind in Abschnitt F anzugeben). Benutzen Sie eine gesonderte Zeile für jeden Wechsel in Stellung oder Rang, oder zur Angabe von Arbeitslosigkeits-Zeitabschnitten, oder für den Besuch von Ausbildungsschulen oder für Versetzungen von einer militärischen oder militärähnlichen Organisation zu einer anderen.

From Von	To Bis	Employer and Address or Military Unit Arbeitgeber und Anschrift oder Militäreinheit	Name and Title of Immediate Superior or C. O. Name und Titel des Dienstver- gesetzten od. vorgesetzter Offiz.	Position or Rank Stellung oder Dienstgrad	Duties and Responsibilities Art der Tätigkeit u. Verantwortungsbereich	Reasons for change of Status or Cessation of Service Grund für Änderung oder Beendigung des Dienstver- hältnisses
1.4.39	Sept. 39	Reichsarbeitsdienst	Ofm.Stockfisch	Arbeitsmann	1.8.39 Vm.	Studienbeginn
1.4.40	1.6.40	Nachr.Ers. Kp.246	Hpt.Schreiner	Schütze	Funker	Versetzung
Juli	Okt. 40	J.R.188	Oberst Diestel	Schütze	Melder	"
Nov. 40	Jan. 42	J.R.694	Oberst v.Franckenberg	1.12.40 Gefr.1.8.41	Gruppenfhr. Uffz.	"
Jan. 42	Mai 42	Marschkompagnie	Oblt.Dübener	1.9.41 O.A. 1.6.42 Fw.	Zugfhr.	"
Mai 42	Okt. 44	Gren.Rgt.32	Oberst Opelt Oberst v.Werder	1.12.42 Lt.d.R. 1.9.44 Olt.d.R.	Kp.-Fhr., Btl.- Adj., stellv. Btl.-fhr.	Verwundung
Okt. 44	April 45	Lazarette				
26.4.45	1.5.45	VII A.K.	Führerreserve			
1.5.45	20.7.45	261. amerik. kanische J.D.		Kriegsgefangener		
Die Beförderungen erfolgten planmässig. Kp.-Fhr.Lehrgang bei der Heeresgruppe Nord Sept.-Okt.43						

30. Were you deferred from Military Service? — 31. If so, explain circumstances completely. — 32. Have you ever been a member of the General Staff Corps? — 33. When? — 34. Have you ever been a Nazi Military Leadership Officer? — 35. When and in what unit? — 36. Did you serve as part of the Military Government or Wehrkreis administration in any country occupied by Germany including Austria and Sudetenland? — 37. If so, give particulars of offices held, duties performed, location and period of service. — 38. Do you have any military orders or other military honors? — 39. If so, state what was awarded you, the date, reasons and occasion for its bestowal.

30. Waren Sie vom Militärdienst zurückgestellt? nein 31. Falls ja, geben Sie die genauen Umstände an _____
 32. Waren Sie Generalstäbler? nein 33. Wann? _____ 34. Waren Sie
 NS-Führungsoffizier? nein 35. Wann und in welchem Truppenverband? _____

36. Haben Sie in der Militärregierung oder Wehrkreisverwaltung irgendeines der von Deutschland besetzten Länder, einschließlich Oesterreich und Sudetenland, gedient? nein

37. Falls ja, geben Sie Einzelheiten über Ihre Aemter und Pflichten, sowie Ort und Zeitdauer des Dienstes _____

38. Sind Sie berechtigt, militärische Orden oder andere militärische Ehrenauszeichnungen zu tragen? ja 39. Falls ja, geben Sie an, was Ihnen verliehen wurde, das Datum, den Grund und Anlaß für die Verleihung _____

1.12.40 Schutzwallehrenzeichen, 9.7.42 EK II, 8.8.42 Verwundetenabz. schwarz
17.11.42 rum. Erinnerungsmedaille, 30.12.42 Krimschild, 6.4.44 Inf. Sturmabz.
13.7.44 EK I, 1.8.44 Verwundetenabz. Silber, 8.9.44 Nahkampfspange Bronze
13.12.44 Verwundetenabz. Gold.
Tapferkeits- u. Teilnehmerauszeichnungen.

E. MEMBERSHIP IN ORGANIZATIONS / E. Mitgliedschaften

40. Indicate on the following chart whether or not you were a member of and any offices you have held in the organizations listed below. Use lines 96 to 98 to specify any other associations, society, fraternity, union, syndicate, chamber, institute, group, corporation, club or other organization of any kind, whether social, political, professional, educational, cultural, industrial, commercial or honorary, with which you have ever been connected or associated. — Column 1: Insert either "yes" or "no" on each line to indicate whether or not you have ever been a member of the organization listed. If you were a candidate, disregard late on which you joined. — Column 2: Insert date your membership ceased if you are no longer a member. Insert the word "Date" if you are still a member. — Column 3: Insert your membership number in the organization. — Column 4: Insert the highest offices, rank or other post of authority which you have held at any time. If you have never held an office, rank or post of authority, insert the word "none" in Columns 5 and 6. — Column 6: Insert date of your appointment to the office, rank or post of authority listed in Column 5.

40. In der folgenden Liste ist anzuführen, ob Sie Mitglied einer der angeführten Organisationen waren und welche Aemter Sie darin bekleideten. Andere Gesellschaften, Handelsgesellschaften, Burschenschaften, Verbindungen, Gewerkschaften, Genossenschaften, Kammern, Instituten, Gruppen, Körperschaften, Vereine, Verbände, Klubs, Logen oder andere Organisationen beliebiger Art, seien sie gesellschaftlicher, politischer, beruflicher, sportlicher, bildender, kultureller, industrieller, kommerzieller oder ehrenamtlicher Art, mit welchen Sie je in Verbindung standen oder welchen Sie angeschlossen waren, sind auf Zeile 96—98 anzugeben.

1. Spalte: „Ja“ oder „nein“ sind hier einzusetzen zwecks Angabe Ihrer jemaligen Mitgliedschaft in der angeführten Organisation. Falls Sie Anwärter auf Mitgliedschaft oder unterstützendes Mitglied oder im „Opfering“ waren, ist, unter Nichtberücksichtigung der Spalten, das Wort „Anwärter“ oder „unterstützendes Mitglied“ oder „Opfering“ sowie das Datum Ihrer Anmeldung oder die Dauer Ihrer Mitgliedschaft als unterstützendes Mitglied oder im Opfering einzusetzen.
2. Spalte: Eintrittsdatum.
3. Spalte: Austrittsdatum, falls nicht mehr Mitglied, anderenfalls ist das Wort „gegenwärtig“ einzusetzen.
4. Spalte: Mitgliedsnummer.
5. Spalte: Höchstes Amt, höchster Rang oder eine anderweitig einflußreiche, von Ihnen bekleidete Stellung. Nichtzutreffendenfalls ist das Wort „keine“ in Spalte 5 und 6 einzusetzen.
6. Spalte: Antrittsdatum für Amt, Rang oder einflußreiche Stellung laut Spalte 5.

	1 Yes or No Ja oder nein	2 From von	3 To bis	4 Number Nummer	5 Highest Office or rank held Höchstes Amt oder höchster Rang	6 Date Appointed Antrittsdatum
41. NSDAP	nein					
42. Allgemeine //	nein					
43. Waffen-//	nein					
44. Sicherheitsdienst der //	nein					
45. SA Aktiv	nein					
45a. SA Reserve	nein					
46. HJ einschl. BdM	nein	Juni 33	Herbst 38		im Deutschen Jungvolk, Jungzugfhr.	
47. NSDStB	nein					Herbst 37-38
48. NSDob	nein					
49. NS-Frauenschaft	nein					
50. NSKK	nein					
51. NSFK	nein					
52. Reichsb. der deutschen Beamten	nein					
53. DAF	nein					
54. KdF	nein					
55. NSV	nein					
56. NS-Reichsb. deutsch. Schwestern	nein					
57. NSKOV	nein					
58. NS-Bund Deutscher Technik	nein					
59. NS-Aerztebund	nein					
60. NS-Lehrerbund	nein					
61. NS-Rechtswahrerbund	nein					
62. Deutsches Frauenwerk	nein					
63. Reichsbund deutscher Familie	nein					
64. NS-Reichsb. für Leibesübungen	nein					
65. NS-Altherrenbund	nein					
66. Deutsche Studentenschaft	ja	Herbst 39	März 40		(Anwärter)	
67. Deutscher Gemeindetag	nein					
68. NS-Reichskriegerbund	nein					
69. Reichsdozentenschaft	nein					
70. Reichskulturkammer	nein					
71. Reichsschrifttumskammer	nein					
72. Reichspressekammer	nein					
73. Reichsrundfunkkammer	nein					
74. Reichstheaterkammer	nein					
75. Reichsmusikkammer	nein					
76. Reichskammer d. bildend. Künste	nein					
77. Reichsfilmkammer	nein					
78. Amerika-Institut	nein					
79. Deutsche Akademie München	nein					
80. Deutsches Auslandsinstitut	nein					
81. Deutsche Christen-Bewegung	nein					
82. Deutsche Glaubensbewegung	nein					
83. Deutscher Fichte-Bund	nein					
84. Deutsche Jägerschaft	nein					
85. Deutsches Rotes Kreuz	nein					
86. Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut	nein					
87. Institut zur Erforschung der Judenfrage	nein					
88. Kameradschaft USA	nein					
89. Osteuropäisches Institut	nein					
90. Reichsarbeitsdienst (RAD)	ja	1.4.39	Sept. 39		Vormann	1.8.39
91. Reichskolonialbund	nein					
92. Reichsluftschutzbund	nein					
93. Staatsakademie für Rassen- und Gesundheitspflege	nein					
94. Volksbund für das Deutschtum im Ausland (VDA)	nein					
95. Werberat d. Deutschen Wirtsch. Others (Specify) andere:	nein					
96. NSBO	nein					
97. FM der //	nein					
98. Opferring	nein					

98. Have you ever sworn an oath of secrecy to any organization? — 100. If so, list the organizations and give particulars. — 101. Have you any relatives who have held office, rank or post of authority in any of the organizations listed from 41 to 55 above? — 102. If so, give their names and addresses, their relationship to you and a description of the position and organization. — 103. With the exception of minor contributions to the Winterhilfe and regular membership dues, list and give details of any contributions of money or property which you have made, directly or indirectly, to the NSDAP or any of the other organizations listed above including any contributions made by any natural or juridical person or legal entity through your solicitation or influence. — 104. Have you ever been the recipient of any titles, ranks, medals, testimonials or other honors from any of the above organizations? — 105. If so, state the nature of the honor, the date conferred, and the reason and occasion for its bestowal. — 106. Were you a member of a political party before 1933? — 107. If so, which one? — 108. For what political party did you vote in the election of November 1932? — 109. In March 1933? — 110. Have you ever been a member of any anti-Nazi underground party or groups since 1933? — 111. Which one? — 112. Since when? — 113. Have you ever been a member of any trade union or professional or business organization which was dissolved or forbidden since 1933? — 114. Have you ever been dismissed from the civil service, the teaching profession or ecclesiastical positions or any other employment for active or passive resistance to the Nazis or their ideology? — 115. Have you ever been imprisoned, or have restrictions of movement, residence or freedom to practice your trade or profession been imposed on you for racial or religious reasons or because of active or passive resistance to the Nazis? — 116. If you have answered yes to any of the questions from 110 to 115, give particulars and the names and addresses of two persons who can confirm the truth of your statements.

99. Sind Sie jemals zu einem Schweigegebot für eine Organisation verpflichtet worden? nein 100. Falls ja, geben Sie die Organisation und Einzelheiten an _____

101. Haben Sie irgendwelche Verwandte, die jemals Amt, Rang oder einflußreiche Stellungen in irgendeiner der von Nr 41 bis 95 angeführten Organisationen haben? nein 102. Falls ja, geben Sie deren Namen und Anschriften an, den Grad Ihrer Verwandtschaft sowie eine Beschreibung der Stellung und Organisation. _____

103. Mit Ausnahme von kleineren Beiträgen zur Winterhilfe und ordnungsmäßigen Mitgliedsbeiträgen, geben Sie nachfolgend im Einzelnen alle von Ihnen direkt oder indirekt an die NSDAP oder irgendeine andere der oben angeführten Organisationen geleisteten Beiträge in Form von Geld oder Besitz an, einschließlich aller auf Ihr Ersuchen oder auf Grund Ihres Einflusses seitens einer natürlichen oder juristischen Person oder einer anderen rechtlichen Einheit geleisteten Beiträge. Keine

104. Sind Ihnen von einer der oben angeführten Organisationen irgendwelche Titel, Orden, Zeugnisse, Dienstgrade verliehen oder andere Ehren erwiesen worden? nein 105. Falls ja, geben Sie an, was Ihnen verliehen wurde, das Datum, den Grund und Anlaß für die Verleihung. nicht betreffend

106. Waren Sie Mitglied einer politischen Partei vor 1933? nein 107. Falls ja, welcher? _____ 108. Welche politische Partei haben Sie in der Novemberwahl 1932 gewählt? nicht betr. 109. Und im März 1933? nicht betr.

