

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Donald Francis Cate for the Master
of Arts Degree in General Studies.

Date thesis is presented June 1951

Title Democracy as Exemplified by
the Western Powers and by the
Soviet Union in the Reorientation
of Youth in Occupied Ger-
many.

Redacted for Privacy

Abstract approved

(Major Professor)

The thesis describes and analyzes the programs of France, Great Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union to reorient youth in occupied Germany. The main objective is to depict the fundamental differences in educational and political philosophies, in social and psychological viewpoints separating the Soviet Union and the Western Powers. The study deals primarily with youth activities and school reforms.

In sketching the background of the problem, the thesis summarizes the activities of the four powers in post-war Germany, the physical and spiritual destruction left in Germany by the war, and the traditional training of German youth in home and school.

The thesis outlines the objections made by the four powers to such elements of traditional youth training as: nationalism and Nazism; the "two-track" school system emphasizing class differences; the academic curriculum divorced from citizenship training and the social sciences; the jealous, competitive relationship of the churches toward youth guidance; the cultural isolation of Germany from other countries. The study notes that the Western Powers criticize traditional youth training for not teaching the parliamentary and discussion procedures, while the Soviet Union laments the neglect of Marx and Lenin in the curriculum. The Western Powers condemn the state control

of youth education and training; the Soviet Union accepts the German principle of centralized control.

The thesis outlines the organization, objectives and policies of each occupation power's youth reorientation program. Policies relating to denazification, non-fraternization, priority and personnel are discussed in detail. Finally, the thesis describes and characterizes typical youth reorientation activities of the four occupation powers.

The investigation finds that diversity, a minimum of controls and a "cultural exchange" approach characterize the Western Powers reorientation programs. The diverse youth organizations and school reforms existing in the western zones illustrate the variety of expression and the independence allowed the Germans. The reorientation programs reflect the ideals of a western democracy, based on parliamentary procedures, free discussion, respect for the individual and tolerance.

France's fears for national security have led her to control German youth more directly. Majority opinion in official British and American headquarters has supported an indirect approach. Especially has "observe, advise and assist" characterized U. S. policy, based on the premise that democracy cannot be legislated or imposed, but must be learned slowly by practice and accepted voluntarily.

The investigation finds that the Soviet Union has made youth reorientation part of an over-all plan to mould German youth and Germany into the Communist pattern of Marxist philosophy and political domination. Soviet "democracy" is characterized by: rigid controls over all formal education; political "front organizations" that serve as "informers" and as control agencies; a youth activity program monopolized and directed in all areas by a centralized authoritarian organization. While the Soviet "democratization" promises liberty and equality for all, the Soviet youth reorientation program permits neither freedom nor criticism and practices class discrimination against those who have the Communistic misfortune of being born of the middle or upper classes.

The investigation finds that the Soviet Union gives high priority to the youth reorientation program and supports it vigorously in all areas of youth activity. The Western

Powers have achieved more lasting, dramatic and worthwhile gains in teaching German youth the western version of democracy. However, by failing to realize the importance of youth reorientation in German reconstruction, by failing to give youth reorientation adequate priority and by failing to coordinate individual programs, the Western Powers exhibit short-sightedness, delay and indecision and the lack of specific objectives and cooperation. These are the "too little and too late" weaknesses of western democracy which handicap the West's struggle with a ruthless power for the future of German youth and the future of Germany.

DEMOCRACY AS EXEMPLIFIED BY THE WESTERN POWERS
AND BY THE SOVIET UNION IN THE REORIENTATION
OF YOUTH IN OCCUPIED GERMANY

by

DONALD FRANCIS CATE

A THESIS

submitted to

OREGON STATE COLLEGE

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

June 1951

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Associate Professor of Education

In Charge of Thesis

Redacted for Privacy

Chairman of School Graduate Committee

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented June 1951

Typed by Virginia Cate

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM	1
Treatment of the Problem	1
Justification.	1
Scope	3
Analysis	3
Procedure, sources and treatment of data.	4
Delimitation, assumptions, implications and definitions	5
Survey of related studies.	10
Background of Problem	29
Four-power activities and relations	29
Post-war physical conditions.	33
Status of Germany's youth at beginning of occupation.	36
Traditional training in home and school.	37
Influence of the Nazi period	41
Attitudes in early occupation period.	44
II. FOUR-POWER CRITICISMS OF TRADITIONAL GERMAN YOUTH TRAINING.	47
Points of Agreement	47
Nazism and German Nationalism.	48
Class System in the Schools	50
Curriculum	56
Church-School Relationship.	59
Isolation	62
Administration.	63
Teaching Methods	63
III. PROGRAMS OF THE FOUR OCCUPATION POWERS TO REORIENT GERMAN YOUTH (Part 1)	65
Organization of Youth Reorientation Programs	65
United States organization	66
British organization	69
French organization.	69
Soviet organization.	70

III.	PROGRAMS OF THE FOUR OCCUPATION POWERS TO REORIENT GERMAN YOUTH (Part 1) (Continued).	65
	Objectives.	72
	United States objectives.	73
	British objectives.	77
	French objectives	79
	Soviet objectives	80
	Policies	87
	Denazification	89
	Non-fraternization.	94
	Priority	96
	Personnel.	104
IV.	PROGRAMS OF THE FOUR OCCUPATION POWERS TO REORIENT GERMAN YOUTH (Part 2)	107
	Youth Activities.	107
	United States youth activities.	107
	British youth activities.	119
	French youth activities	121
	Soviet youth activities	125
	School Reform	138
	French school reform	142
	British school reform.	143
	United States school reform.	145
	Soviet school reform	153
	Theoretical reform	155
	Practical controls	160
	Students	160
	Teachers	165
	Curriculum.	168
V.	CONCLUSION.	171
	Summary	171
	LITERATURE CITED.	176
	APPENDIX	183

DEMOCRACY AS EXEMPLIFIED BY THE WESTERN POWERS
AND BY THE SOVIET UNION IN THE REORIENTATION
OF YOUTH IN OCCUPIED GERMANY

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

JUSTIFICATION. Germany today is a focal point for some of the world's most difficult problems. First is the problem of Germany. What can be done to insure a peaceful future for Germany? A larger problem concerns those who determine Germany's future. It is the conflict between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union, a confused "cold war" fought with words as well as with political, economic and military strategies. This conflict has made Germany a testing ground for the ideologies of East and West and a storm center for the world-wide struggle¹ in which both groups claim to represent democracy.

A vital part of this struggle is the attempt of the occupation powers to influence German youth, to win them from the old Nazi doctrines to the new "democratic" ideals. Whether the occupation powers use persuasion, example, indoctrination or force, they realize that today's German youth are a potent factor in tomorrow's Germany.

The programs fostered by the four occupation powers

1. At least three recent books emphasize in their titles the struggle over Germany (1, 15, 25).

to reorient German youth are significant. They reveal the educational philosophies, the political and social ideals, the psychological hopes and fears, the very ways of life of the world's most powerful nations.

In Germany the four powers agreed on a one-word objective--democracy. This word, so popular in American speeches and so precious to the western world, is used even more often by the Russians, according to William F. Russell, Teachers College, Columbia University (2, p.133).

It was soon apparent in Germany that the western and eastern worlds disagreed fundamentally on the meaning of democracy. At one four-power meeting in Berlin it was suggested that each of the delegates should give his definition of democracy. The British representative listened to the definitions given by his three colleagues. Then he remarked that he could only reconcile these divergent conceptions of democracy by defining it as what four powers could agree to inflict on a fifth (29, p.7)!

The "cold war" is partly a war of propaganda. Democracy is a word weapon in that war. There are claims and counterclaims as to who is bringing a true democracy to Germany. In this confused world it is important for the people of the United States to know what democracy means to the western and eastern worlds and to each of the four powers.

Deeds sometimes define better than words. Knowing what the four powers are actually doing to reorient German youth toward democracy may orient the observer toward a better understanding of his own culture and that of other peoples.

The subject is of personal interest to the writer for two reasons. First, he studied during 1948-1949 at the Universities of Berne and Zürich, part of a German educational system in northern Switzerland, similar to that of Germany. Second, he visited all three western zones in Germany in the spring of 1949, going from Kufstein on the southern border of Germany to Flensburg on the Danish border.

SCOPE. By describing and analyzing educational reforms and youth activities sponsored by the four occupation powers in Germany, this study attempts to depict the kinds of democracy represented by these reorientation programs. The primary purpose is to illustrate and clarify the differences between the eastern and the western worlds. The main objective, then, is to depict the fundamental differences in educational and political philosophies, in social and psychological viewpoints separating the Soviet Union and the Western Powers.

ANALYSIS. The study includes the following elements. What factors in the traditional upbringing of

German youth are considered undemocratic by the occupying powers? What does each nation consider the fundamental objectives of democracy in training youth? What specific techniques and methods are being used in reforming the German school system; in sponsoring youth groups, clubs and activities?

Of minor emphasis are the following questions. Are there also wide differences separating the attitudes and methods of the three Western Powers in training German youth for democracy? Are the programs of France, Great Britain and the United States coordinated with one another? Has the United States followed a sound policy in its program for German youth? What might be done to improve the efforts of the United States to reorient German youth?

PROCEDURE, SOURCES AND TREATMENT OF DATA. Materials used for information include the periodicals, books and government documents related to the problem. Additional information was obtained by querying the following organizations and individuals: political parties, universities, student groups and ministers of culture in all four zones of Germany; religious organizations of the United States which have done youth work in Germany; education experts and youth leaders who represent or did represent the United States in Germany; information

services of the four governments that occupy Germany. To a limited extent the writer used some of his own experiences and observations in Germany and Europe.

Most of the pertinent data in current books and periodicals relate to the work of the United States. Far less material is available on the work of the French and the British occupation forces in youth reorientation. Russian zone activities are often mentioned, but seldom described in great detail. The writer does not attempt to describe the activities of the British and French to any great extent, but to point out some of the differences in their approach which differentiate their methods from those used by the United States. The main emphasis is on the differences between the Soviet Union and the United States, the strongest member of the Western Powers.

In treating the data the writer seeks to characterize each power's program in sponsoring education reforms and youth activities; to analyze these programs in order to depict clearly motives and methods involved; to distinguish and compare the fundamental tenets underlying each power's youth reorientation work, especially the work of the United States and the Soviet Union.

DELIMITATION, ASSUMPTIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND DEFINITIONS. The situation in Germany, particularly in regard to education, is complex and confused. Germany is

divided into four zones, each of which is subdivided into Länder or states. Often Länder in the same zone of occupation have entirely different educational reforms. However, the writer believes that these very differences within a zone are significant since they indicate the degree of administrative centralization within a zone and the policy of the occupying power.

For example, Professor Lilge, specialist in the Philosophy and History of Education at the University of California and an observer for the War Department in Germany, points out that variations are found in the three Länder in the American zone, while almost complete uniformity prevails in the five Länder of the Russian zone (40, p.36).

The subject is broad and complex. Detailed, reliable information is often difficult to obtain. However, the writer assumes that the information he has obtained, while only describing a small part of the total activities, is fairly typical of all youth reorientation activities in the zones.

There are some limiting factors which impinge upon this study. First, is it possible to reorient the German youth who have known no other system than the Nazi regime and who have been thoroughly indoctrinated? Second, does the very nature of military occupation prevent the

implanting of democracy? Third, do the youth reorientation programs conducted by the occupying nations in Germany reflect with any degree of accuracy the democratic practices of these nations at home?

In answer to these questions, the writer assumes that it is possible to a varying degree to direct German boys and girls trained under Nazism toward new philosophies of life. The existence of the youth reorientation programs indicates that the four powers have made the same premise.

Military occupation does pose serious problems for teaching democracy as far as the American way of life is concerned. It may pose a less serious problem for the Soviet Union in its interpretation of democracy. The consideration which each occupation power has given to this particular problem helps exemplify the kind of democracy which each has practiced in Germany.

The third question probably indicates that the four powers may have been guided by other motives than a wish to replace the ideals of German youth with something better. Or it may indicate that the instruments through which the four powers work are not the best for reflecting democratic practices at home. Again, a nation can not transplant an educational program or social system from its own culture into a foreign culture, and

expect to have two identical programs or systems. The very nature of the foreign culture changes the educational program or social system so that it is no longer the same as it was in the home country. Germany differs considerably from each occupying power. The occupying powers may have to change somewhat their forms of democracy to make them function in Germany.

For the purpose of this thesis, occupied Germany is considered to be the German territory divided into zones for administration by France, Great Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union. This territory does not include the city of Königsberg and the adjoining northern portion of East Prussia which the Potsdam Agreement designated as to be ultimately transferred to the Soviet Union (22, p.52). The remaining German areas east of a line following the Oder and Neisse Rivers from the Baltic Sea to the Czechoslovak frontier are also excluded (22, p.54). These areas were placed under the temporary administration of the Polish State, but no commitments were made as to their ultimate status in the Potsdam Agreement (21, p.6). The thesis does not include the Saar territory, claimed by both France and Germany, and administered differently than other portions of German territory under French occupation.

German youth is considered to include all elementary, secondary and university students as well as those young adults who were in youth activities under the Nazi regime and who are no longer in school.

Reorientation refers primarily to those educational reforms and youth activities which are sponsored or encouraged by the occupying nations.

Reorientation has economic and material implications. What the occupation powers do or do not do to lift their zones above a subsistence level determines part of their success in reorienting youth. Bidwell, Director of Studies, Council on Foreign Relations, points out the sharp conflict between the French economic policy and their re-education program. He reports that the tough French economic policy is to make the zone support itself, and if possible to contribute something to French recovery. Thus, French educational officers see increasing difficulty in their program as long as the standard of living remains depressed (10, p.85).

This thesis recognizes the economic implications of youth reorientation, but places primary emphasis on the specific educational reforms and youth activities fostered by the occupation powers. However, the material setting in which the reorientation programs operate must always be kept in mind.

Reorientation might also be considered to include programs for war-injured children or for orphans and child refugees. However, this type of rehabilitation fits into the pattern of economic and physical reconstruction.

SURVEY OF RELATED STUDIES. Many recent books, documents and magazines describe reconstruction activities in Germany. Usually they deal with broader phases of the German problem rather than with the specific work of youth reorientation. The education journals of this country have touched on this subject most extensively. The various authors for all these publications treating Germany include journalists, military officials, foreign specialists of the State Department, educators and others.

Descriptions of United States activities in reorienting German youth may frequently be found in the monthly magazine of the Office of the United States High Commissioner for Germany, entitled Information Bulletin. A special issue, January, 1950, "Activities of the Office of Public Affairs," has one pertinent section reviewing the work of the Education and Cultural Relations Division, which has been the government agency primarily responsible for youth activities and re-education in Germany (44). Another useful issue, "Educational and Cultural Activities in Germany Today," consists of reprints from Information Bulletin articles published in

1949 (47). It differs from many issues in having articles with by-lines.

Several other government publications related to the problem are also obtainable from the State Department. Occasionally, the Department of State Bulletin contains related material.

Department of State Publication 2583, The Present Status of German Youth, consists of reprints from issues of this government publication (19). Publication 2583 describes the problems of German youth after the war and the policies of the occupation powers in meeting those problems. It concerns only the early stages of the occupation. The publication presents a rather depressing picture of German youth, emphasizing juvenile delinquency, subversive activities, nationalism, etc. Possibly the author's position prevents other than a negative appraisal of the status of youth. The author, Henry J. Kellermann, served as Chief of Research and Consultant to the Office of Chief of Counsel for the Prosecution of Axis Criminality.

A lengthy Department of State publication, Germany 1947-1949, The Story in Documents, contains a most useful section on educational, informational, cultural and religious developments (22). This section presents the

general United States policies regarding education and other phases of youth reorientation. It lists the Allied Control Council directives on re-education, Western Powers agreements on youth reorientation and United States Military Regulations relating to education. German school reforms, education provisions of state constitutions and similar material are also included.

The Report of the United States Education Mission to Germany is valuable background material (20). A group of distinguished experts surveyed German educational conditions in 1946 on behalf of the State and War Departments. Their detailed report influenced United States reorientation work in Germany to a great extent.

Useful for background are the Handbook of Education Statistics, Education and Cultural Relations Division, OMGUS¹, July 1949 (46), and the Cultural Exchange Program, Interdivisional Reorientation Committee, OMGUS, February 1949 (48).

A government publication devoted specifically to the work of United States occupation personnel with German youth is German Youth between Yesterday and Tomorrow (45). Published by the U. S. Office of Military Government in

1. OMGUS is the military symbol for the United States Office of Military Government in Germany.

Germany, it is the third in a series of documents dealing with German youth. It describes activities between April 1, 1947 and April 30, 1948 and summarizes previous events. Its treatment of the subject is commendable in that it also includes frank criticism of the U. S. youth program, as for example, the report of the German-American conference at Wiesbaden in September 1947. The publication includes statistical tables on youth membership and describes in detail youth groups in the Western zones.

The British High Commissioner publishes a monthly magazine, Monthly Report of the Control Commission for Germany (British Element), which usually mentions education or youth activities briefly in each issue.

The magazine, International Affairs, published quarterly by the Royal Institute of International Affairs, is useful for background information on Germany. At least two recent articles deal specifically with youth reorientation in Germany.

Robert Birley writes "Education in the British Zone of Germany" with some authority in the January 1950 issue (11). He was Educational Advisor to the Deputy Military Governor, British zone, Germany, 1947-1949, and is now Headmaster of Eaton.

A detailed study, "Education in Occupied Germany," appears in the January 1948 issue (39). This field study

by Helen Liddell, Secretary of the Information Department at Chatham House, characterizes the school reforms and youth activities sponsored by all four powers. Much of her material is based on her visit to Germany in 1947.

The problem of university reform in Germany is discussed extensively by a German commission appointed by the British Military Governor of Germany. The official report of this body, Der Studienausschuss für Hochschulreform, is titled, Gutachten zur Hochschulreform. Available is an English translation prepared by His Majesty's Stationery Office in London and called, University Reform in Germany (26). Editors stress that it is an English version of the report rather than an exact translation.

As one might expect, the Germans have written extensively on various phases of youth reorientation. The writer has had access to two different types of material from Germany concerning the subject: (1) letters or reports which to the best of the writer's knowledge have not been published; (2) published material including reports of speeches, organization programs and constitutions, etc.

The unpublished material includes a number of reports from the archives or library of the Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands or SPD (55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 63). These reports were sent by Dr. Christian Gneuss and R. Thomas, two SPD officials at the party headquarters in

Hannover, Germany. Most important of these reports are the typewritten statements of former teachers and university professors in the Russian zone.

Perhaps the authenticity of these reports may be questioned, due to the form of the reports and their political source. The reports are unsigned and are usually copies of originals. However, the writer believes these reports give a factual picture of typical conditions in the Russian zone. Statements made in the reports agree with those made by other observers.

One of these reports is by Dr. Steinbrecher, a professor of education at the University of Rostock until February 1950 (63). Steinbrecher describes school reform techniques applied in the Rostock area. A second report comes from an educator active in teaching and administration in the Land Thuringia (58). His work, like that of Dr. Steinbrecher, included supervision of new teachers. He calls his sixteen-page, single-spaced typewritten report, "Die Entwicklung des Schulwesens in der Ostzone von 1945 bis zur Gegenwart." (The Development of School Affairs in the Eastern Zone from 1945 until the Present)¹ The remaining reports are less comprehensive in scope and

1. Written May 5, 1949.

deal largely with individual incidents of youth reorientation.

A survey of school reforms in the zones of the Western Powers comes from the Ständige Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. That is, the Permanent Conference of the Ministers of Culture of the States of the German Federal Republic. The report was written by Dr. Eugen Löffler, the Minister of Culture of Land Württemberg-Baden (41). It describes the specific reforms to date¹ in each Land of Western Germany. It characterizes the common reform elements which pervade all Länder despite individual differences in school reforms.

The director of the Pädagogisches Seminar or education seminar of the University of Göttingen has sent the writer a comprehensive report on democratic youth reorientation. The report, written by Reinhild Böttcher, a student, describes in detail the school reforms and youth organizations sponsored by the four occupying powers (12). The report is called: "The Democratic Education of German Youth Since 1945."²

Student Böttcher contrasts the democratic ideals of

1. Written June 9, 1950

2. Written in 1950.

East and West by quotations from British, American and Russian sources. After quoting John Dewey to exemplify American democracy in education, she gives the British ideal which emphasizes respect for human personality. Independence, tolerance and freedom of thought and discussion are central principles. She questions whether one can speak of independence, tolerance and freedom within Communism's ideological borders which go back to the Communist Manifesto and Karl Marx (12, p.2).

She contrasts the ideals of the Soviet Union and the United States. The Soviet Union believes that in the new education for Germany a democratic spirit can be ordered or imposed. The U. S. Education Mission to Germany report states to the contrary that a genuine democracy can not be imposed by anyone, but must arise from the cooperative will of free men (12, pp.2-3).

Student Böttcher states that the school reforms in all four occupation zones have as their highest principles: (1) raising of general educational standards; (2) equality of educational opportunity for all. Therefore, the most decisive changes concern the Volksschulen or the elementary schools. These schools are to raise the general educational level. Upon them will be built the continuing vocational and higher schools. She believes the reforms in the universities are not so extensive. An exception is

the education of teachers for the new schools, upon which naturally depends the success of the school reforms (12, p.3).

She cites significant quotations from Paul Wandel, Präsident der deutschen Zentralverwaltung für Volksbildung in der Sowjetzone or President of the German Central Administration for People's Education in the Soviet zone. These quotations illustrate that Soviet zone education is completely centralized and that authority proceeds imperiously from top downward. Her study includes material from Swiss and German newspapers describing educational conditions within the Soviet zone.

Her description of youth organizations and activities is especially valuable for its detailed analysis of individual youth organizations in Western Germany. Her bibliography is helpful for its list of German references.

Published material from Germany on youth reorientation includes the SPD pamphlet, Methoden und Ziele der Kulturpolitik in der Sowjetzone (60). This pamphlet deals with the methods and aims of the so-called "cultural politics" in the Soviet zone. It names organizations and individuals through which the Soviet Union works in Germany. One pertinent section describes schools and education (60, pp.31-33).

Expressing a different viewpoint on youth reorientation is the pamphlet, Die Regierung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik Hilft der Jugend (3). That is, The Government of the German Democratic Republic Helps Youth. This publication expresses the opinion of East German Government officials and indirectly the opinion of the Soviet Union. It has these parts: speeches by Deputy Prime Minister Walter Ulbricht and by another official, Erich Honecker; the Law for the Participation of Youth in the Construction of the German Republic and the Aid Given to Youth in School and Vocation Through Sport and Recreation.¹ This law was approved in February 8, 1950. The law and the speeches describe what is expected of youth and what youth can expect from the government.

Publications from Eastern Germany which bear upon various aspects of youth reorientation include among other materials: the Hochschulprogramm der Freien Deutschen Jugend or the University Program of the Free German Youth (4); Heinrich Deiter's Schule und jugenderziehung in den deutschen verfassungen der gegenwart² or School and Youth Education in the German Constitutions of the Present (17);

-
1. Gesetz über die Teilnahme der Jugend am Aufbau der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik und die Förderung der Jugend in Schule und Beruf, bei Sport und Erholung.
 2. The entire article is written without the customary capitalization of German nouns.

Die Verfassung der Freien Deutschen Jugend or The Constitution of the Free German Youth (73).

The American Council on Education, Commission on The Occupied Areas, has initiated a series of pertinent booklets with Basic Elements of Educational Reconstruction in Germany (28). This booklet, prepared by Dr. Alonzo G. Grace, formerly Director, Division of Education and Cultural Relations, OMGUS, is based on principles agreed upon by a conference of American education officers representing the entire U. S. zone in the summer of 1948 at Berchtesgaden, Germany.

The booklet describes the methods and future needs of the re-education program in the U. S. zone. It states the philosophy of the present program in twelve "principles underlying policy (28, pp.12-14)."

As Grace points out, the present program represents a substantial change of policy (28, p.14). Formerly, there was great emphasis on reorganization of the German educational structure. The philosophy expressed at Berchtesgaden emphasizes an "observe, advise and assist" formula. Or as Grace states:

Primary emphasis is placed on moral and spiritual matters, attitudes, cultural exchange, informal education activities, education of teachers, machinery to establish democratic practices, rather than on the structure and organization of formal education (28, p.14).

