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ABSTRACT

This study is primarily concerned with the years 1950-1960, but the period 1945-1949 is also addressed, because many of the policies and institutions introduced to democratize Germany immediately after World War II were carried forward.

The official position on both sides during the 1950s was that cooperation was of the essence. In the beginning, the Americans believed that the virtues of democracy could best be cultivated in the German consciousness if the Germans themselves implemented democratic programs under broad, philosophical guidelines, while simultaneously observing Americans and American ideas in practice. This study points out that the Germans accepted the guidelines and their responsibilities for building a democracy, and by the end of the decade, Germany was considered to be an established democracy.

Economic recovery was crucial to overall recovery, and this dissertation describes how spending by the U.S. forces contributed more to the German economy than did the Marshall Plan.

The Americans had definite ideas on how to change the German educational system to make it more democratic. However, Germany had its own traditions, and German educators insisted on restoring the school structure of the Weimar period. How these traditions were restored while complying with the principles of denazification and democratization are discussed.

The Americans reshaped the information media, contributed to cultural changes, and influenced political life in Germany. The measures taken in these areas are treated in this study.
Specific examples from the city of Zweibruecken are presented to illustrate how the American presence affected the Germans and how they got along together. This dissertation shows that personal contacts produced an untold number of individual friendships as well as conflicts. Countless joint ventures, literally thousands of German-American marriages, and hundreds of friendship clubs resulted. These relationships, together with organized efforts, such as the America Houses, exposed millions of Germans to American ideas, products, practices, and tastes and left a lasting impression on German life.

Germans value traditions, and they retained a distinctiveness, but this dissertation concludes that the American presence had a large influence which was felt rather distinctly at the grass-roots level.
German-American relations have a long, rich, and sometimes stormy history. The first substantive connection began in October 1683, when a shipload of German immigrants landed in the new world. Since that day, over seven million Germans have found their way to America's shores. It has been estimated that in the mid-20th century one out of every eight Americans is of German heritage. Other estimates say the percentage of German-Americans is much higher; the census of 1980, for example, showed over twenty percent of present-day Americans claim German heritage. These immigrants and their descendants have provided America with a large, influential segment of society which has literally shaped the face of America. This shaping process brought with it the deep, subtle, yet still significant result of binding the two nations together.

Even the stark reality of millions of dead from both countries brought about by two world wars in this century was only able to disrupt that bond temporarily, not to destroy it permanently. Both sides were prompted to set their disputes aside after World War II, when it became obvious that Russian communism was a mutual enemy. The necessity of accepting one another was facilitated by some common links. The very large German influence in America fostered
on the American side feelings of sympathy for the German people that helped the two countries to patch up their differences almost immediately. On the German side, there was undoubtedly a considerable amount of reciprocal affection, once the immediate bitterness and shock of defeat wore off. This is substantiated by the fact that, of 21,306 opinions expressed about Americans in censored German mail in late 1945 and early 1946, approximately seventy-five percent indicated that the Germans were satisfied with their impressions of the Americans. In contrast, only twenty percent of the opinions expressed about the Russians showed satisfaction. Natural inclinations made cooperation easier, but it was further encouraged because the Germans were so thoroughly dependent on the victorious Americans for their very livelihood.

When the armed hostilities ceased, Germany lay in ruins. Sixty-five percent of the Germans had lost either everything or nearly everything. There were 48,000,000 people in the western zones, including 9,000,000 Germans sent there from Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. The American Zone had 17,600,000 people in it. The railroads were not in working order, food and other essential supplies such as clothing and medicine were scarce, millions of soldiers were held prisoner, and the conquering Allies were intent on removing all Nazis from positions of responsibility, a process which denied the war-torn country much of the trained leadership it had left. The situation was bleak. But within five short years, virtually the entire picture had changed.
Germans have been co-architects of American society since 1683, and in a different but very real way, Americans have been co-architects of German society since 1945. Germans found a tabula rasa on which to build a society in America. On the other hand, Americans found an old country with many strong traditions, most of which were undemocratic. The Americans entered the occupation phase with a determination to rebuild Germany as a democracy. This goal was never changed, but the procedures followed to achieve it were flexible. By 1950, the official attitude of Americans towards Germans had changed from hatred to friendliness, and American influence was working at every level of German society, helping to make certain that democracy would succeed. The plans for Germany's development as an industrialized member of the western world were in full swing. What had been a policy of "no German employment by the Allies" had switched to one of "full employment." And the effort to push all former Nazis out had been converted to an approach which left the identification and punishment of former Nazis in the hands of the Germans themselves. Many former Nazi party members were back in government, industry, and the business world. Even the U.S. military forces employed former Nazis, and plans were being made to remilitarize Germany as a bulwark against Russian aggression.

This transition was neither simple nor easy. It required great understanding and patience on both sides. The Germans had to succumb, willingly or otherwise, to American control, and the Americans went to great lengths to fulfill the commitment to democratize the Germans. The influence of the Americans was felt at all levels, and it is one
intent of this study to examine, within the time and resources available, the extent of the American influence as it affected the ordinary citizens of the Federal Republic of Germany. An attempt will also be made to understand how the Germans and Americans related to one another as a result of having worked together to rebuild Germany. There are many fine analyses of the occupation period, but none of them has adequately addressed the impact of the American presence at the grass-roots level. Studies such as John Gimbel's *A German Community under American Occupation* and Edward N. Peterson's *The American Occupation of Germany: Retreat to Victory* reveal much about the officially articulated policies and how leaders of the occupation and of Germany interacted. However, studies which are concerned mainly with the actions of elites treat only part of the total relationship. One must also look at how the ordinary members of the vast American military establishment and German citizens fared in their daily lives during the occupation, and also during the following years because an evolutionary process existed. Furthermore, even though mistakes occurred and many changes had to be made in the American approach to reorienting Germans, real alterations in German life did result. There was an almost spontaneous spirit of togetherness which frequently arose wherever Germans and Americans met, and the fact that this spirit was in line with the overall policy of democratization reflected a consistency in American views and a German willingness and ability to accept responsibility.

The Americans had different sorts of influence in Germany depending on the nature of the issues at hand or the proximity of the
Americans to the Germans. For example, there was statutory or administra-tive influence due to the legal right of the Americans to prescribe rules and regulations prior to the reestablishment of full German sovereignty. This was normally the case in the U.S. Zone, and whenever American influence was constrained by zonal authority, the term "U.S. Zone" is used in this study. Some of the changes were directed, but oftentimes they were the results of policies jointly decided upon by Americans and Germans and executed by Germans. There was also personal influence derived from person-to-person contacts. This situation existed wherever Americans were located -- even outside the U.S. Zone, as often happened. In addition, there was influence attributable to knowledge of American products and the American way of life; such influence existed throughout West Germany and was spread by a variety of ways -- with America Houses being of particular importance.

The approach of this study is to look at the areas of influence in the Republic as a whole (Berlin excluded) while also using examples from a local community, Zweibruecken in the Rhineland-Palatinate, to gain a better understanding of what was happening where Americans were physically located. It is an effort to ascertain how American policies, practices, and presence affected the Germans.

There is frequent mention in this study of the early, formative years of the American presence in Germany because that is when the major policy decisions were made, the laws formulated, and the institutions established. The attitudes of the German people were also
heavily influenced during the early years. In many cases, once the course was set, the Germans stayed on the same path for several years.

A few words on the setting are necessary. When the war ended in 1945, U.S. forces occupied a large portion of southwest Germany, an area which subsequently evolved into the states of Hesse, Bavaria, and Baden-Wuerttemberg. In addition, they occupied a sector of Berlin and the Bremen enclave in Northern Germany. There were also significant numbers of Americans in the Rhineland-Palatinate.

The city of Zweibruecken was captured by the Americans on March 20, 1945, during the waning days of World War II. The Americans held Zweibruecken until July 7, 1945, when they left the city in the hands of the French, inasmuch as it was in the French area of occupation. Thus, the people of Zweibruecken were subject to the Americans for the first three and one-half months after the fighting ended in their city, and they were under French administrative control for the remainder of the time of the occupation. The U.S. forces returned early in the decade of the 1950s, and then in 1953 the Canadians too came to town. (In this respect, it should be noted that the terms "America" or "American" are used throughout this study as synonyms for the U.S.A. or a person from the U.S.A. The Canadians are referred to as such — even though they too are North Americans.) All three nations (France, the U.S.A. and Canada) shared garrison duties in Zweibruecken from 1953 until 1956, when they were joined by units of the newly formed Bundeswehr. From that time on, all four nations had troops stationed in Zweibruecken until the Canadians moved out in 1969. The French left in 1977.
In addition to that already mentioned, some information on the city of Zweibruecken is appropriate, since that city is the source of many examples used here.

Zweibruecken is a small city located in the Rhineland-Palatinate only a few kilometers from the French-German border. It is in a region historically influenced by the nearness of France. The present population is 33,169, and many of its residents are fluent in French, although it is unquestionably a German city. For centuries, Zweibruecken was agriculturally oriented, surrounded by small farms and forests. However, in 1834, a factory for farm implements was built there, and the city has had a touch of industrial life ever since although it has never lost its country connections. Its kinship with its surroundings has been enhanced by the presence of an extension of a school of agriculture located in Pirmasens. The city has been the administrative center for the surrounding area throughout modern history. The Kreis (county) which it serves bears the same name, i.e. Zweibruecken. There is much pride in local history; for example, the citizens of Zweibruecken are quick to point out that their city was the site of a duke's residence, and the rebuilt castle is a stately reminder of that bygone era. The citizens mark as one of the highlights of Zweibruecken's history the fact that the Royal Deux-Ponts Regiment, which fought on the side of the American colonists at Yorktown, was Zweibruecken's own regiment fighting under the French flag. Thus, they like to claim at least a little credit for America's independence.
As far as the social and economic structure of the community is concerned, figures from a census dated May 17, 1939, show that just before World War II the city of Zweibruecken had a permanent population of 28,221. The inhabitants were categorized according to social standing into five groups based on the occupation of the head of each household. The most numerous by far were those in the Arbeiter (blue-collar worker) class; there were 13,367 people classified as such. Of the blue-collar group, 10,294 people were spread out through eight different metal-work factories (where farm implements, tools, barbed wire, nails, and chains were made), one electrical components factory, one tile and brick factory, one furniture factory, a printing business, and a brewery. The second largest group fell under the heading of Angestellte (white-collar workers) and totaled 4,190. Close in number to the Angestellte was a category titled Selbstaendige (self-employed persons) with 3,768. Beamte (civil servants and comparably situated officials) accounted for another 3,301 people. The remaining, assorted members of the population, 3,595, were termed Beruflosen ohne Hauptberuf (These were persons without any career, or with more than one career but no one dominating career. Further clarification, other than they were independent, was not noted in the census.) Unemployed persons did not appear in the census, presumably because the building of the Westwall and a military installation, Kreuzberg Kaserne, had employed every available person. In fact, military construction in and around Zweibruecken brought an influx of more than 20,000 temporary workers and family members to Zweibruecken for a short period of time in the late 1930s. The 28,221 permanent residents were further categorized based on
the nature of their respective businesses. These categories were: Land- und Forstwirtschaft (agriculture and forestry); Industrie und Handwerk (industry and crafts); Handel und Verkehr (shops, restaurants, etc.); Oeffentliche und private Dienstleistungen (public and private services); and Haeusliche Dienste (domestic services). People in the catch-all social group of Berufslose ohne Hauptberuf were not applied against any particular business group. Table 1 shows the population distribution of the permanent inhabitants of the city in May 1939, and the percentage of the total represented by each social category. These figures indicate that Zweibruecken was heavily blue collar in nature with industry and crafts supplying nearly one half the population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Category</th>
<th>Agriculture and Forestry</th>
<th>Industry and Crafts</th>
<th>Shops Restaurants etc.</th>
<th>Public and Private Services</th>
<th>Domestic Services</th>
<th>Unspecified Careers</th>
<th>Total for Social Group</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue-Collar Workers</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>10,294</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>718</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,367</td>
<td>47.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-Collar Workers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,167</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>14.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,768</td>
<td>13.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officials</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,301</td>
<td>11.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Careers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,595</td>
<td>12.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>14,057</td>
<td>4,110</td>
<td>4,815</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>3,595</td>
<td>28,221</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENDNOTES

Introduction


3European Command, Report on "The Relations of Occupation Personnel with the Civil Population 1946-1948," Occupation Forces in Europe Series, 1946-1948, No. 69 (Karlsruhe: Historical Division, 1951), p. 11; OMGUS ICD Intelligence Summary (ICIS), No. 47, 22 June 1946, pp. 1-4, on file at Center for Military History, Alexandria, Va. This Intelligence Summary contains comparable but slightly different data on the French and British. The period of censorship was December 1945 - March 1946, with each month recorded separately for these two occupying powers. The raw numbers are no longer available, but the percentages for each month for the two powers were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Percentage of Germans Satisfied With Impressions of French</th>
<th>Percentage of Germans Satisfied With Impressions of British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5Ibid., p. 271.

6Bayerisches statistisches Landesamt, "Census of the City of Zweibruecken for the Year 1939," on file in the Statistische Abteilung in the Zweibruecken City Hall.
PART I
BACKGROUND
Chapter 1
Nonfraternization

At the end of the war, the entire spectrum of interpersonal relations between the occupation forces and the Germans was governed by the Allied policy on nonfraternization as expressed in General Eisenhower's letter of September 12, 1944, to all Allied occupation troops. The policy had been formulated and decided upon at the governmental level and sent to the Supreme Commander in Europe, General Eisenhower, for implementation.\(^1\) In effect, the policy banned all contact between members of the American and British occupation forces and the Germans except for that which was absolutely essential to the conduct of official business. When official contacts were made, it was prescribed that they be accompanied by a "firm and correct attitude." Nonfraternization was defined as follows:

Nonfraternization is the avoidance of mingling with Germans upon terms of friendliness, familiarity, or intimacy, whether individually or in groups, in official or unofficial dealings. However, nonfraternization does not demand rough, undignified, or aggressive conduct, nor the insolent overbearance which has characterized Nazi leadership.\(^2\)

The policy was carefully stated to leave little or no doubt as to what was authorized and what was not. The Allied commanders were instructed to enforce it and to maintain a position of superiority over the Germans at all times. Numerous acts were specifically forbidden. Members of the occupation forces were prohibited from:

(1) entertaining Germans.
(2) billeting Allied personnel with German families.
(3) marrying Germans.
(4) visiting German homes.
(5) drinking with Germans.
(6) shaking hands with Germans.
(7) playing games or participating in sporting events with Germans.
(8) giving gifts to Germans or receiving gifts from them.
(9) attending German dances or other social events.
(10) accompanying Germans in the streets or into places of entertain­ment, such as theaters, taverns, hotels or elsewhere (except when required to do so by official business).
(11) conversing or arguing with Germans.
(12) sitting with Germans in church.

The directive which specified these restrictions further stated that the occupation troops would receive orientations to acquaint them with their expected conduct.³

Eisenhower's letter also contained a prediction as to how the conquered Germans would react to their defeat, and the fear of a resistance movement was a primary reason for the promulgation of the policy of nonfra­ternization. First and foremost, it was a security measure.⁴ Military operations can be significantly impaired if information pertaining to troop dispositions, strengths, activities, attitudes, and plans are divulged. It was felt that personal contacts between Allied personnel and Germans could reveal such facts. This was of particular concern during the time that only portions of Germany were occupied and the fighting was still in progress. Once the hostilities had ceased, there was a possibility renewed fighting might erupt. There was an additional security factor involved, and that was the need to safeguard the lives of Allied soldiers from acts of retribution by embittered Germans who might have attacked Allied soldiers during unguarded moments.
The policy of nonfraternization had reasons beyond security, even though that was the primary motivating factor. It was also designed to prevent the minds of the Allied soldiers from being influenced by German propaganda — propaganda which was intended to cleanse the German image in the eyes of the occupiers. The insurance of respect for the victors by discouraging familiarity and maintaining aloofness was an additional reason, as was the belief that this separation would help to emphasize the total defeat of the Germans and their "black sheep" status in the eyes of the rest of the world. Emotions played a part too. A "mixture of self-righteousness and indiscriminate contempt" was present. It was considered advantageous to make certain that the Germans accepted their state of inferiority and that this condition be emphasized.

General Eisenhower's subordinate commanders made a serious attempt to enforce the nonfraternization policy. It was communicated down to the lowest levels of command, company and comparable sized units, but the American War Department also decided that, in order to make certain that the policy was understood, it should be given in writing to every soldier. Thus, the soldier's official *Pocket Guide to Germany* was printed for issue to Allied soldiers when they arrived in Germany. This little guide contained the rules expressed in the nonfraternization policy; however, incongruous as it seems, it also contained a section on conversational German — information which would have been primarily of use to persons violating the policy. This inconsistency was brought to Eisenhower's attention, and he approved the withdrawal of the guide, but it was subsequently released and given to a great many soldiers. A campaign to
publicize the official position was launched using every means available. The soldier-oriented press was used. The * Stars and Stripes*, *Yank*, and *Army Talks* all gave extensive coverage to the nonfraternization issue. The War Department produced a film titled *Your Job in Germany*, which stressed Germany's warlike heritage, but it also featured the peaceful, industrious nature of the average German. It is hard to say which aspect of German life had the most impact on the American soldiers who viewed it, but all American personnel in Germany were required to see the film. The American Forces Network also conveyed the nonfraternization policy. A total of seventy-four different spot announcements appeared on the radio network, a network which was intended to entertain and inform the Americans. Sometimes they were simple slogans, such as, "Soldiers wise don't fraternize," but others were lengthier and carried more explicit messages. Some announcements went as follows:

(1) Pretty German girls can sabotage an Allied victory. Don't fall for that booby trap. Steer clear of all German civilians. Don't fraternize!

(2) In heart, body and spirit, every German is Hitler! Hitler is the single man who stands for the beliefs of Germans. Don't make friends with Hitler. Don't fraternize!

(3) If, in a German town, you bow to a pretty girl, or pat a blond child, you bow to Hitler and his reign of blood. You caress the ideology that means death and persecution. Don't fraternize!

Another official document meant to educate Allied soldiers on the pitfalls of occupation duty was a little folder entitled "Special Orders for German-American Relations." It was first issued in January 1945. The guidance provided in these "Special Orders" was compatible with that issued by General Eisenhower on September 12, 1944, and discouraged all but the
most essential contacts. During the closing days of the war and in the early months of the postwar period, these "Special Orders" were issued to all soldiers in Germany and were carried inside their helmet liners. In addition, there was a widespread training program conducted by officers to inform the men orally of the restrictions. When all of these factors are considered, there is little doubt that the occupying soldiers knew that they were prohibited from fraternizing with the Germans.

It was relatively easy to inform the troops that they were not allowed to associate with the conquered Germans and of the reasons for the prohibition -- but enforcement was another matter.

American soldiers had no sooner crossed the border into Germany than fraternization began. The first German town to be taken by Americans was Roetgen, and the children of the town immediately asked the conquering soldiers for chewing gum and candy. The Americans gladly obliged, and the newspaper coverage reached the Supreme Allied Commander, General Eisenhower. Eisenhower told General Bradley, the commander of the 12th Army Group in whose area the incident had occurred, "This must be nipped in the bud immediately." At various times, other reports of fraternization showed that Americans were not being stern with German prisoners of war. For example, an American general was photographed while shaking hands with Goering, and that high Nazi official was allowed to give interviews to newspaper reporters. It was also reported that German civilians were being shown kindness in matters of housing, transportation, and food. One official U.S. Army record on the fraternization problem states, "The perplexities of the American soldier on finding that the enemy whom he had been
taught to hate and fear was a people with a culture and living habits so much like his own had already become evident.\textsuperscript{9} The attitude of the American soldier toward his recent enemy was tested by a survey in November, 1945. Eighty percent of the soldiers surveyed indicated that they had been favorably impressed by the Germans. In fact, twenty-eight percent of the Americans surveyed preferred the company of Germans to that of the people of any other nationality with whom they associated. It is interesting to compare this figure with the factor of eleven percent, which represented those Americans who preferred the French. It is also worth noting that only forty-three percent held the German people responsible for the war. Over half, fifty-six percent, volunteered the information that they had engaged in conversation with German girls during the preceding week. According to the survey, the attributes which most impressed the Americans were the Germans' cleanliness and industriousness\textsuperscript{10} -- characteristics which stood high on the list of admirable qualities which Germans assigned to themselves in 1952, when these two traits topped the list of their perceived "best qualities."\textsuperscript{11}

The incidents of fraternization were not confined to common soldiers. Officers, too, were involved, and even the members of the military government were alleged to have had inappropriate contacts; they were charged with commandeering the most desirable houses for their own billets and engaging the prettiest German women as office and domestic workers. It was also felt on occasion that the military government personnel were overly solicitous when it came to caring for German refugees. There were, in addition, instances when Allied soldiers fraternized with captured German soldiers to
obtain war souvenirs.\footnote{12}

The problem was large enough to cause the senior commanders and government officials consternation prior to V-E Day; there had been courts martial cases in an attempt to discourage the prohibited contacts, most of which involved German girls or visits to German homes. But the problem took on new dimensions once the hostilities stopped.\footnote{13}

When the immediate dangers of war were removed and when the soldiers began to have more free time, the policy of nonfraternization became increasingly more difficult to enforce. The repeated admonitions evidently did not appeal to the intellect of the occupation troops and in reality made little sense to them.\footnote{14} The Americans believed that the other Allies (British, French and Russian) were not restricted in the same way.\footnote{15} They were hungry for the company of women, curious about their defeated foes, sympathetic to those who suffered, intent on obtaining souvenirs, and desirous of what comforts could be found in the German homes left standing. On top of all these personal reasons, there were also frequent requirements for translators, above and beyond those which could be satisfied by using Allied personnel; during those times, Germans who spoke English were brought into service by the Americans. Both the Americans and the Germans were willing to fraternize, and the opportunities were there -- to try to stop them was practically impossible. It was a well-known fact that the American soldiers had an abundance of cigarettes, chocolate bars, and other food-stuffs, as well as items of clothing. The subjugated Germans traded services, sexual favors, and material things such as cameras, jewelry, and works of art to gain these treasures --
frequently out of the direst necessity. Much of the task of enforcing the rules against fraternization fell on the shoulders of the military police, but they seem to have had essentially the same attitude as their fellow soldiers and took action only when flagrant violations occurred. Unit patrols, officers, and noncommissioned officers all shared the responsibility of enforcement, but their exercise of it was spotty at best. The situation was also complicated by the rule against fraternization not applying to displaced persons (individuals of a nationality other than German who were in Germany against their will). It became a common practice for soldiers to declare their female companions to be displaced persons, and it was frequently difficult to prove otherwise.

As the combat forces turned into occupation forces and units became more stabilized, the rate of fraternization incidents increased. Most of the violations were never detected, and a true measure of just how extensively the victors and the vanquished were socializing was impossible to reach. Although the problem of fraternization began with German children, it did not take long to spread to adults of the opposite sex. This became evident as the venereal disease rate accelerated and the number of court martial cases involving contact with German females grew. Enlisted men were tried under Article of War 96, for violating standing orders, and given fines of up to two-thirds of their pay for six months and prison sentences for up to six months. Officers were fined and could even be dismissed from the service.

Venereal disease was used as a rough barometer to measure the extent of contact; since VD is primarily transmitted by sexual contact and
since there were relatively few females other than the Germans, it was a
means of showing that soldiers had associated with German females. A medi­
cal report covering the period May 8 to September 30, 1945, revealed the
severity of the situation.

The venereal disease rate for the Continent which had leveled off
below 50 per 1000 per annum during the spring of 1945, took a
sudden rise after V-E Day. The rate increased steadily through
the summer and reached a peak of 190 per 1000 per annum in August
1945. Since August, the venereal disease rate has begun to
decline, until by the end of September the annual rate reached 153
per 1000. After the cessation of hostilities the rate in the
fighting troops, which had remained consistently below 20, imme­
diately increased to a figure approximately equivalent to that for
Com Z [rear area] troops. The rate for colored troops soared to
the unprecedented peak 890 per 1000 per annum in August. Since
then it has dropped gradually to a little over 500. The rate for
white troops followed the theater trend and climbed to 138 in
August, subsequently falling to 118 by the end of September.21

It should be noted that these figures are for the continent and not
just Germany. In fact, another medical report covering the period July 6 -
December 21, 1945, showed that France accounted for the greatest number of
VD cases, 56,320, as compared to Germany’s 43,988.22 Fraternization was
not prohibited in France; it was merely a health problem there. The rate
began to decrease in September due to the establishment of centers for the
treatment of venereal diseases in civilians, wherever American troops were
located.23

It is difficult to assess precisely why the disease rate was so much
higher among black soldiers than white soldiers. A lower educational level
was assumed to be one reason; blacks did not know what precautions to take.
Also, it was not unusual for several black soldiers to associate with the
same woman. Blacks were relatively strange to the Germans and thus shunned by many. Those German women who did accept the blacks were often ostracized by whites, German and American alike. Once rejected by white men, they continued to associate with black soldiers, and one infected woman could infect several men.24

One recorded effort to estimate the extent of fraternization shows that noncompliance with the policy was widespread, but it varied from unit to unit.25 The reasons for these differences were not explained, but they quite possibly had to do with the degree of contact afforded by proximity to civilian population groups, the amount of free or unsupervised time the soldiers had, and the methods of estimation used by the authorities.

**TABLE 2**

**ESTIMATES OF EXTENT OF FRATERNIZATION FROM V-E DAY TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1945**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Amount of Fraternization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th Armored Division</td>
<td>15-20 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Authorized strength was 10,666)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70th Ordnance Group</td>
<td>all but a small percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53rd Quartermaster Base Depot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60th Infantry Regiment</td>
<td>all members of the unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Authorized strength was 3,207)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Infantry Division</td>
<td>minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Authorized strength was 14,037)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Nonstandard units were tailored for changing missions. Strengths varied according to the way the units were tailored; therefore, strengths cannot now be determined.
Some early attempts were made to punish the German parties in fraternization cases by fining them, but before the war was even over, it was decided that the American witnesses probably would be sympathetic with the Germans and not testify against them. Thus, that course of action was not pursued beyond March of 1945.26

Black marketing too became a prodigious problem. The Americans had material goods that the Germans needed and wanted and were even willing to pay exorbitant prices to obtain. Cigarettes, gasoline, coffee, and alcoholic beverages were in particular demand. The military government tried to combat the flourishing underground trade by publishing notices to remind the Americans that they could not transfer either items issued to them by the U.S. forces or articles purchased in the post exchanges. It was even made unlawful for Germans to acquire such things — unless they were bona-fide gifts — and the giving of gifts by occupation troops was prohibited. The law placed the burden of proof on any German who came into possession of American-made products, but it was almost in vain, and goods continued to change hands. Black-market contacts led to greater social contacts and vice versa.27 General Bruce C. Clarke described the black-market period of 1945-1953 as "a black period" as far as the ethics, honesty and discipline of the U.S. Army were concerned.28

Other attempts were made to keep the Germans and the Americans apart. In the beginning, Americans were discouraged from shopping in German stores because it would lead to fraternization and because it would take scarce commodities away from the Germans.29 At one point, steps were taken to bar from Germany all U.S. military personnel with relatives in Germany. The
A directive which sought to implement this policy was issued on March 29, 1945, and specified the degrees of relationship constituting a bar to duty in Germany.

The forms of relationship could be either by blood or by marriage and were as identified in Table 3.30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relatives by Blood</th>
<th>Relatives by Marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>Husbands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Wives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothers or half brothers</td>
<td>Fathers-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisters or half sisters</td>
<td>Mothers-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons</td>
<td>Brothers-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughters</td>
<td>Sisters-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousins (if descended from one or more grandparents of the individual concerned)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The biggest objection to this policy came from those agencies responsible for dealing with the Germans, the G-2 (intelligence) and G-5 (civil affairs) staffs. This policy effectively denied the G-2 and G-5 elements the very linguists they needed to function and threatened to place such heavy reliance on German linguists that the military government would, effectively, have been in their hands. The policy was successively modified until its intended purpose was no longer discernible. In May
1945, cousins were removed from the list and specially qualified individuals were exempted. In July 1945, grandparents, uncles and aunts no longer applied, and a provision was added which simply required that the soldier be separated by at least one hundred miles from his German relative.31

The prohibition against serving in Germany, if one had a relative there, was written specifically to preclude soldiers from fraternizing, but it was generally interpreted to include U.S. civilians as well — even though it was never rigidly enforced for either category of personnel.

A particularly curious aspect of the nonfraternization policy was that it was never officially announced to the Germans. It was believed that if the Germans knew of the restriction, they would encourage violations by tempting Americans, and thus the Germans would be given an opportunity to conduct a subversive campaign — one that would be difficult to defeat. It also seemed at the time that a public proclamation on such an unpopular issue would have led to disrespect for the Allied authorities and thus defeated one of the policy's goals.32 The Germans did know about the policy of course through the posters, radio announcements, newspaper articles, and word of mouth whenever soldiers told them of it.

Fraternization, officially banned by a few on the American side, was practiced by many on both sides; however, there was a certain element within German society that opposed fraternization with Americans. A small but intent group of German youths and some members of the defunct military forces took it upon themselves to conduct a campaign to discourage Germans,
particularly females, from associating with Americans. There were many Germans who disapproved of collaborating with the former enemy, but only a small number resorted to violence. The advocates of violence assaulted American soldiers, wrote threatening letters, circulated inflammatory posters and handbills, and sheared the hair of German females who associated with Americans. This form of resistance to the illegal but common practice of fraternization produced only isolated incidents and ceased to be a concern after the policy of nonfraternization was revoked.\textsuperscript{33}

The fact that Americans and Germans did associate extensively with one another prompted the ban to be lifted on October 1, 1945; it was a restrictive policy which could not be enforced. It was a farce.\textsuperscript{34}
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The change in policy on fraternization was not abrupt. The reversal began on June 8, 1945, when Eisenhower declared via telegram to his subordinate commanders that the nonfraternization policy was "obviously not expected to apply to small children." He refused to specify a definite age above which the rules would apply, thereby leaving it open to interpretation. As a result, the exception for children was interpreted liberally, and the rule on nonfraternization must have lost some of its impact.

A further relaxation came three days later on June 11, 1945, based on the Judge Advocate General's advice that soldiers could not be punished for fraternization simply because they were receiving treatment for a venereal disease. This was not a concession to individual rights (that is, an admission by the military that it was improper to use privileged medical information against the soldier), but rather an acknowledgment that it was more important to get soldiers to go for medical treatment and admit contact than it was to court martial them for the contact. Based on the advice of the theater's Judge Advocate General, the policy on nonfraternization was modified as follows:

The contraction of venereal disease or the facts concerning prophylactic treatment will not be used, directly or indirectly, as evidence of fraternization or as evidence of violation by the individual of the policy on nonfraternization with the inhabitants of Germany.²

The order of June 11 stated that it was not intended to ease the
restrictions against social contacts; nevertheless, it did constitute a relaxation because now one type of contact with German women, while not authorized, was not punishable.

On July 14, 1945, Eisenhower lifted the ban against conversations on the streets and in public places between Germans and members of the occupation forces. Differences of opinion arose as to what constituted "conversations." There was also a question as to just what was a "public place"? In some cases, the term "public places" was interpreted to include places of entertainment. In any event, the door had been opened to allow for cordial relations, and from then on, even the pretense of nonfraternization was doomed to failure. It was about this same time that a major disciplinary problem suddenly came to an end. Initially, rape had been a frequent occurrence. During the first seven months of 1945, 1,301 charges of rape had been filed against American soldiers. Of this total, 623 had been brought to trial with 297 resulting in convictions. By August 1945, the number of rape cases dropped abruptly to what officials termed "only a scattering."3

The final nail was driven into the coffin of nonfraternization on September 20, 1945, when Eisenhower decided to lift all restrictions except the prohibitions against marriage to Germans and the billeting of occupation troops with Germans. Eisenhower explained his rationale for the change in a statement made available to every member of the command.

The strict nonfraternization policy, instituted upon the entry of our forces into Germany, has been gradually relaxed to help you carry out your occupational duties. The time has come when it is to our best interests to make further modifications.
Therefore, restrictions on fraternization will comprise strict prohibition against marriage to Germans and against the billeting of troops with German families. This policy goes into effect on October 1, 1945. I want to impress on each of you that so long as you are stationed in Germany you will be regarded as representatives of the American way of life, and in your contacts with the German people I expect you to so conduct yourselves as to reflect credit on your country and your uniform.4

While marriages were still banned, it was speculated that they were possible, with Eisenhower's permission.5

Although fraternization was no longer barred, it was still officially discouraged. As the occupation proceeded, the Americans (in 1946) started to bring their dependents to Germany and facilitated isolation by building their own communities and making themselves so self-sufficient that they really did not need to mix with Germans. Where Americans did not build, they expanded the practice of requisitioning German homes to accommodate their families and keep them separate from the Germans. Such requisitioning caused more than a little resentment. A certain amount of requisitioning was understood, but Americans took property from both Nazis and non-Nazis with little apparent discrimination between them. Property owned by Nazis usually went first because it was the best, and comforts were in demand. However, non-Nazis were not immune and routinely had to give up their holdings as well. Resentment was fueled when larger buildings and more furnishings than necessary were lost and vacant rooms were left lighted at night.6 These practices were viewed by the Germans as wasteful. Language was a problem too, and some people on both sides still harbored feelings of hostility. But the majority of Americans continued to associate with Germans as the opportunities allowed.7
The attitude that fraternization, while legal, was to be discouraged did not last long. In January of 1947, a "Theater Troop Information and Orientation Program," which encouraged fraternization as a means of teaching an appreciation for democracy, was unveiled. This new approach called for teaching such subjects as German history, German organizations, and the "correct attitude" to be shown towards Germans. Soldiers were also encouraged to study the German language.  

