

Karl-Heinz Füssl

Tinkering Toward Utopia: American Social Sciences, European Émigrés and United States Policy Toward Germany (1942–45)

Following the rise of European totalitarian movements in the twentieth century several scholarly covenants originating in the United States sought in varying intensity and breadth to explain these developments.¹ Central to the following inquiry are the discussions and contributions of the “Council for Intercultural Relations” (CIR) which from 1942 through 1945 submitted suggestions developed by scholars for a cultural policy toward Germany. The CIR was affiliated with New York’s Columbia University. In particular, my ongoing research will answer the following questions: (1) what role social science based knowledge played in political actions and perspectives; (2) what influence basic political convictions had on the course of theory processing; (3) whether the experience of flight, expulsion, and migration generated a genuine scholarly profile; (4) what practical consequences a policy legitimated by scholars achieved, and (5) which mental and institutional processes became reality or were brought to fruition.

Anthropology and Politics

In 1946, State Department Assistant Secretary William Benton, then in charge of the cultural policy of the American Military Government in Germany, wrote to the anthropologist Margaret Mead: “Your part in the war-time information program in foreign countries created the foundations for a peace-time program.”²

The United States entry in the Second World War assumed a significant place in Margaret Mead’s biography. Apart from her full-time job as a curator of the American Museum of Natural History, she decided to offer her collected anthropological knowledge and experience to the good services of American warfare. In times of war, confessed Mead, social scientists have

several options. They could remain in an ivory tower, do something patriotic or use their accumulated knowledge and elaborated scientific methodology to the best of one person's ability to win the war:

We must analyze the social organization of Prussia and Japan, especially, and attempt scientifically to strike out those elements which produce the convinced fascist . . . and with equal vigor we must set about developing within the culture of our enemies those tendencies which will enable them to use well the freedom which they have never had. If we fail in either job, if we let those fascist tendencies flourish at home we have disarmed abroad, we, of course, win nothing . . . And if we fail to make every effort to cure all the curables in the other culture, then it is clear that what we glossed over as hospitalization was really after all only a prison designed to punish, not to cure.³

An important building block in Mead's way of thinking was based on anthropological similarities and regularities in societies which originate in connection with political racism. Mead took the view that each socialization theory is necessarily racist in itself when it is constituted on the basis of cultural characteristics and simultaneously maintains an early and constant determination of the future life cycle. Furthermore, Mead represented the point of view that human development only coincides with democratic ethics if postulated as a life-long learning process by encouraging changes in human behavior. She also refrained from theoretical approaches that claimed the exclusive relevance and irreversibility of cultural experiences in early childhood. Within the contemporary controversy between the protagonists supporting supremacy of predisposition (nature) or environmental development (nurture), Mead undoubtedly belonged to the followers of the latter. She told her readers the optimistic message that among the diverse ethnic groups an improvement of human relations through transcultural and intergenerational understanding will be reached, symbolizing a key function for social progress.⁴

A Social Scientist's Anti-Hitler Alliance

In 1940, at a meeting of the American Association of Anthropology" (AAA) Mead founded the Council on Intercultural Relations (CIR). In subsequent informal meetings she emphasized the value and virtue of the newly established social sciences for future research. "Its members realized that the older sciences of history, political science and economics needed to be supplemented by the newer disciplines of anthropology, sociology, psychology, and psychiatry."⁵ Mead recognized scholarly meaningful results in the social sciences predominantly by their application in society. Through the collaboration in

the newly founded CIR, Mead advanced an intensified exchange of experiences between the American social scientists Clyde Kluckhohn, Rhoda Metraux, Philip Mosely, Gardner Murphy, Edward Y. Hartshorne, David Riesman, Talcott Parsons, Geoffrey Gorer, Gregory Bateson and the Hitler refugees Erik H. Erikson, Kurt Lewin, Elsa Frenkel-Brunswik, Marie Jahoda, Erich Fromm, Erich Kahler, Martha Wolfenstein, and Richard Brickner. In their basic orientation, these discussions were heavily influenced by Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytical theories, because they promised to explain the irrationality associated with the rise of totalitarian movements. Mead's prominent status in the American academia permitted direct access to Eleanor Roosevelt who facilitated connections with influential political circles. In 1942, Mead, in cooperation with Bateson, Lewin, Erikson, Fromm, Brickner, Mosely, Kahler, and Hartshorne, presented a preliminary memorandum about German character structure, whereby Mead served as a mentor for the German studies and Ruth Benedict dissected Japanese cultural phenomena.⁶