There is a basic difference of opinion still prevailing among the American educators who have worked in OMGUS or who criticize the reform program from without. The "observe, advise and assist" opinion prevails, but a number of educators still insist that if democracy is to be achieved in Germany, the education system itself must be reformed and reorganized. These educators would have the United States officials act directly to reform the German system. Those of the "observe, advise and assist" philosophy insist that reform which is carried out by U. S. officials and not by the Germans themselves is a violation of American democratic principles. Both groups may agree on many factors which they consider the essentials of a democratic training program for youth. The two groups disagree on what means are ethical and desirable to achieve those essentials.

An examination of some of the twelve principles outlined by Grace illustrates the thinking involved. The first emphasizes that true reform of the German people must come from within, a reform spiritual and moral in nature. The second states that the "German problem" is part of the entire European problem, to be considered against the whole background of German and European history. The third principle describes the role of Military Government. It is not to superimpose an American system

of education, but to indicate to the Germans certain essential ingredients in the education of children and youth. These include: equal access to education regardless of race, class, creed or economic status; freedom of the individual to utilize the type of educational opportunity for which he is talented; and training of each individual to give his best toward developing world peace, international understanding, law, order and social justice (28, pp.12-13)

The main emphasis of these principles is that reform must come from the German people themselves. Military Government can best accomplish this by encouraging the work of democratic organizations, nongovernmental groups, programs by UNESCO, etc. (28, pp.13-14).

A secondary emphasis is a theme, often emphasized by Grace, that Germany's problem as well as that of the world at large is a problem of spiritualism versus materialism. The belief underlies the twelfth principle.

12. The more rapid the material reconstruction and economic recovery, the more difficult becomes the problem of intellectual, moral, and spiritual redemption. The United States will have failed in Germany if materialism is allowed to supersede moral values. A concurrent program of educational and cultural reconstruction on a long-time basis is required (28, p.14).

The first sentence of this twelfth principle might be seriously questioned. Can the German people be taught

morality, freedom, justice and democratic principles when economic conditions are desperate, when people steal coal from railroad yards to keep warm? This might be the very worst time to bring about moral redemption. Material reconstruction and economic recovery should make the problem of intellectual, spiritual and moral redemption much easier.

L. Thomas Hopkins, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, believes that liberal democracy can not develop in Germany unless the economic basis on which it rests is developed, too (33, p.203). He considers economic recovery as a helpful factor in bringing democracy to Germany.

Although Hopkins disagrees with much of the philosophy typified by Grace, he would agree on some factors. For example, Hopkins stresses the point made by Grace in his twelfth principle that educational reconstruction must be on a long-time basis (33, p.204).

Hopkins, contrary to Grace, calls for direct reform of not only the authoritarian controls within the school system, but also within the culture which produced that system (31, p.14). For example, he believes that Military Government should take control of schools away from the church. He considers the surrender of a church-controlled educational system to be just as much of a war reparation

as machinery from the Nazi factories (33, p.210).

Hopkins distinguishes between the totalitarian democracy practiced by Russia and the liberal democracy of the United States. He considers liberal democracy as a dynamic state directed by the cooperative thinking of a free people; totalitarian democracy as a dynamic state directed by a few individuals through the secret police (33, p.201).

Franz L. Neumann, formerly Chief of German Research Section, Department of State, agrees more or less with Hopkins in advocating basic educational reforms. He recommends "the destruction of education privileges, the elimination of the caste spirit in German universities, the secularization of education (33, p.225)."

Neumann believes that the clash between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers "is most clearly reflected in their educational policies (33, p.212)."

He states the clash begins with the disagreement of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union over nazism and democracy. The Allies had agreed at Potsdam to eliminate nazism and to make possible the development of democracy. The Western Powers believe that nazism is a political phenomenon to be eliminated by democratic procedures. Democracy is considered "as a method of ascertaining the popular will in a free manner (33, p.211)."

Nazism to the Soviet Union is a political form of an economic and social system to be destroyed only by replacing the social-economic system. Democracy to the Soviet Union is a society without exploitation, not merely a method of determining what the people want. Equality of the citizens in a Soviet democracy must include the economic sphere (33, pp.211-212).

Neumann characterizes the American reorientation program as having two basic policies: (1) turning over to the Germans, through democratically elected representatives, as many tasks as possible without endangering fundamental principles of OMGUS: (2) transferring full powers to the separate Länder or states whether or not those powers were previously held by the Reich or the Länder (33, p.213).

Neumann characterizes the British reorientation program as emphasizing more direct control and more central administration. Former Reich functions instead of being given to the Länder have been turned over to central zone authorities. Thus, the British zone has a Zonal Educational Council under a former Prussian Minister of Education, Dr. Adolf Grimme. However, the council has only coordinating and advisory powers. It has no legislative or executive powers (33, p.213-214).

The French like the British have more direct

control, but differ from both zones in their emphasis on cultural penetration and the high caliber of the educational and cultural personnel (33, p.214).

Neumann describes the Soviet as having a German Central Administration for the whole zone, just as the British do. In addition, the Länder have elected representatives and constitutions as in the U. S. zone. The Central Administration has an extensive department of popular education, directed by Paul Wandel, a leader in the Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands or SED. Neumann reports that while in theory the Central Administration only coordinates, it actually directs since the SED holds key positions in the Central Administration and in the Länder (33, p.214).

Professor Lilge makes interesting comparisons of the U. S. and Russian educational reforms. Lilge explains the essential features of the "Law Concerning the Democratization of the German Schools," adopted on May 23, 1946, for reform in the Soviet zone. He states that the reorganization of the school system in the Soviet zone:

...resembles the public school system of the United States much more closely than do the educational reforms which have thus far been promoted and carried out in the American zone of occupation (40, p.39).

He regards the new law as expressing a socialist philosophy of education which denies the child-centered school and the individualistic psychology of education. He reports differences of opinion between the Soviet Military Administration and the German Central Administration Office, sometimes resolved in favor of the German representatives rather than the Soviet military. Lilge believes the new educational system in the Soviet zone "is in large part still only an accomplishment on paper (40, p.45)." He thinks the new educational system, no matter how progressively or generously conceived, will be nullified if "accompanied by progressive impoverization of the land (40, pp.45-46)."

Finally he states that the:

...coercive, bribing, and bullying methods by which the S.E.D. is building up its political power in the zone...are regarded by the Germans as identical with those of the former National Socialist Party (40, p.46).

Robert E. Keohane, University of Chicago, effectively presents some of the dilemmas facing a re-education program based on democratic principles (35). He thinks that while the United States could have used direct methods to reform the German educational system in 1945, such an approach is impossible now (35, p.414).

A number of recent books treat the reorientation problem in more or less detailed fashion. Most of them

deal with the broad phases of the economic, political and military problems rather than the training of youth.

Marshall M. Knappen's book, And Call It Peace, printed in 1947, describes effectively the early development of United States educational work in Germany (36).

For background material Howard Becker's book, German Youth: Bond or Free, is helpful (9). Becker describes in a literary and philosophical manner the German youth movements preceding the occupation period.

There are a considerable number of books describing the work of Military Government in Germany which naturally include some material on youth reorientation. Hill, Middleton and Warburg are typical of the journalists who mention problems of youth, education and democracy in books on the "German problem (29, 43, 68)."

A valuable source book for study of the early period of military occupation is Harold Zink's American Military Government in Germany (74). Two chapters especially pertinent are: "Denazification"; "Problem of Re-educating the Germans." Zink criticizes the low priority given to re-education. He praises the re-education personnel for excellent work despite limited assistance from higher headquarters.

Two additional magazine articles deserve mention. Zausmer reviews youth reorientation work in all the

Western zones, praising the work of the French for their cultural penetration program (72). Bidwell discusses the French program alone (10).

The list of writers who have written on some aspect of the problem is long. Few, however, have written books or articles which compare the programs of all four powers in detail and which deal specifically with the reorientation of youth.

BACKGROUND OF PROBLEM. The background for a study of youth reorientation in Germany may be divided into three parts. These include: (1) a brief sketch of four-power activities and relations; (2) post-war physical conditions in Germany; (3) the status of German youth in the beginning of the occupation period.

FOUR-POWER ACTIVITIES AND RELATIONS. In 1950 there are two Germany's. There is Western Germany administered by France, Great Britain and the United States. There is Eastern Germany administered by the Soviet Union. The political struggle between the East and the West is reflected by the German governments at Berlin and Bonn. The existence of two Germany's does not eliminate the desire of the German people for one unified Germany.

Conditions have changed rapidly and tremendously since the days of wartime cooperation. Behind the

formation of the two German governments lies a long series of disputes between the East and the West--reparations and dismantling, the Berlin blockade, currency reform, the return of German prisoners of war, and many other points of conflict.

A difference in the aims of the occupying powers was soon apparent after the war ended in May 1945. A Department of State publication gives the opinion of the United States government as to the four powers' motives during the German occupation, 1945-1946, as follows:

United States policy emphasizes the establishment of democratic procedures and freedoms on the basis of autonomous political action by the Germans. British policy is directed toward administrative efficiency and economic revival, with some measure of socialization of basic industries. French policy strongly resists all centralizing tendencies and seeks a definite orientation of the Rhineland toward France. Soviet policy attempts to reconcile the pressing need for maximum reparations from Germany with a desire to rebuild a German state that will be friendly to Communist ideology and to broader Soviet aims in Europe (21, p.59).

Russell Hill typifies a popular approach of American journalists when he says that each power envisaged Germany reconstructed in its own image. Russia saw a workers' state; Great Britain, a social democracy; the United States, a land of free enterprise. France did not care so much what Germany became as long as it remained weak and divided (29, pp.5-6).

General Lucius Clay, former American Military Governor of Germany, charges that the Soviet Union blocked efforts to form a democratic government in Germany. He states that the Soviet would approve only a governmental structure lending itself to Communist domination (14, p.6).

Clay reports that the United States and England were forced to move slowly and steadily to establish popular government from the village up in their zones, and subsequently to unify economically the two zones. He says that they were not joined by France during this period as France was unwilling to encourage German recovery until French security fears had been allayed (14, p.6).

Hill reports that the French vetoed national trade unions, national political parties, central administrations, and even refused to agree to uniform postage stamps for Germany. He quotes General de Gaulle, then still president of the French Provisional Government, as saying bluntly when asked his views: "We do not want any more Reich (29, pp.152-153)."

To sketch the background of four-power relations in Germany, it is probably necessary to mention their early agreements and conferences regarding Germany. The Atlantic Charter is described as the first step in the making of the postwar policy of the United States, although it was signed by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister

Churchill on August 14, 1941 (68, p.257).

Warburg describes another meeting of these same two men at Casablanca as bringing the second development of United States policy. This meeting brought forth the famous "unconditional surrender" terms for the Axis powers (68, p.259).

A concrete step in organizing Allied rule over Germany was the establishment of the European Advisory Commission in September 1943 to insure cooperation among the Allies in matters arising from the defeat of Germany and her satellites. This body was first composed of representatives of the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union. Later a French representative was added (43, p.28).

On February 12, 1945 President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill and Generalissimo Stalin issued the famous communique known as the Yalta Declaration. The communique announced that the three powers represented would each occupy a separate zone in Germany. France was also invited to participate in the occupation. Representatives of the three nations at Yalta declared:

The establishment of order in Europe and the re-building of national economic life must be achieved by processes which will enable the liberated peoples to destroy the last vestiges of Nazism and Fascism and to create democratic institutions of their own choice (22, p.43).

Coordination and control was to be achieved through a central Control Commission consisting of Supreme Commanders of the Occupying Powers with headquarters in Berlin (43, p.29).

The most significant Allied agreement was that achieved at the Potsdam Conference, held July 17 to August 2, 1945.

The part of the Potsdam Agreement which specifically mentioned education was included in the political principles to govern the treatment of Germany in the initial control period (II A 7).

7. German education shall be so controlled as completely to eliminate Nazi and militarist doctrines and to make possible the successful development of democratic ideas (22, p.49).

The Potsdam Agreement was followed by the Level-of-Industry Plan, the various Paris Conferences, the Anglo-American Economic Merger Agreement and the whole series of events which culminated in the formal separation of Eastern and Western Germany.

POST-WAR PHYSICAL CONDITIONS. The ruins left by mankind's most destructive war form a background which must be considered in discussing any phase of reconstruction in Germany. The war left scenes of destruction so incredible that they must be seen to be comprehended.

Whole areas in cities like Hamburg, Bremen,

Dusseldorf and Frankfurt were leveled to the ground. Many buildings which remained standing in bombed cities like Berlin were burned-out shells. A report of the Control Commission for Germany (British element) states that the task of debris clearance alone was reckoned to require 700,000 man-years of labor, an average of 70,000 men working for ten years (15, p.16).

Grade schools and universities along with the factories, churches and theaters were smashed to the earth. Zausmer reports that in cities like Ulm and Heilbronn, practically every school building is in ruins (72, p.48). Frost states that one-third of the German schoolrooms were bombed out of existence (25, p.338). Bombs and shells depleted further the university libraries, previously diminished by the Nazi burning of the books. Zausmer lists the losses from bombing and shelling as ranging from 200,000 volumes at the University of Bonn to 600,000 at the University of Hamburg (72, p.49).

Frost lists other war-caused problems which plague German schools in the American zone, if not all Germany. War havoc and the denazification procedure have decreased the number of teachers. The pupil-load has nearly doubled. Paper, pencils, paste, thumb tacks, chalk, benches and all other school supplies are in short supply. The same classroom is often used for double, triple or even

quadruple sessions (25, p.338). However, the physical situation has improved considerably since Frost's report. Hopkins states that at least supplies of paper and pencils are now adequate (31, p.16).

The food and housing problem has been increased by the influx of German refugees. Pickett, Executive Secretary of the American Friends Service Committee, describes them as "people of German descent who have been forced out of surrounding countries into defeated Germany." He estimated their number at twelve million (5, p.4).

Barton says of the children in the refugee group:

The adolescent refugees, both boys and girls, in the 14 to 18 or 20-year groups are particularly pathetic. One social worker spoke of them as "retarded but over-developed," the victims of a lost childhood. They contribute heavily to the "wandering youth" who are a post-war problem in Germany as in Italy and France (5, p.29).

By decreasing the number of men in Germany, the war intensified another German problem--the role of German women in society. The German woman has been traditionally relegated to Kinder, Kirche, Küche (children, church, kitchen). Now the loss of manpower has left a surplus of women who somehow must be absorbed in Germany's economic and social life.

A census in the U. S. zone revealed that in the age group 20 to 24 years there are 171 women to every 100

men (47, p.21). In all Germany there are 7,500,000 more women than men (44, p.30).

The following statement was made by Dr. Keller, after he served a year in Germany in charge of the Vocational and Technical Section of the Education and Religious Affairs Branch of American Military Government: "What Germans do to learn, to entertain themselves, and to worship, is a story of improvisation, of makeshift, and of despair (34, p.26)."

His report states that while the problems of German youth are the same "as your and my problems when we were young," the material and human obstacles against German youth have been raised in magnitude to the nth power (34, p.23).

They [the material and human obstacles] leave the young people numb and bewildered. It is only the rare spirit, who can somehow rise above physical pain and craving, who can renounce the false gods of Nazism and view life with a wholesome respect for individual human values (34, p.23).

STATUS OF GERMANY'S YOUTH IN BEGINNING OF OCCUPATION PERIOD. The status of the German youth at the beginning of the military occupation can be considered from three aspects: (1) the traditional training of German youth in home and school; (2) the influence of the Nazi period; (3) attitudes of German youth in the early occupation period.

TRADITIONAL TRAINING IN HOME AND SCHOOL. Warburg makes three main generalizations on the German home: (1) the German emphasis on authoritarianism, which he says lies at the heart of the German problem; (2) the tendency of the pre-Hitler home to begin preparing its boys and girls at a very early age for quite different careers in later life; (3) the emphasis of the pre-Hitler home on an escapist atmosphere--turning away from the hard realities of life to the realm of music, arts, abstractions and idealistic romanticism (68, pp.147-151).

Warburg's emphasis on escapism, obedience and early selection of career are often voiced by other American critics of German society. One critic had similar views over a half-century ago. Then James E. Russell, Dean of Teachers College and Barnard Professor of Education, Columbia University, visited over forty German towns and cities, principally in north and central Germany, as Special Agent of the Bureau of Education of the United States.

Russell describes the reflection of the class system and authoritarianism in the German school system. "The gravest defect in the German school system is the organization which fosters distinctions of class and sex." While Russell says this may be theoretically deplorable, he considers it a practical necessity in German

society (51, p.420).

The emphasis on authority is a natural outcome of the German school's main aim. As Russell says:

The German school exists primarily for the state. The pupil is a citizen in training. That he should be an obedient, loyal, submissive subject is a self-evident truth. Respect for authority is the one essential prerequisite to German citizenship (51, pp.420-421).

A distinction must be made between conditions at primary and secondary schools and conditions at the university. Russell states: "The state is authoritative, autocratic, conservative; the university is free, liberal and democratic (51, p.406)."

The student in the German university has in many ways more liberties and freedom of choice than the student in a university in the United States.

Howe, a man with great sympathy and admiration for much of the German educational system, reported in 1915 that the class or caste system was inherent in German education.

Elementary, secondary, and technical education partakes [sic] of the same caste system, the same state control. The individual child is educated for the station in life to which he is born (32, p.333).

In more recent times William F. Russell criticizes the German school emphasis on obedience. He deplores the "sheep-like psychology of the Germans

(52, p.75)." He states that most of the people are taught only to obey, never to lead and "come out of school looking for a Fuehrer and are uncomfortable and unhappy if they cannot find one (52, pp75-76)."

There is a danger in considering certain factors in the training of German youth as being uniquely German and in assuming these factors to be the causes of German aggression. A caste system in education can be found in many cultures and countries, including areas in the United States where those who do not belong to the white race receive something less than equal educational opportunity. The emphasis on authoritarian methods, class distinctions and nationalism may be found in a number of European countries.

Röpke, a native German and anti-Nazi, criticizes the statement of the recent American educational mission to Germany in regard to the class system. The mission blamed the dual or class system of education for making the German people submit to authoritarianism.

This system has cultivated attitudes of superiority in one small group and 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 (20, p.19).

Röpke rejects the belief that this class emphasis

made possible the submission of the German masses to a Führer.

As a matter of fact, it would be almost as relevant to say that the German character is such because the Germans eat German pancakes or sauerkraut. Apart from the fact that higher education would be killed in any country if it were not reserved to a small minority (to be sure, on the principle of equal opportunity for all), the whole theory founders hopelessly on the other fact that what those experts took for a particular German system of education is the system to be found in most European countries, some of which even have an educational system much more exclusive than the German (50, p.119).

Even freedom-loving Switzerland has elements of authoritarianism in its educational system. The writer remembers the Berne and Zürich University students who always stamp their feet when the professor enters the room to start his class and when he concludes the lecture. German and Swiss students do this to symbolize the authority of the professor.

One day a young German studying at the University of Berne in Switzerland complained to the writer that the Swiss students did not fulfill the stamping ritual as faithfully and enthusiastically as the Germans. Possibly this suggests a basis for evaluation of authoritarianism in Germany. The real question is to what degree does authoritarianism exist in Germany? Is it more typical and extensive in Germany than in any of the other European

countries? Another question, more difficult to answer, is to what extent has the so-called class system in education been a cause rather than an effect of authoritarianism in German society?

Answering the above questions is more difficult than asking them. The main consideration is to note that authoritarianism, nationalism and a class system are true of Germany as well as of many other countries in Europe and elsewhere. The question is one of degree. Warburg's statement that part of a child's background is the early choice of a career is also true of many European countries. This choice is probably conditioned by family wishes and family social position to a far greater degree than in America. Warburg's characterization of the Germans as escapists has been voiced frequently by the critics. This trait may be more typical of the Germans than the others mentioned.

INFLUENCE OF THE NAZI PERIOD. What was the influence of the Nazi period on these characteristics attributed to the traditional training of German youth? First, the Nazi philosophy accentuated the principle of unquestioning obedience to authority. The first of the twelve duties of the Nazi party member was: "Der Führer hat immer recht (38, p.8)!" (Hitler is always right!)

All boys and girls who became leaders in the Hitler-Jugend had to take the following oath: "Ich schwöre Adolf Hitler unverbrüchliche Treue. Ich schwöre ihm und den Führern, die er mir bestimmt, unbedingten Gehorsam (38, p.16)."

(I swear unswerving loyalty to Adolf Hitler. I swear to him and to the leaders whom he designates to me absolute obedience.)

The Nazi philosophy accentuated the emphasis on nationalism. Dr. Grace points out that this emphasis included even the day nurseries. The nurseries provided the first stage in the Nazi educational pattern which included special uniforms for all, pictures of Nazi leaders and heroes on the walls, flags, military toys and songs like this (47, p.18):

Unseren Fuehrer lieben wir
Unseren Fuehrer ehren wir
Unserem Fuehrer folgen wir
Bis wir Maenner werden.

An unseren Fuehrer glauben wir
Fuer unseren Fuehrer leben wir
Fuer unseren Fuehrer sterben wir
Bis wir Helden werden.

We love our leader,
 We honor our leader
 We follow our leader
 Until we are men.

We believe our leader,
 We live for our leader
 And die for our leader
 Until we are heroes (47, p.18).

The Nazi era emphasized extreme nationalism, and, even worse, caused moral deterioration among youth. Seydewitz, a German and former member of the Reichstag, thinks the greatest problem of reorienting German youth is not to liberate them from false political and racial doctrines, but to re-educate them morally. Seydewitz believes the Nazi training caused the majority of youth to lose their ideals. They came to believe in nothing; to dread work because it meant brutal compulsion; to avoid order and discipline; to lie, fight and steal (54, p.341).

What proportion of the German youth believed the Nazi philosophy? Seydewitz estimates that:

...by the end of the fourth year of the war the boys and girls who had been brought up successfully as fanatical Nazis constituted no more than 10 per cent of the entire German youth (54, p.338)

Almond and Kraus consider this as probably too low an estimate (1, p.316). However, they feel that a realistic appraisal of the youth under the Nazis would show that the fanatical zealots were a declining group (1, pp.315-316).

These observers, Seydewitz and Almond and Kraus, agree that there were three main divisions of Nazi youth: (1) the fanatics; (2) the opposition; (3) the vast majority who were neither confirmed Nazis or anti-Nazis

(1, pp.85-86) (54, pp.330-338).

In analyzing the influence of the Nazi era on youth one must remember the monopoly of the Hitler-Jugend youth activities. Grace states that by 1940 the Hitler Youth Movement had approximately 10,000,000 members between the ages of ten and eighteen. At one period the Hitler-Jugend included 87 per cent of all youth (47, p.41). Many German young people have known practically no other youth activities than those provided by the Hitler Youth Movement.

The writer remembers a conversation with a German family in northern Germany during the spring of 1949. The father lamented the effect of the Hitler regime. He said it had produced nothing but grief, indecency and destruction. Then his daughter, in her early twenties, replied quickly: "But you forget, father, that the most fun I ever had was the ski vacation I had in the Hitler-Jugend."

Later the father commented to me privately that his daughter, having grown up in the Nazi period and in the war years, had experienced little of the joys he had known in youth.

ATTITUDES IN EARLY OCCUPATION PERIOD. What were the attitudes of the German youth at the beginning of the Allied occupation? Was there a real possibility of

reorienting the German youth toward democracy?

There are those who believe that youth indoctrinated early in life are the most difficult people to change. As far as the American ideal of democracy is concerned, Middleton thinks the German youth were too schooled in authoritarianism to appreciate or want democracy. He cites the attitude of a student at Erlangen University, north of Nürnberg, who spoke with Middleton early in the occupation:

For you with your big country, your limitless resources it probably is good enough....But for us here in Germany it would mean anarchy; our minds do not respond to these teachings. We want order and a settled society in which everyone knows his place and his prospects in life. The German is too unstable for your democracy (43, p.53).

Lawrence W. Prakken, publisher of The Education Digest, on the other hand said after visiting postwar Germany: "The youth of Germany are the ones to whom democracy can make its greatest appeal (49, p.3)."