Just as before the ban was lifted, the most common type of social relationship between Germans and Americans immediately after it was that of the American soldier and his German sweetheart. The male-female relationship seemed to dwindle in numerical significance, however, as the Americans became more settled at their duty stations. In November, 1947, the military government had a survey conducted, by German pollsters, of 3,500 Germans in various areas of the country. Twenty-seven percent of those interviewed had made the acquaintance of Americans since the war. The survey showed that by the time of the poll, a greater percentage of German men than women had met Americans, and that most of the Germans involved were from the upper socio-economic brackets. Table 4 shows the percentages by age, gender, and socio-economic grouping of the Germans who had met Americans. Another interesting piece of information came out of the survey -- twelve percent of those interviewed had been the recipients of gift packages from Americans.
TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE OF GERMANS WHO HAD MET AMERICANS BY NOVEMBER 1947

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Age</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 years and over</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Social Status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that associations had been legalized led to confrontations on the issue of marriages between Germans and Americans. American soldiers, as members of the occupation forces, were theoretically barred by the military from marrying Germans. But the civil authorities in Germany were still empowered to conduct weddings, and by international standards, such marriages were legal. Even if the military punished a soldier who circumvented the rules and married a German, he was still married. The occupation authorities contemplated punishing German officials who performed such marriages, but that would not have made the marriages any less valid. Therefore, in December, 1946, it was announced that American soldiers could marry German citizens if approval was obtained in advance from the military and if the German civil authorities were given the order to perform the ceremony by the military government. At first, only a general officer could approve such a marriage, and then the couple had to wait at least three months. A further stipulation was that any such
marriage could only take place in the soldier’s final month of duty in Germany. In other words, marriages were allowed — but still discouraged.

Prior to the legalization of German-American marriages, some marriages were performed by church officials — even though they were not legally recognized. There is no accurate count of the number of marriages that took place before they were officially sanctioned, but they probably numbered in the dozens, and some took place as early as the summer of 1945. A few couples showed their determination and ingenuity by finding loopholes in the laws. One enterprising soldier saw that the law addressed only soldiers, so he took his discharge in Europe and then legally married his fiancee. Subsequently, the law was expanded to include U.S. civilians, but not before another soldier who had been discharged in America had returned and been married. Evidently some soldiers considered renouncing their citizenship, because in September, 1946, the U.S. Government announced that it would not acknowledge any such renunciation when the circumvention of marriage restrictions was the intent.

After it became legal for Americans to marry Germans, applications began to roll in, and it soon became necessary to grant approval authority to officers of lower rank; it was simply too time-consuming for only generals to handle the applications. Although accurate records do not exist, it was estimated that there were about 3,500 legal German-American marriages by June 30, 1948.

The granting of the right to marriage was one of the first steps in the renewal of German emigration to America, because the wives of American
citizens had certain rights and privileges; these included financial allotments, free transportation to the U.S.A. and entry on a nonquota basis. Emigration from Germany to the U.S.A. had been suspended in 1941. The War Brides Act of December 28, 1945, did not specify that it did not apply to Germans, since marriages to Germans were not yet legal; thus, when the bar was lifted, they too were entitled to some of the same benefits as other war brides. The children of these war brides, whether fathered by Americans or adopted, were also allowed entry into the U.S.A., but not on a nonquota basis.

Contacts between Germans and Americans took many forms. Members of the occupation forces attended church services in the civilian places of worship, and in some areas they were encouraged to do so. It was commonplace for Americans to attend German cultural events, go to German motion picture theaters, and congregate in German beer halls. The beer hall was the favorite gathering place for American soldiers. It was in these establishments that many black-market contacts were made and that rowdy, undisciplined behavior flourished. The standard approach to correcting the problem was to place notorious bars off limits, but the soldiers usually moved elsewhere and picked up where they had left off. The problem was normally not the bar, but the patrons. Large-scale black marketing by Americans was significantly curbed in 1948, when so-called "barter markets" in Frankfurt and Berlin were closed and when the currency reform replaced the cigarette as the standard of value with a solid currency.

As time passed, Germans were allowed in American messes (troop dining
facilities), clubs, theaters, and snack bars. It became standard practice for Germans and Americans to associate with one another socially, but efforts were made to screen out unacceptable Germans wherever functions on post were involved; German girls were not allowed on post without social passes. The social passes were approved by local commanders, and emphasis was placed on trying to induce Germans of a better class to apply for the permits. The girls had to fill out questionnaires and submit to an interrogation. This was one of the first efforts to provide a controlled environment for the purpose of socializing. For a while in late 1946, it was standard policy. During the three-to-four-month period for which records were kept, 4,762 applications for social passes were submitted, and 1,333 were turned down. Those refused were for the following reasons: thirty percent, married with children; twenty percent, politically undesirable; twenty percent, generally bad appearance; ten percent, pregnant; ten percent, police records; and ten percent, false statements on their questionnaires or during interrogation. Eventually, the practice was discarded as mandatory, and it was left to the discretion of the local commander as to whether or not it would be continued. One reason for its discontinuance was that some German girls with good backgrounds chose to avoid Americans because they did not want the passes which were too similar to the permits carried by prostitutes.

Another avenue by which the Germans and Americans were brought together was that of employment. The history of the employment of Germans by the U.S. forces is very similar to that of fraternization. In the early days of the American presence in Germany, it was intended that Germans generally would not be employed by Americans unless the labor was offered
voluntarily and then only if a sufficient number of displaced persons was not available.21 In fact, German civilians were put to work as early as the occupation of Aachen in October, 1944. They served essentially as laborers to repair roads and clean up rubble, but they also worked as nurses' aides and in offices. Due to the absence of skilled people of other nationalities, it was soon deemed necessary to revamp the rules, and in October, 1944, the employment of Germans was authorized to fill 112 skilled and semiskilled trades, 15 clerical and supervisory occupations, and 14 hotel, mess and hospital occupations. Five months later, the list was expanded to include jobs in the welfare services, such as post exchanges. The policy was subsequently interpreted to allow professional, technical, and other skilled positions to be filled by Germans.22

After V-E Day, the number of Germans employed by the U.S. forces shot up. Comprehensive statistics for the entire army of occupation were not kept, but on November 1, 1945, there were 168,000 Germans employed by the U.S. forces in Europe.23

The fact that Germans worked for the Americans brought them into immediate contact with one another, and although the contact was supposed to be minimal, social relationships and black-market connections developed.24 Working for the Americans also meant eating, since provisions had been made to feed German workers one meal a day, and in certain cases up to three meals per day were allowed.25 It did not take long for the American military to earn a reputation as a preferred employer. German prisoners of war who returned from camps in the U.S.A. seemed to be particularly eager to
work for the Americans. It was estimated that about thirty-five percent of all repatriated Germans who had spent time in a prisoner of war camp in America and who returned to the U.S. Zone went to work for the Americans. One returned prisoner who did so explained it.

We had been treated well in America. We had learned some English, and besides, the Americans were just about the only ones hiring. If you did not have a farm or a business to go to, you looked for work with the Americans.  

The position of the American military as a major employer in Germany became a standard feature of the German economy, including the entire spectrum of employment from common laborers to physicians and attorneys. Domestic servants were also hired by the Americans, and it was common for these servants to become closely acquainted with the American families for whom they worked and with whom they lived. During the postwar period, when quarters were built for American families throughout the U.S. Zone, a room for the live-in maid was almost always included.

It has already been mentioned that American soldiers were quick to take up with German children and that the policy of nonfraternization was not expected to be applied where children were concerned. Early contacts were incidental and casual; however, it was not long until American soldiers were actively involved in youth programs, and the U.S. military command was sponsoring German youth clubs throughout the U.S. Zone. Unofficially, there were some efforts by Americans to support German children's groups as early as July of 1945. The situation was officially sanctioned in September of 1945, when the Seventh U.S. Army directed that German youth clubs be formed and that military chaplains, along with other personnel, take part and devote resources to that mission. Shortly after the Seventh Army had taken an official position on the issue, the program was taken out
of the military's hands and given to local youth committees comprised of Germans who had the approval of the military government. This did not, however, mark the end of American involvement, because military units continued to sponsor unofficial activities, such as Christmas parties.

And on April 15, 1946, the military was brought back into the picture. A directive pertaining to the entire theater was issued, stating that sports equipment would be provided to German children and urging military personnel to lend a helping hand in organizing programs. The connection took on new proportions at Christmas time of 1946, when every soldier was encouraged to give presents to German children. By this time the program, which was officially designated the "Program of Army Assistance to German Youth" but routinely referred to as the "GYA" (German Youth Assistance), enjoyed considerable support. In October, each unit (down to company level) had been instructed to assign an officer, or a noncommissioned officer in the case of a company, on a full-time basis to the task of implementing the program. This was the practice in the U.S. Zone; elsewhere, the support continued to be voluntary.

The GYA had its negative side too. Some German parents preferred their children stay home and work or participate in activities organized by Germans. And one famous story tells how soldiers in Nuremberg gave baseball equipment to a group of German boys, told them to be back at 1600 hours, then disappeared with their German girl friends. In 1948, GYA was expanded to bring in support from the U.S. Air Force and the U.S. Navy, and the name was changed to "The Armed Forces Assistance Program to German Youth Activities." But it was still referred to as GYA.29
By the end of 1948, the program was touching the lives of many. In December of that year, 1,689,046 German youths of both sexes were participating. Americans, 9,589 of them, worked in one way or another in the program, as did 3,108 German adults. There were, at that time, 285 German youth centers in operation to accommodate the 1,668 organized youth groups. The GYA program continued under American auspices until the end of the occupation, when it was turned over to the Germans. This American influence undoubtedly contributed to good relations, both at the time and later on, as the Germans who benefited from the program knew from whence the help came. It was not an integral part of the plan for youth reorientation and re-education designed to channel young people away from the kind of thinking found in the earlier Hitlerjugend, but it served much the same purpose.30

When the GYA program, with its personal touch, was coupled with other organized efforts to assist the Germans, such as CARE and the Marshall Plan, it was clear to many Germans who their benefactors were. Throughout the period of the occupation, the Germans received $3,578,900,000 in various forms of economic assistance from the U.S.A. In addition, huge sums of money were spent in Germany by the American forces stationed there.31

To some U.S. authorities, increasing German-American contacts served a political end. It was argued that besides allowing normal human relations to occur, the association of Germans with Americans facilitated the acceptance of democracy in Germany. It was held that the typical American
soldier was the best ambassador of American democracy. Through personal contacts, the Americans were supposedly providing examples of how individual freedom worked for the benefit of the nation as a whole. Germany’s Grundgesetz (Basic Law) was drafted under the aegis of the military government and based on the American interpretation of democracy. What better way to convince the average German of the merits of democracy than to let him see Americans living by its precepts?

These convictions provided a conscious rationale for the founding of German-American clubs and discussion groups. The first of these clubs was the Cosmopolitan Club founded in Bad Kissingen in the U.S. Zone on June 19, 1946. It was specifically dedicated to improving German-American relations and inculcating an appreciation for democratic principles in the German members. Prince Louis Ferdinand and a former colonel in the German air force were among the members. The inclusion of these individuals caused concern in the U.S. War Department that it created an impression of favoritism; therefore, the club was disbanded, in spite of General Lucius Clay’s objections. The only other German-American club at the time was an informal discussion group at the University of Marburg. Since it concerned itself with religious, scientific, and educational subjects and evidently had no controversial members, it was allowed to continue. Towards the end of 1946, the military government instituted other discussion groups made up of American servicemen and Germans. These discussion groups were intended to demonstrate to Germans, through personal contact, the American way of life. In late 1947 and in 1948, German-American Women’s Clubs began to appear. Here, Germans and Americans
shared offices, e.g. American president and German vice-president. These clubs were concerned with repairing and distributing clothing to needy Germans, with cultural exchanges between the two countries, and with various women's problems in Germany. Mrs. Sumner Sewall, the wife of the military governor in Wuerttemberg-Baden, founded one of the more successful women's clubs in Stuttgart. Mrs. Sewall's organization, the Stuttgart American-German Young Women's Progressive Club, had as its avowed purpose, "To share the spirit of democracy with young German women so that they not only can see it in us, but also can live it with us in our homes."36

The re-education and reorientation program alluded to above was another conscious effort to convince Germans that they should embrace democracy. It was intended to condition the thinking of German children through planned associations between them and American children. Beginning in 1948, American parents, along with the teachers and supervisors of the schools for American dependent children, were encouraged to:

promote desirable relationships between American and German children by sponsoring school visits, programs and occasional parties with German children and by recommending that American children make every attempt to play with German children and to invite them into their homes ... It is earnestly desired that all personnel ... foster good will with the German populace. Surely the school is one place to teach democracy in action; Germans are certain to be influenced in their estimation of the American way of life by observing the behavior of our children. All concerned realize that a proper understanding and relationship between German and American families is of fundamental importance in accomplishing the occupation mission.37

All things considered, the first five years of the postwar period were profitable. By 1950, the recovery period was over, and Germany was back on its feet. The immediate postwar obstacles had been successfully negotiated. People were eating again, a viable, democratic government had
been established, Germany was only a step away from being in control of itself again, and the economy was approaching its pre-war production level (it exceeded the 1936 level by about twenty percent in 1950). The foundation for a profitable decade had been laid.

At the grass-roots level, those years comprised an eventful period for German-American relations. On the positive side, interpersonal relations had been free to develop after the initial attempt to restrict contacts had failed. Friendships had been founded between former enemies. Numerous marriages had taken place creating all the attendant familial relationships, and emigration from Germany to America had been reinstituted. The American presence provided food, sustenance, jobs and security to the Germans. The impossible policy of nonfraternization had been turned around, and a more mature policy which not only allowed but encouraged bonds to be forged had taken its place.

Both peoples benefited from the recovery period, but it was not without its low points. The records from the period show that interpersonal relations were punctuated by conflicts and scarred by crimes on both sides; Germans sometimes served Americans poisonous liquor, and Americans frequently raped German women, while nearly everyone dealt in the black market. There were racial problems, diseases, illegitimate children, and abandoned mothers. The Americans were the victors and the Germans the vanquished, but the German vitality was never really broken. The Americans needed the Germans as allies against Russian communism, and the Germans, too, needed the Americans as allies. But more immediately, America was needed for its economic aid. Thus, the two sides mended their fences,
renewed their old family ties, and prepared for a future together. This spirit of cooperation was vividly demonstrated during the Berlin Airlift, when 2,343,301 tons of supplies were flown to Berlin by the Allies to feed and support the entire civilian population of the American, British, and French sectors of Berlin.39
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The Resurrection Of Democracy

Key to recovery was the reestablishment of a political framework to accommodate democratic institutions in all walks of life at all levels. The Americans found competent help in some persons who had experienced the Weimar years, albeit such survivors were relatively few in number. The politics of the Third Reich had, ironically, grown out of a democratic setting. Democracy had lived briefly in Germany during the Weimar period, but its death knell had been sounded by the rise of the National Socialist Party and Hitler's seizure of power. The Nazi reign, which lasted twelve years, came to an end in 1945, and was replaced by the military governments of the Allies.

Originally, the Allies intended their zones of occupation to be administrative districts which would ultimately give way to an all-German government, but they soon had to take on governmental functions. In the West, the Americans ruled their zone through a military government until 1949, when the American, British, and French Zones came under the nominal authority of the newly formed Federal Republic of Germany. At that time, the U.S. Military Government was dissolved, and the U.S. High Commissioner of Germany assumed the responsibility of representing America's interests in Germany. The High Commissioner continued until 1955. In that year, the Federal Republic of Germany became a sovereign state, and the position of High Commissioner was converted to that of U.S. Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany; this arrangement has been in effect ever since.
The U.S. Military Government and the High Commission both bore heavy responsibilities for reintroducing into Germany a democratic form of government, and it was during their times that the political foundation was laid and the basic elements of democratic thinking infused into German thinking.

The Potsdam Declaration of August 2, 1945, stipulated that democratic institutions were to be installed. Article II.A.3. (IV) called for democratization of political life on the national level, and Article II.A.9. stated that changes would be directed at the state and local levels; therefore, it was necessary for responsible authorities to address the entire spectrum of German political life.\(^1\) Denazification was a high priority for the Americans at first; however, they backed away from that soon and emphasized the rebuilding process. The basic principle which directed American actions was that Americans would guide the development of self-responsibility among the Germans and then allow the Germans to take control of their own destiny as early as possible.\(^2\) The guidance provided by the Americans took several forms and was aimed at both individuals and institutions.

A federalist arrangement was considered best. Strong state governments would preclude a strong central government with the potential for reviving authoritarianism. To achieve this decentralized form of government, planners deemed it wise to build from the ground up. In the words of U.S. Secretary of State James F. Byrnes:

In the American Zone, we have placed great emphasis upon the development of a sense of local responsibility and have taken the lead in creating Laender or states so that the people will look to the states and not to a central government on all matters that do not basically require national action. We want to see the federal government of Germany created by the states and not the states created by the central government.\(^3\)
Thus, the steps in the reestablishment of government were: In 1945, the approval of codes for local municipalities (Gemeinden); in 1946, the approval of codes for rural counties (Landkreise) and the larger city-counties (Stadtkreise); in 1946, the approval of constitutions for the states (Laender), a move spearheaded by General Clay; and finally, in 1949, the approval of the Basic Law (Grundgesetz) for the Federal Republic of Germany, the final act in occupation involvement in German politics, except at the top level. The Basic Law was drafted by a Parliamentary Council of sixty-five members elected by the various state parliaments on the basis of one delegate for every 750,000 people. The Council was established in accordance with guidance provided by the London agreement of June 7, 1948, and advice from the American, British and French Military Governors. The Council had twenty-seven Christian Democrats, twenty-seven Social Democrats, five Liberals, and two each from the Communist, German, and Central parties. The document itself and the circumstances surrounding its creation bear several similarities to the U.S. Constitution. Both provide for a democratic system with a federalist structure. Both contain a Bill of Rights which guarantees individual freedoms. Both contain "precise legal norms rather than vague programmatic statements." Both are products of special constitutional conventions. Both were framed by delegates sent by the states rather than elected by the people. Both are products of elite members of society, many of whom were lawyers. Both were written in relative isolation from the general public where conscience rather than political posturing prevailed. And both provide for judicial review of state acts. The American authorities were particularly influential in the drafting and approval process. General Lucius Clay
frequently found himself arbitrating within the circle of military governors. In this role, he was often able to influence decisions. For example, it was General Clay's firmness which overcame German determination to establish a more centralized government. The British Military Governor, General Sir Brian Robertson, was ready to give in to the German position in a crucial meeting with the Parliamentary Council on April 25, 1949, and the French Military Governor, General Pierre Koenig, agreed to do whatever Clay decided. Clay stood fast, and Robertson also then decided to back the demand for decentralization -- the position which subsequently prevailed.

General Clay also had the decisive voice in the matter of how much tax authority the central government would have for the purposes of health, education, and welfare. His precise words were adopted and included in the Basic Law.6

State Constitutions, too, felt the American touch. It was General Clay who urged the drafting of such documents.7 The actual provisions of these constitutions were also directly influenced by the military governor, who insisted they contain a Bill of Rights specifying freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and the right to form political parties.8

The Basic Law had the protection of individual citizens and the states as its main purpose. Its framers were acutely aware of the weaknesses of the Weimar constitution that enabled Hitler to rise to power legally. The authors of the Weimar constitution had failed to recognize that individual liberties could be imperiled under a popular form of government, just as under a monarchy. In retrospect, it was seen that the members of the National Assembly of 1919 were naive because they believed elected representatives would not infringe upon the liberties of the citizenry;
consequently, elected officials were entrusted with extensive powers which ultimately were used to curtail, even eliminate, individual rights. For example, the now infamous Article 48 of the Weimar Republic's constitution allowed the democratically elected President of the Republic to suspend civil rights in an emergency. The Basic Law crafted in the wake of the Third Reich and under the watchful eye of the Western Allies placed no such provision at the disposal of the executive. A look at some of the provisions of the Weimar constitution compared with the Basic Law is instructive. Under the Weimar constitution the Reichstag could pass laws which actually threatened the very existence of the states by changing their borders; or, the President of the Reich could compel the states, through federal military force, to abide by changes to the constitution forged by the Reichstag. The Basic Law, on the other hand, specifies what the federal government can do while leaving any responsibilities not enumerated to the states. Additionally, the states are constitutionally guaranteed the right to have their own constitutions, administrative organizations, educational systems, and church laws. And the Bundesrat, which was conceived to protect the states, is empowered to block any legislation infringing upon states' rights. One of the most significant changes provided for in the Basic Law is the Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht), which exists not only to settle disputes between states or between states and the federation but also to protect private citizens whose rights have been infringed upon by the organs of government, as happened under the Weimar constitution. In some respects, the U.S. Supreme Court served as a model for the Constitutional Court.9

Following approval of the legal foundation of government at each
level, the next step was the introduction of the respective popularly elected representative bodies. Elections for the Gemeinde councils occurred on January 20 and 27, 1946; the Landkreis councils on April 28, 1946; the Stadtkreis councils on May 26, 1946; the Landtag on November 24, and December 1, 1946; and the Bundestag on August 14, 1949. At every step in the entire process, American advice was given, and approval by the U.S. Military Government was required before matters could proceed.

The first type of political activity which took place under American auspices was the appointment of German officials to carry out American directives in newly occupied areas. As a general rule, this was done by summoning local clergymen, school teachers, and a few other citizens and asking them for suggestions for a Bürgermeister or Landrat. American officials questioned the nominees, conducted whatever investigations were feasible, administered political questionnaires, and then made a selection. The new Bürgermeister, or however the administrative chief was titled, then appointed other officials to help him execute the duties of his office. In the case of Zweibrücken, the man selected for the job was Ignaz Roth, a carpenter who was fifty-one years of age. Ignaz Roth was appointed as Oberbürgermeister on March 22, 1945, and the wisdom of his selection is attested to by his tenure; he remained in office until his retirement in 1959. He was, in many ways, typical of officials appointed by the Americans, a local man who had remained apart from National Socialism as much as possible and one who was dedicated to reconstructing his home town. Ignaz Roth's first thoughts were for the welfare of the people. A food rationing system was set up to ensure a fair distribution
of what was available. Water also was a problem, as the city's water lines had been destroyed, along with the gas works and the electrical supply network. As soon as the most critical needs of the citizens had been taken care of, Roth and the people of Zweibruecken began rebuilding the city.

The Americans, who remained in the city only until July 7, 1945, when they turned the city over to the French, disagreed with Roth's intentions to clean up and rebuild; they considered it a futile task, inasmuch as eighty-two percent of the city had been destroyed. Roth persisted and led the city in its reconstruction efforts until his retirement. The French encouraged the rebuilding but gave little material help. The Americans, on the other hand, did much after they returned in the early 1950s; their contributions will be addressed in Chapter 8. The reconstruction work lasted until 1972, when the museum was reopened largely with the help of an American grant.

As soon as the situation stabilized in the U.S. Zone, the matter of political parties arose. U.S. authorities authorized the formation of political parties at the Kreis level on August 27, 1945. However, it was not a blanket approval. Local American officials had final review authority, and they could withdraw permission if the local Germans did not comply with all the stipulated provisions. Each party had to have a sponsor, a German who was identifiable and responsible to the Americans. Sponsors had to fill out Fragebogen and file statements of their party programs and of changes to the programs with the local military government officials. It was also necessary during the early days to obtain approval before party meetings could take place. This was done by filing an application with
the Americans telling them the time, place, and purpose of the proposed meeting and providing a list of the names and addresses of all scheduled speakers. Soliciting funds was permissible, but periodic, sworn statements had to be filed to show their sources and the purposes for which they were spent. Furthermore, all party literature was strictly controlled, and the use of party uniforms, armbands, or emblems was prohibited. If it was determined by the Americans that a political party was violating any of these rules, the permission to operate as a party was withdrawn.12

In order to succeed in a democracy, political parties obviously have to be able to attract votes, and the Americans defined who could and who could not vote in Germany. Nationality was the first requirement. A voter had to be German, and this meant, according to a U.S. directive, that a person had to have been a German national prior to September 1939, and not to have acquired another citizenship in the meantime. The second requirement was that of minimum age; every voter had to be at least twenty-one years old. Both men and women were given the right to vote. And residency requirements could not exceed one year. The right to vote could be denied based on insanity or a criminal record (other than those interpreted as of a political nature under National Socialism). Additionally, persons in a mandatory arrest category (unless already released); Nazi party members whose membership antedated May 1, 1937; active members of the Nazi party who joined after May 1, 1937; officials of the Sturmabteilung, Hitlerjugend, Bund deutscher Maedel, National-sozialistischer deutscher Studentenbund, N-S Dozentenbund, N-S Frauenschaft, N-S Kraftfahrkorps,
N-S Fliegerkorps, and known Nazi sympathizers or collaborators were all barred from voting. The restrictions for Nazi Party affiliation remained in effect during the decade of the fifties for those individuals imprisoned for crimes, but not for those already released.¹³

Although there appeared to be a considerable amount of political apathy, four significant political groupings emerged. The pre-war socialists returned as the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD). The Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union (CDU/CSU) block derived from the former Catholic Center Party. The Free Democratic Party (FDP) developed as the heirs of German liberalism. The fourth group, was the Communist Party of Germany (KPD); it was later banned in 1956, as a threat to democracy.

Not everyone was anxious to become aligned with a political party or movement. In fact, many Germans rejected politics. The world of politics held too many pitfalls; Germany had followed the Nazis and then been made to pay a high price. Who was to say that a new master might not arise later and punish those who participated in the democracy installed by the occupying powers? Furthermore, to be active in politics required time and dedication. Although persons who chose not to become involved in public affairs probably did so for a variety of reasons, it was still disturbing, because citizen participation is the heart of democracy. The reluctance to become actively involved in political matters manifested itself in a movement called ohne mich (without me). The ohne mich movement was at its strongest in the early part of the 1950s, when controversy over
the creation of a new German army was widespread. Those who subscribed to the ohne mich philosophy wanted no responsibility for either politics or rearmament. In 1950 and early 1951, the U.S. High Commission sponsored a survey to determine the extent of such feelings; it revealed that thirty percent of the German men said they would refuse to serve in a new German army. It should be remembered that this was only a few months after the outbreak of the Korean War. Another survey taken a few months earlier in the summer of 1950, showed that sixty-six percent of the Germans were pessimistic about another world war. Thus, even though the majority of Germans feared they might be embroiled in another war, a sizable segment of the male population felt they would not serve in the military. Perhaps this can be explained by the fact that the vast majority of the Germans felt confident that America would come to their aid if they were attacked by the communists.

Detailed American Influence

The American authorities exercised considerable influence at the lower levels of government, especially during the formative stages of the new democracy, a time when denazification and German enforcement of laws consistent with the views of the Western Allies caused far-reaching changes in political, economic, and social structures. By the early 1950s, German government was functioning quite well with American ideas almost unnoticeably incorporated in the overall scheme.

At the hub of the democratization process was the need to gain the
support and participation of the average German citizen. To build the
necessary popular support, Americans urged the formation of citizens'
groups to discuss public questions and seek information on governmental
activities and policies. The Germans responded by founding organizations
which encompassed a broad range of subjects. The existence of these organi-
zations caused the U.S. Military Government and the High Commission to set
up programs to give aid and advice in the following areas.17

1. Citizen participation in government.
2. Local government.
3. The public employee, the citizen, and the state.
4. Civil liberties.
5. Police policy and administration.
6. Political parties and election systems.
7. Legislative organization and practice.
9. Education in political and governmental affairs.

It was believed that German citizens lacked an adequate understanding
of the conception of "citizen." That is, the rightful place of the indivi-
dual in relation to the community and the state was not fully comprehended;
this perception was, of course, based on American standards. German citi-
zens, it was held, had too long been accustomed to authoritarian types of
government and felt as if they were servants of the state, rather than its
masters. To alter this perception, the American Kreis Resident Officers,
America Houses, and other officials and institutions organized forums,
discussion groups, and lecture programs. As German groups developed, the Americans encouraged them to think about such things as government programs, citizen-official relations, and civil liberties. Particular attention was paid to German youth organizations and women's associations. The German Youth Assistance Program (GYA), discussed above, was one avenue used to influence the young. The GYA, with its voluntary nature, casual give-and-take relationships, and openness, contrasted sharply with the disciplinarian Hitlerjugend; it appealed to many young Germans and helped to demonstrate democracy at work at the lowest level.

Consultants were brought from America to help Germans adapt American techniques to German conditions and to demonstrate the practical aspects of citizen participation in government and politics. American media experts worked with local Germans to present governmental and political matters in such a way as to gain public support and get results. Germans were sent to America to observe life in American communities. And informative pamphlets were distributed to group leaders and participants. Pamphlets such as "Let's Hold a Discussion," "Citizens' Organizations and Rules of Order," and "Is Politics your Business?," were adaptations of publications put out by the U.S. League of Women Voters and served to interest German women in their rights as citizens. Another pamphlet entitled "The State and I" discussed the theory of the state and its relation to the citizen. These pamphlets were distributed to hundreds of thousands of Germans.

The four areas of "local government"; "the public employee, the citizen and the state"; "civil liberties"; and "police policy and administration" were seen as having a common denominator, in having an
impact upon the daily life of the citizen. They also represented encounters with or were related to the first area, "citizen participation in government."

To help Germans realize that public problems were citizens' problems and affected each citizen personally, U.S. officials sponsored numerous consultants to work with German groups as well as lecturers to stress the necessity for citizen participation in the democratic process. Among their other efforts, the Americans established schools on local government to orient city council members on their rights and responsibilities. Numerous pamphlets on the facets of local government, e.g. municipal finances, were published, and films were produced as well.21

Combatting the long-standing view in Germany that public officials were superior to citizens was somewhat of a special problem, since it entailed not only educating the citizens as to their rights and the need to demand them but also convincing public officials that they were not superior. Towards these ends, new civil service laws were promulgated in all states in the U.S. Zone, the German Society of Personnel Administrators was founded to improve personnel standards and professional attitudes, and administrative court decisions which reflected the triumph of individual rights over the arbitrariness of public servants were made public. One German statute which generated very little sympathy from Americans made Beamtenbeleidigung (insult of officials) a legal offense. The Germans were urged to cancel it because it gave public servants special protection from criticism. The law went unchanged, but it came to be interpreted rather liberally so that only true insults were punishable.22
Americans considered the German conception of civil liberties to be in dire need of improvement, and authorities set forth some objectives to help rectify the situation. First, it was deemed necessary to engender public understanding and appreciation for the meaning of basic human rights. Second, it was thought appropriate to extend assistance to citizens whose rights were violated by capricious or illegal official action. In addition, Americans urged the Germans to review legislation and regulations and to change those that were repressive.

The objective of increasing understanding and appreciation of human rights was pursued through consultants, lecturers, newspaper articles, radio programs, pamphlets, and films. After the German courts became functional, there was very little the Americans could do to extend assistance to individuals, but Kreis Resident Officers, Land Resident Officers, and other U.S. officials were instructed to be alert to violations and to bring them to the attention of the German authorities. As an indication of how well Germans accepted the idea of civil liberties, active civil liberties groups were formed in cities throughout the Federal Republic; Munich, Frankfurt, Heidelberg, Mannheim, Stuttgart, and Berlin were among them. The various groups were tied together in a League for Citizens' Rights, with their headquarters in Frankfurt. The league published a periodic newspaper, and the Bavarian group reported on arrests, searches, and seizures.23

The recent past had shown how citizens can be victimized by the abuse of police powers. Hence police policy and administration merited close attention. It was a stated goal of the Americans to educate German citizens as to their proper relationship with the police and to organize
the police in such a fashion that the abuse of police powers would not occur again. The first requirement for control, as the Americans saw it, was to decentralize police organizations enough so that communities would have some authority of their own. This was accomplished throughout the U.S. Zone. Concurrently, legal controls over the police were established to restrict arbitrary actions and confine their duties to maintaining public order, preventing crimes, and bringing offenders to justice. Also on the list of American priorities was the objective of freeing the police from political influence, so that they would be free to pursue their rightful duties without fear of political reprisals. As a consequence of the campaign to improve police policy and administration, a number of changes were made. These improvements were not universal; some were widespread while others were localized. Some occurred earlier and some later. But all were attributed to American influence on the German police system.

1. Juveniles were detained by welfare agencies or church homes, rather than in jails or prisons.

2. The incarceration of persons against whom no specific charges were made was prohibited.

3. Policemen lectured elementary school students on the police, problems of law enforcement, crime prevention, and traffic safety.

4. Schoolboy traffic patrols were established at street crossings.

5. Police chiefs visited the U.S. and on their return gave lectures to others on the advantages of the American police system.

6. Policemen started wearing numbered badges.

7. The use of firearms was restricted to cases where life was actually endangered or where it was necessary to prevent escape.

8. Relations with the press were improved.

9. Public participation in crime prevention via cooperation by
community groups was encouraged.

Every available avenue was used to educate the German people. Newspaper articles, pamphlets, radio programs, films, and lecturers were all employed as instruments to make the public aware of its rights and responsibilities. The net result was that citizens came to think of policemen as friends. Policemen themselves felt better integrated into the community. The image of the policeman as a "little god" was gone.24

The remaining major areas of "political parties and election systems," "legislative organization and practice," "education in political and governmental affairs," "federal-state relations," and "public affairs," all involved aid to specialized groups working on subjects of a specific nature.

One major concern for the new republic revolved around the electoral system. The lessons of Weimar indicated it would not do to have too many parties; splintering had led to chaos and contributed to the downfall of the Weimar Republic. Beyond this shortcoming, there was an additional feature which needed changing: voters of the Weimar period voted for parties more than for individuals, since seats were filled from party lists prepared by party committees. The Americans had little or no direct control over the way these problems would be addressed by the Germans, but through visits to the United States by German political leaders, advice of American consultants, articles in newspapers, and commentaries on the radio, the advantages of the American system were widely publicized. Exactly how the American view was accepted is a matter of conjecture, but in the end,
party splintering was dealt with by establishing a "five percent hurdle" (only parties receiving at least five percent of the votes in a given election are entitled to send representatives to the legislature), and it was decided that officials would be selected by both direct-vote and party-list systems.25

Historically, the legislative process in Germany had been, to a great degree, in the hands of the executive branch of the government. It was staffed by professional, long-term civil servants who intentionally cultivated the idea that they were the experts in government -- not the untrained legislators. Moreover, the legislators lacked the staff and reference libraries to draft complex bills. As a result, most legislative enactments originated with cabinet ministers and the bureaucracy and were not necessarily representative of public views. Popular desires were further thwarted by the lack of public hearings on pending legislation. These conditions appeared to the Americans as undesirable; they undermined the concept of separation of powers and denied the citizen a voice in the law-making process. Setting the situation right was not a matter of legislation per se, but rather a problem of execution. The Basic Law and state constitutions contained the right words and provisions, but the means of implementation were lacking. The approach chosen by the Americans to address this difficulty involved four steps. These steps were:

1. Legislative reference services were established.

2. Thirty observers from the Bundestag were sent to the U.S.A. to
visit the U.S. Congress, the Supreme Court, the TVA, and various cities to study congressional organization and procedures, committee work, public hearings, the Library of Congress, and relations between the public and Congress. Similar groups of observers from the Landtag (totally forty-two persons) in the U.S. Zone were sent to study comparable issues at the state level in the U.S.A.