The memorandum created ample space for a detailed analysis of the National Socialist film "Hitlerjunge Quex," conveyed by British anthropologist Gregory Bateson.⁷ The propaganda movie described the political socialization and tragic death of a male adolescent in the quarrel between Communists and Nazis. With Hitler's personal blessings, the film had its première in 1933 in Berlin. Bateson's tentative efforts to apply anthropological techniques for the analysis of a propaganda film resulted in the categorization of time perspectives, political groups, interactions, sexuality, the family dream, and death. In his analysis, Bateson realized that in a way of orgasmic rebellion a permanent status change is performed which destroys the traditional family unit. These status changes parallel multiple symbolic extinguishing of lives, where the newly created persona finally finds its reincarnation and redemption in a realm lasting a thousand years. Quex walks from the living world to the kingdom of reincarnated heroes. The "Rites de passage" proceed in the same age cohorts as initiation ceremonies which fatefully seal the loss of the old status and characterize National Socialism as a phantasmagorical, infinite, and restless parade. Bateson predicted an audience behavior pattern that identifies reality from the angle of adolescents and stimulates for observers a nostalgic desire for innocent childhood. In his conclusion, Bateson accused National Socialism of considering the individual person as a mechanical object who is exposed to the extreme dualism of authority and temptation. Since the film did not explicitly mention the analyzed categories, Bateson assumed an emotionalized reception dynamic that sets its action potential free as soon as the attention is called for. Prospective Nazi converts learned in the media performance to organize their view on ideology, environment and behavior in an entirely new way.

Additional inquiries on Nazi indoctrination focused on the age group of kindergarten children where the sharp contrast between the authoritarian father role within and the servile status outside the core family pointed out the perception of a threefold mother role: Firstly, as a advocate for the child when the father is absent. Secondly, within the parthenogenetically reproduced passage to new alliances, the mother sacrifices her child for the returning father. Finally, the mother suffers under her opportunistic behavior when she carefully devotes herself to the child again. Erik Erikson developed his "suffering mothers" concept out of a psychoanalytical interpretation of Hitler's Opus *Mein Kampf* and raised the further leading question about the meaning of adolescence in German culture.⁸ According to Erikson, the difference between paternal role and maternal child alliance results in a crisis during the adolescent life cycle and is exercised either in open rebellion, cynical contempt, flight from home or humiliation and finally backbone-breaking submissiveness. The undemocratic German tradition advances this basic cultural pattern because of the distorted authority of the father role, subsequently symbolized in rigidly practiced pedagogical methods that represented fears about the loss of social status and supply mentalities instead of ethics based on visions of liberty. Even the German Youth Movement of the turn of the century with its mystic-romantic overstatement of nature, culture, genius, nation and race excluded parental welfare. The dichotomy between individual rebellion and surrender to societal reality leads to political immaturity and favors the takeover of nihilist attitudes. Once established, generational conflict rejects traditional authorities and recognizes paternal substitutes in a *Führer* culture.

Erikson unmasked the ideology of *Lebensraum* and revealed its true nature by constructing a strategic intersection of psychology and history. The German Reich, geographically positioned in the center of the European great powers, suggested that its population remained tied to an imagination of spatial encirclement. Under the circumstances of interior inner strife alien influences reinforced the pathogenically over-determined inner conflict of ethnic plurality. Hitler promised the solution of the outer menace and interior conflicts in racist homogeneity and superior Aryan world rule. Hitler's imagery of unbroken adolescence symbolized the regaining of a lost imagined self through restless and unscrupulous activism. Erikson attributed to adolescent rebellion the function of inner emancipation of the sons. Their whole generation experienced the same rituals. For the young, there existed the myths of Hitler, who never sacrificed his will to his father and whose ascetic habitus embodied not only the antipode of the bad, insane, impure and forever sponging Jew, but also assumed the right to annihilate the enemy. The now synthetic national character presented the soldier as a hero who

violates obsolete natural frontiers and substitutes for the old aristocratic caste thinking an allegedly responsible people's community (*Volksgemeinschaft*). Technological innovations bestow on the warrior those insignia which enable him to fight the *Blitzkrieg*. In his psychoanalytical interpretation, Erikson concluded that the acceptance of the atavistic connoted pathological adolescence reflected the imagery of an entire nation. The greatest danger lay in the influence on the younger generation that represses adolescence conflict in hypnotic action und substitutes blind obedience for an independent mind. As an antithesis to Hitler, Erikson suggested the strengthening of the institution of the family as well as the role of women and placed in the foreground the meaning of *Heimat*, of local and regional traditions as a grassroots policy. In his further considerations for a post-war order, Erikson recommended an elaborated program for education and leisure to counteract the indoctrinated youth and the building and construction of a political and economically unified Europe under a social order of culturally autonomous regions. Finally, Erikson recommended future research efforts of a sophisticated psychology: "It will be one of the functions of psychology to recognize in human motivation those archaic and infantile residues which in national crises become subject to misuse by demagogic adventurers."⁹