Saul K. Padover, a lieutenant colonel in the Psychological Warfare Branch of the U. S. Army, makes this optimistic statement:

Despite much propaganda to the contrary, I should like to assert that by and large Germany's younger youth is the most hopeful element in an otherwise gloomy situation, that the young people are not universally poisoned with nazism, and that they are generally eager for a new life (33, p.182).

Padover, however, emphasizes that the youth under eighteen and especially under six years are the best possibilities for reorientation (33, p.183).

The German youth attitudes toward the occupation powers have undoubtedly been affected by material considerations. Gollancz, after visiting the British zone, states that the attitude of youth varies from puzzled bewilderment, still friendly to the British, to bitterness, cynicism and "growing hostility to us and all our works (27, p.230)."

When democracy is mentioned to German youth, Gollancz says that they ask whether democracy means:

...starvation rations and lack of the barest necessities, or turning people out of their homes and seizing their furniture, or blowing up shipyards, closing down factories, and throwing tens of thousands of men out of employment (27, pp.230-231).

Keohane says that underlying the problem of education and democracy in Germany is a question that:

...haunts us all--though more constantly and horribly in Germany than here--.... How does one inspire hope and a reasoned faith that there is a future of some worth for this generation (35, p.406)?

CHAPTER II
FOUR-POWER CRITICISMS OF TRADITIONAL GERMAN
YOUTH TRAINING

POINTS OF AGREEMENT. The four powers could agree on certain undesirable factors to be eliminated from traditional German youth training. They disagreed as to how these factors should be eliminated and as to what should replace them. Even many of the apparent points of agreement represented the amalgamation of widely different viewpoints in the ambiguous framework of words which had as widely varying meanings to the West and the East as the word, democracy, itself.

There were at least five basic factors in German youth training to which observers from both East and West objected. East and West agreed that Nazism and the old German nationalism must go; that the German schools reflected an undemocratic class system and discriminated against the lower classes; that the church-youth relationship provided undemocratic practices; that the too academic curriculum was divorced from the real problems of life; that Germany's isolation during the Nazi period made essential a program of "democratic contact" with other countries.

Great Britain and the United States criticized also the central government control of schools and youth organizations. Both these powers denounced authoritarian teaching methods and leadership practices in both schools and youth organizations. The Soviet Union criticized teaching practices, too, but from an entirely different viewpoint. The Soviet Union denounced the reactionary teaching methods which did not reflect the new political spirit of the times. While denouncing the old German nationalism and its dreams of a world empire for Germany, the Soviet Union, in the eyes of Western critics, has been the only one of the four powers to build up new feelings of extreme nationalism in the German people of the Eastern zone.

NAZISM AND GERMAN NATIONALISM. The Nazi system had permeated German society with a completeness which amazed those not familiar with the German genius for organization. The arm of the Führer extended into every community and every area of life, as the Organizationbuch der NSDAP, edited by Dr. Ley indicates (38). The four occupying powers saw the trappings of Nazism in all phases of youth training. Youth leaders and programs, teachers, textbooks and curriculum reflected Nazism and extreme nationalism in the same manner as did all other areas of German life.

The four powers could agree at Potsdam that Nazism must be eliminated to make possible the development of democracy. But the four powers did not necessarily agree as to what factors of Nazism and the old German nationalism were objectionable. Neumann's previously mentioned distinction between the Eastern and the Western Powers is significant. His emphasis was that the Western Powers criticized Nazism because it excluded the parliamentary and democratic procedures and prevented "ascertaining the popular will in a free manner (33, p.211)." The Soviet Union rejected Nazism because it was not based on the proper economic and social system.

The West rejected the militaristic demonstrations of the Hitler youth organizations. The Soviet also disapproved of the Hitler youth organizations, but there is no evidence to indicate a disapproval of militaristic tactics. The Freie Deutsche Jugend, official youth organization of the Soviet zone, uses marching tactics, display of banners, flags, etc. in much the same manner as the old Hitler-Jugend.

It should be noted that France fears German nationalism more than her two Western allies. Liddell comments, "French mistrust of Germany is, with reason, more profound at all events than that of their two Anglo-Saxon allies (39, p.42)."

CLASS SYSTEM IN THE SCHOOLS. An article on democratization of the German school system in the special January 1950 issue of the official United States magazine, Information Bulletin, begins: "Perhaps no feature of German education is so strikingly undemocratic as the two-track school system (44, p.18)."

The sentence may well have spoken for the other occupation powers, at least for Great Britain and the Soviet Union. These powers agree that the German school system discriminated against the lower classes.

What was this so-called "two-track school system?" "Two-track" refers to the division of German school students at the age of ten years. After the first four years of common elementary school, the paths of German school pupils divide. About 80 per cent of them continue in the elementary school. This is called the Volksschule or people's school (44, p.18).

The remaining 20 per cent of the pupils enter the secondary schools. Of these pupils only about one fourth graduate (44, p.18). Those who drop out while within the compulsory school age (up to fourteen years for full-time, to seventeen for part-time school work) go back to the elementary school (20, p.18).

On completion of the eight years of elementary school the graduates receive vocational training. Some

are apprentices who attend part-time vocational school or Berufsschule as part of their training. Others go to a full-time vocational school or Fachschule for a one to three-year course before taking a job in trade or commerce or in similar work (20, p.18).

This system of secondary schools in Germany is complicated. During the Weimar Republic there were sixteen different types of secondary schools. The Hitler Government abolished all but three, according to the report of the United States Education Mission. These were the Gymnasium, the Oberrealschule and the Aufbauschule (20, p.18).

The nomenclature of the German schools is confusing. For example, Tone and Warninghoff, a German and a U. S. educator, list five secondary schools in the pre-Nazi system. These were the Aufbauschule, Realschule, Gymnasium, Realgymnasium and Oberrealschule. All were isolated except for the Aufbauschule, based on more years of elementary education than the others. All but the Realschule led to the university (67, p.334).

The United States Education Mission report mentions also an intermediate or middle school based upon the four year Grundschule.

The pupils came from the lower middle classes of the population and were prepared by these schools for lower civil service positions
(Quotation continued on next page)

and for the trade, industry and commerce. About the same number of children were enrolled in the middle schools as in the secondary schools (20, p.18).

Objections to the school system emphasized that primary and secondary education were two separate levels of education. The secondary school was not a continuation of the elementary school.

Each of the secondary schools had a distinct curriculum. Each required the payment of fees, described by the U. S. reformers as expensive for the average student.

According to the U. S. Education Mission report, the tuition ranged from 120 to 240 Reich Marks annually.

Because of this tuition, the paucity of scholarships, and the limited curriculum, the vast majority of German youth were excluded from the secondary schools, and consequently from the universities (20, p.18).

Those who entered the secondary schools had to pass an examination. Attendance at these high schools, which were the only road to university training, depended then on three factors: (1) ability to pass the examination; (2) ability to pay the fees; (3) desire of the parents or child to continue the education in a higher school.

Tone and Warninghoff report:

It was, and in most of the western states still is, a caste system which barred 90 percent of the children from higher education and decided admission to high school mainly on the
(Quotation continued on next page)

ability to pay tuition. This caste system kept the children of the rich and the children of the poor separated educationally and socially for all but the first four years of schooling (67, p.333).

Vaughn R. De Long, Deputy Director of the Education and Cultural Relations Division, Land Hesse, states that the pupils were trained in a school system that emphasized and deepened the class differences instead of lessening them (18, p.39).

Newman, U. S. occupation official in Hesse, claims that recent studies in the American occupation zone show that the average ability of the elementary school students is but "slightly below that of gymnasium pupils, the supposedly highly-selected group (47, p.36)."

The American educators also maintain that the superior teaching which the pupils in the high schools receive in contrast to the Volksschule is undemocratic. De Long and Newman both lament that the Gymnasium often has one teacher for every thirty pupils while the Volkschule for the same grade and age has one teacher for sixty pupils (47, p.36) (18, pp.39-40).

Newman makes another criticism which has been emphasized by other occupation officials. Newman states that the elementary school teachers do not receive a university education as the high school or university teachers do. The elementary teachers attend a special

seminary for training elementary school teachers after completing the elementary course of study (47, p.36).

The United States Education Mission report notes that the secondary teachers enjoy greater pay and prestige than the elementary teachers (20, p.25).

The German University Commission appointed by the Military Governor for the British Zone was of unanimous opinion that there should be a three-year university course for the elementary school teacher (26, p.56).

Part of the objection to the class system in education refers to the status of women. The German educational system has usually provided separate schools and inferior educational opportunities for women.

Summarizing American objections to the German school system, a sentence from an Information Bulletin article reads:

The selection of youngsters who are to go on into the higher schools at the early age of 12, the charging of tuition in the higher schools and wide differences in the preparation of teachers in favor of the academic elite are all contrary to democracy in education (44, p.18).

The writer probably meant ten years in place of twelve when he spoke of the early selection of students to enter high school as being undemocratic. Part of the objection of American reformers to this early selection probably relates to the choice of vocation.

Tone and Warninghoff emphasize that choice of school after the first four years of elementary school also means choice of vocation. Once the choice is made there is little if any chance to switch to a different type of school. The high schools "exist in splendid isolation (67, p.333)."

American educators have stated it is undemocratic to require youngsters to choose a life work at the early age of ten and undemocratic to keep youth from switching to a different school in order to prepare for a different vocation.

This is particularly an American objection, perhaps influenced by the American propensity to change vocations three, four or more times in a life time. The inclination, or perhaps rather the possibility, to switch vocations easily and often in a life time astounds many Europeans. The great economic wealth of the U. S. makes changes in vocation easier.

Agreement of the Soviet Union with many of these criticisms is indicated by Lilge's interview with the dean of the new department of education at the University of Berlin, also director of teacher training in the entire Soviet zone (40, p.37). The director of teacher training was so impressed by the report of the United

States Education Mission that he had several thousand copies of it distributed among teachers and administrators in his zone. He was chiefly impressed by the section of the report which stated:

...all children should stay together for six years in the elementary school without being divided according to sex, social class, race, vocational or professional intentions (20, p.22).

The university program of the Freie Deutsche Jugend criticizes the same class distinctions in German education. The program mentions the "privilegierte Kaste," the privileged caste or class, and "das Bildungsmonopol der besitzenden Schichten," the cultural monopoly of the ruling classes (4, p.2).

CURRICULUM. Representatives of the United States charge that the German curriculum lacks the social sciences; that it is too academic and is divorced from the real problems of life; that it affords no opportunity for democratic practices; that it provides insufficient vocational education, particularly in the matter of guidance.

Criticisms made by the United States Education Mission are typical of American occupation attitudes. The report made by the Mission insists that the whole concept of social science, both as to form and content must change.

The pupils themselves must be the active agents in the learning process. Thus the social sciences (history, geography, civics, and Heimatkunde) will contribute perhaps the major share to the development of democratic citizenship (20, p.23).

The special January 1950 issue of Information Bulletin reports:

Long before the beginning of the occupation, American educators in the social sciences recognized that a major job would have to be done to rebuild the German university educational programs in the social and political sciences (44, p.47).

As to the academic nature of the curriculum the Mission report reads:

The present curriculum of the secondary school seems crowded with subjects, heavy with academic tradition, and in most respects remote from life and ill-adapted to the present and future needs of the pupils (20, pp.22-23).

The British apply the same criticism to the universities. The University Commission states that it cannot emphasize enough the dangers to the nation and to the university which result from two shortcomings of the German universities. First, the universities have not kept step with social changes of the times. Second, they train the specialist intellect but not the whole man and are tending to break up into aggregates of specialist institutes (26, p.5).

Vocational education receives considerable

criticism. Some U. S. educators like William Russell criticize the lack of modern methods and techniques in agricultural and industrial production. Russell thinks that a few skilled workmen in Germany have great technical ability but that the ordinary worker has little training (52, p.70).

However, the sharpest American criticism relates to the failure of vocational education to provide training in citizenship and some instruction in cultural as well as technical subjects (20, p.23).

Keller, formerly Head of the Vocational and Technical Section of the Education and Religious Affairs Branch of American Military Government in Germany, emphasizes the need for instruction in liberal arts and training for citizenship. He reports that vocational guidance is practically non-existent in any type of school. Guidance is given through the Labor Office under the Ministry of Labor (34, pp.40-41).

The French have disapproved of the German curriculum, too. Part of their criticism relates to the old classical emphasis of German education. Liddell's study of the French re-education program indicates the French believe that the Germans overemphasized the importance of Latin (39, p.41).

What does the Soviet Union regard as undemocratic

in the German school curriculum? On the surface, the Russians make the same objection to the improper treatment of social and political sciences in the curriculum.

The constitution of the Freie Deutsche Jugend, although referring to youth activities rather than the formal school system, characterizes a Russian attitude. The FDJ constitution speaks of the necessary "Entwicklung des politischen Bewusstseins und die Hebung des kulturellen Niveaus der jungen Generation (73, p.8)." In other words, it is necessary to develop political understanding and to raise the cultural level of the younger generation.

The constitution states it is also necessary for an education toward "selbständig denkenden und verantwortungsbewusst handelnden demokratischen Menschen (73, p.8)." That is, independent-thinking and responsible-acting democratic men.

Such a critique resembles that made by the United States Education Mission. What the Soviet Union occupation officials and the Germans who carry out their policies mean by political understanding and by independent, responsible democrats can only be determined by analyzing deeds and programs.

CHURCH-SCHOOL RELATIONSHIP. In the previous history of Germany the churches of the country have had a

definite and influential role in influencing schools and youth organizations. Hopkins points out that prior to 1933 the Evangelical and Catholic churches controlled four-fifths of the publicly supported elementary schools (33, p.209). The question of the confessional or religious school has become an issue in the Western zones.

Sketching the background of the role of church and school, Neumann states that the school system of the Weimar Republic resulted from a compromise between the secular Social Democrat Party joined by the Democratic Party, and the clerical Catholic Center Party.

Three types of schools emerged from the compromise: the Gemeinschaftsschule, or community school (also called Simultanschule), comprising members of both religious confessions; the Bekenntnisschule, or denominational school; and the secular school (weltliche Schule). These schools were to be established according to the wishes of the parents. Private confessional and private secular schools were also permitted (33, p.219).

Hopkins maintains that the church through many years of support from the state and association with the monarchy cultivated conservation and loyalty to tradition (33, p.209).

Hopkins says of the churches:

They built up an educational system which was differentiated by classes and gave only the most traditional education even to the few who graduated from the universities (33, p.209).

Liddell in describing reactions to the French occupation in Germany states that the Catholic Church supported the traditional, classical education against the criticisms of the French (39, p.41).

Hopkins and Neumann represent the American group who would remove all control of churches over schools. This was not the official opinion of American occupation forces as actual events illustrated. However, U. S. representatives did not approve of the church-youth relationship which encouraged bickering, strife and attempts to monopolize the training of youth in school and clubs in an authoritarian manner.

The report of the United States Education Mission pleads for toleration and sportsmanship:

But we cannot in the name of democracy allow such arrangements in education as will deprive any religious claimants of equal opportunity or as will through continuous bickering for pious advantage depreciate the high claims of a free spiritual life upon the very generation whose magnanimity will condition the future of the democratic way of life in Germany (20, p.13).

An OMGUS publication of 1948 noted the zealous attitude of the churches toward youth organizations.

It was evident that the pastors, far from encouraging the development of self-initiative and self-government in their youth groups, exercised very close control of them, seeking first and foremost to guard them from any possible contact with youth of other groups (45, p.12).

The attitude of the Soviet Union toward church control of schools and youth organizations is best indicated by the school system and youth organizations established in the Eastern zone. Church-administered schools and youth organizations do not exist in the Eastern zone.

ISOLATION. East and West agreed that post-war Germany, emerging from the isolation of the Nazi era, urgently needed democratic contact with the rest of the world. Grace calls this isolation period "a ten-year intellectual blackout (47, p.41)." The East and West soon made it clear, however, that they were not in agreement over the meaning of "democratic contact." The Soviet Union considered this to apply to association with the "people's democracies." The Western Powers did not consider the so-called satellite nations of the Soviet Union as true democracies. Each of the Western Powers emphasized primarily an exchange of its own culture with Germany. However, the Western Powers did not consider themselves as the sole representatives of democracy. For example, Robert Birley, Educational Adviser to the Deputy Military Governor, British zone, 1947-1949, points out that in the British effort to put Germany in touch with the world outside, "...we have done all we can to enlist

the help of the surrounding nations, the Swedes, the Danes, the Dutch, and the Swiss (11, p.42)."

ADMINISTRATION. The Western Powers disapproved of German centralized control over youth training. Birley states, "...we felt that German history showed the dangers of concentrating automatically all educational provisions in the hands of the State (11, p.39)."

Speaking for many U. S. educators, William Russell criticizes the same state control over education. He believes that to establish local initiative and responsibility in regard to schools is all important in Germany (52, p.77).

The Soviet Union often approved the principle of decentralization in theory. The constitutions of the Länder or individual states in the Soviet occupation zone theoretically permit individual action. By means of control of the ruling political party, the SED, the Soviet Union maintains centralized control.

TEACHING METHODS. Education officials of the United States have criticized severely the German authoritarian teaching methods. The American educators disliked what they called rote learning, memory drills and repetition devices. These, they said, did not build self judgment nor individual thinking essential to a democracy.

Dr. Arne Jewett, visiting expert for the Education

and Cultural Relations Division, claims instruction is almost entirely of the lecture-memory drill type in Germany. He maintains that fear of teachers and examinations is the chief motivation for learning in the schools (47, p.45).

U. S. officials have criticized the old German youth organizations for repressing imagination and initiative, for developing only leaders and followers, for neglecting the democratic processes.

Dr. Elizabeth Lam, of the Education and Cultural Relations Division, states:

The techniques of group processes such as parliamentary practices, committee organization, program and policy-making with the youth membership, discussion and forum techniques are virtually unknown (47, p.32).

The Soviet Union rejected for different reasons the teaching methods of the German schools and the training techniques of the youth organizations. The Soviet officials criticized German youth training for its failure to teach the significance of the Marxist philosophy and the social and political doctrines of the Soviet Union.

CHAPTER III

PROGRAMS OF THE FOUR OCCUPATION POWERS
TO REORIENT GERMAN YOUTH (Part I)

ORGANIZATION. The organizational pattern of the occupation powers' youth reorientation agencies is exceedingly complex. From time to time the occupying powers have changed organizations. At times several diverse and uncorrelated agencies have worked simultaneously in the field for the same power. Both the East and the West have switched from military to civilian control in Germany. In the United States program, for example, the State Department assumed responsibility in Germany on September 21, 1949. The Military Government of the United States Zone of Germany (OMGUS) was terminated and the United States High Commissioner for Germany (HICOG) was authorized to exercise all governmental functions of the United States in Germany except the command of troops (22, p.188).

The organizational pattern is still more complex since the four powers have sought whenever possible to work through and with German organizations and agencies. Thus, it is essential to note these German agencies and also the nature of the area in which each occupation power operates.

The western zones comprised over 44,000,000

population compared to the 17,000,000 plus in the Soviet zone, according to the 1946 census (45, Table 5 in statistical section without page numbers). The three western zones comprise about 70 per cent of Germany's area (33, p.62).

Of course, the main German organizations through which the occupation powers operate are the two governments of East and West Germany. That is, the German Democratic Republic with its headquarters in Berlin and the Federal Republic of Germany with its capital, Bonn. The other agencies can best be specified by examining the organizational structure of each occupying power's youth reorientation program.

UNITED STATES YOUTH REORIENTATION ORGANIZATION.

The United States zone extends southward from the British zone to Austria and eastward from the French zone to Czechoslovakia. To the north and east is the Soviet zone. The U. S. zone includes the three Länder of Bavaria, Hesse and Württemberg-Baden, the Bremen Enclave and the U. S. sector of Berlin. The area contains about 17,000,000 people and 42,500 square miles (33, p.61).

Before the defeat of Germany the United States was at work planning various phases of youth reorientation. Zink lists many different agencies which participated in this work. American and British officers

formed a cooperative group known as the German Country Unit. Later U. S. personnel alone planned reorientation activities for their zone. American military personnel composed the US Group, Control Council for Germany. Zink also lists the G-5 of USFET (United States Forces, European Theater), various staff and planning organizations, and military government organization detachments (74, pp.41-65). In addition to the staff and planning agencies and the military detachment personnel actually at work on education and youth problems in Germany, there were other planning and coordinating agencies. These included the Coordinating Committee of the State, War and Navy Departments, the Civil Affairs Division of the War Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Assistant Secretary of State for Occupied Areas (74, p.74). The long list of U. S. organizations who worked in one or more phases of youth reorientation illustrates the complex organizational pattern which prevailed particularly in the early stages of occupation.

Under OMGUS most of the youth reorientation program was carried out by the Education and Cultural Relations Division. Under the State Department the program has been more or less stabilized under the Office of Public Affairs. This Office has four main branches: Exchanges Division; Informations Services Division;

Public Relations Division; Education and Cultural Relations Division. In addition, the Office of Public Affairs supervises the "Resident Officers," representatives of the High Commissioner within the Kreise or counties. These "Resident Officers" have among other duties the sponsorship of youth activities (44, pp.49-50).

A separate program is the U. S. Army's German Youth Activities Program. The idea of army help to youth originated with a military directive, April 15, 1946, to stimulate contacts between American troops and German young people (22, p.582). The program, originally called Army Assistance to German Youth Activities Program, is best known as the GYA program. It provides for sharing of sports facilities, discussions, debates, gifts of sports equipment, Christmas parties, etc.

Under the Office of Public Affairs the Education and Cultural Relations Division is primarily concerned with the school reforms and youth organizations. The Exchanges Division provides for the exchange of persons and materials to enable the Germans to "rub elbows with democracy." The Information Services Division and the Public Relations Division deal primarily with books and magazines and with films and radio.

The above-mentioned groups do not include the private, non-governmental agencies such as church groups,

which are active in German youth work.

BRITISH YOUTH REORIENTATION ORGANIZATION. The British zone has an area of 36,800 square miles and about 22,000,000 people. It includes North Rhine Westphalia, Lower Saxony, Schleswig-Holstein, the Hansestadt Hamburg and the British sector of Berlin. A vital part of the British zone is the Ruhr basin where a large part of German heavy industry is concentrated (33, p.61).

The British organization for youth reorientation resembles that of the United States, but is less complicated and extensive. Reorientation activities are directed by the Educational Advisor who is responsible to the British Control Commission. The Educational Advisor supervises the Education Branch and the Information Services Division. The Education Branch deals with universities, training colleges, schools, adult education, youth activities and women's organizations. The Information Services Division has jurisdiction over theaters, cinemas, libraries, information centers, book publishing, press and radio (13, p.15).

FRENCH YOUTH REORIENTATION ORGANIZATION. The French zone has an area of 16,500 square miles and a population of about 6,000,000 (33, p.61). The French zone includes the Rhineland-Palatinate, Württemberg-Hohenzollern, South Baden and the French sector of Berlin.

A distinctive feature of the French organizational structure is the placement of French educational officials in German schools. These French officials not only instruct and advise but report on conduct observed to French educational authorities. Bidwell points out that in every university are one or more lecteurs français who perform such functions (10, p.81). Liddell states that in every secondary school in the French zone there is a French teacher who must report every six months to French authorities on conditions in the school in general terms without reference to individuals by name. Each école normale has two or three French staff members. One French teacher is in each Volkshochschule (39, p.42).

SOVIET YOUTH REORIENTATION ORGANIZATION. The Soviet zone has an area of 46,400 square miles (33, p.61). The population is over 17,000,000 (45, Table 5 in statistical section with unnumbered pages). Under Soviet control are Thuringia, Saxony, Saxony-Anhalt, Brandenburg, Mecklenburg and the Soviet sector of Berlin.

The Soviet Union works through and with various German organizations in carrying out the youth reorientation program. The Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) lists these organizations as of the end of 1948. They included such groups as these: the "Gesellschaft zum Studium der Kultur der Sowjet-Union"

or the Society for the Study of Culture in the Soviet Union; the "Demokratischer Frauenbund" or the Democratic Women's Federation; the "Vereinigung der gegenseitigen Bauernhilfe (VdgB)" or the Union of Mutual Farmers Help; the "Freie Deutsche Jugend (FDJ)" or the Free German Youth; the "Freie Deutsche Gewerkschaftsbund (FDGB)" or Free German Trade Union Federation (60, pp.3-4).