3. Consultants from the Library of Congress came to Germany and assisted the Bundestag and the Landtag in setting up reference services.

4. A public information campaign was carried out to educate the public and governmental agencies on how the legislative process can serve the public interest. Pamphlets, radio, and newspapers were all used in the campaign.26

Concerning federal-state relations the CDU/CSU generally supported federalism while the SPD favored centralism. But on this issue, American, British, and French authorities stood fast. Extensive efforts were made to convince all Germans of the merits of a decentralized system of government, and where persuasion failed authority prevailed: the drafters of the Grundgesetz were specifically given permission to proceed only on the grounds that they provide for a federal state.27 As a result, Article 73 of the Grundgesetz lists the fields in which the federal government has exclusive authority. In Article 70, it is specified that all legislative power not given to the federal government belongs to the state governments.28

The last two major political areas specifically addressed by the U.S. officials were related. "Education in political and governmental affairs"
and "public affairs" were different aspects of the same problem -- educating Germans to grasp the significance of politics to the well-being of the nation. To achieve this, the interdisciplinary study of the social sciences was encouraged at the university level, American specialists discussed issues with German professors and administrators, Germans studied in America, and an Institute of Public Affairs was founded in Frankfurt. This institute was responsible for conducting research and conferences and publishing the findings. The topics covered a wide range of subjects within the social sciences with frequent references to the way things were done in the United States. Representatives of the High Commissioner's office participated actively and contributed to the emerging German view of society and government as Germany recovered from the philosophy of National Socialism.29

There were other areas in which the Americans helped shape German attitudes towards the individual, politics, the community, and government, and together with those cited above, they had a sizable if not always recognizable impact on the average German's life. In the 1950s, Germans saw life in the political realm as not only different but far improved with greater opportunities for personal growth and pursuits. One observer stated it this way:

First of all, the big difference was we had political parties again. Pluralism was back. We were free to speak, and of course the newspapers printed different opinions. We were free to grow, but we felt stability and safety. People were probably happier than they are today, and although food was not as plentiful as now, it was healthier. Capitalism was something we were proud of; we all knew how different it was in the East. We knew what was happening in the rest of the world again. No forced obedience, food and shelter, our own opinions -- that is what it was like, but it was not new. It was new for those born in the 1930s or later, but the rest of us knew it was like Weimar -- but with stability, and naturally some changes.30
Chapter 3
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Economic Overview

The decision to rebuild Germany as an economic power was a conscious one. There had been a certain amount of sentiment for the notion that Germany should not be allowed to develop its heavy industry, for fear of another war. Henry Morgenthau Jr., the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, had been a leading advocate of this idea which would have turned Germany into an agricultural nation, but in the long run, such voices were not dominant. The very fact that the Germans had to be fed, clothed, and sheltered militated against such a plan. As a basically agrarian nation, the Germans would not have been able to provide for themselves, and the Allies could not support Germany forever. Furthermore, the Allied Control Commission had not been able to carry out its plans to administer Germany as an economic unit, as called for at Potsdam. Thus, it was decided that the dismantling of factories in the West should be stopped and the Germans left with the wherewithal to rebuild, to take care of their own needs, and to become a respectable, contributing member of the family of nations. This position was articulated by James F. Byrnes, the U.S. Secretary of State, in Stuttgart on September 6, 1946.

...The basis of the Potsdam Agreement was that, as part of a combined program of demilitarization and reparations, Germany's war potential should be reduced by elimination and removal of her war industries and the reduction and removal of heavy industrial plants. It was contemplated this should be done to the point that Germany would be left with levels of industry capable of maintaining in Germany average European living standards without
assistance from other countries... The conditions which now exist in Germany make it impossible for industrial production to reach the levels which the occupying powers agreed were essential for a minimum German peacetime economy... Germany needs all the food she can produce. Before the war she could not produce enough food for her population. The area of Germany has been reduced...[and] Armies of occupation and displaced persons increase demands while the lack of farm machinery and fertilizer reduce supplies... While Germany must be prepared to share her coal and steel with the liberated countries of Europe dependent upon those supplies, Germany must be enabled to use her skills and her energies to increase her industrial production and to organize the most effective use of her raw materials... Germany must be given a chance to export goods in order to import enough to make her economy self-sustaining. Germany is a part of Europe, and recovery in Europe, and particularly in the states adjoining Germany, will be slow indeed if Germany with her great resources of iron and coal is turned into a poorhouse.¹

Germany's ultimate division left West Germany to grow and prosper under the philosophy stated by Secretary Byrnes, while East Germany's development was stunted by the restrictive policies imposed by the Soviets.

The "Economic Miracle," as the West German economy came to be called, provided unprecedented prosperity for the average West German and enabled the country to become a stalwart partner of the U.S.A. in its ideological competition with the Soviets. The alliance was accepted by the West Germans, and a series of polls conducted by the Allensbach Institute in West Germany during the decade of the fifties reveals some of the reasons why. Over half of the Germans, fifty-eight percent, believed in 1950 that America wanted to prevent Western Europe from becoming communist (sixty-six percent in 1952); and a considerable number of Germans felt that Germany was menaced by Russia. Nothing happened to change their minds either, as at the turn of the decade, sixty-one percent of those polled still felt America wanted to save West Germany and her Western European neighbors from communism. The vast majority of Germans said that, in addition to the
economic differences, freedom was an attribute of life that distinguished the West from life in the East. By 1958, the German perception that America was needed had not waned; sixty-six percent said that, even if all Western European countries stuck together, Americans would still be needed to prevent Eastern domination. And in that same year, an additional reason for German-American alignment was identified when eighty-two percent of the Germans polled indicated they believed the modern Americans descended from Germans.2

The view of the Western Allies, led by America, that Germany should develop its industrial potential, led to jobs, which fed and clothed grateful Germans. An examination of the trade which flourished between Germany and America indicates the interdependence that developed between these two partners, who held both work and capital growth in high esteem. Throughout the decade of the fifties, the U.S.A. was the principal source of imports for West Germany, and only the Netherlands purchased more of Germany's exports than did the U.S.A. During the period 1950 to 1960, West Germans imported goods from the U.S.A. worth 38,389,000,000 German marks and exported to the U.S.A. goods in the value of 21,253,000,000 German marks.3 The U.S.A. was unquestionably West Germany's number one trading partner, and Germans worked because of that trade. These figures are not intended to challenge the idea that America derived at least as much benefit from the trade as did the Germans. But they are evidence of how relations between the two countries served to help Germany recover.

From a grass-roots point of view, the most significant aspect of the "Economic Miracle" was that individuals benefited. For the people, it was
not simply a development with implications at the national level. Germans were working, eating, taking care of themselves, contributing to the world at large, and even saving. As early as 1952, there were 7,404,000,000 German marks in private West German savings accounts. Instead of being a burden to the Western Allies, Germany joined them as a valuable partner.
The People Involved

As a gross indicator of the potential for German-American contacts during the eleven years under consideration, it is helpful to compare the resident population figures in both West Germany as a whole and the city of Zweibruecken with the corresponding numbers for the American forces.

The resident population figures in the Federal Republic and in Zweibruecken for each year under consideration are shown in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Residents in the FRG</th>
<th>Number of Residents in Zweibruecken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>*45,400,000</td>
<td>26,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>*45,400,000</td>
<td>27,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>*45,400,000</td>
<td>28,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>*45,400,000</td>
<td>29,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>49,516,000</td>
<td>30,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>49,995,000</td>
<td>31,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>53,500,000</td>
<td>31,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>53,339,000</td>
<td>32,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>54,373,000</td>
<td>33,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>55,009,000</td>
<td>33,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>55,577,000</td>
<td>33,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1946 Census was carried forward.
The total numbers of Americans in Germany from 1950-1960, as a consequence of the military, are shown in Table 6.5

**TABLE 6**

**U.S. FORCES PERSONNEL IN GERMANY 1950-1960**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mil &amp; Civ Employees</th>
<th>Dependents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>88,706</td>
<td>44,337</td>
<td>133,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>242,235</td>
<td>45,214</td>
<td>287,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>317,500</td>
<td>69,992</td>
<td>387,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>292,143</td>
<td>78,709</td>
<td>370,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>249,693</td>
<td>109,871</td>
<td>359,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>256,818</td>
<td>125,407</td>
<td>382,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>259,572</td>
<td>145,360</td>
<td>404,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>230,955</td>
<td>158,967</td>
<td>389,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>220,337</td>
<td>157,704</td>
<td>378,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>230,631</td>
<td>171,279</td>
<td>401,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>225,694</td>
<td>183,896</td>
<td>409,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The U.S. Military in Germany added to the economic recovery in no mean way by employing Germans and spending large sums of money. The details of employment will be addressed below; the point here is that the employment brought Germans and Americans together in the work place. Every German employee and every American associated with the U.S. forces, who was old enough, had the opportunity to get to know members of the other nationality.

At the beginning of the decade, only a handful of Americans were in
Zweibruecken, but as time passed more Americans were stationed there, more dependents arrived, and more German employees were hired. Table 7 depicts the reconstructed numbers of Americans who lived and worked in Zweibruecken from 1950 to 1960.6

**TABLE 7**

**U.S. FORCES PERSONNEL IN ZWEIBRUECKEN 1950-1960**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
<th>Dependents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>1,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>1,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>2,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>3,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>2,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>2,273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The "Assigned" line reflects the combined total of military personnel and Department of the Army civilians. These figures represent the number of people authorized in the Zweibruecken units. The real numbers undoubtedly varied somewhat from time to time, but since the reported strength figures are no longer in existence, the number of authorized personnel is the closest means of determining the strength for each year. In any event, it is unlikely that the real figures would have varied more than ±
ten percent from what was authorized at any given time; over the span of eleven years, it most certainly would have balanced out. If there is any error, it is probably that more Americans were present, since Zweibruecken was a replacement center temporarily housing a few hundred soldiers on a constant basis throughout the period. The replacements were normally restricted to the caserne for control purposes, but frequently some were given passes for a few hours and ventured into town. The "Dependents" line is based on the ratio of American dependents to military personnel and Department of Defense civilians which existed throughout Germany in the respective years, except for 1950 and 1951, when it is unlikely that dependents lived in Zweibruecken.

Official U.S. Army records show units were assigned in Zweibruecken during 1950. However, it is questionable whether or not soldiers were physically in the city on anything other than a temporary basis until December of 1951, because the Zweibruecken newspaper, Die Rheinpfalz, reported on December 21, 1951, that Americans had arrived only two days before. In light of this contradiction, it is assumed that the movement of units to Zweibruecken was in the planning stages in 1950 and 1951, with Americans coming and going to prepare for the arrival of the main body of troops in December 1951. It is doubtful if any dependents came with the initial units assigned to the town, due to the absence of living quarters. Furthermore, it required a period of weeks or even months to find apartments at that time. If dependents did arrive during the years 1950 and 1951, they were not apparent to the citizens of Zweibruecken.
Since Americans, French, and Canadians were all present in Zweibruecken during the course of the decade, it would be interesting to compare their respective population figures. However, this is not feasible, since none of the three nations ever publicly disclosed their strength figures. It was only possible to arrive at figures for the Americans by virtue of the fact that the author has an American security clearance and was given access to the official U.S. Army histories and was able to get pertinent data declassified. It is neither practical nor within the scope of this study to attempt to reconstruct the French and Canadian population figures. Nevertheless, city officials in Zweibruecken estimated there were about nine hundred French in the city at any given time until 1954, when the count was reduced to about five hundred. As for the Canadians, city officials estimated there were always about twice as many Canadians as Americans in the city.

Employment of Germans

America's influence was felt by all West Germans, whether indirectly through the booming economy or directly through employment by the U.S. forces and through various business dealings with the U.S. forces or their members.

America's role in the reconstruction of Germany often has been demonstrated by citing gross figures for direct aid provided by such programs as CARE ($5,000,000,000), the Marshall Plan $1,346,200,000,1 Government Appropriations for Relief in Occupied Areas (GARIOA) ($5,809,000,000)9 and the Mutual Security Act of October 10, 1951 ($253,000,000).10
But the U.S.A. also contributed significantly to the economic well-being of a great many Germans through the creation of employment. The task of trying to count every dollar contributed to the West German economy by America is an impossible one. Corporations, private businessmen, churches, and tourists were spending money for which there is no way of accounting. But since the U.S. forces represented such a large portion of the total American presence in Germany, a look at the number of Germans who worked for the American military and the amount of money they received can add greatly to our total understanding of how the presence of Americans affected individual Germans.
Table 8 depicts the number of Germans who drew their salaries from the American forces during the years 1950 to 1960, throughout West Germany.\textsuperscript{11}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
\textbf{TABLE 8} \\
\textbf{GERMANS EMPLOYED BY U.S. FORCES IN GERMANY 1950–1960} \\
\hline
1950: & 212,269 \\
1951: & 227,594 \\
1952: & 186,160 \\
1953: & 117,154 \\
1954: & 166,294 \\
1955: & 161,129 \\
1956: & 127,541 \\
1957: & 125,605 \\
1958: & 114,479 \\
1959: & 114,186 \\
1960: & 100,834 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

These statistics take on added importance when viewed alongside figures for Germans employed in major industrial sectors. One example will show how important the U.S. military establishment was as an employer: in 1951, when the U.S forces had 227,594 persons on the official payroll and approximately another 20,000 private workers (not to mention the sizable but unknown number of Germans who were paid from nonappropriated funds), there were only five industries in all of West Germany that employed a larger work force. Table 9 shows the top ten sources of employment in West Germany in 1951.\textsuperscript{12}
TABLE 9
WEST GERMANY'S TOP TEN SOURCES OF EMPLOYMENT
IN 1951

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Group</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Textile Manufacturing</td>
<td>592,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Coal Mining</td>
<td>532,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Machine Manufacturing</td>
<td>513,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Chemical Industry</td>
<td>304,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Electrical Industry</td>
<td>300,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. U.S. Forces</td>
<td>*247,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Garment Industry</td>
<td>222,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Stone and Mineral Industry</td>
<td>220,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Automobile Industry</td>
<td>212,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Woodworking</td>
<td>185,524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Nonappropriated-fund employees not included, but twenty thousand estimated domestic employees are included.

By 1955, the U.S. forces had dropped out of the top ten employment categories, but they were still quite important and ranked in fourteenth place out of forty-seven major sources of jobs in Germany. At the end of the decade, the U.S. forces ranked as the twelfth largest, because by then, nonappropriated-fund employees (41,475 of them) were accounted for in the total of their workers.

German employees of the U.S. forces were paid on scales in line with those prevailing in German industry. Furthermore, union membership, the concept of co-determination, social benefits, vacation
policies, and working hours were all compatible. So the U.S. establishment was a competitive, desirable employer.13

The fact that the U.S. forces and their employees were concentrated mostly in Hessen, Wuerttemberg-Baden, Bayern, Baden, Bremen, and Rheinland-Pfalz made the impact on the economy in those states even more dramatic. In the areas where the U.S. forces were located, they employed more Germans than any single group of industries in 1951 (Table 10).14 In 1955, the U.S. forces represented the sixth largest source of employment in their area of Germany (Table 11).15 By 1960, the U.S. forces were still among the top ten in the states where they employed Germans; in that year, they were the eighth largest employer in the five combined states (Table 12).16

**TABLE 10**

**TOP TEN SOURCES OF EMPLOYMENT IN THE COMBINED STATES OF HESSEN, WUERTTEMBERG-BADEN, BAYERN, BADEN, BREMEN, AND RHEINLAND-PFALZ IN 1951**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Group</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. U.S. Forces</td>
<td>*247,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Textile Manufacturing</td>
<td>246,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Machine Manufacturing</td>
<td>243,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Electrical Industry</td>
<td>172,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chemical Industry</td>
<td>146,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Automobile Industry</td>
<td>141,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stone and Mineral Industry</td>
<td>125,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Garment Industry</td>
<td>95,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Woodworking</td>
<td>92,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Shoe Manufacturing</td>
<td>65,113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Nonappropriated-fund employees not included, but twenty thousand estimated domestic employees are included.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Group</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Machine Manufacturing</td>
<td>380,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Textile Manufacturing</td>
<td>328,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Electrical Industry</td>
<td>303,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Automotive Manufacturing</td>
<td>198,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chemical Industry</td>
<td>181,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. U.S. Forces</td>
<td>*181,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dairy</td>
<td>165,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Stone and Mineral Industry</td>
<td>157,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Garment Industry</td>
<td>145,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Metal Working</td>
<td>135,083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Nonappropriated-fund employees not included but twenty thousand estimated domestic employees are included.
### TABLE 12

**TOP TEN SOURCES OF EMPLOYMENT IN THE COMBINED STATES OF HESSEN, BADEN-WUERTTEMBERG, BAYERN, BREMEN, AND RHEINLAND-PFALZ IN 1960**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Groups</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Machine Manufacturing</td>
<td>504,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Electrical Industry</td>
<td>462,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Textile Manufacturing</td>
<td>335,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Automotive and Airplane Manufacturing</td>
<td>253,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chemical Industry</td>
<td>227,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dairy</td>
<td>190,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Garment Industry</td>
<td>179,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. U.S. Forces</td>
<td>*162,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Precision and Optical Instruments</td>
<td>116,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Shoe Manufacturing</td>
<td>84,485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes 41,475 nonappropriated-fund employees and twenty thousand estimated domestic employees.

Such employment statistics are not available for the city of Zweibruecken for the entire period, but similar statistics were compiled in 1957, and they are complete enough that an understanding of the significance of the Americans as employers in the city can be seen for that year. The grouping of workers into specific employment categories was not done in the same way in Zweibruecken as was done at the state and national levels. Several categories of industrial workers and craftsmen were combined, and together they comprised the number one source of employment.
The U.S. forces stood in fifth place. The rankings for 1957 are depicted in Table 13.

### TABLE 13

**TOP FIVE SOURCES OF EMPLOYMENT IN ZWEIBRUECKEN IN 1957**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Groups</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Industry and Crafts (includes machine</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and shoe manufacturing and construction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Public Employment</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sales, Finance, and Insurance</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Agriculture and Forestry</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. U.S. Forces *</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes an estimated three hundred private employees.

At this point, it is necessary to point to where the money came from to pay the German wages and salaries. During the early phase of the occupation, there was no budgeting for occupation costs paid by the Germans. Whatever was needed was requisitioned locally, and it was up to the local Bürgermeister to pay the bills. Commencing in the 1951 fiscal year, however, the occupation costs paid by the Germans were budgeted at the national level, and thus they were recorded. These funds were spent by the U.S. forces in Germany in support of the occupation effort. Among other things, they were used to pay for the wages and salaries of German employees, care and maintenance of displaced persons, and governmental functions performed by the occupation force. Since the occupation marks were spent in Germany, the Germans contributed to their own recovery. German marks paid by the German government to the Americans and then cycled back into the hands of individual Germans were in the amounts shown in Table 14 below.
TABLE 14

GERMAN MARKS PAID TO THE U.S.A.

FY 1951: 2,470,000,000
FY 1952: 2,760,000,000
FY 1953: 2,760,000,000
FY 1954: 3,179,820,000
FY 1955: 1,479,282,579
FY 1956: 1,022,700,000
FY 1957: 325,000,000

Note that in 1955 the amount of German marks paid to the U.S. forces dropped considerably. At this time, obligatory occupation costs ceased and defense support payments commenced. However, a sizable residual amount remained at the disposal of the U.S. forces, and this residual was spread out over the next two years. The amount dropped considerably again in 1957, when the last of the German marks left over from the occupation were gone. Commencing in 1958, the wages and salaries paid to Germans came entirely from U.S. appropriated funds.

In the city of Zweibruecken, the Americans were barely noticeable in the year 1950. The city was still occupied by the French, but during that year it was decided that one caserne, Kreuzberg Kaserne, would be turned over to the Americans, and the lead elements of three units were assigned there. At various times during the year Americans arrived, and by the end of the year it is possible that close to a hundred Americans were in Zweibruecken. The hiring of Germans also commenced in 1950. In December, 1950, 117 Germans were on the U.S. payroll in Zweibruecken.
Throughout the eleven-year period under consideration, Germans worked for Americans stationed at Kreuzberg Kaserne. The number of employees ranged from 117 to 256. Thus, the U.S. Army was an important employer in Zweibruecken throughout the decade. The recorded yearly figures are shown in Table 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were, of course, over and above the numbers reflected in the tables above, other Germans who derived their livelihood directly from the Americans: throughout West Germany, several thousand more received their pay from nonappropriated-funds. That is, they worked in post exchanges, theaters, recreation centers, officers' clubs, enlisted clubs, service clubs, snack bars, laundries, and various other concessions.
At these concerns, the patrons paid out of their own pockets for what they got, and the proceeds were used to cover the costs of operating the concessions, including salaries. Records for the numbers of nonappropriated-fund employees are not available for the years prior to 1959, but in 1959, there were 34,317; and in 1960, 41,475. An example of how significant such employment was to a given area was highlighted in the *Stars and Stripes* newspaper on July 6, 1955. In the Heidelberg, Mannheim, Karlsruhe area, 3,500 Germans worked in nonappropriated-fund jobs and collectively brought one million German marks into the economy each month. Beyond these, there were another several thousand Germans who worked privately for American families as housekeepers, maids, cooks, gardeners, and nannies. It is estimated that at any given time at least twenty thousand Germans earned a living by working privately for Americans. In Zweibruecken, approximately 150 Germans had private employment in American homes from 1952 to 1954, and from 1954 to 1960 the figure was close to 300.

**Investments Which Benefited Germans**

Many Germans found themselves better off as a consequence of the American presence. The direct employment discussed above benefited some. Others profited through contracting for construction of buildings needed to suit the U.S. forces or for the manufacture of products used by U.S. personnel.

The American forces moved into casernes previously occupied by the German military, but such facilities rarely had houses and apartments to
accommodate the ever-growing number of American families who came to Germany as dependents of the soldiers and civilians who comprised the U.S. forces. To try to meet this need, housing was built by German contractors using German labor, raw materials, and products. In addition to housing for families, other housing had to be constructed for bachelor officers and senior civilians. Schools for dependent children, chapels, signal sites (for communications), and ordnance projects (ammunition storage and maintenance facilities) were other major construction projects required by the Americans.

The construction records for the U.S. forces in Germany are on a fiscal year basis and cover the period July 1, 1950, to September 30, 1960. During this time, 6,183,240,000 German marks were spent on building projects in West Germany.22

The most important period of construction in Zweibruecken was short but intense. Some modification to existing buildings began in 1950, while major construction was done in two phases. The first phase started in September, 1951, and ended in late 1953. The projects are shown in Table 16.23
TABLE 16

U.S. CONSTRUCTION IN ZWEIBRUECKEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Cost in German Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Officers' Quarters</td>
<td>319,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Housing</td>
<td>3,515,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Sites</td>
<td>1,096,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airstrip</td>
<td>*1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordnance Projects</td>
<td>336,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent School</td>
<td>155,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel</td>
<td>126,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Paid for with U.S. funds but occupied by the Canadian Air Force

Essentially the second phase involved only dependent housing; 328 family units were built from 1954 to 1957. The expenditure for this construction can not be documented but it was certainly substantial. Even assuming the same cost per unit that applied in phase one, 13,102,855 German marks would have been involved.

During that same time period, 1954-1957, the total amount of money generated by industry in the Landkreis of Zweibruecken (not just the city) was approximately 500,000,000 German marks. This means that American-sponsored construction represented nearly three percent of the total amount of money generated by industry in Zweibruecken during those four years.24

As in-all cases throughout Germany, the construction, renovation, or rehabilitation of buildings in Zweibrucken were accomplished by German firms
and workers, and according to German specifications. Zweibruecken contractors did the work using local laborers. The effect was that Zweibruecken's streets were swept clean of the unemployed. This was only the second time in Zweibruecken's long history that it had an excess of employment opportunities. The first period occurred during the construction of the West Wall in the late 1930s.

As new buildings were constructed and damaged or sub-standard structures restored, the U.S. forces returned German homes and buildings to German control. Commandeering structures to accommodate the occupation was necessary, but it potentially damaged German-American relations. With the shortage of housing, Germans especially resented American use of apartments. The Statistisches Jahrbuch for 1955 documents the number of German apartments held by the occupation forces from 1952 to 1955, when the occupation officially ended. In the American area in 1952, 38,620 German apartments were held under occupation authority. When the occupation period ended in 1955, this figure had been reduced by 9,915. At that time, 28,705 German apartments were still held, but the return of nearly 10,000 apartments to German control had most certainly reduced one source of friction between the German people and the U.S. forces. A total of 56,230 new apartments had been built in the meantime, but the increasing number of Americans requiring government housing made it impossible to release more units for German occupancy. In Zweibruecken no apartments or buildings were returned, inasmuch as none had been appropriated by the American forces. Eighty-six percent of the city had been destroyed in the war, and
Americans first settled in Zweibruecken in late 1951. By that time, it was not considered wise or appropriate to commandeer German housing, which had been so laboriously reconstructed.

By the end of 1960, in spite of the vigorous construction program, the problem of adequate housing for Americans in Germany still had not been solved. In October of 1960, the U.S. forces in Germany needed 10,041 more sets of family quarters than they had available. This meant that many of those entitled to government quarters still lived in German apartments as private renters. In fact, many Americans had rented privately from German landlords since the late 1940s, since there had never been enough sets of government quarters to fill the needs of those entitled to them. Furthermore, some Americans brought their families to Germany at their own expense, or married German women and then lived in German apartments. This resulted in several thousand Americans paying rent to German landlords. Whenever an American married a German, it was normal for the newly married couple to live with her family, due to the housing shortage. But, it was also normal for the couple to contribute to the household expenses — rent included.

By the end of 1957, over two thousand apartments had been rebuilt in Zweibruecken. This did not solve the problem, however, because at the war's end the city had been short four thousand apartments, and in the meantime a thousand refugees from the east had been added to the population. And, of course, the Americans' needs compounded the problem. Americans were able to pay higher rents than the Germans, and so exorbitant rents were charged. The German landlords frequently used their rental income to build new
houses, and some justified the high rents with the specious argument that
the Americans should pay to rebuild the houses they had destroyed in the
war. In Zweibruecken this rationalization was even less valid than else­
where, since the Canadian Air Force had bombed the city -- not the forces
of the U.S.A.

Procurement (purchases) with appropriated funds was another practice
which injected American money into the German economy and helped make the
people more prosperous -- individually and collectively. As already men­
tioned, during the early phase of the occupation the Americans simply took
what they needed without concern for budgeting or accounting for the value.
But starting with fiscal year 1951, items procured from the German economy
became a matter of record. During the succeeding ten years, procurement by
the U.S. forces from German sources amounted to 95,760,000 German marks.30

Total Monetary Stimulation By The U.S. Forces

All sources considered, the fact that a large number of Americans were
in Germany had a very definite impact on the economic life of West Germany
and its citizens during the period 1950 to 1960. Billions of dollars were
poured into Germany from the U.S.A. by the Americans stationed in the
country and by the military as an institution. The official histories for
the U.S. European Command contain data indicating the total amounts of
money spent by the U.S. military in Germany during the years 1953 through
1960.31
TABLE 17

MONEY SPENT BY THE U.S. MILITARY IN GERMANY

1953–1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>German Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1,024,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>967,680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1,009,680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1,325,940,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1,783,320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>2,290,260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2,879,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2,872,800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accurate yearly figures for the years prior to 1953 cannot be determined from the available records. Accounting procedures were rough, in some cases nonexistent, with expense categories which varied from year to year. However, it was estimated in 1953 that the total contributions from V-E Day to June 30, 1952, amounted to 1,239,000,000 German Marks.32

Perhaps a look at what percentage of West Germany's GNP came from the U.S. military is a better means of assessing the impact on the "Economic Miracle." Using the figures from Table 17 and West Germany's GNP for each year the percentages are as shown in Table 18.33 It is interesting to note that the percentage of the American military's contribution to West Germany's GNP increased over the course of the decade.
TABLE 18

PERCENTAGE OF WEST GERMAN GNP FROM U.S. FORCES

Calculations: \( \frac{\text{U.S. Forces' Spending}}{\text{GNP}} = \% \text{ West German GNP from U.S. Forces} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Spending</th>
<th>GNP</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1,024,800,000</td>
<td>147,700,000,000</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>967,680,000</td>
<td>158,600,000,000</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1,009,680,000</td>
<td>181,400,000,000</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1,325,940,000</td>
<td>200,500,000,000</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1,783,320,000</td>
<td>218,500,000,000</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>2,290,260,000</td>
<td>234,300,000,000</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2,879,200,000</td>
<td>254,900,000,000</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2,872,800,000</td>
<td>302,300,000,000</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The entire amount from 1945 through 1960 is 15,392,680,000 German marks. When this amount is compared with the 5,654,040,000 German marks contributed by the Marshall Plan, its significance is even more obvious.

Thus it can be seen that, when viewed as a single entity, the U.S. military was making a substantial contribution to the West German economy, while at the same time serving as a protector of the country. It should also be noted that a multiplier effect was present. That is, the above figures represent only the "first use" of the money involved. The money was subsequently spent again and again after being put into circulation, thereby making more people wealthier and the end effect even greater.
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Chapter 5
Reconstruction of Education

The Schools

During the period of the Third Reich, the schools in Germany had changed markedly. National Socialist educators made their first move to eliminate democratic thought from the schools by pasting slips over some of the pages of books which conveyed such free ideas. Sometimes the slips bore new passages in line with National Socialist doctrine, but on other occasions, they were simply blank strips of paper. As time passed, however, the offending books were removed from the classrooms and shredded. New books which purveyed Nazi ideology took their place in the German school system. These new books stressed the role of the Hitlerjugend and cultivated nationalistic and militaristic tendencies. Hitler, Goering, Goebbels and other Nazi leaders were idealized. History was twisted to convince students that Germany's development had been perfected under Hitler's guiding hand; among other things, young people were taught that the ancient Greeks had really been Aryans and therefore the racial and intellectual ancestors of the modern Germans. In other words, the books used by the schools in Hitler's Germany were little more than instruments for the politicization of German youth — with little or no regard for humanistic or scientific teaching. The books produced under the auspices of the National Socialists were the products of writers who conformed to Nazi
ideology and who were effectively sealed off from the outside world; there was no chance for the books to reflect any other philosophy.

Even before the war's end, the Allies had decided to democratize Germany, so such books had to be removed from the schools. The decision was further cemented in Allied policy by the Potsdam Declaration which stated, "German education shall be controlled completely to eliminate Nazi and militaristic doctrines and to make possible the successful development of democratic ideas."4

Thus a total purge of all National Socialist literature was required, and replacements had to be provided. This proved to be a very large task, but it was only one of several problems which had to be solved. The schools themselves stood in shambles; in the U.S. Zone, one fifth of the school rooms had been destroyed, and an equal number had been severely damaged. Furthermore, the teachers had to be screened to eliminate Nazis from the classrooms. Beyond the shortage of books, facilities, and teachers, there was insufficient food to provide students and teachers with a diet adequate for academic pursuits, while clothing was similarly in short supply.5

It actually took several years to replace all the books, but enough books were produced early to allow the operation of the schools. The replacement of books was accomplished by looking to a number of different sources. Since the Allies had anticipated the need for new books even before the end of the war, some had been located, printed, and stocked
during the winter and spring of 1944 and 1945. Forty thousand sets of books were produced by reprinting, in Germany, texts dating from the Weimar period and purified versions of some books issued during Hitler's reign. This course of action had the advantage of providing German children with approved books written by Germans and published in Germany. Thus, the Allies protected themselves against accusations that they were importing propaganda. The Americans were particularly careful to support the idea that the Germans had to re-educate themselves based on democratic principles. The books provided were somewhat dated, lacked the latest pedagogical ideas, were printed on poor-quality paper, and were insufficient in numbers, but they helped solve the problem.

In the spring of 1945, 5,328,616 copies of various books were printed in Munich for use in the U.S. Zone, the Bremen enclave, and the U.S. sector of Berlin. The Munich printing consisted of a series of twenty volumes containing eight readers, five arithmetic books, three history texts, and four books on nature study. With this printing, students throughout the American-controlled areas were able to return to their studies, but the books available still fell far short of the total requirements, so the search continued. Additional suitable texts were found in Switzerland and France — and even in Germany, where some usable books had been overlooked in the Nazi campaign to divest German schools of democratically oriented texts. Whenever books which German authorities thought suitable were located, they had to be approved by the U.S. Military Government before being used.
As time passed, new books which met the standards of the American authorities were written in Germany. Each new book had to be approved and licensed for publication. Table 19 indicates the number of books licensed and published in Germany under the control of the U.S. Military Government for use in the U.S. Zone.

TABLE 19
LICENSED TEXTBOOKS PUBLISHED IN GERMANY UNDER U.S. MILITARY GOVERNMENT CONTROL
1945-1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>862,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>5,395,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>12,608,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>14,002,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To accelerate the writing of textbooks, the U.S. Military Government established curriculum and textbook writing centers. These centers provided German writers with American reference works, magazines, newspapers, textbooks, and other research aids. The centers were supervised by Americans, who directed the work of the German writers. Many of the books produced according to American wishes were used in German schools until the middle of the 1960s. One two-volume work on history written in 1952, Damals Und Heute, used in the fifth through the eighth grades in the Volksschulen in Baden-Wuerttemberg, contained the following account of Hitler's invasion of Czechoslovakia:
Hitler's Excesses Started World War II. Hitler had assured the English Foreign Minister: "Germany desires no additional territory. We do not want the Czechs." And what happened? German soldiers occupied Czechoslovakia. The Czechs, Moravians, Bohemians, and Slovaks, were all included. The German people did not feel good about this use of force. The government had broken the Munich agreement. After that, what other country could believe or trust Hitler and his government?^10

And the horrors of Hitler's regime were given the following treatment:

German men and women wanted to overthrow Hitler. [In 1944, Germans were saying] Hitler and his power must go. "He has misused the great industrious German people for objectionable purposes. He has caused millions to be in need and disgraced the state. The secret police (Gestapo) have murdered millions of Jews." They were Hitler's willing tools. At home and in the occupied areas, they herded Jewish men, women, and children into forced-labor camps and tortured them to death. Only a few Germans knew of this horror. Nobody wanted to believe in these atrocities, even though a considerable portion of the German people had already turned privately from Hitler. But there was no free speech, no free press. Whoever spoke openly or preached was put in a concentration camp.\textsuperscript{11}

While this rendition of history offered to the students excuses for the German people, it at least told them of Hitler's criminality and how the Nazi state repressed freedom. Through such lessons the German people were supposed to come to grips with their past. The Americans made certain that a reasonably accurate version of history was included in the books, but oftentimes the teachers did not cover the period of the Third Reich in class. Information was there, but it was up to the students themselves to read it.