A different point of departure occupied Kurt Lewin, who assigned to an experimental cultural anthropology the task of investigating distinctions between modern cultures.¹⁰ Within the transformation from a war to a peace culture, the change of values implied the emphasis of humane ideals to secure for members of the society an education for maturity, indicating the freeing, unfolding, and growing of what has been latent, potential or suspended. Lewin wove together democratic objectives with all other cultural segments, particularly in their habitual customs of education, processes of public checks and balances, group statuses, and status differences. Democratic cultural change ranged under the premise of attacking every form of intolerance. The general granting of individual freedoms would result in chaos. To produce a value change of a whole nation means establishing a cultural atmosphere permeating every part of life. Regarding Germany, Lewin mentioned especially the central problem of the leader and fellow traveler relationship that existed even prior to National Socialism and created a type of submissive behavior instead of principles of loyalty. Methodically, with an authoritarian, a *laisse-faire* and a democratic leadership, Lewin accentuated three different social climate types. He assigned enormous relevance to a system of practical experiential learning through visual examination, conception, model, and idea. In his theory, Lewin admonished an unconditional avoidance of propaganda. As a substitute, individual persons should be addressed in their capacity as group members in society. He subdivided the German population

in the age cohorts of forty or more years with experiences from the Weimar era, the indoctrinated twenty to thirty year age group, and adolescents and children. In spite of indoctrination, Lewin recognized in both groups above the age of twenty still sufficient potential for the application of a democratic leadership model by addressing the individual in his social interactions. He assigned special importance to the transformation of fellow traveler attitudes, a comprehensive distribution of power relations to every part of society and a change in democratic leadership in all social segments. These new leadership styles and techniques, applied as training on the job, would produce enough modification without carrying the stigma of pedagogical instruction. "Such training on the job of leaders and trainers of leaders might well reach into every aspect of community leadership. It might help to set in action a process of self-re-education."¹¹

Members of the CIR and its successor organization called Institute on Intercultural Relations, established in 1944 at Columbia University, were substantially funded by the Office of Naval Research. They discussed numerous additional topics, like Richard Brickner's thesis about German paranoia.¹² The think-tank's scientific discourses received massive publicity through Brickner's book, *Is Germany Incurable?* (1943), which was strongly supported by Margaret Mead. One can confidently assume Mead's intention to use the book as a medium to generate a strong public interest for post-war policies toward Germany. She returned early drafts of Brickner's book with remarks for rewriting chapters for a wider readership. Moreover, Mead asked Yale University psychologist Geoffrey Gorer not only to integrate stylistic refinements, but to upgrade Brickner's manuscript for an interdisciplinary undertaking involving psychiatry and cultural anthropology.¹³

Brickner, a neurologist, subdivided his book in three parts. In an introductory chapter, the paranoid patient and the nature of contemporary modern psychiatry are presented. The second part analyzes the complex nature of the German problem with the instruments of psychiatry by setting the German people's character in analogy to Brickner's ill and feeble-minded patients. The internalized passion for drill, discipline and order, together with the neurotic fear for encirclement by enemies, establishes a paranoid culture. German paranoia is enriched by the experience of being exposed over generations to authoritarian thinking and military rituals. The Brickner study's third part deals with the intention to find a solution through therapeutic treatment. He indicates that within the recovery process a completely different cultural atmosphere must be created where rational thinking can unfold and the convalescent German is placed in an entirely new environment. Further details of therapeutic treatment, organization and administration remained the domain of participating experts.¹⁴ Brickner also seized the opportunity

to conduct several anamneses with German prisoners of war. They did not, however, construct additional knowledge about the patients' psychological conditions.¹⁵