The education and training for youth in the Soviet zone are directed from Soviet headquarters in Karlshorst, according to the Social Democrats. Youth reorientation work represents just one of the tasks of Soviet Kulturpolitik or what might be freely translated as cultural politics. The Soviet occupation organization for cultural politics has two main divisions. They are the Kulturabteilung and the Informationsabteilung. While theoretically of equal status, the Information Division rather than the Cultural Division has greater influence, since the Information Division is considered to be more important politically. The work of both divisions depends on the Finanzabteilung or Finance Division, which according to the Social Democrats, applies all economy measures first to cultural affairs (60, pp.4-5).

The Cultural Division in the Karlshorst headquarters has charge of the Abteilungen für Volksbildung or the Departments for People's Education. There are

department subdivisions in the Länder and Soviet cultural officers in the Kreise (60, p.5).

The German cultural officials follow the same organizational pattern of centralized control from the top down through Länder, Kreise and Städte (cities). Paul Wandel, Communist, heads the Deutsche Verwaltung für Volksbildung or German Administration for People's Education. Social Democrats say the other education posts are held almost exclusively by Communists, and that these officials work closely with the Soviet authorities who have final say in all matters of importance (60, pp.5-7).

The four powers are not unlike each other in having similar organizational structures for youth reorientation. The French and particularly the Soviet Union have a greater degree of centralization. The four powers seem to distinguish between culture (or education) and information services. The Soviet Union exercises additional influence in youth work through the ruling political party, the SED, and through the militant youth organization, the FDJ, which works everywhere--schools, industry, recreation, etc. Other Soviet-influenced organizations provide additional control.

OBJECTIVES IN YOUTH REORIENTATION. The professed objectives of each occupying power help illustrate the kind of democracy each represents. However, the

professed objectives are not always indicative. What a nation does is more important than what it says. Usually, words indicate the nature and the direction of the deeds which follow. It is important to note the statements of each as to what should be given German youth in schools and youth organizations to replace the traditional training.

UNITED STATES OBJECTIVES. The "Long-Range Policy Statement for German Re-education" forms perhaps the foundation for the re-education work of the United States. This statement was completed June 5, 1946 and released to the press August 21, 1946. The originating group was called the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee by one State Department publication (22, p.541) and simply "a Committee of American Educators" by another (21, p.215).

In any case the statement represents the official viewpoint of the United States. This statement emphasized the necessity of developing in Germany for both youth and adults certain ideals and institutions which are in harmony with universally valid principles of justice.

These primary principles of justice which the committee considered basic to German re-education may be summarized as follows: (1) recognition that men and nations owe obligations to each other regardless of creed, race,

nation or group; (2) respect for the dignity and integrity of the individual by society and other individuals; (4) freedom to pursue truth and freedom of expression; (5) tolerance between diverse cultural and racial groups (22, p.542).

The Long-Range Policy Statement said that in German re-education maximum use would be made of those German resources which would offer promise of developing ideals and institutions in harmony with these principles of justice. More immediate objectives were listed as the elimination of the "Nazi and militarist doctrines and practices and the permanent exclusion of objectionable persons from posts of influence (22, p.541)."

The aims stated by the Long-Range Policy committee were echoed again and again by U. S. occupation officials. In January 1950 the Information Bulletin listed five basic objectives embodying practically the same goals. For example, the second objective was:

2. To educate for representative and responsible self-government by fostering the untrammelled pursuit of truth as a prerequisite for the maintenance of justice, by arousing a sense of personal responsibility for social and political affairs, and by encouraging recognition that public officials are servants of the people (44, p.9).

A Long-Range Policy Statement was also prepared on German youth activities and was released to the press on February 3, 1947. It emphasized that youth groups

should be formed to teach good citizenship, promote greater interest of youth in community activities, prevent delinquency, protect against undesirable political influences, permit means of control, etc. (22, pp.578-583).

In April 1948 OMGUS stated that the role of Military Government was threefold:

(a) assisting those forces inside Germany to provide leadership and direction to the citizens of tomorrow; (b) fostering an atmosphere in which the positive elements can find expression in society; and (c) preventing the recurrence of any totalitarian or militaristic tendencies among youth organizations (45, p.2).

The U. S. objectives include supervision and advice. This includes the outlawing of those schools and youth organizations which are definite expressions of totalitarianism or militarism. This includes urging the Germans to create schools and youth organizations which will develop those principles of justice inherent in western democracy.

The Office of Public Affairs describes the objective of the reorientation program as "to develop a democratic, peaceful Germany through guidance, and assistance in its cultural, educational and informational activities (44, p.1)." The words guidance and assistance are significant. They indicate the desire of the United States to bring about reforms by indirect methods, not by coercion.

The objectives of the four branches of the Office

of Public Affairs follow the guidance and assistance approach. The Exchanges Division seeks to make "as close and extensive as possible...contact between Americans and Germans" and is based on "the belief that the Germans can best learn democracy by rubbing elbows with it (44, p.3)."

The Education and Cultural Relations Division bases its work on five main objectives which closely resemble the Long Range Policy Statement for German Re-education. The fourth listed objective includes this emphasis, "encouraging the Germans to view and develop their own culture as an integral part of the culture of western civilization (44, p.9)."

The Information Services division has a two-fold objective. First, it keeps a "close surveillance...over German public media to combat anti-democratic developments." Next, it seeks to bring democracy to the Germans through radio, films and other publications (44, p.2).

The Public Relations Division, a publicity agency, seeks to keep the people of the U. S. informed on the American occupation in Germany and to make the German people aware of what the U. S. is doing in and for Germany.

These objectives represent the aims and goals of the present reorientation organization in Germany, concerned with both adults and youth.

The first objective of the U. S. occupation forces

was primarily a negative one--to eliminate the Nazi influences. This meant closing the schools, ousting teachers, discarding textbooks, etc. The next objective, a positive one, was to provide the elements to create a democratic atmosphere in Germany. One phase of this positive goal was to bring about reform of the schools. Another phase was to provide youth organizations in Germany which operated democratically. Perhaps, one may distinguish a third phase or objective, giving the Germans an opportunity to see democracy at work. This could mean democracy at work in countries outside Germany, particularly the United States, or it could mean bringing American examples of democracy inside Germany.

The objectives may be said to voice unselfishness, optimism and high idealism. They express the faith that the German people themselves, guided and supervised by the United States authorities, can learn and establish the principles of western democracy.

Those who criticize the objectives most severely ask for more specific goals and less lofty idealism. These critics' main objection, however, is to the "observe, advise and assist" approach which avoids force and direct control to achieve its aims.

BRITISH OBJECTIVES. British objectives in German youth reorientation more closely resembled those of the

United States than either France or the Soviet Union. The British believed with the United States that the main reforms in education should come from the Germans themselves. The British aim was to encourage the Germans to adopt those schools and youth organizations which emphasized freedom, equality, tolerance and individual responsibility.

The British objectives in school reform illustrate the general program of reorientation. Birley states that the British insisted on four main objectives in school reform.

"The first principle was that the status of the Teachers' Training Colleges should be raised (11, p.38)." This represents the British recognition of the inferior status of the elementary teachers who attended these colleges and the British objection to the "favored status" of the secondary teachers.

"The second principle was that secondary education should be free (11, p.38)." This agrees with the American aim of increasing educational opportunity to all classes.

"The third principle was that no legislation should make the eventual adoption of the six-year primary school impossible (11, p.38)." Birley explains the British wanted to make secondary education more easily available to the poorer classes. The British thought

that these classes would better be able to choose the course of further education at the age of twelve than at ten (11, p.38). The British refusal to insist on the immediate adoption of the six-year primary school shows their agreement with U. S. occupation officials that reforms could not be forced on the Germans.

"The fourth principle was that private schools should not be abolished (11, p.39)." Birley states this reflects the British distrust of concentrating educational control in the hands of the state and also the British conviction that "the Churches had a legitimate right to conduct their own schools," provided these could be inspected and had the same standards as state schools (11, p.39).

Birley maintains that the main objective of the British, however, is not school reform. Speaking of the work of British members of the Education Branch in the Control Commission, he states:

Their main task has been to get to know those persons, teachers, and officials, who have it them to create a new and healthy education in Germany, to help and encourage them, and to put them in touch with the world outside their own country (11, p.42).

FRENCH OBJECTIVES. Although similar to both the English and American programs in ultimate objectives, the French reorientation program differs in its great stress on "culture." As Bidwell points out, the great French

hope is to reintegrate German culture with that of France and Western Europe (10, p.80).

Some observers criticize the French for giving too much place to the role of French culture in the reorientation program. Others like the British observer, Liddell, make allowances. Liddell states, "French culture is, of course, to be the means of German salvation but it is only fair to add that the emphasis is not solely on 'French' culture (39, p.40)."

The French had as their foremost objective, the democratic training of the very young. Perhaps they were more pessimistic than the British or Americans as to the possibilities of changing the older children. Bidwell states that the French expect to accomplish the greatest results with children so young as never to have experienced the Hitler indoctrination (10, p.80). Naturally, a primary aim of the French is to give special training to the elementary teachers, since through them the very young can learn the democratic processes.

SOVIET OBJECTIVES. It is difficult to obtain material giving specific statements of Soviet occupation personnel on Soviet objectives in youth reorientation. However, the aims of the Soviet Union are reflected in the Soviet zone organizations. The constitution of the German Democratic Republic, the government

of the Soviet zone, gives the goal of the new education.

Article thirty-nine states:

Jedem Kind muss die Möglichkeit zur allseitigen Entfaltung seiner körperlichen, geistigen und sittlichen Kräfte gegeben werden. Der Bildungsgang der Jugend darf nicht abhängig sein von der sozialen und wirtschaftlichen Lage des Elternhauses. Vielmehr ist Kindern, die durch soziale Verhältnisse benachteiligt sind, besondere Aufmerksamkeit zuzuwenden. Der Besuch der Fachschule, der Oberschule und der Hochschule ist Begabten aus allen Schichten des Volkes zu ermöglichen (53, pp.22-23).

(Every child must be given the possibility for a complete development of his physical, spiritual and moral strength. The education of the child must not be dependent upon the social and economic position of his parents. On the contrary, children handicapped through social conditions shall be given special attention. Attendance of the vocational school, high school and university is to be made possible for the talented from all classes of the people.)

This objective is not so foreign to American principles. The Educational Policies Commission in its book, Education for All American Youth, states:

Schools should be dedicated to the proposition that every youth in these United States--regardless of sex, economic status, geographic location, or race--should experience a broad and balanced education (24, p.21).

The Soviet Union and the three Western Powers were in fact able to agree on ten basic objectives for the new education in Germany. These objectives were originally

formulated by the U. S. Military Government and distributed to the Land Ministries of Education in the American zone, January 1947 (18, p.40). These ten basic principles were adopted by the Allied Control Council, representing all four powers, and were known as Control Council Directive No. 54 (22, p.550) (18, p.83).

The essential difference between the American Regulations and the Control Council Directive "was the changing of the word 'shall' in each one to 'should' and making them for guidance of the Military government of each zone (18, p.82)." The principles listed in Control Council Directive 54 were:

1. There should be equal educational opportunity for all.
2. Tuition, textbooks and other necessary scholastic material should be provided free of charge in all educational institutions fully supported by public funds which cater mainly for pupils of compulsory school age; in addition, maintenance grants should be made to those who need aid. In all other education institutions, including universities, tuition, textbooks, and necessary material should be provided free of charge together with maintenance grants for those in need of assistance.
3. Compulsory full-time school attendance should be required for all between the ages of six and at least fifteen--and thereafter, for those pupils not enrolled in full-time educational institutions, at least part-time compulsory attendance up to the completed age of eighteen years.
4. Schools for the compulsory periods should form a comprehensive educational system. The terms "elementary education" and "secondary education" should mean two consecutive levels of instruction, not two types or qualities of instruction which overlap.

5. All schools should lay emphasis upon education for civic responsibility and a democratic way of life, by means of the content of the curriculum, textbooks and materials of instruction, and by the organization of the school itself.

6. School curricula should aim to promote understanding of and respect for other nations and to this end attention should be given to the study of modern languages without prejudice to any.

7. Educational and vocational guidance should be provided for all pupils and students.

8. Health supervision and health education should be provided for all pupils and students. Instruction will also be given in Hygiene.

9. All teacher education should take place in a university or in a pedagogical institution of university rank.

10. Full provision should be made for effective participation of the people in the reform and organization as well as in the administration of the educational system (22, p.550).

Despite agreement with the other powers on these ten basic re-education principles, the Soviet Union differed sharply from the other powers in its objectives. Some characteristic tendencies may be noted. The Soviet occupation forces and the German officials of the Soviet zone claimed basic objectives of peace and a unified, single Germany embracing all zones. These basic objectives included: special emphasis on educational opportunity for children of workers and farmers; close integration of the youth program with the entire economic and social program for East Germany; bitter attacks

against the United States and the program of the Western Powers in West Germany; closer relationship between Germany and the Soviet Union; the use of youth to help convert western as well as eastern Germans to the Soviet philosophy.

Speaking of the new youth law adopted by the German Democratic Republic, February 1950, Deputy Prime Minister Walter Ulbricht states:

Die Jugend muss ihre Aktivität auf allen Gebieten noch mehr steigern, um täglich gemeinsam mit dem ganzen Volk in den Betrieben, Dörfern, Verwaltungen und Schulen die Aufgaben des Aufbaues praktisch zu lösen (3, p.8).

(The youth must increase their activities in all areas still more, in order to solve practically the tasks of construction in cooperation with the entire people in the industries, villages, administration and schools.)

The law requests all state, administrative and industrial leaders to draw youth more and more into all phases of civic, economic and cultural reconstruction. Youth must help in increased agricultural and industrial production. Youth should participate actively and voluntarily in clubs, culture groups, theater groups, libraries, sports activities, etc. (3, pp.45-46).

The opening paragraph of the youth law states:

Eine gebildete, körperlich gesunde, kräftige, in ihren Auffassungen und ihrem Streben fortschrittliche Jugend sichert ein einheitliches, demokratisches und friedliebendes Deutschland (3, p.43).

(A cultured, healthy, strong youth, progressive in perception and endeavor, insures a unified, democratic and peace-loving Germany.)

This may seem a noble goal to American observers, until Ulbricht explains what this goal involves. He states that the previous paragraph means:

Erstens: Jeder Jugendliche soll ein bewusster Demokrat werden, der weiss, wer die Freunde und wer die Feinde des Volkes sind. Jeder Jugendliche muss die Quellen der Kriegsprovokation kennen, von tiefem Hass erfüllt sein gegen den Imperialismus, gegen jene Deutschen, die zu Werkzeugen der imperialistischen Unterdrückung und Kriegspolitik in Westdeutschland geworden sind (3, p.10).

(First, every youth shall become a conscious democrat, who knows who the friends and who the enemies of the people are. Every youth must know the sources of war provocation; must be filled with deep hate against imperialism, against those Germans who have become tools of the imperialistic oppression and war politics of Western Germany.)

Ulbricht emphasizes the need for youth to learn their trades, to understand the advanced knowledge and economy of the times. Then he states:

Fünftens: Unsere Jugend soll gründlich die Erfahrungen des sozialistischen Aufbaues in der Sowjetunion und die Ergebnisse der Sowjetwissenschaft studieren (3, p.10).

(Fifth, our youth shall study thoroughly the experiences of socialistic organization in the Soviet Union and the results of Soviet science.)

Ulbricht states the necessity for youth to study the great classical works (Marx and Lenin), to know the life and struggles of the great Germans from Thomas Münzer to Thälmann.¹ Furthermore:

Es ist Pflicht der Lehrer, die Schüler über die Kriegsvorbereitungen des Herrn Truman und über den Kampf der Nationalen Front des demokratischen Deutschlands für die Sicherung des Friedens aufzuklären (3, p.15).

(It is the duty of the teachers to enlighten the students on Mr. Truman's war preparations and on the struggle of the National Front of democratic Germany to safeguard peace.)

The Hochschulprogram der Freien Deutschen Jugend lists similar objectives. The document asks the German government to make possible the study of young Germans from western Germany at "democratic universities" of the German Democratic Republic (4, p.3).

The document declares unrelenting war against "amerikanische Pseudokultur" or American false culture, against all forms of Americanism as the expression of American imperialism (4, p.3).

The FDJ program looks forward to increased scholarship aid for the studies of workers and farmers, for more student clubs, better student cafeterias, etc.

1. Münzer and Thälmann are some of the "great Germans" who fought for Communism in Germany.

The professed objectives of the German Democratic Republic and of the FDJ youth organization, both sponsored by the Soviet Union, are significant. They show the wish of the Soviet Union to make the youth an integral and vital part of Soviet reform in Germany. While the professed aim is peace, that peace is considered to include the power to hate, to wage a propaganda war against the United States and the other Western Powers.

POLICIES. The Western Powers and the Soviet Union differ fundamentally in their methods of control. With the exception of France, the Western Powers have favored indirect control. The Soviet Union, while acting through and with Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands, has favored direct control.

Birley states that the year 1947 marks the beginning of a new period for the Western Powers re-education program. In this year control of education was turned over to German authorities in the various Länder in the British and American zones (1, p.32).

Specifically, the United States Military Government Regulation, Title 8, Part 2, March 1947 stated:

It is the policy of Military Government to place the immediate operational responsibility for German education on the German education authorities subject to the encouragement, supervision and inspection of the
(Quotation continued on next page)

Directors of Land OMG's through their Education officers. The final approval of OMGUS is necessary for all major policy decisions (22, p.545).

As the occupation continued, the Western Powers apparently favored less and less direct intervention in German education. Hopkins describes with regret a slowing-down process in the drive for school reform. He speaks of the present policy of American occupation officials as being a "cultural penetration" process rather than reform (31, p.21). Keohane, writing in March 1949, approves "the recent American shift to an emphasis upon reconstruction rather than reform of German education (35, p.412)."

A formal correctness characterizes the policies of the United States and Great Britain. The two powers wish to follow what they consider democratic policies and principles in reorienting German youth. The Soviet Union and to some extent France are more concerned with the final objective. They are less worried about using pressure or direct tactics to get the Germans to act. Zausmer states, for example, that Paris had wanted to impose a German school reform in 1945, but was blocked by Washington D. C. (72, p.47).

Liddell speaks of American "formalism" and declares it the most often cited subject of criticism (39, p.45).

She speaks of the "excessive caution" of the British and also of a "colonial attitude" which "is in the best British tradition of a kindly, tolerant, efficient superiority (39, p.50)."

DENAZIFICATION. The program of denazification helps illustrate the difference between the emphasis of the Western Powers on being correct and the Soviet Union's emphasis on accomplishing specific objectives regardless of the means used.

Denazification in youth reorientation meant purging undesirable Nazis from the lists of teachers and youth leaders. It meant banning certain organizations and eliminating improper textbooks. It was the first task in reorienting German youth and a negative emphasis rather than a positive one.

Landeen summarizes this negative side of reorientation as follows:

Negatively, they have denazified the teaching profession at all levels, eliminated Nazi and militaristic textbooks, destroyed the vast educational press of the Nazis, purged German administrative personnel in education, and screened all educational films and all school libraries (33, p.192).

Zink states that the Americans probably gave more attention to denazification as a program than to any other activity including education and economic reconstruction. He believes the United States carried out

denazification more vigorously and energetically than the French, British or Russians. Zink feels that preoccupation with the denazification of personnel may have blinded the Americans to the more constructive problem of "filling the key positions with those persons who have both democratic sympathies and ability (74, pp.144-145)."

Liddell points out the contradiction of American officials who admit the denazification law to be mistaken while at the same time "declaring themselves in the face of 'the law (39, p.45).'"

American observers disagreed over the U. S. denazification policy. Hermens, Professor of Political Science, University of Notre Dame, in an article written in 1947 points out how denazification had detrimental results. Among those handicapped were the university professors and grade school teachers (33, pp.176-177).

Neumann speaks of denazification of teachers in the American zone as being "carried out speedily, energetically, and successfully by MG (33, p.219)." He complains that the admission of Nazis and former officers to universities causes deterioration of the student body. He remarks that the Soviet policy is to screen aspirants for membership in the Nazi party (33, p.216).

Other observers complain bitterly that former Nazi

party members are still serving as teachers, educators or in similar posts of influence. In a 1949 article Zausmer writes that between 60 and 70 per cent of the teachers are former Nazis and that many of them still brazenly peddle the Goebbels ideology (72, p.48).

Perhaps it is well to remember the completeness with which the Nazi party organizations permeated the social structure. Germans, particularly teachers, found it difficult to remain free of Nazi entanglements. Zink points out, however, that there were Germans who did remain free (74, p.136). Nevertheless, belonging to a Nazi organization did not necessarily mean active and whole-hearted support of the Nazi policies. Hermens calls attention to the report of a British parliamentary committee which visited Germany in 1946. One sentence of the report stated.

No man, for instance, who has been a Nazi can in 1946 be a technician in a mine, whereas, in 1945, no man could be a technician in a mine unless he was a Nazi (33, p.176).

Zink remarks that the British and the French denazification policies have stressed the "big fellow" and have more or less ignored the "little fellow" as a mere pawn or victim who had to join the party because his life and livelihood depended on it (74, p.145).

Of the Russians Zink says that they have never been interested in an elaborate denazification

organization. They are not so interested in the past record of a German, but they are interested as to whether he will "contribute to the Russian goals of the future (74, p.144)."

From the archives of the Social Democratic Party comes the report of a former educator in the Eastern zone. From 1945 to 1947 he was principal of the Grundschule at Kranichfeld on the Ilm. He was also a director for the training of new elementary teachers. The area under his supervision included the southern part of the Kreis Weimar with the city Kranichfeld, about 8,000 people, and including a number of small communities in the area. His duties also included being director of culture and education for the city of Kranichfeld (58, p.1).

He mentions a report from the Thuringia Ministry of Education, which stated 98 per cent of the teachers in this Land were former members of the NSDAP or Nazi party.

He points out that it was necessary to use either the old teachers or else delay the reopening of schools for a long time. The teacher situation was made even more critical for two other reasons. War had taken its toll of teachers, particularly the younger ones. Evacuees or refugees had increased the population of some localities to double or even triple the original amount. He estimates

there were sixty to a hundred pupils to one teacher in some areas (58, p.2).

The educator from Kranichfeld states that all the teachers had to attend eight-to-ten day courses of democratic reorientation. However, it was learned later that by far the greater part of the speakers had once belonged to the Nazi party. In this way all the nominal members of the former NSDAP regained teaching positions. Former Nazis with positions higher than Blockleiter were excluded (58, p.3).

He states that teacher training schools were founded to train new teachers. During 1945 in the same proportion as there were new teachers, the teachers who had been nominal members of the NSDAP were dismissed, "fristlos und ohne Entschädigung und ohne Pension (58, p.3)." That is, without warning, compensation or pension.

Very few of the former Nazis were fortunate enough to retain their positions. The educator from Kranichfeld points out that this action was final, for a word against the SED or the Russians "bringt sie um ihre Stellung." That is, it would cost a person his job. For those teachers who belonged to the Nazi party but who were born after January 1, 1920 an amnesty was declared in 1947 (58, p.3).

NON-FRATERNIZATION. What relations should the occupying powers have with the German people? This is another problem which, like denazification, helps illustrate the different attitudes of the occupying powers. America's policy was at first an absolute ban on associating with the Germans. This policy proved impossible to enforce, but the Americans nevertheless continued to pay more attention to non-fraternization than any of the other occupying nations. Zink maintains that while the British also banned fraternization, they never attempted to enforce the ban to the extent which the United States did. France and Russia had no non-fraternization ban. However, their policy of cold aloofness provided more limited relations between the rank and file of the military and the general German population than either the British or American policies. There was a distinct difference, however, in that both the British and French followed a different course in the case of influential Germans (74, p.240).

Zink maintains that all the formal attention to non-fraternization and its application hampered the United States in its occupation responsibilities. The policy prevented making use of the services of selected Germans and sometimes antagonized those Germans who offered to help and who would have been of great service

(74, p.242).