The shortage of teachers called for drastic measures as well. The denazification process removed nearly seventy percent of the elementary school teachers in the U.S. Zone; this left only fifty thousand politically acceptable teachers, with the majority of them being close to sixty years
of age. To compensate for this massive loss, teachers were recruited from other professions, and an emergency training program for teachers was initiated. Forty training centers were opened where twenty thousand new teachers had been trained by 1948. This was in addition to those recruited from other professions, who also went through the training program. The training centers concentrated on giving the teachers an appreciation for democratic ideals and teaching them the necessity of inculcating such ideals in German youth.

Another far-reaching change encouraged by the Americans was the reduction of social stratification in the German school system. The U.S. Military Government viewed as undemocratic the practice of allowing students who were favored economically or socially to pursue studies at the university while others were essentially condemned to trade schools or menial careers regardless of ability or inclination. While serving as the Chairman of the U.S. Education Mission to Germany in 1946, George F. Zook, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, sent a report to the Secretary of State which described the break up of the caste system in Germany as "the hardest and the longest of all our responsibilities in Germany, and in the long run the most decisive." The system's fault, according to the U.S. Education Mission was that:

At the end of the fourth grade of elementary school, or about age 10, a small group that is destined for the universities and the professions is set apart in secondary schools which then separate them for advanced work. In practice, the financial or social position of the parents is, to an overwhelming extent, the basis of selection for these secondary schools. The overwhelming majority of pupils, a large proportion of whom deserve university education because of their ability, finish elementary school and then go on to vocational education, their adult potentialities
frustrated by the early and undemocratic division of the educational stream...this system has cultivated attitudes of superiority in one small group and of inferiority in the majority of the members of German society, making possible the submission and lack of self-determination upon which authoritarian leadership has thrived. Such caste distinctions in education, based on money and position rather than on promise of achievement, constitute a violation of the fundamental democratic doctrine of equal opportunity.

To correct this situation, the mission advocated several changes.

The mission recommends for Germany a unified and comprehensive (although not over-centralized) educational system open to all up to the university level; with secondary schools, tuition free, following consecutively after the primary schools, and embracing vocational education.13

Thus, one of the principal changes originally advocated by the Americans was the introduction of a single school system, termed either an Einheitsschule or a Gesamtschule, which would provide all German students the same elementary and high school education. But this change was ultimately rejected.

Returning emigrés and other German educators from the former opposition were willing partners in the effort to reconstruct the school system, but they often disagreed on the extent and nature of reforms. For example, they differed over whether or not to introduce guidance counselors, as recommended by the Americans. Some of the problems arose because many of the educators found their knowledge dated; a decade, more or less, had lapsed since they had last practiced, and they had not kept pace with the state of the art.14 They distrusted radical innovation. On the other hand, some of the Germans had advocated greater democratization of the schools during the pre-Hitler days.15 The educators disagreed about the recommended unitary school organization, and in the end, the traditional
system was retained. This result was influenced by the sheer weight of tradition both in education per se and in society at large. In spite of the democratizing efforts, Germany still had its elites.

When it became obvious to the Americans that German educators intended to retain the tripartite school system, the Americans sought at least to extend the common elementary school from four to six years; at the end of that time, students would decide for either a purely academically oriented high school or some type of vocationally oriented high school. This proposal met with considerable resistance from German educators because they saw it not as a lengthening of the elementary school but rather as a shortening of the time available for gifted students in the academically oriented Gymnasium. The six-year elementary school was accepted only in Schleswig-Holstein, Bremen, Hamburg, West Berlin, and Hesse. The Americans also advanced the idea of extending mandatory, full-time attendance for the academically oriented students from twelve to thirteen years; in this matter they were supported by many German educators. During the Third Reich, the period of mandatory attendance for such students had been shortened from thirteen to twelve; thus, the change constituted a restoration of the Weimar standard. In the end, as far as school organization was concerned, all West German schools, except those in West Berlin, reverted to the Weimar practice of four years of elementary school followed by either nine years of academically oriented high school or some type of shorter, vocationally oriented school. In any event, it became necessary for most students to go to school on a full-time basis for nine years — as opposed to eight years as required under the Third Reich.

The U.S. Education Mission also suggested that a program be set up to
allow German students and teachers to travel to America to study and observe democratic principles in practice. The mission stated that young Germans should be encouraged to participate in group activities, largely self-directed, and that Germans should have expanded opportunities to study and discuss social, economic, and political affairs through adult education programs. The goal of having German students study in America was facilitated by the advent of the Fulbright Scholarship program. This program, which was enthusiastically received in Germany, involved over thirty thousand students and had a very large impact on German views of the U.S.A. and the American version of democracy. Study in the United States conditioned people, many of whom were later to be influential, to think in American terms or along American lines. Fulbright scholars subsequently returned to Germany and taught others who in turn taught still others; thus, the effect of American education on the Germans was multiplied.21

The U.S. Education Mission provided neither the first nor the last report on what America should do to reform the German school system. The findings of numerous American educators were printed in various journals, magazines, and newspapers, but the Mission presented basically the same themes found elsewhere. These views were accepted by the American authorities, and changes were pursued on the basis of them.

The U.S. Military Government sought to remain true to the essential procedures for educational reform which evolved as a consequence of such early analysis. In 1950, the Office of the U.S. High Commissioner reaffirmed America's commitment to the philosophy of democratization in
"A Guide to Education and Cultural Relations":

1. The only certain method of establishing a society based on the democratic ideal is to avoid terms which can be misunderstood, and by practice, precept, and demonstration lead the German people to accept this ideal.

2. The true reorientation of the German people will come from within. It will be spiritual and moral. The types of school organization or structure, for example, are of less importance to the future of Germany and the world than what is taught, how it is taught, and by whom it is taught. Reforms imposed from without are temporary and lead to a return to previous practices.

3. The solution to the so-called German problem will be more readily attained when we recognize that it is a European and, in many ways, a world problem - one of moral disorientation in an era of profound social change.

4. It will not be the purpose of Military Government to superimpose an American system of education on the German people. It is our purpose to influence the German people to an understanding that the education of children and youth should be so organized and developed that:

   a. Each individual regardless of race, class, creed or economic status shall have equal access to education;

   b. Each individual shall be allowed to pursue that form or type of educational opportunity for which he is endowed;

   c. Each individual shall be so educated as to enable him to make his maximum contribution toward the maintenance of world peace and international understanding, law and order, and the development of social justice.

5. Provision for the training of a corps of democratically minded teachers and leaders is of primary necessity.

6. Effective and durable educational reform will come in Germany when the people recognize, and those who speak for the people realize, that free institutions and the natural rights of man can best be perpetuated through an educational system which places major emphasis upon the development of moral responsibility, education for freedom, and education for responsible citizenship.
7. Education for responsible citizenship involves not only the basic knowledge of the history of the past, but also the knowledge of how to act intelligently and independently in the solution of contemporary problems. It involves not only book knowledge but the opportunity to learn how to protect freedom by experiencing freedom in school organizations, in the free flow of ideas, and in the capacity and courage of the individual to make decisions.

8. We must not be guilty of attempting to develop the ideal, but must concentrate our efforts and resources on changes which have meaning to the Germans and which are possible to realize within the not-too-distant future.

9. The redirection of the goals, programs, or policies of social institutions must grow from the German people. Wide citizen participation in community planning, in the discussion of community problems, and in the formulation of public policy is one guarantee that no single individual again can dominate their thinking and living.22

The American intention, as stated here, was virtually to rebuild the German school system along American lines with Germans carrying out the work but with Americans making the decisions on policy.23 This had the advantages of giving the Germans a measure of responsibility for their own development and making minimal personnel demands on the U.S.A. The reforms were intended to affect every level of education with the greatest influence being exercised at the lower levels. The reform measures were intended to make the school system more democratic. The desired degree of success was never achieved due to ingrained German resistance based on faith in traditional education.24 Nevertheless, the existing evidence indicates that some progress was achieved. The elementary school system was later judged to be thoroughly democratic.25 Moreover, a measure of democratization can be seen if the number of university students from wage-earning families shortly after the war is compared with those a generation later. In 1952, only four percent of German university
students came from the wage-earning classes. By 1979, that figure had grown to seventeen percent.26

Early in the decade of the fifties, a British publication, the International Yearbook of Education, featured an assessment of the changes that had been wrought throughout Western Germany's school system. The assessment was submitted to the XIV International Conference on Public Education by Mr. E. Loeffler, a delegate from West Germany. Mr. Loeffler reported that, "Sole responsibility for the legislation and administration of schools and universities is in the hands of the various states (Laender) composing the German Federal Republic." This meant that the Allied goal of decentralizing the control of schools had been accomplished. The goal of decentralization had been articulated in the Aide-Memoire of November 22, 1948, which advised the Parliamentary Council of Allied preferences with respect to the Basic Law. In addition, Mr. Loeffler indicated in his assessment that, "most schools and universities have been reorganized at the request of the occupation authorities." It should be noted that every Kreis had an American Resident Officer who oversaw the schools.27 The assessment claimed that among the reforms accomplished were:

1. Foreign language instruction commenced in the primary school.

This statement was somewhat misleading; at the time, primary schools in some states had been extended to six years; however, students were not learning foreign languages any earlier in life. Nevertheless, emphasis had changed. Before the war, French had been the leading foreign language in German schools, but after 1945, English replaced French as the first foreign language. It was taught in the fifth year of school as an elective in some institutions, while in others it was mandatory.28
2. Mandatory attendance in primary schools had been extended to eight
or nine years with a minimum of two or three years of part-time study
beyond that. The length of full-time study has already been addressed
above, but it can be added that, in actuality, German students had long been
required to attend school on a full-time basis for eight years, although
this rule had not been enforced very well during the Hitler years since
members of the Hitler Youth had often been excused from classes so that
they could tend to their duties in that youth group. But the ninth year of
mandatory full-time study was a real change.29

3. All primary school teachers had to be at least enrolled in a uni­
versity, or to have passed an equivalent exam. The National Socialists had
reduced training for elementary school teachers to only two years beyond
the eight-year elementary school, with one of those two years spent in a
student-teacher capacity. During the Weimar years, elementary school
teachers had been required to have studied at least four semesters at a
Paedagogische Akademie. So although this postwar reform represented an
improvement over the Nazi standards, it did not restore the Weimar
standard. In reality, newly graduated teachers were either approaching the
old, higher standard or exceeding it, as was the case at the Pedagogical
Institute of the University of Hamburg.30

4. Special instructorships and academies had been established to
train teachers on the problems of democratic education and to familiarize
them with advances in science and teaching.

5. Positions for school psychologists had been created in several
towns, and instruction in psychology and educational guidance established.
The credit for change implied here was considerably overstated at the time. School psychologists and guidance counselors did indeed become standard features in German schools -- but not until the 1960s. When they were added, however, the addition was attributed to American influence.

6. Exchange programs for students had been set up between West Germany and the United Kingdom, France, the U.S.A., and Sweden.

7. Education was free in all states for primary and vocational schools. In many schools, all education, materials, and texts were free.

8. Adult education programs, the Volkshochschulen, had increased considerably both the variety and number of courses.

Beyond these advances, parent-teachers' associations had been founded, elected school boards had been introduced, schools had been rebuilt, libraries had been added, and slides, maps, and other teaching aids had been provided. Subject matter, too, was influenced by the Americans. The most important reform in curriculum content was the introduction of social studies, defined as those subjects which deal with the problem of men living together in society. Although the subjects of history, geography, and civics had long been taught in German schools, the concept of social studies as known in America was first added to the curriculum in Germany in 1947, at American insistence. Social studies was such a novel idea that German educators could not agree on what to call it or where to place it in the curriculum; it was variously termed: Politische Gemeinschaftskunde, Politische Bildung, Gemeinschaftskunde, Sozialkunde, and Politische Bildung und Erziehung. Under the rubric of "social studies," German educators were instructed to make certain that students learned about the Third Reich.
For the first several years after the war, teachers were reluctant to discuss the the atrocities of the Hitler regime; accounts were printed in the text books, but discussions were limited or nonexistent. Inquiring students were faced with the problem of either not getting a correct answer or being put off. To correct this situation, the Laender passed legislation which specified that the period of the Third Reich had to be covered in the classroom.

How the school books were changed at the direction of the Allies has already been addressed, but it is important to point out that the impetus which originated during the time of the occupation carried forward, and by 1962 a number of books and other publications which treated the period of National Socialism in a frank manner were in use in German schools. For example, in 1961, the city council of Frankfurt published a brochure for Frankfurt schools which contained the following indictment:

With tiresome regularity in conversations about concentration camps and Jewish persecutions one hears the assertion, "But I knew nothing about it." ... This is an absurd statement. Hundreds of thousands of Germans were involved, directly and indirectly. ... We will concede to our most naive fellow-citizens that they knew nothing of this before 1933. ... But after the pogrom of November 1938 we can make this concession only to the weakminded. For in all of Germany the synagogues were burning, one waded in blood and debris, and even in the smallest villages one heard the cry of the persecuted and the tortured. ... Everyone who lived in Germany at that time must have seen this or heard of it ... let us not, I beg you, quibble whether it was really six million Jews who were murdered. ... Consider rather that a single murder sanctioned by the state puts the right of that state to exist in question.

The universities, too, felt the impact of America's guiding hand, but the reforms in higher education were less extensive than at the lower levels.
At the beginning of the occupation, the Americans viewed the German institutions of higher learning as breeding grounds for fascism. Re-education was seen as necessary, but just as elsewhere, the Germans were supposed to carry out the reforms based on general guidelines provided by the Americans. However, the guidelines were so broad that the Germans were left with a great deal of latitude, questions, and problems. The Americans never set detailed rules for reform of higher education because they hoped for a four-power agreement which would establish uniformity in a democratically oriented system. The Americans, however, did stress the release of personnel with a Nazi past and the purging of books; German educators agreed to these two measures, but they insisted on retaining the traditional forms of organization. When the institutions reopened, they had too few books, facilities, and teachers. The teacher problem was the most important since training time was so much longer than that required to replace books or facilities. The Americans had originally divided teachers and administrators into three categories and put them on black, gray, or white lists according to their previous degree of affiliation with National Socialism. Those on the black list were absolutely prohibited from employment. Those on the gray list could be employed if investigated and cleared. And those on the white list were accepted without further questioning. However, the teacher shortage proved to be too great, and more and more people who had been banned were reinstated. It has been estimated that by the middle of the 1950s, nearly all of the personnel banned earlier had been rehired. Nazi books were taken out of the university libraries and classrooms just as in the rest of the educational system, and new books were provided. Some of those books were still on the
shelves of university libraries in 1983.\textsuperscript{40}

To ensure that the universities complied with the Allied dictum that democratization would take place, an American University Officer was placed in each university.

The universities went one step further than the other schools in that they used American professors to augment their own faculties, particularly in the social sciences. This was an exception to the American policy that American teachers would not be used in German classrooms.\textsuperscript{41}

It is also worth noting that university students had to contribute labor to the reconstruction of the buildings. Each student was expected to work for a given period of time, usually about two hours each school day. This work was done without pay.

Other Re-educational Programs

The United States did not limit its efforts to the U.S. Zone alone. In order to assist on a broader scale, a Special Projects Program was inaugurated; it used GARIOA (Government Aid and Relief in Occupied Areas) funds, and reached into every state and the city of Berlin. This program increased the welfare, health, education, and general democratization of the people of West Germany. Schools, libraries, universities, youth and community centers, youth hostels, health centers, welfare institutions, and cultural centers all benefited — and so did their patrons. By February of 1952, when the U.S. High Commissioner reported on the extent of the Special
Projects Program, 52,710,857 German marks had been contributed. Without the U.S. sponsorship, many of the facilities would not have been built, and the effectiveness of all the others would have been greatly reduced. The facilities and institutions which benefited from the Special Projects Program contributed to the growth of democracy and the acceptance of America as a role model for a widespread segment of the German population.

In order to reach people who might not otherwise have heard the message of democracy, the U.S. authorities developed the Audio-Visual Educational Program; this was intended to provide large numbers of Germans in rural areas with the opportunity to gain a new insight into the democratic world. Traveling discussion leaders armed with projectors and films met with Germans in schools, restaurants, and churches and introduced them to democratic ideas. Records were kept which show that from April 1, 1948, to March 31, 1950, 23,579,607 Germans attended these film and discussion sessions.

As an adjunct to school reform, educational radio was reintroduced in Germany. It had been used earlier during the Weimar period with some success, and Hitler had used radio rather successfully to spread propaganda. The reintroduction came shortly after the end of the war in order to help compensate for the shortage of teachers, classrooms, and books. U.S. consultants came to Germany at the invitation of the military government and assisted German radio and education specialists in putting the program together. Certainly, there were German experts, but they were tainted by their Nazi past. During the early 1950s, about sixty percent of all the schools in the U.S. Zone used radio programs in their classrooms on a
regular basis. Five radio stations in the U.S.-occupied area broadcast education programs totaling over 160 hours per month. Many of the radios used in the classrooms were donated by Americans. The military government, for example, purchased one thousand sets from a German manufacturer and donated them to the German schools.44

The school reform was never intended to stand alone; it was not an end in itself. The revised school system was intended to facilitate industrial prosperity and social solidarity in a democratic context. To complement the formal educational system, several other social institutions were revamped or introduced to reorient the Germans. Youth activities (such as those already mentioned), exchange programs, libraries, and trade unions were all instruments for education.

Youth activities were perceived by the American authorities as being particularly important because, if properly supervised, they would teach young people to accept the duties and responsibilities of citizenship; ironically this was the same basic philosophy that had guided the National Socialists. In addition to the help and guidance given through the German Youth Activities Program discussed above, the U.S. occupation forces also sponsored leadership training schools for German youths. Five of these schools were operational by 1950, and 10,740 young Germans had been trained in the principles of group organization and leadership. Besides these schools, the U.S. authorities also sponsored 130 youth hostels and summer camping programs that saw 435,000 young Germans take part.45
Through the exchange programs, American experts on a wide variety of subjects came to Germany, and Germans (in search of American methods) went to America. Thousands of persons traveled back and forth between the two countries, observing, teaching, learning, and evaluating. The military government actively supported the exchange of persons, having been given the charter to do so on July 11, 1947, when the U.S. State, War, and Navy Departments sent to General Clay the following directive.

In furtherance of the programs of the reorientation of the German people and the revival of international cultural relations, you will permit and assist the travel into and out of Germany of persons useful for this program within the availability of your facilities. You will also permit and assist to the extent of your facilities, the free flow of cultural materials to and from Germany.46

The first academic group went to the U.S.A. in September, 1948. This was a group of students who went there to study for one year. Professional people, technicians, businessmen, religious leaders, trade unionists, and leaders in women's organizations (to name a few) followed. The program was turned over to the State Department in 1950, and concurrent with the transfer from the U.S. Military Government to the State Department, an evaluation of the program was made. The evaluation concluded that the German participants had done, and would continue to do, a great deal of good once back in Germany. German exchangees returned to their home towns prepared to improve human relations, add to an active community life, support self-government, and cope with individual responsibilities.47

However, there was usually an element of caution involved, as the following example illustrates. One representative exchange visit of a group of German educators was reported in Social Education in 1950. The
account tells how the German teachers were impressed with, "the informality and friendliness of the classroom procedures — the degree to which democracy is actually practiced..." They were puzzled by the way in which teachers and students discussed issues without the students being told what to believe. According to their American hosts, "The concept of initiating the student's thinking but letting him reach his own conclusion had not before occurred to our guests." The lessons were evidently valuable, as the Germans stated they intended to put them into practice once back home. However, they cautioned their hosts, "We must work slowly and quietly; we must not attempt to Americanize German schools, but must adapt American methods to meet German needs." This was a way of pointing out that the Germans, once given the tools and the opportunity, were capable of reforming themselves. It also reflected the fact that the importation of cut-and-dried remedies was likely to breed resentment.48

The exchange of persons was important enough that a Fulbright Lecturer in Germany, Dr. Thomas N. Bonner, was able to describe it in glowing terms in 1957:

No other investment of American money abroad has paid such high dividends in understanding as the interchange of American students, teachers and research specialists with their counterparts in other lands.49

The America Houses

One of the means of re-educating the Germans most familiar to the public was the system of America Houses that made information on American culture and democratic life readily available to millions of Germans. Each house had an American cultural adviser as its director and a German staff.
The basic feature in each house's operation was the library. Here Germans could avail themselves of American encyclopedias, dictionaries, and other reference works. Each library also had a collection of books on the various aspects of American and Western European culture; this usually included many of the books banned by the Third Reich. Most works were in English, but translations in German of American literary works were provided. About twenty percent of the available books were in German. In 1951, when the program was in its heyday, there were twenty-seven U.S. Information Centers (America Houses) distributed throughout Germany, each with its own central library, and 135 branch libraries or, as they were commonly called, "American Reading Rooms." Collectively, these facilities were serving over one million patrons per month. In addition to books, they featured lectures, music programs, exhibits, films, theatrical productions, and discussion groups. The activities were designed to stimulate knowledge and understanding of and sympathy with American democratic ideals and cultural patterns. In 1952, an America House was established in Kaiserslautern. It served the Zweibruecken area as well.

The Kaiserslautern House is credited by the people of Zweibruecken with having done a great deal to enhance mutual understanding. It served the German community which housed the largest concentration of Americans in Europe, although in the French Zone, and the types of questions regularly referred to it indicated that the Germans were interested in knowing more about their guests. Questions on American government, American personalities, American homes, and American life and society were among the most common. The library in the Kaiserslautern America House contained
12,907 volumes in 1959, mostly books on the social sciences, useful arts, fine arts and recreation, ancient and modern history, and fiction. The house featured all of the educational and cultural advantages of the America House program, and articles on it appeared periodically in the Zweibruecken newspapers.

It seems that the people of Zweibruecken took advantage of the America House itself only occasionally, due to the fact that it was about a forty-mile round-trip from Zweibruecken. However, the America House frequently brought programs to the people of Zweibruecken. The Volkshochschule in Zweibruecken worked with the America House to bring lectures, films, and concerts to Zweibruecken. From 1953 until 1960, events on such subjects as "The History and Development of American Literature," "A trip through the U.S.A.," "City Planning in America," "The American Satellite Project," and "Readings from Thomas Wolfe" were featured in Zweibruecken. The Bibliotheca Bipontina (library in Zweibruecken) also worked with the America House to inform the people of Zweibruecken on famous German-Americans.51

The America Houses were patronized by Germans of all classes and walks of life. In May of 1960, the U.S. Information Service produced a special report which revealed information on the nature of visitors to the America House libraries. The report, "The America House Libraries: Who are the readers? What do they read? How well are they served?" was based on a three-month survey of six libraries in late 1959.52 Table 20 shows the professions of those visitors who borrowed books.
Even though the libraries filled a vital need, the books were not always warmly received. The managers sometimes had to cope with indignant readers. Regardless of how much care they exercised to keep out books which contained offensive, name-calling, some slipped through, and occasionally German readers were insulted by uncomplimentary references to Germans. But perhaps even more surprising to German patrons was the fact that the libraries even offered materials critical of the United States. The American libraries in Bavaria addressed both types of problems by posting in the libraries a disclaimer of sorts. Visitors to the libraries were advised that:

If a book is critical of us, our beliefs, our customs, or the beliefs or customs of other peoples...[it] does not mean that we are ignorant of its contents, or indifferent....The people of the U.S. who support this library believe that only when authors may freely write and readers may freely read, can all acquire the
background and develop the understanding necessary to an intelligent, mature, and constructive approach to the problems of the work and its people.53

Nor were the people in outlying areas neglected. The larger libraries operated mobile libraries by loading books on trucks and taking them to readers who otherwise would not have had access to them.

Germans used the libraries on their own initiative or as the result of having been introduced to them through schools, civic, social, or cultural organizations. Specialized bibliographies were often compiled and sent to doctors, housing officials, members of the press, and other interested persons. Universities, too, took advantage of the services offered by these libraries. The office of the U.S. High Commissioner reported in 1950 that, "Collections of scientific, historical, and literary works are placed on loan to the many universities which have been handicapped by a critical shortage of these publications." Many struggling German students used these books at no cost. The availability alone was often significant, and the fact that they were free made them even more valuable to students who were striving hard for enough money even to eat.

Another feature of the America Houses which cultivated good feelings among the Germans was the emphasis on young people. The larger houses had children's rooms, films, and libraries. It was not uncommon for German schools to pay visits to the America Houses or to ask for help in supplementing their classes with films or lectures. And the houses regularly sponsored English conversation classes for both children and adults.

The America Houses had programs for women also. They conducted
special "Women's Hours," supported women's organizations with organizational help and meeting rooms and actively encouraged German-American Women's Clubs, Parent-Teachers' Associations, and parents' meetings.54

The American authorities believed that contact with American culture through the America Houses increased America's prestige in the eyes of the Germans. And indeed, next to travel to the U.S.A. itself, the America Houses provided Germans with the best opportunity to understand American culture and tradition. Besides literature, American art exhibits and musical programs were media through which Germans were taught that America is not a cultural wasteland. In these institutions, literally millions of Germans, male and female, young and old, from all walks of life came into contact with "America," and many were stimulated enough by the experience to return again and again or at least to be more open to the ideas of democracy and the merits of capitalism. On the other hand, some persons undoubtedly looked upon the America Houses as nothing more than another feature of the foreign occupation worthy of only a minor amount of curiosity. In late 1954, about half of the Germans in the West knew about the America Houses, and of those who were aware, eighty-four percent could give specific information on what the America houses offered.55

As an indication of how valuable the Germans considered the America Houses to be, in June, 1951, when the German press began to report that America was planning on reducing the size of the program, people throughout Germany protested vigorously. The U.S. High Commissioner reported receiving many letters "stressing the immense value and importance of the America House" to the respective communities. An expansion rather than a
reduction was requested, and the U.S. officials in the different states similarly reported a public outcry of objection to the proposed cut-back on information from America. Nevertheless, the program was adjusted. Many of the reading rooms were turned over to the Germans or phased out, while a number of houses were converted to German-American Institutes, moved or closed. Some new ones were also opened, as the entire program was in a state of flux for several years.

On February 22, 1952, the Minister President of North Rhine-Westphalia, Karl Arnold, described the importance of the opening of the new America House in Essen in terms which echoed the sentiments of those who had voiced objection to the announced reduction a few months earlier:

Thanks to this America House and the media through which information will be put at our disposal, we shall no longer be obliged to see the world through the eyes of foreign observers, but will be enabled to judge many aspects of world problems for ourselves. Here, American literature, American science, American music and American culture are made directly accessible to us, and documentary films will give us an impressive idea of the New World, its people and its activities. This House shall be a meeting place where ideas can be exchanged freely; it will show us the way to form opinions of our own, free from compromise of any kind.

During the same opening ceremony, Mr. Christian Fette, head of the German Trade Union Federation, stated that the house would "give its German visitors a view of the democratic way of life." He went on to say that it "will be of great importance to the growth of democracy in our country." 56

Twenty-six years later, from an historical perspective, similar accolades were still being heaped upon the America Houses by public officials. In December, 1978, Reinhold Zundel, the Lord Mayor of Heidelberg, penned
The city of Heidelberg has more than thirty years of good experience with the German-American Institute our "America House." In both quiet and less quiet times, the institute has served as an international meeting place. The transition to a German-American Institute has provided for special consideration of reciprocity and mutuality. It will always be a special concern that the German-American Institute remains as a forum for German-American friendship, and for the deepening and broadening of the understanding between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Re-education through the Trade Unions

The trade unions entered into the schooling process by developing their own programs for vocational education, influencing persons to participate in more academic programs, and teaching the people to think in union terms. Adult trade schools were established in conjunction with industrial firms and the Volkshochschulen. The union schools provided courses in commerce and specific occupational subjects to fill the needs of industry. They also trained their own officials and shop stewards. Workers were enrolled in the Volkshochschulen in classes of a general educational or cultural nature at the urging of the unions. German language and literature; politics; sociology; and the history, aims, and methods of trade unionism were the more popular subjects. The unions were even represented on local and zonal Volkshochschulen committees, to make certain that the workers' needs were met. Unions took little interest in the efforts to restructure the schools along more democratic lines and, consistent with the attitudes of the working class, subscribed to the
philosophy of Bildungsabstinenz (educational abstinence). They demonstrated this philosophy largely through indifference. The tripartite structure seemed appropriate since the acquisition of trade skills represented tangible achievement and security. Efforts to convince German labor leaders otherwise met with the argument that attendance at the Gymnasium would only lead people to migrate from the working class and thus deprive the unions of leaders. However, in 1948, the Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund (German Trade Union Federation), commonly known as the DGB, announced it supported advanced technical training. In 1958, the DGB still sponsored such training because it strengthened the economy but kept people in their original social position.58

Trade unions were first authorized on December 24, 1945, and local organizations started to take root, but collective bargaining for wages was not allowed until May, 1948. By advocating the rights of the individual, something they were forced to do if they were going to survive as local entities, the unions did much to further democracy. According to Current Affairs in 1950, "They provide the only mass school for democracy in action that is to be found in the Federal Republic."59

The Volkshochschulen introduced the worker-student to democratic ideas; this was totally in line with the desires of the Americans, but the influence of the unions was seriously questioned and unions were reintroduced with caution. In the beginning, the U.S. Military Government prohibited national unions and permitted local unions to function only after permission was granted to form them on a case-by-case basis. It was feared that the unions might become dominated by communists, and that once
formed, they might try to break away from the democratic course charted for the German people. Such reasoning may not have been sound, but there was genuine concern for the growth of democracy, and the military government was not inclined to take what was seen as unnecessary chances. The goal of uniting Germany played a role also. General Clay took the position that until all four zones were economically united, a national union was simply out of the question.

The earliest attempts to organize German workers were disapproved because the U.S. Military Government felt that they were being organized from the top down. This indicated they would be large, centrally managed unions and thus carry many of the same threats to the democratization process as national unions. The Americans wanted unions to "grow up" from the desires and needs of the workers rather than start off as large bodies capable of directing the actions of the workers toward the goals of a central committee. On the other hand, some Germans saw the immediate organization of large unions as necessary to forestall trade-union rivalries, as had occurred during the Weimar period. The advocates of large unions argued further that organized labor would do more to rebuild the economy than would small, impotent unions.

Americans were indeed cautious about unions, but they recognized a need for organized labor and agreed to Article 9 of the Basic Law which states, "The right to form associations to safeguard and improve working and economic conditions is guaranteed to everyone and to all trades and
professions." The Basic Law also guarantees "free development of personality." With respect to the latter, German labor leaders reasoned the worker had to be more than a component in a production process managed exclusively by capital interests. In other words, German labor leaders were guarding against the "industrialization of the soul." The legally established rights to organize and develop the personality furthered the Germans' tendency towards collectivism, and the unions along with an associated institution, the works council, ultimately gave German workers a sizable say in the economics and social development of the country. The works council dates from the Soviet movement after World War I, and, as an institution with communist origins, it was viewed by the Americans with some suspicion after World War II. Through the works council, employees gained a share in certain managerial functions, such as hiring, firing, promotions, and the establishment of supervisory policies. This system of sharing in certain managerial decisions is called Mitbestimmung (co-determination) and was introduced only after much debate and in spite of American counsel. American officials had objected to co-determination because they saw it as a form of socialization similar to a directed economy, land reform, a socialization of key industries. The opposition to co-determination was strong enough in 1948 to cause General Clay to suspend a state law implementing co-determination in Hesse. However, the Germans persevered, and co-determination became law in 1951, when it was introduced into the coal and steel industries; in the following year, it was extended to all other industries.

Initially the proponents of big unions were not happy with either the
provisions of the Marshall Plan or the currency reform. They felt that the Marshall Plan was intended to retard the growth of socialization, and that the currency reform would virtually wipe out their financial holdings. However, given the alternatives of either accepting the Marshall Plan and the currency reform and seeing a speedy capitalistic recovery, or refusing the measures and seeing a long, drawn-out process based on their own resources, union leaders accepted the former.  

Different Views

The events of the first few years of the Allied occupation in Germany were formative years for a society that had been devastated and was rebuilt according to a master plan designed and implemented to one degree or another by the conquerors. Each of the four occupying powers chose to do things in its own way. The cultivation of "democracy" was supposed to be the underlying principle; this was interpreted differently in the Soviet Zone, but America, France, and England proceeded along compatible courses. American programs were evaluated according to how much they would help build "democracy" and facilitate the rapid turnover of affairs to the Germans themselves. How successful the programs were can be measured by the fact that democratic principles have persisted. Certainly, the type of democracy which evolved in Germany differs from that found in America. The Americans based the guidance given to the Germans largely on the American idea that individual freedom leads to individual achievement, but the Germans were given the freedom to work out details, and the
collectivistic tendencies and traditions native to Germany came to the fore. For example, an elaborate, social-welfare state emerged to protect the individual. Such extensive, communal support is not exactly what the Americans originally had in mind when they spoke of democratization. But by providing comparable support to each individual, the German system gives each person the chance to develop to the fullest extent possible and is indeed democratic.