110. Waren Sie seit 1933 Mitglied einer verbotenen Oppositionspartei oder -gruppe? nein 111. Welcher? _____

112. Seit wann? _____ 113. Waren Sie jemals Mitglied einer nach 1933 aufgelösten oder verbotenen Gewerkschaft oder eines Berufs- oder Wirtschaftsverbandes? nein 114. Sind Sie jemals aus dem Beamtenstand, dem Lehrerberuf oder aus einer kirchlichen oder irgendeiner Stellung auf Grund aktiven oder passiven Widerstandes gegen die Nazis oder Ihre Weltanschauung entlassen worden? nein

115. Wurden Sie jemals aus rassistischen oder religiösen Gründen oder weil Sie aktiv oder passiv den Nationalisten Widerstand leisteten, in Haft genommen oder in Ihrer Bewegungs- oder Niederlassungsfreiheit oder sonstwie in Ihrer gewerblichen oder beruflichen Freiheit beschränkt? nein 116. Ist die Antwort auf eine der Fragen von 110 bis 115 bejahend, so sind Einzelheiten, sowie Namen und Anschriften von zwei Personen, welche dies wahrheitsgemäß bezeugen können, anzuführen. nicht betreffend

F. PART TIME SERVICE WITH ORGANIZATIONS / F. Mitgliedschaft oder Nebendienst in anderen Organisationen

117. With the exception of those you have specifically mentioned in Sections D and E above, list: a. Any part time, unpaid or honorary position of authority or trust you have held as a representative of any Reich Ministry or the Office of the Four Year Plan or similar central control agency; b. Any office, rank or post of authority you have held with any economic self-administration organization such as the Reich Food Estate, the Bauernschaften, the Central Marketing Associations, the Reichswirtschaftskammer, the Gauwirtschaftskammern, the Reichsgruppen, the Wirtschaftsgruppen, the Verkehrsgruppen, the Reichsvereinigungen, the Hauptausschüsse, the Industrieringe and similar organizations, as well as their subordinate or affiliated organizations and field offices; c. Any service of any kind you have rendered in any military, paramilitary, police, law enforcement, protection, intelligence or civil defense organization such as Organisation Todt, Technische Nothilfe, Stoßtruppen, Werkscharen, Bahnschutz, Postschutz, Funkschutz, Werkschutz, Land- und Stadtwacht, Abwehr, SD, Gestapo and similar organizations.

117. Unter Auslassung der bereits in Abschnitten D und E beantworteten Punkte führen Sie an:

- Jedwedes Nebenamt, einflußreiches unbezahltes oder Ehrenamt, oder Vertrauensstellung, welche Sie als Vertreter eines Reichsministeriums, oder der Leitstelle für den Vierjahresplan, oder ähnlichen Wirtschaftsüberwachungsstellen innehatten.
- Amt, Rang oder einflußreiche Stellung jedweder Art, welche Sie bei öffentlich-rechtlichen Selbstverwaltungs-körperschaften innehatten, wie z. B. dem Reichsnährstand, den Bauernschaften, den Hauptvereinigungen, den Reichswirtschaftskammern, den Gauwirtschaftskammern, Reichsgruppen, Wirtschaftsgruppen, Industrieringen, oder ähnlichen Körperschaften, sowie bei deren untergeordneten und angeschlossenen Körperschaften und Gebietsstellen.
- Jeglicher Dienst in militärischen, militärähnlichen, polizeilichen, Gesetzvollzugs-, Schutz-, Aufklärungs- oder Luftschutzdiensten, wie z. B. der Organisation Todt, der Technischen Nothilfe, den Stoßtruppen, Werkscharen, dem Bahnschutz, Postschutz, Funkschutz, Werkschutz, der Land- und Stadtwacht, Abwehr, des SD, der Gestapo und ähnlichen Organisationen.

From Von	To Bis	Name and type of organization Name und Art der Organisation	Highest office or rank you held Höchstes Amt oder Rang erreicht	Date of your Appointment Antrittsdatum	Duties Pflichtenkreis
		nicht betreffend			

G. WRITINGS AND SPEECHES / G. Veröffentlichungen und Reden

118. List on a separate sheet the titles and publishers of all publications from 1923 to the present which were written in whole or in part, or compiled or edited by you, and all public addresses made by you, giving subject, date, and circulation or audience. If they were sponsored by any organization, give its name. If no speeches or publications write "none" in this space.

118. Geben Sie auf einem Extrabogen die Titel und Verleger aller von Ihnen seit 1923 bis zur Gegenwart ganz oder teilweise geschriebenen, zusammengestellten oder herausgegebenen Veröffentlichungen, und alle von Ihnen gehaltenen öffentlichen Ansprachen und Vorlesungen, mit Angabe des Themas, Datums, der Auflage oder Zuhörerschaft. Falls Sie unter Obhut einer Organisation standen, geben Sie deren Namen an. Falls keine Reden, Ansprachen oder Veröffentlichungen, setzen Sie das Wort „keine“ ein keine

H. INCOME AND ASSETS / H. Einkommen und Vermögen

119. Show the sources and amount of your annual income from January 1, 1931 to date. If records are not available, give approximate amounts.

119. Herkunft und Beträge des jährlichen Einkommens vom 1. Januar 1931 bis zur Gegenwart. In Ermangelung von Belegen sind ungefähre Beträge anzugeben.

Year Jahr	Sources of Income - Einkommensquelle	Amount Betrag
1931		
1932		
1933		
1934		
1935	bis August 1941 kein Einkommen	
1936		
1937		
1938		
1939		
1940		
1941	Aug. 41 Kriegsbesoldung Uffz.	620.-RM
1942	" " Uffz. u. Fw.	1480.-RM
1943	" " Lt. d. R.	2840.-RM
1944	" " Lt. d. R.	2840.-RM
1945		

120. List any land or buildings owned by you or any immediate members of your family, giving locations, dates of acquisition, from whom acquired, nature and description of buildings, the number of hectares and the use to which the property is commonly put. — 121. Have you or any immediate members of your family ever acquired property which had been seized from others for political, religious or racial reasons or expropriated from others in the course of occupation of foreign countries or in furtherance of the settling of Germans or Volksdeutsche in countries occupied by Germany? — 122. If so, give particulars, including dates and locations, and the names and whereabouts of the original title holders. — 123. Have you ever acted as an administrator or trustee of Jewish property in furtherance of Aryanization decrees or ordinances? — 124. If so, give particulars.

120. Ihnen, oder unmittelbaren Angehörigen Ihrer Familie gehöriger Grundstücks- oder Hausbesitz. Erwerbsdatum, von wem erworben, Art der Häuser, Grundstücksgrößen in Hektaren, und die übliche Verwendung des Besitzes sind anzugeben.

Kein Besitz

121. Haben Sie oder ein unmittelbarer Angehöriger Ihrer Familie jemals Besitz erworben, welcher anderen Personen aus politischen, rassischen oder religiösen Gründen entzogen oder anderen Personen enteignet wurde im Verlauf der Besetzung fremder Länder, oder zwecks Förderung der Ansiedlung von Deutschen oder Volksdeutschen in von Deutschland besetzten Gebieten? nein 122. Falls ja, geben Sie Einzelheiten an, einschließlich Zeit- und Ortsangaben, sowie Namen und gegenwärtigen Aufenthalt der ursprünglichen Besitzer. nicht betreffend

123. Waren Sie jemals als Verwalter oder Treuhänder für jüdischen Besitz zwecks Förderung von Arierisierungserlasse oder -verordnungen tätig? nein 124. Falls ja, geben Sie Einzelheiten an nicht betreffend

I. TRAVEL OR RESIDENCE ABROAD / I. Reisen oder Wohnsitz im Ausland

125. List all journeys or residence outside of Germany including military campaigns.
125. Zählen Sie alle Reisen oder Wohnsitze außerhalb Deutschlands auf (Feldzüge einbegriffen).

Countries Visited Land	Dates Datum	Purpose of Journey Zweck der Reise
Frankreich	Jun.-Jul.40	Feldzug
Polen	Aug.-Okt.40	Sicherung Generalgouvernement
Frankreich	März 41-Jan. 42	Sicherung Kanalküste
Russland	Jun.42-Okt.44	Feldzug

126. Was the journey made at your own expense? — 127. If not at whose expense was the journey made? — 128. Persons or organizations visited. — 129. Did you ever serve in any capacity as part of the civil administration of any territory annexed to or occupied by the Reich? — 130. If so, give particulars of office held, duties performed, location and period of service. — 131. List foreign languages you speak, indicating degree of fluency.

126. Haben Sie die Reise auf eigene Kosten unternommen? nein 127. Falls nein, auf wessen Kosten? Wehrmacht 128. Welche Personen oder Organisationen haben Sie besucht? keine

129. Haben Sie jemals, und falls ja in welcher Rolle in der Zivilverwaltung in einem der von Deutschland eingegliederten oder besetzten Gebiete gedient? nein

130. Falls ja, geben Sie Einzelheiten an über Ihr Amt, Ihren Pflichtenkreis, sowie Ort und Zeitdauer des Dienstes nicht betreffend

131. Kenntnis fremder Sprachen und Grad der Vollkommenheit lateinisch, englisch Schulkenntnisse
französisch Umgangssprache

REMARKS / Bemerkungen
Keine

The statements on this form are true and I understand that any omissions or false or incomplete statements are offenses against Military Government and will subject me to prosecution and punishment.

Die auf diesem Formular gemachten Angaben sind wahr und ich bin mir bewußt, daß jegliche Auslassung oder falsche und unvollständige Angabe ein Vergehen gegen die Verordnungen der Militärregierung darstellt und mich der Anklage und Bestrafung aussetzt.

Karl Wotz
Signed / Eigenhändige Unterschrift

16. Dezember 1945
Date / Datum

CERTIFICATION OF IMMEDIATE SUPERIOR

I certify that the above is the true name and signature of the individual concerned and that, with the exceptions noted below, the answers made on this questionnaire are true to the best of my knowledge and belief and the information available to me. Exceptions (if no exceptions, write "none").

Bescheinigung des unmittelbaren Dienstvorgesetzten

Ich bescheinige hiermit die Richtigkeit obigen Namens und obiger Unterschrift. Mit Ausnahme der nachfolgenden Punkte sind die in diesem Fragebogen gegebenen Antworten meines besten Wissens und Gewissens und im Rahmen der mir zur Verfügung stehenden Auskunftsmöglichkeiten richtig. Ausnahmen: (Das Wort „keine“ ist einzufüllen, falls solche nicht vorhanden sind).

Die Richtigkeit obigen Namens und obiger Unterschrift bescheinigt.
Schwetzingen, den 18. Dezember 1945

Ortspolizeibehörde Schwetzingen



A.A. Wotz
Official position

A.A. Wotz
Official position

Datum

Story of life.

Lebenslauf.

Am 13.9.1920 wurde ich als Sohn des Reichsbahnsekretärs Karl Wörn und dessen Ehefrau Apollonia geb. Eschenfelder in Schwetzingen geboren. - Ostern 1927 trat ich in die Volksschule Schwetzingen ein, um nach Beendigung der 4. Klasse in die Hebel-Oberschule dasselbst überzuwechseln, wo ich am 27.2.39 mein Abitur machte. - Ostern 39 erfolgte meine Einberufung zum RAD, Anfang September wieder entlassen, begann ich an der Universität München das Studium der Volkswirtschaft und der Rechtswissenschaft. Das zweite Semester war ich an der Universität Heidelberg. - Am 26.3.40 wurde ich zur Wehrmacht eingezogen. Am 1.12.42 wurde ich zum Leutnant der Reserve, am 1.9.44 zum Oberleutnant der Reserve befördert. Nach meiner 6. Verwundung - Unterkieferschussbruch - kam ich im Oktober 44 in ein Heimatlazarett, aus dem ich Anfang April vorläufig entlassen und zur Führerreserve des VII A.K. versetzt worden bin. Am 1.5.45 erfolgte meine Gefangennahme durch amerikanische Truppen. Am 20.7.45 wurde ich aus der Gefangenschaft entlassen. -

Seit August 42 bin ich verheiratet. Ich habe zwei Kinder.