Comments of American educational observers in Germany support Zink's conclusion. A number of educators have complained that they could not even have dinner with a German educator without undergoing tremendous difficulty. The non-fraternization policy placed a barrier between the Americans and the Germans whom they hoped to use to reorient German youth.

Keller mentions an incident in Frankfurt, when he had to smuggle a German educational consultant, "a man of fine democratic spirit and high intellectual attainment," into the American mess in order to get him something to eat (34, p.25). Keohane remarks:

The lowering--far too belatedly--of the barriers which were raised originally in a vain attempt to prevent fraternization, has helped. In June, 1948 it became possible for me to have the Minister of Education as my guest in the Officers' and Civilians' Club where I usually ate (35, p.408)!

Many of the United States educators wanted to work closely with the German educators, to work in an atmosphere of mutual respect and consideration to establish the friendly, open-minded discussion techniques which they viewed as an essential part of the democratic process. Keller, Keohane and others complained against the non-fraternization ban as well as other policies of American military government which they felt prevented

cooperation between Germans and Americans.

Despite the American policy of "formalism," denazification and non-fraternization, the over-all policy of American occupation compares favorably with the other powers as far as humane treatment of the Germans is concerned. Zink states that "none of the Allies dealt more considerately with the Germans as a whole than the United States (74, p.241)." Keohane points out that while many Germans disagree with educational reforms sponsored by the Americans, "only the most suspicious or malicious among them fail to credit us with good intentions (35, p.414)."

Liddell's studies lead her to believe that the Germans respect the British more than any other occupying power. She states that even when British policy is being attacked, Germans say the British are "correct (39, p.50)." The writer has also heard Germans speak with approval of British "correctness." However, the writer found in his observations in Germany that the Germans rank the occupation powers in order of preference or popularity as: (1) United States; (2) Great Britain; (3) France; (4) Soviet Union.

PRIORITY. Regardless of the wisdom or humaneness of the over-all policies of the four occupying powers, it is important to note the priority which each has

assigned to youth reorientation. Considerable evidence indicates that the Western Powers with the exception of France have given youth reorientation a far lower priority than the Soviet Union. Though the United States and Great Britain have had exceptionally qualified, hard-working personnel working in youth reorientation, the two powers have given little recognition to the program. This was particularly true in the early phases of occupation.

Speaking of the 1945 and 1946 years, Zink stated:

Despite all of the lip-service given to the importance of reeducating the Germans, especially the German youth, the official policy of the United States was not such as to permit the military government organization essential to an entirely adequate program (74, p.157).

According to Zink, the Education Section of the Anglo-American Country unit never had the staff or the recognition that Legal, Finance, Economic Affairs and other no more important fields received. The U. S. Group, Control Council for Germany gave even less recognition to re-education (74, p.151).

In other military government units having jurisdiction over re-education, Zink notes the same lack of recognition. He describes the same prevailing Army attitude in G-5 of SHAEF, G-5 of USFET and in lower echelons and field detachments. Education matters were usually neglected or ignored, assigned to officers burdened with

other duties or to officers without experience or training in education (74, pp.152-153).

Zink states that at one time in the organization chart of the US Group CC for Germany, education was lumped together with public safety, public health, public welfare, religious affairs, local government and civil service, and communications all in a single division. At the same time both manpower and transportation, which Zink considers less complicated fields, had division status (74, p.44).

Education and religious affairs, despite their responsibilities, never received anything like fair recognition in the organization setup of the US Group CC for Germany. It was difficult to know where they might be located at any given moment, for at times they belonged to communications; again they were made a tail of public health (74, p.44).

Prakken, writing in 1947, states that the program to reorganize German education receives relatively little attention or money. He notes the severity of budget cuts, reported as from ten to one million dollars. Prakken believes the priority and small budget indicate that while lip service is paid to the program at the highest level of military government, it is not considered an important part of the occupation program by high officials (49, p.6).

The United States Education Mission reported insufficient personnel in the Education and Religious Affairs Branch of OMGUS. The report criticized recruiting

methods which did not fill the staff quota authorized. Furthermore, the report recommended doubling the quota allowed in order to do a thorough job (20, pp.43-44). Liddell says, also, that the U. S. education officers were too few in number (39, p.46).

The OMGUS report on German youth activities between April 1, 1947 and April 30, 1948 states that during this period only one expert consultant in youth work came to Germany at Government expense (45, p.5).

The use of German school buildings indicates the U. S. priority assigned to re-education. The Mission report, while granting that school buildings are a natural target for those seeking to satisfy some fundamental space need, lamented undue requisitioning of school buildings and professors' homes for other than educational purposes. "Arbitrary whim, in the name of military necessity, seems at times to prompt the requisition of facilities only serving a slight army need (20, p.44)."

Keohane gives a specific example:

To put a snack bar and other special services in the main building of one of the world's greatest universities and to banish students from the building, except for special occasions, is not the best evidence that Americans love learning! The fact that American educators had no direct responsibility for this blunder only suggests to Germans that perhaps education is not so highly regarded in America as it is in Germany (35, p.407).

As of the latter part of 1949 Zausmer reports:

Education was at the bottom of the table of organization either as a branch or as a section of Military Government. It rose to the rank of a division only after the arrival of Dr. Grace a year and a half ago. Education still has neither the budget nor the influence it needs and deserves (72, p.49).

Hopkins complains too, of the minor status of the field of education, the lack of sufficient personnel.

Hopkins voices a common criticism of U. S. educators when he says there "are few inducements to competent American educators to make a career of educational work in Germany (33, p.205)." The insecurity and the absence of long-time security provisions such as tenure and retirement make re-education jobs in Germany unattractive.

The British priority on youth reorientation seems to have been similar to that of the United States. In 1947 Gollancz reported that the British education and youth section, although doing devoted work, was as grotesquely understaffed as the Trade and Industry section was overstaffed (27, p.231).

Liddell discerns a difference of priority within youth reorientation. She believes the British emphasized formal education too much and neglected the needs of youth outside the school (39, p.50).

The Mission report of the United States gives important reasons for considering the out-of-school needs

of youth. It is traditional in Germany that boys and girls between ten and eighteen years be active in some organization outside of school. The school program and leisure-time activities are traditionally separated. In 1946 at least, many children were spending but fifteen to twenty hours a week in school. Most of the time the children were outside the school's influence (20, p.33).

After visiting the British zone of Germany in the fall of 1946, Gollancz criticizes the British severely for neglect of this vital outside-of-school time. He found only one youth magazine in the British zone. It was issued monthly. Gollancz states nine magazines were being printed in the U. S. zone, usually fort-nightly. In North Rhine-Westphalia there were no books, magazines, handicraft materials, indoor games or outdoor sports equipment for youth work and no special allocation of fuel for meeting places. He regrets that youth work was at the bottom of the priority list, when it should have been not far from the top (27, pp.16-17).

Observers compliment the French for a higher priority on youth reorientation. Bidwell notes the particular emphasis on educational and cultural activities. He thinks the French were only being wise in making best use of their zone and their own talents. The French had

little chance for economic development due to their own resources and the agricultural nature of the zone. The borderland area separating France and Germany has many people who know and enjoy both the French and German languages and culture. These people France could use well in a reorientation program (10, pp.84-85).

Liddell states that as early as 1943 in Algiers the French had drawn up policy and plans for re-education (39, p.40). Zausmer notes also that the French carefully planned German re-education before the occupation (72, p.47).

It is perhaps unwise to imply that the British and Americans did not plan German youth reorientation or give it attention. Zink in fact believes that the American zone gave more attention to the problem of German reeducation than any other zone (74, p.164). The educators investigated and planned every known possibility of reorientation. However, they lacked the staff, the organization, and the support from higher headquarters to act.

Zausmer states the men in charge of occupation in the American zone have been primarily soldiers, technicians, businessmen and economists. They were men with little experience in education and primarily interested in short-range security and financial problems (72, p.49).

What priority does the Soviet Union give youth re-orientation? The priority is influenced by the place given to education in the Soviet Union. Counts and Lodge characterize education as an all-embracing process which includes everything that might mould the mind of young and old (16, p.244).

The Soviet educational system constitutes the most gigantic and comprehensive marshalling of forces to shape the human mind in the whole history of mankind. It is under the close supervision of the central organs of the Party and is directed toward the achievement of Party purposes. It is, indeed, as the Soviet leaders never tire of repeating, a "weapon of Communism (16, p.245)."

If the appraisal of Counts and Lodge is correct, then it would seem that the Soviet Union would place the highest possible priority on youth reorientation; would use every means to shape teachers, curriculum, youth leaders and youth organizations into the Communistic pattern.

The Soviet Union has given considerable attention to German youth. Typical is the field of youth publications. The OMGUS report on youth activities between 1947 and 1948 records this instance. A young boy walked into the Military Government office in Württemberg-Baden and tossed two piles of papers on the desk. He pointed to the larger pile. "These are the papers which the eastern zone gives us," he exclaimed, and then turning to the

smaller pile, "these are the papers you give us (45, p.24)."

The OMGUS 1948 report calculates that 60 per cent of the youth publications read in the U. S. zone come from the Russian zone (45, p.24). It is only fair to admit that 80 per cent of the German paper mills are in the Russian zone, as Liddell points out and adds, "...the Russians will barter paper only against steel (39, p.53)." Yet OMGUS states that not only does the Russian zone have more publications, but it also has more appealing ones (45, p.25).

Hayes Beall, formerly chief of youth activities in Hesse in the U. S. zone for two years, describes the support the Soviet Union gives its Freie Deutsche Jugend youth organization.

Participation in the Freie Deutsche Jugend (FDJ) is not strictly a communist activity because many young people take part for lack of any other opportunity for recreational and related activities. However, the soviet occupation is sparing nothing to bring German youth into the FDJ. All other youth organizations are forbidden. Access to recreational pursuits is barred to all except FDJ members. The communist part (SED), trade unions and others give it funds. It has excellent training centers in Eastern Germany and Russia for training its leaders. It has access to press, radio and every other avenue for reaching youth. Soviet initiative and German communist leadership are so intermingled that there is no clear line where one ends and the other begins (7, p.1).

PERSONNEL. What might be said of the quality of

personnel who reorient German youth? Printed comment on the quality of occupation personnel in youth reorientation has been highly favorable. However, the United States and Great Britain may have neglected the quantity of personnel, they were at least partially successful in getting highly qualified personnel.

Zink praises the U. S. education personnel.

And if education never carried the numbers of officers and men that other far less important sections displayed, it could boast of a general uniformity of professional skill and experience that perhaps no other subdivision with the exception of religious affairs could offer (74, p.153).

Prakken supports Zink's appraisal and maintains that the education personnel have been doing a consistently good job from the beginning, especially in view of the small budget (49, p.6).

Melby, Dean of the School of Education of New York University, lauds the work of the U. S. education personnel during the period of Army jurisdiction, particularly the work of Dr. Grace (42, p.70).

Of the French, Bidwell reports that they have been able to obtain competent and optimistic administrators and teachers who believe German thought can be reoriented from the distorted ideology of the Nazis to the humanistic ideals of French culture (10, p.84).

Keohane writes of an able Soviet major who served on the history subcommittee of the Education Committee of Allied Commandatura in Berlin during the spring of 1948. Keohane relates that the Soviet major succeeded all too well in making his point as the four-power subcommittee were writing a history textbook for Berlin children. The major pressed for an undue stress on the countries with a "new democracy." The major wanted this emphasis placed strategically at the end of units of work, so that it would appear the East represents the "wave of the future." The major cleverly pointed out that 87 per cent of the thinkers mentioned in one part of the outline had no taint of Communism. Nevertheless, the outline prepared by the committee reflected the major's emphasis that while "the treatment of the forms and theories of the state might begin with Plato,...they ended with Karl Marx, Joseph Stalin, and the new democracies (35, pp.410-411)."

Liddell, speaking of experts in education and youth organization from Britain, the United States, France and the Soviet Union, remarked that they have perhaps made the greatest single contribution toward the reconstruction of Germany (39, pp.36-37).

CHAPTER IV

PROGRAMS OF THE FOUR OCCUPATION POWERS
TO REORIENT GERMAN YOUTH (Part 2)

YOUTH ACTIVITIES. The Western Powers sought first to eliminate nationalism and militarism from all youth activities. The next step was to encourage all types of organizations and activities which agreed with democratic principles of the West and to enroll as many youth as possible. The Western Powers discouraged those organizations and activities which were politically sponsored and which were organized on other than a local basis. France, Great Britain and the States differed somewhat in the degree to which they enforced these controls.

UNITED STATES YOUTH ACTIVITIES. Böttcher makes these chronological divisions in United States youth activities reorientation: 1945, denazification; 1946, reorientation, the formation of Kreis and Land youth committees; 1947-1948, transfer of reorientation activities to the Germans themselves (12, p.13).

The denazification process set limitations on the new program. For example, in sports activities the United States Military Government banned the following: (1) aviation, parachuting, gliding; (2) fencing;

(3) military or para-military drill or display; (4) shooting with firearms (22, p.585). These prohibitions also illustrate the desire of the United States to remove all traces of militarism. This emphasis was perhaps carried to an extreme. A 1948 OMGUS report notes that under Allied Control Authority Directive 43, Military Government disbanded several organizations and forbade their use of model airplanes (45, p.2).

In the early stages of occupation the U. S. Military Government altogether discouraged youth organizations which were politically sponsored. Later politically sponsored youth organizations were permitted as long as the youth groups could form constitutions and elect officers independently of the sponsoring party (22, p.583). An example of such a group is the Falken or Sozialistische Jugendbewegung Deutschlands, sponsored by the Social Democratic Party.

The U. S. Military Government permitted youth organizations to serve areas only up to and including the Land (22, p.583). Occupation authorities found it difficult, if not impossible, to block the natural tendency of the Germans to organize nationally. An OMGUS publication comments: "Practically every youth organization has broken the spirit of this regulation even though it has stayed within the letter of the law (45, p.2)." The

Military Government, in spite of the ban, did permit inter-zone and inter-Land meetings and conferences of youth organizations (45, p.27).

To initiate new youth organizations the U. S. Military Government worked closely with the German people. Committees of Germans were established on a Kreis or county level to work with Military Government officials in forming new groups to replace the Hitler youth organizations. The committees were composed of youth leaders, teachers, clergymen and others whom the occupation officials considered responsible persons.

In each Land, in the Bremen Enclave and in the U. S. sector of Berlin, OMGUS appointed an American officer or civilian to work with the committees and to have full responsibility for youth activities (22, p.581).

Hayes Beall, former chief of youth activities in Land Hesse in the U. S. zone, states:

Kreis and Land youth committees in the U. S. Zone were organized at the recommendation of the Occupation Government and often with the help of a Kreis military government officer. The leaders of various groups such as the churches, trade unions, school, health and welfare authorities were invited to send representatives to such a committee. Once the committee was organized, at least on an informal basis, the Kreis committee was given authority to do some of the screening necessary to make sure that local youth groups seeking to organize were neither military nor Nazi in leadership or program. Once this screening function was performed the committee
(Quotation continued on next page)

functions as a cooperative coordinating and planning agency to meet the needs of youth within its territory. The Land youth committee was organized through the initiative of the Kultusministerium and the Land chief of youth activities in the U. S. Occupation Government. This committee structure has been very helpful all the way through (8, p.1).

The U. S. occupation authorities encouraged a variety of youth organizations. They included religious, sport, labor, political, cultural and recreational groups. Beal states that the youth groups which have arisen in Germany since the war are primarily those that existed in the pre-Hitler period. Each group tried to resume the work left off some time earlier. Only minor--local or regional--associations were formed (7, p.1).

Youth groups in the U. S. zone increased from approximately 2,000 in April 1946 to over 10,000 in April 1948. Members of organized groups increased from 200,000 in April 1946 to 1,200,000 at the end of March 1948 (45, p.1).

The Army Assistance to Germany Youth Activities Program was perhaps the most controversial youth undertaking of the Western Powers. Sponsored by the United States, it had noble objectives. Certainly the program was active and extensive.

Böttcher states that 307 youth centers were established under the GYA program. In 1948 there were 201

officers and enlisted men who devoted full time to this program. In addition there were 948 indigenous personnel. In November 1948, 570,294 youth participated in work and play groups and in discussions. In 1948 thirteen international work camps were held in the U. S. zone. There were 60,000 youth who participated in summer camps. In 1949 the GYA homes were transferred to German hands. The Military Government limited itself to support with material and equipment. The financial position of many a GYA home has thus become difficult; likewise, the participation of the youth has decreased since the active ones among them are now in most cases organized in other youth groups (12, p.13). Böttcher may have included some of the activities sponsored by the State Department's Office of Public Affairs in her summary of GYA activities.

There is no doubt that the GYA program of the U. S. Army was an extensive one. The well-meaning program accomplished a great deal, but encountered heavy criticism for some of its activities. The Army, operating on a command and authority basis, is perhaps not ideally fitted to teach the ways of democracy.

The U. S. occupation officials had noted some friction existing between German youth centers and those

sponsored by the Army. Thus, they sought to integrate the established GYA centers into the Germany community (45, p.11).

At a conference of German youth and American personnel in Wiesbaden these criticisms among others were made by Germans, indicative of "the attitude of intelligent German youth leaders toward GYA (45, p.8)."

a. The first part of the GYA program has been of tremendous help (providing of tents, transportation, etc.) but that has been completed and the second part, in which German youth itself is assuming greater responsibility, has begun...

b. There is disillusionment, since GYA has not to date touched the need of the German youth at its very center. Instead of requisitioning a house and taking it away from a German family or agency for use as a youth center, it would be better to provide material and let the German youth work together to build a center. This would be more helpful and would be better than creating tensions between the parents who lose the house and the German youth who take it over (45, p.8).

In similar vein other criticisms rebuke not the objectives of the German Youth Activities program, but the methods used. The young Germans think the Army should seek to help the German youth help themselves rather than to impose an Army program on German youth (45, p.9).

Fred Sparks, newspaper correspondent who made a study of German youth activities in June 1950, severely criticizes the GYA program. He cites the army's attempt

to introduce baseball to German youth as a typical failure. Sparks claims that thousands of dollars were spent to send baseball equipment to Germany in the belief that "baseball makes a man more democratic than continental football." Sparks states that most of the baseball equipment "rots in GYA clubs all over Germany today (62, p.3)."

Sparks objects to the "official gibberish" of GYA policy. The policy is to teach the precepts of democracy by example, democratic leadership and the sponsoring of community activities, rather than by propaganda and formal education (61, p.2).

Sparks' criticism implies that the army program wasn't sufficiently specific, direct and dynamic. Beall, who had actual experience in youth work in Germany, criticizes from a different viewpoint.

The errors made by the army in the GYA program were basically errors in philosophy or lack of understanding of how a democratic youth movement should function. Their leadership was not able to distinguish between doing for German youth and providing this youth with an opportunity to do things for itself (8, p.1).

The Community Activities staff of the Education and Cultural Relations Division sponsors a number of German youth activities. Five short-term training schools have been established. Community Activities reported in January 1950 that 5,550 youth leaders had been trained. The nature of the courses are described as:

The basic elements of discussion leading, social psychology, democratic leadership and social group work are given by American experts, three headquarters and state commission youth officers, and German youth leaders trained in the United States through the exchange program (44, p.43).

The United States is also advising and encouraging a self-help program for German youth. The three-point program is sponsored by a board of directors of German industrialists and labor leaders. First, 125 youth homes have been built in the U. S. zone for homeless and needy youth. There is a cooperative living system under the advice of trained educators. In the three zones of western Germany about 15,000 youth live in 308 self-help homes. Second, work students have been sent to the U. S. for two years to work in industries not competing with American labor. Third, university students are assisted in a self-help program of loans, reconstruction, student councils, etc. (44, p.43).

The Community Activities staff report on January 1950 states that there are 11,000 German youth groups with 1,452,141 members in the U. S. zone. There are seven U. S. experts on the staff to deal with these young people. The U. S. occupation officials note the great increase in youth membership with some pride (44, p.42).

However, one of the recommendations of the Wiesbaden German-American conference in September 1947 may

be pertinent. The report recommended "putting less emphasis on the increase in numbers, on statistics, reports, and the development of a bureaucratic machinery (45, p.4)."

Where statistics are concerned, the number of German youth who belong to no German organization is pertinent. In July 1949 Grace reported there were approximately 75 per cent of the young people between ten and twenty-five years who did not belong to a youth organization (47, p.42). Correspondent Sparks reported in June 1950 that 80 per cent of the youth in the western zones did not belong to any youth organization (62, p.3).

Perhaps one of the most effective methods of youth reorientation is in sending German youth to the United States to observe democracy at work. Willi Birkelbach, a young German who studied five months in the United States as a cultural exchange student under a Rockefeller Foundation grant, states:

Very few of our young generation have had an opportunity of exercising their own judgment. They did not even have the opportunity of expressing an opinion, and none could develop the skill of presenting views before an audience. I found it one of the most striking things in America that even a child is not afraid of talking to a group and obviously possesses a certain skill in expressing himself. Without timidity he will ask questions if he does not agree or
(Quotation continued on next page)

understand.

And almost everyone seems to know how to handle a committee meeting or understands the responsibilities of the chairman, so that rights in democratic assembly may be protected. To provide experience in this field everywhere--in classrooms, meetings and group discussions--is one of the most urgent tasks in Germany (47, p.27).

The U. S. occupation officials encourage private foundations and organizations which sponsor exchanges of German students. The work-study plan is one of the programs sponsored jointly by the occupation officials and by Germans. Dr. Grace points out that of 500 students who participated in a work-study plan between 1925 and 1932 only one ever became a Nazi and dozens died in concentration camps because of anti-Nazi activities (47, p.42).

The quality of youth publications in the U. S. and other western zones has improved since the 1948 OMGUS report. Then OMGUS spoke deprecatingly of the twenty-five youth publications appearing in the U. S. zone. The magazines were critized as intended primarily for young people over eighteen and as having poor articles on foreign countries and few articles on specific youth subjects (45, p.24).

Since that report a commission on youth publications in Hesse has been printing an interesting series of

articles on youth activities. The writer has received a publication of the Bayerischer Jugendring or Bavarian Youth Ring of Munich which attractively illustrates various youth organizations in the U. S. zone. The publication, entitled Junges Leben, illustrates graphically the problems of German youth--homeless, jobless, tempted by questionable recreational facilities, etc. The problems are followed by a pictorial review of activities sponsored in the western zones (6).

The 1948 OMGUS report on German youth predicted that the newly-formed Hesse youth publications commission would draw mainly on translations of articles in youth publications of the United States (45, p.24). Fortunately, the publication's directors have departed from this policy to print many articles on specific problems of German youth. For example, the Hesse commission's magazine, Wir Alle (We All), devotes its February 1950 issue mainly to the problem of German youth unemployment (71).

Other issues emphasize some democratic trait or practice which the U. S. occupation officials wish to stress. The January 1950 issue of Wir Alle emphasizes in an indirect manner that Germany belongs to the family of European and world nations (70). A picture of a young Italian in the international camp, Wetzlar, graces

the front cover. Sample titles of articles are "Internationale Freundschaft," (International Friendship), "Weltfriede in der Gruppe" (World Peace in the Group). Another issue, October 1949, exalts the value and practicality of discussion and discussion groups (69).

Articles of this type are effective only if the message or "democratization" emphasized is tactfully and interestingly treated. Another media of reorientation drew negative response. The 1948 OMGUS youth report mentions the ICD documentary film, "Hunger," which the Germans claim is filmed in a crude and propagandistic manner. Youth as well as adults cheered when some of the former German war heroes were shown on the screen (45, p.25).

In sponsoring youth organizations, publications and numerous miscellaneous activities, the United States has been more active than either France or Great Britain. Böttcher states that the U. S. occupation authorities have been more active in sponsoring youth groups. However, she points out that no active spiritual or intellectual center for youth activities came into existence in the U. S. zone like the British youth center, Vlotho. To compensate for this the United States authorities have initiated the youth leadership training schools (12, p.15).

Böttcher notes that in the U. S. zone the youth

themselves are assuming more and more the leadership of their organizations. Control of the Jugendringe or Youth Rings, which came into existence under the supervision of the Ministers of Culture, is being transferred and to youth. Most progressive of the Jugendringe is the previously mentioned Bayrische Jugendring. It seeks to strengthen the ideals of tolerance and cooperation, and strives to represent youth to the general public (12, p.15).