Americans were reasonably good teachers, but they were not without fault and not above reproach. The Germans knew this from the start. For instance, even while preaching democracy, individual freedom, and human values, they appeared hypocritical to some of their German students because of the racial discrimination practiced in America and the segregationist policies of the occupying military forces. Nevertheless, Germans contended that they "could learn much from the Americans." In January, 1950, a survey in the U.S. Zone showed that fifty-seven percent of the Germans believed this to be the case. This belief increased with education; fifty-three percent of those with eight years or less of education subscribed to this theory while ninety-two percent of those with twelve or more years of education held it to be true.65

Since the French remained in charge in Zweibruecken until Germany regained its sovereignty in 1955, it is helpful to look at another, comparable city in the American Zone to see how the Americans actually carried out their reorientation efforts there.

Bruchsal, a city of thirty-four thousand people in present-day Baden-Wuerttemberg, has some characteristics in common with Zweibruecken and can be used for comparison purposes. Bruchsal was founded about one
thousand years ago and had traditionally been a city dependent on agriculture and small industries. Tobacco, hops, and lumber were the main products prior to World War II. There was also a modest leather-tanning industry there, and the railroad provided additional employment for the citizenry. After World War II, the Siemens electrical company established a plant in Bruchsal and quickly became the principal employer.

In April, 1945, the French captured Bruchsal and occupied it until July, 1945, when the city was turned over to the Americans. This is the reverse of what happened in Zweibruecken where the Americans took the city in March, 1945, and then relinquished control to the French in July. The citizens of Bruchsal gladly exchanged the French for the Americans because the French had confiscated nearly everything that was movable -- bicycles, radios, and the like. Furthermore, the Americans brought food and shared it with the citizens. When the Americans assumed control of Bruchsal, one of the first things they did was to replace the French-appointed mayor; then they proceeded with their denazification program. The denazification program in Bruchsal amounted to little more than a temporary inconvenience. One school teacher and the man who had served as mayor during the Third Reich were the only persons permanently branded as Nazis. Several other individuals were considered to have been associated with the Nazis, but after investigation they were released and allowed to return to the city and their work. This is not to say that there were no penalties imposed, because there were. Direct fines, demotions, adjusted pay scales, reduced pensions, frozen promotions, and job transfers were some of the forms of punishment. The Americans established a small military government
detachment to insure compliance with their overall reorientation plans, but that administrative function was gradually reduced until, in early 1951, it was completely abandoned.69

In the beginning, Americans commandeered five or six entire houses; this was a source of irritation between the Germans and the Americans in Bruchsal until the houses were returned in 1946 and 1947, when the troops left. In this respect, the French fared better than the Americans, since the French had taken possession of only a few apartments or rooms. However, the commandeering of houses was ameliorated somewhat by the fact that the owners were allowed to continue using laundry facilities, kitchens, basements, and gardens.70 Another aspect of the American occupation which caused extraordinary resentment was that they prevented some of the local teachers from meeting and organizing; presumably, this was to prevent any type of organized opposition to American policies and decisions. The teachers became bitter and refused to show any outward sign of friendship for the Americans for the duration of the American stay in Bruchsal.71

Initially, the city officials were required to get approval on nearly everything they did, but they carefully complied with American directions, and soon the process of requesting became one of consulting, and that rapidly turned into a process of informing.72 The Lord Mayor and other officials met regularly with the Americans and even made special pleas on behalf of the citizens. Beyond the commandeering of houses and the infernal Fragebogen (questionnaire) and associated punishments, the Americans rarely imposed their will.
The people of Bruchsal received CARE packages well into the 1950s, and additional food was distributed in the schools. English replaced French as the first foreign language in the schools, and although students in the 1950s did not notice that democracy was at work in the classrooms, later reflection brought them to realize that the patience and give-and-take attitudes exhibited by their teachers were real changes brought about by the Americans.

The Americans organized, constructed, and ran a youth camp near Bruchsal. At this camp, American soldiers provided food, shelter, games, and leadership training for about one hundred and fifty young people who later used the democratic principles learned there in various youth groups in the city. American speakers visited the Gymnasium and talked about life in a democracy and the responsibilities of citizens. And parent-teacher associations were organized in the city's schools. In the latter part of the decade, a few students from Bruchsal were sent to the United States to study, and in 1964 the first Fulbright Scholarship in Bruchsal was awarded to Lioba Grillenberger, a language teacher in a local Gymnasium.

The reforms and institutions deemed necessary for reorientation in Bruchsal were established in the period 1945-1949, and then left in German hands. Gustav Loeffler, a local architect and member of the Stadt-Kreisrat, (city-county council) characterized the American presence in Bruchsal in the fifties as "hardly noticed." Lioba Grillenberger described the American influence on democracy in Bruchsal as definite but philosophical. The impetus was supplied and the framework established by the Americans, but the Germans filled in the details.
These observations are similar to Peterson's overall interpretation of the American Military Government's success, or lack of it: that Americans succeeded most where they tried to regulate the least. 79 Peterson, of course, was talking about official attempts to influence -- not the influence from daily contacts between Germans and Americans at the grass-roots level.

French Re-education Efforts

With the essential knowledge in mind of how America went about reforming German education, it is worthwhile to look at some of the policies and practices employed by the French, the policies and practices to which the people of Zweibruecken were exposed.

The French encountered the same basic problems as the Americans; textbooks had to be replaced, politically acceptable teachers identified, and facilities reconstructed. And while the French had the same ultimate goal of democratizing the Germans, they viewed the process somewhat differently. Specifically, the American position on German guilt was that Hitler and the Nazi conspirators were largely responsible for the war and its consequences; the German people had been led astray but bore no special responsibility for the horrors of the Third Reich. Of course, some form of punishment was imposed on individuals whenever responsibility for crimes could be established, party membership determined, or other overt support to the party proven. The French, on the other hand, were not so willing to blame only the leaders. The bitter memories of the German occupation, the invasion, inter-war differences, World War I, and even the War of 1870 influenced French thinking. This view was bluntly stated in 1946, by Cesar Santelli, a French official involved in educational reform in Germany.
Santelli, while commenting on the influence of National Socialism on the German population, concluded that, "the generation of those aged over twelve, is almost completely lost."80

Such a philosophy left little room for denazification per se. The French, according to F. Roy Willis in his book *The French In Germany 1945-1949*, chose more to follow a course of "degermanisation." That is, it was not feasible simply to remove the Nazi element and leave Germany to the Germans. National traits themselves had to be reformed. As a consequence, the removal of Nazis took a different course in the French Zone, a course which led to charges by the Americans and British that denazification was not being vigorously pursued there.81 Ostensibly, the French argument went something like this: since most Germans were genuinely guilty, the hope of finding innocent Germans to fill responsible positions was futile. Thus, the French made little effort to identify anyone other than the most avid Nazis. The national character had to be restructured anyway; so for the vast majority of Germans, there was no reason to go through the motions of denazification.

The elimination of Nazis from the teaching staffs took its toll in numbers in the French Zone as well. Whereas the French were relatively lenient in allowing former Nazis to stay on the job in some areas, their policy for educators seems to have been almost as strict as the Americans' policy.82 Nearly sixty percent of the teachers in primary and secondary schools were removed. As a consequence of denazification, twenty-nine teachers in Zweibruecken were punished but most managed to continue teaching. Only one teacher was released outright. One was forced to retire with a full pension. Two had future retirement incomes reduced. Four were
forbidden promotions for specified periods. Thirteen were demoted. And existing pensions were reduced or stopped for eight retired teachers or their widows. Teachers' training colleges were set up in the French Zone along the lines of the French écoles normales, to help replace teachers. The teachers' colleges offered a two-year program, but briefer courses were made available to produce teachers in a short time.83

To alter the German way of thinking, to bring them more in line with the French philosophy of life, the French Government chose Raymond Schmittlein, an experienced Germanist. Schmittlein chose a staff of Germanists to help him so that the decisions affecting the course of German education would be made by people who understood both countries.84

The French reopened both the primary and secondary schools in their zone on September 17, 1945, two weeks earlier than the Americans. Zweibruecken's Volksschulen were the first to reopen. In September, 1945, seven classrooms, all that remained of the seventy-five which existed before the destruction, opened their doors. Even these seven had required some repairs. Next, also during the month of September, came the high schools; these were the Oberschule fuer Jungen, the Lyzeum (the girls school), and the Altsprachliches Gymnasium. The Oberschule fuer Jungen had been severely damaged so classrooms were limited. The classes were limited to five students per class until more room was made available, at which time they expanded to ten students in each class. A bit later they were able to accommodate twelve per class. The curriculum was very limited, and only French, English, and mathematics were offered. By February, 1946, more space was available and the curriculum enlarged to include a
wider range of classes. The reconstruction was partly done by the students themselves. The students in the Lyzeum were more fortunate. The school itself was the least damaged of all the schools. It opened, and offered the full range of classes, on October 1, 1945. The Altsprachliches Gymnasium had been so heavily damaged that it remained closed until December 6, 1945, but even then its operations were greatly restricted. By 1950 much had been done, but much remained to be done; forty-one rooms in the Volksschulen had been brought back into service, and twenty-six Gymnasium rooms had been restored to usefulness. 85

The textbook problem was less significant for the French than for the Americans. First of all, there were only 900,000 school children under French control, whereas the Americans had 3,000,000. Secondly, there were more paper mills available to the French, so paper was in better supply there than in the American area. Many textbooks were rewritten to exclude Nazi views and others were brought in from Switzerland, Luxembourg, and America. Others were supplied from France, in the French language. The local characteristics of the zone were stressed, and so the books used in one area differed from those in other areas. In Freiburg, for example, students used books from Switzerland written in German. In Zweibruecken, books from France written in French and translated into German were used; these books sometimes included statements which denigrated the Germans as a people. The following article appeared in a reader used in the high schools in Zweibruecken.
The German Children

"One has to recognize and obtain for oneself the advantages gained by other nations in order not to fall behind one's rivals. Well, you little Frenchmen, so what if German children learn a little slower than you do. The northern races are usually of slower wits. Nevertheless, they work with great courage; they concentrate all their diligence on what they are doing and are not distracted by a humming fly or by an opening door. Their heads, with their square foreheads, are bent diligently over the books written in gothic lettering. They know that it is not sufficient to try to understand too quickly; they are serious about learning, and they are trained early to obey their teachers promptly and to the letter.

Later, when they enter the army, they retain this discipline; discipline is the first characteristic of a soldier: they do not march into battle with enthusiasm, but in total obedience to the orders of their corporal.

Finally, those children are the same in life as in school. They work hard, live in a colder country than we do, and need more coal and warmer clothing in winter. In addition, the workers are not paid as well over there as they are in France, and they toil hard. No matter, they have the strength and patience of a steer which step by step draws his furrows and makes the field fertile. The ones who do not wear themselves out totally by the hardest bodily work replace this lack of exercise through sports. There are three thousand sport clubs which include 300,000 members. That means there are 300,000 men, hardened in all possible exercises, who if necessary, will be untiring soldiers.

Dear children of France, you are just as well off and better than the children in Germany. Most of you are just as strong and have a livelier understanding of things. You have better and gentler teachers. Your country is much more beautiful and richer. These are the reasons you can look forward to an easier time, but you must learn to work during your early youth; you must have courage and determination, as only he who tries the hardest will succeed the most."86

By 1948, ten million new books had been printed in the French Zone.87 They were not all so blatantly prejudiced, but the message that France was superior was regularly conveyed in the schools.
School organization, too, underwent a change. Like the Americans, the French advocated a system which allowed students to transfer from one school to the next and wait longer before deciding on whether or not to attend a university. Under the French system, Latin was suppressed in the three lowest grades in the Gymnasium. Thus a student could wait until the eighth year before making the decision. This reform was later discarded, and all the schools in the former French Zone switched to the tripartite system used elsewhere in Germany, with the decisive point being the end of the fourth school year.

In the universities, none of which was in Zweibruecken, the French replaced books and teachers, as did the Americans, but whereas every university in the American Zone had one University Officer to encourage change, the French placed in each institution four French assistants who worked directly with the German professors, usually in the arts.

A somewhat different view was taken by the French officials on food rations, as long as rationing existed. In the American Zone, students and teachers alike received fewer rations than workers, but the French authorized full, manual-labor rations for persons in the academic environment. It should be noted, however, that even at the reduced level, students in the American Zone were authorized more calories per day than manual laborers were authorized in the French Zone.

The results of the French re-education efforts have been termed both a failure and a success. These totally different conclusions can, at least partially, be attributed to the fact that the French did things differently.
in different areas. Their approach left room for individual initiative on the part of the French education officers. This room, according to one view, was not due to any formal plan but rather due to the fact that the French achieved the status of occupier rather suddenly and with little forethought. Hence, they had to improvise at every turn and regularly made compromises. There was disagreement among the French as to their goals vis-à-vis Germany. Some Frenchmen advocated using Germany as a source for rebuilding France, while others believed working together was the best course of action. Some supported the idea that France should cultivate a sympathetic political sphere, and yet others spoke for the establishment of little more than a cordon sanitaire (guarded line). As a consequence of differing approaches, there was no consistency in either the way the French operated or the results they achieved. The French attempted to impose their cultural values by degermanizing the Germans, but they were less strict in their denazification process than were the Americans and British. As far as the Germans were concerned, they knew that France had thrown its army together at the last moment; therefore, it was difficult for the Germans to view the French as rightful victors. The realities of French presence and French rule were accepted, but there was more resentment toward the French than toward either the Americans or the British. America was respected for its power and the British for the way they conducted themselves, but the French were more tolerated than respected. In fact, the reforms imposed by the French were rescinded as soon as possible.

On the other hand, F. Roy Willis concluded that, "there can be no doubt of the success of the French educational and cultural programs." And
Alfred Grosser described the French methods as "the most fruitful" of all the re-education programs. The success enjoyed by the French has been attributed to a sense of individuality which made them willing to treat each situation on its individual merits. Furthermore, the French have been credited with having had a true insight into the different ways the Germans viewed themselves and National Socialist ideology. There was a cleavage between the young and the old in postwar Germany; some youthful Germans distrusted politics and older people, while the older Germans held that the younger citizens either still used Hitler's ideas or were ineffective and did too little to help their country back onto its feet. It has been argued that French insight into these problems enabled French education officials to make truly positive cultural and educational changes.

Willis also states, "Day-to-day association with French people and with the cultural achievements of France undoubtedly created a friendliness toward France which was not felt in the other zones toward their occupiers." This observation needs qualification. The bonds forged between the Americans and Germans in most communities in the U.S. Zone appear to have been at least as strong. Furthermore, research in the Zweibruecken area, where both French and American forces were located, indicates that there was a distinct preference in the minds of Germans for the Americans, as compared with the French.

This conclusion is substantiated by polls taken by the Allensbach Institute in 1962 and 1965. In 1962, fifty-four percent of those polled nation-wide stated that they "liked" the Americans, while only forty-four percent gave this same accolade to the French. By 1965, fondness for the Americans had increased, with fifty-eight percent responding that they
"liked" the Americans. This same poll revealed that the French had slipped; only thirty-nine percent of the Germans said they "liked" the French. In both polls, which involved at least two thousand people, "like them" was the highest accolade with the other possibilities being: "not particularly," "undecided," and "no opinion." Similar polls were taken in 1957 and 1961, to measure German attitudes vis-à-vis the Americans, but the French were not included. In those two polls, the Americans were "liked" by thirty-seven percent and fifty-one percent, respectively.99

British Re-education Efforts

For the sake of comparison, it is interesting to look also at events in the British Zone. The British encountered the same shortages as did the Americans and French in their respective zones. Teachers, buildings, books, materials, and food were all in short supply. All the Allies based their policies on the same basic philosophy, which had evolved during the final years of the war and eventually was articulated in Allied Control Council Directive No. 54, a document issued on June 25, 1947.100 Since the challenges and the guiding philosophy were essentially the same, it should come as no surprise that British aims and methods were, in many ways, similar to those employed by the Americans. But there were some distinct differences in policy.101

At the end of the war, there were seventy thousand teachers in the British Zone. As a consequence of denazification, sixteen thousand, or twenty-three percent, were suspended.102 Ultimately, the vast majority was reinstated, but their immediate loss made it all the more necessary
for an emergency teacher-training program to be established. Two programs were set up to meet the requirements. A one-year program was used to train temporary teachers, and a two-year program was established to prepare permanent teachers. To augment teaching staffs, radio lectures were widely used.103

Buildings were a crucial, immediate problem due to both destruction and the needs of the occupation forces and displaced persons. One example can serve to illustrate the seriousness of the problem. In Schleswig-Holstein, there was only one classroom for every 123 children. Before the war, there had been only 37 children per classroom. To get by, classes were conducted in shifts.104 One expert assessment of the British role in reconstructing Germany's education system holds that Field Marshal Montgomery's decision to stop commandeering schools for other purposes was one of the most important steps taken.105

Textbooks were replaced using the same philosophy as in the U.S. Zone. Indeed, many of the first books were even identical, having come from the same sources. The British set up textbook writing centers where books were written by Germans under British supervision, and the rate of books produced per student in the two zones did not differ significantly. By 1947, the British had distributed 8,090,100 books to 4,100,000 students, or 1.97 books per student. About that same time, the Americans had given 6,295,600 books to the 2,441,750 students in their zone, 2.58 books per student. It was a somewhat different story for other school materials. Pencils and paper were in shorter supply in the British Zone.
To alleviate the food problem, school lunches of three hundred calories were served in the British Zone. This program, which started in February, 1946, eventually grew until 1,750,000 students and thousands of teachers received such a daily meal.106

British reformers attempted few administrative changes in the primary and secondary schools apart from "the destruction of the Nazi Party machine." They watched over the reconstruction of the schools and curriculum, replaced books, and approved programs, but most actions (not unlike the situation in the U.S. Zone) were in the hands of Germans. However, the British were more cautious, more aloof, and less committed to reform of primary and secondary schools than were their counterparts in the U.S. Zone.107

Some of the matters on which the British caution was pronounced merit discussion here because on the surface the British agreed with the Americans but they did not offer much practical support to achieve American objectives. The British sided with those who wanted to lengthen the primary school to six years. But their commitment was weak. They had greater concern for the more pressing problems of improving the physical conditions under which the schools and universities were opening and operating.108 Another reform issue on which the British and Americans agreed but yet disagreed was that of free secondary education. The British were convinced free secondary education would not work, but they publicly supported it inasmuch as the idea was included in the four-power compromise document published on June 25, 1947, Allied Control Council Directive No.54.109
The British saw eye to eye with most German educators on a tripartite division after the primary years. The division into practical, technical, and academic branches was consistent with the 1944 Education Act in Britain. The Americans, as related above, opposed the tripartite division as undemocratic.

Many Germans, especially in the Catholic areas, wanted to reestablish their denominational schools. The British Military Government opposed this idea at first, due to limited facilities. But, based on popular demand, such schools were allowed again beginning in February 1946.

As for the universities in the British Zone, all six were conducting classes by the end of 1945, and by the spring of 1946 teaching had been resumed in the eight specialized colleges on the university level. A major attempt was made to reform German universities by way of a special commission variously called "The German Commission on University Reform," the "Lindsay Report," the "Lindsay Commission," or "The Blue Report." This was an effort to put German universities "in step with the social changes of the times." The author of the report recommended establishing a studium generale for the first year in each university, giving students training in democratic life, and forming a University Advisory Council with broad powers. The recommendations of this commission were not adopted due to opposition from the universities' rectors and senates.

British authorities tried to mandate a specific set of controls to regulate who could attend these institutions of higher learning. The specific academic criteria were left up to the Germans, but political realism
played a role too. According to British guidance, ten percent of the students had to be refugees; after that, priority was given to men and women who had never been members of the Nazi Party or any affiliated organization. The remainder of the student body, if any spaces were left, could be persons who had been members of these now-prohibited organizations — but not officials; personnel in this category could not exceed ten percent of the total student body, exclusive of the ten percent reserved for displaced persons. The selection process hinged on the Fragebogen system, but the applicants were too numerous for the admissions personnel to check, and oftentimes persons were admitted without having completed the Fragebogen. In any event, it was not long before many formerly restricted individuals were given unrestricted access as a consequence of the Exoneration of Youth Act in 1946, which applied to persons born on or after January 1, 1919.

Volkshochshulen were reestablished in the British Zone along the same lines as those which existed prior to 1933. For the first few years, the emphasis was on courses with little practical application. One study in 1947 stated that, except for a demand by young people for language courses, "the Volkshochshulen are largely a refuge for middle-aged and middle-class men and women anxious to study history of art, art, philosophy, music or literature." Modern history, economics, and international relations were in little demand. An exception existed in Hamburg where foreign languages, courses concerned with Weltanschauung, civics, economics, history, and sociology were popular — in that order.
The trade unions in the British Zone participated actively in the adult education programs. Union representatives sat on local and zonal committees for adult education. The relationship between the unions and the Volkshochschulen grew and assumed particular importance with the advent of a jointly sponsored movement called Arbeit und Leben (work and life). This movement, which was based on the Workers' Educational Association (WEA) in Britain, began in Lower Saxony and spread to all the states in the British Zone, Bavaria, Hesse and Berlin. Its influence was also noted to a degree in the French Zone. "Arbeit und Leben" encouraged students to study German, mathematics, current events, business management, economics, labor problems, psychology, and sociology.

Many Anglo-German discussion groups were formed where, as in the U.S. Zone, democracy and life styles were often topics on the agenda. Exchange programs for teachers and students were also quite common. British information centers, also known as Die Brücke (the bridge), served much the same function as the America Houses. At their height, 1947, there were over sixty of these centers, but by the middle of the 1950s only four remained intact and another ten had been changed to Anglo-German centers.

The British information control policy, as a whole, differed from that of the Americans, but the British authorities had to operate under more hardships due to limited resources. For example, the film situation was far better in the U.S. Zone, since the Americans (and Russians) had inherited the German movie studios. The studios enabled the Americans to produce, reproduce, and synchronize films for distribution to the Germans. In addition, America was able to equip its information centers
and libraries with a more complete array of reading materials and audiovisual equipment. While the Americans were translating, providing copyright privileges, and distributing books by American authors, the British were not able to move on anywhere near the same scale. By late 1947, the British had been able to produce only twenty-three of their native works in translation. The slow production of acceptable books had a negative impact in numerous areas, but the impact on history classes was remarkable. History courses were taught for at least two or three years without textbooks in many schools in the British Zone. Consequently, in 1947 inspectors found history being taught by "medieval" methods -- on old "political" and "heroic" lines which furthered nationalism and cultivated an aversion to international affairs and current events.121

In many of the reform efforts, there was a definite kinship between the approaches chosen by the British and the Americans. As a general rule, the British efforts were on a lesser scale than those made by the Americans, as a result of limited resources. It was in youth activities that the differences appear to have been the greatest. The British, at least in the early stages, apparently placed too much emphasis on formal re-education and paid too little attention to what was "needed outside school hours." It was often said that the British Military Government had a "colonial attitude."122 The responsibility for executing youth programs was given to the Germans with coordinating control retained by the occupation authorities. However, when compared with the American youth program (GYA), there were few controls or regulations and almost as
little in the way of resources. Where American soldiers and even families were actively engaged with German youth, the British remained apart. The Americans reinforced the GYA by setting up troops of Boy and Girl Scouts, but the British prohibited these organizations based on the history of the German Pfadfinder (scouts). A contemporary assessment of both the American and British youth programs stated "The vitality and generosity of the average American is nowhere more clearly seen than in these GYA activities." The description continued:

The impression in the American Zone is, broadly speaking, that German youth is being catered for, not wisely, but too well. In the British Zone, it is that German Youth is suffering from a sense of isolation, of being in a vacuum.

This feeling of abandonment may have been encouraged by the attitude of some British officials. Long after the Americans had made a commitment to work with the former enemy, British officials tended to have contact with the Germans only during office hours or as needed for control purposes. These officials, it was reported, were not interested in contact and made no attempt to learn the German language.123 Two decades later, British conduct during the occupation period was characterized as "aloof." But in the words of one German scholar, "The British education officers came with the also typically British idea of simply doing what was necessary."124

In the end, both the British and the Americans enjoyed less success than desired with their educational reforms.125 German educators were more tradition-bound than had been expected. Education had served the elite well in the past, and the determination to return to that situation proved to be dominant. This predilection, coupled with the leeway afforded Germans
in guiding their own future and the limitation of funds, stood in the way of radical changes. Certainly some alterations were made, and with respect to varying influences, it is worth noting that the British point of view on teaching English in the German schools prevailed. German schools tend, overwhelmingly, to teach British pronunciation, vocabulary, and idioms — as opposed to the American versions. Furthermore, "Anglistik" is a more common area of study in German universities than is "Amerikanistik." This has been attributed to geographic and cultural proximity. It is easier and less expensive for Germans to go to Britain than to America, and Anglo-German relations have a much longer history than do German-American relations. Other factors have influenced the attitude as well. One must acknowledge that, at least in Europe, the British are considered more sophisticated than the Americans, and German teachers have been known to tell their students as much. Thus, status-conscious Germans prefer the British style. Additionally, and perhaps of greater importance, British English was taught in Germany long before America's ascendancy on the world's stage. Given the German educator's penchant for tradition, it is not surprising that the old way prevailed.

Even though the British style of speaking is preferred by Germans, and even though "Anglistik" is the more popular area of study, it should not be assumed the British presence had the larger impact on Germany. On the contrary, it was the Americans who succeeded in propagating their "way of life."
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Chapter 6

The Rehabilitation Of The Information Media

Like virtually everything else in Germany, the information media came to a halt at the end of the war. Perhaps "pause" is a better word to describe the situation, because the press and radio were started again as soon as new rules could be established. The publication of books and magazines and the resumption of theatrical productions followed somewhat behind broadcasting and newspapers, since the latter two were more valuable to the occupation authorities for communicating with the German public. The number and frequency of printings and broadcasts were greatly restricted at first due to the shortage of every type of resource, but the interruption was kept as brief as possible.

Newspapers

In defining the role of the newspaper in a new, democratized Germany, Americans set out to correct what were seen as deficiencies stemming not only from the Nazi era but also from earlier periods. Traditionally, German journalists had mixed hard news with opinions so extensively that readers could not tell the difference. The privately owned, decentralized press of the Weimar period had been "weak on objective news coverage, as compared to Anglo-American journalism." These earlier papers often had served local, religious, or political interests. Many of the papers had earned the epithet of Kaeseblatt (useful mainly for wrapping cheese), due to the emphasis on special interests. Indeed, the political
papers had been "political instruments rather than purveyors of news." On the other hand, the traditional, mass-circulation papers had been "politically colorless" "business ventures," which had "sought to please everyone and offend no one." These mass-circulation newspapers, known as the Generalanzeiger press, had carried stories on crime, catastrophe, divorce, and human interest, but, in the words of one analyst, "the public interest was scarcely discernible." Certainly, there had been good papers. German papers before Hitler's regime contained a wealth of cultural and educational material as well as competing political views, but the special-interest, small-circulation press and the bland, mass-circulation Generalanzeiger press had been dominant. With these historical conditions in mind, it was reasoned that if newspapers were going to take their rightful place at the head of the democratic information media, clear distinctions would have to be made between facts and opinions, and news would have to be written to inform the masses on important issues.

The newspaper had to be a tool for informing the average citizen so that he could act responsibly in a free society. To guarantee that newspapers would be properly oriented, the U.S. Military Government enforced certain guidelines.

1. No dissemination of nationalist, militant, or anti-democratic materials was allowed.

2. No dissemination of materials disruptive to the occupying powers or hostile to occupation authorities was allowed.

3. Facts and editorial opinions had to be separated.

4. No affiliation with political parties was allowed.
5. Writing had to be understandable to the average German. Before any newspaper could be published, it was necessary for the military government to approve it and issue a license. These controls lasted until May 2, 1949, when licensing ended. The first two guidelines were specifically stated in the licenses granted to German newspapers, while the last three were practiced as matters of principle.  

The enforcement of the guidelines proved to be relatively easy. Only on rare occasions did the newspapers stray, and then the punishment was rather slight. The Sueddeutsche Zeitung, for instance, was once required to reduce its size from six to four pages for one month for criticizing the Soviets. Scrutiny of the newspapers' practices was accomplished on a post-publication basis. There was no censorship in the U.S. Zone. Editors were free to print, but they knew they would be held accountable for what appeared in their papers.

In addition to the guidelines identified above, newspapers were encouraged to emphasize news of an international nature, rather than concentrate too much on local events.

The first newspapers which appeared after the war were U.S. Military Government papers. These were the so-called "overt publications," through which the Americans disseminated information to the population. The most significant overt publication was Die Neue Zeitung, although it commenced publication rather late. It first appeared on October 18, 1945, and remained an accepted paper throughout West Germany and Berlin until the American officials decided to cease publishing it in January, 1955.
By the time it was first printed in 1945, many of the earlier overt publications had already ceased to exist, and some German papers had been licensed. Die Neue Zeitung was printed twice each week and enjoyed considerable success. Its circulation was regularly 1,500,000, but for a time, the number of copies reached 1,900,500. It was so much in demand that Germans routinely stood in line to buy a copy. Die Neue Zeitung was intended to be a model for the licensed press. The editors were determined to show the Germans that news, sports, features, and editorials could all be reported on separately and in an interesting, readable way. In the beginning, the subject matter tended to be mostly German. Some of the paper's early critics accused it of being "too German," and in fact its readers frequently did not know that it was an official U.S. Military Government paper. The Zeitung, as it was commonly termed, had to rely on the same press services as the licensed newspapers for its content. However, the Zeitung's editors did have the advantages of the best quality ink, paper stock, and photographic and engraving equipment in Germany. The Zeitung was published in Munich on the presses of the Nazis' Voelkischer Beobachter; this was another advantage, since those presses came through the war almost unscathed. So it was, by most accounts, the best paper available.

Evidently the U.S. authorities took the criticism that the Zeitung was "too German" to heart, because, in 1948, they changed the paper to bring it more in line with the guideline recommending an international flavor. It began to feature articles on America and happenings outside of Germany. Stories about American literature and music appeared. English lessons were
printed, and articles such as, "Some Kind Words for Uncle Sam," by Bernard Baruch were offered.8

The first German paper licensed by the U.S. officials was the Frankfurter Rundschau. Its first edition came out on July 31, 1945. Then came the Rhein-Neckar-Zeitung in Heidelberg on September 6, 1945; one of its publishers was Theodor Heuss. At least a dozen others followed during that same month. By the beginning of October, German papers were available from Bremen in the north to Garmisch-Partenkirchen in the south. It is interesting to note that during this period of sudden growth, the lead from the type of Mein Kampf was ceremoniously melted down and recast to print the first edition of the Sueddeutsche Zeitung, the first American-licensed paper in Bavaria.9 All of these newspapers were plagued by paper shortages, inadequate equipment, and a lack of qualified personnel. Membership in the Third Reich's Federal Press Chamber had tainted nearly all newspapermen in Germany, and so they were not considered eligible for work on postwar papers. This was not necessarily the case with ownership. The military governments in the West did not expropriate the old Nazi publishers. The occupation authorities were criticized for this apparent lack of evenhandedness; however, complaints had little or no effect.10 The Americans, British and French all seemed to agree that it was sufficient to control the editorial, writing, and production staffs. The U.S. Military Government thus had the challenge of developing technical competence in the inexperienced personnel who emerged to run the new, democratic press in the U.S. Zone. American press control officers had to give advice on virtually every aspect of the newspaper business from basic journalism to general management.11 Experts came from America, and German
journalists went to America to learn not only techniques but the democratic approach. One German editor who visited America, Dr. Annemarie Langens, placed the problem in perspective when she wrote:

One of the outstanding differences between newspaper work in your country and in Germany to me seems to consist in the fact that you do have a free press in a democratic country and a long tradition of freedom and democracy behind you. With us this is entirely different. We are struggling for something we have hardly ever possessed, something we longed for but did not visualize too clearly. To have watched from so very close a free press in action means a confirmation of immeasurable value to our faith in the importance and workability of a free press.¹²

There was, of course, some difficulty with credibility. Some readers distrusted the licensed press because they knew the newspapers had to conform with the opinions of the occupying power.¹³ But in spite of this shortcoming, the licensed press was widely accepted as independent.¹⁴

The newspapers were serviced by several news agencies. The Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, and Reuters had outlets in the U.S. Zone. However, the most important news agency was the Deutsche Nachrichten Agentur (DENA). This agency began as a U.S. Military Government office in June of 1945, but quickly changed hands so that by the middle of 1946 it was completely owned and operated by Germans. In spite of this, one could not say that it was free of American influence. Its policies were those of the U.S. Military Government. The Information Control Division of the Military Government provided guidance and routed copy to DENA from the U.S. Reorientation Branch Press Unit in Washington, D.C. and the U.S. State Department. On an average day, DENA passed on to the German papers approximately 30,000 words of news. Additionally, 25,000
words of feature material were disseminated weekly and 20,000 photos monthly. The German press used the copy from DENA on a regular basis. Through DENA German readers received information on such things as Boys' Town, the PTA in America, agriculture, and industry.  

Even though the U.S. Military Government ended the practice of licensing newspapers in 1949, controls continued. It was still against the law for papers to print the type of materials previously banned. This prohibition remained in force until the Korean War, at which time censorship by the Americans was ended so the Soviets could be criticized. The end of licensing meant that the newspapers were essentially in German hands less than four years after the war had ended. A whole host of German papers sprang to life as soon as licensing ended, but some lasted for only a very short period of time. These papers took some of the circulation away from those established under the licensing procedures; nevertheless, five years later, virtually all of the previously licensed papers were still publishing.  

In Zweibruecken, the revival of newspapers followed an almost parallel pattern as far as controls were concerned. For example, affiliation with political parties was prohibited. The French Military Government licensed the publishers, established a news agency, and practiced censorship. The French-controlled news agency which provided the German papers with approved copy was the Sueddeutsche Nachrichtenagentur (SUDENA); however, papers in the French Zone also had access to the American-sponsored news agency, DENA, as well as Reuters and the Associated Press. In 1949, DENA and SUDENA merged with DPD (Deutscher Presse Dienst, the press service in
the British Zone); combined, they became known as DPA (Deutsche Presse Agentur) and served West Germany throughout the decade of the fifties.

Where the Americans practiced censorship by reviewing what had been printed, the French censored the copy before it was printed. French censorship continued, albeit on an ever-diminishing basis, until 1955.17

The Zweibruecken Mitteilungsblatt was the first postwar paper. It appeared on August 11, 1945, and was an instrument of the French Military Government. The French Commander used the paper to convey his message to the citizens of Zweibruecken.