United States Policy Toward Germany

The predictable German surrender in Europe paralleled and increased political plans for the shape of Germany's future. Several conferences acknowledged mounting awareness of the issue. The final conference in New York in April 1945 demonstrated that the social scientific analysis of National Socialist Germany had enough substance to present a valid argument. The conference was called together by the Joint Committee on Post-War Planning. Prior to the conference, five secret sessions took place in April, May, and June 1944, attended by members of the State Department and the Departments of Navy and War.¹⁶ Alongside Mead, Parsons, Brickner and Gardner Murphy, the 28 person circle of participants primarily consisted of psychiatrists, psychologists, psychoanalysts and neurologists. The submitted proposal unmasked National Socialism as an expression of longer smoldering deformations, resulting in distorted ideals and value judgments under which the majority of Germans suffers. The proposal rated the deficient character qualities not as an inherited, but as a socialized product. The cultural basis of the German people's character was explained by authoritarian status thinking that exists in the dichotomized co-existence of superior and inferior position attributions. This role pattern is reproduced in the family where the mother sacrifices her care taking devotion to the child for the returning father who outside the family demonstrates submissive sentiments and an obedient outlook. On the basis of authoritarian traditions, the longing for superiority determines the ultimate power instinct that manifests itself in romantic and sentimental feelings as a reaction to existing rigidly fixed hierarchies. The effects of this dualism are paranoid deficiencies of the personality by striving for national prestige and hegemony and indulging in extreme militarism. German delusions culminate in racism and anti-Semitism and potentialize the deletion of images of the enemy. As a result, collaboration and actions of checks and balances are alien to the German character. The proposal suggested the direction of all military, political and economic post-war planning toward the fundamental reorientation of German behavior.

At the beginning of the conference the shape of Germany's economic future was held in equilibrium between re-industrialization and an agrarian state. In the end the plain effect, use and valuation of industrial production came to fruition due to the intervention of Germany expert and sociologist Talcott Parsons. By the end of 1944, Treasury Secretary Henry J. Morgenthau vetoed the State Department's ongoing planning process and demanded the

conversion of Germany to an agrarian state. In opposition to this policy, Parsons argued for his concept of controlled institutional change, which he linked with the argument of gradual internalization of cultural norm systems and concrete social objects as an underlying pattern of a socialization theory.¹⁷

Parsons classified internalization as a structural component of the personality system. The parallel appearance in the social system proposes the institutionalization processes which constitute special social relations through components of a normative culture. These components establish immediate structural parts of the social system respectively. Moreover, either concept only preserves a meaning if one imagines the primary subsystems of a general action system as mutually penetrating and interdependent. Thereby specific elements of the cultural system are components of certain social and personality processes at the same time. The entire central conception rests upon the formation of an abstract character of the referred part- or subsystems. Society as a social system is not a unity but a means to arrange certain relations between action components that differ from each other according to the variety of existing reality.¹⁸

Parsons presented in several memos the view that an agricultural transformation would do more harm than good to Germany and discussed the classification of regressive, permissive, and direct social control types. He characterized the German people's character as captured in the dualism between romanticizing, sentimental-idealistic and order-emphasizing, hierarchically structured materialistic components. If these elements could be separated and the second component newly composed, then the aggressive tendency could be eradicated. As far as the economic occupational system was concerned, status ascription by individualistic achievement stood out as permissive control against a regression on traditional patrimonial-agricultural principles. Consequently, industrialization together with the option of full employment was the maximum target to lead Germany again into the community of peaceful nations. The third category of direct control should reduce the political expression of sentimental escapism and anti-Semitism and outlaw former racist ideologies. Controlled institutional change included the punishment of war criminals, the loss of squire (Junker) privileges, and the abolition of the military caste including National Socialism.

Even the social scientific analyses differentiated between short- and long-term strategies after the war. Subsequently, political planning demanded complete military defeat, unconditional surrender and the entire military disarmament of Germany as the short term goal.¹⁹ These measures were meant to symbolize the end of the Third Reich and National Socialist government. National sovereignty could only be re-achieved after the recruitment of responsible personnel and the establishment of effective institutions. A

consequent de-Nazification should not distinguish on the surface between responsible leaders, war criminals, and fellow travelers but mark out in vertical depth a collective punishment frame for part of the overall population. Obstinate members of the society who obstruct the aims of a new beginning were to be interned, liable to forced labor or to be quartered in re-education barracks. The anticipated reconstruction programs would be placed under the supervision of military government but handed over to German authorities as soon as possible by emphasizing the grassroots task of the role of women, family, local traditions, and the organization of a modern youth education according to the latest scientific knowledge. The length of this purging time period was not fixed. It should depend on the readiness of German collaboration.