In summary, the youth activities sponsored by the United States include: encouragement of legitimate youth groups; establishment of leadership schools; the Army GYA program; exchange programs; encouragement of youth homes and self-help activities; aid to youth publications, etc.

BRITISH YOUTH ACTIVITIES. The 1948 OMGUS report remarks that American and British youth activities are more similar than either the French or the Russian (45, p.5).

Liddell states the British youth program differs from the American in having more control and less activities. When the Americans permitted youth organizations at the Land or state level, the British permitted them only at the Kreis or county level. The British banned scouting, at least for the early part of the occupation,

because of the uniform and the potentially militaristic nature of the Boy Scouts. However, some Germans were trained abroad in Sweden and England in the Boy Scouts (39, p.47).

Beall also reports that the British have also participated more directly in the guidance of some groups than the Americans, although the British allowed considerable freedom, showed a good understanding of German life and did a good job of leadership training (7, p.1) (8, p.2).

Böttcher reports that as early as 1945 in every youth office in the British zone there was an official German youth adviser in liason with the British Military Government. Since 1948 the registration and admission of youth groups has been transferred to German hands, with the exception of sport groups. Youth officers were appointed in order to help materially the developing youth organizations and in order to promote the activities of the various organizations and cooperation between groups. It was not planned to establish youth clubs according to the English pattern (12, pp.14-15).

Members of the British Army did not participate actively in the German youth work. However, athletic contests with German teams were often held. Discussion groups were activated through voluntary organizations

like the YMCA, etc. The St. Michaelishaus in Hamburg has existed since 1946 to train leaders for Christian youth work. German youth leaders were invited as guests of foreign youth groups to England, Denmark, Sweden, etc. Cooperative reconstruction camps were organized for renovation of youth hostels (12, pp.14-15).

British youth officers have founded with German cooperation various youth centers or Jugendhöfe which include: Vlotho, Weser; Barsbüttel bei Hamburg; Bundenheim, Harz; Steinbach, Eiffel. Courses are held in these centers for youth leaders. Böttcher states, however, that these Jugendhöfe were established as meeting places for youth rather than as schools for youth leadership. They seek to promote mutual respect and tolerance (12, p.15). Speaking of Barsbüttel and Vlotho, Liddell states that they seek to bring together representatives of different political and religious groups and thus diminish that "competition for youth" which many young Germans seem to resent (39, p.52).

FRENCH YOUTH ACTIVITIES. Observers do not always agree on the nature of the French activities. The French, however, seem to have moved cautiously at first and to have exercised considerable control. Culture and exchange are predominant emphasis.

Kellermann reported in 1946 that the French

insisted on an initial period of quiet and made careful preparations for resumption of youth activities (19, p.21). Beall typifies the French policy as quite paternalistic.

They have approved a limited number of long-established organizations and they have supervised them closely, allowing little freedom or democracy (7, p.1).

Liddell describes the French as encouraging youth organizations, especially those like the Boy Scouts without religious or political affiliations. She points out the "cultural" emphasis of youth activities--cinema clubs, concerts, painting exhibitions, etc. (39, p.42).

Böttcher states that in the French zone, which does not have so many large cities, the youth work followed a moderate course within churches and political parties. The military government concentrated upon intellectual-cultural guidance. The youth groups founded on an intellectual-ideological basis were particularly supported (church, political party and trade union youth organizations). Böttcher states that for the present (1950) no splinter groups are permitted, but only large collective groups are authorized (12, p.14).

According to Böttcher, two approaches predominate in the French program. They include: (1) facilitation of international acquaintance and exchange; (2) development of youth organizations and establishment of Volksbildungswesen (folkways, culture). Helping the first

approach is the Institut für Internationale Begegnungen or Institute for International Acquaintance in Freiburg. The French have supported the following: meetings between leaders and followers of youth movements of various nations; youth conferences; work sessions for youth specialists and youth leaders including teachers, professors, school superintendents and representatives from schools, women's organizations, and journalist trade unions. The French encourage these meetings on a systematic basis and seek to develop more and more private initiative. Peace can only be secured, the French believe, through exchange of ideas, methods and experiences, by responsible people (12, p.14).

The French Military Government has supported German authorities in establishing youth offices and youth welfare agencies. The French have encouraged private initiative in restoration of youth hostels and youth homes. The Jugendringe, youth committees and other means of cooperation between youth groups are encouraged (12, p.14).

Although exercising a certain amount of control, the Western Powers have allowed German youth considerable freedom. The freedom has been increasing. Böttcher states that in 1947 the licensing of Jugendverbänden on a Land basis was announced and that from their own

initiative the Jugendverbände have developed throughout the western zones. German Government participation in youth work is discouraged as far as political or government control is concerned. German Government participation is encouraged for construction of youth homes for wandering youth, the institution of youth self-help programs, etc. (12, p.15).

Even the Freie Deutsche Jugend is permitted in the western zones. American occupation officials hasten to add, however, that the FDJ has attracted less than one per cent of all youth in organized groups in the U. S. zone (44, p.42).

The writer does not attempt to describe the activities of individual youth groups within the western zones. They include such groups as: the Bund der deutschen katholischen Jugend (Union of the German Catholic Youth, includes several individual organizations); Evangelische Jugend (Evangelical Youth, also including several individual groups); Gewerkschaftjugend or Trade Union Youth; the Sportjugend or Athletic Youth groups; the Falken; Freie Deutsche Jugend; various small independent groups like the Deutsche Jugendschaft, Wandervogel and Freischar, Böttcher calls these small independent groups non-partisan, non-confessional, but not non-political (12, pp.15-17).

SOVIET YOUTH ACTIVITIES. The Soviet Union tolerates only one youth organization in its zone, the FDJ. The West maintains that the FDJ is the instrument of the SED, the Communist party. However, the FDJ claims to be an independent organization, entirely free from party control.

The first paragraph of the FDJ constitution states:

Die Freie Deutsche Jugend ist eine einheitliche, unabhängige, demokratische Organisation, die auf freiwilliger Grundlage die breiten Schichten der Jugend in Stadt und Land vereinigt und erzieht mit dem Ziel, den Interessen des deutschen Volkes zu dienen (73, p.5).

(The Freie Deutsche Jugend is a unified, independent, democratic organization which on a voluntary basis unites and educates the broad ranks of youth in city and country with the aim to serve the interests of the German people.)

An OMGUS report, however, stated in 1948 that the FDJ is a highly-centralized organization with its headquarters in Berlin. At the time of the report eleven of the sixteen members of the FDJ central committee belonged to the SED party. OMGUS maintained the other party representatives were retained to keep the semblance of a non-party organization and an "open-to-all" appearance (45, p.17).

Kellermann pointed out in 1946 that all the FDJ

administrative organs, including the Zentraljugendausschuss (Central Youth Committee) in Berlin are ultimately responsible to the Zentralverwaltung für Volksbildung (Central Administration for People's Education). This permits adult supervision (19, p.15).

A paragraph of the constitution states: "Die Freie Deutsche Jugend steht im Lager des Friedens und der Demokratie, an dessen Spitze die Sowjet-Union steht (74, p.11)." (The Freie Deutsche Jugend stands in the camp of peace and democracy, which is led by the Soviet Union.)

In structure the FDJ is organized similarly to the youth organization in the Soviet Union. According to Counts and Lodge, there are the Society of Young Pioneers and the League of Young Communists in the Soviet Union. The latter enrolls youth between fourteen and twenty-three; the former between ten and sixteen years of age (Counts, 16, pp.244-245).

The FDJ like the League of Young Communists has a subsidiary or "feeder" agency. Significantly, it is called Junge Pioniere or Young Pioneers. Its relation to the FDJ is indicated by Walter Ulbricht, Deputy Prime Minister of the German Democratic Republic: "Die Freie Deutsche Jugend hat eine grosse und sehr schöne Aufgabe übernommen: die Erziehung der Jungen Pioniere (3, p. 23)." (The Freie Deutsche Jugend has undertaken a great

and wonderful task: the education of the Jungen Pioniere.)

As previously noted, the objectives of the FDJ echo the propaganda line of the Soviet Union. They emphasize hate of the United States and the other Western Powers. The FDJ like the Soviet Union claims to represent the wish for peace and a genuine democracy. It declares itself a determined opponent of the Western Powers program.

Die Freie Deutsche Jugend kämpft unermüdlich für die Herstellung der Einheit Deutschlands, für die Schaffung einer unteilbaren deutschen demokratischen Republik für die Herbeiführung eines gerechten Friedens. Deshalb ist sie ein entschiedener Gegner des Besatzungsstatuts und der Kolonisierung Deutschlands durch die ausländischen Bank- und Industrieherrn (73, p.5).

(The Freie Deutsche Jugend battles untiringly for the restoration of a united Germany, for the creation of an indivisible democratic German republic, for the establishment of a genuine peace. Therefore, it is a determined opponent of the occupation statutes and colonization of Germany through the foreign bankers and industrialists.)

The Hochschulprogram of the FDJ speaks even more bitterly against American imperialism. The Soviet Union is proclaimed as the truest friend of Germany and the strongest bulwark of peace (4, p.4).

The program declares the need to help the Arbeiter- und Bauernfakultäten (colleges for workers and farmers) at the universities in order to democratize the schools.

Other Soviet Union policies are supported: acceptance of the Oder-Neisse boundary; friendship for the people's democracies, particularly neighboring Poland and Czechoslovakia. The program supports the world's millions of democratic students united in the "Internationalen Studentenbund" by the glorious example and leadership of the students of the Soviet Union (4, pp.2-3).

American occupation officials claim the FDJ has "all the trappings of the Hitler organization" (44, p.42). Dorothy Thompson is one of many newspaper columnists who after the FDJ Whitsuntide parade in Berlin of half a million youth noted the similarity to the old Hitler-Jugend organization.

The German Hitler kids wore brown shirts, brown shorts or skirts, and stockings to the knee....The German Stalin kids wear blue shirts, blue shorts or skirts, and stockings to the knee....So we have it all over again. This time they wear blue; make a different salute; listen to a different Pied Piper. But it's the same one--the Pied Piper of power to be won through the mass-man, raised from a mass-kid (66, p.16).

The FDJ does use many of the Hitler youth techniques. There is the same emphasis on discipline, marching, parades, banners, etc. A favorite slogan of the Hitler Youth was: "Wir danken unserem Führer." (We thank our Führer.) On page fifteen of a recent edition of the FDJ constitution is a picture of FDJ youth standing before flags and posters. A huge poster proclaims:

"Wir danken der SU (73, p.15)." (We thank the Soviet Union.) In smaller letters below is a banner which states: "Wir helfen mit im Kampf um die Einheit Deutschlands." (We join in the battle for the unity of Germany.) Despite the emphasis on peace in FDJ and Soviet Union objectives, the word, Kampf or battle, is generally linked with the word, Friede or peace.

The Freie Deutsche Jugend seeks to use its monopoly on youth activities to penetrate into every area where youth may be found. The organizational structure provides for groups in industry, administration, agriculture, dwelling areas, villages, schools, colleges and universities. There are Ortsgruppen, Kreisverbände, Landesverbände, and the Verband der Freien Deutschen Jugend. This means organization on a local, county, state and national basis.

Dr. Steinbrecher, former professor at the University of Rostock in the Soviet zone, describes the efforts of the FDJ to take over increasing areas of university life. His report to the Social Democrats in western Germany estimates that considerably over half of Rostock's more than 2,000 students belong to the FDJ. He states that many students joined because of rumors that all who were not members of some political party must at least show their democratic views by joining the FDJ (63, p.1)

Steinbrecher says that the SED, according to exact instructions from occupation officials, insured itself the decisive leadership in the FDJ. In 1949 the FDJ in the University of Rostock unobtrusively founded its own Arbeitsgemeinschaften beside those already existing independently. These Arbeitsgemeinschaften in a German university are work associations of students and professors in particular fields of study. Then in January 1950 the FDJ suddenly claimed to be the sole representative of student life. Thus, the FDJ sought to take over the action of the old Korporationen, Verbindungen, usw. (associations and fraternities, etc.) in a new unified pattern (63, pp.1-2).

The FDJ made its claim on the Arbeitsgemeinschaften at a general meeting of the students, attended by no more than 300 of the 2,000 students, according to Steinbrecher. There was some student opposition. About six students from western Germany questioned the necessity of FDJ-controlled Arbeitsgemeinschaften. The representative of the college of theology categorically rejected the proposal, refusing to even take a vote on the FDJ claim. As a result of this action, the FDJ did not press the issue. No election took place and the free Arbeitsgemeinschaften were tolerated (63, pp.1-2).

The FDJ claim on the Arbeitsgemeinschaften,

however, was but a preparatory move. The FDJ sought to control the nominations for the elections of Studentenrat and Fakultätsrat (student councils and faculty councils). The FDJ began by proposing its own lists of candidates in the individual colleges for the election. In a careful manner the FDJ started with those colleges where support for the FDJ candidate lists seemed assured. So the FDJ began with the Arbeiter-und Bauern-Fakultät (the college for the workers and farmers initiated in the German universities by the Soviet Union) and the college of social sciences. These colleges justified the confidence placed in them by the FDJ. However, the agricultural college did not respond satisfactorily in spite of its dean, Professor Petersen, an FDJ supporter. As a result the FDJ did not hold an election on its proposed list of candidates in the agricultural college (63, p.2).

Next, the FDJ tried the "uncertain" college of education. Here Steinbrecher reports that in spite of the fact that he was ousted as dean and was replaced by Dr. Struck and Dr. Fritz Müller, on November 1, 1948, the college of education had made "keine sowjetischen Fortschritte" (no Soviet advancement). However, only a few in the college of education dared to appear as opponents of the FDJ, because in most cases they were approached afterwards and threatened. The opponents of the FDJ,

nevertheless, always received general applause and foot-stamping approval (63, p.2).

In the college of education a FDJ representative moved that the FDJ demand for the unity of Germany be joined with the FDJ claim for political leadership. This was protested with the remark that everyone was for the unity of Germany. An FDJ member stated that he doubted this. He was "thundered down" with the sharpest words by the assembly. Professor Müller spoke of the reactionary spirit of the assembly, but he could not prevent a student from calling him to order. Professor Müller soon left the assembly. Steinbrecher reports that the vote resulted in an overwhelming majority against the leadership claim of the FDJ (63, p.2).

Even worse for the FDJ were the voting results in the colleges of philosophy, medicine and law. Nevertheless, the FDJ almost exclusively nominated the candidates (63, p.2).

This was possible since in the election committee the SED usurped the majority of places. Then, they examined the nominees undesirable to them as to whether the candidates supported the Oder-Neisse line as a peace border and if they considered the Soviet Union as the sole friend of peace. The election committee rejected all those who did not answer clearly and crossed from the list

of candidates or nominees all those undesirable to them. The committee claimed as an excuse that the election rules did not permit candidates in number above 30 per cent of those to be elected. Complaints against this action were rejected under threats (63, p.2).

Steinbrecher comments on the announcements made by the radio stations RIAS¹ and NWDR² prior to the election. He regrets that these stations could not advise the students how to vote until very late since those in power at Rostock had moved so quickly. Furthermore, the radio stations advised the students to mark the ballots for the Studentenrat invalid, and in the case of the Fakultätsrat, less important politically, to vote for the least dangerous candidate. This caused some confusion. Steinbrecher states that in such cases, one should be simple, clear and exact. For example, the advice should have said to write over all the ballots with "ungültig" or invalid. This advice should have been repeated again and again in the evening announcement, particularly when there were only a few days at disposal (63, p.3).

-
1. RIAS means Rundfunk im Amerikanischen Sektor (Radio in the American Sector). It is located in Berlin and is "the only American radio station behind the iron curtain (44, p.59)."
 2. NWDR means Nordwestdeutscher Rundfunk (Northwest German Radio). It is in the British zone (44, p.61).

Steinbrecher states that in Rostock the reception of RIAS is usually bad or not possible at all. In most cases the NWDR and London can be heard. Whispering propaganda is extremely dangerous, not only because of the many spies, but even more so because of the harmless, gossiping students. The credulity and naivete of the students are not equal to the cunning methods of the persons in power (63, p.3).

Thus it happened that in the school of education only 27 per cent of the ballots were marked invalid. Nevertheless, Steinbrecher states this was a heavy blow for the Soviet Union followers. The Dean told the school of education that Minister Grünberg had informed him at once of this result of his reactionary college. Steinbrecher adds that this was the last decisive reason to blame him (Steinbrecher) as the main originator of this result (63, p.3).

Ulbricht's description of the cultural activities of the FDJ illustrates how completely the organization penetrates all areas of life. The FDJ sponsors special interest groups for music, art and culture. Part of their work is to bring the culture of the people and of other nations, especially the Soviet Union, closer to the working man. In addition Ulbricht states that FDJ members

have voluntarily donated fifty million working hours to reconstructing cultural areas devastated by the war. He asks that the FDJ find ways to help young writers to write about the land reform and political projects (3, pp.22-23).

Observers of the Social Democratic Party believe that the FDJ considers itself the political supervisor of teachers and professors. An observer for the Social Democratic Party reported the following incident in 1949:

In einer Versammlung von Vertretern der Schülerschaft, die der FDJ angehörten, erklärte Oberregierungsrat Dr. GRENDA, die Schüler müssten unter Umständen die Lehren anzeigen (57, p.1).

(At a meeting of representatives of student organizations belonging to the FDJ Dr. Grenda, Oberregierungsrat (a government official), declared that the students must inform on the teachers.)

The FDJ critic relates another example of FDJ zeal. A pupil wrote to a Dr. Elchlepp, school director, to complain that the pupil's father would not permit him to enter the FDJ. Dr. Elschlepp declared that he would seek to have the youth removed from the legal custody of his father (57, p.2).

Werner Knop, who secretly visited "Russia's forbidden zone" during 1948, describes events at the University of Leipzig in 1947, which indicate Soviet control of university students. For political reasons the

university had been allowed to elect its student council on a fair basis. Knop states the Soviet Union had intended Leipzig to be a model city. Since 60 per cent of the undergraduates were studying on scholarships provided by the SED, the trade unions and other Communist-controlled bodies, the occupation officials had little fear of the election results. Knop describes election results as a "political sensation," since opponents of the SED gained a large majority. The new council blocked SED proposals in the university. Soviet authorities ordered the council to be dissolved. The new elections surprisingly brought victory again to SED opposition. The Soviet Military Administration permitted the council to operate for a time; then enforced strict controls (37, pp.64-65).

Knop interviewed a student who had attended a number of conferences with the Russians. The student said:

The whole affair was an extraordinary revelation of how the mind of these Soviet officers works. I remember one meeting at which the presiding officer, a colonel, beseeched us almost tearfully to show some gratitude for the magnanimity of the Russians. 'We do not want to purge the Students' Council,' he said, 'but having treated you well, we expect you to give us a quid pro quo. We have given you more freedom than any other university, and the least we can expect is that you come to terms with the SED.' In other words, they tolerated a measure of liberty in the anticipation that we would surrender voluntarily what they could have taken by force. It was
(Quotation continued on next page)

as if a highway robber, having left his victim with his purse, would request it as a reward for having been so civil. In the end the Russians grew thoroughly indignant. They told us we had confirmed their view that liberty tends to be abused and that only dictatorial discipline achieves results (37, p.65).

While the FDJ is not the only tool used by the Soviet Union to control youth activities, the FDJ is a typical and effective tool. Its monopolistic advantage is increased by its stress on emotionalism, militarism and nationalism, all familiar qualities to these youth trained in the Nazi era.

The number of FDJ members has been variously estimated. A significant half million paraded in Berlin, according to Western journalists (65, p.1). Ulbricht speaks of 800,000 members, although from the context of his words it is not possible to determine whether he refers to the FDJ or its juvenile replica, the Jungen Pioniere (3, p.23). In 1948 OMGUS reported that the FDJ claimed to have 500,000 members (45, p.17).

It is difficult to estimate how effectively the FDJ has captured the minds of youth in the Soviet zone. Undoubtedly there is some resistance. There are also German youth who follow FDJ activities with zeal and enthusiasm. Beall represents one opinion which officials of the Western Powers would like to believe is true.

It would no doubt be safe to say that the FDJ program would largely dissolve into a small handfull [sic] of people if the pressures and restraints and monopoly features were removed (8, p.2).

SCHOOL REFORM. Diversity characterizes school reform in the three western zones of Germany. The occupation powers have allowed the individual Länder to proceed individually.

Though school reform in each Land differs from that of all other Länder, there are some characteristic tendencies in all the Länder. These tendencies may be said to reflect objectives of the Western Powers.

Dr. Eugen Löffler, ministry of culture for the Land Württemberg-Baden, lists the general tendencies toward democratization. Freely translated, they include: the attempt to build the school organization on a single, unified structure; fulfillment of the challenge of social justice so that every youth can develop his individual talents regardless of his economic background; modernization of instruction methods and their correlation as far as possible to actual life; the establishment as far as possible of eight to nine years' full-time school attendance and of three additional years' part-time attendance in vocational school; and the instruction and guidance of pupils according to modern psychological principles (41, pp.1-2).

Löffler includes as typical the attempt to develop the democratic way of life through parents and teachers' associations, free discussion groups composed from all classes of the people to discuss educational problems, participation of the students in the administration of the school (41, p.2).

The aim of the school reform is to educate the students "zu selbständig denkenden Staatsbürgern mit hohem Verantwortungsgefühl (41, p.2)." That is, to develop independent-thinking citizens possessing a high degree of responsibility. This is practically the same goal professed by the German Democratic Republic in Article thirty-seven of its constitution. Practically, the same words appear: "zu selbständig denkenden, verantwortungsbewusst handelnden Menschen (53, p.22)."

Löffler states that the school reforms of the Länder of the Federal Republic of Germany place special emphasis on the social sciences. Introduction of new teachers with the new democratic spirit is particularly stressed. Material reconstruction of buildings, books, libraries, etc. is necessary for both the "inner" and "outer" school reforms. The question of modern school construction is pertinent also to the school reforms of the Länder (41, p.2).

In this manner, Löffler, a German educator,

characterizes the tendencies of school reform in Germany. The actual democratization reflects the wishes of the occupying powers only to a relative degree. While it is true that some German educators have advocated similar reforms for decades many Germans do not endorse all proposed reforms. What the Germans have changed in their educational system is considerably less than that requested by the occupying powers. Keohane states:

Those émigré Germans, and others, who have been worried by the possibility of a serious "Americanization" of German education may be reassured. They have overlooked the immense capacity of German educators for producing large plans which have little to do with what actually goes on in schools (35, p.413).

The German's resistance to many of the reforms precipitated the split in occupation opinion as to how the reforms should be accomplished. As previously noted, some educators favored direct action. However, the wishes of those favoring indirect action prevailed. Democracy as exemplified by the Western Powers in implementing German school reform is the democracy which rejects coercion and imposition as its methods. This still leaves unsolved the problem facing western democracy in Germany and in other parts of the world, when the occupied nation refuses to adopt voluntarily democratic practices, and despite the gentle stimulus of coaxing, prodding, rebuking and pleading, still stubbornly clings to its old undemocratic ways.

The Western Powers have not been entirely free of nationalistic tendencies in German youth reorientation. Keohane speaks of the tendency of the French to reform education "à la français" while the U. S. authorities a short distance away try mildly to "Americanize" some elements of the schools (35, p.410). Liddell notes that at the beginning of the occupation the British tried too hard "to graft British ways on to the German political consciousness or rather lack of it (39, p.50)."

It is only natural for an occupying power to think of its own country as having the finest and best of educational systems. Many educators undoubtedly sought to eliminate all conscious prejudice for their own country's system of education. Lawrence G. Derthick, chief of the Education Branch, Education and Cultural Relations Division, Bavaria, states: "It is important that the Germans realize that school reform is not a project for Americanizing the German system (47, p.5)." Dr. Grace, summarizing the fundamental principles agreed upon by educators from all U. S. zones who met in Berchtesgaden October 1948, warns: "We must not be guilty of attempting to transport the American educational system to Germany (22, p.543)."

Some educators expressed greater consideration for the German system. They conceded the superiority of

German education in some respects. Keohane states that those who worked with German educators may return home to view American educational problems in a new light.