As General Eisenhower has already said, we come not as oppressors but as administrators, agents of justice, and as educators. Together with the healthy elements of the German people, we will eliminate the remnants of Nazism, an ideology whose theory of a chosen people has been defeated by an alliance of nations. We are coming to teach the German people the utilization of freedom and democracy [a form of government] which they used only as a dominant force. I was appointed to this position by the Allies, and I will treat all persons equally regardless of religion, race, or color. I am asking your cooperation in this formidable task, and I will overlook the suffering you have caused my country.

A few weeks after the Zweibruecken Mitteilungsblatt was printed, the Amtsblatt der französischen Oberkommandos in Deutschland was published for the first time, on September 3, 1945. This publication served chiefly to communicate laws and instructions to the people. It was followed, also in September, 1945, by the first licensed newspaper available in Zweibruecken, the Pfälzische Volkszeitung, which came from Kaiserslautern. Immediately on the heels of the Pfälzische Volkszeitung came another licensed paper, Die Rheinpfalz. In 1946, these two papers merged under the name of Die Rheinpfalz. This paper was the principal newspaper in Zweibruecken until June 1950, when the Pfälzischer Merkur joined it to serve the community.18
On balance, the Americans had considerable influence on German newspapers. By encouraging factual reporting, freedom of the press, and private ownership, they helped establish an enduring set of principles which have served the German people well.

Of these three principles, factual reporting is perhaps the hardest to assess, but neutrality and objectivity were unquestionable features in the German newspapers of the 1950s. Political alignment and subjectivity began to reappear in earnest in the 1960s and 1970s, but in a much milder form than existed in the Weimar years. American insistence on objectivity has been termed the most decisive part of American influence on the German press. Even with the renascence of special-interest papers and the greater subjectivity of later years, the separation of fact and opinion has remained largely "eingefleischt" (engrained) in German journalism, as compared with the Weimar period.19

Aside from the specific guidance to be factual, American influences were felt in other ways by the German press. Whenever political activity by one of the major parties was reported, equal coverage for the opposition was required — and generally given. Through the American-fostered press services, ever-faster means of communications, and modern business techniques, a common press was furthered. The general cultural milieu was also altered — aided by American ideas. This alteration was due, at least partly, to the faster pace of life which accompanied the economic growth; occupied with their new goals, the consumers of information became less and less patient with reading. Consequently, the so-called Boulevard Zeitungen with their snappy headlines prospered, and the public turned more and more
to radio and the new medium of television.\textsuperscript{20}

Freedom of the press, with private ownership, was successfully reintroduced. German politicians, institutions, businesses, and prominent personalities were, and are, praised or criticized by the press much the same as in America, Great Britain, or France. Party newspapers were reinstated, although with relatively little effect. The insignificance of party papers can be attributed to how well the independent press has provided a full range of political views. Large-circulation, independent papers with different political philosophies are available throughout the country. \textit{Die Welt} (right) the \textit{Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung} (right-center), the \textit{Sueddeutsche Zeitung} (left-center), and the \textit{Frankfurter Rundschau} (left) are examples of papers which together cover the political spectrum.\textsuperscript{21}

Since the middle of the 1950s, the tendency has been towards fewer papers with ever-widening circulation for those that survive. Small local papers have been discontinued, while the remaining ones have been inclined to consolidate newsrooms. In 1954, there were 225 "full newsrooms" (manned by independent staffs). At that same time, there were thirteen million daily readers. By 1982, there were one hundred fewer full newsrooms, but the number of daily readers had grown to over twenty million. These changes are, to a large extent, the results of economic circumstances. Businessmen prefer to advertise in large papers, but by doing so, they put smaller papers out of business and thus risk silencing some of the weaker voices in the democracy. This, it should be recalled, is in conjunction with the consolidation of newsrooms. In other words, louder and more
homogeneous voices are being heard by more and more people. This trend may be viewed as harmful, but in 1982 there were still 1,250 daily editions in West Germany.22

Radio

Like newspapers, radio was seen by the Americans as an immediate necessity for the control and reorientation of the German people. Two million radio sets existed in the U.S. Zone. They provided an obvious channel for communicating with the millions of people whose activities were of concern. Some war-damaged stations were actually repaired and functioning under U.S. control even before the fighting was over. Radio was also returned to German management early. By June 30, 1949, every state in the U.S. Zone had approved radio laws, and on that date, when Radio Stuttgart was turned over to German management, the Germans assumed control of their own airways. American Radio Officers stayed on as consultants and observers until 1955, but effectively the Germans were masters of their own broadcast media.23

In spite of the fact that the transfer of responsibility was accomplished rather quickly, it had not been a simple task. The initial requirement to put out information to the conquered Germans had been satisfied by using German-speaking Americans and jerry-rigged transmitters made up of the remnants of German stations with American parts and generators. Sufficient experienced personnel could not be found among the politically unobjectionable Germans, so the Americans trained acceptable Germans in every aspect of broadcast journalism. Technicians, broadcasters, and
writers all had to be prepared. Most of the training took place on the job with Americans doing the initial training, but the Germans quickly accepted the responsibility, trained more people, and successfully formed the nucleus of a free radio system which, although not individually owned and operated (as Americans would have preferred), nevertheless provided coverage of the significant elements of community life. Politics, culture, religion, agriculture, industry, labor, youth organizations, and women's groups were all represented. The American Military Government carefully cultivated the growth of radio and insured that the stations would be free of government control by having the appropriate safeguards written into each state's laws before relinquishing control; the states had to incorporate broadcasting codes which would guarantee objective news reporting on divergent views of public interest. The codes had to prohibit broadcasts of a nature considered to be harmful (prejudicial to the occupying powers or supportive of militant nationalism or totalitarianism). With these few exceptions, commentators were able to express their opinions on the air.

The American officials desired the radio stations to be under decentralized control to prohibit any future seizure by a centralized regime. The evil use of the radio for propaganda purposes, as had been achieved by Goebbels, was never to be repeated.24

The U.S. radio officials influenced both the style and content of German programming and helped form the tastes of the postwar listener by the nature of the offerings. German audiences became acquainted with American-type broadcasts. Programs emphasizing democratic processes ("Town Meeting of the Air"), religious values, and political responsibilities were
broadcast regularly. And the Voice of America (VOA), produced by the U.S. State Department, was a nightly feature. This thirty-minute program normally presented news, commentary, educational features and music to German listeners during the evening mealtime. The broadcast came via short wave from New York. It was in German and carried on every German station. In 1951, the program length was reduced to fifteen minutes and the frequency of broadcasts changed from nightly to six nights per week. By then, VOA was directed more at the audience behind the Iron Curtain than at the West Germans. Three years later, in 1954, seventy-five percent of VOA broadcasts were aimed at listeners either behind the Iron or Bamboo Curtains. West Germans could continue to listen to the broadcasts, however, as broadcasts were still in German to reach people in East Germany.25

The American Forces Network was another source of influence. German listeners often tuned in to hear the swing music; but those who understood English had the opportunity to hear news, commentary, and entertainment intended for the troops. One of the more popular American programs was "The Ten of the Week." It featured the top ten American songs — songs which Germans learned to like as well.26 For those Germans intent on learning or improving their English, the American Forces Network was also an educational tool.27

From a technical point of view, the Americans went beyond showing the Germans how to operate. U.S. radio officials encouraged the development of frequency modulation to cope with the shortage of frequencies. Furthermore, they prohibited the operation of radio stations by special interest groups, such as political parties, labor unions etc., due to the
shortage of frequencies and the advantages which would accrue to any group that succeeded in getting its own station.

But the U.S. representatives were not able to impose all their views concerning the organization of the radio system. Organizational issues had to be worked out through discussions with the Allies and with the Germans themselves. To be their representative in these deliberations the British Military Government appointed Sir Hugh Greene, a bilingual official of the British Broadcasting Corporation, as the Radio Control Officer. He worked extensively with both state officials and Radio Hamburg, which became the Nordwestdeutscher Rundfunk in 1948, the zonal radio network. The American position was formulated and advanced by the U.S. Military Government's Information Control Division. These officials had various discussion partners, since they negotiated with Landtag committees in the various Laender.

One area where Americans were unsuccessful had to do with the generation of revenues to offset operating expenses. Americans urged the Germans to emulate the American system of broadcasting commercials and charging for the advertising services, but the Germans wanted instead to collect a listener's fee from every radio owner. This method was already in use elsewhere in Europe, and it had been used in Germany before. The British supported the idea of a nationwide network with users' fees. The Americans, after encountering resistance to a privately owned and commercially financed system, recommended that each state determine how the stations in its area would be operated.
Both the Americans and British opposed the idea of a state-run radio network, but the Germans preferred state management. The German argument was that if they placed radio broadcasting in the state's hands, it would be controlled by elected officials and therefore democratic. A compromise was needed. The Germans conceded on state controls but insisted on a control mechanism that would guarantee a balance. The resulting compromise, as set up between 1948 and 1956, established nine broadcasting corporations that are publicly owned and regionally operated. These corporations derive most of their revenues from users' fees but are authorized to broadcast commercials on a limited basis. Each corporation is governed by: A Rundfunkrat (broadcasting council), which functions as a parliament; a Verwaltungsrat (administrative council), which supervises the daily operations; and an Intendant (director-general), who, as the chief executive, is responsible for the control of program contents. Each broadcasting council has members representing various components of the population it serves: political parties, church groups, unions, employees' organizations, agricultural groups, newspaper publishers, welfare societies, sports confederations, refugee organizations, educational societies, women's groups, and youth services. These representatives are either elected by the respective state parliaments or appointed by the particular groups they represent. The administrative councils are appointed by the broadcasting councils. The French did not have a decisive part in formulating broadcasting policy, but they agreed to the compromise. Thus broadcasting in all the states in West Germany came under a common set of rules, but it was managed regionally with a dual based means of financing operations.
To guarantee the broadcast councils would pursue democratic goals, courses of indoctrination were established and every council member had to attend such a course. These councils continued throughout the decade of the fifties with many of the managers originally selected by the Americans. The provisions established between 1948 and 1956 still exist and have been expanded to include television as well.

Books and Periodicals

The paper shortage which plagued the newspaper business until 1948 had a somewhat greater impact on the book and periodical industry. Because the newspapers were of more immediate value, they received a higher priority for the scarce printing materials. Also, distribution channels were paralyzed in the immediate postwar days. Nevertheless, it was not long before books and periodicals were again on the market. The first publisher to be granted a license by the Americans was Hermann Meister of Heidelberg, who published works of general interest. One of his first products was a German translation of Benjamin Franklin's autobiography.

The restrictions applied to the publication of books and periodicals essentially mirrored those applied to newspapers. Anything harmful to Allied policies or supportive of National Socialism or militarism was prohibited. Forbidden works were collected, pulped, and then turned into new paper. Most bookdealers readily complied with Allied policies, and their cooperation enabled the U.S. authorities to allow bookdealers to operate on an honor system. As long as they did not offer prohibited items they could stay open. This system worked remarkably well, and only a few warnings or closures were imposed.
The political reliability of the publishers had to be established, since they made the written works available. In contrast, authors were not subjected to the same scrutiny. At first Americans depended on the so-called "white publishers" (publishers who somehow had avoided contamination by the Nazis), but in October 1945, the Boersenverein (the German book-trade association) was reestablished in Wiesbaden. This institution served as an instrument of the U.S. occupation regime by controlling German publishers and funneling American guidance to them. Licensing of a publisher was accomplished only after the applicant satisfied the American authorities that the license would be used to produce works serving democratic ideas and principles. Each applicant had to answer questions relative to his political views and to file a publication plan for one year in advance, complete with all titles to be published.

As a rule, all editions were limited to five thousand copies due to the paper shortage. There was no censoring prior to publication. As in the case of newspapers, all monitoring of content was done on a post-publication basis. The Americans did help control the content, however, through an information service program which provided news, features, and editorials from America. Through this service, Amerika Dienst, and the right to reprint American magazine articles, the U.S. authorities channeled American views into German publications and into German minds. As a result of governmental urging, more than one hundred American periodicals gave free reprint rights to German publishers. Senior Scholastic, Farmer's Digest, Science Newsletter, Catholic News, The Christian Science Monitor, New York Times Magazine, Atlantic Monthly, and the Saturday Evening Post were among those who allowed free use of their articles.
Naturally, not all of the articles recommended for use were printed, but a large number were. The articles covered a wide range of interests. Popular science, social and political science, agriculture, education, art, religion, philosophy, psychology, and labor were some of the more common topics. Some of the more notable German periodicals were: Die Wandlung, a literary and scholarly publication in Heidelberg; Sie, a magazine for women; Ulenspiegel, a magazine modeled on the earlier Simplicissimus; and Der Penguin and Der Horizont, both of which were magazines for young people.

The Americans also imported American books in translation; 35,000 copies of twenty-five works were imported during the first six months of the occupation. This was only a temporary measure, as the right to print American works in Germany soon obviated the necessity for importing books from America. German publishers printed such things as biographies of Abraham Lincoln, Daniel Boone, and Benjamin Franklin. They also turned out some of Margaret Mead's writings, and various works on democracy. In the fiction area, Ernest Hemingway, Thomas Wolfe, James Thurber, Herman Melville, and Nathaniel Hawthorne were all made available to German readers.

To promote the translation of American books, the American Military Government set up and ran the Book Translating Unit, a part of the Information Control Division. Even after commercial channels were opened between American and German publishers in 1950, the unit continued. By March, 1953, 341 American books had been translated under this program. As an additional bit of assistance to further the translating of American
books, the Book Translating Unit published a monthly bulletin, *Buecher aus Amerika*. This bulletin, which went to both British and U.S. Zones, explained how German publishers could acquire translation rights and suggested books thought suitable for use in Germany. The Americans made special issues of paper stock to German publishers to print translated American works and then recouped the costs of the stock by buying the printed books at a fifty percent discount. The books purchased by the Americans were resold, some through the America Houses.38

The American authorities gave the translating process the necessary impetus and offered American works to German readers, but that was only a start. The process continued, and in the years that followed, thousands more were translated, and, as Germans became more proficient in English, the flow of American books to Germany grew even stronger. By 1965, Germany was importing over 800,000 American books per year, and by 1970, the figure was close to three 3,000,000.39

Just as there were overt U.S. newspapers, there were overt U.S. periodicals. *Die amerikanische Rundschau* was a somewhat scholarly publication which aimed to cultivate interest in Western values; it existed from 1948 until February 1950. The *Neue Auslese* had a larger circulation than the *Rundschau*, 650,000 monthly as compared to 120,000 monthly. It was rather like the *Reader's Digest* and featured articles on politics, economics, society, and culture. The *Neue Auslese* remained available until August 1950, when it was stopped, due to declining circulation and financial difficulties. *Heute*, which was published from 1945 through 1951, was a
bi-weekly magazine which used photographs extensively. It was much like Life magazine, and devoted considerable space to American institutions and customs; articles on the corner drugstore, county fairs, and elections were typical offerings. In the beginning, Heute had stressed collective German guilt and responsibility for suffering, but those themes were at odds with the American view that the Nazi leaders rather than the people at large were guilty.40

Publications crossed readily over zonal boundaries in the West, and two excellent examples of early German periodicals that succeeded are Die Zeit, a weekly paper with liberal inclinations, and Der Spiegel. Both originated in the British Zone. Die Zeit was the first non-union weekly paper printed in the British Zone and was the derivative of a daily, Der Tag, which suited the tastes of the British Military Government. Die Zeit was suspended on two occasions for violating rules, one of which involved criticism of the Morgenthau Plan. Der Spiegel was modeled on Time in the U.S.A. and Social Review in Great Britain. In the beginning, Der Spiegel was called Diese Woche and was published by Germans under the auspices of the British Military Government. The magazine soon irritated the occupying powers, especially the British, and after only five issues, the Crown served notice that either the editorial staff would have to find private financing or be shut down. (The British took action when the magazine published an uncomplimentary photo and article on the Netherlands' royal family. Since both Britain and the Netherlands held their monarchies in high esteem, something had to be done.) Private financing was arranged, the name changed to Der Spiegel, and publication continued. The first
edition under the new name appeared on January 4, 1947. The editors chose
to pursue a critical line, complaining about mistakes of the occupying pow-
ners and searching out graft and corruption wherever they could find it.
Der Spiegel was often a thorn in the Allies' side, even though the
publisher once concluded, "It is not our task to denounce every Allied
mistake." The French once labeled Der Spiegel as "the magazine of militant
nonconformism." Both Die Zeit and Der Spiegel were published throughout the
1950s and remain popular today.41
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Chapter 7

Other Influences On The Cultural Milieu

How the Germans spent their free time was also of concern. Opinions which could be influenced during periods of leisure were just as important as those which were formed during the hours of work. The motion picture industry, the theater, musical productions, and literature all received their share of American attention. The Information Control Division was an instrument for affecting what the Germans saw, heard, and read during the crucial rebuilding phase. The Information Control Division was an element within the Office of Military Government for Germany; it was the focal point for the implementation of Information Programs and Cultural Policies established by the U.S. Military Government. Decisions made in this division were based on pertinent guidelines from the U.S. Government and Policy letters, such as those issued by General Lucius D. Clay, the U.S. Military Governor.

In 1948, the Information Control Division underwent the first of three changes in terms of title and intensity of control, but its basic function, i.e., guiding information disseminated to the German people continued. In that year, the Information Services Division (ISD) was founded with a subordinate office located in each state in the U.S. Zone. The ISD had eleven branches staffed by over two hundred Americans and more than two thousand Germans. In 1952 the ISD was renamed the Information Division, and the state-level offices were disbanded. The dissolution of those offices did not mean the function of information guidance was
abandoned; it was more of a relaxation, with the Public Affairs Regional Centers assuming the necessary monitoring and coordinating functions. The Information Division and the Public Affairs Regional Centers existed until the end of the occupation.\(^1\) At that point, the Office of the High Commissioner was converted to a U.S. embassy with a public affairs office.

**Motion Pictures**

There were two large motion picture production studios in the U.S. Zone. One of these was in Munich and the other in Berlin. The Munich studio, *Bavaria Film Kunst*, was captured in good condition while the one in Berlin was seventy-five percent destroyed. Both studios were reopened under American supervision, and their facilities were used initially to adapt films sent to Germany from America for reorientation purposes. The studios were soon turned over to German control, but they continued to operate under U.S. Military Government policy. German producers were licensed by the Americans, who approved the scripts, monitored production, and reviewed the finished products. On the business side, the U.S. Military Government broke up the motion picture cartel (*Universal Film Allianz*) and prescribed the reorganization of the industry into four separate entities: production, studio operation, distribution, and exhibition. The German-made films were placed on the market in competition with those which were imported, mainly from the U.S.A. Additionally, American commercial films with German sound tracks were widely shown. The German sound tracks were added in Germany under the supervision of Americans. *The Bells of St. Mary's*, *One Foot in Heaven*, and *Holiday Inn* were some of
the more popular films. Attendance records kept until February, 1946 show that 13,980,952 Germans had seen American-made films.

Educational films from America were also frequently shown to German audiences. The Library of Congress, Tuesday In November (a film on the American election process), The Great Lakes, New England, and The Rural Co-op were all seen in both the U.S. and British zones. Other films included discussions on such diverse subjects as nursery training, music, and soapbox derbies. It is perhaps significant that at a time when luxuries were at a premium and going to a motion picture was a luxury, Germans were conditioned to associate times of enjoyment with American ideas. They also formed concepts of standards of living by watching films which featured a country endowed with riches and populated by people free to indulge in all that their land had to offer. This situation reinforced the democratic and capitalistic ideas espoused by the Americans in Germany and no doubt kindled desires for the good life.

American films served as a standard for German producers. The newly licensed producers had to compete with American movies, and so they adopted American techniques, processes, and approaches to production. The first films produced by Germans after the war tried to be realistic by describing conditions and attempting to deal with the past. This came to be called the Truemmer (rubble) phase. The film Die Moerder sind unter uns (The Murderers Among Us)(1946) is a prime example of a Truemmer film. It depicted the quest for Nazi criminals in postwar Germany. The Truemmer phase was replaced by a wave of films, nostalgic in nature, which were
referred to as Heimat films, a picture postcard portrayal of happy country life. Romy Schneider's Sissi films, set in an idealized imperial Austria fall into this category.

These Heimat films were a variation of what was known as the UFA (Universal Film Allianz) cliché. The UFA cliché was, for all practical purposes, a standardized formula which had long been used in the German film industry, but it was not strong enough to hold off changes from Hollywood.

Germans had been sealed off from American-made films for several years, and the Hollywood style proved to be very attractive; there was a newness, a freshness about it which appealed to German audiences. Thus the UFA cliché was diminished by the Hollywood cliché, which lasted into the 1960s. This American formula usually called for a story somewhat divorced from reality, "a dream factory," or a cultural hero. One such film was The Big Chance, which featured an aspiring German pianist who finally got the chance to play with Louis Armstrong. Within a few years, the Hollywood cliché was fully integrated into the German film industry, and German films had gained in popularity. In 1954, seventy-eight percent of the Germans preferred German-made films, many of which employed American techniques, but American films still exceeded by far the number of films from any other country. By the time the decade of the sixties dawned, the German film industry was producing in excess of 140 films a year, some of which were American. Kirk Douglas' The Vikings; Interlude, staring June Allyson; and the Werner von Braun story, I Aim at the Stars, were all produced in Germany for American audiences. This quantity paralleled
Germany's largest pre-war production year of 1930, when 146 films had been produced. Even after German films had returned to favor, American film stars remained popular. For example, in 1964 two of the top ten female stars were Americans. Elizabeth Taylor and Doris Day ranked eighth and ninth, respectively, and Rock Hudson was in ninth place among the favorite male stars. A year later, Doris Day was number ten in the female category, while Rock Hudson had risen to the number two spot among the male performers.5

The motion picture field had its "overt" production, as did the newspapers and magazines. The U.S. and British Military Governments combined their efforts in a weekly newsreel called Welt im Film. This newsreel, which ran in over two thousand movie houses, was produced in the studios of the Bavaria Film Kunst in Munich and served to inform German audiences on international events and other major news stories.6 A survey in 1950 revealed that seventy-seven percent of the filmgoers saw Welt im Film every time they went to the movies, and almost all of them rated it "good" or "fair."7

To augment Welt im Film and the controls exercised over the other films shown to Germans, the U.S. Military Government produced special documentary films to educate German youth on Nazi crimes and postwar American aid. A special, animated film called Races of Mankind depicting understanding and brotherhood was particularly well received — a ninety-three percent approval rate.8 These films were shown to assemblages of the Army's GYA program. By the middle of 1947, 200,000 youths per month were watching these special films.9
Further influence on German cultural affairs was exerted by the Americans in the world of the theater. This was done largely by encouraging the German theater to present American plays. By portraying American life on the stage, the theater added another dimension to America's influence on the lives of individual Germans. The Information Control Division assisted in getting the necessary permission to produce American plays in Germany. Once a clearance was granted, the play was translated into German and frequently performed in all zones. American plays constituted a sizable portion of the plays presented; for example, during the month of January, 1947 there were twenty-seven American plays presented in Berlin. This amounted to fifty percent of all the plays in all of Berlin at that time.10

In the years that followed, American plays continued to comprise a significant percentage of the productions staged in Germany. A special report prepared at the American Embassy in Bonn in June of 1962, for the years 1956 to 1961, showed that almost ten percent of the professional plays performed during those years were American. In addition to quantity, quality was also present. In every year but one, there were at least three American plays among the top twenty-five in terms of performances. The Diary of Anne Frank, by Goodrich and Hackett, was the single most popular play; it was performed four thousand times during the period. Other popular American playwrights were Eugene O'Neill, Thornton Wilder, Tennessee Williams, and Arthur Miller. The special report concluded, "evidently the
American 'Modern Classics' have become an integral part of the German language theater's repertoire.\textsuperscript{11}

The America Houses played an important role in introducing American plays into the German repertoire. The America House personnel cultivated close personal contacts with theater people, recommended titles, provided copies, furnished critical reviews, publicized the plays, printed programs, conducted discussions on the plays, and gave guidance on such things as backgrounds, costumes, and props.\textsuperscript{12}

**Music**

Americans made no pretense of being culturally superior to the Germans from an historical perspective, particularly in respect to music. The timeless contributions of the great, classical composers remained unchallenged, but works which conjured up feelings associated with the Third Reich were banned. In their place, the Americans introduced the works of American composers. American chamber music, orchestral works, and opera were all performed. To encourage the acceptance of American music, the American authorities in Germany obtained permission for several categories of German musicians to perform American works at no expense. German students, conservatories, and critics had free access to American works. However, those Germans who chose to use such compositions for commercial reasons had to pay modest rental fees for copies of the scores.

American experts came to Germany and lectured on music as well.
Typical of the lecture topics were: "Trends in Contemporary North and South American Music," "American Folk Music," and "American Popular Music or Jazz During the Past 30 years." Germans were certainly no strangers to American music. Swing music was favored by some Germans even before the Americans arrived as conquerors, but through concerted efforts to show the wide variety of music offered in America, the number of fans of American music grew considerably. It was the intent of the U.S. authorities to demonstrate that the sociological climate in America encouraged musical education and development, and thus musicians who had fled Nazi Germany and taken up residence in America received special attention. American musicians went on tour in Germany, U.S. military bands played countless concerts, and the music of the American Forces Network (AFN) was popular with many Germans, particularly the young.  

The American Forces Network always had a large shadow audience. It was perhaps the single greatest source of American influence on the Germans' taste for music. As stated above, AFN was also educational; it was a common practice for Germans to listen to AFN to improve their understanding of the English language. The net effect of America on popular German music was overwhelming. Jazz and rock and roll became integral parts of German music. Nowhere was this acceptance more evident than in the reception given to Elvis Presley and his guitar. He was recognized everywhere in Germany and had the same kind of frenzied fans as he had in America.

American music and films were but two aspects of the popular culture transferred from America to Germany. A whole host of material things which symbolized America were accepted in Germany, more so by the young than the
American cigarettes, chewing gum, comic books, Coca Cola, and blue jeans were among the more obvious items. Some of the initial acceptance may have stemmed from the sheer availability of American items and the dearth of comparable German items, but in the long run other, more significant factors also influenced it. By accepting these material things, the Germans were accepting the "good America." They were accepting a new life style, one of freedom, individuality, and abundance — all consistent with the lessons of democracy preached by Americans.

Literature

Where literature was concerned, the Germans were at a crossroads. The authors of the late 1940s and the 1950s searched for new frames of reference. The recent past provided little of which they could be proud. Henry M. Pachter, the author of Modern Germany: A Social, Cultural, and Political History, wrote that they had to seek roots or affinities in the "modern development of the western countries...[they] found...cultural orientation in western literature." German authors adopted a mind-set which led them to view their task "first of all as a political mission: overcoming the past, preaching new attitudes, reorienting the mind of Germany." They chose social and political themes to serve this end, but these themes were not very popular. The immediate postwar period was so dreary that the German people sought to forget the past. Surrounded with rubble in their daily lives, they looked for relief in their literature. The German authors of this time were too serious and moralistic, so German readers turned to the classics or to foreign works which had been
prohibited during the Third Reich. As time passed, the Germans were caught up in the process of making the economic miracle succeed. They rebuilt their homes and lives and wanted to be comfortable. They repressed the past and reveled in their new-found prosperity. Art and beauty began to be appreciated again, along with old values. The new German writers needed time to establish themselves, so foreign writers continued to be popular. American writers had the highly desirable quality of "world openness," so German writers imitated them. Hemingway, Faulkner, and other Americans served as models for German writers who copied their narrative style and use of everyday language.  

But not everyone greeted the American influence with open arms. There was some resentment. For example, one commentator found it "not flattering to us [Germans] that America, on which we like to look down a little, should have created the idealistic literature of our times, novels born of an idealistic concept of the world and of values." Furthermore, literary critics sometimes observed that German readers were subjected to mediocre German imitations, as an avalanche of pulp literature and the fifty-pfennig thriller modeled on True Story and the Wild West Story poured into the market. Eventually there were complaints that German readers were becoming both weary and wary of American literature. In time, German authors came to be popular in postwar Germany, but throughout the decade of the fifties, American influence was pronounced, and American writers remained popular. In fact, Horst Oppel stated in Studies in Comparative Literature in 1962 that American writers were still preferred in Germany.
Oppel commented:

Around the middle of the 19th century Edgar Allan Poe made the well-known statement in his "Letter to Mr. B.": "You are aware of the great barrier in the path of an American writer. He is read, if at all, in preference to the combined and established wit of the world." And now, a hundred years later, it is tempting to change this to read: "You are aware of the great barrier in the path of a German writer. He is read, if at all, in preference to the combined and established wit of America."... There is not the slightest doubt of the preferences of the general public today.21

Art

To reorient an entire society is no easy task. In the case of Germany, not only the building blocks of society (educational and political institutions, economic system, and class structure) had to be modified, but daily experiences as well. Thus, even the casual experience of viewing a painting or visiting a museum had a significance larger than usual and became a matter for the attention of the American authorities in Germany in the postwar period. They were not blind to such opportunities to reorient German thinking. Efforts were made to free contemporary German art from Nazi influence and to make the German museum a democratic institution. Since the creation of a work of art is a subjective process, no attempt was made to manage it, but the Americans were able to encourage free expression, provide support, open the door to new ideas, and offer opportunities for growth.

As far as the preservation of existing works of art and historical items was concerned, the Americans left their mark on the many museums in German towns and cities. Americans contributed to the restoration and safeguarding of structures, monuments, and other works of art. These
were important things to culturally minded Germans who were not preoccupied with the search for food and shelter, and as the necessities became less of a problem, Germany's monuments, art collections and museum pieces came to mean more and more to a wider segment of German society. Wherever possible, cultural reorientation was addressed, but those in charge realized it was a long-term project. Dr. William G. Constable, a special consultant to the U.S. Military Government in 1949, predicted the desired changes would take at least fifteen to twenty years. Authorities acknowledged real change would come about only by influencing the young people and waiting for them to move into positions of responsibility. The older generation would, it was believed, resist change.22

The overall program for the rejuvenation and preservation of art was approached with a certain degree of caution. It was not simply a matter of allowing artists to do as they chose or of saving articles of cultural value, because the Americans felt that while these things were important there was also the danger of rekindling intense nationalism and building the German ego too high.23

As with the rest of the reorientation program, it was held that the American role of control and direction should be replaced as quickly as possible by one more oriented towards advice, assistance, and supervision. The Germans were to shoulder the responsibilities and reconstruct their own world of art -- but in consonance with American aims. The American approach suggested that the previous emphasis on nationalism in art had stymied the growth of liberal and nonnationalistic elements in Germany. To regenerate creativity, the great names of the past (Duerer, Bach, Goethe et al.) were
celebrated. But to avoid developing overwhelming pride in Germany's accomplishments, it was considered wise to stress how democratic and liberal ideas inspire cultural activities and how democracy and liberalism would strengthen Germany's best elements.  

U.S. policy makers in Germany sponsored exhibitions of art from nations other than Germany to emphasize the achievements of non-German artists and to help correct the German bias for German art cultivated by National Socialism. American artists frequently were featured to influence German thinking along democratic lines, but attempts at direct and deliberate propaganda were avoided. Simply seeing the products of talented, free minds was considered a valuable experience. Exhibitions included photographs and drawings of American architecture and commercial and industrial items of art which had the potential to influence the life and outlook of Germans as they rebuilt their country. Exhibitions of American art appeared in all areas of West Germany, and American money, organization, or sponsorship contributed to numerous other exhibitions; the American share was generally made clear by notices in the exhibitions or in newspaper articles about them. The exhibition of good, contemporary works by German artists was encouraged by the Americans to stimulate rivalry, raise standards, and encourage experimentation. It is interesting that the American exhibits usually did not include artists of German birth who had moved to America. This was to prevent claims that they were really German artists. Why this argument was considered valid for artists but not musicians was never made clear.  

Other efforts were made by American officials to advance art in
Germany. The appointment of liberal-minded men as art professors was urged. University curricula were altered to include the study of art. University museums were established where students could study and actually handle works of art. Libraries were equipped with books, photographs, and slides to facilitate learning. Help in obtaining art materials was given. And art teachers were trained, some in America and some in the Teachers Training Centers by American art teachers. Generally speaking, the emphasis placed on art by the Americans was intended to benefit the masses. A widespread appreciation of art and art history was a goal, as was the provision of the tools and training for average artists. Beyond this type of concern, there were no special provisions to accommodate men or women of genius.26

Museums

Closely related to the rejuvenation and reorientation of art was the American regard for museums. During the years 1933 to 1945, museums in Germany had served the National Socialists' cause. In the process they had lost their worldwide preeminence, and, due to isolation, their curators had failed to keep abreast of the changes that had occurred elsewhere. Traditionally, German museums had been regarded as places for educated people; they had not served the cause of democracy. The state of the German museum in 1949 was described by Dr. Constable, the special consultant to the U.S. Military Government for cultural affairs.

[The] hours of opening are rarely convenient for those who work all day and most of the week, at least one museum I know being closed on Saturdays and Sundays. The charging of entrance fees is practically universal. Exhibits are tidily arranged but are
apt to be overcrowded, and are not as a rule grouped to give accent and meaning; labels give the minimum of information and are useful only if the visitor has some previous knowledge. There are exceptions to all this, but for the most part there is little idea of making the museum friendly, attractive and comprehensible to ordinary men and women.

Little is done or intended to be done to make museums part of the educational system by such means as lectures, a "docent" service, collaboration with schools, and through publications.

There is little attempt to vary the arrangement of exhibits except to make room for new acquisitions. The ideas of special groupings, frequent loan exhibitions, and short loans among museums, are rare. Even when they exist they may be marred by faulty carrying out. In one museum an "Exhibit of the Week" was put out on a screen in the middle of the gallery, but no information as to the artist, the subject, or the significance of the work was given. In consequence, few people gave it more than a passing glance.

Though most museums are state or city owned, little is done to foster the idea of their belonging to their community, and being responsible to that community. Rather, they are regarded as part of the sacred machinery of government.

To correct this state of affairs, Dr. Constable recommended the U.S. take an active role in the reconstruction of the museums and that the entire plan of operations in German museums be oriented towards making them more democratic. Dr. Constable's recommendations covered three broad areas: (1) curator qualifications, (2) operations, and (3) physical facilities.

