

# 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*<sup>1</sup> and Democratic Republic of Germany (East Germany) called officially the *DDR*.<sup>2</sup> 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> BRD is the German abbreviation of *Bundesrepublik Deutschland*.

<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> 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.”<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> Richard Kuisel, a French historian, has explained why it is

---

<sup>4</sup> 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).

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

<sup>6</sup> 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).

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

<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup>

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.<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup>

---

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

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

<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup> 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,<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> 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.

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

<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup>

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.<sup>16</sup> The supporters of partial and Europeanized Americanization incline to the opinion that Europeans have never been passive receivers<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup> For example, Richard Kuisel in his book argued that France was not entirely Americanized, because the process of Frenchification needed be taken into consideration.<sup>20</sup> 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).

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

<sup>16</sup> 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).

<sup>17</sup> 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.

<sup>18</sup> 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).

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

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

national one rather than having been Americanized.<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup> 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

---

<sup>21</sup> Lunden, *Networks of Americanization*.

<sup>22</sup> 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."<sup>23</sup> 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.<sup>24</sup>

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

---

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

<sup>24</sup> 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.<sup>25</sup> 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.<sup>26</sup> 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.”<sup>27</sup> 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

---

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

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

<sup>27</sup> 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.<sup>28</sup>

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.<sup>29</sup> 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.<sup>30</sup> 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.”<sup>31</sup>

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

---

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

<sup>29</sup> 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.

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

<sup>31</sup> 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,<sup>32</sup> 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.<sup>33</sup>

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.

---

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

<sup>33</sup> 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.<sup>34</sup>

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.<sup>35</sup> 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.<sup>36</sup> In addition, an analogous social transformatory role for education has been noted in connection with Soviet policy in the Third World.<sup>37</sup> Among the works

---

<sup>34</sup> 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).

<sup>35</sup> 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*.

<sup>36</sup> Carnoy, *Education as*; Berman, *The Influence*.

<sup>37</sup> 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.<sup>38</sup> 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.<sup>39</sup>

#### *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.<sup>40</sup> 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).

<sup>38</sup> Carnoy, *Education as*.

<sup>39</sup> Barghoorn, *Soviet Foreign*.

<sup>40</sup> 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.<sup>41</sup> 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.<sup>42</sup> Response theory and reception studies are shifting the theme of cultural expansion

---

<sup>41</sup> 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.

<sup>42</sup> 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.<sup>43</sup> 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.<sup>44</sup>

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.<sup>45</sup> 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

---

<sup>43</sup> 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).

<sup>44</sup> 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.

<sup>45</sup> 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.”<sup>46</sup>

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.<sup>47</sup>

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

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 127.

<sup>47</sup> 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.<sup>48</sup> 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.<sup>49</sup> 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.<sup>50</sup> 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*;<sup>51</sup> other scholars suggest replacing it with that of so-called *transculturalism*.<sup>52</sup> Some historians use the *liberal imperialism* thesis to revise once again the relationship between the United States and Native Americans<sup>53</sup> or they have applied the *language domination* thesis to demonstrate how language can be exploited for the imperial ambitions

---

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

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

<sup>50</sup> D. Y. Jin, "Reinterpretation of Cultural Imperialism", 301-325.

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

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

<sup>53</sup> Konkle, "Indigenous Owership," 298-299.

of a government.<sup>54</sup> 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.<sup>55</sup>

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

---

<sup>54</sup> 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.

<sup>55</sup> 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.<sup>56</sup>

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

---

<sup>56</sup> 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.”<sup>57</sup> 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.”<sup>58</sup>

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.<sup>59</sup> 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

---

<sup>57</sup> 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.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 38

<sup>59</sup> 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.<sup>60</sup> 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.<sup>61</sup> 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.”<sup>62</sup>

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.<sup>63</sup> 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

---

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

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

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 159.

<sup>63</sup> 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.<sup>64</sup>

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

---

<sup>64</sup> 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."<sup>65</sup> 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."<sup>66</sup> 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.<sup>67</sup> 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

---

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

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 212.

<sup>67</sup> 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.<sup>68</sup>

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*,<sup>69</sup> 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

---

<sup>68</sup> 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.

<sup>69</sup> 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.<sup>70</sup>

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.<sup>71</sup>

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 GDR<sup>72</sup> economy into its present position, and given the East Germans the highest standard of living in the whole of the Communist block.”<sup>73</sup>

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

---

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

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

<sup>72</sup> 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.

<sup>73</sup> 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.<sup>74</sup> 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.<sup>75</sup> 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.<sup>76</sup> 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.

---

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

<sup>75</sup> 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 Germanii, 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).

<sup>76</sup> 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.<sup>77</sup> 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.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> 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.

<sup>78</sup> 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.”<sup>79</sup> 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.<sup>80</sup>

---

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

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

<sup>80</sup> *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.<sup>81</sup>

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.<sup>82</sup> The work has a lot of intriguing features when compared with the work of James Tent.

---

<sup>81</sup> 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).

<sup>82</sup> 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."<sup>83</sup> 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).