Perhaps we shall try to strike a better balance between the deadening bureaucracy of the German and the excessive decentralization of the American systems of school administration. Perhaps we shall imitate Germans in giving a relatively high and secure social and economic status to our teachers, requiring in return that they be really well-educated men and women. Perhaps we shall learn that democracy does not preclude some special attention to the more thorough earlier education of the "gifted (35, p.415)."

Certain characteristics are true of school reforms in all three of the western zones. However, each occupying power has its own particular emphasis in advocating school reform measures.

FRENCH SCHOOL REFORM. France's emphasis, as numerous observers have noted, is on culture. Another characteristic is the high priority given to education for the very young. Zausmer and Bidwell both note the French attention to the very young as being the least contaminated by Nazism and therefore the most promising for redemption (72, p.47) (10, p.80). A natural result of this policy was to establish a new and accelerated program for training elementary school teachers.

The French have established special academies of university rank at Germersheim and Speyer for training civil servants, public relations specialists, diplomats,

interpreters and others. In textbook reform the French led both the British and American zones, at least in the early years of occupation. Zausmer reports, as of 1949, that the average German child in the French zone has four or five times as many textbooks as the child in the U. S. zone (72, p.47).

Bidwell observes that the French have broken with German tradition by providing living quarters for 800 students at the re-opened ancient University of Mayence, closed previously since 1915. The dormitory system and the grounds plan follow the British or American university plan (10, p.83).

Two other characteristics of French school reform previously mentioned are: placing of French observers in the German schools to give advice and to report on German conduct to higher French authorities (39, p.42); placing less emphasis on Latin in general education (39, p.41).

BRITISH SCHOOL REFORM. The British emphasis on school reform is more similar to the United States policy than the French. As in the U. S. zone there are confessional and private schools as well as the public schools. In the British zone the issue of confessional schools was left to a vote of the parents in the smaller administrative divisions of the country (11, p.33). The British, too, have been tolerant of German pride in the

old educational system. Birley makes this clear in explaining why the British did not insist on adoption of the six-year primary school. "This is essentially an educational problem and the opposing views can be, and are, sincerely held (11, p.39)." As previously noted, the British insisted that no legislation should make eventual adoption of the six-year primary school impossible.

The British considered university reform highly important. The British Military Governor appointed a separate commission to study the needs of university reform. Originally a delegation from the Association of University Teachers visited the universities of the British zone and later made a report. Birley calls this move a mistake, since the German universities naturally reacted against a report by foreigners. A new commission was appointed from representative Germans. Two foreigners--a British and a Swiss educator--were also included (11, p.41).

The British sponsor the exchange of numerous students and professors between England and Germany. Distinguished British lecturers tour the British zone in Germany. An international voluntary service reconstruction camp is sponsored each summer. Volunteers, usually

students from foreign countries, live, work, play and study with an equal number of German youth. The British state with some pride that they were the first to establish a school meals scheme, which preceded a similar U. S. plan by nine months. In 1947, 2,500,000 German school children in the British zone received a midday meal of 300 calories. There are a school broadcasting system and a special emergency college for training teachers (13, pp.14-16).

UNITED STATES SCHOOL REFORM. The United States uses a variety of methods to bring about school reform in Germany. Like the other Western Powers, the U. S. has urged the German Länder to pass laws to reform the school system. However, the American officials have generally agreed that the problem cannot be solved by laws. The German people must believe that the reforms will improve their education. Generally speaking, the U. S. has used a more indirect approach in encouraging reforms than either France or Great Britain. Many of the methods used in the U. S. occupation zone are not unique, but with few exceptions the U. S. has applied these methods more extensively and intensively than either France or Great Britain. The greater wealth of the U. S. has been only one of the contributing factors.

Textbook reform represents an exception. In the

early stages of occupation the U. S. zone lagged far behind the British and French zones in producing new books to replace those of the Nazi era. Zausmer rebukes the Americans for "this textbook calamity (72, p.49)." Keohane, taking a more apologetic attitude, attributes the snail's pace in producing new and revised textbooks to three factors: (1) shortage of newsprint; (2) lack of coordination between American educational authorities; (3) a "leaning-over-backwards" attitude to avoid any appearance of coercion (35, p.410). The last factor may typify the American emphasis on indirect reform of the German system.

Geographical distances make student and teacher exchanges more difficult for the United States than for any other occupying power. Nevertheless, the Exchanges Division expects that in 1950 the students participating in the program will total 1,000. In addition German school teachers and university professors have visited America. The U. S. government has not been the sole agency sponsoring the exchange program. Private organizations have been active in promoting exchange and other reorientation programs. The U. S. occupation officials assist and aid the work of private organizations (44, p.4).

Though designed for adults as much as for youth, the U. S. Information Centers serve indirectly to help

in the democratizing of German schools. Germans call these libraries of American books, newspapers and magazines, Amerika Häuser. In early 1950 there were twenty-five Amerika Häuser in key cities of the U. S. zone and in the U. S. sector of Berlin (44, p.11).

In reconstruction of German school buildings the U. S. occupation officials sought to instill the democratic spirit. American educators thought the new German schools should be built to fulfill democratic needs; and should be built through the cooperative planning of the community. The Americans wanted the Germans to do more than patch or repair the old bombed-out buildings. The U. S. educators sent a school building specialist to Bremen to help arrange a model exhibit. They encouraged Bremen citizens to develop a school building project on a community, cooperative basis (44, p.20).

Like the French and the British, the Americans also sought better training for elementary teachers. They encouraged Teacher Education Institutes in various Länder to develop a curriculum on a college level for elementary teachers. In Württemberg-Baden an international workshop held sessions from May 23 to August 12, 1949. Twenty-four German educators met with six consultants from neighboring countries and ten consultants from the United States to develop a new curriculum

for a model teacher training institute on a college level to include training for elementary, secondary and specialized types of teachers (44, p.23).

Eleven so-called Education Service Centers represent a similar approach. These centers have extensive library facilities on modern psychology, pedagogy and sociology. Directed by U. S. educators, the centers encourage Germans to:

...interest German educators in the psychological approach to learning and stimulate them to devise both curricula and methods for a new type of German education which will place the child, growing and developing in his capacities for knowledge and for social experiences, as the center of interest (44, p.27).

Another technique is the encouragement of the adult education schools. These can be considered as part of youth reorientation since 68 per cent of those enrolled in the U. S. zone are less than thirty years of age. Fifteen per cent are young people working toward high school or college degrees. Adult education centers are not unique in the U. S. zone. They are actually organized, supported and sponsored by the Germans. The U. S. does give financial aid to two schools, one in Bavaria and the other in Hesse. The U. S. also furnishes staff experts for advice and assistance to all adult education schools (44, p.44).

An important emphasis is the effort to interest

German citizens to take part in the management and direction of their schools. Representatives of OMGUS and later HICOG have sought to encourage lay participation in various ways. An American specialist in Bavaria organized teachers' "steering committees" and later citizen groups to review school practices, "with an eye to reform (44, p.28)."

An international conference on comparative education was sponsored at Chiemsee in Bavaria, April 25-29, 1949. Educators from twelve European countries and the U. S. met with eighty German educators from the western zones (44, p.28). Other approaches included the establishment of a school for journalism, more or less American style (47, pp.38-40). The U. S. officials claim, also, to have brought about "the first political science conference in German university history (44, p.47)."

Initiative came from an American consultant, Professor Carl Loewenstein. Political scientists from England, France and the United States met with German educators and government officials from all of the western zones to discuss the introduction of political science courses in German universities. In the same year 1949 some German professors visited American colleges on the exchange program. In the words of the Information Bulletin:

Professors visited Harvard, Yale, Chicago and Michigan, and returned to Germany to introduce courses in political parties, constitutional law, preparative government and other subjects which have not been taught in Germany since 1933 or in some cases not at all during the twentieth century (44, p.47).

The American Affairs Institute at the University of Munich represents another youth reorientation program. It is called "the first school of its kind in Europe to present a comprehensive and well-rounded program on American life extending into all major academic fields (30, p.5)." When Dr. Henry F. Peters of Reed College, was invited to the University of Munich as professor of American literature, he conceived the idea for a school embracing all academic fields. The Institute, encouraged by the U. S. occupation officials, is sponsored and supported by the Bavarian Government and the Rockefeller Foundation (30, p.5).

The need for such an institution is demonstrated by an analysis of German university courses. American subjects at German universities were in fifteenth place as compared with subjects of other nations.

During 1948-1949, only 47 lectures on the United States of America were in the programs of German universities while the British Commonwealth of Nations was the subject of 500 lectures (44, p.26).

Perhaps the most dramatic example of youth reorientation is the Free University of Berlin (Freie

Universität Berlin). This university was established in the U. S. sector of Berlin in 1948. It exemplifies close cooperation between Americans and Germans, aided also by the British and French; represents the clash between East and West; and demonstrates what a democratic university means to the Western Powers in contrast to the Soviet Union.

Howard W. Johnston, U. S. education official, tells the story (47, pp.13-16). The old and famous Humboldt University of Berlin lies in the Russian sector. After the occupation began, the Soviet Union began "democratizing" the university.

As 1946 drew to a close it was apparent that the Soviet authorities were fitting the university into a definite plan. Extra food and coal were allotted to professors and special favors granted to students. The sons and daughters of workers were favored over those of professional men and "capitalists". A strongly communist preparatory school was established to provide the university with party-liners. A separate teachers faculty was formed and this was being filled with communist instructors. Communist professors were brought in to fill key positions on the legal, economics and philosophical faculties. By making some of these courses compulsory, by requiring special examinations and by making sure that ample brochures for instruction were printed, the new school soon felt the pressure of the Communist Party line (47, p.14).

Student resistance developed and increased when six student opposition leaders were kidnapped in the spring of 1947. The student magazine, Colloquium, became

the spokesman of student opposition. In April 1948 three of the Colloquium editors were arbitrarily expelled. There was no reference to the regularly constituted system for student discipline. Students held two large demonstrations against the action (47, p.14).

Resistance grew. Civic leaders took the part of the rebelling students. The city assembly, meeting in the Soviet sector, May 10, voted 83-17 to try once again to place the school on Unter den Linden under the Magistrat and, if this should fail, to found a new and free university in the western sectors of the city. The SED party opposed the action and refused to share control of the university (47, p.14).

The city officials led by Mayor Ernst Reuter began the difficult task of establishing the new university. The main task fell on the Germans. Johnston states that in the American sector the Germans were promised nothing except temporary assistance and whatever help might be possible through regular military government channels. However, the commandant of the U. S. sector, gave the program strong support from the beginning (47, pp.14-15).

Not until August did the Germans learn that \$600,000 had been made available to them from a fund accrued from the sale of German publications issued in the United

States. The work continued and on December 4, 1948 a formal opening was held. In 1949 the student body numbered 2,200 students selected from more than 5,000 applicants. The university had fifteen buildings. The medical students also used hospitals located in the French and British sectors. Twenty-five per cent of the students were women. Less than eight per cent were former officers of the army or of Hitler organizations. Johnston thinks this is perhaps the lowest ratio of any German university. Twenty per cent were the sons and daughters of laborers, which Johnston compares to the three per cent for German universities before the war (47, pp.13-16).

The Free University of Berlin perhaps represents the best application of the U. S. youth reorientation policy. It was an "observe, advise and assist" policy which provided indirect but constructive help. The zeal and action came from the Germans themselves. Of their own volition they established a university espousing some of the reform measures advocated by the Western Powers.

SOVIET SCHOOL REFORM. The Soviet Union's school reforms in eastern Germany may be said to consist of two parts. The first part is theoretical; the second, practical. The first involves the reorganization of the educational structure into one unified system which will

give equal educational opportunity for all. The second consists of the practical controls used to force all education into a rigid mould reflecting Marxist principles and serving the present political purposes of Communism.

The practical controls apply to students, teachers and curriculum. Most significant are the controls on teachers. Through teachers the Soviet Union expects to control all education. A corps of "Neulehrer" have been trained to teach the new "people's democracy." Academic qualifications are not important. The one essential is that the teacher be "politically correct" in the eyes of the SED, the political organ of the Communist party.

The controls have distorted the theoretical democracy of the German Democratic Republic which promises to give equality of education regardless of class or economic circumstances. The controls have not only opened the doors of education to the sons of the farmers and laborers. The controls have also pushed these sons into educational channels regardless of ability or inclination. The controls have excluded those talented poor who have the Communistic misfortune of being born to middle or upper class parents. The controls have made teachers of those who are poorly qualified academically but are willing to espouse the Communist doctrine.

Control measures have been gradually extended.

Education in eastern Germany is a tool not only for moulding German youth into the Marxist pattern, but also in fostering hate and contempt for the Western Powers, especially the United States.

THEORETICAL REFORMS. Examining first the theoretical side of school reform in the Soviet zone, one finds little to criticize. Lilge points out that the reorganization of the school system in the Soviet zone more closely resembles the school system of the United States than do the educational reforms which have thus far been carried out in the western zones (40, p.39). This applies to the organizational structure of the schools, established in May 1946 by the law for democratization of the German schools (40, p.38). Though adopted individually by the Länder, this law is for all practical purposes the same in each Land. The law established the Einheitschule, a single-track educational system.

Frank Vogel, a student in philosophy at the University of Leipzig and a representative for the Studentenrat or student council at this Eastern zone school, describes this law for the Land Sachsen (64, pp.1-2). He states this law can also be considered to represent the other Länder.

Paragraph one describes the purpose of education. It resembles closely the section on education in the

constitution of the German Democratic Republic. It maintains that all, regardless of parentage, economic circumstances, etc., shall have an education corresponding to interests and talents (64, p.1).

Paragraph two says education is the duty of the state. Religion is the affair of religious organizations and no longer the concern of the school.

Das soll aber nicht heissen, dass die Schule am christlichen Gedankengut vorübergehen kann. Sie wird dieses genauso in den Mittelpunkt ihres Unterrichts stellen wie die Ideen und Taten der modernen Arbeiterbewegung, die allerdings bisher keinen Platz in der Schule hatten (64, p.1).

(This does not mean that the school can neglect the Christian ideas. They shall be in the same center point of instruction as the ideas and deeds of the modern worker's movement which certainly hitherto had no position in the school.)

Paragraph two states that for boys and girls alike there is the same, organically-divided, democratic school system--the democratic Einheitschule. Paragraph three explains this school system which includes all education from kindergarten to university. After kindergarten the pupil attends an eight-year Grundschule. This is followed by the four-year Oberschule which leads to the university. Or, after finishing the Grundschule, the student may elect to attend the vocational schools--the Berufs- und Fachschulen. The Berufsschule has a three-

year course. The Fachschule has continuing courses which permit the student to enter the university without attendance of the Oberschule (64, pp.1-2).

The curriculum of the eight-year compulsory elementary school or Grundschule includes German, history, geography, biology, physics, chemistry, mathematics, foreign languages, art, manual workshops, music and physical education. In the fifth year all children begin a modern foreign language. In the seventh and eighth school years additional courses are offered in a second foreign language and in mathematics and natural sciences (64, pp.1-2).

Observers differ as to what foreign language is actually being taught in the fifth year of the Grundschule. Lilge states that the new school law specifies a modern foreign language--Russian, English or French (40, p.38). Vogel merely states that it will be a modern foreign language (64, p.2). Böttcher, citing an article from the Swiss newspaper, Die Tat, Zürich, May 1949, states that the Russian language is compulsory from the fifth year (12, p.5). The former educator at Kranichfeld in the Russian zone reports that the Russian language is obligatory from the fifth year and that English is optional at the seventh school year. He states this was provided by the new curriculum plan issued by Berlin headquarters

in the summer of 1946 for the entire Russian zone (58, p.9). Steinbrecher states that early in the occupation English was often taught in the fifth year. Now, however, Russian is taught exclusively, since enough teachers have been trained to accomplish this. Some of these teachers teach Russian exclusively (63, p.4).

Lilge describes the "two differentiated programs of study" which the new school law provides, beginning with the seventh and eighth grades. One program is for those scientifically inclined; the other, for those linguistically inclined. The Oberschule, which follows the Grundschule, has a core curriculum embodying economic and cultural requirements of modern life and also providing for the continuation of the differentiated study programs already started in grades seven and eight of the Grundschule (40, pp.38-39).

Steinbrecher mentions still a third program of study, a "gymnasialer Zweig" (classical branch), but he adds that this program is seldom followed (63, p.4).

Vogel states that paragraph four of the new school law deals with the curriculum (64, p.2). He does not elaborate. Lilge, whose summary of this law agrees in practically all points with that of Vogel, states that paragraph four requires all instruction to follow curricula approved by the Central Educational Office in

Berlin (40, p.39).

Vogel continues his summary to state that paragraph five provides free education in the Grundschule and the three-year Berufsschule. Students of less privileged parents are to receive additional education through free tuition in the Fachschule and through scholarships, stipends and other help measures in the Oberschule and university. Especially noteworthy, Vogel remarks, is the association of the school with the youth organizations, Freie Deutsche Jugend and Junge Pioniere.

The Constitution for the German Democratic Republic, formulated after the above-mentioned school law, makes several pertinent references to education. School attendance is declared compulsory until completion of the eighteenth year of age. All citizens are said to have the right to attend the universities through Vorstudienanstalten or special preparatory schools which permit by-passing of the Oberschule (53, p.22).

The new Soviet school reform also plans a Zentral-schule for rural areas to act in the same capacity for the country as the Einheitschule for the cities. In the Einheitschule the kindergarten, the eight years of the Grundschule and the four years of the Oberschule are placed in one building and under one administration. The Zentralschule is to be located centrally in a rural area.

It is to include the fifth to eighth years of the Grundschule and at least the first two years of the Oberschule. The Zentralschule is also to serve as a boarding school. The first four years of the Grundschule are to be taught in village schools of the rural area (58, p.6).

PRACTICAL CONTROLS. In theory the German school system in the Eastern zone embodies the highest aspirations of western democracy. In practice that system denies the fundamental principles of western democracy. American educators have seen the Soviet-controlled educational system at work in Berlin. The comments of Johnston on the Free University of Berlin indicate Soviet methods at the Humboldt University of Berlin. Reports from the archives of the Social Democrats indicate that relatively the same pattern of Soviet controls exists in the rest of the Eastern zone.

STUDENTS. Eastern zone authorities stress educational opportunity for children of the farming and laboring classes. The law for the participation of youth in the construction of the German Democratic Republic claims these children make up the following ratios in the schools: one-third of the Oberschule pupils as compared to between 5 and 7 per cent in 1939; 34 per cent of the university students as compared to about 3 per cent in pre-war years. In addition, there are special colleges for workers

and farmers in the universities (3, p.44).

Children of other classes apparently receive little encouragement for higher education. Professor Steinbrecher states that only the children of workers and farmers and of the functionaries of the SED and other "Überparteilichen Organisationen" (super-party organizations) receive scholarships and stipends (63, p.10).

In 1946, Steinbrecher reports, it was already obvious that the Soviet Union intended to lower the intellectual level of the universities and to create willful tools in the academic professions, especially among the teachers, by admitting young people with only elementary education to higher studies (63, p.10).

Steinbrecher states that in 1947 a Russian Captain, Jeftschenko, of Schwerin in Land Mecklenburg, rebuked a school superintendent for having admitted too many children of the intellectual classes into the Internat (boarding school) of the high school. Jeftschenko said:

In Russland hat man die Intelligenz liquidiert; in Deutschland geht das nicht, da muss sie von den höheren Schulen ferngehalten werden (63, p.10).

(In Russia one has liquidated the intelligence; that is not possible in Germany. Here one must keep them away from higher education.)

Steinbrecher supports the principle of helping the talented children of workers and peasants, but insists

that all talented children of the poor classes be helped (63, p.10).

He refuses to make teachers of students--as he claims the Soviet officials have required of him--who can hardly write German correctly, merely because they are Communists and work actively for the Soviet Union. Steinbrecher claims that "one" goes into the factories and into the country and presses young people into the universities with all kinds of promises. "Ich kenne verschiedene Fälle, wo die Betreffenden unglücklich sind, weil sie nicht mitkommen und kein Interesse am rein Geistigen haben (63, p.10)." (I know various cases, where the ones concerned are unhappy, because they cannot keep up with the studies and they have no interest in the intellectual studies.)

Students who receive higher education must meet certain political qualifications. The "talented" children who are selected to enter the Oberschule after completion of the Grundschule are chosen by a committee. The Social Democrats report that the SED possesses the majority in this committee. Scholastic talent is a secondary consideration in selection. Decisive is the status of the child's parents, particularly the political status. It is claimed that because of "social needs" the children of middle-class parents should be held back (60, p.32).

Böttcher, citing the Swiss newspaper, Die Tat (Zürich, Mai 1949, 14, Jahrgang Nr. 135), gives the priority for entering the universities and technical schools of university level; (1) children of farmers and workers; (2) victims of Fascism; (3) politische Aktivisten or those active in promoting the cause and doctrines of "the new democracy"; (4) secondary school graduates whose parents were intellectuals, engineers, etc. The practical result is that members of the fourth group are excluded from the universities (12, p.5).

In the archives of the Social Democratic Party is a copy of a test given to applicants for the Technikum Ilmenau in Thuringia. A Technikum is a technical school on university level. Among other things, the candidates had to answer one hundred questions to the satisfaction of the SED. One candidate left three questions unanswered. He was refused admittance. In this case 60 per cent of the candidates were rejected.

Some significant questions¹ included in the test are (55, pp.1-2):

1. What are monopolies?
(Questions continued on next page)

1. For a complete list of the questions in German see Appendix 1.

2. What are classes?
3. Examples of class struggle?
4. Examples of the misuse of the national conscience of the people by capitalism?
6. The laws of dialectic?
9. What significance has dialectical materialism for science?
10. What is historical materialism?
12. What is capital?
13. How does exploitation take place in capitalism?
21. The founders of scientific socialism?
22. The birth document of the worker's movement?
24. Principles of Soviet foreign policies?
28. The democratic school reform?
32. What is real and formal democracy?
Examples?
33. Which form of government will Germany have?
34. What is to be understood by anti-fascist democratic order?
36. Why is the Vatican against the Land reform?
38. What form of government has the Soviet Union?
40. What is people's democracy?
41. What forms of dictatorship exist?
43. Is the national policy a progressive policy?
45. What forms of socialism are there?
Explanation!
46. How does the transition take place from the capitalistic to the social order?
53. What does the dictatorship of the proletariat mean?
55. Significance of the Ruhr for Germany?
56. What significance do the events in China have for us?
58. Significance of the steel works in the Eastern zone?
60. Is there a free science?
66. Results of the World Peace Congress in Paris?
67. Marshall plan?
71. How do you judge the Ruhr statute, Oder-Neisse border, separation of the Rhine-Ruhr area?

(Questions continued on next page)

75. How do you judge the Bonn constitution?
76. The constitution of the German Democratic Republic?
77. What position does the Soviet Union hold in the camp for peace? Why?
78. What purpose does the anti-Soviet propaganda of the Western Powers serve?
96. Significance of the October revolution?
98. Results of the second imperialistic World War?
99. Characteristics of German imperialism?
100. Leninism?

TEACHERS. A primary objective of the Soviet school reform in occupied Germany was the development of a corps of new teachers. "Neulehrer" is the term applied by the Germans, a term which has become odious to those traditional German educators who consider the new teachers as academic incompetents. However, it is these same traditional German educators whom the Soviet Union considered as "reactionaries" and whose replacement was an essential part of the reform.

The Social Democrats' Denkschriften 24, which describes the cultural politics of the Soviet Union, states that the courses established to train the "Neulehrer" were at first only four to six weeks in duration. Later when it was apparent that the academic ability of the new teachers was not equal to the task, the time of training was extended to eight months (60, pp.30-31).

The educator from Kranichfeld states that the first courses for the new teachers were eight weeks in

length. The "Neulehrer" were then either assigned to "schon bestehenden Lehrerkollegien" (already existing teaching staffs) or they were appointed as completely independent "Dorfschullehrer" (village teachers) (58, p.2).

The Kranichfeld educator reports that in 1946 courses of eight-months training were initiated for the "Neulehrer". These were scientific basic training courses. Later special courses for individual teachers, according to talent and ability, were established on three to six months basis. These included courses for history, biology, etc. In addition to these two short courses, complete three-year training programs were established for teachers at the Pädagogischen Instituten or teacher's colleges (58, p.2). Special one-year training schools provided teachers for the Russian language. Similar training for teachers of English was established in the Arbeitsgemeinschaften.