Curators, according to Dr. Constable, should be trained in America with American experts brought to Germany to teach other German curators.

It was suggested that the total concept of museum operations be revised to accommodate the average person. Displays should be attractively arranged, well lighted, and labeled with adequate explanations so that
visitors would be able to understand the displays. The cost of admission should be low enough that the masses could afford to frequent museums, and admission should even be free at times, with hours of operation being extended to include weekends or evenings. This would allow workers to visit. Preservation and restoration techniques also needed improvement; Dr. Constable urged that American techniques be adopted.

The physical facilities needed to be different in order for them to serve the communities. In Dr. Constable's estimation, the museums should not be reconstructed in a "brick-for-brack fashion" (not exactly as they were before), but rather in a manner which would make them useful contributors to cultural growth and understanding. Lecture halls, study areas, and explanatory pamphlets or guides should all be features of German museums.

The American officials took the consultant's recommendations. Some elements of the plan progressed faster than others. For example, the exchange of curators did not take place until the 1970s in some places and in many not at all. But, in principle, all of these recommendations were carried out in West Germany as a whole. Display techniques, lecture halls, labeling, guide books, weekend hours, and low-cost or free admission in today's German museums are all attributable at least in part, to American influence. In sum, the American influence on German museums contributed to an increased understanding by the average German of the past and of cultural achievements and relationships.
Churches

Historically, the churches had played an important role in the life of the German people, and American policy towards religion in Germany considered this historical role. While Hitler had been in power, the churches had been forced to make compromises. It was America's goal to allow the churches to become a moral and spiritual force once again. To an extent this required passive guidance, but it also necessitated establishing and articulating the rules.

American policy prescribed freedom of worship, protection and fair treatment for the various religious elements, and respect for churches and religious institutions. The authors of the Basic Law of the Federal Republic codified the American policy of freedom of religion. Article 4 states:

Freedom of faith, of conscience, and freedom of creed in religion and in philosophy of life are inviolable. The practice of religion without interference is guaranteed.

The American goals were to eliminate Nazi influences, prevent the recrudescence of nationalism and guarantee fair play for all competing interests. Other than that, American control was to be held to a minimum. Toward these ends, the American authorities established a Religious Affairs Branch. But to illustrate how little attention was given to the subject of religion, paragraph 8.33 of the Guide to Education and Cultural Relations, published by the High Commissioner, simply stated that the Religious Affairs Branch:
a. Assists church organizations and inter-faith groups in formulating programs to utilize their spiritual and moral resources in the establishment of a free society based on social justice and the dignity of man.

b. Assists and encourages all German elements promoting freedom of religion, interfaith understanding, and cooperation in international religious relations.30

To accomplish this mission, the Religious Affairs Branch had only a handful of staff. Originally there were eight professionals in the central office and six field representatives spread out over the U.S. Zone and Berlin. When the High Commission was established in 1949, the numbers dropped to three professionals in the Religious Affairs Branch and four in the field.31

The Americans who made the most frequent and most direct contact with German church leaders were not from the U.S. Military Government or High Commission but rather representatives sent to Germany by the churches in America. The visitors fell in two categories. The first category was comprised of individuals sent, at the behest of General Clay, by the three predominant religious faiths in America to provide liaison with German religious communities. Each faith (Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish) sent one such representative to Germany and paid that person's salary. The U.S. military in Germany afforded the liaison representatives limited logistic support but no formal assistance. They provided information on religious developments to the occupation authorities and served as a channel for passing on to the Germans any information on religious matters from the occupation officials deemed appropriate, but they were not part of the occupation establishment.32
While religious agents working directly for the occupation authorities were relatively few, voluntary church agencies existed in substantial numbers, and through them American congregations provided a second set of emissaries to help German churches recover. The National Catholic Welfare Conference, Church World Service, Lutheran World Relief, the Mennonite Central Committee, The Brethren, The Unitarians, the American Friends Service Committee, and the Mormons were the major voluntary organizations. In order to operate in Germany, such agencies had to be licensed in the United States by the Council of Relief Agencies Licensed for Operation in Germany (CRALOG) and to have the approval of the U.S. Military Government, but they operated throughout West Germany and Berlin.

The exchange program managed by the Americans included church personnel and visiting consultants. And the U.S. High Commission cooperated with the World Council of Churches on numerous conferences on international and ecumenical matters in the three zones in the West. These conferences were complemented by social action programs set up with the permission of the occupation authorities, and collectively they made important contributions to progress in the religious affairs field.

All things considered, the most emphasis was placed on helping church groups establish themselves as community-oriented service organizations which encouraged individuals to accept social and political responsibilities along with their moral responsibilities as members of a church. In Zweibruecken, the American church organizations set an example by sponsoring activities such as dinners, games, picnics, and Christmas parties for German children. Specific examples of these church activities are provided in Chapter 8 below.
American relief agencies frequently worked through the German churches to channel gifts from America to needy families, orphanages, and other institutions; this was the case in Zweibruecken, as well as elsewhere. And groups from American church congregations in the military communities often had contact with German church groups. But Americans did not control the German churches. To be sure, there were times when the U.S. decision makers attempted to make use of the churches. For example, the American authorities encouraged the churches to exert influence on the trade unions to temper their tendencies towards socialism, which sometimes brought the unions dangerously close to communism, but how much influence the churches had was always questionable. The trade unions often were in the hands of the socialist party (SPD), and the SPD and the churches had a history of being adversaries. The number of organized efforts made by the U.S. Military Government and High Commission dropped significantly in 1950, due to budget cuts. At that time, voluntary efforts took on even greater importance.35

German Awareness

Some of the American impact on cultural life was seen second-hand by most Germans. The average citizen was not informed on the specifics of how textbooks were cleansed, newspaper features provided, museum standards redefined, or radio programs organized. Germans knew such things were controlled, but the details were not obvious. On the other hand, they knew American movies when they saw them. By the same token, lectures by American speakers, performances by American orchestras or bands, displays of American art, and stage events with American performers were clear indications of the intent to acquaint Germans with American ideas. This was the case in Zweibruecken. Food and shelter came first, but after that the
people were starved for cultural events. Zweibruecken's Festhalle reopened in 1953, and American-sponsored activities often took place there. The America House in Kaiserslautern helped with some of the arrangements, as related above. American military personnel and their families helped organize clubs. Joint German-American functions were common, and these developments are related in detail in Chapter 8, but the essence of these happenings was that the people of Zweibruecken recognized they were being presented with something new. They listened to the American radio station, and at first it seemed strange, but they welcomed the music even though "it was not to be compared with Wagner." Some said it was vibrant and should be seen in that light. It was even suggested their own Abendlaendliche Kultur (occidental culture) had grown stale, and the Americans were offering something refreshing. Americans were seen as relaxed, open, and confident. It was a time for Germans and Americans to get to know each other. They did just that with the result being that American cultural influence progressed over the years. American products such as films, music and clothes were accepted as part of life. Material comforts (television, automobiles, and appliances) evident through the American presence helped the Germans to modify their tastes.36

These are views of persons who lived through the decade of the fifties as adults. They directly benefited from the democratic way of life that succeeded National Socialism, and they acknowledged this influence in the 1950s. In order to get an assessment of how enduring and cumulative the American influence has been, it is perhaps instructive to leap forward
three decades and measure the attitudes of the successor generation, people who were either very young during the time addressed by this study or were born later. In 1983, the U.S. Information Agency commissioned an opinion survey to gauge German attitudes toward their own and American society. That portion of the survey pertaining to American influence on West German society concluded the following:

Given the part played by the U.S. in the Federal Republic's post-World War II history, successor generation members, unsurprisingly and overwhelmingly (86 percent), point to the U.S. as exerting a greater influence than any other country on the West German way of life. By comparison, only a handful (2 percent) think that one or another West European country's influence is most telling.

American influence is seen as touching many aspects of West German society. However, it is most widely perceived to impact on economic aspects, concretely, on the economy itself and, philosophically, on people's materialistic outlook on life.

And exposed daily to highly visible expressions of popular culture, many also see American influence as "cultural," identifying fashion, pop music, eating habits, leisure time activities, including jogging and aerobics, and language.

Some one in five detect American influence in the political sphere but, in this context at least, only one percent mention U.S. post-war aid including the Marshall Plan.

Surprisingly perhaps, successors' perceptions of U.S. influence on West Germany's way of life do not materially differ from those of the older elites.

The survey showed that Germans felt greatly influenced by America; however, that influence was not always viewed favorably. The influence was seen as negative because of economic matters and values; seventy-three percent of the respondents deplored the "excessive emphasis on material striving in the FRG."37

Material striving was encouraged by the Americans, but they should not
get all the blame or credit, since material things naturally appealed to the Germans of the 1950s, a people who had lost so much in the war. It appears that the successor generation grew up without the real needs experienced by their predecessors and therefore allowed themselves a different form of idealism. Nevertheless, American influence is still a fact of life in West German society.

Changes In Society

At this stage, it is worthwhile to recount and to reflect on some of the changes in German society as a whole during the decade of the fifties, because the American influences related above were integral to altered attitudes and new practices. By 1950, people were beginning to be able to live the way they wanted to live. While only a fraction, 9.3 percent, said they were happy, a majority, 60.9 percent, considered their lives to be satisfactory. Most were still toiling six days a week in the workplace, but a reduction in work hours was sought. During the course of the decade, the five-day, forty-hour work week became a reality for some, and by 1960, most workers were on a forty-five hour per week schedule. Basing their conclusions on the American example, sociologists recognized that Germany was becoming a highly industrialized, leisure-time, consumer-oriented society.

Families generally spent their time together. Reading and listening to the radio were popular pastimes. Movies with romantic, uncomplicated themes were popular. Handicrafts, painting, and music returned to the average German's life. People tended to avoid politics, except at the
polling place. And vacations were usually spent at home or with relatives (until the latter part of the decade when mass tourism returned). In short, the decade was a time for normalization and modernization, which included a reestablishment of traditional values.

But comfortable living was a major goal for the average German, and modern technological improvements, as known in America, were introduced to facilitate comforts. Super highways, bridges, skyscrapers of glass and steel, factories, and television all became features of the new German society. These features were not necessarily new to Germany because super highways and glass and steel structures were known in Germany, before World War II, but the rate of construction was faster and more extensive in the 1950s. It was a period of rapid modernization comparable only with the decades of industrialization between 1870 and 1914. By the 1960s, the face of the cities had been permanently changed due to city planning, new construction, the growth of suburbs, and a sizable shift of population from the country to the city. In 1950, 25 percent of the population was agrarian. In 1960, only 13.3 percent of the people were left in country or village settings. There was also a measurable decline in religiosity. The church became but one of many organizations, and religion became more and more an individual matter. In 1954, 19 percent of the Protestants and 61 percent of the Catholics were regular churchgoers. Ten years later, in 1964, those percentages had declined to 15 percent and 58 percent respectively.

A process of homogenization took place. There was an increasing interdependence between urban and rural segments of society. Earnings for
publicly and privately employed persons and men and women drew closer. And the middle class grew rapidly with the old middle class becoming only a fraction of the whole. There was also a shift in elites. At the beginning of the decade, the leading figures in the learned professions were by and large individuals who had their professional roots in the Weimar years, but as the years passed, this changed in the universities, in literature, and in the theater as influence streamed in from the West.

This cultural current came mostly from America. The British and French certainly contributed with the likes of T.S. Eliot and Jean Paul Sartre, but it was primarily the Americans who contributed to the changes wrought in German society in the 1950s. This American influence took many forms: literature, theater, films, music, styles, city planning, traffic management, architecture, production management, marketing methods, and even election campaigning. Everything American served as an example. In effect, America was an "ersatz nation" for the Germans in the 1950s.

One pronounced result of the infusion of imported ideas and technology was an alteration in values. Ralph Dahrendorf expressed it, in 1967, in his book *Society and Democracy in Germany* in the following way:

> Discipline, orderliness, subservience, cleanliness, industriousness, precision, and all the other virtues ascribed by many to the Germans as an echo of past splendor have already given way to a much less rigid set of values, among which economic success, a high income, the holiday trip, and the new car play a much larger part than the virtues of the past.

What Dahrendorf described is nothing more, or less, than an intense desire to acquire material things and the pleasures of life. At the same time, he
pointed out that the developments in Germany all but precluded the rebirth of the kind of authoritarianism which produced Hitler. People accustomed to seeking and finding individual happiness are, as he put it, "unlikely candidates for totalitarian organizations." In their pursuit of individual gratification, Germans, on both the left and right, rejected any significant opposition to democracy.

In spite of all these changes, German society was not turned upside down by modernization. Germany reconfirmed its preferences for some traditional (premodern) aspects of life. Family ties were still encouraged, even promoted by the state by anchoring parental prerogatives in the Basic Law. The Laender were given greater rights than before, and particularism was furthered through the social acceptance of dialects. These tendencies moderated the modernization process. As an additional impediment to modernization, as Ralph Dahrendorf pointed out, the government's policies in the fields of subsidies and social services seem "designed less to lay an effective basis for citizenship rights than to bring about a welfare state in the traditional sense." These extensive social services discouraged, and continue to discourage, social mobility. People are secure in their inherited social classes. Peasants tend to remain peasants and merchants tend to remain merchants, etc. Certainly many sons and daughters of working-class parents went to the university (as mentioned in the discussion of education above), and the middle class had many new additions, but such changes occurred in spite of a welfare state which rewarded stagnation.
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PART III
POLICY, PRACTICES AND ASSESSMENT

Chapter 8
Interpersonal Relations

Introduction

Across all factors -- economic, cultural, social, and political -- was a vast network of interpersonal German-American relations. These factors supported the interpersonal relations and, in fact, were integral to them. But the day-to-day happenings were the most obvious to both sides. Germans and Americans lived together in harmony and co-existed in estrangement. Love, anger, envy, admiration, compassion, resentment, and detached acceptance were all present at all times. The perceptions of the people involved and the fruits of their labors are the things of which grass-roots relations are made.

Americans were seen regularly by most Germans in the areas where the American forces were stationed. Obviously, being in such close proximity, the two nationalities formed both positive and negative impressions. It was the official American desire that Americans create positive impressions wherever and whenever possible. This was reflected in the numerous classes, orientation efforts, and policy statements organized, conducted, and promulgated by the Americans. The American officials were always aware of the American image in the mind of the German people and were anxious to make the best possible impression. Thus it was that in February 1950, the Commanding General of the U.S. Army in Europe issued a set of instructions to the field commanders on release of information to the German press. The instructions stated:
It is important that the German press in the U.S. Occupied Zone is made cognizant of the fact that crimes of violence by occupation personnel against German nationals are thoroughly investigated and appropriate disciplinary action taken by this command.

All commanders and court-martial authorities will insure that the German newspapers in their respective areas are promptly and fully informed of the results of investigations and court-martial trials of members of their commands who have been involved in any alleged crime of violence against German nationals.1

German-American relations were always a matter of concern for responsible officials at every level, and statements to that effect were regularly entered in the official historical files for the U.S. forces. A typical entry, this one from 1951, states:

The betterment of German-American relations was the object of continuous and ceaseless effort throughout the year .... In October, for example, a letter was sent to all EUCOM subordinate commanders requesting that they submit a list of present and potential sources of friction between the U.S. and civilian populations, together with their recommendations for corrective action.2

In that same year, 1951, a survey sponsored by the High Commissioner, but conducted by German pollsters, showed that seventy-five percent of the West Germans judged relations between the occupying forces and the Germans to be from fair to good. A small fraction (eight percent) of the Germans in the U.S. Zone felt that American soldiers behaved badly, and a majority (fifty-three percent) expressed the opinion that there should be either much or very much social contact.3

The official position was represented by more than just guidance. Community Advisory Councils made up of Germans and Americans existed in most communities where Americans were located. Orientation classes were
given to advise Americans on how to get along with the Germans. These classes were mandatory for the military and were given to all soldiers. German language programs were offered to teach soldiers the fundamentals of conversational German, although participation was generally less than desired. Understanding of the Germans was further promoted through regular features in the *Stars and Stripes* newspaper. The features described customs, traditions, government, and items of interest to tourists. Radio programs over AFN offered information on such topics as the European Coal and Steel Community, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the impact of Europe upon Americans stationed there and the American influence on Europe. Town patrols composed of senior non-commissioned officers roved the streets during off-duty hours to apprehend drunken soldiers before they got into greater mischief, and soldiers' pass privileges were tightly controlled. All of these measures, plus swift punishment, were used to control the number of incidents.  

On the German side, compliance and survival were the essential concerns of life in the early days after the war. However, after the nature of the occupation became clear to the Germans, their attitudes tended to take on a more cordial air. Since every effort was being made to help them get back on their feet and since it was widely believed that the Americans were essential as protectors, it was only right for them to cooperate. Even under the best circumstances, it was obvious that the Americans were going to be around for a while. Realism became the guiding principle.
The Negative Side

Complete records on the numbers of legal infractions by Americans during the occupation no longer exist, and in some cases those that do exist are expressed in different terms, but a review of the records available shows that, by far, the single largest problem, as far as numbers are concerned, involved traffic violations. Speeding, reckless driving, and drunken driving were the most common violations, and accounts of these dot the pages of German newspapers and the *Stars and Stripes*. But the incidents that caused the most consternation were those involving crimes by Americans against Germans. The official historical files for the years 1952 through 1956 reflect the numbers of crimes per one thousand members of the U.S. forces per month. The rates ranged between 0.32 and 0.39 crimes per one thousand per month for the years 1952 through 1955, but then in 1956 the rate went up to 1.04. The reason for the sudden increase is that, in 1956 all crimes committed by Americans against Germans, even minor offenses, were included. Prior to 1956, only serious crimes were reported, e.g. assaults, robbery, rape, and murder. Only in the years 1954 and 1955 were the rates for crimes committed by Germans against Americans recorded in any files. Those rates were 0.80 and 0.61 crimes per thousand members of the U.S. forces per month for 1954 and 1955, and primarily represented thefts, burglaries and assaults.5

The military's historical summaries for the period portray the greater American concern for offenses perpetrated by Americans as opposed to offenses committed against them. However, accounts of both types of cases appear in both German newspapers and in the *Stars and Stripes*. 
One case which received wide coverage pertained to a German girl who, while riding in a jeep with an American soldier, was killed by an angry, stone-throwing mob of Germans near Nuernberg in December 1949. Other accounts show Germans were sentenced for such things as beating Americans. Yet the vast majority of crimes by Germans against Americans centered on the theft of personal or government property.

The archives of the Zweibruecken newspaper Die Rheinpfalz contain numerous references to incidents between Germans and Americans. Certainly many minor confrontations, such as verbal altercations, never made the papers, but confrontations of any real consequence, e.g. robberies or rapes, were reported. The majority of incidents reported were relatively harmless; these consisted of matters such as damage to doors, windows, lights, fences and other types of property which resulted from the antics of intoxicated soldiers. Other incidents, unfortunately, were more serious.

Fights often occurred in bars and restaurants. Sometimes they were limited to only two persons but on other occasions larger groups engaged in fisticuffs. In July, 1953 two Americans accosted two German women outside a Gaststaette. One woman was struck in the face, and the other ran into the Gaststaette to get her husband. The husband went to a nearby military police station but was followed by one of the Americans who hit the German man and injured his ear.

It was worse when weapons were involved. Chains, bottles, knives, and pistols were sometimes used. In August, 1952, two Americans tried to
sell some cigarettes to Germans. They failed to peddle their goods and became engaged in an argument. One of the Americans pulled a knife and stabbed a German man in the neck. On another occasion in 1955, an American soldier used a knife to stab and severely injure two German men at a festival (Kirchweih) in the nearby town of Bubenhausen. Truly serious fights were relatively few and far between, but in January of 1960 two Americans, who had already had too much to drink, attempted to steal a bottle of cognac from a restaurant. The proprietor tried to stop them and was attacked with a chair and a knife. In the ensuing struggle, furniture, ash trays, and a window were damaged. The participants in fights were generally apprehended by the German police or the American military police, punished, and made to pay for damages; however, the Germans were not always satisfied that the punishment was sufficient. One incident took place in which the police's job was made very simple. Nine Americans in search of excitement stopped a car and threw a beer glass through the window -- it turned out to be a German police car. The offenders were caught red-handed.

Before the Americans came back to Zweibruecken, there was very little demand for taxi services. After the Americans arrived, however, the taxi business boomed. Occasionally, the American customers who thought that the fares were too high or that they were being cheated assaulted the drivers or refused to pay -- or both. Such disturbances received a lot of attention, and periodically feelings ran high in the community. Some taxi drivers took to carrying weapons, and in March, 1958 one driver shot at but did not hit an American who argued over the fare. The taxi drivers'
problems came to a head in 1960; over a truly grim incident. An American motorist hit a taxi driver with his car and killed him. The German taxi drivers subsequently organized a demonstration in which they drove through the city to protest the way Americans drove and to honor the memory of the deceased driver. After this demonstration, the American and Canadian commanders in the city met with Zweibruecken's Lord Mayor and Police Chief to discuss what could be done to alleviate the situation. After much discussion it was decided that the officials were already doing everything possible. Drivers licenses were being revoked, violators were being punished, and reasonable controls were in effect. The commanders promised to continue to do everything possible to minimize the problem, but it was generally acknowledged that regardless of how strict the commanders were, there would always be some difficulties. The spokesman for the taxi drivers asked that in the future the military police be available to help them collect their fares. Help from the military police was given, but at times the confrontations took place where there were no military police, and on occasion the incidents even involved military policemen who were off duty.

Some episodes of an unprovoked, brutal nature took place which hurt German-American relations far more than many minor ones combined. In 1953, a German pedestrian dropped a briefcase in the street and caused an approaching American car to brake suddenly to avoid hitting him. An American got out of the car in a rage and fatally beat the German with his fists. The American was identified and caught, but such incidents contributed to bitterness and resentment that burned in the minds of some Germans for an extended period of time. On another occasion, a German doctor
enroute to a house call where he was to treat a sick child was stopped, beaten, and severely injured by four Americans. When they were tried and sentenced, two of the culprits received sentences of six months at hard labor and fines of one thousand German marks each. The remaining two Americans had to pay six hundred German marks each and serve three months at hard labor. The Germans felt the sentences were far too light.\textsuperscript{17}

Americans committed two known rapes in Zweibruecken during the 1950s. In July, 1952 two American soldiers raped a teen-aged girl. Both men were convicted, sent to prison for ten years, and given dishonorable discharges from the military service.\textsuperscript{18} The second rape was in April 1954. Three American soldiers attacked a married couple who were on their way home from the movies. They beat the husband and raped his wife.\textsuperscript{19} Whether or not the rapists were ever caught was not reported in the press. It was a common occurrence for American soldiers to call out to passing females, whistle, or make rude gestures as they drove by in their vehicles; these acts were generally dismissed as boorish behavior, but they did not help German-American relations.

It is perhaps a universal fact of life that wherever large numbers of young males are gathered together, prostitutes will follow. Prostitution was legal in some parts of Germany throughout the 1950s, but it was controlled by licensing and restricting the prostitutes as to where they could ply their trade. In Zweibruecken, both prostitution and procuring were illegal. That is not to say that it never happened, but since the city was relatively poor, there were few customers. When it was first announced that Americans were coming back to Zweibruecken in numbers, the
citizens expressed their concern that prostitution would soon become a problem.

As early as August, 1952 accounts of problems with prostitution and procuring appeared in the local paper. The practitioners were referred to as "Frolleins," "Veronikas," or "Amizonen," and they seem to have found ample employment. They were regularly brought to court and fined, as were the hotel managers and others who rented rooms to them. Most of the prostitutes came to Zweibruecken from places such as Kaiserslautern or Landstuhl, but some local wives and daughters offered their services and took their customers home with them. Most of the traffic seems to have taken place in the first half of the decade, but isolated violations continued later on. One case aroused considerable ire amongst the local citizens. In the nearby town of Winterbach, an underaged female refugee conducted business with a number of Americans. She was temporarily housed with her parents in makeshift quarters on the upstairs floor of the local school. The parents of the school children protested this flagrant violation and organized a boycott of the school. The girl's parents were convicted of procuring, but she continued her business.20

Crimes of breaking and entering or theft by Americans were rare in Zweibruecken. Only three cases received any notice in the papers. In June, 1952 an American soldier was convicted by a military court for attempting to burglarize a German house. He was sentenced to one year in prison and given a discharge from the military service for bad conduct.21 In June, 1960 an American sergeant was sentenced to seven years in prison and given a dishonorable discharge for his part in an otherwise German ring of safecrackers.22 The periodic German festivals in Zweibruecken, as
elsewhere, always provided ample alcohol and opportunities for conflict. As a rule, festivals in Zweibruecken were remarkably free of fights, but the beer vendors were regularly victimized by patrons who stole their beer mugs. In June 1960, over 1,500 beer mugs were stolen during one festival. The Americans and Canadians were largely blamed for the loss.23

This combination of Americans and Canadians brings to the fore the difficulty of identifying the problems caused by Americans in Zweibruecken. It was often not possible for the local citizens to distinguish between Canadians and Americans, and the Canadians normally outnumbered the Americans two to one. Canadians and members of the U.S. Forces had different license plates, different types of identification, and lived and worked on opposite sides of the city, but when on the street in civilian clothes, it was hard to tell them apart. Casual observers could easily attribute offenses to the Americans that in reality had been done by the Canadians.

Traffic offenses were a real source of irritation. Americans had large cars which were envied by many Germans. The Germans were critical of the way Americans drove, and perhaps rightfully so. They often drove too fast for conditions, and driving while under the influence of alcohol, although prohibited by both the Americans and Germans, was not an unheard-of problem. While most violations were minor in nature with few or no consequences, some proved to be deadly. In 1952, one accident caused by an American resulted in a death. In 1953, three more persons lost their lives in wrecks for which Americans were found guilty, and in each of the years 1957, 1958, and 1960, a total of four additional deaths was caused by negligent American driving. A sample survey of accidents in Zweibruecken for the year 1957 shows that of the 546 accidents which
occurred, 40 were caused by Americans. The Canadians were responsible for 51 and the French 10.\textsuperscript{24}

In 1957 there were 2,383 Americans in Zweibruecken. That means there was roughly one accident for every sixty Americans. There were 32,616 Germans in the city in that same year, and 438 accidents were attributed to that population group; so there was one accident for every seventy-four Germans. A better method of comparison would be to base the calculations on the number of vehicles, but there is no way of knowing how many vehicles were in operation at that time. This is especially true for the Americans because military vehicles as well as privately owned vehicles were in use and involved in accidents.

The very presence of the Americans and their military mission created some frictions. It was necessary, for instance, to requisition some German properties such as fields and buildings, although living accommodations were not taken.\textsuperscript{25} Farmers were particularly hurt by the requisitioning. Land was taken to build a housing area for the families on the Kreuzberg and more was taken for an airbase which the Americans built for the Canadians. Several farmers had to curtail their operations due to the loss of land.\textsuperscript{26} Construction, although it provided work for the unemployed people of Zweibruecken, was a handicap to others. Crops and fields were damaged when poles for high wires were erected. Access to farm land was impeded due to construction on Kreuzberg.\textsuperscript{27} Erosion of fields was blamed on the American construction, which on occasion changed the water flow.\textsuperscript{28} And the construction required so much manpower that agricultural workers
were hard to find.\textsuperscript{29} The situation developed to the point where citizens' committees were formed and demonstrations organized to protest the activities of the Americans, and the police had to be called in to control the demonstrators.\textsuperscript{30} The American construction had brought prosperity to the city as a whole, but at the expense of a minority, and some bitter feelings were created in the process.

Black marketing was practiced to one degree or another in Zweibruecken throughout most of the decade of the 1950s. Although it was not nearly as severe as in the first few years following the war, it was a cause for concern to the authorities. It was, generally speaking, more important to the Germans than to the Americans. Every item sold on the black market represented a loss in tax revenues to the German government and deprived German merchants of the profit from selling a comparable item — if available.

Nevertheless, black marketing was a two-way street; both the seller and buyer had something to gain. Germans interested in making purchases could go to Kreuzberg Kaserne, usually at night, slip through the fence, do their business, and leave again. Or they could find Americans who had something to sell in the bars, restaurants, or side streets of Zweibruecken. Cigarettes, coffee, tea, sugar, alcohol, and gasoline were still favored black market items in the 1950s, due to high German taxes.

The Americans could buy these products on a rationed but tax-free basis in the exchanges and commissaries. They then sold the items for several times what they had paid. Some individuals made a handsome profit on a regular basis — until they were caught. Soldiers who did not use
their rations were not allowed to transfer them to others, but they often did for a fee.

The Germans bought black market items for their own use or for resale at a yet higher price. Entire smuggling rings operated in the vicinity of military bases and even crossed over international boundaries. While the occupation was still in effect, American cars were allowed to travel back and forth between Germany and France exempt from searches by customs officials. At least one team of German smugglers based its operation in Zweibruecken and used an American car, with the consent of its owner, to take black market goods into France.31

Customs officials periodically seized items and conducted surveillance operations, but black market traffic did not really slow down until taxes were lowered.32 Penalties varied depending on the value of the goods. But even small-time or occasional smugglers could expect rather severe punishment. In 1954, a German employee of the Americans was caught buying five packages of American cigarettes and received a three-month jail sentence for tax evasion. American violators usually were reduced in grade, fined, or in some cases given jail sentences.

The last incident of black marketing reported in Die Rheinpfalz in the decade of the 1950s was in 1958, when two Germans were fined for buying American cigarettes. One had to pay twenty German marks, and the other one paid fifty German marks.33

Although all types of problems occurred throughout the decade, the predominant nature of the difficulties changed. In the early years, the
conflicts tended to involve person-to-person contacts, such as black marketing, barroom fights, robberies, and rapes or attempted rapes. By the middle of the decade, automobile accidents, rent squabbles, and property damage were the dominant sources of trouble. And by 1960, policies were becoming a cause of friction as Germans demonstrated against the continued presence of Americans, or as works councils took issue with American efforts to reduce the gold outflow by releasing German employees. In short, as the material situation improved for the Germans, and as Americans became more settled with families and privately owned automobiles, the relationships became more regulated, civil, and sophisticated, and the problems became more depersonalized.

The Americans brought a problem to Germany and to Zweibruecken in the form of a racially integrated army. Blacks were viewed first of all as items of curiosity to be kept at a distance. Some of the older citizens remembered the French occupation by black troops from North Africa after World War I and the bad experiences associated with them. These memories were combined with alarming stories about the behavior of blacks during the last months of the war; therefore, suspicion as well as curiosity highlighted the attitude of the average person in Zweibruecken. This was particularly the case where women were concerned. The blacks found that they could go wherever they wanted. They were not restricted from any restaurants or public places, but they were shunned by the local women, who believed the stories. This belief was undoubtedly reinforced when the black soldiers began to associate with the prostitutes from Landstuhl and Kaiserslautern. Blacks were noticed wherever they went, and whenever they engaged in unseemly conduct, it added credibility to the negative side of their reputation.
Naturally, not all of the experiences with blacks were bad. Gradually they were accepted as members of the U.S. forces. They were particularly friendly to children, and friendships also developed with adults. The men made friends first, and after women observed that no apparent harm came to those who associated with the black Americans, they also began to change their attitude. Blacks were accepted as members of the American forces, but they still had trouble finding German apartments, and the Germans continued to be wary of meeting groups of blacks on the street at night. Such fears were more imagined than real, but they existed.\(^{35}\)

A lingering reluctance to accept blacks on the same basis as white Americans was not unique to Zweibruecken. Most Germans who came in contact with blacks were also in contact with white soldiers and discerned that, in spite of an integrated military force, social mixing was more of an exception than a rule. With white Americans setting the standards, it was common for Germans to prefer not to associate with blacks on anything other than a casual basis. Marriages between black soldiers and German women presented special difficulties. In addition to acceptance of the couples, the inter-racial aspects promised problems because of the stresses that would be placed on their off-spring. Furthermore, antimiscegenation laws in the U.S.A. made marriage less than practical at times. In light of such barriers, the military discouraged inter-racial marriages.\(^{36}\)

The German image of Americans was not enhanced by the fact that numerous American soldiers fathered children and then left the mothers alone to fend for themselves and the children. This was particularly a problem whenever the father was a black man. Children of such mixed
heritage were never really accepted in German society as Germans; they were always thought of as different. From an institutional point of view, that is by the government or the news media etc., it was recognized that they were German citizens, and efforts were made to facilitate their acceptance. In 1952, for example, when the first of the black occupation babies became visible in the schools, the media issued appeal after appeal to be nice to the black children. It was feared that the children would have enough troubles, and indeed that was the case. In 1960, the University of Hamburg conducted a study that examined the plight of black children in Germany. This study, *Farbige Kinder in Deutschland*, concluded that in spite of all the efforts made by various groups the children still grew up with trauma.37

The Positive Side

An overview of German-American grass-roots relations shows the nature of both the positive and negative forces that were at work. In the early part of the decade, positive occurrences were basically of a material nature. Americans were still helping with food, clothing, and shelter. By the middle of the decade, these "helping hands" had largely given way to joint activities, such as clubs, intended to aid understanding or build bridges. At the end of the decade, grass-roots relations featured more sophisticated or elaborate events which utilized those bridges; concerts, dancing exhibitions, athletic contests, and discussion groups typified the times. This progression represented a natural growth in relationships as the Germans became more self-sufficient and had more time and money to indulge in
leisure activities.  

Some examples serve to illustrate this evolution in relations. In 1950, twenty million articles of clothing were collected in the U.S.A. during a Thanksgiving clothing drive. The clothes were sent to Germany to clothe needy people. In 1955, a German TV documentary featured Americans stationed in the Rhineland-Palatinate. It was reported as "an attempt to give the German people a deeper insight into the lives and problems of Americans in Germany." A more ordinary type of event with a common theme saw Americans assisting Germans with the organization of theater or sports groups. In 1960, an American soldier had a part in a musical performed in the municipal theater in Frankfurt. It was an American play, Bells Are Ringing, but with a mostly German cast.

Although the Americans were often seen in an assistance role (providers of food, clothing, and equipment) or as innovators, they also contributed to traditional cultural events. For example in 1950, Wieland Wagner acclaimed Robert L. Charleboise, a former American soldier, as a "great Wagnerian tenor," and he was invited to perform in Bayreuth in 1951.