Karl Wörn

Annex 3

*The Content of Lectures delivered by the American Houses to German
Students (2 pages)*

Page 1

AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

Authority	82-11
By	ww
NARA Date	1/24/07

Enclosure 1
HICOG BONN Despatch # 2887

Schedule of Lectures

THE GROWTH OF AMERICA

A Seminar in Thirteen Lectures on the Evolution of American
Culture and Thought Viewed in Historical Perspective

sponsored by: Alfred Weber-Institut
Collegium Academicum
Historisches Seminar der Universitaet

in conjunction with the Amerika Haus Heidelberg

Friday, Nov. 7, 1952	COLONIAL TIMES Origins of the Movement into the American Frontier - with special emphasis upon the influence of environmental and human factors in the early colonial era (to 1763)
Friday, Nov. 14, 1952	THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION The Influence of the American Revolutionary Movement upon American Institutions and Thought - with special emphasis upon the period 1763-1787
Friday, Nov. 21, 1952	THE FORMING YEARS American Constitutional Development (the Federal Idea; Cen- tralization versus States Rights) - with special attention to the period to 1815
Friday, Nov. 28, 1952	THE CLASH OF RIVAL SECTIONAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEMS TO 1861 - with special emphasis upon the great struggle between in- dustrialism and agriculture
Friday, Dec. 5, 1952	THE WAR BETWEEN THE STATES - an Interpretation of the American Civil War in its Effects upon American Institutional Growth (1861-1865)
Friday, Dec. 12, 1952	THE RECONSTRUCTION The Evolution of the American Constitution after 1865 - with special attention to the effects of the 14th Amendment


P a r t II

- Friday,
Jan. 9, 1953 DIE EUROPAEISCHE EINWANDERUNG IN DIE VEREINIGTEN STAATEN NACH
1848 - unter besonderer Beruecksichtigung wirtschaftlicher,
kultureller und geistiger Faktoren
EUROPEAN IMMIGRATION IN THE UNITED STATES AFTER
1848 - with special emphasis on economic, cultural
and spiritual factors
- Friday,
Jan.16, 1953 THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION AND THE EMERGENCE OF AMERICA
AS A WORLD POWER AFTER 1865
- Friday,
Jan.23, 1953 WILSONIANISM AND THE FIRST WORLD WAR
- Friday,
Jan.30, 1953 JOHN DEWEY UND WILLIAM JAMES - DIE VERKUNDER EINER
AMERIKANISCHEN PHILOSOPHIE
- Friday,
Feb. 6, 1953 THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE NEW DEAL AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION
BY FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT
- Friday,
Feb.13, 1953 THE UNITED STATES AND THE SECOND WORLD WAR - The Devel-
opment of the UN Idea
- Friday,
Feb.20, 1953 THE AMERICA OF 1953 IN ITS RELATIONSHIP TO WORLD PROBLEMS

The Application Form for Participation in the American Educational Program, 1949 (5 pages)

REPRODUCED BY THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES BY NARA Date 2-5-07 U.S. GOVERNMENT FOR GERMANY (U.S.) REGISTRATION DIVISION

APPLICATION FOR STUDY AND OBSERVATION OF POLITICAL LIFE AND GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION IN THE UNITED STATES



Dir Use pen and ink or typewriter. Answer all questions unless otherwise directed. If more space is required to answer any question, use an extra sheet of paper. Date 25th June 1949

Name (Last, First, Middle Initial) Homan, Charlotte Project (Leave Blank)

Street Address City Land Home Telephone No. Frohnauerstr. 3 Berlin-Hermsdorf Germany

Date of Birth Marital Status Place of Birth (City & Land) Kennkarte No. 10th February 1922; unmarried; Berlin; Germany 294/2895/46

Spruchkammer Decision Knowledge of English

Speaking:	None	Fair	Good	Excellent
Reading:	None	Fair	Good	Excellent
Writing:	None	Fair	Good	Excellent

EDUCATION

Name of School	Location	Major Subjects	Years Attended	Degree or Certificate Conferred	Date
Volksschule	Hamburg	-	+	-	-
Hans-Thoma-Schule (High School for Girls)	Berlin-Hermsdorf	-	8	Matriculation Examination	1936 (July)

PROFESSIONAL or TRADE EXAMINATIONS

NAME of EXAMINATION	TAKEN	YEAR	RESULTS
-	-	-	-

SPECIAL EDUCATION HONORS SCHOLARSHIPS ATTAINED

University (Freie Universität Berlin) (before Humboldt Universität) since 1952 } Economics }
 Social Policy } 5th term

MEMBERSHIP IN CLUBS, SOCIETIES, ASSOCIATIONS, SOCIAL OR POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS, Past and present

BDM 1932-45

PRESENT POSITION

Title Student, Scientific Assistant Organization University (Freie Universität Berlin) (Betriebswirtschaftliche Institut)

City Berlin-Dahlem Land Germany Office Telephone No. 76 58 87 App. 100

Duties: Scientific researches

1004
 1004
 1004

Information concerning my previous work experience.

During my school time, in autumn 1944 I was drafted to the "Reichsarbeitsdienst" (labour service); here I worked in a factory and this first connexion with industrial problems awakened my interest in this subject.

After having absolved school with the matriculation examination in July 1946 I was employed at the Institut fuer Volkswirtschaft und Statistik at the Berlin university. In July 1947 I was matriculated as a student of economics at the same university. I left this university (Humboldt Universitaet) in summer 1948 and took part in the foundation of the Freie Universitaet Berlin. (This foundation became necessary because of the unbearable Russian interference in the rights and scientific researches of a university and as a protest against the Russian injury of the rights of human beings).

During my term holidays I worked two times in a Sozialpolitisches Fraktikum at the council of Berlin. In 1949 I was engaged for three months at the Csram Company.

I am now employed as a scientific assistant in the Betriebswirtschaftlichen Institute of our Freie Universitaet.

I am delegate of my faculty in our Asta (General Student's Council)

Because of my studying economics I have a special interest in the problems of industrial management and the social problems which result from it. My chief-interest is the women-question for it is necessary for Germany to find the right way to solve our women-surplus. All those unmarried women must find a working-place which satisfy them, and industry and trade have to procure working-conditions which are bearable for women.

I think that the United States during the last decades made progress in the solution of this problems. So I want to get personal impressions of it in the US; to study and observe women-labour in industry (equal pay for women's work, the question of working-time etc) and the social position of women in American life; its effect on the economic policy of the US.

I study economics for I think that it is necessary to have the scientific basis (industrial management and scientific management, Taylor etc), from which one can try to solve the problems in practice.

After having finished my studies with the examination of a Dr. rer.pol. I hope to work later on at the International Labour Office in Genf or a similar German institute, to observe the working-conditions in foreign countries and to see whether their methods are applicable for Germany. Or to see the difference and find out the best way.

During a visit to the US, I should like to visit many manufacturing towns and their factories (work some weeks in the industrie), get connexion with trade-unions and women organizations.

Charlotte Homann
Berlin-Hermsdorf
Frohnauerstr. 3

June 20th 1949

Lebenslauf

I was born February 10th 1927 in Berlin as daughter of the
Diplom-Kaufmann Wilhelm Homann and his wife Lotte Bauermeister.


From 1933 to 1936 I attended the elementary school in Hamburg and
subsequently for one year the high school in Volksdorf near Hamburg.
In 1938 we returned to Berlin, where I attended the Hans-Thoma-Schule
(high school for girls). In 1944 I was drafted to the "Reichsarbeits-
dienst" (labor service) and consequently could not as yet take my
matriculation examination.

After the end of the war I worked with a tax-advisor. From
February to July 1940 I once more went to the Hans-Thoma-Schule
and passed my matriculation exam in July 1946. In July 1947
I was matriculated as a student of economics at the Humboldt
university. I left this university in summer 1948 and took part
in the foundation of the Freie Universitaet Berlin. Here I was
matriculated in October. At the same time I became a scientific
assistant at the institute of economics at this university. I
am besides delegate in our Asta (General Student's Council).

/s/ HOMANN

I herewith certify that I never was a member of the NSDAP.
I only belonged to the BUND DEUTSCHER MAEDCHEN (BDM) the members
of which now fall under the amnesty.

Berlin, 27 June 1949.


CHARLOTTE HOMANN

References

Archival records

State Archive of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russian Federation

Record group P-7317. Files of the Soviet Military Administration in Germany, 1945-1949.

Inventory 4. Secretariat of the First Vice-chief of the Soviet Military Administration in Germany

File 107

Inventory 8. Staff of the Soviet Military Administration in Germany. Departments.

Files 6, 8, 10, 12

Inventory 10. Political Division of the Soviet Military Administration in Germany

Files 27, 37

Inventory 54. Records of the Education Division of the Soviet Military Administration in Germany

Files 1, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 81

File no #. "Reports on the Inspection of Higher Educational Institutions"

File no #. "Results of the Examination of Higher Educational Institutions"

File no #. "Papers Relative to the Inspection of the Universities"

Inventory 55. Reports of the Education Division of the Soviet Military Administration in Germany

Files 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11

Record group P-7133. The Main Office of the Soviet Military Administration in Germany, Sachsen-Anhalt

Inventory 1. Files of the Main Office.

Files 254, 273, 280

Record group P-9396. The Ministry of Higher Education of the USSR, 1946-1959

Inventory 19. The Foreign Relations Division

File 30

Record group P-9518. The Committee on Cultural Ties with Foreign Countries at the Council of Ministers, 1957-1967

Inventory 1. Plans and Reports on Cultural Cooperation with Foreign Countries

Files 741, 883

Record group P-9606. The Ministry of Higher and Vocational Education of the USSR, 1959-1988

Inventory 1 (Parts I-V). Directives of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Council of Ministries. Materials Relative to their Fulfillment.

Files 301, 336, 606, 3011, 5349

Record group P-9563. The Ministry of Education of the USSR, 1966-1988

Inventory 1. Diplomatic Correspondence on Cultural Cooperation in the Field of Education between the GDR and the USSR

Files 2032, 2033, 4150, 4974, 5186

Record group P-9661. State Committee on People's Education, 1988-1991

Inventory 1. Collected Data on Admissions, Graduation, and the Contingent of Foreign Citizens Studying in the USSR

File 589

Russian State Archive of Modern History, Moscow, Russian Federation

Record group 5. Central Committee of Communist Party. Records of the Education and Science Commission, 1949-1991

Inventory 35. Division of Science and Education

Files 102, 180, 223

Inventory 55. Ideological Division

File 55

Inventory 69. *Organization and Party Work Division, 1976-1977*

Files 578, 636

Inventory 88. Organization and Party Work Division, 1982-1983

File 208

Russian State Archive of Social-Political History, Moscow, Russian Federation

Record group 17. Central Committee of the Communist Party

Inventory 125. Commission on Propaganda, 1948-1953

File 526

Inventory 137. Records of the Commission on Foreign Policy at the Central Committee of the Communist Party, 1949-1953;

Records of the Commission on Relationships with Communist Parties
Overseas, 1952-1953

Files 90, 637, 888, 889, 891

Inventory 132. Commission on Propaganda, 1948-1953

Files 63, 108, 165

Inventory 128. International Information Division

File 338

**Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation, Moscow,
Russian Federation**

Record group 082. Files Referent to Germany

Inventory 27

Box 123. File 36

Inventory 30

Box 134, File. 68

Inventory 31

File 65

Inventory 35

Box 174. Files 91, 92

Record group 059. Handwritten documents.

Inventory 4

Box 5. File 26

Record group 0457-b. Soviet Military Administration in
Germany

Inventory 4

Box 31. Files 8, 34

Inventory 6

File 25

Inventory 35

File 25

Record group no #. "Department of the Telegraph Agency of the
Soviet Union."