<sup>83</sup> 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.<sup>84</sup> 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.<sup>85</sup> 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.<sup>86</sup> The book written by the latter was

---

<sup>84</sup> 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 Edinoy 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).

<sup>85</sup> 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);

<sup>86</sup> 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.<sup>87</sup> 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.<sup>88</sup> Yet, this thesis contradicts the newly declassified Soviet records<sup>89</sup> 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).

<sup>87</sup> Tent, *The Free University*, 112.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 112.

<sup>89</sup> 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.”<sup>90</sup>

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.<sup>91</sup>

#### **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.

---

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., 141.

<sup>91</sup> 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.<sup>92</sup> 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.<sup>93</sup>

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,<sup>94</sup> arranged a conference on Soviet

---

<sup>92</sup> N.P. Timofeeva, *Nemetskaya Intelligentsia 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).

<sup>93</sup> 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).

<sup>94</sup> 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,<sup>95</sup> and the second edition of proceedings with additional papers and interviews of eyewitnesses was published as a book in 2000.<sup>96</sup> 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.

<sup>95</sup> *Bildung und Erziehung* 45, no. 4 (1992).

<sup>96</sup> 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.<sup>97</sup> 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

---

<sup>97</sup> 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.<sup>98</sup>

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.<sup>99</sup>

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.<sup>100</sup> 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

---

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

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

<sup>100</sup> Heinemann, *Hochschuloffiziere*.

from universities; however, they were later returned.<sup>101</sup> 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.<sup>102</sup>

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

---

<sup>101</sup> 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.

<sup>102</sup> 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.<sup>103</sup> 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.<sup>104</sup>

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.”<sup>105</sup>

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

---

<sup>103</sup> 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.

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

<sup>105</sup> 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,<sup>106</sup> the article by Peter Walther about the founding of Humboldt University,<sup>107</sup> and the article by Ilko-Sascha Kowalczyk about student life at this University.<sup>108</sup>

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.<sup>109</sup>

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

---

<sup>106</sup> 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.

<sup>107</sup> 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.

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

<sup>109</sup> 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*).<sup>110</sup> 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,<sup>111</sup> Connelly argues that the Soviets arrested and subjected 423 German students to repressive measures.<sup>112</sup> 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.<sup>113</sup> Finally, he concludes that the Communists gave those Germans who were deprived of education a chance to go to university.<sup>114</sup>

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

---

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

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

<sup>112</sup> Connelly, *East German*, 259-298.

<sup>113</sup> Connelly, *Captive University*, 4, 274.

<sup>114</sup> *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%.”<sup>115</sup> 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.<sup>117</sup>

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.”<sup>118</sup> 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.<sup>119</sup> 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

---

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

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

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

<sup>118</sup> Connelly, *Captive University*, 6.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, 3-4, 98, 133.



professoriate would make impossible the training of students.”<sup>120</sup> That’s why, “from 1948 the SED proved willing to readmit former NSDAP<sup>121</sup> 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.”<sup>122</sup>

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.<sup>123</sup> 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.<sup>124</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup> Ibid., 71.

<sup>121</sup> NSDAP is the German abbreviation of *Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei*, the party of the Nazis.

<sup>122</sup> Connelly, *Captive University*, 134.

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

<sup>124</sup> 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.<sup>125</sup> 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

---

<sup>125</sup> 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.<sup>126</sup> 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.<sup>127</sup> 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.<sup>128</sup> The scholars, who study the American activities in German universities, very seldom make use of the materials of the Office of

---

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

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

<sup>128</sup> 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.<sup>129</sup>

*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.<sup>130</sup> 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.<sup>131</sup> The American government has

---

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

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

<sup>131</sup> *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.<sup>132</sup>

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.<sup>133</sup> 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.<sup>134</sup> 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.<sup>135</sup>

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

---

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

<sup>133</sup> *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".

<sup>134</sup> *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).

<sup>135</sup> *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.<sup>136</sup>

*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.<sup>137</sup>

## **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

---

<sup>136</sup> The reports were published under different titles in different years: *The International Information Educational Exchange Program. The 5<sup>th</sup>-25<sup>th</sup> 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.

<sup>137</sup> 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*,<sup>138</sup> 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

---

<sup>138</sup> 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.<sup>139</sup>

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.<sup>140</sup>

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.<sup>141</sup>

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

---

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

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

<sup>141</sup> 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.<sup>142</sup>

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.<sup>143</sup> 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

---

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

<sup>143</sup> 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.<sup>144</sup>

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.<sup>145</sup>

*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-

---

<sup>144</sup> 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.

<sup>145</sup> 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.<sup>146</sup> 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.<sup>147</sup> Recent series published in the 2000s have contributed to filling in some blank spots

---

<sup>146</sup> *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).

<sup>147</sup> *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.<sup>148</sup>

*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.<sup>149</sup> The recollections of other Soviet officers who

---

<sup>148</sup> *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).

<sup>149</sup> 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.<sup>150</sup>

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

---

<sup>150</sup> 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.