When the Americans first returned to Zweibruecken, the Germans in the community were still struggling to rebuild the city and take care of their physical needs. A considerable amount of progress had been made since the war, but the destruction had been so extensive that more time was needed. The French were the official occupiers, so Americans were not immediately thrust into positions of visibility; therefore, it can be said that the appearance of the Americans generated neither shock nor fanfare.
In the beginning, the Americans came without their families. Some of the soldiers conducted themselves in an ungentlemanly manner, consumed too much beer, and made advances towards the local females. These advances were not always welcome; they were a nuisance to some, and there were times when jealous boyfriends or husbands became irate. Improper behavior created hard feelings which no doubt left those who were offended wishing that the Americans, and indeed all occupation soldiers, would go away. However, there were also Germans who accepted Americans as friends. The first local citizens who accepted the Americans were those Germans who were employed by the American military. Since the soldiers did not have their families with them and were lonely, these Germans assumed the role of hosts and invited soldiers into their homes. Friendships developed, and thus Germans and Americans started spending their free time as well as their duty hours together. Once American families arrived, the possibilities for contacts expanded with many good, long-term relationships being a result.\textsuperscript{44}

As time passed, the web of acquaintances expanded. It became a commonplace for Americans to be invited to join German clubs and for American and German clubs to develop associations. It is worthwhile to give a brief account of some of these associations. A photo club was organized through which German and American photographers exchanged ideas, went on excursions, and arranged joint exhibitions.\textsuperscript{45} In 1955, a German automobile club (\textit{Der allgemeine deutsche Automobil-und Motorradclub}) held a sports car rally that saw a number of American participants.\textsuperscript{46}
A lot of Americans missed being able to go hunting, and so it was arranged for the hunters in and around Zweibruecken to invite Americans who were members of the Rod and Gun Club to go with them. The Judo Club was another forum which brought the people from Kreuzberg Kaserne together with those from the city. This particular type of event pitted the Americans against the Germans because they competed as teams, but it was another building block in their relationship. Music, too, was often a vehicle for drawing people together. Americans became members of various singing clubs, and a former citizen of Zweibruecken arranged for the men's choir from his new home in Port Chester, New York to come to Zweibruecken and present a joint performance with a German singing club. The proceeds from the performance were used to help rebuild the Alexanderskirche in the city.

Although the Americans had their own church in Kreuzberg Kaserne, soldiers and their families attended services in the German churches on occasion. There were also special events for which they were invited. The procession for Corpus Christi Day (Fronleichnamsprozession) in 1959, and the World Day of Prayer (Weltgebetstag) in 1960, were two such celebrations.

These activities evolved naturally from German and American associations, but they were only the tip of the iceberg. For every organized event, there were hundreds of personal visits in homes and restaurants. Altogether they contributed much to mutual knowledge and understanding. More often than not, socializing was the real goal with learning taking
place in a subtle way.

While learning was of secondary importance at social events, it was the primary reason for other activities. There were lectures, slide shows, films, and displays sponsored by the America House in Kaiserslautern and the Volkshochschule in Zweibruecken. These events helped to broaden the Germans' understanding of America and its people. In 1953, there was a series of lectures on the "History and Development of American Literature." And in 1956, a lecture on "Anglo-Saxon Literature" was presented. A further lecture on literature, this time on Thomas Wolfe, was given in 1958. Travel in America was the theme of other presentations. One such lecture was "A Trip Through America" with emphasis on the place of children in society, mechanization of the household, employment for women, and the influence of women in politics. Other themes were: "Nature Parks in America," "City Planning in America," "A View of New York," and "Pennsylvania." Actually, accounts of trips through America were given rather frequently. The Historical Society of Zweibruecken used this as a theme when a reporter from Suedwestfunk spoke on how widespread and numerous Germans are in America.

The people of Zweibruecken expressed a particular interest in the Germans who had emigrated to America. This interest helped spark attendance at the lecture on Pennsylvania mentioned above. It also contributed to attendance at a special display in 1955 which stressed cultural and historical ties between Germany and America. Something which aroused
considerable attention was the fact that a regiment of soldiers from Zweibruecken had fought on the side of the colonists against the British at the Battle of Yorktown in October, 1781.

Some lectures were more intellectually stimulating, e.g. "The American Space Program" and "Where to, Europe?" (Wohin Europa?); the latter was a presentation by a member of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences which set forth an American view of Europe's world problems.55

Both German and American officials took special pains to make things go well. Neither group cared about the credit for improving relations. As a rule, whenever a good suggestion was made, regardless of who made it, both sides worked hard to see to it that it was a success.56 The city published in English a guide book to Zweibruecken in March, 1952. The historical connection was mentioned, and advertisements for local businesses were included. Over the years many receptions, parties, and assorted other events were celebrated in Zweibruecken with the help of Americans.

By 1953 the community was well aware of the spirit of international friendship and of the value of improving relations. To that end, the city and the military authorities (American, French, and Canadian) staged a Christmas celebration called the Union of Hearts (Union der Herzen). There were entertainers, speeches, and social opportunities, all dedicated to international friendship. It was a major event for the city that has been repeated yearly ever since. The proceeds traditionally are donated to charity.57 Response to the Union of Hearts was always so great that each nation had to be restricted to a set number of participants.
Fasching (pre-Lenten festival) had long been celebrated with enthusiasm in Zweibruecken, and starting in 1954, Americans were included in the city's official Fasching balls. At first only officers and their ladies were invited, but later the soldiers were welcomed as well. After the formal Fasching ball, the next step was to organize a formal ball dedicated to international friendship, and this took place in 1956, with the Internationaler Sommernachtsball.58

Somewhat similar to the Fasching season were the various festivals which took place every year between late spring and early fall. In this category were Volksfeste, Jahrmaerkte, and Kirchweihen. The rides, booths, games, and overall carnival atmosphere attracted the Americans, but the single biggest drawing card was the beer tent. The soldiers went to the beer tent alone or in groups, but they went. They went to drink beer, to listen to the music, and to try to meet girls. The large, earthen-ware beer mugs were another attraction. Every soldier had to have at least one as a souvenir of Germany. It has already been related above how Americans were blamed for stealing the mugs; that happened when the mugs were not for sale. When the mugs could be purchased, most Americans were willing to pay for them. But one way or another, the Americans had to have mugs. On one occasion an American man and wife came to the tent with a baby buggy and offered to buy a buggy-full of mugs. When told the mugs could not be bought empty, he ordered them full, paid for everything, stopped entering Germans, gave each a mug full of beer to drink, and then rolled his mug-laden baby buggy home. There were minor arguments from time to time, but from 1952 to 1960 there were no fights between Germans and Americans in
the beer tent. There were also no lasting or significant negative incidents involving American soldiers and German women in the tent. Prostitutes, usually from Kaiserslautern or Landstuhl, tended to gather at one table where they negotiated with customers. The prostitutes wore specially colored ribbons in their hair, and thus the potential customers knew with whom they could strike up casual relationships. The festivals, as a whole, were judged to be beneficial to the city's economic well being, as well as to German-American relations, and the beer business owed much of its success to the Americans' thirst.  

As an additional encouragement to mingling, the city sponsored an official program whereby American soldiers were invited to spend Christmas in German homes in 1959.  

Hunting had informally been opened to Americans in 1957; to this was added the privilege of fishing in 1958. To make this possible, the Germans made three kilometers of a fishing stream available to the American Rod and Gun Club. This was not a gift but rather a lease; money changed hands, but in an area where both hunting and fishing rights are precious, it was also an act of goodwill. Before the decade had ended, more land for recreational areas (fishing ponds, tennis courts, playgrounds etc.) had been turned over to American control.  

It was a further act of goodwill when the city granted the Americans the right to name the streets in Kreuzberg Kaserne. The installation was within the city's jurisdiction, a fact which gave the city the authority to designate the streets. After the names were decided, the city undertook the job of marking them as a favor to the people who lived and worked there.
Initiatives to enhance relations were taken by the Americans as well. American officials were, first and foremost, concerned with cultivating the democratic ideas which had taken root. This goal may have been vague to the average soldier — even though it was part of his initial orientation when he came to Germany and was periodically reinforced in troop information classes; ideals have a tendency to become blurred among the concerns for daily living. Nevertheless, individuals were a part of the process of democratization, because it was based on the theory that "democracy observed is democracy learned." The programs and established controls produced a continuing environment where democracy could grow and rewarding personal relationships could thrive.

One institution which provided an impetus to German-American relations in Zweibruecken was the America House in Kaiserslautern. During the course of the decade, the America House sponsored a number of events which helped the Germans to become better acquainted with the Americans in their midst. Some of these have already been mentioned, but still more merit additional discussion.

Concerts were always popular. The U.S. Air Force Band gave a public concert in 1953, which was openly appreciated. American musicians presented a violin and piano concert in November of the same year. This was followed a few months later by two American operas which featured both German and American singers; the accompanying music was provided by the Seventh U.S. Army Symphony Orchestra. An all-female orchestra from Portland, Oregon, played a summer concert in the Rosengarten while on a
tour of Europe in 1957. Shortly before, the orchestra had performed for
the Queen of England, a fact which the Zweibruceken newspaper reported
proudly.66 The Seventh U.S. Army Symphony Orchestra, the same orchestra
that accompanied the two operas in 1954, was a favorite of the people in
Zweibruecken; the orchestra made more appearances in the latter half of the
1950s, evidently strengthening German-Americans relations with every
visit.67 The Seventh Army Symphony Orchestra was very much in demand all
over Germany. It had an excellent reputation, and its performances were
free -- no minor consideration for the thrifty Germans. Due to its popu­
larlity, it was frequently not available when wanted, so other American
military bands appeared in Zweibruecken on occasion. An Army band provided
the music for the city's 600th anniversary, a ceremony which also saw the
American commander (who was a guest of honor) read a letter from the
governor of Virginia congratulating the city and recalling Zweibruecken's
part in the battle of Yorktown. Another American band played at the horse
races in 1954, and yet another one played at the coronation of the city's
Rose Queen in 1957.68

In 1954, Americans and Germans started to marry one another, although
the requirements for obtaining permission were still exhaustive. To aid
understanding, the American consulate in Frankfurt sent a representative to
Zweibruecken at the request of the America House to give a lecture on
"American Marriage Laws."69

These efforts on the part of the America House combined with other
smaller but still helpful programs, such as visits by the bookmobile,
brought bits of Americana to Zweibruecken and added to the good feelings that already existed.

As a means of informing local citizens on what takes place on military installations, the American military has long held "open houses." The gates are opened to the community, and equipment and facilities are put on display. This was the practice in Zweibruecken as well. At these open houses, the people of the city who were guests of the Americans saw aero-batic exhibitions, simulated rescues by helicopters, fire-fighting demonstrations, parades, artillery pieces, and other types of equipment. Sporting events, bands, fireworks, hot dogs, hamburgers, and Coca Cola were standard offerings at every open house. America's Independence Day and Memorial Day were sometimes celebrated in such a fashion as well. Events like these gave the Americans an opportunity to extend hospitality to the Germans, and they responded in numbers.

German-American friendship had grown so much by the latter part of the decade that it was deemed appropriate to set aside an entire week to celebrate it. The first German-American Friendship Week was declared in 1957 by the Lord Mayor and the American commander. It was such a success that it was decided to continue the practice. These weeks contained a host of activities, all of which were accented by public declarations of friendship between the two nations with special emphasis on the situation in Zweibruecken. The number of events was always sizable. Some typical, joint activities were church services, dances, athletic contests, films, concerts, dinners, trips, scouting exhibitions, car races, open houses,
and variety shows. Awards for contributions to German-American friendship were routine during these weeks as well.70

The list of ways which were found to do things jointly is extensive. Whenever an occasion to be celebrated arose, Germans and Americans did so together. In the entire period from 1950 through 1960, not even one German-American event was ever reported in the press as having produced negative results. Joint events were an unquestioned success.

Occasions were even invented. One can find evidence of this in the papers or by talking with persons who were in Zweibruecken at the time. A few such events are given here as examples. A women's group put on its own fashion show with members working as models. On another occasion the American movie house, the Idle Hour Theater, held a fashion show for German women from a local shoe factory.71

As the American community grew larger, so did the employment opportunities for the Germans. The American Civilian Personnel Office offered a program designed to inform the Germans on how to find jobs with the Americans and conducted a tour of Kreuzberg Kaserne so that they could become familiar with the American surroundings.72

German-American friendship clubs had started in many parts of Germany in the early days of the occupation, but for one reason or another formally organized clubs did not get off to such a good start in Zweibruecken. Perhaps it was because there were troops from three foreign nations occupying the small city, and to start a formal club with one would have
required the Germans to include all three. Or perhaps it was because there
did not appear to be a need for one. Whatever the reason, the first
try to establish a formally structured club was not made until May of
1955. The Public Relations Adviser to the Commanding General of the
Western Area Command (the American Military Command which included
Zweibruecken) proposed the organization and urged participation. The
idea, however, did not particularly appeal to those involved, and it was
allowed to wither. It was not until a year and a half later that the idea
came back to life and was adopted.

Meanwhile, a group was getting together regularly and doing valuable
work in community relations, even though it did not become a formally
recognized club for a few more years. The group met regularly and con­
sisted of the Lord Mayor, the Police Chief, and the military commanders
stationed in Zweibruecken. The men first began to meet in 1955 to deal
with mutual problems. One of the notable challenges with which they had to
cope was the traffic problems created by soldiers who drove recklessly
through the city, as related above. The club which eventually grew out of
this group was called Little NATO. Little NATO developed three different
levels, Commanders' Little NATO, Junior Officers' Little NATO, and the
Noncommissioned Officers' Little NATO. Of these three, the junior
officers organization proved to be the most active; monthly meetings with
dinners, soccer and softball games, and various culturally oriented outings
were typical activities. The group ultimately included officers from the
German army and air force as well as officers from the U.S. Army and Air
Force, the Canadian air force and the French army. The German officers came into the picture because the Federal Republic established its own military force in 1955 and stationed units in Zweibruecken in 1956. The Junior Officers' Little NATO was not chartered until 1966, but it evolved from the group of 1955, and is cited as an example of the enduring nature of the spirit of the 1950s.

The women of the community also started to think in terms of a formally structured club. In April, 1957, the wife of the American commander suggested that the prominent women in the German and American communities meet on a regular basis. The suggestion was enthusiastically accepted, and the meetings did take place, but an actual club was not formed until the following decade. Once formed, the German-American Wives' Club took a leading role in promoting German-American relations. It accepted the wives of the French officers as members but the Germans and Americans provided the leadership. The club sponsored activities for charity, organized social events, and encouraged exchanges of a cultural nature.

In the final analysis, clubs did not play a big role in community relations in Zweibruecken in the 1950s. They were positive factors, but they were more a manifestation of good relations than the cause. The seeds were planted in the 1950s, but they did not grow to bear fruit in the form of clubs until subsequent years. Even without clubs per se, relations in Zweibruecken were solid enough that it was chosen as a model community for a film made in 1956, by the American Press and Information Service and shown to German audiences elsewhere.75
Just as the people in Zweibruecken avoided the formal organizations popularly accepted elsewhere in Germany where Americans were stationed, they also adopted a different course for youth activities. The GYA program was evidently never a part of life in Zweibruecken. The Americans were most definitely concerned with youth problems, but these were addressed by volunteers or locally devised programs rather than through the official GYA channels. The Methodist congregation from Kreuzberg Kaserne was an early, active force on behalf of the city's young. The Methodists organized a Christmas party for German children in 1952. They also worked with the U.S. Service Clubs to offer the German children a chance to play bingo, billiards, and table tennis. Gifts, refreshments, and the use of recreational facilities not otherwise available no doubt gladdened the hearts of the children. American-sponsored Christmas parties for German children became common occurrences in Zweibruecken. The various military units hosted their own parties with individual soldiers "adopting" individual children. The soldiers gave presents and a Christmas meal to each child; this practice was called "Dad for a Day." The American officers' club traditionally gave a Christmas party for the children of the Germans who worked in Kreuzberg Kaserne.76

The Protestant women of the chapel gave a Christmas party for refugee children, and childless American couples took German children into their homes for the holidays, while needy children received presents from other Americans.77 These parties and presents were paid for by individuals. Other presents came from America and were distributed by soldiers, and the recipients were told from whence the gifts came.78 America, particularly at Christmas, must have looked like a veritable cornucopia to the young
people in Zweibruecken.

American scouts, both boys and girls, had a part in building German-American relations, too. The American scout troops invited German scouts to join them in outings and in their annual banquets with parents. This practice, together with school visits, gave a youthful dimension to relations within the community.79

Others who needed help were not overlooked. The American women's clubs visited the homes for the elderly, gave Christmas parties and presents, entertained, and conversed with the lonely. In 1956, the American commander presented a gift of money on behalf of the American community to the Lord Mayor to be used for the elderly, and the American Officers' Wives' Club presented a coffee table and books to a home for the elderly in January 1957.80

Many isolated expressions of concern were made, too. The U.S. military made a donation to the city to provide food for the needy, and American officers gave presents to hospital patients in 1954. To help atone for the death of a German killed in a hit-and-run accident by an American, American soldiers took up a collection for the family.81 The German blood bank in Landau issued a call for blood in 1960, and eighty Americans responded.82

The Germans did not always have the heavy construction equipment they needed to restore or build community structures. As a rule, the Americans did not help with private or commercial construction, but they frequently
assisted with community projects. American soldiers and equipment helped to build the stadium in Zweibruecken in 1954 and 1955.\textsuperscript{83} They also moved a monolith from near Landstuhl to Niederauerbach and set it up at the request of the monuments association in Zweibruecken.\textsuperscript{84} Help was offered in different ways. The American fire department put out a fire in the city's train station in 1953, and in 1957, the American Red Cross chapter in Zweibruecken made it known that its help was available to the city in case of emergencies.

In general, a spirit of cooperation was always present in Zweibruecken; the people of the different nations in Zweibruecken shared responsibilities. Individual tendencies toward polarization were offset by the common desire to work together. For example, in 1952 a joint police patrol was established. Policemen from all four nations patrolled the city to control problems. The patrols were numerous and effective. The number of patrols ranged from 85 to 105 per week, and in one year, 1953, they retrieved 20 stolen cars and assisted 24,900 motorists in one way or another.\textsuperscript{85}

The American soldiers in Zweibruecken certainly caused their share of problems, as did the Canadians, French, and Germans, but the people of Zweibruecken forgave incidents when corrections were made and when the commanders apologized or otherwise demonstrated their regret for any problems created by their soldiers.\textsuperscript{86}

Housing was always a problem in Zweibruecken. Before the war, in 1939, there had been an average of eight persons per domestic building. During the war, 1,587 buildings with living accommodations had been
destroyed; another 564 had been severely damaged and 1,128 slightly damaged. This all translated into a shortage of 4,000 apartments at war's end. Between the end of the war and the return of the Americans, about five percent of the uninhabitable buildings had been restored to the point where they were habitable. At that time the density of persons per habitable building stood at twelve.

During the decade of the 1950s, construction took place at a rapid pace in Zweibruecken. At the same time, refugees arrived in the city from the east, the birth rate exceeded the death rate, and the number of personnel in the various military installations grew. The net result was that by the end of the decade there were still six hundred too few apartments in the city.87

Americans were part of the problem as well as the solution. As mentioned above, the Americans were able to compete for existing dwellings by paying high rents — rents which were sometimes used to build more houses. This meant that for every American family living in a German apartment, a German family was left wanting, but the prospects for expanded housing were brighter due to American money.

Aside from the complex issue of housing, the Germans were pleased to see American families join their husbands in Zweibruecken. First of all, the presence of the American wives reduced the number of American males who had dumme Gedanken (dumb ideas) about German women. A second factor which influenced the Germans was that the expanded American community meant more money for local merchants and the economy of Zweibruecken as a whole. A third factor was that the number of Americans who lived among the Germans
increased, and therefore the possibilities for making friends increased correspondingly. It was so much more convenient for both sides when Americans lived as neighbors rather than in relative isolation in the caserne.  

Particularly good contacts were made between German and American women. Most of the American women were homemakers and thus spent the majority of their time at home. As is the American custom, they tended to go next door to chat and drink coffee (which they frequently obtained illegally for their German friends in the American commissary). These contacts spread to the husbands, children, and acquaintances. They were also a source of information for the Americans on where and how to buy things and what to see during leisure time. Knowledge about Germany and America was exchanged freely. As might be expected, not all the exchanges were heart warming. The German desire for privacy and order was not always compatible with the American penchant for casualness. American women in hair curlers would suddenly appear at the door when German women were busily preparing the mid-day meal. Or, even worse, American women went shopping with their hair in curlers. Such practices gave rise to expressions reflecting German disapproval; schlampige Frauen (sloppy women) was a typical term used to describe American women. Another cultural difference which was highlighted as a result of proximity had to do with the rearing of children. Germans were appalled at the ungezogene amerikanische Kinder (undisciplined American children). They found it hard to believe that American children were allowed to do what they wanted to do and were not properly dressed.
Marriages between Americans and Germans were very much accepted in Germany in the 1950s, even more so at the end of the decade than at the beginning; the stigma that had been attached to these marriages in the immediate postwar period had dissipated considerably. However, it must be stated that some people on both sides always looked down on anyone who married a foreigner -- particularly if it was an interracial marriage. As in so many other cases where precise statistics would be helpful, the numbers of German-American marriages that took place in Germany were not made a matter of record until 1959. Nevertheless, an idea of the magnitude can be gained by reviewing the number of immigrants admitted to the United States from Germany by reason of marriage to American citizens. Table 21 shows the numbers of marriage partners admitted during the period under consideration. It is recognized that some of these marriages took place prior to 1950, and some of the persons who married during the 1950s emigrated later or never emigrated. Even though not exact, an impression can be obtained of the frequency with which German-American marriages occurred, which reflects a state of acceptance at the grass-roots level.
TABLE 21
GERMANS ADMITTED TO THE
U.S.A. BY REASON OF MARRIAGE
TO CITIZENS 1950-1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Marriage Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>4,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>2,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>4,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>6,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>5,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>6,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>7,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>6,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>7,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>6,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>63,056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Beginning in 1959, the Statistisches Bundesamt commenced keeping accurate records on marriages between Germans and non-Germans. As a measure of comparison with the figures in this table, in 1959, there were 7,828 German-American marriages in the Federal Republic, and in 1960, the count was 6,159.

More accurate statistics can be constructed for Zweibruecken. Table 22 depicts the total number of marriages per year in the city and those which were between Germans and Americans.91
TABLE 22
MARRIAGES IN ZWEIBRUECKEN
1950-1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Marriages</th>
<th>German-American Marriages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note that there were no German-American marriages prior to 1954, and then suddenly there were twenty-one. The reason is clear. The year 1954 marked the end of the first full tour for the real build-up of troops which commenced in 1952, when expanded facilities allowed the assignment of soldiers in numbers. The fact that the wedding bells rang out for the first time in 1954 (and in respectable numbers), reflects a tendency on the part of both the soldiers and their girlfriends to wait until the last minute to take the big step.
Similarly the jump between 1956 and 1957, was due to the increase in the number of Americans in Zweibruecken which occurred in 1955, when the count swelled from 302 to 1,101.

It is also worthwhile to look at how the German-American marriages compared, statistically, with the totals for other groups. From 1954 through 1960, the period when German-American marriages were taking place, there were 2,592 total marriages in Zweibruecken. Of this total, 244 or 9.4 percent of the marriages were between Germans and Americans. During this same period, there were 489 other marriages involving foreigners, or 13.2 percent; these marriages were almost exclusively German-Canadian or German-French.

From the nature and frequency of the positive experiences, it can be concluded that Americans were accepted as friends in Zweibruecken. It appears that there were several reasons for this acceptance.

Zweibruecken had international connections long before the Americans returned. It is rather close to the French border and not far from Luxembourg and Belgium. It is not situated on a particularly historical trade route, but through the centuries travelers have come and gone, and strangers have settled there as well. The city was never really wealthy; therefore, some native sons went elsewhere in search of their fortunes. This was especially true during the last two centuries when many persons left the area and moved to America. It was common for these emigrants to maintain contact with the people back home, and a degree of sympathy for
foreign ideas had become a part of the Zweibruecken psyche. The historical connection between the city and America that went back to the battle of Yorktown also conditioned the people of Zweibruecken to think in terms that reached beyond Germany's borders. More recently the French had occupied the city after World War I. As a consequence of these various international connections, people in Zweibruecken were predisposed to accept foreigners and foreign influences. They were not consciously aware of this at the time, but in retrospect it apparently was a factor. In the postwar period, it was common for local citizens to talk about their relatives in the United States. This may have been a result of the American presence, but even so it was a factor which facilitated acceptance. Other connections between America and Zweibruecken were also cited, whenever the opportunity arose. The people liked to recall that the famous dog of American movie fame, Rin-Tin-Tin, had been born in their town, or that the widow of their beloved Duke Christian IV had been one of Benjamin Franklin's lovers. Such connections with the home country of their most powerful military neighbor were trivial but real.92

There were even natives of Zweibruecken serving in the U.S. Army. One of these soldiers lost his life fighting for democracy in Korea. The Purple Heart was awarded posthumously and presented to his family in Zweibruecken by the American commander.93 Another son of Zweibruecken came back to Germany in an American uniform and was stationed in nearby Kaiserslautern. Yet another one served in Hawaii.94
America was the strongest power in the world. She had helped to defeat the Germans, but as a victorious power she was not acting the way victors traditionally acted. Instead, she was helping to rebuild the very country over which she had triumphed. Even before the Americans returned to Zweibruecken, the people there knew of America's magnanimous gestures. Some families in Zweibruecken had received CARE packages, while their children in school had been given soup from American Quakers. The CARE packages and the soup were welcomed; they were important to the recipients, but even more important was the symbolic value as seen by those who were aware of their arrival; it was recognized that Americans thought that the Germans were worth helping. This was very important psychologically; it was a vote of confidence in the value of a people who had been totally defeated and who were despised by so much of the rest of the world.95

Additionally, the Germans were aware of the deepening rift between the East and the West. The people in West Germany were convinced that life in a democracy as advocated by the Americans was far superior to the way their relatives in the Russian-dominated part of Germany had to live.

These conditions contributed to the acceptance of the Americans. But even before these conditions existed, the Americans had taken a big step which had facilitated their ascent to a position of preeminence in the minds of the Germans; at the outset, Americans had appointed local leaders who were sympathetic with American goals. The leaders worked with the Americans, and the communities were rewarded. Success bred further cooperation, which earned more rewards. In this manner, Germans and
Americans combined their efforts and resources to put Germany back on the road to recovery.96

In brief, it was generally believed that Germany's future could best be served by an alliance with America. This was the idea at large in Germany. This was the guiding principle for Germany's conduct. However, it does not necessarily follow that individual Germans had to accept individual Americans, or vice versa.

The reasons for private acceptance are as varied as those for acceptance at large. To many Germans, Americans represented the idea of a far-away world (Duft der grossen, weiten Welt) and were interesting from that point of view. In the eyes of the Zweibruecker, a person who knew hard times, Americans seemed lax, open, receptive, uninhibited, and happy. At the same time, they gave the impression of being practical, level-headed, and quite natural with a mixture of naiveté and sovereignty. These characteristics seemed somewhat strange in Zweibruecken, where propriety, form, and tradition had always been so important. In spite of being strange, these characteristics appealed to the people of the small city, who pointed with pride to their international connections. The Zweibruecker felt that only a citizen of a free and prosperous land could conduct himself in such a way. Surely, such a man was from a country that had been spared the pain of war on its own soil, and certainly he must be free from major problems and confident of the future; otherwise, how could he be so conscious of the importance of his country? The American soldier in Zweibruecken was the symbol of a country that was experiencing conditions unknown in Zweibruecken -- but conditions that the people wanted
to get to know. The Americans, in spite of their shortcomings, served as models; they had freedom, material goods, and peace of mind. Twelve years of National Socialism and its aftermath gave its survivors a heightened appreciation for freedom. The devastation of the war created a great need for material things, and the psychological trauma stemming from the total experience of war, destruction, and hatred spawned a yearning for tranquility. The Germans, at least the people in Zweibruecken, looked at the Americans in their midst and reasoned that there must be some wisdom in the American way of life. A survey of 1,500 Germans in the U.S. Zone in 1950 indicated that fifty-seven percent of the Germans believed they could learn "some good things" from the Americans. These "good things" were identified as: tolerance, trust, absence of envy and hatred, political affairs, and technical and scientific knowledge. On the other hand, German pride was shown by the fact that sixty-five percent of those polled stated that the Americans could learn "some things" from the Germans; they cited ability to work, discipline, orderliness, and thoroughness as German qualities worthy of emulation by the Americans.
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Chapter 9

Summary

In the years of the postwar period, the average German found himself or herself living through the trauma of seeing the crushed country grasp for the barest necessities while standing humiliated before the eyes of the world for the macabre deeds of the National Socialists. The experiences of daily life were largely controlled by the occupying powers. The occupying powers were determined from the very beginning to reorient the Germans by punishing the guilty, developing new attitudes, and changing the institutions which constituted the framework of German society.

In the West, the Americans, British, and French chose to build a democracy. Each of the three occupying powers administered its own zone, directed reorientation programs, erected institutions, and consented to the ultimate merger that formed the Federal Republic of Germany. But, America, as the strongest member of the triad, was destined to have influences which transcended the bounds of its assigned zone.

One of the most basic principles of the American occupation was to democratize Germany through Germans. At each step in the process, the re-education machinery was set in motion, Germans were involved, and then control was given to them so that they could reorient others.

As time passed, society was changed in Germany by both overt and subtle means. Proclamations and dicta were issued, which the typical German knew had to be obeyed. Behind the scenes, these overt pressures
were supplemented by urgings which were often heeded by the German authorities and ultimately followed by the public. At the same time, examples of American society offered by the presence of Americans were also at work. By the time the country achieved autonomy, institutions were established and society's course was charted.

Progress in the economy put people to work, fed and clothed the families, paid for comforts, and provided for the future. Economic prosperity demonstrated to the Germans the advantages of capitalism and generated gratitude for America.

The educational system offered a realistic, more expanded view of Germany and the world than had been the case during the Hitler years. It taught Germans to have an appreciation for others while casting light on the past, and, for some, it offered a critical view of the society that had spawned the Third Reich and those who had lived in it as adults. The educational system gave the Germans the wherewithal to climb back, but at the same time it created an acknowledgement of national guilt which would hang over their heads for years. Education reforms were achieved; however, many of the reforms sought by the Americans were not realized because German educators had their own ideas about how to reconstruct a system that would meet the needs of a democracy. But in one sense, the school system that evolved after the war was the product of a joint effort. The Americans insisted on a democratic, decentralized means of education and provided German educators with the freedom to implement changes. Some of these changes were new, others had already been suggested unsuccessfully during the Weimar period, while yet others represented a restoration of pre-1933
practices. Although not practiced to the extent desired by the Americans, democratization of the education system seems to have enhanced social mobility. It was concluded, in 1970, that:

social mobility, while still limited in many ways, is greater than in Britain or France: it is easier in Germany for newcomers, not from the poorest circles but from the middle ranks of society, to become members of the governing class.¹

The information media had a new mission; it was to inform and entertain, not deceive. Every German had access to the airways and the newspapers and other forms of the print media — and the media were free.

The arts had been liberated from the stultifying constraints of National Socialism. Creative minds were once again free to express themselves, but Germany had been divested of much of its talent, and it would take several years for German artists in various fields to find themselves and begin producing German works again. Germany was not without native talent, but those who survived National Socialism had to regenerate their energies and find a new orientation while coping with scarcities of every kind. In the meantime, the gap was filled with imported plays, compositions, and other forms of art.

The traditional religious institutions once again offered refuge to troubled souls. Immediately after the war, when the moral atrocities of Nazism were exposed, the Germans went to church in droves. This was a temporary phenomenon, as the material demands of life required so much effort, and attendance soon dropped.

Politics had come to mean something to the individual. Human rights
and individual obligations had achieved a balance so that the citizens of Germany could lay claim to their right as masters of government, rather than its servants. The German citizen had a place in society and Germany had reclaimed a place as a nation among nations. This reorientation was not without turmoil. Opposing points of view evolved which embraced a wide range of options from extreme, left-wing socialism to extreme, right-wing conservatism. There was also a sizable portion of society that was reluctant to have anything at all to do with politics.

At the grass-roots level, personal problems and ventures received more attention than the conscious development of democracy. The belief that the individual American was the best possible ambassador for the nation allowed for this, and as a result, the presence of the American forces in Germany served both to protect the fledgling democracy and to instruct it. Institutionally, no stone was left unturned to further friendship, and the two peoples proved to be compatible. Ethnic similarities, compatible values, a common potential enemy, American resources, and German needs all figured in the mutual successes of the decade of the 1950s. The conduct of the American personnel in Germany spoke to the Germans in both negative and positive terms, but on balance the positive factors seem to have had more lasting effects, perhaps because the prevailing view on both sides was that the Germans and Americans would get on well with one another — a self-fulfilling prophecy. Virtually every facet of every person's life in West Germany was touched, if not molded, by American influence. This is not to say that Germany could not have recovered without America's assistance, because it could have. America did not make the Germans an industrious
people, but it did help guide their energies and thoughts, and Americans provided valuable resources. Zweibruecken is an example of this. Interviews with citizens of Zweibruecken who lived and worked there during the 1950s reveal a common conclusion: without Americans, Zweibruecken's economy would not have rebounded so quickly as it did or to the extent that it did. The citizens of Zweibruecken owed their prosperity in the decade of the 1950s to the presence of U.S. military forces.²

Americans were constantly on the scene. They supervised the recovery and then partook of the benefits derived from that recovery. Germany became a favored destination for American tourists, a profitable environment for American business, a lucrative market for American products, a strong military ally, and a home away from home for hundreds of thousands of American military men and women and their families. Not every American soldier who went to Germany during the decade of the fifties liked it, but the majority did, and few who served there regretted it afterwards. Germans acquired a taste for American things — democracy, styles, and the material products, and even after the period of forced acceptance was over, that taste persisted. It was nourished by the continued presence of Americans in German communities and homes and Germans in American homes and institutions. The daily contact that many Germans had with Americans helped to keep their mutual interests alive; they shared ideas, time, things, and values. The Germans retained their "Germanness" but it was spiced by "Americanness."
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