In a long-term perspective, the conference participants agreed on universal principles which should advance the re-orientation process and produce cooperative and peaceful situations in Germany. These new fundamentals for institutional, social and political transformations were assigned as genuine German reconstruction goals clearly separating democratic developments from ideological distortions. The conceptualized strategy appealed for an integration of personnel able to recognize, to understand and to instill democratic values in the society. The executive administration would develop from a paramilitary education to a civil and democratically oriented police system. The de-Nazified public service and education system were to be constructed along decentralized grass-roots lines with newly fashioned hierarchies. Liberal education principles revealed the fostering of international understanding, independent thinking and social learning. Teacher training should be advanced to the level of higher education and modified to increase female participation under allied authority. Schools should develop community centers including greater parental involvement. They should promote extracurricular subjects as well as advanced education courses for adults. New family policies were to be strengthened for the task to fight authoritarian structures. Blind obedience, subordinate and inferior attitudes were contrasted by state granted civil rights and plebiscitary participation models. The government had the duty to guarantee the construction of independent mass media. Industrial production differentiated itself according to individual and functional achievements in order to break the monopoly of traditional functional elites. The creation of a balanced economy incorporated the use of industrial and agricultural resources in harmony with other European countries. Foreign experts involved in the reconstruction should be properly trained and educated. Altogether, the planning promised to unmask the ideology of master race, to replace the power driven instincts by a consensual maxim and to eradicate the aggressive humane-hostile race concept of superior and inferior taxonomies by ethically motivated social relationships and interactions.

Even since September 1943, preliminary discussions existed in the American State Department to counter the German situation.²⁰ There was a widespread conviction to encourage democratic principles by fundamental changes in chauvinistic German attitudes. In April 1944, War Department officials addressed the Department of State for cultural policy directives. The actual impulse came from Archibald MacLeish, a multiple Pulitzer price winner and Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs and Cultural Relations. On his initiative, the United States State Department decided in March 1945 to entrust the issue of German democratization to a special advisory council which instigated its work on 12 May 1945. Even at the Yalta conference, the allies had agreed along with the division and unconditional surrender of the German Reich the elimination of National Socialism, the punishment of war criminals, the de-militarization and deletion of the armament industry, and the eventual reconstruction of political life on a democratic basis. Deliberations about the long-term democratization of Germany included the participation of Eduard C. Lindeman of New York's School of Social Work at Columbia University, Martin McGuire from the Catholic University in Washington DC, Reinhold Niebuhr of Union Theological Seminary in New York, John Milton Potter, President of Hobart College, and official representatives from the State and War Departments as well as the Office of War Information. A session following the initial negotiations expanded the advisory council's membership with Frank Graham, President of the University of North Carolina and George N. Shuster, President of New York's Hunter College, which validated the American directives for a cultural policy towards Germany. A short time later the policy guidelines were accepted by Deputy Secretary John J. McCloy and General Hilldring from the War Department.

In 1945, the State Department created a re-education policy which advanced democratic principles in order to fundamentally change chauvinistic attitudes.²¹ Its impact for the short-term occupation period meant the extermination of National Socialism and militarism. The Germans should inevitably recognize that they lost the war and were responsible for the crimes committed during the Nazi era. The aspired transformation of the social structure was justified by the necessity to allow a democratic change. A basic aim was the participation and self-determination in a pluralistically constituted, peace-securing democracy. The policy guidelines earmarked Germany for the reintegration of itself in the long run within the community of peace loving, cooperative, international law-abiding nations. Universally effective human rights and the principles of dignity, justice and freedom, equality before the law, the compliance with moral norms, freedom of thought and speech, tolerance and responsibility toward the state defined the nomenclature of future learning objectives. The task and responsibility for the realization of the

policy guidelines should be carried over to the Germans as soon as possible: New projects and programs should be advanced on a democratic basis by incorporating, encouraging and supporting trustworthy Germans. Initiatives for reforms in education and society stood on the top of the agenda. In a second step, international cultural relations should be re-established. Already in November 1945, Secretary of State Byrnes approved the "Long-Range Policy Statement for German Re-Education" (SWNCC 296/5). The policy directive came into operation on 21 August 1946. Its full cultural impact of the directive became clear at the end of the occupation period when thousands of mostly younger exchangees traveled for sojourns up to one year across the Atlantic Ocean.²² In the new environment the visitors would not only experience American democracy and way of life but predominantly serve as multipliers who disseminate new knowledge in the professions and upon return would initiate reforms in society and instigate a change in political culture. The corpus of visitors consisted of numerous social workers, teachers, educators, scientists, state officials and members of public services, students, journalists and rank and file politicians.