Steinbrecher mentions the opening of six Pädagogischen Fakultäten at Berlin, Halle, Leipzig, Rostock, Greifswald and Dresden (63, p.4).

The basis for selecting these "Neulehrer" is significant. The Kranichfeld educator reports that the Russians proceed from this theory: "...jeder kann alles und Wissenschaftler und Intelligenzler sind überflüssig".

(58, p.2). That is, anyone can do everything and scientists and intellectuals are superfluous. According to this principle, teachers who had no previous training but who had formerly belonged to the Communist youth were accepted in the early days of occupation (58, p.2).

New teachers are now selected on the same basis as the higher employees and officials in the Soviet zone. They are taken first from the social class of peasants and workers. When the number from this group is insufficient, sons and daughters from craftsmen and the property-owning class are admitted in limited number.

Decisive for the selection of the teachers are the following questions (58, p.2):

1. Are you a worker or do you come from the property-owning class?
2. Who are your parents?
3. What is their profession?
4. Did they belong to the NSDAP?
5. Are you a member of the SED?
6. Do you belong to the Freien Deutschen Gewerkschaftsbund?
7. What training do you have?

According to the answers to these questions, the applicant is accepted or refused without an examination (58, p.2).

The selection and training of these "Neulehrer"

hardly provides a high degree of academic competence. Disrespect for the "Neulehrer" adds to the resistance against Communism. The Kranichfeld educator claims the children ridicule the new teachers, who lack confidence and make many mistakes. He thinks the ridicule will become hate. He reports that even seven and eight-year-olds place chairs and tables in front of the doors, smear shoe polish on the door knobs and do other pranks which he feels are indicative of much more than youthful enthusiasm (60, p.14).

CURRICULUM. The curriculum is carefully controlled in the Soviet zone. The Social Democratic party reports that the Soviet occupation officials permit no deviations from the established curriculum plan. Special importance is placed on the teaching of history. It is usually taught by specially trained and selected teachers who are Communists (60, p.31). The Kranichfeld educator states that these teachers present history to youth as the history of class struggle (58, p.13). Social Democrats claim that history is treated as subjectively as in the time of the Nazi regime. Lectures in history, philosophy and economy can only be given by teachers who do not represent middle-class opinions. Expressions of opinion which deviate from "vorgeschrieben Richtungen" (in this case the approved Marxist philosophy) are

considered reactionary (60, pp.31-32).

Steinbrecher reports that the Soviet Major, Patent, delivered four lectures at the University of Rostock in which he classified all philosophy as pure idealism and not equal in importance to the teachings of Marx and Lenin. Patent later demanded in the summer of 1947 that the East German universities give "Marxismus-Leninismus" at least as much emphasis as philosophy (63, p.9).

Steinbrecher states that detailed lecture plans must be submitted a semester in advance by university professors to official headquarters in Karlshorst for approval. The lecture material must be divided into individual class hours (63, p.11).

The controlled curriculum is as evident in the elementary and secondary schools as in the universities. In addition, every effort is made to integrate the school curriculum into the social and political plans which the Soviet Union has for Germany. Considered absolutely essential to the curriculum is the Two-year plan of the German Democratic Republic. The Central Ministry for People's Education reported in May 1949:

Der Zweijahrplan ist ein untrennbarer Bestandteil des gesamten Lehrplans....Unsere Kinder sollen die Schule als aktive Kämpfer für den Zweijahrplan verlassen (23, p.2)

(The Two-year plan is an inseparable element of the total teaching plan....Our children must leave the schools as active fighters for the Two-year plan.)

Supplementing the curriculum are the pictures of Russian statesmen which hang on the classroom walls. Social Democrats report that in Thuringia quotations from Stalin or Lenin are read before classes begin. On school holidays the children sing Communist battle songs.

Curriculum, teachers and students are all closely controlled to achieve the fundamental objective of the Soviet Union's democratic school reform. That objective is to mould German youth into the Communist pattern. All else is secondary. Nothing is to be tolerated which disagrees with the political and economic views of Soviet Union officials. Absolute authoritarianism and police controls characterize the school reform.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

SUMMARY. The Western Powers and the Soviet Union claim to represent democracy in reorienting the youth of occupied Germany and to seek the same objectives--freedom, peace and equality of opportunity for all. However, the writer believes that this investigation indicates a fundamentally different interpretation and application of democracy by the Western Powers and by the Soviet Union.

There are a few points of agreement. Both the East and the West find the Nazi atmosphere intolerable, but for different reasons. Both insist that all youth training must have as a primary purpose the development of the good citizen; but they fundamentally disagree on the means and methods to be employed to achieve this goal, as well as on the rights and responsibilities of the good citizen. Both insist that in a democracy education from kindergarten to university should be unified in a single one-track system which does not discriminate against the lower-income classes.

The Western Powers seek to show German youth that democracy means a government resting upon the consent of the governed as expressed through parliamentary practices.

Tolerance and freedom of expression are basic principles. The democracy of the Western Powers welcomes public discussion and all criticism, as long as physical violence is not advocated. Youth must be trained to express themselves intelligently and forcefully in the peaceful parliamentary practices.

The majority opinion of the Western Powers disapproves of coercion as a method of teaching democracy. Some individuals of all three of these western democracies believe that the Germans should be forced to accept certain practices of western democracy, especially in formal education, since it is feared that the Germans will never achieve these forms of democracy voluntarily. The French fear for security has caused France as a nation to advocate this approach. Great Britain disapproves of coercion, but favors more direct controls than the United States. The official policy of the United States is that democracy can only be achieved by an evolutionary process in which the Germans are persuaded rather than forced to accept democracy.

Democracy to the Soviet Union is a social-economic system based on the teachings of Marx and Lenin. Equality of opportunity means that all property must be owned by the state as opposed to the capitalistic system of private ownership. These principles cannot be criticized by the

citizen. Freedom is the right to work for these principles, to report to government officials those who do not accept these principles and to cooperate wholeheartedly with the government to achieve social, economic and also political goals of the Soviet Union. At the present time this means hating the United States and all other countries which do not have the Soviet form of government or which stand in the way of Soviet political ambition.

Contrary to the ideals of the Western Powers, the Soviet Union democracy follows the principle that the end justifies the means. The Soviet Union uses police controls, "informers," hypocrisy and other means of deception and coercion to achieve political and economic objectives. The Soviet democracy finds it necessary to control absolutely and authoritatively the total school system and all youth activities. Political front organizations, such as the SED and the FDJ, help the government maintain police controls, and stimulate the people to greater effort for the Communist cause.

The Western Powers have yet to give sufficient priority to the German youth reorientation program. The people of the Western Powers do not fully realize how much the western democracy depends upon education and youth activities. Public inertia and the authoritative,

inflexible structure of military occupation have retarded the development of democratic ways in German youth. The independent ways of the three Western Powers have placed another obstacle before the development of a unified, effective youth reorientation program.

The Soviet Union gives the highest priority to German youth reorientation, since through youth the police state strengthens its controls and stifles the questioning mind so dangerous to the police state. Therefore, the Soviet democracy, which in theory promises equal opportunity for all, discriminates against all those individuals who refuse to accept Soviet democracy because of personal courage, moral conscience or intelligence.

Only a dynamic western democracy can meet the challenge of Communism in a Germany whose citizens are accustomed to authoritarian controls and know little of parliamentary practices and freedom of discussion. Therefore, the Western Powers should give top priority to the youth reorientation program in Germany. It is the German youth of today and tomorrow who will create the new Germany.

Contrary to the opinion of many critics who expect a full-fledged democracy to emerge overnight in Germany, the Western Powers have made considerable progress in German youth reorientation. Above all, the Germans are

convinced of American good will, even while they sometimes doubt American good judgment. Teaching democracy is a long and difficult process which requires careful planning, coordination and skillful execution. The Western Powers are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of youth reorientation in Germany, of German psychology and culture, of the need for an integrating program. With patience and hard work, the Western Powers may make their democracy endure in Germany, while the democracy of the Soviet Union will last only as long as the police controls, which support it, remain.

LITERATURE CITED

1. Almond, Gabriel A. (ed). The struggle for democracy in Germany. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina, 1949. 345p.
2. American association of school administrators. Official report. Regional conventions 1949. Washington D. C., American association of school administrators, May 1949. 224p.
3. Amt für Information der Regierung der deutschen demokratischen Republik. Die Regierung der deutschen demokratischen Republik hilft der Jugend. Sachsen, Landesdruckerei Sachsen, 1950. 56p. (Heft 5)
4. Auditorium, FDJ Studentenzeitung der Humboldt-Universität Berlin, pp.1-10. 5. February 1950.
5. Barton, Betty. The problem of 12 million German refugees in today's Germany. Philadelphia, American friends service committee, 1949. 39p.
6. Bayerischer Jugendring. Junges Leben. München, Bayerischer Jugendring, ohne Datum. Ohne nummerierte Seiten. (No numbered pages. No date given, but probably 1949 or 1950)
7. Beall, Hayes. Personal letter, Superior, Wisconsin, June 6, 1950. 1p.
8. Beall, Hayes. Personal letter, Superior, Wisconsin, June 6, 1950. 2p.
9. Becker, Howard. German youth: bond or free. New York, Oxford, 1946. 286p.
10. Bidwell, Percy W. Emphasis on culture in the French zone. Foreign affairs 27:78-85. October 1948.
11. Birley, Robert. Education in the British zone of Germany. International affairs 26:32-44. January 1950.

12. Böttcher, Reinhild. Die demokratische Erziehung der deutschen Jugend. Göttingen, Pädagogisches Seminar der Universität Göttingen, 1950. 19p. (Typewritten report, attached to letter from the director of the education seminar at the University of Göttingen, July 1, 1950. Reinhild Böttcher is a member of the seminar.)
13. British information services reference division. Britain and cultural reconstruction in Europe. New York, British information services reference division, 1948. 22p. (I. D. 870)
14. Clay, Lucius. New York Herald-Tribune, p. 19. October 27, 1949.
15. Control commission for Germany (British element). Building reconstruction. Monthly report of the control commission for Germany (British element) 4:16-19. January 1949.
16. Counts, George S. and Nucia Lodge. The country of the blind. Boston, Houghton, 1949. 378p.
17. Deiters, Heinrich. Schule und jugenderziehung in den deutschen verfassungen der gegenwart. Berlin, Sonderdruck aus der Zeitschrift Pädagogik Nr. 8:4 Jahrgang 1-11. 1949.
18. De Long, Vaughn R. School reform in Land Hesse. The American school board journal 117:39-40, 83. October 1948.
19. Department of state. United States of America publication 2583. The present status of German youth. By Henry J. Kellermann. Washington D. C., Government printing office, 1946. 25p. (European series 11).
20. Department of state. United States of America publication 2664. Report of the United States education mission to Germany. Washington D. C., Government printing office, 1946. 50p. (European series 16)
21. Department of state. United States of America publication 2783. Occupation of Germany, policy and progress 1945-46. Washington D. C., Government printing office, August 1947. 24lp. (European series 23)

22. Department of state. United States of America publication 3556. Germany 1947-1949, the story in documents. Washington D. C., Government printing office, March 1950. 631p. (European and British Commonwealth series 9)
23. Deutsche Verwaltung für Volksbildung (jetzt Volksbildungsministerium). Volksbildung und Erziehung. Berlin, Deutsche Verwaltung für Volksbildung, Mai 1949. 4p. (As reported by the Social Democratic Party, April 17, 1950, in a report attached to the letter of R. Thomas, Social Democratic Party official, April 21, 1950.)
24. Educational policies commission. Education for all American youth. Washington D. C., National education association of the United States, 1944. 421p.
25. Frost, Norman. Some post-war problems of German schools. Peabody journal of education 26:338-342. 1949.
26. German university commission appointed by the military governor for the British zone of Germany. University reform in Germany. London, His majesty's stationery office, 1949. 67p.
27. Gollancz, Victor. In darkest Germany. Hinsdale, Henry Regnery, 1947. 252p.
28. Grace, Alonzo G., Basic elements of educational reconstruction in Germany. Washington D.C., Commission on the occupied areas, American council on education, 1949. 14p.
29. Hill, Russell. Struggle for Germany. New York, Harper, 1947. 260p.
30. Hoggan, David L. American affairs institute. Information bulletin 7:5-6. February 1950.
31. Hopkins, L. Thomas. Educational progress in Germany. Teachers college record 51:14-21. October 1949.
32. Howe, Frederic C. Socialized Germany. New York, Charles Scribner's sons, 1915. 342p.

33. Johnsen, Julia E. (compiler). The dilemma of post-war Germany. The reference shelf. New York, Wilson, 1948. 304p. (Volume 20. No. 3)
34. Keller, Franklin J. Germany--a clinical case. High points in the work of the high schools of New York City 30:22-43. April 1948.
35. Keohane, Robert E. Dilemmas of German re-education: reflections upon an experiment noble in purpose. The school review 57:405-415. 1949.
36. Knappen, Marshall Mason. And call it peace. Chicago, University of Chicago, 1947. 213p.
37. Knop, Werner. Prowling Russia's forbidden zone. New York, Knopf, 1949. 200p.
38. Ley, Dr. Robert (ed.). Organisationsbuch der NSDAP. 3. Auflage. München, Zentralverlag der NSDAP, Franz Eher Nachfolger, 1937. 556p.
39. Liddell, Helen. Education in occupied Germany: a field study. International affairs 24:30-62. January 1948.
40. Lilge, Frederic. German educational reforms in the Soviet zone of occupation. The Harvard educational review 18:35-46. Winter 1948.
41. Löffler, Eugen. Neuere Entwicklungen im Schulwesen der deutschen Länder. Bonn, Ständige Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 9. Juni 1950. 13p.
(Typewritten report, attached to letter from the general secretary of the ministers of culture of the states in the Federal Republic of Germany, June 16, 1950.)
42. Melby, Ernest O. Our responsibility in Germany. The journal of educational sociology 23:68-77.
43. Middleton, Drew. The struggle for Germany. Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1949. 304p.

44. Office of the United States high commissioner for Germany. Information bulletin. Special issue: 1-73. January 1950.
45. Office of the United States military government for Germany. Education and cultural relations division. German youth between yesterday and tomorrow 1 April 1947 - 30 April 1948. Office of military government, adjutant general, April 30, 1948. 36p. (third of a series)
46. Office of the United States military government for Germany. Education and cultural relations division. Handbook of education statistics (United States occupied area of Germany). Office of military government, adjutant general, July 1949. 67p.
47. Office of the United States high commissioner for Germany. Educational and cultural activities in Germany today. Reprints from Information Bulletin, magazine of U. S. occupation authorities in Germany, issues published in 1949. Frankfurt, Office of the United States high commissioner for Germany, Office of public affairs, 1949. 55p.
48. Office of the United States military government for Germany. Interdivisional reorientation committee. Cultural exchange program. Reproduction division, Nurnberg, Germany, Office of military government, February 1949. 80p.
49. Prakken, Lawrence W. American educational policy in Germany. The education digest 13:1-6. October 1947.
50. Röpke, Wilhelm, The solution of the German problem. New York, G. P. Putnam's sons, 1947. 282p.
51. Russell, James E. German higher schools. 2d ed. New York, Longmans, Green, 1910.
52. Russell, William F. Teaching Germans to teach themselves. Foreign affairs 27:68-77. October 1948.
53. Sekretariat des deutschen Volksrates. Die Verfassung der deutschen demokratischen Republik. Berlin, Kongress-Verlag GmbH, 1949. 48p.

54. Seydewitz, Max. Civil life in wartime Germany. New York, Viking, 1945. 448p.
55. Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands. Aufnahmeprüfung für 18-20-jährige beim Technikum Ilmenau in Thüringen. Hannover, Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands, 10. Februar 1950. (Attached to letter of R. Thomas, Social Democratic Party official, April 21, 1950.)
56. Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands. Bericht über die Berufsschulen in der Ostzone. Hannover, Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands, 18. Juni 1949. 3p. (Attached to letter of Dr. Christian Gneuss, Social Democratic Party official, March 21, 1950.)
57. Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands. Bericht über die Umorganisierung der höheren Schulen in der Ostzone. Hannover, Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands, 26. Juli 1949. 2p. (Attached to letter of R. Thomas, Social Democratic Party official, April 21, 1950.)
58. Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands. Die Entwicklung des Schulwesens in der Ostzone von 1945 bis zur Gegenwart. Hannover, Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands, 20. Mai 1949. 16p. Attached to letter of R. Thomas, Social Democratic Party official, April 21, 1950.)
59. Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands. Gesellschaftswissenschaft statt Wirtschaftswissenschaft. Hannover, Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands, 21 Mai 1949. 1p. (Attached to letter of R. Thomas, Social Democratic Party official, April 21, 1950.)
60. Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands. Methoden und Ziele der Kulturpolitik in der Sowjetzone. Hannover, Vorstand der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands, 1948. 48p. (Denkschriften 24)
61. Sparks, Fred. The Oregonian, p. 2. June 23, 1950.
62. Sparks, Fred. The Oregonian, p. 3. June 27, 1950.

63. Steinbrecher. Bericht über die Verhältnisse an der Universität, über den sowjetisch-kommunistischen Einfluss und über die Lehrerausbildung in der Sowjetzone. Hannover, Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands, 1950. 13p. (Attached to letter of R. Thomas, Social Democratic Party official, April 21, 1950.)
64. Studentenrat der Universität Leipzig. Material von Studenten einer Studiengruppe für Publizistik an der philosophischen Fakultät. Brief, Studentenrat der Universität Leipzig, 24. Mai 1950.
65. The Oregonian, p. 1. May 28, 1950.
66. Thompson, Dorothy. The Oregonian, p. 16. June 2, 1950.
67. Tone, Fred H. and Hans Warninghoff. The Bremen school reform. The educational forum 14:331-337. 1950.
68. Warburg, James P. Germany--bridge or battleground. New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1947. 386p.
69. Wir Alle ? :1-23. Oktober 1949. Herausgegeben von der Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Jugendschrifttum, Wiesbaden, Deutschland.
70. Wir Alle ? :1-23. Januar 1950. Herausgegeben von der Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Jugendschrifttum, Wiesbaden, Deutschland.
71. Wir Alle ? :1-23. Februar 1950. Herausgegeben von der Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Jugendschrifttum, Wiesbaden, Deutschland.
72. Zausmer, Otto. Losing the war in Germany. The atlantic monthly 184:45-49. December 1949.
73. Zentralrat der freien deutschen Jugend. Die Verfassung der freien deutschen Jugend. Berlin, Verlag Neues Leben GmbH, 1949. 46p.
74. Zink, Harold. American military government in Germany. New York, Macmillan, 1947. 272p.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

The questions listed below were asked of students who applied for admission to the technical school, Ilmenau, in Thuringia. See pages 163-165 for English translations of typical questions.

1. Was sind Monopole?
2. Was sind Klassen?
3. Beispiele des Klassenkampfes?
4. Was ist national und was nationalistisch?
5. Beispiele des Missbrauches des nationalen Bewusstseins der Völker durch den Kapitalismus?
6. Was ist Faschismus?
7. Was ist Materialismus?
8. Die Gesetze der Dialektik?
9. Welche Bedeutung hat der dialektische Materialismus für die Wissenschaft!
10. Was ist historischer Materialismus!
11. Was ist Mehrwert?
12. Was ist Kapital?
13. Wie erfolgt die Ausbeutung im Kapitalismus?
14. Was ist Kapitalismus?
15. Welche Gesellschaftsformen gibt es?
16. Was ist Imperialismus? Was ist roter Imperialismus?
17. Entstehung der Wirtschaftskrisen!
18. Was ist Sozialismus? Was ist Sozialisierung?
19. Was ist Kommunismus?
20. Gesetze der Produktion!
21. Begründer des wissenschaftlichen Sozialismus!
22. Geburtsurkunde der Arbeiterbewegung?
23. Ziele der nationalen Front?
24. Grundsätze der sowjetischen Aussenpolitik?
25. Grundsätze der USA, Aussenpolitik?
26. Die Volkskongressbewegung?
27. Welche Aufgaben hat der Volksrat?
28. Die demokratische Schulreform?
29. Die Handelsorganisationen?
30. Hauptaufgaben des Zweijahresplanes!
31. Was ist der Staat?
32. Was ist reale und formale Demokratie! Beispiele?

(Questions continued on next page)

33. Welche Staatsform wird Deutschland haben?
34. Was ist unter antifaschistisch demokratischer Ordnung zu verstehen?
35. Welche Folgen hat die Bodenreform in der sowjetischen Besatzungszone!
36. Warum ist der Vatikan gegen die Bodenreform?
37. Ist die Religionsfreiheit in den demokratischen Ländern gewährleistet?
38. Welche Staatsform hat die SU?
39. Was bedeuten die Sowjets?
40. Was ist Volksdemokratie?
41. Welche Diktaturformen gibt es?
42. Wesen des Opportunismus?
43. Ist die nationale Politik eine fortschrittliche Politik?
44. Was versteht man unter einer Nation?
45. Welche Arten von Sozialismus gibt es? Erklärung!
46. Wie erfolgt der Übergang v.d. kapit. zur gesellsch. Ordnung?
47. Drei geschichtliche Epochen der Arbeiterbewegung?
48. Politische Parteien der Ostzone und Massenorganisationen?
49. Ziele der Blockpolitik?
50. Aufgaben der Gewerkschaften?
51. Der Weltgewerkschaftsbund?
52. FDJ? Ziele der und Erfolge?
53. Was heisst Diktatur des Proletariats?
54. Die soziale Planwirtschaft in der SU?
55. Bedeutung des Ruhrgebietes für Deutschlands?
56. Welche Bedeutung haben die Ereignisse in China für uns?
57. Der Atlantikpakt?
58. Bedeutung der Stahlwerke in der Ostzone?
59. Was lehrt uns der erste Haushaltsplan in der Ostzone?
60. Was ist Freiheit?
61. Gibt es eine freie Wissenschaft?
62. Stellung der Intelligenz im demokratischen Neuaufbau!
63. Volksrichter?
64. Volkskontrolle?
65. Die Stellung der Frau in der Gesellschaft?
66. Ergebnisse des Weltfriedenskongresses in Paris?
67. Marshallplan?
68. Übereinkommen v. Jalta?

(Questions continued on next page)

69. Potsdamer Konferenz?
70. Warschauer Beschlüsse?
71. Wie beurteilen Sie das Ruhrstatut, Oder-Neisse-Grenze, Abtrennung der Rhein-Ruhrgebiete!
72. Aussenhandel Deutschlands?
73. Wirtschaftsplanung und Planwirtschaft?
74. DWK?
75. Wie beurteilen Sie die Bonner Verfassung?
76. Die Verfassung der deutschen demokratischen Republik?
77. Welche Stellung nimmt die SU im Lager des Freidens ein? Warum?
78. Welchen Zweck dient die Antisowjethetze der Westmächte?
79. Welche Bedeutung hat die Arbeitsproduktivität für den Plan?
80. Was ist Arbeitsproduktivität?
81. Welchen Einfluss haben die Abschreibungen auf den Rentabilität eines VEB?
82. Welche Rolle spielt der Zirkulationsmittelumlauf in VEB.
83. Preispolitik in der Ostzone?
84. Leistungslohn und progressiver Leistungslohn?
85. Wesen der Bilanzmethode in der Planwirtschaft?
86. Bedeutung technisch begründeter Arbeitsnormen!
87. Refa und VEB?
88. Bedeutung der Wettbewerbe in der sozialistischen Wirtschaft!
89. Aktivistenbewegung?
90. Rolle des gesellschaftlichen Bewusstseins?
91. Wie kann ich die Arbeitsproduktivität erhöhen?
92. Der kapitalistische Sektor in der Ostzonenwirtschaft?
93. Entwicklung und Organisation der VEB?
94. Bedeutung und Wesen der VEB?
95. Bedeutung der MAG?
96. Bedeutung der Oktoberrevolution!
97. Oekonomische Ursachen des ersten und zweiten Weltkrieges?
98. Ergebnisse des zweiten imperialistischen Weltkrieges?
99. Kennzeichen des deutschen Imperialismus?
100. Leninismus?