Inventory 9

Box 104. File 124

**University of Arkansas Library, Fayetteville, Arkansas, United
States of America**

Manuscript Collection 468. Bureau of Educational and Cultural
Affairs (CU)

Group IV. Special Program

Box 141. Folder 7. EDX 22-2. US Specialists in Germany, 1950
Group IX. Country Files
Box 239. Germany. Folder 18. [Articles on German Exchange, 1949-1962, n.d.]
Box 239. Germany. Folder 10. EDX 2 Reports. Exchanges with Germany, 1949-1955.
Box 240. Folder 4. HICOG-Special Projects, 1953
Box 240. Folder 25. EDX 19-2. Review of US Professors Program in Germany, 1953-1954
Group XVI. Post Reports
Box 317. Folder 17. Germany, Federal Republic of, 1963-1970

National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, District of Columbia, and College Park, Maryland, United States of America

Record group 12. Records of Office of Education. Records of Special Projects and Programs. Case Files of the Foreign Leader Program, 1950-1954
Box 2

Record group 59. General Records of the Department of State
Bureau of Cultural Affairs, 1957-1962
Box 50
Bureau of Public Affairs. International Exchange Service 1950-58
Boxes 1, 3
Bureau of European Affairs. Records relating to Berlin and Eastern Affairs 1957-1968
Box 2
Central Files 1950-54
Boxes 2450, 2451, 2456
Central Files 1963
Box 3559
Central Files 1964-1966. Educational and Cultural Exchange
Boxes 385, 395, 396
Central Files, 1967-1969

Boxes 345, 363
Confidential US Department of State Central Files.
Germany. Internal and Foreign Affairs 1945-1949
Microfilm. Reel 7
Confidential US Department of State Central Files. FRG.
Internal Affairs 1955-1959
Microfilm. Reel 30
Confidential US Department of State Central Files.
Germany. Internal and Foreign Affairs 1950-1954
Microfilm. Reel 24
Confidential US Department of State Central Files.
FRG, 1963-1966
Microfilm. Reels 34, 35
Culture and Information, 1970-1973
Boxes 392, 403
Decimal Files
Boxes 2436-2449
International Information Administration Programs 1949-
1952
Boxes 7, 12, 25
International Information Administration. Field Program
for Germany 1945-1953
Boxes 1-7
Office of Educational, Cultural Affairs. Lot 98D 252
Boxes 169-172, 205-206
Office of Educational, Cultural and Public Affairs.
Subject Files 1945-1997
Boxes 123, 124
Records of the Plans and Development Staff, Evaluation
Branch, 1955-1960
Box 44
Records of the U. S. Board of Foreign Scholarships,
1971-1980
Boxes 7, 27
Records relating to the Department of State's
Participation in the Operations Coordinating Board and
National Security Council, 1953-1960
Entry 1586. Box 18

Record group 260. Records of US Occupation Headquarters,
World War II

High Commissioner for Germany. Office of OMGUS,
Hessen. Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1947-48
Box 702

Office of OMGUS, Berlin. Education and Cultural
Relations Branch, 1945-49
Boxes 128-134

Office of OMGUS, Württemberg-Baden. Records of
Education and Cultural Relations Division, 1945-1949
Boxes 913-917A

Office of OMGUS, Bavaria. Office of Education and
Cultural Relations Division, 1945-49
Boxes 57-63

Records of the Educational and Cultural Relations
Division. Visiting Consultants Program
Box 211

Records of Education and Cultural Relations Branch,
1945-1949
Boxes 148-151

Record group 306. Records of the United States Information
Agency

Office of Research Country Project Files, 1951-1964.
West Germany
Box 117

Record group 466. Records of the US High Commissioner for
Germany

Berlin Element. Public Affairs Division, 1943-1953
Boxes 1,2,4,5,9

Records of US High Commissioner for Germany Bremen
Land Commissioner. Records relating to Special Projects
Box 133

Published Documents and Memoirs

A Statistical Profile of the US Exchange Program, FY 1971. Washington,
DC: Department of State, 1973.

Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and
the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on Cultural
Exchange. Washington, DC: GPO, 1952.

- Alienation and Protest: Students in Eastern Europe. Radio Free Europe Research Report, 1988.* Open Society Archive, <http://www.osa.ceu.hu/files/holdings/300/8/3/text/119-4-7.shtml> (Accessed May 27, 2009).
- An Annotated Survey of Independent Movements in Eastern Europe. Radio Free Europe Research Report, 1989.* Open Society Archive, *Background Report. So Geht Das Nicht Weiter – Dissidence in East German Universities. January 29, 1957. Box-folder-report: 23-10-210. Germany.* Open Society Archives, <http://files.osa.ceu.hu/holdings/300/8/3/text/23-10-210.shtml> (Accessed July 9, 2009).
- Chernayev, A.; Galkin, A. (eds.). (2006). *Mikhail Gorbachev i Germankiy Vopros. Dokumenty. 1986-1991 (Michael Gorbachev and the German Question. Documents. 1986-1991).* Moscow: Ves' Mir.
- Chetyrehstoronnee Soglashenie po Zapadnomu Berlinu i ego Vupolnenie, 1971-1977 (The Quadripartite Agreement on West Berlin and its Implementation. Documents, 1971-1977)* Moscow: Press House of Political Literature, 1977.
- Clay, L. (1950). *Decision in Germany.* London: William Heinemann Ltd. Conversation between Joseph V. Stalin and the SED leadership. April 7, 1952. In Ch. Ostermann (ed.), *Cold War International History Bulletin, 4* (pp. 35, 48) Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson International Institute for Scholars, 1995.
- Document 113. Special Report Prepared in the Central Intelligence Agency, May 28, 1965. In *Foreign Relations of the United States 1964-1968*, vol. XV. Department of State. Office of the Historian.
- Document 191. Memorandum of Conversation. December 14, 1966. In *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1964-1968*, vol. XV. Department of State. Office of the Historian, <http://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1964-1968v15/d191> (Accessed April 5, 2009).
- Documents on Germany, 1944-1985.* Washington, DC: GPO, 1985.
- Dokumenty po Vneshney Politike Germanskoy Demokraticheskoy Respublike, 1949-1954, 1954-1955, 1955-56 (Documents on the Foreign Policy of German Democratic Republic, 1949-1954, 1954-1955, 1955-56).* Trans. from German. Moscow: Press House of Foreign Literature, 1955-1958.

- Dvadsat' Let SEPG. Dokumenty SEPG (Twenty Years of the SED. Documents of the SED)*. Moscow: Press House of Political Literature, 1966.
- Educational and Cultural Diplomacy, 1962, 1964*. Washington, DC: GPO, 1963, 1965.
- Educational and Cultural Exchange Program. July 1, 1960 - June 30, 1961. Annual Report of the Secretary of State to Congress*. Washington, DC: GPO, 1962.
- Foreign Relations of the United States*. Vol. III, 1945; Vol. V, 1946; Vols. II, III, 1947; Vols. II, III, 1948; Vols. I, III, IV, 1949; Vols. I, II, IV, 1950; Vols. III, IV, 1951; Vols. I, II, V, VI, VII, VIII, 1952-1954; Vols. IV, V, 1955-57; Vol. XIV, 1961-1962; Vol. XV, 1962-1963; Vol. XV, 1964-1968; Vol. XL, 1969-1972; Vol. E-15, 1973-1976.
- Germany 1947-1949. The Story in Documents*. Department of State Publication 3356. European and British Commonwealth. Ser. 9. Washington, DC: GPO, 1950.
- HR 3342. US Information and Educational Exchanges Act 1947. Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. US Senate, 80th Cong., 1st sess.* Washington, DC: GPO, 1947.
- Handbook of Education Statistics. US Occupied Area of Germany*. Education and Cultural Division Berlin: Office of the Military Government for Germany, 1949.
- Heinemann, M. (2000). *Interview mit Pjotr I. Nikitin*. In M. Heinemann (ed.), *Hochschuloffiziere und Wiederaufbau des Hochschulwesens in Deutschland 1945-1949. Die sowjetische Besatzungszone* (pp. 75-146). Berlin: Akad.-Verlag.
- Heubner, W.O.L. (1953). Education in the Shadow of the Iron Curtain. *Science, New Series*, 118, 121-124.
- Hochschulführer der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*. Berlin, 1968.
<http://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1964-1968v15/comp1> (Accessed April 5, 2009).
- <http://www.osaarchivum.org/files/holdings/300/8/3/text/120-4-279.shtml> (Accessed May 27, 2009).
- <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/direct.htm> (Accessed February 15, 2006).
- International Educational and Cultural Exchange: a Human Contribution to the Structure of Peace*. Washington, DC:

- Department of State. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, 1974.
- International Educational, Cultural and Related Activities for African Countries South of the Sahara*. Washington, DC: Department of State, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, 1975.
- International Exchange and Training Programs of the US Government. Annual Report, 1988, 1989*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, USIA, 1988 and 1989.
- International Exchange, 1967-1970. A Report of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State*. Washington, DC: GPO, 1968-1971.
- International Exchange, 1968. A Report of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1968.
- IREX Annual Reports, 1975-1992*. Official Web page of the IREX, www.irex.org/resources/annual/ (Accessed May 27, 2009).
- Joint Soviet-United States Statement on the Summit Meeting in Geneva. November 21, 1985. In *The Public Papers of President Ronald W. Reagan*. The Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, <http://www.reagan.utex.edu/archives> (accessed 1 March 2005).
- Kellermann, H.J. (1978). *Cultural Relations as an Instrument of US Foreign Policy: the Educational Exchange Program between the United States and Germany, 1945-1954*. Washington DC: Department of State Publications.
- Kolesnichenko, I. (1987). *Bitva Posle Voynu (The Struggle after the War)*. Moscow: Voenizdat.
- Merril, D. (ed.). (1995). *Documentary History of the Truman Presidency. Vol. III. US Policy in Occupied Germany after WW II: Denazification, Decartelization, Demilitarization and Democratization*. Bethesda, MD, University Publications of America.
- Merrit, A.; Merrit, R. (1970). *Public Opinion in Occupied Germany: The OMGUS Surveys, 1945-1949*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- National Security Decision Directive 223. Implementing the Geneva Exchanges Initiative. April 2, 1986*. Presidential Directives and Executive Orders. Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/direct.htm> (Accessed February 15, 2006).
- National Security Directive 194. Meeting with the Soviet Leader in Geneva: Themes and Perceptions. October 25, 1985*. Presidential

- Directives and Executive Orders. Federation of American Scientists, <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/direct.htm> (Accessed February 15, 2006).
- Nikitin, P.I. (1997). *Zwischen Dogma und gesundem Menschenverstand: wie ich die Universitäten der deutschen Besatzungszone "sowjetisierte."* Erinnerungen des Sektorleiters Hochschulen und Wissenschaft der Sowjetischen Militäradministration in Deutschland. Berlin: Akad.-Verlag.
- Oppen, R.B. (ed.). (1955). *Documents on Germany under Occupation, 1945-1954*. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Otnosheniya SSSR-GDR, 1949-1955. Dokumenty i Materialy (The Relationship between the USSR and GDR, 1949-1955. Documents and Materials)*. Moscow: Press House of Political Literature, 1974.
- Picture History of Western Man* (1951). New York: Time Inc.
- Politika SVAG in Oblasti Kultury, Nauki i Obrazovaniya: Tseli, Metody i Rezultaty, 1945-1949. Dokumenty (The Policy of the SMAD in the Area of Culture, Science, and Education: The Aims, Methods, and Results, 1945-1949. Document)*. Moscow: ROSSPAN, 2006.
- Presidential Review Memorandum 28. On Human Rights. July 8, 1977.* Presidential Directives and Executive Orders. Federation of American Scientists,
- Professor Kanuer's resignation from the Free University of Berlin (1974). *Minerva*, 12, 510-514.
- Schweitzer, C.-Ch. (1995). *Politics and Government in Germany. Basic Documents, 1944-1949*. Providence, Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Semiryga, M. (1995). *Kak Mu Upravlyali Germaniyey: Politika i Zhizn' (How We Governed Germany: Politics and Life)*. Moscow: ROSSPAN.
- Smith, J. (ed.). (1974). *The Papers of General L.D. Clay*, in 2 vols. Bloomington, IN.: Indiana University Press.
- Sobranie Dogovorov, Podpisannyh Sovetskim Soyuzom i Zarubezhnumi Stranami, 1945-1990 (The Collection of the Treaties Signed by the Soviet Union and Foreign Countries, 1945-1990)*. Moscow, 1946-1991.
- Sobranie Osnovnykh Dokumentov po Otnosheniyam s GDR, FRG i Zapadom Berlinom (1980-1986) (The Collection of Basic Documents on the Relationships with the GDR, FRG, and West Berlin (1980-1986))*. Moscow: Press House of Political Literature, 1988.