Hitler Refugees and the Challenge of Scholarship

Accountings of loss and gain take a static concept of science and culture for granted by suggesting that émigré scientists and scholars brought completed pieces of knowledge with them into exile and inserted them as contributions into existing cultures. Such an approach may be useful as a reminder of how destructive the Nazis were to German-speaking culture and scholarship, but it overlooks the central question whether of how such forced career breaks might have led to new opportunities and significant innovations that might not have happened otherwise. Established research on émigré scholars after 1933 reveals that they did not simply transfer already finished knowledge from one place to another but rather developed new approaches and frequently turned to new topics as they interacted with new colleagues and changed sociocultural and research environments.²³ These examples support a dynamic view of both the scholarly world and of cultures as fundamentally open systems. At the level of scholarly careers, the large university and research system of the United States which remains relatively decentralized and therefore richer in possibilities for scholarly work, offered émigrés, especially in the social sciences, chances that they might never have had in Europe which in the following consideration will be illustrated in the case studies of Kurt Lewin and Erik H. Erikson.

After a Cornell grant where he worked on children's eating habits, Kurt Lewin obtained in 1935 a new grant that sent him to the Child Welfare Research Station at the University of Iowa.²⁴ Soon he received a tenured

appointment which from 1939 until 1944 rose to the rank of full professor. In Iowa, Lewin took up the problems of minorities and the topic of cultural differences in education. From these considerations came the famous studies of democratic and authoritarian leadership styles in children's play groups. Before 1933, the preferred social unit in Lewin's experiments had been dyad groups, consisting of two interacting people. It was only in Iowa that he began to experiment with larger groups as units. In 1935 Lewin came to the conclusion that education in the United States, despite the hierarchical social structure of the classroom situation, was democratic in the sense that it oriented toward adaptation to life in a racially and ethnically heterogeneous society grounded on liberal principles. From this optimistic conviction, he fostered an ambitious program in the late 1930s that he called "action research", to be conducted not in laboratories but in real life situations such as factories or communities.

As in the case of Lewin, the United States played a key role for Erik H. Erikson. For him the American heritage was a different and more glorious one.²⁵ Erikson thought that America had made an exceptional effort not to be ideological. The United States as a nation represented for Erikson the most notable example of an attempt to forge a new, broader identity out of the fragments of European identities. His standard of value, which he believed to be evolving in history, is that of universalism. From 1934 to 1935 he was at the Harvard Medical School and for the next three years at Yale. In the year of Freud's death and the outbreak of the Second World War, he moved once more, this time to the University of California at Berkeley where he spent the decisive decade of his life. Erikson's move to the San Francisco Bay and not to the Los Angeles area, where so many German speaking émigrés were to congregate, gave him a feel for American life that he might never have acquired if he had stayed in the East.

Erikson entered Freud's circle in 1927. In later years Erikson considered himself delinquent for not continuing to practice the new nonmedical profession of child analysis for which he had been trained by Anna Freud. Sigmund Freud preferred to think of psychoanalysis as a theory and technique relatively independent of the practitioner. Erikson has written of the application of the psychoanalytic instrument as a historical tool. Psychoanalysis is supposedly a system of thought that verifies observations. In his behavioristic turn, Erikson has sought in Freud what can be empirically verified and of value today. His optimism may have been encouraged by his emigration to America and the heightened perspective it gave him on the role played by social variables in personality development. The impact of his own removal from European culture was further magnified by his willingness to expand his clinical awareness through anthropological field work and to study and compare American

tribes. Erikson has noted the influence of his own early work of the political and social climate of New Deal America which was an anti-totalitarian and antiracist impression, especially in the eyes of a recent immigrant. People like him could not forget the menace of Hitler. Erikson has concentrated on describing the integrative relationship between the individual and his society. More importantly, in speculating how American family life can be said to train its children for democracy, Erikson used his psychology for the sake of buttressing political ideology. Erikson has consistently tried to examine, on a cross-cultural basis, the way societies provide what individuals need as youths. It was Erikson's conviction that societies must offer young people this kind of way station, a span of time after they have ceased being children but before their deeds and works count towards a future identity. He called this suspended period a psychosocial moratorium. Erikson's own career has demonstrated that psychoanalysis cannot survive as a medical specialty, but needs the infusion of interdisciplinary contributions. Perhaps the most valuable lesson was the incorporation of past knowledge into an individual vision of human existence. It was a vision he shared with his American counterparts in the Council on Intercultural Relations.

Technische Universität Berlin
Berlin, Germany

Notes

¹ Boris Schilmar, *Der Europadiskurs im deutschen Exil 1933–1945* (München: Oldenbourg, 2004); Ursula Langkau-Alex and Thomas M. Ruprecht, eds., *Was soll aus Deutschland werden? Der Council for a Democratic Germany in New York 1944–1945* (Frankfurt a. M., New York: Campus, 1995); Claus Dieter Krohn, *Wissenschaft im Exil. Deutsche Sozial- und Wirtschaftswissenschaftler in den USA und die New School for Social Research* (Frankfurt/New York: Campus, 1987); Volkmar Zühlsdorf, *Deutsche Akademie im Exil: Der Vergessene Widerstand* (Berlin: Ernst Martin Verlag, 1999); Volkmar Zühlsdorf, *Hitler's Exiles: The German Cultural Resistance in America and Europe*, translated by Martin H. Bott with foreword by Klaus-Dieter Lehmann (London and New York: Continuum, 2004); Joachim Radkau, *Die deutsche Emigration in den USA: Ihr Einfluß auf die amerikanische Europa-Politik 1933–1945* (Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1971).

² Library of Congress, Washington DC: Special Manuscript Division, Papers of Margaret Mead (in the following abbreviated under the acronym MM): C 15: William Benton, State Department, to Margaret Mead, 26 February 1946.

³ Margaret Mead, *And Keep Your Powder Dry: An Anthropologist Looks at America* (New York: William Morrow & Co., Fifth Printing 1975), 245ff.

⁴ Margaret Mead, "The Study of Culture at a Distance. Part I: Introduction," in Margaret Mead and Rhoda Métraux, eds., *The Study of Culture at a Distance*, with an introduction by William O. Beeman (New York: Berghahn Books, 2000), 331–50 (originally Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), 3–50.

⁵ Margaret Mead, *Blackberry Winter: My Earlier Years* (New York: William Morrow, 1972), 189.

⁶Ruth Benedict, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1946).

⁷MM: O 6: An Analysis of the Nazi Film *Hitlerjunge Quex* by Gregory P. Bateson, Museum of Modern Art Film Library, Spring 1943; Gregory Bateson, "An Analysis of the Nazi Film *Hitlerjunge Quex*," in Margaret Mead and Rhoda Métraux, eds., *The Study of Culture at a Distance* with an introduction by William O. Beeman (New York: Berghahn Books, 2000), 331–50 (originally published by University of Chicago Press, 1953); David Lipset, *Gregory Bateson: The Legacy of a Scientist* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1980).

⁸Erik H. Erikson, "Hitler's Imagery and German Youth," in *Psychiatry: Journal of the Biology and Pathology of Interpersonal Relations* 5 (November 1942): 475–93. Reprinted in the ground breaking monograph Erik H. Erikson, *Childhood and Society* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1950). The book appeared in ten more printings until 1963.

⁹Erikson, *Hitler's Imagery and German Youth*, 493.

¹⁰Kurt Lewin, "Cultural Reconstruction" (1943) in Kurt Lewin, *Resolving Social Conflicts: Selected Papers on Group Dynamics* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948); Kurt Lewin, "The Special Case of Germany" in *Public Opinion Quarterly* (Winter 1943): 555–66. Both essays are reprinted in Walter Stahl, ed., *Education for Democracy in West Germany. Achievements-Shortcomings-Prospets*, with an introduction by Norbert Muhlen (New York: Published for Atlantic-Bruecke by Frederick A. Praeger, 1961).

¹¹Kurt Lewin, *The Special Case of Germany*, 566.

¹²MM: M 29: Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson, "Preliminary Memo on Problems of German Character Structure" (undated, 1942) in collaboration with Kurt Lewin, Erik Erikson, Erich Fromm, Richard Brickner, Philip Mosely, Erich Kahler, and Edward Y. Hartshorne.

¹³MM: M 29: Correspondence Margaret Mead and Geoffrey Gorer, Yale University, 25 November 1941; 18 November 1941; Correspondence Margaret Mead and Richard M. Brickner, 10 September 1941, 30 August 1941.

¹⁴Richard M. Brickner, *Is Germany Incurable?* (Philadelphia, PA: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1943). The book was unanimously criticized in the reviews by Sigrid Undset, Horace M. Kallen, Gregory Zilboorg, Bertrand Russell and Erich Fromm, in "What Shall We Do With Germany? A Panel Discussion of *Is Germany Incurable?*" in *The Saturday Review of Literature* 26, no. 22 (29 May 1943): 4–8.