- Sovetskiy Faktor v Vostochnoy Evrope, 1944-1953. Dokumenty (The Soviet Factor in Eastern Europe, 1944-1953. Documents)*, in 2 vols. Moscow: ROSSPAN, 1999.
- Sovetskiy Soyus i Berlinskiy Vopros. Dokumenty (The Soviet Union and the Berlin Question. Documents)*. Moscow: The Press House of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1948.
- Sovetskiy Soyus i Unifikatsia Germanii i Mirny Dogovor s Germaniyei (The Soviet Union and the Unification of Germany and Peace Treaty with Germany)*. Moscow: The Press House of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1952.
- SSSR i GDR. 30 Let Otnosheniy, 1949-1979. Dokumenty i Materialy (The USSR and GDR. 30 Years of the Relationship, 1949-1979. Documents and Materials)*. Moscow: Press House of Political Literature, 1981.
- SSSR i GDR: Druzhiba i Sotrudnichestvo. Dokumenty i Materialy (The USSR and GDR: the Friendship and Cooperation. Documents and Materials)*. Moscow: Press House of Political Literature, 1986.
- SSSR i Germanskiy Vopros. 1941-1949. Dokumenty iz Arhiva Vneshney Politiki Rossiyskoy Federatsii (The USSR and the German Question. 1941-1949. Documents from the Archive of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation)*, 3 vols.; Vols. 2, 3. Moscow: International Relations, 1996-2003.
- SSSR-GDR: Sotrudnichestvo i Sblizhenie (The USSR-GDR: Cooperation and Rapprochement)*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya, Berlin: Staats Verlag, 1979.
- Stasi Report on the Size and Structure of the East German Opposition, June 1, 1989*. German History in Documents and Images, <http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/> (accessed May 27, 2009).
- Statement by the Principal Deputy Press Secretary Speaking on Soviet-United States Cultural and Educational Exchanges. August 5, 1986. In *The Public Papers of President Ronald W. Reagan*. The Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, <http://www.reagan.utex.edu/archives> (Accessed March 1, 2005).
- SVAG: Otdel Propagandy (informatsii) i S. Tulpanov, 1945-1949. Dokumenty (The SMAD. The Propaganda (Information) Branch and S. Tulpanov, 1945-1949. Documents)* (Moscow: AIRO-XXI, 1994).
- The Harvard Report on General Education, 1945 (2008). In W. Smith; Th. Bender (eds.), *American Higher Education Transformed 1940-*

2005. *Documenting the National Discourse* (pp. 14-20). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- The International Information Educational Exchange Program. The 5th-25th Semiannual Reports to Congress by the Secretary of the Department of State. 1953-1960.* Washington, DC: GPO, 1951-1961.
- The Program of Emergency Fund to Chinese Students, 1949-1955.* Washington, DC: GPO, 1956.
- The Stalin Terror.* Memorial Society, <http://www.memo.ru/memory/donskoe/> Accessed August, 9, 2009.
- Ustanovlenie Diplomaticheskikh Otnosheniy mezhdu Sovetskim Soyuzom i Federativnoy Respublikoy Germanii. Sbornik Dokumentov i Materialov. (The Establishment of Diplomatic Relations between the Soviet Union and Federal Republic of Germany. Collection of Documents and Materials).* Moscow: MGIMO, 2005.
- Vneshnyaya Politika i Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya. Dokumenty, 1961-1985 (The Foreign Policy and International Relations. Documents, 1961-1985).* Moscow: The State Press House of Political Literature, 1962-1985.
- Vneshnyaya Politika Sovetskogo Soyuza. 1945-1950 (The Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union. 1945-1950).* Moscow: The State Press House of Political Literature, 1949-1953.
- Vo Imya Mira i Besopasnosti Ludey. Dokumenty Sovetskoy Vneshney Politiki, 1966-1971, 1985-1988 (For the Sake of Peace and the Security of Peoples. The Documents of Soviet Foreign Policy, 1966-1971, 1985-1988).* Moscow: International Relations, 1983-1990.
- Za Antifashistskuyu Demokraticeskuyu Germaniyu. Sbornik Dokumentov, 1945-1949 (In Favor of an Anti-Fascist Democratic Germany. Documents. 1945-1949).* Moscow: Press House of Political Literature, 1969.

Literature

- Aldrich, R.J. (1999). The Struggle for the Mind of European Youth: the CIA and European Movement Propaganda, 1948-60. In G.D. Rawnsley (ed.), *Cold-War Propaganda in the 1950s.* (pp. 183-203). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Altbach, Ph., & Kelly, G. (1984). *Education and the Colonial Experience.* New Brunswick: Transaction.

- Arnove R. (1982). *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Arnove, R. (1982). Foundations and the Transfer of Knowledge. In R. Arnove (ed.), *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Axmann, A. (1973). *Aufbau, Reform, Krise: die Entwicklung des Otto-Suhr-Instituts an der Freien Universität Berlin von 1959 bis 1979*. Berlin: Spiegel der Presse.
- Barghoorn, F. (1964). *Soviet Foreign Propaganda*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Barker, M.J. (2008). Democracy or Polyarchy? US-Funded Media Developments in Afghanistan and Iraq post 9/11. *Media, Culture & Society*, 30, 109-130.
- Barsamian, D. (2001). *Propaganda and the Public Mind: Conversations with Noam Chomsky*. London: Pluto.
- Bathrick, David. (1978). The Politics of Culture: Rudolf Bahro and the Opposition in the GDR. *New German Critique*, 15, 3-24.
- Baylis, Th.A. (1974). *The Technical Intelligentsia and Eastern European German Elite*. Berkley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Behrend, H. (1997). The Rise and Fall of the East German Civil Rights Movement. *New Politics*, 6, <http://www.wpunj.edu/newpol/issue23/behren23.htm> (Accessed 27 May, 2009).
- Berman, E.H. (1983). *The Influence of the Carnegie, Ford and Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy: The Ideology of Philanthropy*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Biebel, Ch.D. (1982). American Efforts for Educational Reform in Occupied Germany, 1945-1955. A Reassessment. *History of Education Quarterly*, 22, Special Issue: Educational Policy and Reform in Modern Germany, 277-287.
- Bills, D. (2006). Book Reviews: Masahiro Tanaka. The Cross-Cultural Transfer of Educational Concepts and Practices: A Comparative Study. *International Sociology*, 21, 899-902
- Boehling, R. (1999). The Role of Culture in American Relations with Europe: The Case of the United State's Occupation of Germany. *Diplomatic History*, 23, 57-69.

- Boel, B. (2003). *European Productivity Agency and Transatlantic Relations, 1953-1961*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Bogatyrev, N.M. (1951). *Democratization of German Schools after the Liberation of Germany. By Materials of the Ministry of Education in Thüringen, 1945-1949*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Moscow.
- Cadiot, J. (2008). Russia Learns to Write: Slavistics, Politics, and the Struggle to Redefine Empire in the Early 20th Century. *Kritika: Explorations in Russian & Eurasian History*, 9, 135-167
- Carnoy, M. (1985). The Political Economy of Education. *International Social Science Journal*, 37, 157-173.
- Carnoy, M. (1974). *Education as Cultural Imperialism*. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.
- Carnoy, M. (1990). *Education and Social Transition in the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Chalaby, J. (2006). American Cultural Primacy in a New Media Order: A European Perspective. *International Communication Gazette*, 68, 33-51.
- Chay, J. (1990). *Culture and International Relations*. New York: Praeger.
- Chomsky, N. (1987). *On Power and Ideology*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1988). *Language and Politics*. New York: Black Rose Books.
- Chomsky, N. (1997). *The Cold War and University*. N. Y.: New Press, cop.
- Chomsky, N. (2003). *Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Choppe, V. (1960) *Bor'ba za Vovlechenie Intelligentsii v Postroenie Sosialisma v Demokraticheskoy Respublike Germanii: Rol' Reform v Vysshem Obrazovanii (The Struggle for the Involvement of the Intelligentsia in the Building of Socialism in the Democratic Republic of Germany: the Role of Reforms in Higher Education)*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Moscow.
- Clark, M.W. (2002). A Prophet without Humor: Karl Jaspers in Germany 1945-1948. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 37, 197-222.
- Clayton, Th. (2000). *Education and the Politics of Language: Hegemony and Pragmatism in Cambodia, 1979-1989*. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre.
- Combs, J. (1983). *American Diplomatic History: Two Centuries of Changing Interpretations* Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Connelly, J. (1996). East German Higher Educational Policies and Student Resistance, 1945-48. *Central European History*, 28, 259-298.
- Connelly, J. (2000). *Captive University: the Sovietization of East German, Czech, and Polish Higher Education, 1945-1956*. Chapel Hill & London: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Duebel, S. (1964). *Dokumente zur Jugendpolitik der SED*. München: Juventa Verlag.
- Dunch, R. (2002). Beyond Cultural Imperialism: Cultural Theory, Christian Missions, and Global Modernity. *History & Theory*, 41, 301-325.
- Ellwood, D. (1992). *Rebuilding Europe. Western Europe, America and Postwar Reconstruction*. London, New York: Longman.
- Feis, H. (1957). *Churchill-Roosevelt-Stalin: The War They Waged and the Peace They Sought*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Filippovich, D.N. (2000). Die Entnazifizierung der Universitäten in der sowjetischen Besatzungszone Deutschlands. In M. Heinemann (ed.), *Hochschuloffiziere und Wiederaufbau des Hochschulwesens in Deutschland 1945-1949. Die Sowjetische Besatzungszone*. (pp. 35-52). Berlin: Akad.-Verlag.
- Fomenko, V. (1973). *Realizatsiya Leninskih Printsipov Proletarskogo Inrenatsionalisma i Ispolzovanie Opyta KPSS v Ideologicheskoy Raboty Sosialisticheskoy Edinoy Partii Germani, 1945-1949 (Implementation of Lenin's Principles of Proletarian Internationalism and the Application of the Experience of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the Ideological Work of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, 1945-1949)*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Moscow.
- Fox S. (1993). "My Bitter America: The Role of Mass Culture in New Identities for East Germans before and after the Wall." In R. Kroes (ed.), *Cultural transmissions and receptions. American culture in Europe* (pp. 198-208). Amsterdam, Vrije Universiteit.
- Galeota, J. (2004). Cultural Imperialism: An American Tradition. *Humanist*, 64, 22-46.
- Gaydarbekov, A.N. (1974). *Rol' Sosialisticheskoy Edinoy Partii Germanii v Sozdanii Sosialisticheskoy Sistemy Obrazovaniya, 1945-1962 (The Role of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany in the Establishment of the Socialistic System of Education, 1945-1962)*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Moscow.

- Geck, W.K. (1969). Student Power in West Germany: The Authority of the Student Body and Student Participation in Decision-Making in the Universities of the Federal Republic of Germany. *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, 17, 337-358.
- Gienow-Hecht, J. (1990). *Transmission Impossible: American Journalism as Cultural Diplomacy in Post-War Germany, 1945-55*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Gienow-Hecht, J. (1999). Art is Democracy and Democracy is Art: Culture, Propaganda, and The Neue Zeitung in Germany, 1944-1947. *Diplomatic History*, 23, 21-44.
- Giles, G.J. (1978). The Structure of Higher Education in the German Democratic Republic. *Higher Education*, 7, 131-156.
- Giles, G.J. (1997). Reeducation at Heidelberg University. *Pädagogik Historica*, 33, 201-219.
- Hadjar, A. (2003). Non-Violent Political Protest in East Germany in the 1980s: Protestant Church, Opposition Groups and the People. *German Politics* 12, 107-128.
- Hallstein, W. (1948). The Universities. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Postwar Reconstruction in Western Germany*, 260, 155-167.
- Haritonow, A. (1995). Sowjetische Hochschulpolitik in Sachsen 1945 - 1949. Weimar: Böhlau.
- Heinemann, M. (1990). *Hochschuloffiziere und Wiederaufbau des Hochschulwesens in Westdeutschland 1945-1952. Die US-Zone*. Hildesheim: Lax.
- Heinemann, M. (1992). Umriss der Kultur- und Hochschulpolitik der Sowjetischen Militäradministration (SMAD) in der SBZ. *Bildung und Erziehung*, 45, 379-391.
- Heinemann, M. (1994). *Hochschulerneuerung und Sowjetische Besatzungsmacht. Oder: Es Muss Alles Neu Geschrieben Werden. In Die deutsche Universität im 20. Jahrhundert. Die Entwicklung einer Institution zwischen Tradition, Autonomie, historischen und sozialen Rahmenbedingungen*. Vierow bei Greifswald: SH-Verlag.
- Heinemann, M. (1995). Die Wiedereröffnung der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena im Jahre 1945. In D. Voigt, L. Mertens (eds.), *DDR-Wissenschaft im Zwiespalt zwischen Forschung und Staatssicherheit* (pp. 11-44). Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
- Heinemann, M. (1997). *Hochschulerneuerung in Ostdeutschland. Das Beispiel Sachsen; Erfahrungen und Überlegungen zur Weiterführung In Wissen und Wandel. Universitäten als*

- Brennpunkte der Europäischen Transformation*. Poznan: Wydawn. Naukowe Uniw. im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- Heinemann, M. (1997). Wiederaufbau: Re-education von 1945-1949. Gesamtdarstellung. 1. Wiederaufbau aus amerikanischer Sicht. In M. Liedtke (ed.), *Handbuch der Geschichte des bayerischen Bildungswesens* (pp. 474-548). Bad Heilbrunn, Obb.: Klinkhardt.
- Heinemann, M. (2000). *Hochschuloffiziere und Wiederaufbau des Hochschulwesens in Deutschland 1945-1949. Die sowjetische Besatzungszone*. Berlin: Akad.-Verlag.
- Heinemann, M. (2001). Auf dem Weg Zur Volks-Universität. Die Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena 1948. In L. Mertens, ed.), *Politischer Systemumbruch als Irreversibler Faktor von Modernisierung in der Wissenschaft?* (pp. 201-231). Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
- Heinemann, M. (1990). Der Wiederaufbau der Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft und die Neugründungen der Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, 1945-1949. In R. Vierhaus, B. vom Brocke (eds.), *Forschung im Spannungsfeld von Politik und Gesellschaft. Geschichte und Struktur der Kaiser-Wilhelm-/Max-Planck-Gesellschaft* (pp. 407-470). Stuttgart: DVA.
- Heß, J. (1996). *Heidelberg 1945*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Hiscocks, R. (1957). *Democracy in Western Germany*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hocking, W.E. (1954). *Experiment in Education: What We Can Learn from Teaching Germany*. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co.
- Hogan, M. (1989). *The Marshall Plan. America, Britain and the Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-1952*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- How the CIA Turns Students into Traitors (1967). *Ramparts*, April, 38-40.
- Inozemtsev, N.N. (1960). *Vneshnyaya Politika SSHA v Epohu Imperialisma (The Foreign Policy of the U.S. in the Era of Imperialism)* Moscow: Gospolizdat.
- Jessen, R. (1999). *Akademische Elite und kommunistische Diktatur. Die ostdeutsche Hochschullehrerschaft in der Ulbricht-Ära*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht Verlag.
- Jin, Dal Yong. (2007). Reinterpretation of Cultural Imperialism: Emerging Domestic Market vs. Continuing US Dominance. *Media, Culture & Society*, 29, 753-771.

- Jurij, B. (1960). *The Russian Communist Party and the Sovietization of Ukraine*. Stockholm: Kungl. Boktryckeriet P. A. Norstedt & Sonel.
- Keler, R. (1973). *Vysshee Obrazovanie v GDR (Higher Education in the GDR)*. Berlin: Nauchno-Issledovatel'skiy Institut Vushego Obrazovaniya, (Research Institute of Higher Education).
- Kieh, J.R.G. (1992). The Roots of Western Influence in Africa: an Analysis of the Conditioning Process. *Social Science Journal*, 29, 7-19.
- King, K. (1990). The New Politics of International Cooperation in Education Development. *International Journal of Education Development*, 10, 47-58.
- Koch, D. (2000). *Das Verhör. Zerstörung und Widerstand*. 3Bde. Dresden: Verlag Christoph Hille.
- Konkle, M. (2008). Indigenous Ownership and Emergence of U.S. Liberal Imperialism. *American Indian Quarterly*, 32, 297-323.
- Kowalczyk I.-S. (2003). *Geist im Dienste der Macht: Hochschulpolitik in der SBZ/DDR 1945 bis 1961*. Berlin: Links.
- Kowalczyk, I.-S. (1993). Die Studenten Selbstverwaltung an der Berliner Universität nach 1945. *Deutschland-Archiv*, 26, 915-926.
- Kraidy, M. (2005). Critical Transculturalism. *Conference Papers – International Communication Association, May*, 1-34.
- Kroes, R. (1993). The Cultural Transmission and Receptions: American Mass Culture in Europe. Amsterdam: Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center.
- Kroes, R. (1999). American Empire and Cultural Imperialism: A View from the Receiving End. *Diplomatic History*, 23, 463-477.
- Kuisel, R. (1993). *Seducing the French: The Dilemma of Americanization*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kuisel, R. (2000). Americanization for Historians. *Diplomatic History*, 24, 509-515.
- Kuklick, B. (2000). The Future of Cultural Imperialism. *Diplomatic History*, 24, 503-508.
- Lange-Quassowski, J.-B. (1979). *Neuordnung oder Restauration? Das Demokratiekonzept der amerikanischen Besatzungsmacht und die politische Sozialisation der Westdeutschen: Wirtschaftsordnung-Schulstruktur-Politische Bildung*. Opladen: Leske Verlag.
- Lasch Ch. (1967). The Cultural Cold War. *The Nation*, 11 September 1967.
- Lasch, Ch. (1969). *The Agony of the American Left*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

- Levering, R., Pechtnov, V., et al. (2002). *Debating the Origins of the Cold War: American and Russian Perspectives*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Liddell, H. (1948). Education in Occupied Germany: A Field Study. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs)*, 24, 30-62.
- Lönnendonker, S. (1988). *Freie Universität Berlin: Gründung einer Politischen Universität*. Berlin: Duncker und Humboldt GmbH.
- Lucas, S.W. (2003). Beyond the Freedom, Beyond Control: Approaches to Culture and the State-Private Network in the Cold War. In G. Scott-Smith (ed.), *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe, 1945-1967* (pp. 53-72). London: Frank Cass.
- Lunden, R. (1992). *Networks of Americanization: Aspects of American Influence in Sweden*. Uppsala, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Macedo, D. (2000). Chomsky on Miseducation. Lanham, M.D.: Rowman & Littlefield Pub. Inc.
- Major P. & Mitter R. (2003). East is East and West is West? Towards a Comparative Socio-Cultural History of the Cold War. *Cold War History*, 4, 1-22.
- Masahiro, T. (2005). *The Cross-Cultural Transfer of Educational Concepts and Practices: A Comparative Study*. Oxford: Symposium Books.
- Mason, J.B. (1958). Review: Government, Administration, and Politics in West Germany: A Selected Bibliography. *The American Political Science Review*, 52, 513-530.
- Mason, J.B. (1959). Review: Government, Administration, and Politics in East Germany: A Selected Bibliography. *The American Political Science Review*, 53, 507-523.
- May, L. (1989). *Recasting America: Culture and Politics in the Age of the Cold War*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mazrui, M. (1990). *Cultural Forces in World Politics*. London: Heinemann.
- McNeill, W. (1953). *America, Britain and Russia: Their Co-operation and Conflict, 1941-1946*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Merritt, R.L., Flerlage E.P., & Merritt, A.J. (1971). Democratizing West German Education. *Comparative Education*, 7, 121-136.
- Mitter, R. (2004). *Across the Block: Cold War Cultural and Social History*. London, Portland: OR: Frank Cass.

- Müller, M., Müller, E. (1953). „...stürmt die Festung Wissenschaft!“ *Die Sowjetisierung der mitteldeutschen Universitäten sei 1945*. Berlin-Dahlem.
- Naimark, N. (1995). *The Russians in Germany: a History of Soviet Zone of Occupation, 1945-1949*. Cambridge, MA, London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Neubert, E. (1992). *Geschichte der Opposition in der DDR: 1949-1989*. Berlin: Ch. Links.
- Nikitin, A.P. (1992). Die sowjetische Militäradministration und die Sowjetisierung des Bildungssystems in Ostdeutschland 1945-49. *Bildung und Erziehung*, 45, 405-416.
- Nikitin, A.P. (1986). *Deyatel'nost' Sovetskoy Voennoy Administratsii v Demokratisatsii Nemetskogo Vysshego Obrazovaniya, 1945-1949 (The Activity of the Soviet Military Administration in the Democratization of German Higher Education, 1945-1949)*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Moscow.
- Nikitin, A.P. (2000). Die Politik der Sowjetischen Militäradministration in Deutschland zur Bildung des Lehrkörpers der Hochschulen. In M. Heinemann (ed.), *Hochschuloffiziere und Wiederaufbau des Hochschulwesens in Deutschland 1945-1949. Die sowjetische Besatzungszone* (pp. 53-74). Berlin: Akad.-Verlag.
- Ninkovich, F.H. (199). *The Diplomacy of Ideas: US Foreign Policy and Cultural Relations, 1938-1950*. Chicago: Imprint Publications.
- Ott, J.H. (1992). Der Bund der Evangelischen Kirchen, Die Protestanten und Die ‚Streitkultur.‘ Der DDR der 80er Jahre. *Revue d'Allemagne*, 24, 143-158.
- Parak, M. (2004). *Hochschule und Wissenschaft in zwei deutschen Diktaturen. Elitenaustausch an sächsischen Hochschulen 1933-1952*. Köln, Weimar, Wien: Böhlau.
- Pells, R. (1997). *Not Like Us: How Europeans Have Loved, Hated, and Transformed American Culture since World War II*. New York: Basic Books.
- Pells, R. (2000). Who's Afraid of Steven Spielberg? *Diplomatic History*, 24, 495-502.
- Pfaff, S. (2001). The Politics of Peace in the GDR: The Independent Peace Movement, the Church, and the Origins of the East German Opposition. *Peace and Change*, 26, 2001, 280-300.
- Philippova, G. (1991). *Obuchenie Inostrannuh Studentov i Stazherov v SSSR I Zarubezhom. (The Training of the Foreign Students and*

- Tranees in the USSR and Abroad*). Moscow: University of the People Friendship.
- Pilgert, H.P. (1951). *The Exchange of Persons Program in Western Germany*. Bonn, Germany: Office of the U.S. High Commissioner for Germany Historical Division.
- Pilgert, H.P. (1953). *The West German Educational System with Special Reference to the Policies and Programs of the Office of the US High Commissioner for Germany*. Bonn, Germany: Office of the U.S. High Commissioner for Germany Historical Division.
- Poiger, U. (1999). Beyond “Modernization” and “Colonization.” *Diplomatic History*, 23, 45-55.
- Poiger, U. (2000). *Jazz, Rock, and Rebels: Cold War Politics and American Culture in Divided Germany*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Prell, U., Lothar, W. (1989). *Die Freie Universität Berlin: 1948-1968-1988*. Berlin: Ansichten and Einsichten.
- Rabehl, B. (1988). *Am Ende der Utopie: Die Politische Geschichte der Freien Universität*. Berlin: Argon Verlag.
- Raditsa, B. (1950). The Sovietization of the Satellites. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 271, 122-134.
- Reeves-Ellington, B.A. (2004). Vision of Mount Holyoke in the Ottoman Balkans: American Cultural Transfer, Bulgarian Nation-Building and Women's Educational Reform, 1858-1870. *Gender & History*, 16, 146-171.
- Richert, E. (1967). *Sozialistische Universität: die Hochschulpolitik der SED*. Berlin: Colloquium Verlag.
- Richter, W. (1945). *Re-educating Germany*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rodden, John. (2006). The Galileo of the GDR: Robert Havemann. *Debatte*, 14, 37-48.
- Rogers, A. (2000). Cultural Transfer in Adult Education: The Case of the Folk Development Colleges in Tanzania. *International Review of Education/Internationale Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft/Revue Internationale de l'Education*, 46, 67-92.
- Rosenberg, E. (1999). Consuming Women: Images of Americanization in the “American Century.” *Diplomatic History*, 23, 499-524.
- Roucek, J. (1958). The Sovietization of Albanian Education. *The Slavic and East European Journal*, 2, 55-60.