¹⁵Gregory P. Wegner and Karl-H. Füssl, "Wissenschaft als säkularer Kreuzzug: Thomas V. Smith und die deutschen Kriegsgefangenen in den USA (1944–1946)," in Jürgen Heideking, Marc Depaepe and Jurgen Herbst, eds., *Mutual Influences on Education: Germany and the United States in the Twentieth Century* (Gent: Paedagogica Historica 1997), 157–82.

¹⁶MM: M 29: A Summary of the First Three Conferences on Germany After the War, April 29–30, May 6 and 20–21. Prepared for the Use of Members at the Final Conference on 3–4 June 1944; Report of a Conference on Germany After the War.

¹⁷MM: M 29: Talcott Parsons: Conference of Germany After the War. Statement on Topic I; Talcott Parsons, "The Problem of Controlled Institutional Change (1945)," in Talcott Parsons, *Essays in Sociological Theory* (New York: The Free Press 1954), 238–74; Uta Gerhardt, "The Medical Meaning of Reeducation for Germany: Contemporary Interpretation of Cultural and Institutional Change," in Jürgen Heideking, Marc Depaepe and Jurgen Herbst, eds., *Mutual Influences on Education: Germany and the United States in the Twentieth Century* (Gent: Paedagogica Historica 1997), 135–55; *Talcott Parsons on National Socialism*, ed. Uta Gerhardt (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter 1993); partially reflected in Jeffrey K. Olick, *In the House of the Hangman: The Agonies of German Defeat, 1943–1949* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

¹⁸Talcott Parsons, "Die Entstehung der Theorie des sozialen Systems: Ein Bericht zur Person," in Talcott Parsons, Edward Shils and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, *Soziologie—autobiographisch:*

Tinkering Toward Utopia

Drei kritische Berichte zur Entwicklung einer Wissenschaft, introduction by Heinz Hartmann (Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1975), 1–68.

¹⁹MM: M 29: A Summary of the First Three Conferences on Germany After the War, April 29–30, May 6 and 20–21. Prepared for the Use of Members at the Final Conference on 3–4 June 1944; Report of a Conference on Germany After the War.

²⁰James F. Tent, *Mission on the Rhine: Re-education and Denazification in American-Occupied Germany* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1982); Howard W. Johnston, "United States Public Affairs Activities in Germany, 1945–1955," Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1956; Hermann Josef Rupieper, *Die Wurzeln der westdeutschen Nachkriegsdemokratie: Der amerikanische Beitrag 1945–1952* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag 1993); Jeffrey M. Diefendorf, Axel Frohn and Hermann-Josef Rupieper, eds., *American Policy and the Reconstruction of West Germany, 1945–1955* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Karl-H. Füssl, *Die Umerziehung der Deutschen: Jugend und Schule unter den Siegermächten des Zweiten Weltkriegs* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1994, 1995).

²¹Karl-H. Füssl, "Restauration und Neubeginn: Gesellschaftliche, kulturelle und reformpädagogische Ziele der amerikanischen 'Re-education'-Politik nach 1945," in *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte, Beilage zur Wochenzeitung Das Parlament* (B 6/97, 31. Januar 1997), 3–14.

²²Karl-H. Füssl, *Deutsch-amerikanischer Kulturaustausch im 20. Jahrhundert: Bildung-Wissenschaft-Politik* (Frankfurt a. M. and New York: Campus, 2004).

²³Henry Stuart Hughes, *The Sea Change: The Migration of Social Thought, 1930–1965* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1977).

²⁴Alfred J. Marrow, *The Practical Theorist: The Life and Work of Kurt Lewin* (New York: Basic Books, 1969); German translation *Kurt Lewin: Leben und Werk*, aus dem Amerikanischen von Hainer Kober (Weinheim und Basel: Beltz Verlag, 2002); Mitchell Ash, "Emigré Psychologists after 1933: The Cultural Coding of Scientific and Professional Practices," in Mitchell Ash and Alfons Söllner, eds., *Forced Migration and Scientific Change: Émigré German-Speaking Scientists and Scholars after 1933* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 117–38.

²⁵Robert Coles, *Erik H. Erikson: The Growth of His Work* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1970); Paul Roazen, *Erik H. Erikson: The Power and Limits of a Vision* (New York: The Free Press, 1976); Lawrence J. Friedman, *Identity's Architect: A Biography of Erik H. Erikson* (New York: Scribner, 1999).