- Rupke, H.N., Grant, B. (2009). "Country Roads" to Globalization: Sociological Models for Understanding American Popular Music in China. *Journal of Popular Culture*, 42, 126-146.
- Ruschhaupt U. (2003). Die Universität nach der II. Hochschulreform 1951. In Ausstellungsgruppe an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin und Zentrum für interdisziplinäre Frauenforschung (ed.), *Von Ausnahme zur Alltäglichkeit. Frauen an der Berliner Universität Unter den Linden* (pp. 173-196). Berlin: Trafo-Verlag.
- Ruschhaupt U. (2003). Die Universität nach der III. Hochschulreform 1968. In Ausstellungsgruppe an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin und Zentrum für interdisziplinäre Frauenforschung (ed.), *Von Ausnahme zur Alltäglichkeit. Frauen an der Berliner Universität Unter den Linden* (pp. 203-214). Berlin: Trafo-Verlag.
- Ruschhaupt, U. (2003). Die Ersten Jahre nach der Wiedereröffnung der Universität 1946-1951. In Ausstellungsgruppe an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin und Zentrum für interdisziplinäre Frauenforschung (ed.), *Von Ausnahme zur Alltäglichkeit. Frauen an der Berliner Universität Unter den Linden* (151-172). Berlin: Trafo-Verlag.
- Said, E. (1994). *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage.
- Said, E. (2001). *Power, Politics, and Culture: Interviews with Edward W. Said*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Saunders, F.S. (1999). *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War*. London: Granta.
- Schiller, H. (1976). *Communication and Cultural Dominance*. New York: International Arts and Sciences Press.
- Schlegel, S. (2007). Die Sowjetische Militäradministration in Deutschland (SMAD) und die Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena. In U. Hoßfeld (ed.), *Hochschule im Sozialismus. Studien zur Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena, 1945-1990* (pp. 96-118). Köln u.a.: Böhlau.
- Schlesinger Jr., A. (1967). Origins of the Cold War. *Foreign Affairs*, 46, 22-52
- Schmidt, A. (2004). Americanization. In D. Junker (ed.), *United States and Germany in the Era of the Cold War, 1945-90: A Handbook* (pp. 635-642). West Nyack, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schneider, U. (1985). Berlin, der Kalte Krieg, und die Gründung der Freien Universität 1945-1949. *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte des Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands*, 34, 37-101.

- Scott-Smith, G. (2003). *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe, 1945-1967*. London: Frank Cass.
- Scott-Smith, G. (2002). *Politics of Apolitical Culture: Congress for Cultural Freedom, and the CIA and Post-War American Hegemony*. London: Routledge.
- Senn, A. (1958). The Sovietization of the Baltic States. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 317, 123-129.
- Silva, E. (1980). Maple Leaf, British Bough, American Branch: Canadian Higher Education in Developmental Perspective. In I. Spitzberg (ed.), *Universities and the International Distribution of Knowledge*. New York: Praeger.
- Stahl, W. (1961). *Education for Democracy in West Germany: Achievements, Shortcomings, Prospects*. New York: Frederick & Praeger.
- Starr, R. (1962). *Poland, 1944-1962: The Sovietization of a Captive People*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Suri, J. (2004). The Cultural Contractions of Cold War Education: The Case of West Berlin. *Cold War History*, 4, 1-20.
- Sywottek, A. (1993). The Americanization of Everyday Life? Trends in Consumer and Leisure-Time Behavior. In M. Ermarth (ed.), *America and Shaping of German Society, 1945-55* (pp. 132-152). Oxford: Berg.
- Taukach, G. (1973). *Vysshaya Shkola GDR (The Higher School of the GDR)*. Kiev: Vischa Shkola.
- Tent, J. (1998). *Academic Proconsul: Harvard Sociologist Edward Y. Hartshorne and the Reopening of German Universities, 1945-1946*. Trier: WVT Verlag.
- Tent, J. (2004). American Influences on German Education system. In D. Junker (ed.), *United States and Germany in the Era of the Cold War, 1945-90: A Handbook* (pp. 394-400). West Nyack, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tent, J. (1982). Mission on the Rhine: American Educational Policy in Postwar Germany, 1945-1949. *History of Education Quarterly*, 22, (Special Issue: Educational Policy and Reform in Modern Germany), 255-276.
- Tent, J. (1988). *The Free University. A Political History*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Tent, J. (1982). *Mission on the Rhine: Reeducation and Denazification in American-Occupied Germany*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Tibi, B. (1995). Culture and Knowledge: the Politics of Islamization of Knowledge as a Postmodern Project? The Fundamentalist Claim to De-Westernization. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 12, 1-24.
- Timofeeva, N.P. (1996). *Nemetskaya Intellegentsia i Politika Reform: Sistema Obrazovaniya v Vostochnoy Germanii, 1945-1949 (The German Intelligentsia and the Politics of the Reforms: The System of Education in East Germany, 1945-49)*. Voronezh: Voronezh State University Press.
- Tomlinson, J. (1991). *Cultural Imperialism: A Critical Introduction*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Torpey, J.C. (1995). *Intellectuals, socialism, and Dissent: the East German Opposition and its Legacy*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Triska, J. (1968). *Soviet Foreign Policy*. New York: Macmillan Company.
- Tsvetkova, N.A. (2007). 'Cultural Imperialism:' *Mezhdunarodnaya Obrazovatel'naya Politika SSHA v Period Holodnoy Voynu ('Cultural Imperialism:' International Educational Policy of the United States during the Cold War)*. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg State University Press.
- Veber, D. (1983). *Ustanovlenie Druzhy Mezhdu Narodami SSSR i Demokraticeskoy Respublikoy Germanii: Bor'ba Sotsialisticheskoy Edinoy Partii Germanii i Sovetskoy Voennoy Administratsii za Novue Otnosheniya Nemtsev k Sovetskomu Soyuzu, 1945-1946 (The Establishment of Friendship between the Peoples of the USSR and the Democratic Republic of Germany: the Struggle of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Soviet Military Administration for the New Attitudes of Germans towards the Soviet Union, 1945-1946)*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Moscow.
- Vorobjev, N.E. (1972). *Vysshie Obrazovanie Germanskoy Demokraticeskoy Respubliki (Higher Education in the Democratic Republic of Germany)*. Rostov: University of Rostov Press.
- Wagnleitner, R. (1994). *Coca-Colonization and the Cold War: Cultural Transmission of the United States in Austria after the Second World War*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Walther, P.Th. (2003). Von 1945 bis zur Gründung der Freien Universität Berlin. In *Ausstellungsgruppe an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin und Zentrum für interdisziplinäre Frauenforschung* (ed.),

- Von Ausnahme zur Alltäglichkeit. Frauen an der Berliner Universität Unter den Linden* (pp.143-150). Berlin: Trafo-Verlag.
- Willet, R. (1989). *The Americanization of Germany, 1945-1949*. London: Routledge.
- Williams, P., Chrisman, L. (1994). *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wolgast, E.K. (1996). Heinrich Bauer—der erster Heidelberger Nachkriegsrektor. *Weltbild and Handeln 1945-1946*. In The German Historical Institute of Washington, DC, and Historisches Seminar der Universität (eds.), *Heidelberg 1945. Papers from a Conference held in Heidelberg, May 5-8, 1993* (pp. 107-129). Germany: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Woods, R. (1986). *Opposition in the GDR under Honecker, 1971-85*. London: Macmillan.
- Yastrebtsov, V. (1977). *Sotrudnichesto Sovetskoy Voenny Administratsii i Nemetskih Demokraticeskih Sil in Poslevoennoy Rekonstruksii Germanii, 1945-1949 (Cooperation between the Soviet Military Administration and the German Democratic Forces in the Reconstruction of Germany, 1945-1949)*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Kiev.
- Zagladin, N.V. (1981). *Antisovetism v Globalnoy Strategii Imperialisma SSHA (Anti-Sovietism in the Global Strategy of the US)*. Moscow: Mysl.
- Zehm, G. (1992). Repression and Widertand an der Universität Jena 1949-1989. *Bildung und Erziehung*, 45, 453-466.
- Zink, H. (1957). *The United States in Germany, 1944-1955*. Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc.
- Zook, G.F. (1947). *Japan and Germany: Problems in Re-education*. New York: Carnegie Endowment, Division of Intercourse and Education.

Newspapers and Magazines

- Time, 1949.
 Die Zeit, 1957 and 1962.
 Neues Deutschland, 1957.

Natalia Tsvetkova

**Transforming German Universities during the Cold War: The
Failure of
American and Soviet Cultural Imperialism**

Summary

My research is focused on reconstructing and comparing American and Soviet policies in the universities of West Germany and East Germany during the entire period of the Cold War, 1945-1990. The policies of the superpowers in German universities have been divided into two periods. The first period is from 1945 through the early 1960s, when the United States and the Soviet Union first initiated their unprecedented reforms in German universities. The second period runs from the mid-1960s until 1990, when the United States and the Soviet Union attempted to continue to impose their divergent cultural values on West and East Germany, all while the resistance of the German university community was undermining the influence of the superpowers in both West Germany and East Germany. The research makes use of newly available archival records and tests the primary assumption that both American and Soviet educational policy in German universities was a policy of cultural imperialism, and that thus the

concept of cultural imperialism is an appropriate framework for describing their activities.

This dissertation consists of six chapters. Chapter I serves as an introduction to the research. It deals with a discussion of the theoretical framework, the previous literature, and the documentary sources. Chapter II explains the Cold War context and the political aims of the superpowers in Germany beyond their university policies. In addition, the chapter provides a description of the governmental agencies of both Washington and Moscow that were in charge of transforming German universities. Finally, this chapter discusses how the superpowers perceived the German university system and what strategies they proposed in order to modify it.

Chapter III investigates the transformations and revisions imposed by both powers on the universities of West Germany and East Germany, respectively, from 1945 until the early 1960s. First, the United States and the Soviet Union both replaced rectors and rewrote university statutes. Second, both powers attempted to change the curriculum of every department through introducing new disciplines, notably, political science or Marxism-Leninism, and American studies or Soviet studies. Third, new academic establishments were set up in the universities and, fourth, the holdings of the university libraries were thoroughly modified. Finally, both powers had a hand in the fall of the great and famous Berlin University in order to take full control over its resources, brains, scientific potential, and property, which were scattered all

over the three sectors of Occupied Berlin. The activities of the two superpowers, determined by their ideological goals, contributed to the break up of this university. The fact of the imposition of reforms from above was the main factor that stirred up indignation on the part of both the faculty and the student body when faced with these reforms. The resistance of the universities managed to have an impact in terms of slowing down the introduction of these reforms. And, in the end, both powers resigned themselves to the fact that German university life was not going to be fully reformed.

Chapters IV and V compare the policies of the United States and the Soviet Union towards the main bodies of the university community – the teaching staff and students – during the initial period of the Cold War, 1945 until the early 1960s.

Chapter IV shows how all the transformations proposed either by the Americans or by the Soviets seriously affected the personal lives and academic careers of those professors who worked in universities. The faculty was faced with the choice of reacting either positively or negatively to reforms which, in turn, would enormously influence the final outcome of the transformations. Although both powers aimed to create a new, pliable kind of professor (either a pro-American or a pro-Soviet one), the methods they used to do so differed. In particular, a demarcation can be drawn in such areas as approaches to purging, modes of communication with the faculty, and methods of promoting reforms by means of the university corporation of the professoriate.

In their attempt to create a new kind of professor, both powers encountered resistance from the *old* German professoriate. Albeit officially accepting the proposed reforms, these professors declared that the imposed reforms would undermine the traditional German university system, and they managed to block some of the transformations. They were mainly opposed to delivering lectures in the field of political science in West Germany and in the field of Marxism in East Germany.

Chapter V discusses the American and Soviet policies towards the German student body by means of the following components of their policies: the purging of students, the modification of the rules of admission to the universities, the instilling of German students with new ideological values, and the establishment of student organizations in the universities from 1945 through the early 1960s. Both governments intended to create a new loyal student body in order to cultivate a new elite which would go on to maintain the political regimes in both parts of a divided Germany. They ended up, however, facing strong and open student opposition. German students articulated their discontent relative to both the Soviet and American reforms. Communism caused more oppositional activities on the part of students because of the association of communist ideology with the introduction of communist organizations and the imposition of Marxism as a new basis for all studies in the universities.

Chapter VI sets about reconstructing the achievements and shortcomings of American and Soviet policies in German universities during the period of the mid-1960s up until 1990. First of all, this chapter discusses the American policy towards radical West German students. To eliminate student opposition, Washington compelled the government of the Federal Republic of Germany in 1969 to introduce a whole new package of reforms that had been proposed for the German universities by designated American experts. However, these reforms in the end soon became bogged down due to the strong resistance of the *conservative old professoriate*. This segment of the German faculty initiated a successful counteroffensive and succeeded in reinstating parts of the traditional German university system that had been eliminated by American reforms going back to the period of the Occupation and to 1969. Second, the chapter goes on to show how the Soviet government conducted a fresh ideological attack on East German universities through the expansion of Marxism in the disciplines, curriculum, and even in the behavior of students and professors in the 1970s and early 1980s. Though demonstrating outward obedience to the indoctrination and ideology of the ruling regime, the university faculty as a whole never became loyal and convinced followers of communism. Third, the American cultural offensive which was aimed at East German universities is subjected to analysis in this chapter. University faculty and a segment of the student body – in contrast to religious young people and most of

the intelligentsia who became members of the broad dissident movement supported by the West – demonstrated a marked lack of enthusiasm towards the new ideology and values coming from the West. It was those very university faculty who still admired the old traditions of the German universities, traditions such as academic freedom, isolation from politics, repudiation of imposed ideologies, and a powerful position for the senior faculty. They believed that both rival ideologies – whether American democracy or Soviet Marxism – undermined the traditions of German university life.

The research ends with the conclusions that can be drawn about the main accomplishments and failures of the policies conducted by the United States and the Soviet Union in German universities. It is proposed in the final analysis that the cultural interference by both powers in the German university system and the ensuing cultural pressure framed in terms of cultural imperialism was not only met with strong resistance on the part of German academic traditionalism or conservatism, but consequently failed as a result of this resistance. Both open and silent resistance by the German university system was able to undermine the cultural pressures from both sides and, according to our analysis, succeeded in reviving some of the traditional features peculiar to German universities. Consequently, both superpowers were forced to admit the failure of their educational policies in Germany as the Cold War drew to a close.

Natalia Tsvetkova

**De hervorming van Duitse universiteiten tijdens de Koude
Oorlog: De mislukking van het culturele imperialisme van de
Verenigde Staten en de Sovjet-Unie**

Samenvatting

Mijn onderzoek reconstrueert en vergelijkt de politiek van Amerika en de Sovjet-Unie met betrekking tot de universiteiten in West- en Oost-Duitsland tijdens de Koude Oorlog, in de jaren 1945-1990. Er worden twee perioden onderscheiden. De eerste periode, van 1945 tot begin jaren zestig, wordt gekenmerkt door ambitieuze hervormingen van de Duitse universiteiten door de Verenigde Staten en de Sovjet-Unie. Gedurende de tweede periode, van midden jaren zestig tot 1990, zetten de Verenigde Staten en de Sovjet-Unie hun pogingen voort om hun divergerende culturele waarden aan respectievelijk West- en Oost-Duitsland op te leggen. Intussen ondermijnde het verzet van de Duitse universiteitsgemeenschap, zowel in West- als in Oost-Duitsland, de invloed van beide grootmachten. Dit onderzoek baseert zich op recent beschikbaar gekomen archiefmateriaal. Met dit materiaal wordt de hypothese getoetst dat de politiek van Amerika en de Sovjet-Unie ten opzicht van de Duitse universiteiten een vorm van cultureel imperialisme is geweest. Er wordt daarbij van uitgegaan

dat het concept cultureel imperialisme geschikt is voor het beschrijven van deze politiek.

Het proefschrift bestaat uit zes hoofdstukken. In het inleidende hoofdstuk I worden het theoretische kader, de belangrijkste literatuur over het onderwerp en de bronnen en archieven besproken. In hoofdstuk II worden binnen de context van de Koude Oorlog de algemene politieke doelen van de twee grootmachten in Duitsland besproken. Tevens geeft het hoofdstuk informatie over de overheidsinstanties van Washington en Moskou die waren belast met de omvorming van de Duitse universiteiten. Ten slotte gaat dit hoofdstuk in op de wijze waarop de grootmachten het Duitse universitaire systeem beschouwden en welke strategieën zij voorstelden om dit systeem om te vormen. In hoofdstuk III worden de omvormingen en herzieningen besproken die werden opgelegd door de twee grootmachten op de Duitse universiteiten tussen 1945 en begin jaren zestig. Allereerst vervingen de Verenigde Staten en de Sovjet Union de rectoren en herschreven ze de universitaire statuten. Ten tweede probeerden ze het curriculum van elk departement te wijzigen door de introductie van nieuwe disciplines zoals politieke wetenschappen of Marxisme-Leninisme, en *American Studies* of *Soviet Studies*. Ten derde werden nieuwe academische instituten binnen de universiteiten opgezet. Ten vierde werd de collectie van de universiteitsbibliotheken grondig aangepast. Ten slotte waren beide grootmachten in sterke mate verantwoordelijk voor de neergang van de eens zo fameuze

Berlijnse universiteit. Zowel Amerika als de Sovjet-Unie wilden de volledige controle uitoefenen over de middelen, het wetenschappelijke personeel en het bezit in de vorm van gebouwen en collecties, die verspreid waren te vinden in drie van de vier zones van bezet Berlijn. De ideologisch gedreven doelen van de beide grootmachten droegen bij aan het uiteenvallen van deze universiteit. Het feit dat de hervormingen van bovenaf werden opgelegd zorgde voor verontwaardiging bij zowel het wetenschappelijk personeel als bij de studenten. Hun verzet droeg bij tot vertraging van de introductie van deze hervormingen. Uiteindelijk moesten beide grootmachten erkennen dat een volledige hervorming van het Duitse universiteitsleven niet zou plaatsvinden.

In de hoofdstukken IV and V wordt het beleid van de Verenigde Staten en van de Sovjet-Unie met betrekking tot deze twee belangrijkste groepen van de universitaire gemeenschap - de docenten en de studenten- gedurende de eerste fase van de Koude Oorlog tussen 1945 en begin jaren zestig beschreven.

Hoofdstuk IV laat zien hoe de veranderingen die waren voorgesteld door de Amerikanen en de Sovjets grote invloed hadden op het persoonlijke leven en op de academische carrières van de hoogleraren. Zij konden kiezen tussen een positieve of een negatieve reactie op de hervormingen en hun reactie zou in sterke mate bepalen wat de uitkomst van de beoogde veranderingen van de universiteit werd. Beide grootmachten waren erop uit om een

nieuw, plooibaar type hoogleraar, hetzij pro-Amerikaans hetzij pro-Sovjet, te creëren. De methoden om dat te bereiken verschilden echter. Verschillen vielen vooral op bij de zuiveringsmethoden in verband met een mogelijk nationaal-socialistisch verleden van de hoogleraren, manieren van communiceren met de hoogleraren, en methoden om hervormingen te bevorderen door middel van het professoraat. De beide grootmachten ontmoetten in hun poging om een nieuw type hoogleraar te creëren echter tegenstand van het traditionele Duitse professoraat. Terwijl de hoogleraren formeel akkoord gingen met de voorgestelde hervormingen, waren zij eigenlijk van mening dat deze hervormingen het traditionele Duitse universiteitssysteem zouden ondermijnen. Daarom probeerden ze enkele van deze hervormingen te ondermijnen, waarbij zij zich met name verzetten tegen de plicht om politieke wetenschappen (in West-Duitsland) en Marxisme (in Oost-Duitsland) te doceren.

Hoofdstuk V behandelt de Amerikaanse en Sovjet politiek ten opzichte van de studenten in de periode van 1945 tot begin jaren zestig. Er wordt ingegaan op de volgende aspecten van dat beleid: zuivering, invoering van nieuwe universitaire toelatingsregels, pogingen om Duitse studenten nieuwe ideologische waarden bij te brengen, en het oprichten van studentenorganisaties. Beide grootmachten hadden als intentie om een nieuwe groep aan hen loyale studenten te creëren om daarmee een nieuwe elite op te leiden welke de politieke regimes in beide Duitslanden zou continueren. In plaats daarvan leidde hun beleid echter tot krachtig

en openlijk verzet van de kant van de studenten. Duitse studenten maakten hun ontevredenheid ten opzichte van de hervormingen van zowel de Sovjet-Unie als van de Verenigde Staten luid en duidelijk kenbaar. Daarbij veroorzaakte het communistische beleid meer oppositionele activiteit van de kant van de studenten omdat de communistische ideologie aan de basis kwam te liggen van universitaire organisaties en omdat het Marxisme moest dienen als basis voor alle universitaire studierichtingen.

De periode van midden jaren zestig tot 1990 staat centraal in hoofdstuk VI, waarin de resultaten en tekortkomingen van het beleid van Amerika en de Sovjet-Unie worden behandeld. Ten eerste komt de Amerikaanse politiek ten opzichte van de radicale West-Berlijnse studenten aan de orde. Ten einde deze studentenoppositie uit te bannen dwong Washington de regering van West-Duitsland in 1969 om een nieuw pakket hervormingen, ontworpen door Amerikaanse deskundigen, aan haar universiteiten te introduceren. Deze hervormingen liepen echter spoedig vast op krachtig verzet van het conservatieve professoraat. Dit gedeelte van het wetenschappelijk personeel aan de West-Duitse universiteiten zette een tegenoffensief in en slaagde erin een aantal elementen van de traditionele Duitse universiteit, verwijderd als gevolg van zowel de Amerikaanse hervormingen in het begin van de Koude Oorlog en als van de hervormingen van 1969, op nieuw in te voeren. Ten tweede wordt in dit hoofdstuk verteld hoe de regering van de Sovjet-Unie een hernieuwde ideologische inspanning leverde om in

de jaren zeventig en begin tachtig op de universiteiten in Oost-Duitsland de invloed van het marxisme uit te breiden in de wetenschappelijke disciplines, in het curriculum, en zelfs in het gedrag van studenten en hoogleraren. Hoewel de wetenschappelijke staf naar buiten toe gehoorzaamheid liet zien ten opzichte van de indoctrinatie en de ideologie van het heersende regime, werd ze als geheel nooit een loyale en overtuigde volgeling van het communisme. Als derde wordt in dit hoofdstuk het Amerikaanse culturele offensief, gericht op Oost-Duitse universiteiten, behandeld. In tegenstelling tot de godsdienstig geïnspireerde jeugdigen en de meerderheid van de intelligentsia die lid werden van de brede beweging van dissidenten die werd ondersteund door het westen, was de universitaire wetenschappelijke staf - en daarnaast een deel van de studenten - opmerkelijk weinig enthousiast voor de nieuwe ideologie en de nieuwe waarden die vanuit het Westen tot hen kwamen. Deze wetenschappelijke staf was vol bewondering voor de waarden van de traditionele Duitse universiteiten, zoals academische vrijheid, grote afstand ten opzichte van de politiek, afwijzing van opgelegde ideologieën, en veel invloed voor de gevestigde staf. Volgens hen ondermijnden de twee rivaliserende ideologieën, of het nu de waarden van de Amerikaanse democratie betrof of het Sovjet-marxisme, de tradities van het Duitse universitaire leven.

Het onderzoek wordt afgesloten met enkele conclusies over de belangrijkste resultaten en mislukkingen van de politiek die

Amerika en de Sovjet-Unie ten opzichte van de Duitse universiteiten voerden. Op basis van het onderzoek kan worden geconcludeerd dat de culturele tussenkomst en daarop volgende culture druk, op te vatten als cultureel imperialisme, van beide grootmachten op het Duitse universiteitssysteem niet alleen krachtige weerstand ondervond van de kant van de conservatieve Duitse academische traditie, maar als gevolg van deze weerstand mislukte. Zowel door openlijke als zwijgende weerstand van de kant van het Duitse universiteitssysteem kon de culturele druk van beide kanten worden ondermijnd. Volgens onze analyse leidde deze weerstand tot herleving van enkele van de traditionele kenmerken van Duitse universiteiten. Als gevolg hiervan moesten beide grootmachten uiteindelijk, tegen het einde van de Koude Oorlog, toegeven dat hun universiteitspolitiek in Duitsland was mislukt.